1	CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD CENTRAL COAST REGION
2	895 Aerovista Place, Suite 101 San Luis Obispo, California 93401-7906
3	(805) 549-3174
4 5 6	CONDITIONAL WAIVER OF WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS FOR ORDER NO. R3-2011-0006 DISCHARGES FROM IRRIGATED LANDS
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	TRANSCRIPTS OF PROCEEDINGS
13	THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 2011
14	WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	ATKINSON-BAKED INC
22	ATKINSON-BAKER, INC. COURT REPORTERS
23	www.depo.com (800) 288-3376
24	REPORTED BY: Tonia L. Webb, CSR No. 4588
25	FILE NO.: A5018B3

		1	
CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTRO	OL BOARD	1	March 17, 2011 8:15 A.M.
2 CENTRAL COAST REGION		2	PROCEEDINGS
3 895 Aerovista Place, Suite 101		3	
San Luis Obispo, California 93401-7906 4 (805) 549-3174			CHAIR YOUNG: Good morning, everybody. I'm Jeff
5		4	Young, chair of the Central Coast Regional Water Quality
CONDITIONAL WAIVER OF WASTE		5	Control Board. I'd like to welcome everybody to
6 DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS FOR ORDER NO. R3	-2011-0006	6	Watsonville for our St. Patrick's Day board meeting on
DISCHARGES FROM IRRIGATED LANDS		7	March 17th, 2011.
7/		8	Take roll call this morning?
9 Transcript of Proceedings, taken at City		9	
Council Chambers, 275 Main Street, Fourth Floor,		-	MR. BRIGGS: Yes. Dr. Jean-Pierre Wolff?
10 Watsonville, California, commencing at 8:15 a.m.,		10	DR. WOLFF: Present.
Thursday, March 17, 2011, before Tonia L. Webb, CSR	No.	11	MR. BRIGGS: Russ Jeffries?
11 <b>4588.</b> 12		12	MR. JEFFRIES: Russ Jeffries present.
13		13	MR. BRIGGS: Dr. Monica Hunter?
14		14	DR. HUNTER: Present.
15 APPEARANCES:			
16 CENTRAL COAST WATER BOARD MEMBERS:		15	MR. BRIGGS: David Hodgin?
17 JEFFREY S. YOUNG, CHAIR, Santa Barbara RUSSELL M. JEFFRIES, VICE-CHAIR, Salinas		16	MR. HODGIN: Present.
18 JOHN HAYASHI, Arroyo Grande		17	MR. BRIGGS: John Hayashi?
DAVID T. HODGIN, Scotts Valley		18	He announced yesterday, he's recusing himself.
19 MONICA S. HUNTER, Los Osos		19	CHAIR YOUNG: Introductions?
JEAN-PIERRE WOLFF, San Luis Obispo		20	MR. BRIGGS: Introductions. To my left is
21 REGIONAL BOARD LEAD STAFF PERSONNEL:		21	-
22 ROGER W. BRIGGS, Executive Officer			Frances McChesney, our counsel from the State Water
MICHAEL THOMAS, Assistant Executive Officer/Ombuds	man	22	Regional Control Board. And also from the State Board,
FRANCES McCHESNEY, Senior Staff Counsel		23	seated in the front row is Frances Weber, the liaison,
ANGELA SCHROETER, Senior Engineering Geologist LISA HOROWITZ McCANN, Environmental Program Mar	ager	24	State Board member.
25	lagei	25	Seated next to her on her right is John Muller
	Page 2		Page 4
1 INDEX PAGE		1	from the our neighbor to the north, the San Francisco
2 INTRODUCTIONS 4		2	Bay Regional Board, board member, currently chair.
3 OPENING COMMENTS, CHAIR YOUNG	8	3	CHAIR YOUNG: Region two?
4 REGIONAL BOARD STAFF PRESENTATION	11	4	MR. BRIGGS: Region two. San Francisco Bay
5 FARM BUREAU PRESENTATION	156	5	
6 STRAWBERRY COMMISSION PRESENTATION	238		Area Water.
7 MONTEREY COASTKEEPER PRESENTATION	269	6	And also in the front is Michael Thomas, our
8 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE COALITION FOR	203	7	assistant executive officer. We have other staff that
WATER PRESENTATION 289	n	8	we'll be introducing as we get into today's item;
9	9	9	however, we would like to recognize Harvey Packard and
	OD.	10	John Robertson in the back of the room there.
CENTRAL COAST WATER ALLIANCE UNITED FO		11	
10 A SUSTAINABLE ECONOMY PRESENTATION	299		Harvey, do you have a testimony card?
SANTA BARBARA CHANNELKEEPER PRESENTA	TION 307	12	MR. PACKARD: I have a stack back here, yes.
12 PUBLIC COMMENTS 329		13	MR. BRIGGS: Harvey has a stack of testimony
13		14	cards that look like this, so if you're interested in
14		15	addressing the board today we just have one item on
15		16	the agenda today, so that would be pretty clear, but
16		17	unless you submit a card, then we won't know to call your
17		18	
18			name.
19		19	And we have
20		20	CHAIR YOUNG: And as to the cards, we want them
21		21	submitted by 12:00 noon so that when we do get to public
22		22	comments in the afternoon, I'm going to divide up the
		23	time accordingly so that everyone gets the same amount of
23			
24		24	time so that I can budget the time based on how many
25		25	cards we have got.
	Page 3		Page 5

1 The fewer the cards, the more time each 1 requirements for discharges from irrigated lands, draft 2 individual speaker will have; the more cards we have, I'm 2 order number R3-2011-0006. 3 just going to reduce time so that everybody gets an 3 MR. BRIGGS: Yeah. You should read that first. 4 4 CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. This is the time and place opportunity to address the board. 5 So if you would, please have those submitted by 5 for a public hearing to consider adoption of a waiver of 6 6 waste discharge requirements for discharges of waste from 12:00 noon. I would appreciate it. 7 7 MR. BRIGGS: So additional introductions. This irrigated lands. 8 8 morning we have Madeline Rios and Frank Parcello here. This hearing is being held before a panel of 9 9 Here's Frank and Madeline's in the booth. And they're members of the Central Coast Regional Water Quality 10 10 here as translators and they'll be making an announcement Control Board. 11 11 in Spanish. I am Jeff Young, chair of the regional board. 12 You can do that now, if you'd like. 12 Also serving on the panel are Russell Jeffries, to my 13 13 Thank you very much. right, and Monica Hunter and David Hodgin, to my left. 14 14 Also from the State Board, the office of public For your information, board members John 15 affairs, we have Dave Clayburn, who is right over here, 15 Hayashi and Dr. Jean-Pierre Wolff have a conflict and may 16 and George Cazurco -- I don't know if I said that 16 not participate in this matter as board member in 17 17 correctly. There's George right there. accordance with state law. 18 And if there are any reporters, any folks from 18 The official record of the testimony at this 19 the media that are interested in getting information, 19 hearing will be created by our court reporter. We are 20 20 there might be information earlier, then you can, at the also using a tape recorder and video tape recording 21 end of the meeting today -- they would be your first 21 today, but the recordings will not be the official record 22 resource in terms of getting some information, so they're 22 of the hearing. 23 23 to assist us today. At the end of this hearing today, I will close the record in this matter and this panel will discuss and 24 24 And that's it for now. 25 CHAIR YOUNG: Folks, part of the reason for 25 arrive at a proposed recommended decision. This panel Page 6 1 dealing with the speaker cards before noon and allowing 1 will make a recommendation that will be presented to the 2 me time to figure out how much each speaker's going to 2 regional board at a future meeting, when the board has a 3 get is, if we have -- that we have to be out of this room 3 quorum that can act on this matter. 4 4 by 5:30, so I want to allocate time fairly, and the only You will be notified of the date and location 5 way to do that is for me to know how many people want to 5 of that hearing. At that time, the full board may adopt, 6 address the board that are not part of a group already 6 reject or modify the recommendation of this panel. 7 7 allocated time early on in this proceeding. Absent extraordinary circumstances, you will not have 8 8 Most of you haven't met, I don't believe, Dr. another opportunity to provide argument or evidence to 9 9 Jean-Pierre Wolff. And he is our newest board member. the full board. 10 And Dr. Wolff is not going to be participating in this 10 Thus, you are encouraged to present today all 11 matter. 11 the evidence that you would like this panel or the full 12 If you want to say a word or two about that? 12 board to consider. If anyone in the audience wishes to 13 DR. WOLFF: Yes. I'm an agriculturist, one of 13 address the panel today, please promptly fill out a 14 my professions, and part of my property is a irrigated 14 speaker card and hand it to the clerk. 15 vineyard, so I will recuse myself from today's 15 To allow time for board panel deliberation, I 16 discussions. 16 will limit the time for speakers, if necessary. I have 17 17 CHAIR YOUNG: You're welcome to be in the allowed extra time to those persons who have requested 18 audience, you're welcome to join us in the audience. 18 extra time in advance, as set forth in the public notice 19 DR. WOLFF: Thank you. 19 for this item. CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Ready to proceed? 20 20 The rest of the public will have up to three 21 MR. BRIGGS: We are. 21 minutes, but it may be less, depending on the number of 22 22 CHAIR YOUNG: Item number 14. speakers. 23 23 MR. BRIGGS: Right. If you wish to speak, please submit a speaker 24 CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Staff recommendation for an 24 card that are available at the back of the room. I will 25 25 updated conditional waiver of waste discharge accept speaker cards until noon. Page 7

Page 9

Page 11

Following the lunch break, I will announce the account of time I will be able to allocate to public speakers. Please summarize your comments and avoid repetition. The board members have fully reviewed the written submittals and will consider all comments.

The hearing will proceed as follows:

Regional board staff will go first, followed by elected officials. They'll have three minutes each. The

Farm Bureau Panel will have 55 minutes.
California Strawberry Commission will have 15 minutes.
Coast Keeper will have 24 minutes. Environmental Justice
Coalition for Water, 12 minutes. Coastal Alliance, 8
minutes. Channel Keeper, 12 minutes. Central Coast
Alliance for Sustainable Economy, 8 minutes.

And then we'll have public comments and we'll see whether we have few enough people that everyone would have three minutes or am I going to have to cut that back down. I won't know at this point.

Closing statement of the Farm Bureau, 5 minutes.

After the conclusion of testimony and comments, staff will be provided an opportunity to summarize and make a recommendation. A timer will be used. To allow for the orderly conduct of the hearing, I request that you end your comments when your time is complete.

Page 10

who's helping us out down here in the City of Watsonville - the city has waived their parking fee for today so -- now we tell you.

I was -- I was hoping there was a little sign on the machine down there, but maybe not.

Anyway, that's -- thank you for making your donation to the City of Watsonville.

And -- let's see. That's it for logistics.

9 So as Chair Young said, this item that we have 10 today -- and, by the way, we had the rest of our -- our 11 board meeting with our items yesterday afternoon so that 12 we could devote the day today, as much time is necessary, 13 to this one item, very important item.

So, like I said, make sure you get your testimony cards in. And, as the Chair said, we'll cut those off at noon. So, again, if you could help out with that. If people come in and sit next to you, you might mention that to them, in case they get by without getting a testimony card.

This -- this item for updating this order for irrigated ag is a process that we actually started about two and a half years ago. And in trying to formulate a process for that, we sent out our first letter on it in December of '08, I think it was. That's two and a half years ago.

Page 12

We will begin with staff's presentation.

Mr. Briggs.

MR. BRIGGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Those -- those times that Chair Young just listed add up to about two hours and twenty minutes, I believe. And with the staff presentation, that -- and even without interruption of those times for Board questions and answers -- that will take us pretty close to noon.

So it looks like our individual speakers will be in the afternoon.

And I want to make a couple other announcements, since we're getting a pretty good-sized crowd here. For those folks that are standing in the back, there are a lot of seats available. I see seats here and seats over here. So, unless you want to stand, there are seats available.

And if we do get filled up, and if folks don't want to stand in the back, we have a room next door, and I understand there's audio available over there.

So in -- and, actually, if you folks and staff could help out if we do get people coming in, obviously after this announcement, if you could let them know that that's available, we'd appreciate that.

Also, the City of Watsonville, whose facility we're using today -- and I should have introduced Irwin,

And so I won't -- I won't go through the whole process. Actually, Lisa McCann is going to talk about the process that we've used, a little bit, in the presentation.

But I just want to point out this has been a very lengthy process. The board itself has had two large formal workshops; one in the north, one in the south; an additional workshop at the regular board meeting in February, and a huge amount of comments and a lot of changes in the -- in the orders as we've gone along in terms of what we have a draft today.

But we'll be getting into the details of that. But today -- today's meeting is consistent with the schedule that we discussed late last year, in terms of how we would roll this out. And that was discussed in the board meetings with the board and with the public.

And so we're on track in terms of what we said we would be doing with consideration today of the kind of -- the fly in the ointment is that we don't have a quorum today. So today's meeting is being held as a panel hearing of the board. And then, once we have a full board with a quorum, the recommendations of the panel would go to the full board.

The new board member or members would review the record, in order to be able to vote on the -- on the Page 13

item.

This -- this issue is unique, really, in terms of the typical items that we deal with. And it's unique in terms of the -- the number of parties; although we do have programs that have actually thousands of parties, whether it's the underground tanks program, storm water program.

But it's -- it's unique in terms of the water quality issues, groundwater, as well -- as well as many aspects of surface water, and the variation and the practices that are involved with agriculture, with the different climates, soil crops and -- and all those sorts of variables.

So it is kind of unique, in terms of the scope that we have to deal with; both in terms of what's happening on the ground and then the -- what -- what's appropriate in terms of regulatory framework.

Because of that, the broadness of the issue, we have several staff here today because we -- over this two and a half years, we've had several staff who have dealt with various aspects of this very broad issue, and have different levels of expertise. And so we decided it would be a good idea for those staff to join us today and, if necessary, to provide more detailed answers to questions, and they will be available.

Page 14

water program, focusing on hydro modification and the riparian protection issues. And he's available for questions about the cost information that we developed.

Jill North is seated next to Dominic, environmental scientist. And she is here on the riparian and aquatic habitat protection issues.

Shanta Keeling, over on the end, water resource control engineer in our total maximum daily load, or TMDL, unit. And she worked on the CEQA, California Environmental Quality Act documents.

And then, additionally, Hector Hernandez is in the back of the room; Corinne Huckaby -- there's Corinne - Steve Saiz, in the back there helping out with information management and other logistics.

Also both Hector -- Hector Hernandez and Harvey Packard can assist Spanish-speaking members of the public. And I haven't verified this, but I understand our translators will also be available to assist at the podium, if that's necessary.

So for our presentation today, in terms of staff presentation, Michael Thomas is going to be providing the opening remarks.

And do we -- we have a -- oh, we do have something on the screen. That's good. We were having a little trouble getting that going.

Page 16

So those -- those staff are -- I already -- I already mentioned Harvey Packard. He's supervising water resource control engineer and our enforcement coordinator.

Karen Worcester is our environmental scientist, who manages our ambient monitoring program and CCAMP, Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program. Of course, we've -- we've relied a lot on CCAMP data and then -- and then subsequent and concurrent cooperative monitoring program data for our water quality information for this program. Karen's right there.

Matt Keeling is a water resource control engineer in our permitting unit. He's been working on groundwater quality, monitoring and recording. That's right there.

Dean Thomas has worked in our groundwater cleanup program. And he's here about groundwater quality and recording. He's right there.

Monica Barricarte -- you're hiding behind Karen - water resource control engineer, works in our agricultural regulatory program. So she works in the -- in the program full time. And she's worked on nitrate load reduction, irrigation and nutrient management.

Dominic Roques -- is Dominic here? There's

Dominic -- is engineering geologist, works in our storm

Michael is a -- an engineer with the board, who has worked for the board since 1985, and has worked in both surface and groundwater issues, including issues having to do with agricultural impacts, notably in the Elkhorn Slough watershed area. And he's going to be starting off.

Lisa McCann is actually third up. But Lisa is our -- she's seated next to Michael -- she's our environmental program manager and manages our watershed protection and planning section. And that section includes storm water, riparian and wetlands protection, regional monitoring assessment and planning. And she's been working with the board -- our board -- since 1995.

She worked in the Morro Bay watershed and in the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary agriculture and rural lands plan programs. She's also worked on many erosion control, irrigation and nutrient management -- best management practices.

She became our region's non-point source program manager, and led the development of many total maximum daily load plans.

These programs and activities involve working with agriculturists to improve water quality information management practices, to reduce pollution loading and to establish more accountable regulatory options.

Page 17

And, lately, she's been co-managing the development of this order with Angela Schroeter. So Angela is seated next to her. She's a senior engineering geologist. She manages our agricultural regulatory program within Lisa's section.

She came to the board in 2006 from -- from -- with the State Board, and has managed the grants program over at the TMDL program. She worked for ten years at the State Board, where she developed and managed the groundwater ambient monitoring assessment program, or GAMA. And worked in several groundwater regulatory programs.

And, like I said, we're going to be starting off with Michael Thomas, who's going to provide the opening remarks and the overview. That'll be followed by Angela with a -- a brief summary of the order and what it entails.

Lisa's going to cover public comments and responses. And then Michael will provide our preliminary conclusion, at this point. Michael Thomas.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Roger.

Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the board.

One of the things that has come up over and over again in the past two and a half years that we've

Page 18

because of that.

So for context, I wanted to talk to the board about relative degree of regulation. What are we actually talking about here compared to other programs? And I think you've seen this graph before. We've -- we've showed it to the board before. So I just wanted to remind you of this.

As far as relative degree of regulation, timber harvesting is one of the least regulated programs that we -- that we have, as far as degree of regulation or comprehensiveness of the regulations, and -- and it's decreasing. The -- that arrow indicates -- indicates that our direction, as far as oversight of timber harvesting, has been decreasing over the past several years.

Urban storm water is more comprehensive, in terms of our oversight and regulations, and that has been increasing over the past several years, as you know, because the board has spent so much time on it.

Municipal waste water is one of the most highly regulated activities that this board oversees. Drinking water pollution cases are also heavily regulated. For obvious reasons, they present a major threat to public health.

Landfills are also heavily regulated; though,

Page 20

been working on this project is this concept of fairness.

And what fairness means depends on who you're talking to. Some people believe that fairness is recognizing that every individual is unique and that everyone should be treated as a unique individual. Other people say that fairness is treating everyone the same.

It also depends on who you are. If you're a farmer struggling to make a living today in this environment of increasing regulations from multiple agencies like ours, or if you are a fisherman who's -- like this photograph here -- someone who's fishing in Oso Flago Lake, that lake is now posted because of the contamination in fish tissue due to pesticides, or if you're a person who's relying on groundwater as a drinking water source, and that water is contaminated, picture can look very different.

So we have a lot of stakeholders involved in this process with very divergent views; much more so than on many of our other projects -- most of our other projects -- and much more so than the -- when the board adopted the 2004 conditional waiver.

And that is by design. We have tried to bring as many stakeholders into this process as possible. But in -- in doing that, we obviously raise this issue of fairness and we -- more controversy comes to the surface  $\begin{array}{c} \text{Page} & 19 \end{array}$ 

in comparison, the 2004 conditional waiver is at the low end of the scale. When you compare the requirements or the conditions in the 2004 conditional waiver to all of the board's other programs, it is one of the least comprehensive or the least burdensome of our regulations.

And we also have to look at the relative degree of water quality impacts from these different activities. Timber harvesting is very low because of the way it's done in our region. In other regions there are major impacts -- environmental impacts -- due to timber harvesting. But here it's relatively low because of the type of timber harvesting that is done. It's very selective.

Landfills represent a medium threat to water quality today because of the regulation that the board has imposed. For instance, all landfills have to be designed, they have to have adequate caps, they have to have adequate lining.

Municipal waste water also has a medium degree of water quality impact compared to other programs; again, because of the degree of regulation. There are some serious issues associated with municipal waste water, like contaminants -- emerging contaminants of concern, such as, endocrine disrupters.

Urban storm water presents a relatively high
Page 21

threat to water quality. We're seeing whole watershed impacts or potential impacts from urban storm water, and that is why we are increasing our regulation and oversight.

Drinking water pollution cases, even though they're heavily regulated, they still represent a major quality impact and human health threat.

Irrigated agriculture on this scale is at the top of the scale. The water quality impacts due to irrigated agriculture are the most serious and severe impacts that we deal with as an agency.

The question now is:

Where does the 2011 draft order fall into place here on that top scale?

It falls into place here. Tier -- as you know, the order has three tiers, and each tier has a different degree of regulation.

Tier 1 is the least, Tier 2 is in the middle,
Tier 3 is the highest. Tier 1 is slightly less than the
2004 conditional waiver. Tier 2 is similar to the 2004
waiver, but has some additional requirements. And we're
going to be talking about those, and those are highly
controversial.

Tier 3 has more significant requirements because those dischargers represent the greatest threat

Page 22

It also concluded that drinking water is considered the highest beneficial use of water. That sound familiar. That's -- our agency agrees with that, and that's one of our highest priorities.

Nitrate removal from drinking water supplies is costly, and we agree. That's documented in our staff report and in the order. And the State maintains a non-degradation policy.

If additional wells go out of production, the nitrate situation will become critical. And it is anticipated that additional regulations will be imposed. They also concluded that specific actions are needed to mitigate existing problems, and to reduce the potential future problem.

And the situation will merit a dedicated effort and special attention by the leadership in the county and around the state. If it is ignored, it will not go away.

Back in 1988 we recognized -- and other agencies recognized -- the significance of this pollution problem.

And I think that first quote is one of the most important, where they're saying that nitrate poses a substantial threat to the industry itself. And I think the industry is aware of that, and has become much more aware of that over the past few years.

Page 24

and greatest impact to water quality.

So it's important to realize where that 2011 order is. I imagine if you're on the receiving end of it, it does not seem like you're at the lower end of this scale, it seems like you're at the other -- the upper end of this scale. But compared to our --

(Interruption)

MR. THOMAS: Because of the microphone or because of their talking? Okay.

Okay. So that's the context. And I want to talk a little bit about some of the water quality problems we have in our region.

We do have some of the most severe pollution in the United States, here on the Central Coast. And this - the -- the information and the realization of this pollution is not new.

A report was published in 1988 by the Monterey County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. It's called Nitrates in Groundwater, Salinas, California. And it concludes some significant -- or has some significant conclusions.

One is that nitrate contamination poses a substantial threat to this industry. The re -- report talked, at length, about nitrate contamination in groundwater. And these are quotes from this report.

Fast forward over 20 years, this is the condition that we have today in the lower Salinas Valley with respect to public water supply wells.

Pie chart -- I'm sorry, you can't see the -- the red very well on this screen that the -- that the public is looking at. But it shows that 23 percent of the wells in the lower Salinas Valley are contaminated with nitrates and another 37 percent are affected by nitrates.

The -- the -- the 37 percent that's in yellow here, concentration of nitrate is just below the drinking water standard, and it is increasing. This underestimates the actual threat to drinking water supplies because these wells tend to be deeper wells; they're not the domestic wells that are in shallow water.

In the Santa Maria area, we have the same situation. Twenty-seven percent of the water supply wells are contaminated with nitrate.

And, by the way, this water has to be treated before it's provided to the public, and is treated. So from these wells people are not drinking contaminated water. That water has to be treated or blended.

Forty percent of the wells are just below the drinking water standard, and those concentrations are rising.

Page 25

Many of these wells that you see in red here on both these maps -- on the Salinas map and the Santa Maria map -- have been abandoned, and they've had to drill new wells to deal with this nitrate problem. As I said, the -- those -- that data underestimates the problem.

Domestic wells pull from shallow water. And we have over 44,000 domestic wells on the Central Coast. Many of these domestic wells are in irrigated ag areas, where we have these high concentrations of nitrate in groundwater. We don't know how many people are currently drinking contaminated water from these wells.

But this is our highest priority -- staff's highest priority, and something that we are taking action on right now. I think you heard a little bit about this yesterday. Some of the actions that we're taking are identifying the high-risk areas -- we actually have identified the high-risk areas.

We are currently identifying homeowners in those areas, so that we can send notices to them about the threat to water quality and options that they have for dealing with it, including treating -- getting treatment for their own water and sampling for their own water.

We're also developing a well testing program to help the homeowners get their water tested so they know

Page 26

users.

Now I'm going to switch to surface water, talk about that -- the conditions of surface water briefly. This is a map of the Monterey area. You see the Elkhorn Slough, Castroville and Salinas, Salinas River and the reclamation dis -- ditch.

In the old Salinas River area is here, we have some of the highest concentrations of nitrate in surface water for any river of lagoon system known in the literature, and they're increasing. They've been increasing for the past several decades, have been increasing over the past decade.

The Elkhorn Slough area is heavily impacted by nitrates and nutrification and cascading biological impacts that occur there because of nutrients coming into the -- into the slough.

There's a report published in 1996 by the Elkhorn Slough Foundation and the Elkhorn Slough Estuary and Research Reserve, and their conclusion was that in 1996 that there has been a significant increase in nitrate concentration since the '70s, and they have extraordinarily high nitrate concentrations in the lower Salinas River, which may be the highest recorded in scientific literature for a river or estuary.

And, as I mentioned, these concentrations are

Page 28

what the quality is.

We're also pursuing alternative water cases; meaning, we're -- in areas where we know there are high levels of contamination in shallow groundwater, where people are using that water, we're looking at the sources; and, in the future, we'll be bringing cases to the board, where we'll be recommending that the responsible parties provide alternative water to the homeowners. As the board has done in other drinking water contamination cases.

The human health impacts due to nitrate are serious. You've heard about blue baby syndrome before, that's well documented.

There's also growing evidence of other risks, including cancer, thyroid inhibitions, Parkinson's, diabetes and endocrine system disruption.

The costs are astronomical, in terms of treating nitrates. Water purveyors -- we've met with water purveyors, and they've talked to us about the costs that they are having to deal with are in the millions of dollars for small communities.

And the water purveyors are routinely going to the Public Utilities Commission, and asking for rate increases to deal with the treatment or the need to drill new wells. So they have to pass the cost on to the  $\begin{array}{c} \text{Page} & 27 \end{array}$ 

still increasing. There are multiple organizations monitoring this area. This data is from the Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute, and it shows increasing concentrations from 2004 to 2011.

That data is very similar to the water board's own data, which we collect through the Central Coast Ambient Monitoring Program.

This is the Salinas River showing nitrate concentrations increasing over time. This is the Old Salinas River. The red line is the drinking water standard of 10, and you can see the -- the concentrations are over 60, or five times the drinking water standard.

They're also 50 times the aquatic index standard of 1 milligram per liter. And we see biological impacts, where the concentrations in surface waters exceed 1 milligram per liter. So these are 60 times that amount. And it's the same situation in multiple places around our region.

This is Quail Creek. You can see concentrations -- surface water concentrations of up to a hundred milligrams per liter, 10 times the drinking water standard.

Natividad Creek also up almost a hundred milligrams per liter

Blanco Drain, over a hundred and 50 milligrams
Page 29

per liter in some cases.

Santa Maria River -- moving down south -- we also see very high concentrations in the Santa Maria River estuary; again, around a hundred milligrams per liter.

Orcutt Creek, upstream of Santa Maria River, very high concentrations, some -- up to a hundred milligrams, actually exceeding it in one case. We have very, very high concentrations of nitrates in irrigated ag areas around our region.

In addition -- this is again moving down south -- Oso Flaco Lake, we have the highest tissue concentration of dieldrin and DDT in the United States, several times higher than the average concentration elsewhere in the United States.

We posted that lake for health warnings, so that people that are fishing there are aware of that.

We have more recent data that -- I do not have the actual numbers here for you, but there's more recent data showing that we also have problems with currently used pesticides in fish tissue in the -- in Oso Flaco Lake.

We also have ongoing sedimentation and fish tissue contamination in other parts of the state and toxicity problems due to pesticides.

Page 30

The dark red areas are the most intensely impacted for the list of parameters that you see there; nitrates, ortho-phosphates, dissolved oxygen turbidity, nitrates, et cetera.

So it's much more than a toxicity problem. We have an overall biological degradation problem. And the most severely degraded areas coincide with our irrigated agricultural areas.

This is why we need to renew the 2004 order. We need to address these water quality problems, and we need to demonstrate tangible improvements in these areas in the amount of pollution being discharged and in the concentrations in the receiving waters overall.

While reviewing the 2004 conditional waiver, the very first finding of the order is this:

The intent of this conditional waiver is to regulate discharges from irrigated lands to ensure that such discharges are not causing or contributing to exceedences of any regional, state or federal numeric water quality standard.

That's not new. That's the first finding in the 2004 order. So the concept of having to comply with water quality standards is not new. This is also in the 2011 proposed order that's in front of you.

Finding 16 of the 2004 conditional waiver said

Page 32

2010 state report on toxicity in California waters shows that the Central Coast streams have the highest percentage of toxic sites statewide. Fifty-six percent of our sites are toxic, 22 percent are highly toxic. Highly toxic just means much more toxic than average.

And the reason why we have this toxicity -- one of the reasons why is that - the amount of chemicals that are used in our region.

It is obviously one of the most productive agricultural regions in the world, and that requires these chemicals -- that yield requires these chemicals.

A DPR study showed the -- DPR is the Department of Pesticide Regulation. Their statewide study showed that the Salinas River area had the highest percent of study sites with pyrethroid detections, the highest percentage of sites exceeding toxic levels, and the highest rate of active ingredients applied, 113 pounds per acre, which is three times as much, as compared to other areas in the state.

We have serious problems with toxicity, but we also have overall water quality problems with surface waters. This -- this is the -- an image from our CCAMP site from the -- from the water board's data, which you can find on-line.

this:

Although time will be allowed, increased reporting and monitoring may be required in order to ensure that water quality is improving, as what we are doing with the 2011 proposed order.

Now I'm going to build on the 2004 order. And this is one of the things that people said to us repeatedly. The board said this to us and many of the stakeholders said to us, is that we should be building on the 2004 order, not simply abandoning it. And we agree.

So here is a list of the content of the 2004 order, in terms of its conditions and its findings. I already mentioned the 2004 order requires that dischargers meet water quality standards.

They also had to file a notice of intent, which is an intent to enroll in the 2004 order, and it describes their farming operation.

Dischargers needed to develop a farm plan, and that farm plan had to have several elements:

An irrigation management element, a pesticide management element, a nutrient management element, an eroding management element, all had to be included in the farm plan, that is the definition of the farm plan in the 2004 conditional waiver.

Farm plan also had to include schedules to

Page 33

Page 34

implement those management practices. It also included a requirement or a condition to submit a management practice checklist, which was a form submitted to the water board which checked off the management practices that were being implemented at each farm.

It also included a requirement for surface water monitoring, and a requirement for education.

Now I'm going to add a few things to this list, and they'll be in yellow, the yellow text below:

Groundwater requirements, backflow prevention
-- which means modifying a well so that pollution cannot travel back down into the well and contaminate groundwater and annual compliance information that must be submitted on-line; not submitted to the -- not submitted to the board like this, but submitted to the board on-line via a form that growers would fill out.

And I'll show you that in a few minutes.

Now if you look at the top of this list, it says 2004 conditional waiver. I'm going to change the title. So watch the title. Don't blink or you'll miss it. I'm going to change it.

This is now Tier 2 of the 2011 order. This is the order that's in front of you today. This is Tier 2. It builds on the 2004 waiver, and we've added some requirements.

92,000 acres, which represents 21 -- 21 percent of the overall acreage. Tier 2 includes about 1200 growers, about 25 percent of the acreage. Tier 3 is about a hundred growers, represents 54 percent of the acreage at about 233,000 acres.

This is an illustration of the documentation -the hard copy documentation that growers will have to
submit to the water board. There aren't any. They will
submit no hard copy documents to us. All the information
submitted to the board will be on-line in the forms that
I'll be showing you.

One of the comments that we've had is that growers would have to produce documents like this by the hundreds or thousands and sub -- submit them to the board, and its staff would have to review all of them.

Not the case. There will be no hard copies submitted to the board. Information will be submitted on-line into a database. And we'll be managing the database, which is how we manage programs with many, many growers. We can't do it in this form.

It has to be done in a -- it has to be done in a 22 a database form.

What is the annual compliance form? It is very similar to the notice of intent -- the on-line notice of intent that we developed several months ago that the vast

Page 36

Notice that the management check -- the management practice checklist is crossed out. That's no

longer part of the order because growers will be submitting information on-line.

Specific information and specific fields at -- with -- they'll be answering specific questions about their actions to implement management practices and the effectiveness of the practices.

So if this is Tier 2, what is Tier 3? Tier 3 is Tier 2 plus some additional conditions and requirements. Tier -- Tier 3 includes a water quality buffer plan for some dischargers; individual monitoring, which means they have to monitor their runoff; an irrigation and nutrient management plan that is more comprehensive than the requirements for Tier 2; and time schedules.

And we'll be talking about each of these in more detail in a few minutes. Lisa and Angela will be talking about these.

And what is Tier 1? Tier 1 is Tier 2 minus the annual compliance info. Growers in Tier 1 do not submit information to the board on-line in this form that I'll be talking about, which we think is -- is a significant reduction in burden from Tier 2.

Tier 1 has approximately 500 growers and about Page 35

majority of growers have now filled out. They went online, filled out the information and we now have that database.

We will modify that notice of intent, depending on what the board adopts. If the board adopts the order that is in front of it today, we will modify this form according to the current order -- the draft order. If you change the order, we'll modify it according to the changes that you make.

But what we will do is add fields with specific questions, and the growers will answer those questions and submit the information under penalty of perjury.

Here's an example of some of things that growers will submit to us, the kind of information they will submit, on this form on-line. All -- I'm not going to read all of these to you.

You can see that the -- just the type of information that they will submit. So all Tier 2 and Tier 3 dischargers must submit information like the date of the completed farm plan, the type and characteristics of their discharge or discharges, identify direct agriculture discharges to a waterbody, et cetera. So they will be submitting information on having done these things.

A subset of Tier 2 and Tier 3 will do photo

Page 37

1 monitoring, and submit that on-line. They will also 1 Program. 2 submit information on the total nitrogen applied at their 2 And Dave provides a lot of help in developing 3 operations. 3 that program, maintaining that program. 4 4 And thanks for assisting, Dave, as always. A subset of Tier 3 will, in addition to the 5 5 Seated next to him is Chris Rose, of our staff, items above, submit proof of a certified irrigation 6 6 who is our program manager for -- and section leader -nutrient management plan and elements, and a water 7 7 quality buffer plan. unit leader for total maximum daily loads, TMDLs. Sorry 8 8 All of that information will be submitted I missed you the first time. 9 9 on-line in a form like this. We'll have pull-down menus And then another thing I missed is that we had 10 10 so it'll be direct and straightforward. You'll answer supplemental sheets that we provided for this item. So 11 11 specific questions, and answer the information in those are materials that went out after the agenda itself 12 response to those questions. 12 was prepared. I'll just mention what those are. 13 13 And, as I mentioned, it -- the form will be the There's one that's dated March 4th, that's a --14 14 very same type of form as the notice of intent, which a summary of comments and responses. And then it 15 we've already developed, and the vast majority of growers 15 references Appendix E, which was on -- on our web site. 16 16 have already used. And it has more detail on the comments and responses. 17 17 That also included Appendix D, which was the CHAIR YOUNG: Question for you, Michael, before 18 you switch screens. Are you proposing to have any 18 options considered. And then the last part of that same 19 explanatory material that is connected to the compliance 19 March 4th supplemental sheet had a few corrections that 20 20 form? Like an example of how to estimate acres just we noted that need to be made to the draft order. 21 21 discharging to ditches or any other type of --And then March 9th a separate supplemental 22 22 MR. THOMAS: Yes. sheet is a memo from Harvey Packard regarding enforcement 23 23 CHAIR YOUNG: -- surface discharge? perspective. 24 MR. THOMAS: Yes. For example --24 So just wanted to mention that those were part 25 25 CHAIR YOUNG: For example. of our -- our record of materials today. Page 38 Page 40 1 MR. THOMAS: -- there will be a question and 1 So Angela Schroeter is up next. 2 then for example. 2 MS. SCHROETER: Good morning. My name is 3 CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. 3 Angela Schroeter, and I'm a senior engineering geologist 4 MR. THOMAS: This is the type of information 4 and program manager of the agricultural regulatory 5 5 that the grower would provide. program. 6 CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. 6 As Michael mentioned, I'm going to provide you 7 7 MR. THOMAS: Yep. with additional background on staff's recommended draft 8 8 Now I'm going to hand it over to Angela agricultural order. In my presentation, I will discuss 9 9 Schroeter, and she's going to go into more detail about the tiers in the draft order, the tiering criteria, and 10 some elements of the order that's in front of you today. 10 summarize key word conditions. 11 MR. BRIGGS: Before Angela starts -- or while 11 I will also provide you with an example of how 12 you're switching programs there, couple other things. 12 the draft order considers a variety of information and 13 Anyway, there are more people standing in the 13 factors to focus on the most important details to best 14 back now. So I see about nine empty seats down here on 14 protect water quality, while taking into account water 15 this side, and I see a couple over here. Maybe you could 15 quality priorities, local conditions and the 16 raise your hand if you have an empty seat next to you, 16 characteristics of individual farming operations. 17 please. 17 This is an image of the Central Coast Region --There are quite -- there are probably a dozen 18 18 oops -- sorry. Oop -- what am I doing here? 19 19 This is an image of the Central Coast Region. seats available, if you'd like to sit down. And then, 20 for those of you coming in later, if we do run out of 20 There's approximately 435,000 acres of irrigated 21 21 seats, there's -- there's room next door. agriculture. And currently approximately 1700 farming 22 22 I missed a couple of staff that I should've operations are enrolled in the current agricultural 23 23 introduced. Dave Paredes (phonetic) is seated next to order. 24 24 Karen Worster, there. As I mentioned, Karen's our CCAMP A farming operation can have multiple 25 25 program manager, Central Coast Ambient Monitoring individual farms. The 1700 farming operations enrolled

Page 39

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in the current agricultural order -- oops -- are represented by more than 3,000 individual farms, which are shown here as green dots.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Each individual farm has very site-specific characteristics that affect the level of waste discharge and threat to water quality. For example, each individual farm has a different size, setting and location.

In addition, each farm grows different crops, uses different types and amounts of fertilizers and pesticides, employs different types of irrigation, and implements different management practices.

The challenge is how to consider these multiple factors, which are unique to individual farms and best -best protect water quality.

As with any other water board program or general order, the draft order simplifies this complex situation by focusing on the most important details.

Early board feedback and public input indicated that individual farming operations are unique; that the requirements should not be one-size-fits-all; and that staff should consider a tiered approach in the draft order.

The draft order has three tiers. The tiers are based on level of waste discharge and threat to water

Page 42

nitrate-loading risk, then the operation must be less than a thousand acres, and not within a thousand feet of a polluted public well.

Alternatively, a vineyard could qualify for Tier 1 if the operation is certified as sustainable in practice. The reason why staff characterizes sustainable in practice certified vineyards as low threat is because a SIP certification requires and verifies implementation of specific management practices that protect water quality.

For example, the SIP certification requires a 12 25-foot buffer along streams and creeks.

13 Tier 2 operations represent a moderate threat 14 to water quality, and the criteria include:

The operation uses chlorpyrifos or diazinon; the operation is located within a thousand feet of a surface water pot -- waterbody impaired for toxicity, pesticides, nutrients, sediment or turbidity; operations that grow crops that have high nitrate-loading risk within a thousand feet of an impacted public well, but are less than a thousand acres.

Tier 3 op -- operations represent an increased risk to water quality. And the criteria include:

Operations that have crops that have ni -- high nitrate-loading risk and are greater than a thousand

Page 44

quality. The draft order includes increased requirements for discharges with the highest level of waste and greatest threat to water quality in the most impaired areas.

The draft order also recognizes that there are some dischargers, especially smaller farms, who may present a very low to minimal threat to water quality. In response to the severity and magnitude of water quality conditions in the Central Coast region, the draft order tiers are based on the following five criteria:

Crops known to have higher nitrate-loading impacts; chemicals known to cause significant pollution -- for example, chlorpyrifos and diazinon; proximity to an impaired waterbody or public water system well; discharge to a toxic or pesticide-impaired waterbody; and size of the farming operation.

Tier 1 operations represent the lowest threat to water quality. The Tier 1 criteria include:

The operation does not use chemicals known to cause toxicity or pollution in surface waters, such as chlorpyrifos and diazinon; the operation is not located within a thousand feet of a surface waterbody impaired for toxicity, pesticides, nutrients, sediment or turbidity.

If growing crops that have a high

acres; operations that use chlorpyrifos or diazinon and that discharge to a surface waterbody impaired for toxicity or pesticides.

So let me provide you with an example. In the next few slides, I will show you specific information to demonstrate how the draft order takes a large number of farms, each with different characteristics, and employs a tiering approach that is both reasonable and responsible given the severity of water quality conditions in the area.

The data I'll be showing you is from operations in the lower Salinas area. And it's based upon the information submitted by farmers as part of the recent 2011 electronic notice of intent.

In this example, I'll focus on toxicity and pesticides to illustrate staff's process in evaluating the threat to water quality and how that process relates to the tiers in the draft order.

The process simplifies a complex number of factors by focusing on the most important details that influence water quality.

This is an aerial view of the lower Salinas area. In the middle, you see the City of Salinas, and to the lower left you have -- you see the Salinas River. There are approximately 360 individual farms in this Page 45

area.

And, again, in this example, I'm going to focus on the criteria related to toxicity and pesticides. I will take you through a series of questions to illustrate staff's process in evaluating threat to water quality and how that process relates to tiers in the draft order.

This is the same area in map view. In the middle, you see the City of Salinas. The rivers and creeks are shown in blue. The Salinas River is there towards the bottom. The top left is the Elkhorn Slough and Monterey Bay.

The green dots are individual farms. In the Salinas area, in this particular image, there are approximately 360 individual farms.

Focusing on toxicity and pesticides, staff asked a series of questions to evaluate which farms pose the greatest threat to water quality, and which pose a lesser threat; or, in other words, which farms are a higher priority for the draft order and which are a lower priority.

The first question we can ask is: Which farms pose lower threat to water quality?

One way we can evaluate this is by identifying operations that are SIP certified. In this case, there are no vineyards in this area that are SIP certified.

Page 46

farms that apply chlorpyrifos or diazinon and are within a thousand feet of an impaired waterbody.

In the lower Salinas area, 22 of the 360 farms apply chlorpyrifos or diazinon and are located within a thousand feet of an impaired waterbody.

We can also identify farms which may have an increased threat to water quality. In this case, we looked at farms which apply chlorpyrifos or diazinon and drain to a creek that's impaired for toxicity and pesticides.

Based on the information submitted with the 2011 electronic NOI related to the use of chlorpyrifos or diazinon, the presence of tailwater and the identification of discharge points on ranch maps, staff estimates that approximately 10 of the 360 farms would fall into this group.

So, in summary, in this example of the lower Salinas area, focusing on toxicity and pesticides, you can better understand staff's process in evaluating threat to water quality. And how that process relates to tiers in the draft order.

Similar to other water board programs and general orders, this process simplifies a complex number of factors by focusing on the most important details that influence water quality; in this case, moving from 360

Page 48

Again, focusing on toxicity and pesticides, we can also evaluate how many farms are applying pesticides. In the lower Salinas area, there are 360 farms, and they all apply pesticides.

Recognizing that not all pesticides are a threat to water quality, staff further evaluated the extent to which pesticides are found in surface water.

As described in the order, more than 75 individual pesticides are found in surface water in the Central Coast region. Staff evaluated the use of these pesticides.

In the lower Salinas area, all 365 -- 360 farms apply at least one pesticide which has been detected in surface water.

While many pesticides have been detected in surface water, a few have been documented to be a primary -- a primary cause of toxicity and impairment, especially chlorpyrifos or diazinon. Staff evaluated the use of these particular chemicals. In the lower Salinas area, 170 of the 360 farms apply chlorpyrifos or diazinon.

We can also prioritize farms based upon location. The idea is that a farm that is in closer proximity to impaired waterbody is of relatively higher priority compared to a farm that is farther away.

In the lower Salinas area, we can evaluate

farms to 10 farms to prioritize those farms that are a higher priority for the draft order.

So undergoing this evaluation in the lower Salinas area provides us with information to inform tiers.

For this area, based on data submitted in the electronic NOI, approximately 151 farms would be Tier 1, 199 farms would be Tier 2 and 10 farms would be Tier 3.

Again, this is for the criteria related to toxicity and pesticides. Staff has also done a similar evaluation for the nitrate-related criteria.

As Michael mentioned, similar to the analysis of data for the lower Salinas area, this slide summarizes staff's assessment of how the tiers would apply to farming operations regionwide.

These numbers are based on information from the electronic notice of intent, the existing enrollment database, county crop maps and pesticide use information.

Staff expects that most operations would fall into Tier 2, which makes sense, given that Tier 2 is intended to include those operations that represent a moderate threat to water quality.

Tier 3 would include the least amount of operations, representing those that have an increased threat to water quality.

Page 49

Again, as Michael indi -- Thomas indicated, this slide summarizes the order conditions. Tier 2 is very similar to the 2004 agricultural order, with additional necessary requirements included to protect groundwater quality and drinking water sources as well as improve reporting for compliance information via an on-line system.

Tier 1 requirements have decreased reporting, and Tier 3 requirement have increased verification and reporting, due to the increased threat to water quality.

Now I'm going to focus on specific aspects of the Tier 3 requirements, because they could be considered new, while other aspects are more similar to the existing agricultural order.

Specifically, I'll discuss Tier 3 individual monitoring, the water quality buffer plan and the irrigation nutrient management plan. Lisa McCann will talk a little bit more about time schedules in a moment.

The draft order requires all Tier 3 dischargers -- dischargers to conduct individual surface discharge monitoring for those farms that have irrigation or stormwater runoff.

Given the relative increased threat from Tier 3 operations, the purpose of individual discharge monitoring is to characterize the nature and amount of

Page 50

nutrient plan include the following:

The plan must be certified by a crop advisor or similarly qualified professional. And it must include standard nutrient budgeting tools, such as the identification of crop needs, reporting total nitrogen applied and calculating nitrogen balance ratios.

I'll talk a little bit more about the nitr -- nitrogen balance ratios on the following slide. But it's simply the total nitrogen applied divided by the crop needs.

The plan must report practices implement and it must also estimate nitrate loading to groundwater. In addition, there's also a requirement to verify the effectiveness of the irrigation nutrient management plan.

In addition, Tier 3 dischargers may -- may choose to conduct groundwater monitoring to evaluate nitrate loading as an alternative to the irrigation and nutrient management plan.

Again, only a subset of Tier 3 dischargers have to develop and implement the plan, and staff estimates that approximately three -- 30 of the 1700 currently enrolled operations will have to comply with this requirement. And only for those farmers with a high nitrate loading risk.

So this is a -- additional detail about the

Page 52

waste that may affect water quality.

Individual surface discharge monitoring includes discharge flow and volume, temperature, Ph, electroconductivity, nitrate and chlorpyrifos and diazinon, if they're in use, as well as toxicity.

A subset of the Tier 3 operations must also develop and implement an irrigation and nutrient management plan. These requirements apply to the subset of Tier 3 operations that have high nitrate-loading risk, and only for the relevant individual farms.

The proposed nitrate-loading risk factors and requirements were developed by staff in consultation with technical ex -- experts, specializing in the field of vegetable crops; consultants, certified crop advisors and representatives from the Central Valley region.

In addition, the December 3rd proposal submitted by the California Farm Bureau Federation and members of the agricultural community proposes to use the same nitrate-loading risk factors.

Given the severity of groundwater impacts in the Central Coast region and the high-nitrate loading risk from Tier 3 operations, the purpose of the irrigation and nutrient management plan is to minimize nitrate-loading to surfacewater and groundwater.

Specific elements of the irrigation and

nitrogen balance ratio. The draft order requires Tier 3 dischargers with high nitrate loading risk to keep specific nitrogen balance ratios.

Specifically, the draft order requires a nitrogen balance ratio of 1 for multiple cropping systems like lettuce, and a nitrogen balance ratio of 1.2 for annual crops, like strawberries.

Again, these nitrogen balance ratios were developed in consultation with technical experts and crop advisers. The nitrate -- nitrogen balance ratio is the total nitrogen applied divided by the crop needs.

To be clear, a nitrogen balance ratio of 1 is not perfection. It actually recognizes that nitrate loading to groundwater will occur. Crops are not 100 percent efficient. If you apply exactly what the crop needs to grow, some amount will load to groundwater.

Staff's goal is to improve water quality and to take steps toward reducing nitrate loading to groundwater and to maximize water quality improvement over time. These targets help us do that.

Now I'm going to show you how this works in a real example. This is a slide presented at a recent 2011 irrigation and nutrient management meeting. It shows data from more than 100 lettuce fields over the past 10 years; specifically, seasonal application of nitrogen.

Page 53

Page 54

Staff has overlaid information onto the slide to apply the requirements of the draft order.

Notice the spring planting for lettuce.

There's a large range in application of nitrogen in this sample of more than a hundred -- a hundred lettuce fields.

Here in the left you see the maximum pounds per acre in the spring planting is 392 pounds per acre, and the minimum is 70. This is a very wide range.

Remember that the nitrogen balance ratio is a total nitrogen application of a crop needs, and the target for lettuce is 1. Data on crop needs is available for major crop types in the Central Coast region and, for lettuce, the crop needs ranges from 120 to 140 pounds per acre.

So if we use the data from the study, we can evaluate the range of nitrogen balance ratios for lettuce in the Central Coast region.

The wide range of nitrogen application yields a very wide range of nitrogen balance ratios. Remember that the target for lettuce is 1. So in the case of the maximum nitrogen application, the nitrogen balance ratio is 2.8, well over the target of 1.

In the case of the minimum nitrogen application, the nitrogen balance ratio is 0.5, well

soil type is a factor. The crop needs that you see here for lettuce, the 120 to 140 is a range. It takes into account the various factors that may affect the nitrogen crop needs.

The irrigation and nutrient management plan allows a grower to be site specific in their operation. So they adapt the plan to their specific crop. And, in fact, they -- we don't prescribe a crop nitrogen uptake. They determine that themselves.

They determine it based upon documentation in the literature, their own crop and tissue analysis and other factors. So the point of the plan is for them to determine their crop needs, report the total nitrogen applied and calculate a nitrogen balance ratio.

CHAIR YOUNG: But what if they can't achieve that ratio because of their soil type?

MS. SCHROETER: The --

18 CHAIR YOUNG: What -- what is going to happen to them?

MS. SCHROETER: Within the irrigation nutrient plan details in the draft order, it specifies that they can provide us with information about their specific crop needs, their nitrogen balance ratio and to verify that if they exceed the nitrogen balance ratio, how much nitrogen loading that would result.

Page 56

under the target of 1, indicating a much more nutrient efficient application and reduced nitrate loading to groundwater.

We look at the average of the lowest nitrogen application fields, the average nitrogen balance ratio is 1.5, fairly close to the target.

Data from this real example indicates that a target of 1 for vegetables like lettuce is possible. And that many farms likely exceed this target and are loading to groundwater.

CHAIR YOUNG: I have a question about that, Angela, if I could just inject before it goes further.

How is soil type factored into this? I mean, it would seem to me that soil type -- how is soil type kind of factored into this? I would think that -- you know, let's assume that all farms are trying to be as efficient as possible with their use of nitrogen, and some are using higher amounts because of soil conditions. And the only way they can get the productivity they want is by using more nitrogen.

It -- it looks like, then, they are going to suffer a consequence because of their soil type because there's going to be greater nitrogen being discharged to groundwater.

MS. SCHROETER: It -- that is correct, that

For example, if they -- if you -- if you exceeded a 1.0, you can provide that information to tell us this is my nitrogen balance ratio and I know that nitrate's not loading to groundwater for these various reasons.

CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah. But what if it is? What - what if the end result is there are farms that are discharging nitrogen to groundwater, and that's because of the soil type they have and the type of crops that they want to grow on their land, and this is going to result in a discharge to groundwater?

I'm not suggesting there shouldn't be some consequence to that if there's a pollutant going to groundwater. I just want to find out what you have in mind in terms of what if they can't achieve that ratio? What happens?

MR. THOMAS: So all this information is submitted to the board in -- into a database, as we talked about earlier.

We review that information, and where we see that people are -- farmers are not meeting this standard, we look at the overall conditions in that area.

So if groundwater is polluted in that area, and, say, there are domestic wells in that area, we follow up with that farmer and say, you've got to reduce

Page 57

1 the loading here or we'll take additional regulatory 1 itself -- which is - the people from Salinas would know 2 2 action to make sure that you reduce it. it as a Blanco area, where there's a lot of tiling in 3 So it will de -- it will depend on the threat 3 that particular area, and we know that there are clay 4 4 that that loading places to water quality and -- and layers in that particular area that nitrate would never 5 human health. And we'll prioritize those cases. 5 reach groundwater because it'd never get to the clay 6 6 CHAIR YOUNG: Hmm. Ad -- additional regulatory layers. 7 7 action. I -- I don't want to -- I guess we won't get Now, consequently, the tiling, that would have 8 8 into a discussion of that at this -- we want what you some runoff. Is that measurement done at -- at the -- at 9 9 have in mind. the runoff location? The tiling where it goes into some 10 10 But, you know, I would think that before we ever get kind of a drainage? 11 11 to that --Then, my other question would be the followup 12 MR. THOMAS: Hm-hmm. 12 of the type of irrigation that would -- they'd be using. 13 CHAIR YOUNG: -- level or stage that there's a 13 For instance, in the Blanco area, if you're a 14 -- a broader discussion of what would be appropriate. 14 strawberry farmer and using drip irrigation, and not 15 MR. THOMAS: Yes. 15 sprinkler or water -- topwater irrigation is that going 16 CHAIR YOUNG: I'm not suggesting something 16 to make a difference with the calculation of nitrates 17 17 shouldn't happen. I'm just concerned about what staff being used? 18 may have in mind, as what it thinks is appropriate. 18 I mean, there's a whole gamut of different 19 MS. McCHESNEY: Mr. Chairman, I could maybe add 19 types of crops. 20 to your -- the answer to that. 20 And then, how do you determine -- I -- I know 21 CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. 21 you're looking at what the ag is providing you, the 22 MS. McCHESNEY: The way the non-point source 22 amount of nitrate that they're providing per acre for the 23 23 policy works and the way the order, I believe, is set particular crop. 24 out, is that if that is not working, the discharger would 24 But I -- I -- to touch on some of this -- what 25 need to provide what additional management practices 25 I started to bring up in February, is about Tier 3, where Page 58 Page 60 could be imposed to meet the standard. 1 you talked about thousand-acre farms; where you have a 1 2 There -- I mean, the obligation, ultimately, is 2 farm operation that might have 200 acres in the Blanco 3 for dischargers to comply with water quality standards. 3 area, 200 acres in the east side, 200 acres Salinas River 4 And so, it doesn't contemplate there'll be some immediate 4 side and so forth. 5 5 enforcement; but, rather, look at what you're doing. Can You're still calculating in that -- that as a 6 you improve what you're doing to -- to im -- to reduce 6 1000-acre farm; is that correct - from the staff? - or 7 7 the impact? are you looking at those individual farming operations? 8 8 And, you know, ultimately, if they don't do MS. SCHROETER: Well, I -- I'll get to this in 9 9 that, they could be subject to some kind of enforcement. a little bit more detail in a moment. 10 But, basically, the approach of the non point source 10 However, in general, the way you get into a 11 policy is to -- to improve your practices so that 11 tier is by the characteristics of your operation. 12 12 ultimately you're meeting the standards. So you are correct in assuming that if your 13 CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Mr. Jeffries, did you have 13 operation totals up -- the ranches total up to more than 14 a comment? Question? 14 a thousand acres, that's correct, you -- and -- and you 15 MR. JEFFRIES: Well, it appears with your line 15 grow a crop that is -- have a higher risk of nitrogen 16 of questioning would kind of change -- if they couldn't 16 loading to groundwater, you would fall into Tier 3. 17 17 meet the requirements, it would change what type of crop However, the requirements are specific to the ranch. So only your individual ranches that are a high 18 that they would be growing. 18 19 19 And I -- I don't know if I'd want to be in that nitrate loading risk would have to implement -- develop 20 position to dictate to the farmer what crop he should be 20 and implement a plan. And I can -- I'll show an example 21 21 growing, because that is his livelihood, he or she's in a moment. 22 22 livelihood. To be clear, the order doesn't dictate what 23 23 And then, getting back to the soil conditions crops can be grown. The goal is to reduce nitrate 24 and -- and since we're talking about the Salinas lower --24 loading to groundwater. The target of one allows us to 25 25 lower Salinas Valley, where most of it is west of Salinas evaluate the relative load to groundwater. It's a

Page 59

1 target. 1 have the highest risk to water quality and public health. 2 2 That's a very real part of our work and of this So what we know here -- like in this example --3 is there are some operations that have a nitrate balance 3 order. 4 4 ratio of almost three times that. CHAIR YOUNG: Well, what I would like to happen 5 5 is that before the staff goes down that line, that we So the goal is to reduce that nitrate loading -6 6 - load as evidenced by a nitrate balance ratio. And have a discussion at the board level, with the public 7 7 clearly, there are some farms that can do that. involvement, in terms of: Here's where we're at and this 8 8 MS. MC CANN: Can I interrupt with -is where we think we need to go -- don't -- and how we're 9 9 MS. SCHROETER: And -going to get there. 10 10 MS. MC CANN: I just wanted to add one thing. MR. THOMAS: Yes. And that --11 11 The order specifically says in the condition that -- that CHAIR YOUNG: So --12 cites the ratios, that the condition is to meet the 12 MR. THOMAS: -- that would happen. Because the 13 13 ratios or an equivalent loading reduction. -- the vast majority of these additional regulatory 14 14 Because a reasonable load reduction so that actions are done by the board, not staff. 15 waste isn't being discharged is what the goal of this is. 15 CHAIR YOUNG: That's right. But some of them -16 16 So these ratios are an indication of a level of loading - and there's quite a few that happen below the board's 17 17 that represents waste discharge. involvement -- and they just start to take place. 18 18 MS. McCHESNEY: Can I just --MR. THOMAS: Yes. And --19 19 CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. CHAIR YOUNG: Before that happens --20 20 MS. McCHESNEY: -- what you mean by that is MR. THOMAS: Yes. 21 that if -- if you don't meet one, it's not -- that's not 21 CHAIR YOUNG: -- I'd like there to be a 22 an enforce -- a number you're going to enforce. It's --22 discussion at the board level, with the public's 23 23 you're looking at it as a -- as a trend or as a goal to involvement, so we can just see where we're at; what's 24 24 the information staff has collected, what have the reduce loading, not to necessarily meet some -- that 25 number of one; correct? 25 growers told us, how the staff - how has staff evaluated Page 62 Page 64 1 MR. THOMAS: Correct. It's - it's an 1 that, and what does staff think would be the next step? 2 indication of loading to groundwater. And we are not 2 So I don't want the public or the -- especially 3 3 going to look at one individual case and -- and the the farming community, to think that staff is going to go 4 4 individual loading at -- at that location. We'll look at down any particular enforcement path at this time, until 5 5 all of the information that is submitted, and the we've had a discussion. 6 information in the particular area, like the lower 6 MR. THOMAS: I agree that --7 Salinas area, or an area where we're -- there are 7 CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. 8 8 domestic wells. MR. THOMAS: -- that's entirely reasonable, and 9 9 And if we find that the loading in that area is it's what we would normally do. And especially in this 10 presenting an unacceptable -- unacceptable risk to 10 case, where you have a lot of growers and we have a 11 domestic wells, for example, where the concentrations in 11 dynamic situation where we are learning, as well as the 12 the domestic wells exceed the drinking water standard, we 12 growers and the technical support people are learning 13 will prioritize these areas and followup on those areas. 13 about this issue. 14 14 We would be providing the information that is And you said earlier, Mr. Young, that we 15 probably won't get into that. We could get into that, 15 submitted to us to the board, as we go along. So we 16 what that additional regulatory action would be. The 16 would be providing regular reports to the board on this 17 17 board has many options for additional regulatory action. and explain to you what we're finding. And then we would 18 We have cleanup abatement orders and cease and 18 have to discuss about what direction do we go now. 19 desist orders and waste discharge requirements with more 19 If we're not achieving measurable improvement 20 comprehensive requirements than what are included here in 20 -- tangible improvement -- which direction do we go? 21 this 2011 proposed order, and enforcement actions for the 21 CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. 22 22 conditions in this order. MR. THOMAS: I also wanted to follow up on one 23 23 So you have a wide range of additional comment that -- well, let's say there's a particular crop 24 24 regulatory action that could be taken. And we would take that is being grown and you're unable to stop loading to 25 25 those actions in cases where it's warranted, where we groundwater.

Page 63

1 We cannot say -- we, staff -- cannot say it's 1 not meeting those standards, we've got to look at the 2 2 okay; if you're growing a particular crop it's okay to particulars. 3 3 load nitrates to groundwater if you can't meet the CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah, and I -- Mr. Thomas, I was 4 4 standard. We cannot say that. We -- and we won't say referring to those enforcement actions that don't come 5 that. 5 before the board that -- that staff launches into. And 6 6 It may very well be that farming practices have I'm not saying it's not done inappropriately. 7 7 to change or that certain types of crops have to change I'm just saying that there are, you know, lower 8 8 in order to meet water quality standards. That's another level forms of enforcement that take place that don't 9 9 very real part of our regulation and our oversight. It come before the board. And so, you know, I'm just making 10 10 my request known now that we have the discussion before could happen. 11 11 I don't want people to think that it could -we go down those paths. That's all. 12 that there's no way that could happen. It could happen. 12 MR. THOMAS: We'll do that. 13 13 CHAIR YOUNG: Well, I understand that. And I CHAIR YOUNG: I expect staff to do what it's 14 doing. But I expect to have a full-blown discussion 14 actually expect staff to do its job, and to apply the 15 law, bring to the board what it thinks is something that 15 about these things at that time. 16 should be done or changed or modified. 16 MR. JEFFRIES: I agree with you, Mr. Chair. 17 17 I just want to make sure with this particular The other thing I wanted to point is, I would 18 huge effort that we're undertaking, that everyone's well 18 say 99 percent of the farmers that I know all have 19 informed about what we're going to do and that there's 19 professional people that advise them how much fertilizers 20 20 ample time to discuss options and to consider or nitrates to put on their crop. 21 alternatives. 21 What are we doing to reach to those 22 I mean, there's an explanation for why we have 22 professionals to bring them into the area of -- of 23 23 a range from 392 to 70, in terms of nitrogen meeting this requirements? Have we -- have we attempted 24 applications. And that's a whole discussion in and of 24 to do that? 25 itself. 25 MS. SCHROETER: There -- there's a whole gamut Page 66 Page 68 MR. THOMAS: Yes. And --1 1 of technical assistance and research going on about this 2 CHAIR YOUNG: So --2 exact issue. 3 MR. THOMAS: -- yes. 3 And, as I mentioned, this graphic is from a 4 CHAIR YOUNG: You know, I -- I -- the target is 4 recent meeting that was well attended by certified crop 5 5 fine. I'm not bickering about that. I'm just more advisers and specialists and consultants, like you're 6 looking down the line of what's going to happen when we 6 describing. 7 7 have people that can't meet that. MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. 8 8 MR. THOMAS: Yes. And part --MS. SCHROETER: And this was just in February. 9 9 CHAIR YOUNG: So --So I think as the information becomes more available, as 10 MR. THOMAS: -- part of that -- you know, the 10 research continues to be conducted and assistance 11 other part of the picture is, as Mr. Jeffries pointed 11 continues to be provided, it'll help us to progress towards water quality improvement. 12 out, what if there are site-specific conditions that a 12 13 person -- where a person is -- a grower is not meeting 13 So I just have a few more slides. 14 14 the target, but they're not loading to groundwater MR. JEFFRIES: Go -- go ahead. 15 because of the particular conditions there? Then we 15 MS. SCHROETER: So -- so, again, staff 16 would have to consider that. 16 estimates that 30 out of the 17 -- approximately 1700 17 17 And that -- that grower can submit that enrolled growers would have to develop an irrigation nutrient management plan and attempt to achieve these 18 information to us, in various forms. We would definitely 18 19 19 nitrogen balance ratio targets here. consider that. 20 We wouldn't -- we would not have a -- an 20 The draft order also requires a subset of Tier 21 21 across-the-board opinion that if you're not meeting the 3 dischargers to develop and implement a water quality 22 target, we're going to take enforcement action. As we do 22 buffer plan. Again, these requirements would apply to 23 23 in -- in every case that comes before the board, we have the subset of Tier 3 operations that contain or are 24 24 to consider the conditions of each individual case. adjacent to a waterbody impaired for sediment, turbidity

25

Page 67

or temperature.

So where we have areas where our growers are

25

1	And given the severity it impacts of discharges	1	this requirement, and only for those farms that contain
2	to aquatic life, the purpose of the water quality buffer	2	or adjacent to a a stream impaired for temperature,
3	plan is to prevent waste discharge, comply with water	3	turbidity and sediment.
4	quality standards and beneficial uses in compliance with	4	So this is one case where a water quality
5	the order and the basin plan.	5	buffer plan would have to would be submitted.
6	MR. JEFFRIES: Can I can I ask you about the	6	However, we anticipate, as with the other reporting
7	plans? Where are they to be kept? Are they submitted to	7	elements that we described, this plan would also be
8	the staff? Are they on-line?	8	submitted on-line through a series either of dropdowns,
9	MS. SCHROETER: They	9	description boxes or could be uploaded as well.
10	MR. JEFFRIES: Are they accessible to the	10	MR. JEFFRIES: I'm sorry. I didn't mean to
11	general public?	11	interrupt you.
12	CHAIR YOUNG: The buffer plans or the farm	12	But I just want to talk about several letters
13	plans or	13	that I've read and it was I want to thank everybody
14	MR. JEFFRIES: Well, the farm plan and that	14	that sent about a hundred and twenty-plus letters in to
15	could be all kinds of plans.	15	us, they're all in this binder that I have right here -
16	MS. SCHROETER: The farm there's no	16	talk about proprietary information and also rapian
17	requirement to submit the farm plan.	17	riparian areas.
18	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.	18	Is this is that included in the 30-foot
19	MS. SCHROETER: The elements elements of the	19	buffer area? No? Yes?
20	farm plan, for example, management practices implemented	20	MS. McCHESNEY: I can answer that. The the
21	would be reported on this annual compliance form that	21	water code specifically provides that if you are
22	Michael Thomas described, and you would submit on-line,	22	requested to submit information that's considered
23	similar to the electronic notice of intent.	23	proprietary or trade secrets
24	The irrigation nutrient management plan is	24	MR. JEFFRIES: Yeah.
25	similar. There is no requirement to submit the	25	FEMALE: that it is to be kept confidential
	Page 70		Page 72
1	imigation nutrient management plan	1	by the beard. Co it!!! he up to the discharger whele
1 2	irrigation nutrient management plan.	2	by the board. So it'll be up to the discharger who's
3	Again, as part of this on-line reporting form,	3	submitting the plan to clearly mark the areas of the plan
4	you would report on key elements of the plan; for	4	that are proprietary information so that the board can
	example, your nitrogen balance ratio, the target you	5	keep it confidential.
5 6	achieved, your description of factors influencing the	6	MR. JEFFRIES: Though the board and the staff
	target you achieved; the practices that you're	7	would have access to that? How and it's not on-line?
7	implementing.  The water quality buffer plan would be		It
8	i ne water quality putter plan would be		MC M-CHECKEY/ M/L-+
		8	MS. McCHESNEY: What correct. So there I
9	submitted to the water board, as written into the current	9	don't know how they're proposing to deal with it on-line.
10	submitted to the water board, as written into the current draft order.	9 10	don't know how they're proposing to deal with it on-line. But it would be required to be kept confidential.
10 11	submitted to the water board, as written into the current draft order.  And let me describe to you some of the the	9 10 11	don't know how they're proposing to deal with it on-line. But it would be required to be kept confidential. But the board and the staff is allowed to view
10 11 12	submitted to the water board, as written into the current draft order.  And let me describe to you some of the the elements of that plan.	9 10 11 12	don't know how they're proposing to deal with it on-line. But it would be required to be kept confidential.  But the board and the staff is allowed to view it.
10 11 12 13	submitted to the water board, as written into the current draft order.  And let me describe to you some of the the elements of that plan.  The specific elements of the water quality	9 10 11 12 13	don't know how they're proposing to deal with it on-line.  But it would be required to be kept confidential.  But the board and the staff is allowed to view it.  MR. JEFFRIES: What kind of assurances can we
10 11 12 13 14	submitted to the water board, as written into the current draft order.  And let me describe to you some of the the elements of that plan.  The specific elements of the water quality buffer plan include a minimum of a 30-foot buffer, any	9 10 11 12 13 14	don't know how they're proposing to deal with it on-line.  But it would be required to be kept confidential.  But the board and the staff is allowed to view it.  MR. JEFFRIES: What kind of assurances can we give to the ag ag groups that this confidential
10 11 12 13 14 15	submitted to the water board, as written into the current draft order.  And let me describe to you some of the the elements of that plan.  The specific elements of the water quality buffer plan include a minimum of a 30-foot buffer, any increases in buffer width to prevent discharge of waste,	9 10 11 12 13 14 15	don't know how they're proposing to deal with it on-line.  But it would be required to be kept confidential.  But the board and the staff is allowed to view it.  MR. JEFFRIES: What kind of assurances can we give to the ag ag groups that this confidential information will be kept confidential?
10 11 12 13 14 15	submitted to the water board, as written into the current draft order.  And let me describe to you some of the the elements of that plan.  The specific elements of the water quality buffer plan include a minimum of a 30-foot buffer, any increases in buffer width to prevent discharge of waste, a schedule for implementation, maintenance provisions to	9 10 11 12 13 14 15	don't know how they're proposing to deal with it on-line.  But it would be required to be kept confidential.  But the board and the staff is allowed to view it.  MR. JEFFRIES: What kind of assurances can we give to the ag ag groups that this confidential information will be kept confidential?  As we know, with all the leaks and all these
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	submitted to the water board, as written into the current draft order.  And let me describe to you some of the the elements of that plan.  The specific elements of the water quality buffer plan include a minimum of a 30-foot buffer, any increases in buffer width to prevent discharge of waste,	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	don't know how they're proposing to deal with it on-line. But it would be required to be kept confidential.  But the board and the staff is allowed to view it.  MR. JEFFRIES: What kind of assurances can we give to the ag ag groups that this confidential information will be kept confidential?  As we know, with all the leaks and all these kind of things that our federal government is involved
10 11 12 13 14 15	submitted to the water board, as written into the current draft order.  And let me describe to you some of the the elements of that plan.  The specific elements of the water quality buffer plan include a minimum of a 30-foot buffer, any increases in buffer width to prevent discharge of waste, a schedule for implementation, maintenance provisions to ensure water quality protection, as well as photo monitoring.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	don't know how they're proposing to deal with it on-line. But it would be required to be kept confidential.  But the board and the staff is allowed to view it.  MR. JEFFRIES: What kind of assurances can we give to the ag ag groups that this confidential information will be kept confidential?  As we know, with all the leaks and all these kind of things that our federal government is involved in, how do we know that this information is going to be
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	submitted to the water board, as written into the current draft order.  And let me describe to you some of the the elements of that plan.  The specific elements of the water quality buffer plan include a minimum of a 30-foot buffer, any increases in buffer width to prevent discharge of waste, a schedule for implementation, maintenance provisions to ensure water quality protection, as well as photo monitoring.  In addition, Tier 3 dischargers may choose to	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	don't know how they're proposing to deal with it on-line. But it would be required to be kept confidential.  But the board and the staff is allowed to view it.  MR. JEFFRIES: What kind of assurances can we give to the ag ag groups that this confidential information will be kept confidential?  As we know, with all the leaks and all these kind of things that our federal government is involved in, how do we know that this information is going to be kept that way? What safeguards do we have?
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	submitted to the water board, as written into the current draft order.  And let me describe to you some of the the elements of that plan.  The specific elements of the water quality buffer plan include a minimum of a 30-foot buffer, any increases in buffer width to prevent discharge of waste, a schedule for implementation, maintenance provisions to ensure water quality protection, as well as photo monitoring.  In addition, Tier 3 dischargers may choose to propose a more site-specific alternative that is	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	don't know how they're proposing to deal with it on-line. But it would be required to be kept confidential.  But the board and the staff is allowed to view it.  MR. JEFFRIES: What kind of assurances can we give to the ag ag groups that this confidential information will be kept confidential?  As we know, with all the leaks and all these kind of things that our federal government is involved in, how do we know that this information is going to be kept that way? What safeguards do we have?  MS. SCHROETER: We would do that similar to any
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	submitted to the water board, as written into the current draft order.  And let me describe to you some of the the elements of that plan.  The specific elements of the water quality buffer plan include a minimum of a 30-foot buffer, any increases in buffer width to prevent discharge of waste, a schedule for implementation, maintenance provisions to ensure water quality protection, as well as photo monitoring.  In addition, Tier 3 dischargers may choose to propose a more site-specific alternative that is functionally equivalent.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	don't know how they're proposing to deal with it on-line. But it would be required to be kept confidential.  But the board and the staff is allowed to view it.  MR. JEFFRIES: What kind of assurances can we give to the ag ag groups that this confidential information will be kept confidential?  As we know, with all the leaks and all these kind of things that our federal government is involved in, how do we know that this information is going to be kept that way? What safeguards do we have?  MS. SCHROETER: We would do that similar to any other program that we and/or set of proprietary
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	submitted to the water board, as written into the current draft order.  And let me describe to you some of the the elements of that plan.  The specific elements of the water quality buffer plan include a minimum of a 30-foot buffer, any increases in buffer width to prevent discharge of waste, a schedule for implementation, maintenance provisions to ensure water quality protection, as well as photo monitoring.  In addition, Tier 3 dischargers may choose to propose a more site-specific alternative that is functionally equivalent.  Again, only a subset of Tier 3 dischargers have	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	don't know how they're proposing to deal with it on-line. But it would be required to be kept confidential.  But the board and the staff is allowed to view it.  MR. JEFFRIES: What kind of assurances can we give to the ag ag groups that this confidential information will be kept confidential?  As we know, with all the leaks and all these kind of things that our federal government is involved in, how do we know that this information is going to be kept that way? What safeguards do we have?  MS. SCHROETER: We would do that similar to any other program that we and/or set of proprietary information that we currently deal with.
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	submitted to the water board, as written into the current draft order.  And let me describe to you some of the the elements of that plan.  The specific elements of the water quality buffer plan include a minimum of a 30-foot buffer, any increases in buffer width to prevent discharge of waste, a schedule for implementation, maintenance provisions to ensure water quality protection, as well as photo monitoring.  In addition, Tier 3 dischargers may choose to propose a more site-specific alternative that is functionally equivalent.  Again, only a subset of Tier 3 dischargers have to develop and implement the water quality buffer plan.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	don't know how they're proposing to deal with it on-line. But it would be required to be kept confidential.  But the board and the staff is allowed to view it.  MR. JEFFRIES: What kind of assurances can we give to the ag ag groups that this confidential information will be kept confidential?  As we know, with all the leaks and all these kind of things that our federal government is involved in, how do we know that this information is going to be kept that way? What safeguards do we have?  MS. SCHROETER: We would do that similar to any other program that we and/or set of proprietary information that we currently deal with.  And, in fact, if we deal with it
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	submitted to the water board, as written into the current draft order.  And let me describe to you some of the the elements of that plan.  The specific elements of the water quality buffer plan include a minimum of a 30-foot buffer, any increases in buffer width to prevent discharge of waste, a schedule for implementation, maintenance provisions to ensure water quality protection, as well as photo monitoring.  In addition, Tier 3 dischargers may choose to propose a more site-specific alternative that is functionally equivalent.  Again, only a subset of Tier 3 dischargers have to develop and implement the water quality buffer plan. Staff estimates that approximately 10 of the 1700	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	don't know how they're proposing to deal with it on-line. But it would be required to be kept confidential.  But the board and the staff is allowed to view it.  MR. JEFFRIES: What kind of assurances can we give to the ag ag groups that this confidential information will be kept confidential?  As we know, with all the leaks and all these kind of things that our federal government is involved in, how do we know that this information is going to be kept that way? What safeguards do we have?  MS. SCHROETER: We would do that similar to any other program that we and/or set of proprietary information that we currently deal with.  And, in fact, if we deal with it electronically, it allows us to mark those clearly, and
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	submitted to the water board, as written into the current draft order.  And let me describe to you some of the the elements of that plan.  The specific elements of the water quality buffer plan include a minimum of a 30-foot buffer, any increases in buffer width to prevent discharge of waste, a schedule for implementation, maintenance provisions to ensure water quality protection, as well as photo monitoring.  In addition, Tier 3 dischargers may choose to propose a more site-specific alternative that is functionally equivalent.  Again, only a subset of Tier 3 dischargers have to develop and implement the water quality buffer plan.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	don't know how they're proposing to deal with it on-line. But it would be required to be kept confidential.  But the board and the staff is allowed to view it.  MR. JEFFRIES: What kind of assurances can we give to the ag ag groups that this confidential information will be kept confidential?  As we know, with all the leaks and all these kind of things that our federal government is involved in, how do we know that this information is going to be kept that way? What safeguards do we have?  MS. SCHROETER: We would do that similar to any other program that we and/or set of proprietary information that we currently deal with.  And, in fact, if we deal with it

_			
1	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.	1	CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah. I want to make sure
2	MS. SCHROETER: However, we staff would have	2	there's a closed loop on that; that, you know, if you
3	to make the determination that that actually was	3	disagree with the applicant, that the applicant has an
4	proprietary information.	4	opportunity to at least bring that to closure.
5	So the the discharger would tell us, mark	5	MS. McCHESNEY: And that and, again, that's
6	those, and then if we would have a discussion about	6	that is the normal process, is to not release the
7	what elements were proprietary and which were not.	7	information without having that conversation with the
8	So	8	with the submitter of the information before and
9	MS. McCHESNEY: But I can just add	9	giving that person an opportunity to defend it, and say,
10	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. If we	10	no, it is proprietary and here's why.
11	MS. McCHESNEY: typically what I mean,	11	And and it's it's extremely rare that
12	this is a common situation, where people submit	12	it happens but, you know, it
13	proprietary information. The board keeps it	13	CHAIR YOUNG: Is that in the code?
14	confidential, and what we typically do is tell the person	14	MS. McCHESNEY: That's just a practice that the
15	who submitted it, we will keep it confidential; if we get	15	board engages in. Because it is required by law to keep
16	a request for this information a Public Records Act	16	it confidential if it and truly is confidential.
17	request we will inform you that we've received the	17	So it's a practice that I mean, you know, I
18	request, and you can assist us, and I'd you know, in	18	just I've been the attorney for boards for 23 years,
19	assuring that what we have to produce publically is not	19	and and it's happened twice that we've even engaged in
20	proprietary.	20	that issue.
21	Because often they'll mark the entire report as	21	So it's not it's common to keep it
22	proprietary, when it's not. And we you know, it's a	22	confidential. It's rare to have to deal with the issue
23	it is an issue because we're required, by law, to	23	of disclosing it. So but it does happen.
24 25	to provide public records.	24 25	CHAIR YOUNG: But this is this is a huge
23	And so we have to be sure that we comply with  Page 74	23	effort Page 76
1	that law to provide public records, as well as to keep	1	MS. McCHESNEY: Right.
1 2	that law to provide public records, as well as to keep information that truly is considered proprietary or trade	1 2	MS. McCHESNEY: Right. CHAIR YOUNG: - encompassing a lot of people -
			<del>-</del>
2	information that truly is considered proprietary or trade	2	CHAIR YOUNG: - encompassing a lot of people -
2	information that truly is considered proprietary or trade secrets by law private.	2	CHAIR YOUNG: - encompassing a lot of people - encompassing a lot of people, a lot of acreage, a lot
2 3 4	information that truly is considered proprietary or trade secrets by law private.  So it's it's this is not a new issue. It	2 3 4	CHAIR YOUNG: - encompassing a lot of people - encompassing a lot of people, a lot of acreage, a lot of issues, so
2 3 4 5	information that truly is considered proprietary or trade secrets by law private.  So it's it's this is not a new issue. It happens all the time, and the staff is prepared to deal	2 3 4 5	CHAIR YOUNG: - encompassing a lot of people encompassing a lot of people, a lot of acreage, a lot of issues, so MS. McCHESNEY: Yeah, and it's you know
2 3 4 5 6	information that truly is considered proprietary or trade secrets by law private.  So it's it's this is not a new issue. It happens all the time, and the staff is prepared to deal with those issues.	2 3 4 5 6	CHAIR YOUNG: - encompassing a lot of people encompassing a lot of people, a lot of acreage, a lot of issues, so MS. McCHESNEY: Yeah, and it's you know CHAIR YOUNG: I would would think that we
2 3 4 5 6 7	information that truly is considered proprietary or trade secrets by law private.  So it's it's this is not a new issue. It happens all the time, and the staff is prepared to deal with those issues.  CHAIR YOUNG: Let me make a suggestion about	2 3 4 5 6 7	CHAIR YOUNG: - encompassing a lot of people encompassing a lot of people, a lot of acreage, a lot of issues, so MS. McCHESNEY: Yeah, and it's you know CHAIR YOUNG: I would would think that we there may be requests for this information.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	information that truly is considered proprietary or trade secrets by law private.  So it's it's this is not a new issue. It happens all the time, and the staff is prepared to deal with those issues.  CHAIR YOUNG: Let me make a suggestion about this point.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	CHAIR YOUNG: - encompassing a lot of people encompassing a lot of people, a lot of acreage, a lot of issues, so MS. McCHESNEY: Yeah, and it's you know CHAIR YOUNG: I would would think that we there may be requests for this information. MS. McCHESNEY: Right. And so, it's important to to be clear and and I've advised staff on how to do that and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	information that truly is considered proprietary or trade secrets by law private.  So it's it's this is not a new issue. It happens all the time, and the staff is prepared to deal with those issues.  CHAIR YOUNG: Let me make a suggestion about this point.  I'd like to make sure that once staff has reviewed what has been marked, you know, by the applicant as proprietary, that staff has had a discussion with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	CHAIR YOUNG: - encompassing a lot of people encompassing a lot of people, a lot of acreage, a lot of issues, so MS. McCHESNEY: Yeah, and it's you know CHAIR YOUNG: I would would think that we there may be requests for this information. MS. McCHESNEY: Right. And so, it's important to to be clear and and I've advised staff on how to do that and CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	information that truly is considered proprietary or trade secrets by law private.  So it's it's this is not a new issue. It happens all the time, and the staff is prepared to deal with those issues.  CHAIR YOUNG: Let me make a suggestion about this point.  I'd like to make sure that once staff has reviewed what has been marked, you know, by the applicant as proprietary, that staff has had a discussion with the applicant; if you come up with a different determination	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	CHAIR YOUNG: - encompassing a lot of people encompassing a lot of people, a lot of acreage, a lot of issues, so MS. McCHESNEY: Yeah, and it's you know CHAIR YOUNG: I would would think that we there may be requests for this information. MS. McCHESNEY: Right. And so, it's important to to be clear and and I've advised staff on how to do that and CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, we would where
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	information that truly is considered proprietary or trade secrets by law private.  So it's it's this is not a new issue. It happens all the time, and the staff is prepared to deal with those issues.  CHAIR YOUNG: Let me make a suggestion about this point.  I'd like to make sure that once staff has reviewed what has been marked, you know, by the applicant as proprietary, that staff has had a discussion with the applicant; if you come up with a different determination that, no, this is not proprietary, we intend to release	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CHAIR YOUNG: - encompassing a lot of people encompassing a lot of people, a lot of acreage, a lot of issues, so MS. McCHESNEY: Yeah, and it's you know CHAIR YOUNG: I would would think that we there may be requests for this information. MS. McCHESNEY: Right. And so, it's important to to be clear and and I've advised staff on how to do that and CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, we would where where there's controversy you know, if there's a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	information that truly is considered proprietary or trade secrets by law private.  So it's it's this is not a new issue. It happens all the time, and the staff is prepared to deal with those issues.  CHAIR YOUNG: Let me make a suggestion about this point.  I'd like to make sure that once staff has reviewed what has been marked, you know, by the applicant as proprietary, that staff has had a discussion with the applicant; if you come up with a different determination that, no, this is not proprietary, we intend to release it if asked, that, at least, you have a discourse with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CHAIR YOUNG: - encompassing a lot of people encompassing a lot of people, a lot of acreage, a lot of issues, so MS. McCHESNEY: Yeah, and it's you know CHAIR YOUNG: I would would think that we there may be requests for this information. MS. McCHESNEY: Right. And so, it's important to to be clear and and I've advised staff on how to do that and CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, we would where where there's controversy you know, if there's a disagreement between us and a discharger, then if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	information that truly is considered proprietary or trade secrets by law private.  So it's it's this is not a new issue. It happens all the time, and the staff is prepared to deal with those issues.  CHAIR YOUNG: Let me make a suggestion about this point.  I'd like to make sure that once staff has reviewed what has been marked, you know, by the applicant as proprietary, that staff has had a discussion with the applicant; if you come up with a different determination that, no, this is not proprietary, we intend to release it if asked, that, at least, you have a discourse with the applicant and allow them to tell you, again, why they	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CHAIR YOUNG: - encompassing a lot of people encompassing a lot of people, a lot of acreage, a lot of issues, so MS. McCHESNEY: Yeah, and it's you know CHAIR YOUNG: I would would think that we there may be requests for this information. MS. McCHESNEY: Right. And so, it's important to to be clear and and I've advised staff on how to do that and CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, we would where where there's controversy you know, if there's a disagreement between us and a discharger, then if there is disagreement between staff and a discharger
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	information that truly is considered proprietary or trade secrets by law private.  So it's it's this is not a new issue. It happens all the time, and the staff is prepared to deal with those issues.  CHAIR YOUNG: Let me make a suggestion about this point.  I'd like to make sure that once staff has reviewed what has been marked, you know, by the applicant as proprietary, that staff has had a discussion with the applicant; if you come up with a different determination that, no, this is not proprietary, we intend to release it if asked, that, at least, you have a discourse with the applicant and allow them to tell you, again, why they think it should be kept confidential.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CHAIR YOUNG: - encompassing a lot of people encompassing a lot of people, a lot of acreage, a lot of issues, so MS. McCHESNEY: Yeah, and it's you know CHAIR YOUNG: I would would think that we there may be requests for this information. MS. McCHESNEY: Right. And so, it's important to to be clear and and I've advised staff on how to do that and CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, we would where where there's controversy you know, if there's a disagreement between us and a discharger, then if there is disagreement between staff and a discharger about confidentiality, we would definitely be talking to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	information that truly is considered proprietary or trade secrets by law private.  So it's it's this is not a new issue. It happens all the time, and the staff is prepared to deal with those issues.  CHAIR YOUNG: Let me make a suggestion about this point.  I'd like to make sure that once staff has reviewed what has been marked, you know, by the applicant as proprietary, that staff has had a discussion with the applicant; if you come up with a different determination that, no, this is not proprietary, we intend to release it if asked, that, at least, you have a discourse with the applicant and allow them to tell you, again, why they think it should be kept confidential.  And, if not, I I'd like them to know what is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	CHAIR YOUNG: - encompassing a lot of people encompassing a lot of people, a lot of acreage, a lot of issues, so MS. McCHESNEY: Yeah, and it's you know CHAIR YOUNG: I would would think that we there may be requests for this information. MS. McCHESNEY: Right. And so, it's important to to be clear and and I've advised staff on how to do that and CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, we would where where there's controversy you know, if there's a disagreement between us and a discharger, then if there is disagreement between staff and a discharger about confidentiality, we would definitely be talking to the board's counsel about that. We won't make the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	information that truly is considered proprietary or trade secrets by law private.  So it's it's this is not a new issue. It happens all the time, and the staff is prepared to deal with those issues.  CHAIR YOUNG: Let me make a suggestion about this point.  I'd like to make sure that once staff has reviewed what has been marked, you know, by the applicant as proprietary, that staff has had a discussion with the applicant; if you come up with a different determination that, no, this is not proprietary, we intend to release it if asked, that, at least, you have a discourse with the applicant and allow them to tell you, again, why they think it should be kept confidential.  And, if not, I I'd like them to know what is going to be released, if asked.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CHAIR YOUNG: - encompassing a lot of people encompassing a lot of people, a lot of acreage, a lot of issues, so MS. McCHESNEY: Yeah, and it's you know CHAIR YOUNG: I would would think that we there may be requests for this information. MS. McCHESNEY: Right. And so, it's important to to be clear and and I've advised staff on how to do that and CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, we would where where there's controversy you know, if there's a disagreement between us and a discharger, then if there is disagreement between staff and a discharger about confidentiality, we would definitely be talking to the board's counsel about that. We won't make the decisions on our own.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	information that truly is considered proprietary or trade secrets by law private.  So it's it's this is not a new issue. It happens all the time, and the staff is prepared to deal with those issues.  CHAIR YOUNG: Let me make a suggestion about this point.  I'd like to make sure that once staff has reviewed what has been marked, you know, by the applicant as proprietary, that staff has had a discussion with the applicant; if you come up with a different determination that, no, this is not proprietary, we intend to release it if asked, that, at least, you have a discourse with the applicant and allow them to tell you, again, why they think it should be kept confidential.  And, if not, I I'd like them to know what is going to be released, if asked.  MS. McCHESNEY: And	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CHAIR YOUNG: - encompassing a lot of people encompassing a lot of people, a lot of acreage, a lot of issues, so MS. McCHESNEY: Yeah, and it's you know CHAIR YOUNG: I would would think that we there may be requests for this information. MS. McCHESNEY: Right. And so, it's important to to be clear and and I've advised staff on how to do that and CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, we would where where there's controversy you know, if there's a disagreement between us and a discharger, then if there is disagreement between staff and a discharger about confidentiality, we would definitely be talking to the board's counsel about that. We won't make the decisions on our own. CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	information that truly is considered proprietary or trade secrets by law private.  So it's it's this is not a new issue. It happens all the time, and the staff is prepared to deal with those issues.  CHAIR YOUNG: Let me make a suggestion about this point.  I'd like to make sure that once staff has reviewed what has been marked, you know, by the applicant as proprietary, that staff has had a discussion with the applicant; if you come up with a different determination that, no, this is not proprietary, we intend to release it if asked, that, at least, you have a discourse with the applicant and allow them to tell you, again, why they think it should be kept confidential.  And, if not, I I'd like them to know what is going to be released, if asked.  MS. McCHESNEY: And  CHAIR YOUNG: Not so that staff gets the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CHAIR YOUNG: - encompassing a lot of people encompassing a lot of people, a lot of acreage, a lot of issues, so MS. McCHESNEY: Yeah, and it's you know CHAIR YOUNG: I would would think that we there may be requests for this information. MS. McCHESNEY: Right. And so, it's important to to be clear and and I've advised staff on how to do that and CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, we would where where there's controversy you know, if there's a disagreement between us and a discharger, then if there is disagreement between staff and a discharger about confidentiality, we would definitely be talking to the board's counsel about that. We won't make the decisions on our own. CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. MR. JEFFRIES: I asked a question about the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	information that truly is considered proprietary or trade secrets by law private.  So it's it's this is not a new issue. It happens all the time, and the staff is prepared to deal with those issues.  CHAIR YOUNG: Let me make a suggestion about this point.  I'd like to make sure that once staff has reviewed what has been marked, you know, by the applicant as proprietary, that staff has had a discussion with the applicant; if you come up with a different determination that, no, this is not proprietary, we intend to release it if asked, that, at least, you have a discourse with the applicant and allow them to tell you, again, why they think it should be kept confidential.  And, if not, I I'd like them to know what is going to be released, if asked.  MS. McCHESNEY: And  CHAIR YOUNG: Not so that staff gets the information, makes the determination, there's no further	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIR YOUNG: - encompassing a lot of people encompassing a lot of people, a lot of acreage, a lot of issues, so MS. McCHESNEY: Yeah, and it's you know CHAIR YOUNG: I would would think that we there may be requests for this information. MS. McCHESNEY: Right. And so, it's important to to be clear and and I've advised staff on how to do that and CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, we would where where there's controversy you know, if there's a disagreement between us and a discharger, then if there is disagreement between staff and a discharger about confidentiality, we would definitely be talking to the board's counsel about that. We won't make the decisions on our own. CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. MR. JEFFRIES: I asked a question about the buffer. Can you elaborate on the buffer?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	information that truly is considered proprietary or trade secrets by law private.  So it's it's this is not a new issue. It happens all the time, and the staff is prepared to deal with those issues.  CHAIR YOUNG: Let me make a suggestion about this point.  I'd like to make sure that once staff has reviewed what has been marked, you know, by the applicant as proprietary, that staff has had a discussion with the applicant; if you come up with a different determination that, no, this is not proprietary, we intend to release it if asked, that, at least, you have a discourse with the applicant and allow them to tell you, again, why they think it should be kept confidential.  And, if not, I I'd like them to know what is going to be released, if asked.  MS. McCHESNEY: And  CHAIR YOUNG: Not so that staff gets the information, makes the determination, there's no further exchange with the applicant. But it just gets released	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIR YOUNG: - encompassing a lot of people encompassing a lot of people, a lot of acreage, a lot of issues, so MS. McCHESNEY: Yeah, and it's you know CHAIR YOUNG: I would would think that we there may be requests for this information. MS. McCHESNEY: Right. And so, it's important to to be clear and and I've advised staff on how to do that and CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, we would where where there's controversy you know, if there's a disagreement between us and a discharger, then if there is disagreement between staff and a discharger about confidentiality, we would definitely be talking to the board's counsel about that. We won't make the decisions on our own. CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. MR. JEFFRIES: I asked a question about the buffer. Can you elaborate on the buffer? MS. SCHROETER: Can you repeat your specific
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	information that truly is considered proprietary or trade secrets by law private.  So it's it's this is not a new issue. It happens all the time, and the staff is prepared to deal with those issues.  CHAIR YOUNG: Let me make a suggestion about this point.  I'd like to make sure that once staff has reviewed what has been marked, you know, by the applicant as proprietary, that staff has had a discussion with the applicant; if you come up with a different determination that, no, this is not proprietary, we intend to release it if asked, that, at least, you have a discourse with the applicant and allow them to tell you, again, why they think it should be kept confidential.  And, if not, I I'd like them to know what is going to be released, if asked.  MS. McCHESNEY: And  CHAIR YOUNG: Not so that staff gets the information, makes the determination, there's no further exchange with the applicant. But it just gets released somehow.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CHAIR YOUNG: - encompassing a lot of people encompassing a lot of people, a lot of acreage, a lot of issues, so MS. McCHESNEY: Yeah, and it's you know CHAIR YOUNG: I would would think that we there may be requests for this information. MS. McCHESNEY: Right. And so, it's important to to be clear and and I've advised staff on how to do that and CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, we would where where there's controversy you know, if there's a disagreement between us and a discharger, then if there is disagreement between staff and a discharger about confidentiality, we would definitely be talking to the board's counsel about that. We won't make the decisions on our own. CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. MR. JEFFRIES: I asked a question about the buffer. Can you elaborate on the buffer? MS. SCHROETER: Can you repeat your specific question, elaborate on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	information that truly is considered proprietary or trade secrets by law private.  So it's it's this is not a new issue. It happens all the time, and the staff is prepared to deal with those issues.  CHAIR YOUNG: Let me make a suggestion about this point.  I'd like to make sure that once staff has reviewed what has been marked, you know, by the applicant as proprietary, that staff has had a discussion with the applicant; if you come up with a different determination that, no, this is not proprietary, we intend to release it if asked, that, at least, you have a discourse with the applicant and allow them to tell you, again, why they think it should be kept confidential.  And, if not, I I'd like them to know what is going to be released, if asked.  MS. McCHESNEY: And  CHAIR YOUNG: Not so that staff gets the information, makes the determination, there's no further exchange with the applicant. But it just gets released somehow.  MR. JEFFRIES: Yep. Because assuming that it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	CHAIR YOUNG: - encompassing a lot of people - encompassing a lot of people, a lot of acreage, a lot of issues, so MS. McCHESNEY: Yeah, and it's you know CHAIR YOUNG: I would would think that we there may be requests for this information. MS. McCHESNEY: Right. And so, it's important to to be clear and and I've advised staff on how to do that and CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, we would where where there's controversy you know, if there's a disagreement between us and a discharger, then if there is disagreement between staff and a discharger about confidentiality, we would definitely be talking to the board's counsel about that. We won't make the decisions on our own. CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. MR. JEFFRIES: I asked a question about the buffer. Can you elaborate on the buffer? MS. SCHROETER: Can you repeat your specific question, elaborate on MR. JEFFRIES: Well, I was talking about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	information that truly is considered proprietary or trade secrets by law private.  So it's it's this is not a new issue. It happens all the time, and the staff is prepared to deal with those issues.  CHAIR YOUNG: Let me make a suggestion about this point.  I'd like to make sure that once staff has reviewed what has been marked, you know, by the applicant as proprietary, that staff has had a discussion with the applicant; if you come up with a different determination that, no, this is not proprietary, we intend to release it if asked, that, at least, you have a discourse with the applicant and allow them to tell you, again, why they think it should be kept confidential.  And, if not, I I'd like them to know what is going to be released, if asked.  MS. McCHESNEY: And  CHAIR YOUNG: Not so that staff gets the information, makes the determination, there's no further exchange with the applicant. But it just gets released somehow.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CHAIR YOUNG: - encompassing a lot of people encompassing a lot of people, a lot of acreage, a lot of issues, so MS. McCHESNEY: Yeah, and it's you know CHAIR YOUNG: I would would think that we there may be requests for this information. MS. McCHESNEY: Right. And so, it's important to to be clear and and I've advised staff on how to do that and CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, we would where where there's controversy you know, if there's a disagreement between us and a discharger, then if there is disagreement between staff and a discharger about confidentiality, we would definitely be talking to the board's counsel about that. We won't make the decisions on our own. CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. MR. JEFFRIES: I asked a question about the buffer. Can you elaborate on the buffer? MS. SCHROETER: Can you repeat your specific question, elaborate on

Is that what you're talking about; the 30-foot buffer or buffers to be increased? MS. MC CANN: What -- what she's talking about, in general, is a requirement to ensure that Tier 3 dischargers, that are discharging to an impaired waterbody for sediment, turbidity or temperature, are ensuring that there are no waste discharges into that stream. A very effective and standard way to do that is to have a vegetative buffer between the edge of the area that has the likelihood of discharging waste, such as a bare field or a row between vegetative crops and the stream that's impaired. MR. JEFFRIES: I brought this issue up before because of the requirements of food and ag that are now requiring that they don't have any buffers. How do we -- you know, we got two -- two jurisdictions telling these folks two different things, 

How do we -- you know, we got two -- two jurisdictions telling these folks two different things, And we're going to say that you're discharging because you don't have some kind of a buffer there; and then you have, on the other hand, food and ag is telling them you can't have a buffer because the possible contamination.

How -- how are the two agencies working together on this?

MR. THOMAS: And I'm not an attorney on this,

Page 78

Though the -- while there is a conflict between buyers and water board conditions or requirements, we don't see a conflict between requirements of different agencies. Those are two very different things.

MR. JEFFRIES: Well, I'm sure we'll hear more about that today.

MS. McCHESNEY: And -- and, Mr. Jeffries, just to add to that, the -- the proposed order has: Submit a buffer plan, where you would identify how it is you intend to prevent discharges of waste to waters of the state.

If it doesn't work for you to have a buffer -to have a -- a riparian buffer of 30 feet or whatever,
you would need to propose another way because you're
still obligated to comply with the basin plan standards
of not discharging.

And I think what you said was there would be about 10 farms in the -- out of 1700 that would be subject to that. So, certainly, staff would be able to work with those individuals to figure out how to work out the plan with them.

CHAIR YOUNG: The -- the minimum 30-foot buffer that, in conjunction with - or any alternative that a farmer could come up with that would accomplish the same end result.

Page 80

but --

MR. JEFFRIES: Neither am I, but I'm just asking the question.

MR. THOMAS: -- the -- there is -- there is a conflict, as you pointed out, between food safety issues and requirements or conditions of the board.

The -- my understanding of it, not being an attorney, is there isn't a agency requirement or regulation that there be no vegetation or no buffer.

There are buyers who have people in the field indicating to farmers that they are reluctant or will not buy produce if there is wildlife in the vicinity of that produce, because of the risk involved.

And the literature does not support the buyers' or auditors' position that there should be bare ground or no vegetation or no riparian vegetation. But that is the greatest risk.

The -- the literature shows that domestic cattle and pigs are the largest source of the most problematic bacteria and that -- and we -- we reference this in our letters to other agencies and in our staff report -- where there are reports and literature that show removing the vegetation could exacerbate the problem, not improve it -- the food safety problem -- by allowing the transport of this problematic bacteria.

So if someone says, you know, I can get something engineered within a 15-foot buffer that'll do the same thing, and we can show it to you, that would be acceptable.

MS. SCHROETER: That's correct.

CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.

MS. SCHROETER: So in conclu -- just -- to conclude here, the draft ag order takes into account the complexity of irrigated agriculture and the specific characteristics of individual ranches and simplifies the tiering criteria and order requirements by focusing on the most important details to protect water quality.

The order is reasonable, and the tiering -tiering and requirements are scaled based on threat to water quality, similar to all other water board programs.

Tier 1 has the minimal requirements and will minimize the burden on small farms and those which pose the least threat to water quality.

Tier 2 is similar to the 2004 agricultural order, and has a reasonable level of requirements for a majority of the farms in the Central Coast region. It includes the necessary reporting of key management practice outcomes and how they are effective.

Tier 3 is necessary and responsible given the increased threat to water quality and the severity and

1	magnitude of water quality problems and impacts to public	1	MS. SCHROETER: It it goes to reasonableness
2	health.	2	and also because of the overwhelming amount of
3	And now Lisa McCann will speak to you more	3	information for these two, so that we just wanted to
4	about our public input	4	start off with the two known to cause severe toxicity and
5	CHAIR YOUNG: Before Lisa starts, I have a	5	impairment in the Central Coast region.
6	couple other questions, Angela, for you.	6	In response to staff's own thinking about other
7	If you could go backwards, you had some slides	7	chemicals that cause toxicity as well as many, many
8	involving the 360 farms in the Salinas area, and the	8	comment letters about that, we included the finding in
9	number of pesticides that were in use.	9	the draft order that specifies, as additional information
10	And I think you said there were a total of 75	10	becomes available and impairments are known and it
11	pesticides in use, that you identified.	11	becomes documented of other chemicals, we may also
12	MS. SCHROETER: There are 75 pesticides which	12	include those or consider those are part of the
13	have been currently detected in surface water.	13	tiering criteria.
14	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.	14	CHAIR YOUNG: And how is that information going
15	MS. SCHROETER: We evaluated of the farms	15	to be known to staff?
16	that apply pesticides are all of them using those 75	16	MR. THOMAS: Well, these studies are ongoing,
17	or are some growers using chemicals that are not even	17	as to the toxicity of various pesticides in in
18	found	18	receiving waters.
19	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.	19	The Department of Pesticide Regulation has a
20	MS. SCHROETER: in surface water?	20	draft report it just came out in February which
21	CHAIR YOUNG: So let's take away the two big	21	goes to this very subject. It it has the sampling
22	ones. Okay? Of those 73, are any of those 73 having a	22	is above and beyond what has been done in the past.
23	toxic affect in surface waters?	23	And it shows that there are other chemicals
24	MS. SCHROETER: Yes.	24	that are causing toxicity and that are found in receiving
25	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. But you're not proposing	25	waters.
	Dago 92		D2 ~ 0 0 1
	Page 82		Page 84
	-		
1	to pull those into the same requirement as you are for	1	And the report or the order, the way we've
2	to pull those into the same requirement as you are for chlorpy chlorpyrifos or diazinon?	2	And the report or the order, the way we've written it, allows the executive officer to take into
2	to pull those into the same requirement as you are for chlorpy chlorpyrifos or diazinon?  MS. SCHROETER: No. Staff considered as	2	And the report or the order, the way we've written it, allows the executive officer to take into account this new information that comes up. And change
2 3 4	to pull those into the same requirement as you are for chlorpy chlorpyrifos or diazinon?  MS. SCHROETER: No. Staff considered as mentioned in the staff report, staff considered a wide	2 3 4	And the report or the order, the way we've written it, allows the executive officer to take into account this new information that comes up. And change the criteria.
2 3 4 5	to pull those into the same requirement as you are for chlorpy chlorpyrifos or diazinon?  MS. SCHROETER: No. Staff considered as mentioned in the staff report, staff considered a wide variety of options for developing requirements related to	2 3 4 5	And the report or the order, the way we've written it, allows the executive officer to take into account this new information that comes up. And change the criteria.  Mister Mr. Young, earlier you said you
2 3 4 5 6	to pull those into the same requirement as you are for chlorpy chlorpyrifos or diazinon?  MS. SCHROETER: No. Staff considered as mentioned in the staff report, staff considered a wide variety of options for developing requirements related to toxicity and pesticide.	2 3 4 5 6	And the report or the order, the way we've written it, allows the executive officer to take into account this new information that comes up. And change the criteria.  Mister Mr. Young, earlier you said you referred to this as a requirement. This is criteria for
2 3 4 5 6 7	to pull those into the same requirement as you are for chlorpy chlorpyrifos or diazinon?  MS. SCHROETER: No. Staff considered as mentioned in the staff report, staff considered a wide variety of options for developing requirements related to toxicity and pesticide.  As an example, we looked at DPR's entire list	2 3 4 5 6 7	And the report or the order, the way we've written it, allows the executive officer to take into account this new information that comes up. And change the criteria.  Mister Mr. Young, earlier you said you referred to this as a requirement. This is criteria for deciding who you know, what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	to pull those into the same requirement as you are for chlorpy chlorpyrifos or diazinon?  MS. SCHROETER: No. Staff considered as mentioned in the staff report, staff considered a wide variety of options for developing requirements related to toxicity and pesticide.  As an example, we looked at DPR's entire list of restricted use chemicals. Looked at which of those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	And the report or the order, the way we've written it, allows the executive officer to take into account this new information that comes up. And change the criteria.  Mister Mr. Young, earlier you said you referred to this as a requirement. This is criteria for deciding who you know, what  CHAIR YOUNG: Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	to pull those into the same requirement as you are for chlorpy chlorpyrifos or diazinon?  MS. SCHROETER: No. Staff considered as mentioned in the staff report, staff considered a wide variety of options for developing requirements related to toxicity and pesticide.  As an example, we looked at DPR's entire list of restricted use chemicals. Looked at which of those chemicals were detected in Central Coast water and which	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	And the report or the order, the way we've written it, allows the executive officer to take into account this new information that comes up. And change the criteria.  Mister Mr. Young, earlier you said you referred to this as a requirement. This is criteria for deciding who you know, what CHAIR YOUNG: Right.  MR. THOMAS: requirements or what conditions
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	to pull those into the same requirement as you are for chlorpy chlorpyrifos or diazinon?  MS. SCHROETER: No. Staff considered as mentioned in the staff report, staff considered a wide variety of options for developing requirements related to toxicity and pesticide.  As an example, we looked at DPR's entire list of restricted use chemicals. Looked at which of those chemicals were detected in Central Coast water and which were in use and still found that that list was very	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	And the report or the order, the way we've written it, allows the executive officer to take into account this new information that comes up. And change the criteria.  Mister Mr. Young, earlier you said you referred to this as a requirement. This is criteria for deciding who you know, what CHAIR YOUNG: Right.  MR. THOMAS: requirements or what conditions are placed on different growers.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	to pull those into the same requirement as you are for chlorpy chlorpyrifos or diazinon?  MS. SCHROETER: No. Staff considered as mentioned in the staff report, staff considered a wide variety of options for developing requirements related to toxicity and pesticide.  As an example, we looked at DPR's entire list of restricted use chemicals. Looked at which of those chemicals were detected in Central Coast water and which were in use and still found that that list was very broad, and felt that that would be overly burdensome to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	And the report or the order, the way we've written it, allows the executive officer to take into account this new information that comes up. And change the criteria.  Mister Mr. Young, earlier you said you referred to this as a requirement. This is criteria for deciding who you know, what  CHAIR YOUNG: Right.  MR. THOMAS: requirements or what conditions are placed on different growers.  CHAIR YOUNG: Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	to pull those into the same requirement as you are for chlorpy chlorpyrifos or diazinon?  MS. SCHROETER: No. Staff considered as mentioned in the staff report, staff considered a wide variety of options for developing requirements related to toxicity and pesticide.  As an example, we looked at DPR's entire list of restricted use chemicals. Looked at which of those chemicals were detected in Central Coast water and which were in use and still found that that list was very broad, and felt that that would be overly burdensome to growers to apply a tiering criteria based upon the use of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	And the report or the order, the way we've written it, allows the executive officer to take into account this new information that comes up. And change the criteria.  Mister Mr. Young, earlier you said you referred to this as a requirement. This is criteria for deciding who you know, what  CHAIR YOUNG: Right.  MR. THOMAS: requirements or what conditions are placed on different growers.  CHAIR YOUNG: Right.  MR. THOMAS: So we would adjust the criteria,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	to pull those into the same requirement as you are for chlorpy chlorpyrifos or diazinon?  MS. SCHROETER: No. Staff considered as mentioned in the staff report, staff considered a wide variety of options for developing requirements related to toxicity and pesticide.  As an example, we looked at DPR's entire list of restricted use chemicals. Looked at which of those chemicals were detected in Central Coast water and which were in use and still found that that list was very broad, and felt that that would be overly burdensome to growers to apply a tiering criteria based upon the use of 75 chemicals.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And the report or the order, the way we've written it, allows the executive officer to take into account this new information that comes up. And change the criteria.  Mister Mr. Young, earlier you said you referred to this as a requirement. This is criteria for deciding who you know, what  CHAIR YOUNG: Right.  MR. THOMAS: requirements or what conditions are placed on different growers.  CHAIR YOUNG: Right.  MR. THOMAS: So we would adjust the criteria, based on new information that comes out. And these
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to pull those into the same requirement as you are for chlorpy chlorpyrifos or diazinon?  MS. SCHROETER: No. Staff considered as mentioned in the staff report, staff considered a wide variety of options for developing requirements related to toxicity and pesticide.  As an example, we looked at DPR's entire list of restricted use chemicals. Looked at which of those chemicals were detected in Central Coast water and which were in use and still found that that list was very broad, and felt that that would be overly burdensome to growers to apply a tiering criteria based upon the use of 75 chemicals.  So that is why we looked at which chemical were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And the report or the order, the way we've written it, allows the executive officer to take into account this new information that comes up. And change the criteria.  Mister Mr. Young, earlier you said you referred to this as a requirement. This is criteria for deciding who you know, what CHAIR YOUNG: Right.  MR. THOMAS: requirements or what conditions are placed on different growers.  CHAIR YOUNG: Right.  MR. THOMAS: So we would adjust the criteria, based on new information that comes out. And these studies that come out about the toxicity of various
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	to pull those into the same requirement as you are for chlorpy chlorpyrifos or diazinon?  MS. SCHROETER: No. Staff considered as mentioned in the staff report, staff considered a wide variety of options for developing requirements related to toxicity and pesticide.  As an example, we looked at DPR's entire list of restricted use chemicals. Looked at which of those chemicals were detected in Central Coast water and which were in use and still found that that list was very broad, and felt that that would be overly burdensome to growers to apply a tiering criteria based upon the use of 75 chemicals.  So that is why we looked at which chemical were well documented to cause toxicity and impairment in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	And the report or the order, the way we've written it, allows the executive officer to take into account this new information that comes up. And change the criteria.  Mister Mr. Young, earlier you said you referred to this as a requirement. This is criteria for deciding who you know, what  CHAIR YOUNG: Right.  MR. THOMAS: requirements or what conditions are placed on different growers.  CHAIR YOUNG: Right.  MR. THOMAS: So we would adjust the criteria, based on new information that comes out. And these studies that come out about the toxicity of various chemicals.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	to pull those into the same requirement as you are for chlorpy chlorpyrifos or diazinon?  MS. SCHROETER: No. Staff considered as mentioned in the staff report, staff considered a wide variety of options for developing requirements related to toxicity and pesticide.  As an example, we looked at DPR's entire list of restricted use chemicals. Looked at which of those chemicals were detected in Central Coast water and which were in use and still found that that list was very broad, and felt that that would be overly burdensome to growers to apply a tiering criteria based upon the use of 75 chemicals.  So that is why we looked at which chemical were well documented to cause toxicity and impairment in waterbodies in the Central Coast region.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	And the report or the order, the way we've written it, allows the executive officer to take into account this new information that comes up. And change the criteria.  Mister Mr. Young, earlier you said you referred to this as a requirement. This is criteria for deciding who you know, what  CHAIR YOUNG: Right.  MR. THOMAS: requirements or what conditions are placed on different growers.  CHAIR YOUNG: Right.  MR. THOMAS: So we would adjust the criteria, based on new information that comes out. And these studies that come out about the toxicity of various chemicals.  CHAIR YOUNG: How is it that you know that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	to pull those into the same requirement as you are for chlorpy chlorpyrifos or diazinon?  MS. SCHROETER: No. Staff considered as mentioned in the staff report, staff considered a wide variety of options for developing requirements related to toxicity and pesticide.  As an example, we looked at DPR's entire list of restricted use chemicals. Looked at which of those chemicals were detected in Central Coast water and which were in use and still found that that list was very broad, and felt that that would be overly burdensome to growers to apply a tiering criteria based upon the use of 75 chemicals.  So that is why we looked at which chemical were well documented to cause toxicity and impairment in waterbodies in the Central Coast region.  And at the time of the drafting of this order,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	And the report or the order, the way we've written it, allows the executive officer to take into account this new information that comes up. And change the criteria.  Mister Mr. Young, earlier you said you referred to this as a requirement. This is criteria for deciding who you know, what  CHAIR YOUNG: Right.  MR. THOMAS: requirements or what conditions are placed on different growers.  CHAIR YOUNG: Right.  MR. THOMAS: So we would adjust the criteria, based on new information that comes out. And these studies that come out about the toxicity of various chemicals.  CHAIR YOUNG: How is it that you know that that there's 73 that do cause toxicity?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to pull those into the same requirement as you are for chlorpy chlorpyrifos or diazinon?  MS. SCHROETER: No. Staff considered as mentioned in the staff report, staff considered a wide variety of options for developing requirements related to toxicity and pesticide.  As an example, we looked at DPR's entire list of restricted use chemicals. Looked at which of those chemicals were detected in Central Coast water and which were in use and still found that that list was very broad, and felt that that would be overly burdensome to growers to apply a tiering criteria based upon the use of 75 chemicals.  So that is why we looked at which chemical were well documented to cause toxicity and impairment in waterbodies in the Central Coast region.  And at the time of the drafting of this order, there was significant evidence in the literature about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And the report or the order, the way we've written it, allows the executive officer to take into account this new information that comes up. And change the criteria.  Mister Mr. Young, earlier you said you referred to this as a requirement. This is criteria for deciding who you know, what  CHAIR YOUNG: Right.  MR. THOMAS: requirements or what conditions are placed on different growers.  CHAIR YOUNG: Right.  MR. THOMAS: So we would adjust the criteria, based on new information that comes out. And these studies that come out about the toxicity of various chemicals.  CHAIR YOUNG: How is it that you know that that there's 73 that do cause toxicity?  MS. SCHROETER: That that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to pull those into the same requirement as you are for chlorpy chlorpyrifos or diazinon?  MS. SCHROETER: No. Staff considered as mentioned in the staff report, staff considered a wide variety of options for developing requirements related to toxicity and pesticide.  As an example, we looked at DPR's entire list of restricted use chemicals. Looked at which of those chemicals were detected in Central Coast water and which were in use and still found that that list was very broad, and felt that that would be overly burdensome to growers to apply a tiering criteria based upon the use of 75 chemicals.  So that is why we looked at which chemical were well documented to cause toxicity and impairment in waterbodies in the Central Coast region.  And at the time of the drafting of this order, there was significant evidence in the literature about chlorpyrifos or diazinon.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And the report or the order, the way we've written it, allows the executive officer to take into account this new information that comes up. And change the criteria.  Mister Mr. Young, earlier you said you referred to this as a requirement. This is criteria for deciding who you know, what  CHAIR YOUNG: Right.  MR. THOMAS: requirements or what conditions are placed on different growers.  CHAIR YOUNG: Right.  MR. THOMAS: So we would adjust the criteria, based on new information that comes out. And these studies that come out about the toxicity of various chemicals.  CHAIR YOUNG: How is it that you know that that there's 73 that do cause toxicity?  MS. SCHROETER: That that's CHAIR YOUNG: Haven't there been studies that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	to pull those into the same requirement as you are for chlorpy chlorpyrifos or diazinon?  MS. SCHROETER: No. Staff considered as mentioned in the staff report, staff considered a wide variety of options for developing requirements related to toxicity and pesticide.  As an example, we looked at DPR's entire list of restricted use chemicals. Looked at which of those chemicals were detected in Central Coast water and which were in use and still found that that list was very broad, and felt that that would be overly burdensome to growers to apply a tiering criteria based upon the use of 75 chemicals.  So that is why we looked at which chemical were well documented to cause toxicity and impairment in waterbodies in the Central Coast region.  And at the time of the drafting of this order, there was significant evidence in the literature about chlorpyrifos or diazinon.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. I but I think you said	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	And the report or the order, the way we've written it, allows the executive officer to take into account this new information that comes up. And change the criteria.  Mister Mr. Young, earlier you said you referred to this as a requirement. This is criteria for deciding who you know, what  CHAIR YOUNG: Right.  MR. THOMAS: requirements or what conditions are placed on different growers.  CHAIR YOUNG: Right.  MR. THOMAS: So we would adjust the criteria, based on new information that comes out. And these studies that come out about the toxicity of various chemicals.  CHAIR YOUNG: How is it that you know that that there's 73 that do cause toxicity?  MS. SCHROETER: That that's CHAIR YOUNG: Haven't there been studies that have shown that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	to pull those into the same requirement as you are for chlorpy chlorpyrifos or diazinon?  MS. SCHROETER: No. Staff considered as mentioned in the staff report, staff considered a wide variety of options for developing requirements related to toxicity and pesticide.  As an example, we looked at DPR's entire list of restricted use chemicals. Looked at which of those chemicals were detected in Central Coast water and which were in use and still found that that list was very broad, and felt that that would be overly burdensome to growers to apply a tiering criteria based upon the use of 75 chemicals.  So that is why we looked at which chemical were well documented to cause toxicity and impairment in waterbodies in the Central Coast region.  And at the time of the drafting of this order, there was significant evidence in the literature about chlorpyrifos or diazinon.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. I but I think you said that the 73 do have a toxic effect in surface waters.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	And the report or the order, the way we've written it, allows the executive officer to take into account this new information that comes up. And change the criteria.  Mister Mr. Young, earlier you said you referred to this as a requirement. This is criteria for deciding who you know, what  CHAIR YOUNG: Right.  MR. THOMAS: requirements or what conditions are placed on different growers.  CHAIR YOUNG: Right.  MR. THOMAS: So we would adjust the criteria, based on new information that comes out. And these studies that come out about the toxicity of various chemicals.  CHAIR YOUNG: How is it that you know that that there's 73 that do cause toxicity?  MS. SCHROETER: That that's CHAIR YOUNG: Haven't there been studies that have shown that?  MS. SCHROETER: There are, but to a lesser
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to pull those into the same requirement as you are for chlorpy chlorpyrifos or diazinon?  MS. SCHROETER: No. Staff considered as mentioned in the staff report, staff considered a wide variety of options for developing requirements related to toxicity and pesticide.  As an example, we looked at DPR's entire list of restricted use chemicals. Looked at which of those chemicals were detected in Central Coast water and which were in use and still found that that list was very broad, and felt that that would be overly burdensome to growers to apply a tiering criteria based upon the use of 75 chemicals.  So that is why we looked at which chemical were well documented to cause toxicity and impairment in waterbodies in the Central Coast region.  And at the time of the drafting of this order, there was significant evidence in the literature about chlorpyrifos or diazinon.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. I but I think you said that the 73 do have a toxic effect in surface waters.  Forgetting forgetting about that there may be not as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	And the report or the order, the way we've written it, allows the executive officer to take into account this new information that comes up. And change the criteria.  Mister Mr. Young, earlier you said you referred to this as a requirement. This is criteria for deciding who you know, what  CHAIR YOUNG: Right.  MR. THOMAS: requirements or what conditions are placed on different growers.  CHAIR YOUNG: Right.  MR. THOMAS: So we would adjust the criteria, based on new information that comes out. And these studies that come out about the toxicity of various chemicals.  CHAIR YOUNG: How is it that you know that that there's 73 that do cause toxicity?  MS. SCHROETER: That that's  CHAIR YOUNG: Haven't there been studies that have shown that?  MS. SCHROETER: There are, but to a lesser degree than to the existing.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to pull those into the same requirement as you are for chlorpy chlorpyrifos or diazinon?  MS. SCHROETER: No. Staff considered as mentioned in the staff report, staff considered a wide variety of options for developing requirements related to toxicity and pesticide.  As an example, we looked at DPR's entire list of restricted use chemicals. Looked at which of those chemicals were detected in Central Coast water and which were in use and still found that that list was very broad, and felt that that would be overly burdensome to growers to apply a tiering criteria based upon the use of 75 chemicals.  So that is why we looked at which chemical were well documented to cause toxicity and impairment in waterbodies in the Central Coast region.  And at the time of the drafting of this order, there was significant evidence in the literature about chlorpyrifos or diazinon.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. I but I think you said that the 73 do have a toxic effect in surface waters.  Forgetting forgetting about that there may be not as much in use as the other two, how I don't I don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And the report or the order, the way we've written it, allows the executive officer to take into account this new information that comes up. And change the criteria.  Mister Mr. Young, earlier you said you referred to this as a requirement. This is criteria for deciding who you know, what  CHAIR YOUNG: Right.  MR. THOMAS: requirements or what conditions are placed on different growers.  CHAIR YOUNG: Right.  MR. THOMAS: So we would adjust the criteria, based on new information that comes out. And these studies that come out about the toxicity of various chemicals.  CHAIR YOUNG: How is it that you know that that there's 73 that do cause toxicity?  MS. SCHROETER: That that's  CHAIR YOUNG: Haven't there been studies that have shown that?  MS. SCHROETER: There are, but to a lesser degree than to the existing.  One of the things that I didn't mention, also,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to pull those into the same requirement as you are for chlorpy chlorpyrifos or diazinon?  MS. SCHROETER: No. Staff considered as mentioned in the staff report, staff considered a wide variety of options for developing requirements related to toxicity and pesticide.  As an example, we looked at DPR's entire list of restricted use chemicals. Looked at which of those chemicals were detected in Central Coast water and which were in use and still found that that list was very broad, and felt that that would be overly burdensome to growers to apply a tiering criteria based upon the use of 75 chemicals.  So that is why we looked at which chemical were well documented to cause toxicity and impairment in waterbodies in the Central Coast region.  And at the time of the drafting of this order, there was significant evidence in the literature about chlorpyrifos or diazinon.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. I but I think you said that the 73 do have a toxic effect in surface waters.  Forgetting forgetting about that there may be not as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	And the report or the order, the way we've written it, allows the executive officer to take into account this new information that comes up. And change the criteria.  Mister Mr. Young, earlier you said you referred to this as a requirement. This is criteria for deciding who you know, what  CHAIR YOUNG: Right.  MR. THOMAS: requirements or what conditions are placed on different growers.  CHAIR YOUNG: Right.  MR. THOMAS: So we would adjust the criteria, based on new information that comes out. And these studies that come out about the toxicity of various chemicals.  CHAIR YOUNG: How is it that you know that that there's 73 that do cause toxicity?  MS. SCHROETER: That that's  CHAIR YOUNG: Haven't there been studies that have shown that?  MS. SCHROETER: There are, but to a lesser degree than to the existing.

Page 83

1	wrong doesn't have an extensive list of pesticides.	1	contributing to toxicity?
2	So, while we do have information, it's not as	2	And it seems like you're you're narrowly
3	robust as what we have for chlorpyrifos and diazinon.	3	defining this criteria here.
4	And what we've done in the draft order is to include a	4	MR. THOMAS: Yes.
5	larger suite of pesticides in the receiving water	5	CHAIR YOUNG: And so I I just have an issue
6	monitoring, so we get a better idea of what chemicals are	6	with that, at this point. And I'll just listen to what
7	being found in surface water and which are causing	7	everyone else has to say about it. But
8	toxicity.	8	MR. THOMAS: Yes. It's true. What you just
9	So this draft order also helps us to gather	9	said is accurate. We're narrowly defining this criteria
10	that new information.	10	according to specific chemicals at this point in time.
11	MR. JEFFRIES: Mr. Chair, if I may, I'd like to	11	The the order requires toxicity sampling in
12	follow up on those other 73.	12	receiving waters. It also says that the executive
13	Are some of those constituents banned	13	officer will will follow up will will order
14	constituents that have been identified?	14	follow-up monitoring to determine what is causing that
15	MS. SCHROETER: The there are banned	15	toxicity, what chemicals are causing that toxicity.
16	constituents that, of course, contribute to toxicity.	16	And there are toxicity identification analyses
17	It's actually, I think, more than 75.	17	that are done. Standard practice is to determine what
18	The the ones that I'm referring to and which	18	chemicals are actually causing it. So that's built in to
19	are indicated in the findings of the draft order are	19	the order to do that follow-up monitoring, to determine
20		20	what those chemicals are and where they are coming from.
21	currently in use.	21	We can't know it ahead of time. We do the
22	CHAIR YOUNG: And in the notice of intent, is	22	
23	there a box there for people to list any pesticides that	23	sampling, we do the analysis to determine what that is,
24	they're using, or just whether they are using C and D?  MS. SCHROETER: The the growers already	24	and then we modify our approach based on those results.  CHAIR YOUNG: But you could know ahead of time
25	report to the Department of Pesticide Regulation, through	25	if they're using any other chemicals on the list, if you
25	Page 86	25	Page 88
1		1	and and instead of the Count the D. I was a thick would
1	the permitting process, which chemicals they plan to use.	1	asked, instead of the C and the D. I mean, that would
2	Staff is has access to that data and we are using that	2	start to give you some information that perhaps you
3	data and evaluating that data.	3	should be looking a little further.
4	Unfortunately, that data doesn't come in a very	4	MR. THOMAS: Hm-hmm.
5	timely manner to us. And so we have put, in the notice	5	CHAIR YOUNG: But we can go on. Lisa, you want
6	of intent, checkboxes that allows them to quickly report	6	to start your portion of this?
7	whether or not they're using chlorpyrifos and diazinon.	7	Oh, actually something else for Angela, if I
8	It also provides a space for them to report	8	could.
9	their pesticide use permit number, so staff can quickly	9	Going back to the tiers, let's say I'm in Tier
10	assess which chemicals they are applying, without	10	1. How do I get out of Tier 1? Is there any way?
11	imposing the burden upon them to report every single	11	MS. SCHROETER: How do you get out of
12	chemical that they're using.	12	CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah.
13	CHAIR YOUNG: Well, seems to me the issue here	13	MS. SCHROETER: Tier 1?
14	is just toxicity, period.	14	CHAIR YOUNG: Let's say I'm a farm farmer
15	MR. THOMAS: It is.	15	NO.
16	CHAIR YOUNG: Not not the individual	16	MS. SCHROETER: You don't want to be in the
17	components of it. I mean, that isn't that what the	17	order.
18	standard is in	18	CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah. You want to you don't
19	in the receiving waters?	19	want to be under this order at all.
20	MR. THOMAS: It is. That is the	20	MS. SCHROETER: Then you would eliminate your
21	CHAIR YOUNG: So	21 22	discharge.
22	MR. THOMAS: basic	1	CHAIR YOUNG: What if you can show that the
23	CHAIR YOUNG: I mean, if you started from	23	discharge is not causing is not violating any
24 25	that and worked backwards, you could simply say, you know, are you discharging anything that might be	25	standards? Yeah, I have a discharge that's water, and
ر ے	Page 87	2 3	Page 89

1 before it gets into groundwater, there's nothing in it; 1 MR. THOMAS: Well, it -- it just --2 before it gets off my land, there's nothing in it except 2 CHAIR YOUNG: -- there is a number out there 3 water, or it -- it's at least meeting receiving water 3 that's not --4 standards. Can I get out of the order? 4 MR. THOMAS: Yeah. They may have a different 5 5 MS. McCHESNEY: I -- let me answer that. The opinion, then, that they're not discharging. 6 6 MR. JEFFRIES: A little levity on this issue. water code requires that a person who's discharging waste 7 7 or intend -- or could discharge waste that could impact CHAIR YOUNG: Right. 8 8 the quality of the waters -- not violate water quality MR. JEFFRIES: But it just -- it brought to 9 9 standards, but could impact the quality of the waters of mind that -- since we're here in Watsonville, I do know 10 the state, must submit a report of waste discharge and 10 that historically there were apple orchards up in the 11 11 receive waste discharge requirements or a waiver of waste Mount Madonna area that didn't irrigate. They were all 12 discharge requirements. 12 natural spring-fed irrigation. 13 13 So just saying that I am not violating water There was no water applied, other than the 14 rainfall and what springs provided to their orchards. 14 quality standards, does not get you out of that 15 obligation to comply with the water code. If you, in 15 There was no turbidity runoff. They did use chemicals to 16 fact, do not discharge anything, then you're not 16 spray. 17 obligated to submit a report of waste discharge or -- or 17 So how do they fit in that criteria? I mean, 18 join this -- enroll in this waiver. 18 there's -- and I think that's kind of where Chairman 19 But the fact that you may discharge something 19 Young was going. If you -- say, if you have a strawberry 20 that could impact the quality of the waters of the state, 20 farm -- I don't want to keep picking on strawberries, but 21 obligates you to comply with the water code and that's 21 I do know they use drip. 22 how it works. 22 And, also, grape. If you have a small 23 23 CHAIR YOUNG: I -- I understand that. And I'm vineyard, 800 acres, then you use drip, you have no 24 24 not -- and I'm not suggesting that someone not file runoff; use some chemicals, but it's all within - you 25 something. 25 meet all the requirements. Page 90 Page 92 1 1 But let's say that people have filed -- let's Why would you have to go through all the nosebleed of filing a -- an application each time, each 2 say they have filed because they could possibly threaten 2 3 3 water quality, but they're then able to demonstrate that reporting time? 4 4 their discharge is not violating any standards. MR. THOMAS: Well, the notice of intent is 5 5 MS. McCHESNEY: Well, the way the order is set something you do once in a five-year period. And it 6 up now is to have a Tier 1. If you want to have a Tier 0 6 would describe your operation. So if you have an 7 7 operation, as you're describing that -- in -- in the or a Tier «, you know, you could have a tier that has 8 8 even lesser requirements if you choose. grower's opinion, is -- is not discharging waste, then 9 9 So if they're below some threshold -that's what they would describe in that. 10 additional threshold -- you know, you could ask how that 10 And I -- I don't think that's a -- a great 11 could work. 11 burden to describe one's operation --12 CHAIR YOUNG: I mean, it's something we could 12 MR. JEFFRIES: Well, there's --13 talk about. But I'd like there to be, you know, some 13 MR. THOMAS: -- every three to five years. 14 14 incentive, you know, for people to try to get to that, MR. JEFFRIES: -- some letters from avocado 15 you know, level where they can demonstrate they're not 15 farmers that gave that somewhat same description. And 16 having an impact on the environment. 16 they want to know why they had to be participating in 17 17 But -this. But -- just bring that up. 18 MR. JEFFRIES: Well, Mr. Chairman, there's 18 MR. THOMAS: As counsel has explained, if -- if 19 obviously 7 percent of the community feels that --19 there is a discharge, and -- they've got to be covered. 20 because we only have 93 percent enrolled in our old 20 MR. JEFFRIES: And if they don't have any 21 order. So there's 7 percent feel that they're in that 21 discharge and they can prove it? 22 22 position already. MR. THOMAS: Then they would not need a permit. 23 23 CHAIR YOUNG: Well, I don't know if that's CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Then could you explain to 24 24 wishful thinking or not. I don't know who the -- who us, like, if you're in Tier 3 or 2, how you could move

25

Page 91

down a tier.

25

they are or what they represent, but --

1	MS. SCHROETER: So the there is a there	1	We heard from many commentors that we shouldn't
2	is we the the order, as with any other pro	2	we should recognize that the the relative load of
3	program or general order, specifies general criteria, and	3	pollutants, and especially recognize that smaller farms
4	so, we recognize that the criteria may not fit all	4	may not have as significant pollutant load as a larger
5	operations, and that some operations may legitimately not	5	farm.
6	belong in a particular tier.	6	And, in terms of nitrate loading potential, I
7	So we included a specific condition I	7	think the evidence shows that you a high
8	believe it's condition number 17 that lists ability	8	nitrate-loading crop over a large acreage is higher risk
9	for a grower to document why they should be in a lower	9	than a high nitrate-loading crop on very small acreage.
10	tier, and it lists all the specific information they	10	So here's an example in front of you that shows
11	could provide.	11	how a Tier 3 operation of greater than a thousand acres
12	And it's similar to other programs. For	12	- how the requirements would apply. Because
13	example, we evaluated what we look at in reports of waste	13	requirements actually apply based upon your individual
14	discharge types of information. It's standard.	14	ranch.
15	MR. JEFFRIES: I don't want to keep harping on	15	So in this example, there is one operation;
16	this issue, but I I keep going back to the criteria of	16	it's 1300 acres and there's three different farms. The
17	Tier 3. And my understanding and correct me if I'm	17	farms may be in the same watershed or they may be in
18	wrong	18	completely different watersheds.
19	if you if you have a farm of a thousand acres or	19	So farm number one is 800 acres lettuce; farm
20	more, is that one of the criterias?	20	number two is 200 acres of carrots; and farm number three
21	MS. SCHROETER: That's correct.	21	maybe is 300 acres of grapes. I put some factors in here
22	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.	22	to help us illustrate more some specifics.
23	MS. SCHROETER: Or, I'm sorry. It's a thousand	23	So let's say the lettuce farm does have
24	acres or more if you grow crops that are high nitrate	24	tailwater; the carrot farm is all on drip, so maybe
25	loading to groundwater. If you just have a thousand acre	25	there's no tailwater; vineyards, of course, have very
	Page 94		Page 96
1	vineyard, you are not automatically Tier 3.	1	little irrigation runoff, and let's say there's no
2	MR. JEFFRIES: In February I used the	2	tailwater.
3	description, and our legal advised me that we couldn't go	3	But let's say that the vineyard is next to this
4	into that at that particular time. And I used the - for	4	creek, which is impaired for sediments and turbidity. So
5	instance, the Jeffries farm. And I farm a thousand	5	farm number one, because it's a high-risk nitrate-loading
6	acres.	6	crop, would have to evaluate their nitrate loading risk
7	But it isn't one plot. It's a thousand acres	7	factor. If that risk factor was high, they would have to
8	over the whole Salinas Valley. I'm one farm, but I I	8	imple develop and implement an irrigation nutrient
9	farm several acres in different parts of the Salinas	9	management plan.
10	Valley; some I own, some I lease.	10	Because they also have tailwater, they would
11	Does that constitute a thousand acres? Would I	11	have to do individual discharge monitoring for their
12	be required to file just because I do farm what	12	irrigation runoff and stormwater.
13	happens if I farm 999 acres?	13	The 200-acre carrot farm would likely after
14	You know, why and so, how does the	14	an evaluation of nitrate loading risk, would likely be
15	collectively you're collecting the amount of acres for	15	low and, therefore, would not require the development and
16	one farming operation.	16	implementation of an irrigation nutrient management plan.
17		1 - 0	
		17	But they have tailwater, and so they would have
18	So Jeffries farm operates a thousand acres, but	17	But they have tailwater, and so they would have to conduct individual monitoring or, I'm sorry they
18 19	So Jeffries farm operates a thousand acres, but it's not one thousand-acre lot; it's 50 acres here, a		to conduct individual monitoring or, I'm sorry they
19	So Jeffries farm operates a thousand acres, but it's not one thousand-acre lot; it's 50 acres here, a hundred acres there and so forth.	17 18	to conduct individual monitoring or, I'm sorry they don't have tailwater, so they would have to do irrigation
19 20	So Jeffries farm operates a thousand acres, but it's not one thousand-acre lot; it's 50 acres here, a hundred acres there and so forth.  Why would I be in Tier 3 if I had a thousand	17 18 19	to conduct individual monitoring or, I'm sorry they don't have tailwater, so they would have to do irrigation runoff monitoring, only stormwater monitoring.
19 20 21	So Jeffries farm operates a thousand acres, but it's not one thousand-acre lot; it's 50 acres here, a hundred acres there and so forth.  Why would I be in Tier 3 if I had a thousand acres?	17 18 19 20 21	to conduct individual monitoring or, I'm sorry they don't have tailwater, so they would have to do irrigation runoff monitoring, only stormwater monitoring.  This farm number three in this example is a
19 20 21 22	So Jeffries farm operates a thousand acres, but it's not one thousand-acre lot; it's 50 acres here, a hundred acres there and so forth.  Why would I be in Tier 3 if I had a thousand acres?  MS. SCHROETER: So I I drafted this slide	17 18 19 20 21 22	to conduct individual monitoring or, I'm sorry they don't have tailwater, so they would have to do irrigation runoff monitoring, only stormwater monitoring.  This farm number three in this example is a vineyard with no tailwater, but next to the sediment
19 20 21 22 23	So Jeffries farm operates a thousand acres, but it's not one thousand-acre lot; it's 50 acres here, a hundred acres there and so forth.  Why would I be in Tier 3 if I had a thousand acres?  MS. SCHROETER: So I I drafted this slide that you see here in front of you. And the draft order	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to conduct individual monitoring or, I'm sorry they don't have tailwater, so they would have to do irrigation runoff monitoring, only stormwater monitoring.  This farm number three in this example is a vineyard with no tailwater, but next to the sediment or turbidity-impaired creek.
19 20 21 22 23 24	So Jeffries farm operates a thousand acres, but it's not one thousand-acre lot; it's 50 acres here, a hundred acres there and so forth.  Why would I be in Tier 3 if I had a thousand acres?  MS. SCHROETER: So I I drafted this slide that you see here in front of you. And the draft order the tiering system is based upon your individual	17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	to conduct individual monitoring or, I'm sorry they don't have tailwater, so they would have to do irrigation runoff monitoring, only stormwater monitoring.  This farm number three in this example is a vineyard with no tailwater, but next to the sediment or turbidity-impaired creek.  Because they're not a high nitrate-loading ran
19 20 21 22 23	So Jeffries farm operates a thousand acres, but it's not one thousand-acre lot; it's 50 acres here, a hundred acres there and so forth.  Why would I be in Tier 3 if I had a thousand acres?  MS. SCHROETER: So I I drafted this slide that you see here in front of you. And the draft order	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to conduct individual monitoring or, I'm sorry they don't have tailwater, so they would have to do irrigation runoff monitoring, only stormwater monitoring.  This farm number three in this example is a vineyard with no tailwater, but next to the sediment or turbidity-impaired creek.

		1	
1	nutrient management plan, but they they would have to	1	independently, and is being evaluated in this aggregate.
2	do the water quality buffer plan or an alternative	2	So, I just have an kind of an issue with it.
3	because they're next to this sediment or	3	MS. SCHROETER: We attempted to be reasonable
4	turbidity-impaired creek.	4	in applying the requirements.
5	So this is an example that illustrates the a	5	CHAIR YOUNG: And I understand. I'm just
6	Tier 3 operation, multiple farms over a large acreage and	6	pointing out what my observation is.
7	how we attempted in the draft order to require	7	Now let's look at farm number two, the 200
8	farm-relevant conditions.	8	acres of carrots. Is farm number two having to do
9	CHAIR YOUNG: Question now. Let's look at	9	anything extra by virtue of the fact that it now happens
10	number farm number one. It has been pulled into Tier	10	to be owned by this individual that has over a thousand
11	3 simply by virtue of the fact that the owner has these	11	acres?
12	other two farms.	12	I mean, would would this be simply a
13	And then, if you had another farm adjacent to	13	could this be a Tier 1? Standing alone.
14	it, everything the same - 800 acres, lettuce, tailwater	14	Got another neighbor next door, farm B, 200
15	- it would not have the same requirements imposed on it;	15	acres of carrots, no tailwater.
16	right?	16	MS. SCHROETER: It depends on if they're using
17	MS. SCHROETER: That is partially true.	17	chlorpyrifos or diazinon. But it's possible. It's
18	Because the if the adjacent acreage was Tier 2, they	18	possible.
19	would still have to evaluate the nitrate loading risk and	19	CHAIR YOUNG: It is possible it could be Tier
20	they would still have to report the total nitrogen	20	1.
21	applied, which are elements of the annual compliance	21	MS. SCHROETER: Hm-hmm.
22	form.	22	CHAIR YOUNG: And it's possible it may not have
23	They would not have to go through the whole	23	to do individual monitoring. Okay.
24	process of evaluation irrigation nutrient management	24	So those are two examples that I I think
25	plan.	25	there's maybe I mean, it's your approach to this. I'm
	Page 98		Page 100
1	And, essentially, what we have done and this	1	not saying it's not reasonable. I'm just pointing out
2	is not to say that the smaller acreage farms don't have	2	that it it's something for us to talk about.
3	the potential for nitrate loading, because they do.	3	MR. JEFFRIES: I think it's going to cause a
4	CHAIR YOUNG: But they do. Right.	4	lot of confusion, in my estimation.
5	MS. SCHROETER: The the the point here in	5	CHAIR YOUNG: Well, it's the fairness factor
6	this requirement is that the smaller operations in the	6	MR. JEFFRIES: Well, it's the fair
7	beginning, have to conduct less requirements. And we	7	CHAIR YOUNG: for me.
8	we are trying to recognize the fact that the smaller	8	MR. JEFFRIES: that on top of that. But
9	farms had several comment letters that the requirements	9	that's the reason I point it out. If you have one
10	were overly burdensome.	10	operation has multiple locations, they may not
11	So it's a phasing of requirements. And	11	collectively be one farm of a thousand acres
12	starting with those operations that are larger and	12	CHAIR YOUNG: Right.
13	potentially have higher risk.	13	MR. JEFFRIES: that they're irrigating or
14	Alternatively, we also considered	14	whatever they're doing at farming at the one particular
15	CHAIR YOUNG: Angela	15	location, but might be spread all over the Salinas
16	MS. SCHROETER: the same requirements from	16	Valley.
17	everybody.	17	CHAIR YOUNG: Right, right, right.
18	CHAIR YOUNG: Excuse me, Angela. But the risk	18	MR. JEFFRIES: And so, consequently, why you
19	to farm from farm number one is no different than the	19	know, if one of their locations meets the Tier 3, why
20	risk to the adjacent farm, doing the exact same thing.	20	does the whole operation meet the Tier 3? The rest of it
21	MS. SCHROETER: Right.	21	might be in Tier 1.
22	CHAIR YOUNG: If that's conceptual, I just have	22	And it and that would make a lot of
23	a problem with the way this is laid out; that just by	23	difference on the type of monitoring that they'd have to
24	virtue of an owner collectively having a lot of land,	24	report and the cost of that monitoring.
25	that each of these farms isn't being evaluated	25	So that's that's my some of my concern.
1	Page 99		Page 101

1 That -- and that's what I was -- tried to allude to in 1 saying good morning, I'm going to say top of the day to 2 February, when I started on that -- that guestioning of 2 you on this St. Patrick's Day. 3 -- of the farm being that size. 3 CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. 4 And I think that's something the staff needs to 4 MS. MC CANN: I'm going to review the public 5 look at and define a little bit better. And maybe the 5 input process and summarize the outcomes of the early 6 6 board should take a little closer look at that. public input prior to us publically distributing the 7 7 CHAIR YOUNG: Well, I -- I think stated another draft -- November 2010 draft agricultural order. And 8 8 way, the -- the level of regulation should be briefly discuss the alternatives that were submitted, and 9 9 commensurate with the threat. Just boil it down to that. how those were considered in developing the draft to 2010 10 10 And if you got two farms side by side that pose 11 11 the same amount of threat, I think that the level of And then I'll review the spe -- some of the 12 regulation should be similar, unless you can demonstrate 12 specific popular comments we got on the -- that draft 13 13 -- better than what I've seen so far -- that it should be that led to the 2011 draft order that we're discussing 14 14 done any differently. today. 15 So, I mean, the only rationale I can see is 15 So we've been seeking input in discussing 16 that you have a -- a landowner with more than a thousand 16 requirements for this order for about two and a half 17 17 acres, that he or she has more money, possibly -- more years, starting in fall 2008; met with numerous 18 revenue stream to deal with this. 18 stakeholders that included several individuals, groups at 19 But I don't know that that should be the 19 multiple events in several different forums. 20 20 criteria that should be used. And through all these meetings and events we 21 MS. SCHROETER: Before we get on to Lisa's 21 received a lot of input, and we've attempted to respond 22 presentation here, just to mention, staff evaluated 22 to all of this input. 23 23 tiering based upon individual ranches. And if you And you might recall that the staff report 24 remember the figure that I showed you in the beginning, 24 included a table that had a long list of all the outreach 25 of the 1700 operations that we have, that's more than 25 events that we attended and participated in. Page 102 Page 104 1 1 3,000 individual farms. In addition to those, we had numerous follow-up And some farms have as many as 10 to 12 ranch 2 2 phone conversations and meetings with individuals as 3 3 -- farms -- individual farms, some operation - I'm outcomes of those particular events, as well. 4 4 So, in summary, as in that early period we sorry. 5 5 And so, what it does is it requires those heard these kind of key -- key points and key input, that 6 particular operations to tier all of their farms 6 we should prioritize based on water quality effects; that 7 individually and to comply with all those requirements 7 human health and drinking water should be the highest 8 8 individually. priority -- protecting human health and drinking water; 9 9 Instead, what we did was to tier versus an that one size does not fit all, and that the requirements 10 operation, and then when it came down to the ranch level, 10 should be higher for those discharging the most or most 11 to apply the conditions ranch -- or farm specific. 11 threatening water quality, and that growers need 12 So, for example, we didn't have all of the Tier 12 flexibility to comply; that we should be reasonable in 13 3 operation -- farms within an operation have to do an 13 terms of providing timeframes that are reasonable, to 14 irrigation nutrient management plan. We attempted to 14 control waste discharges and to meet water quality goals; 15 say, okay, only -- that condition only applies to the 15 that we should require reasonable amounts of 16 farm where it makes sense. 16 implementation, monitoring and reporting requirements; 17 17 CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Who is next? Lisa. and that the flexibility is needed to comply with these 18 We'll take a break after your presentation. So 18 requirements based on uniqueness of the multitude of 19 19 -- I need to get some water. operations. 20 MS. MC CANN: Okay. Well, this is the section 20 So we considered a -- a wide range of options. 21 21 I know you've all been waiting for. And, again, we -- we gave you a lot of pages describing 22 22 CHAIR YOUNG: The end; right? all those options, in the staff report. And that was 23 23 MS. MC CANN: Yes. Exactly. Actually, Michael based on staff research, input from stakeholders and 24 24 -- Michael will be the end. reviewing some readily available examples that we had, as 25 25 And since my last name is McCann, instead of well as alternatives submitted.

Page 103

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, first of all, we used as a basis, as Michael illustrated earlier, the existing 2004 conditional waiver. We also looked back to the recommendations that we had made in our February 1st, 2010 preliminary draft order.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We looked at an alternative that was submitted by OSR Enterprises, which is a farming operation in our region; alternatives submitted by the California Farm Bureau Federation in conjunction with other agricultural organizations and the county farm bureaus; and an alternative submitted by a -- a group of environmental organizations, including the Environmental Defense Setter, Monterey Coastkeeper and others.

I've lined these up in terms of the degree of regulation or requirements, which Michael also talked about in his introduction.

In staff's opinion, the 2004 conditional waiver and the alternative submitted by OSR Enterprises and the Farm Bureau Federation are similar and provide the lowest degree of regulation, relative to this list.

And we compared all these to develop the 2011 draft agricultural order and - this is where it falls in this list as far as the degree of regulation and requirements in evaluating, compared all these options and alternatives to build an order that was responsive to

Page 106

effectively controlling discharges or reducing pollution loading and that the milestones are inadequate.

I want to elaborate on what we found inadequate about the milestones, as proposed in this alternative, and explain the milestones in the draft agricultural order and compare them.

The draft agricultural order includes a general condition for all dischargers to comply with water quality standards, protect beneficial uses and prevent nuisance over time, by controlling their waste discharges.

It also includes specific conditions for Tier 3 dischargers to control individual dischargers of pesticides, toxic substances, sediment and nutrients, by specific dates. So, for example, a condition says, must control discharges -- nutrient discharges by October 1st, 2015.

Both the draft order and the farm bureau proposal contain milestones. And these milestones are indicators of compliance. They're not in of themselves enforceable. But they're indicators of compliance with the conditions of the order, and they give us some indication of whether we're making water quality improvements, both in discharges and receiving waters.

A side-by-side comparison of all the milestones

Page 108

stakeholders' recommendations, while still addressing water quality problems, providing accountability, reasonableness and flexibility.

The farm bureau alternative and the environmental alternative contain some unique features or terms, which I want to mention briefly.

The farm bureau proposal led staff to add the use of coalitions as an acceptable means for individual growers to comply with the order.

But there were several other elements of the proposal that we found unworkable and we did not change anything in our recommendation.

The most unwork -- one of the most unworkable elements is the monitoring and reporting as proposed in that alternative because it did not include any indicators to show control of waste discharges; no indicators to show pollution reduction at individual farm level; no reporting on the results of groundwater monitoring; and no reporting of the results of individual discharge monitoring, which is only an option if a grower wanted to choose it anyway, but, if they were to choose it, that they wouldn't be reporting any of the results of that monitoring.

Equally unworkable was the absence of time schedules to show that management practices are

in the farm bureau proposal and the draft order is contained in the staff report, in section 7 of appendix D. I'm not going to go over all of them, but I just want to explain some of the general differences and give you one example.

The milestones in the draft order apply to both receiving waters and individual discharges for Tier 3 dischargers. The farm bureau proposal only includes milestones for receiving waters.

The milestones in the draft order for individual dischargers are indications of pollution reduction and runoff from these farms. The milestones in the order -- excuse me.

Most significantly, the draft order also includes milestones for nitrate loading to groundwater from individual farms. And there's no comparable milestone in the farm bureau proposal for groundwater.

And, most significantly, the milestones in the draft agricultural order represent greater water quality improvement over shorter timeframes.

These milestones and timeframes are necessary given the severity of the pollution.

They are also necessary so growers have shorter term indicators to inform if and how they are controlling their pollution in their waste discharges such that they Page 109

can be provided the flexibility to use adaptive management in response, and within the five-year term of the order to improve their level of waste discharge.

The milestones in the draft order are reasonably based on technical information that indicates fate of chemicals in the environment and known pollution control practices that have been measured to successfully achieve similar milestones as in the timeframes proposed in the draft agricultural order. And this information is detailed in the staff report, mainly in chapter 3C.

So I want to show how this would relate to an actual stream, the application of these two milestones over time.

In order to do that, we have to convert the farm bureau milestone, which is a 10-percent load reduction, to a concentration, in order to compare directly to staff's milestone, which is the water quality standard for nitrate in drinking water of 10 milligrams per liter.

So that's a concentration expression of the milestone over a five-year timeframe.

So if flow stays the same, a 10-percent load reduction is equivalent to a 10 percent concentration reduction.

So, assume that this stream has a current

Page 110

people implemented management practices and were able to achieve that level of reduction.

At the rate of reduction proposed by the farm bureau group, it would take about 100 years for the river to meet the 10 milligrams per liter concentration.

So this is just a -- the -- a table expression of comparing the nitrate milestones for surface waters between the draft agricultural order and for surface waters for the farm bureau proposal. And, I apologize, these got out of order because I meant to show you this first.

Drinking water quality standard, 10 milligrams per liter over five years, as an indicator of progress and whether we're approaching that in — in the draft order versus a decrease in ni — nitrate loads from the current cooperative monitoring sites, which are the receiving water sites in stream of 10 percent in 10 years.

And I just want you to note here that there's no milestones in the farm bureau proposal for individual discharge reductions; and, as well, not for groundwater.

Okay. Moving on to the environmental alternative.

The environmental alternative was submitted as a letter that expressed support for the components in the

Page 112

nitrate concentration of 30 milligrams per liter. This is a typical surface water concentration for several waters in the lower Santa Maria River and Salinas River watersheds.

If the farm bureau proposal is achieved in this river reach, the concentration would go down by 3 milligrams per liter in 10 years, for an ultimate concentration after 10 years of 27 milligrams per liter.

If the draft order's milestone is achieved, the concentration will go down by 20 milligrams per liter in five years, for a 67-percent reduction.

Let me remind you again at this point, that these -- these milestones are indicators of progress. We don't expect a waterbody, necessarily, that's meeting 30 milligrams per liter, to achieve 10 milligrams per liter in five years.

But we do think that it's reasonable to expect tens of milligrams per liter of reduction, if all of the farms contributing nitrate loading to the surface waterbody actually comply with all the conditions, that that's -- it's reasonable to assume that 10 milligrams per liter or -- or something in that vicinity could be achieved.

And, again, that's -- that's related to the evidence that we have, that we have waterbodies where  $$\tt Page 111$$ 

February 1st, 2010 preliminary draft order, but said the draft order ultimately should be more protective of water quality.

We incorporated some of the elements of the environmental alternative, in terms of monitoring requirements, increased erosion and sediment control requirements, riparian area protections, and clarifications to make it clear how one complies and compliance would be determined.

Okay. We received 116 letters, comment letters, by the comment submittal date of January 3rd, 2011. And those, again, were comments on the November 2010 draft order.

The comment letters themselves represent much more -- or many more than 116 comments and suggestions, because some of the letters were very lengthy and had multiple comments that spanned quite a broad list of topics, as well as the fact that many letters were signed by multiple organizations and/or individuals.

And we posted all these letters on our web site. So for - those who are interested should have by now been able to take a look at what some of the nature of those comments were. And I'm just going to focus on sharing a little bit of our response to some of the more common comments.

1 The focus of the most common comments were 1 2 2 around tiering criteria, drinking water impacts, 3 groundwater protection, monitoring and some legal issues. 3 4 4 Okay. In terms of tiers and tiering criteria 5 - some of this is actually going to speak to some of the 5 6 6 issues that we've already talked about, so I hope it's 7 7 insightful and might clear up some of the -- our 8 8 responses to some of your questions. quality. 9 9 We added proximity to public water supply wells 10 10 that exceed the drinking water standard for nitrate to 11 11 the tiering criteria for Tier 3, so that we'd have a 12 parallel criterion that was protective of groundwater or 12 13 13 -- or spoke to the threat to groundwater quality parallel 14 14 to those that we had already, that were about the threat 15 to surface water quality. 15 16 We removed the size or the acreage amount 16 17 17 relative to the use of pesticides. And this is because 18 we agreed with comments that the size of the operation, 18 19 when it comes to pesticide use, is not necessarily 19 20 20 indicative to threat to water quality. 21 21 And, you know, for example, that goes in part 22 to some pesticides are more toxic than others. So a 22 23 23 little bit has a bigger effect. 24 MR. JEFFRIES: Lisa, before you go on, can you 24 25 go back to the public water supply wells, and what is 25 Page 114 1 that -- can you give me a definition of that? 1 2 MS. MC CANN: Of what a public water supply 2 3 well is? 3 4 4 MR. JEFFRIES: Correct. Fifteen? Over 5 5 fifteen? 6 6 MS. MC CANN: Over fifteen connections with 7 people. Yeah. So that's fifteen connections. 7 8 8 MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. 9 9

And we added the sustainable in practice certification that Angela spoke about earlier, because we got a lot of comments that a certification such as that should be allowable, if it's verifiable and there's demonstrated evidence, which in the case of SIP certified with the Central Coast vineyard team, we have evidence that those farms are having minimal to no impact on water

We also broadened that to say that others -other -- equivalent certifications could be submitted, and the executive officer could then approve those, as also qualifying criterion for Tier 1.

Okay. On the topic of drinking water and conditions related to groundwater, we reduced the frequency of groundwater sampling for Tier 3 dischargers. I -- I think it was quarterly originally, and we made it two events in the first year, so it's parallel to the requirement the -- the number of events for sampling. And that was in response to comments that the cost of groundwater monitoring were -- were burdensome.

We also clarified that groundwater levels are only required where existing well construction allows ease of these measurements, to make it clear that we weren't intending anybody to drill a new well, change their -- their well construction or spend a lot of money

Page 116

MS. MC CANN: Okay. We replaced the term "adjacent to." So there was a criteria that said if you're adjacent to a waterbody impaired for toxicity or pesticides, that that was a qualifying criterion.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And we changed that to say, if you are discharging to that impaired waterbody, rather than just adjacent to it. So there has to be the connection there.

And, again, this -- this more adequately considers operations that are, in fact, actually affecting water quality and don't just happen to be nearby. So that'd be regardless of their proximity to an impaired waterbody. So they could be farther away, but if they're discharging directly, that would qualify.

We added this clarification that the executive officer can add specific pesticides as a criteria, as we have new information that supports that they are causing toxicity along with chlorpyrifos and diazinon.

Page 115

10

11

12

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

on that in order to be able to measure wells and get some baseline information from a suite of wells on levels.

And, again, that responded to comments where people said they were concerned that this sounded like they had to have new wells to meet that requirement.

And we had a requirement to install backflow prevention devices was originally three years. We made it one year because we received several comments that said: Why allow so much time to continue a practice that threatens, if not actually affects, water quality directly?

CHAIR YOUNG: Aren't they already under some requirement to do that?

14 MS. MC CANN: Most counties, but not all 15 counties, in our region have ordinances that require. So 16 that -- that covers the gap there.

Okay. We removed some parameters from being required -- or in the surface water receiving -- surface water receiving monitoring, such as, bacteria.

And this was responsive to comments, again, about costs, but also that there were some constituents that we originally had that are not -- don't appear to be directly discharged or affected from or related to agricultural discharges.

> MR. JEFFRIES: Was that considered from road Page 117

			,
1	discharge, highways?	1	MR. THOMAS: I'm not sure that I I
2	Because I know there was one or two letters	2	understand the question, if you're saying that -
3	that talked about it, there was chemicals coming off of	3	pollution that runs off of Highway 101 onto a farm, who's
4	highways onto their waterways.	4	responsible for that pollution?
5	Would they would they be responsible for	5	MR. JEFFRIES: Right.
6	that cleanup?	6	MR. THOMAS: Under the law I'll be a
7	MS. MC CANN: So so the removing the	7	practice being attorney here for a second both parties
8	parameters is not responsive to that.	8	are responsible.
9	The removing the parameters was specifically	9	MS. McCHESNEY: Well, let me clarify that. So
10	because of the mismatch of the chemicals that we were	10	if a if a if a highway like, if Caltrans is
11		11	subject is discharges from the highway, Caltrans
12	asking to be monitored in receiving water not coming	12	has to have a stormwater permit and has to control those
13	not typically being used or generated by irrigated	13	
14	agricultural activities.	14	discharges, and they would be responsible.
15	MR. JEFFRIES: I don't think you answered my		The farm would not become responsible for that
	question.	15	discharge.
16	MS. MC CANN: I I don't think I did, either.	16	MR. JEFFRIES: Well, I I understand that.
17	But I want to clarify that this this response to	17	And and I knew that would be the answer.
18	comments did not	18	But in in all practicalities, if that
19	MR. JEFFRIES: Maybe listening	19	constituent comes up with the monitoring and the testing
20	MS. MC CANN: respond to those comments.	20	of the water, it's initially going to go to the farmer.
21	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.	21	Now, is he going to have to hire an attorney to
22	MS. MC CANN: So so if you want to restate	22	prove that this is not his or her responsibility?
23	your question, then I'd be happy to answer that. Or try.	23	That that's the area that I'm looking at.
24	MR. JEFFRIES: Well, I'll ask the question	24	MS. McCHESNEY: I think it's a issue in every
25	again. But somebody in the staff surely can answer it.	25	dischargers that monitors. That there's of any
	Page 118		Page 120
1	How do we handle the discharges from roadways;	1	program. They monitor, we get the information. Then you
2	highways, county roads and so forth?	2	evaluate the information: Is there reason to believe
3	Well, city streets are handled under their	3	that that particular discharger is causing that problem?
4	their orders that they have. And whether they	4	Then they would address it.
5	where they end up is another issue.	5	But I think they've attempted the staff has
6	But I'm talking about well, yeah,	6	attempted to have the monitoring program specific to the
7	stormwater, whatever. But, you know, you take Highway 1	7	kinds of chemicals that would come from farms.
8	between here and Salinas, you've got multiple ranches	8	MR. JEFFRIES: I understand.
9	along Highway 1 that there is drainage.	9	MS. McCHESNEY: Not things that would come from
10	MS. MC CANN: I believe Highway 1 would be	10	roads. And and they would evaluate that. Whether
11	covered on the Caltrans has a stormwater permit.	11	that leads to further management practices or any
12	So, yeah. If it's a state road, it's covered	12	enforcement, would be evaluated based on the information.
13	under Caltrans for stormwater runoff and any pollutants	13	It's not some automatic enforcement.
14	in stormwater. If it's a municipal road, it's covered by	14	MR. JEFFRIES: But when you look at if you
15	our municipal stormwater program, and the municipality's	15	take monitoring at the Salinas River or if you take it at
16	obligation to control runoff from roads.	16	the Moro Cojo or if you take it at the Elkhorn Slough or
17	If they are rural roads in rural areas that	17	if you take it at Quail Creek, you're going to have all
18	don't fit into that, there might be a gap there.	18	those involved in that.
19	MR. JEFFRIES: So you're saying that during the	19	
20	monitoring process, if and I don't know if one of the	20	And so, as as a farmer, as the Jeffries farm
21		21	is saying, hey, that isn't my responsibility, is that
22	constituents is benzine or any hydrocarbons are	22	going to be accepted by the staff, or do I have to argue
	detected in that waterway, they're not responsible? Ag?	1	somewhere down the line, or do I have to hire a legal
23	That farm is not responsible?	23	representation to to argue with with you, and say,
24	What happens	24	ain't my job?
25	MS. MC CANN: This well Page 119	25	MS. MC CANN: Could I make a couple comments,
	rade 119	1	Page 121

1 now that I understand where you're going better? 1 the proposed order requires monitoring specific to what 2 2 First of all, be very clear that the is -- might come off of a farm. So that --3 3 constituents that we are recommending be monitored to MR. JEFFRIES: Well, if it's --4 4 inform compliance with the conditions of this draft order MS. McCHESNEY: -- so they're not --5 are those types of constituents that could reasonably be 5 MR. JEFFRIES: -- if it says -- if that says 6 6 assumed to be loaded from agricultural discharges. that --7 7 If we were to find in monitoring for this order MS. McCHESNEY: -- yeah. And that's --8 8 that there are other constituents that are popping up MR. JEFFRIES: -- there, specifically. 9 9 MS. McCHESNEY: -- and the -- right. And the somehow that are signals, then we would be working with 10 growers to followup and figure out what is the source. 10 monitoring and reporting program if -- if a farmer says 11 11 Additionally, in general, our CCAMP program that doesn't fit our farm, they can request the executive 12 monitors parameters beyond what's required in this draft 12 officer to revise and reduce the monitoring. 13 13 order receiving water monitoring, exactly so that we can But, basically, there -- it's not requiring 14 14 find parameters that are coming from anywhere that might people to monitor for things that aren't expected to be 15 be impairing our waters, and respond to that. 15 on farms. And then, there's no suddenly jump to, oh, 16 And my last point is, we have a parallel 16 we're now going to enforce against you because the water 17 17 program -- as you might recall -- the total maximum daily body has this in it. 18 load program, which is explicitly about following up from 18 It's -- it's --19 constituents that are impairing our surface waterbodies 19 MR. JEFFRIES: Yeah. 20 20 identifying all the sources to different reaches or MS. McCHESNEY: -- the -- the non-point service streams or estuaries, and making all the responsible policy and the waiver requires that then you evaluate 21 21 22 sources in loading for those. 22 that information: Are my management practices working to 23 23 So irrigated agriculture would continue to be control my -- the discharges from my farm not from 24 responsible for their portion of the contribution, if 24 somebody else's farm, not from the roads, not from 25 roads or other sources are also causing similar chemicals 25 whatever? Page 122 Page 124 1 or other different chemicals, then we would be involved 1 So it's specific to -- to that. And the waiver 2 in a parallel process with those dischargers about their 2 law requires that there be monitoring to evaluate the 3 3 waste discharges. effectiveness of complying with the terms. MR. JEFFRIES: Do we have a specific language 4 4 So there needs to be some monitoring and 5 5 in this order that defines that? followup, but it's not suddenly we're going to do 6 MS. McCHESNEY: Mr. Jeffries, I'm still 6 enforcement, you have to go hire an attorney. And that 7 confused about - what is your concern? 7 isn't triggered by the way the order is written. 8 8 MR. JEFFRIES: Well, I'm -- my concern is, MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. I just want to make sure 9 9 these folks are working on a very slim margin to operate that there is specific information in -- in that order 10 their ranches. 10 that says what you just said. 11 And if we start making them require for other 11 MR. BRIGGS: If I -- if I could add a comment, 12 people responsibilities; whether it's erosion or from 12 Mr. Jeffries. The examples you're giving of major 13 some other area, or chemicals off of a highway that's 13 waterbodies -- I think you mentioned Elkhorn Slough and 14 responsible to Caltrans or the county perhaps -- then I 14 Quail Creek and so forth -- those waterbodies are - and 15 think it puts undue financial burden on the individual 15 the receiving water are measured currently through the 16 farmer to make that happen. So --16 cooperative monitoring program. 17 17 MS. McCHESNEY: Okay. And I think that --MR. JEFFRIES: Right. 18 MR. JEFFRIES: -- and that's -- and that's 18 MR. BRIGGS: And they are confluence points. 19 19 So that is more watershed scale monitoring, which isn't where, you know, clarification and -- most of these folks 20 out here, you know, they don't have legal staff on -- on 20 just affected by agriculture. 21 21 their -- you know, to be paid to -- to analyze and So that's what we have going now already with 22 22 interpret all these rules and regulations of exactly what the existing order, and will continue with the propose --23 23 they're supposed to do. proposal that we have here. 24 24 MS. McCHESNEY: Okay. And I think that the So we recognize that there are going to be 25 25 answer to the first part of your question is that the -signals in that data -- min -- mineral results, for

Page 123

1	example where some of the elevations in certain	1	at the second bullet
2	watersheds are from what comes out of the natural	2	MR. JEFFRIES: Right.
3	formations; from the soil and the rock that are that	3	MS. MC CANN: related to our response to
4	are in those watersheds.	4	comments to some comments related to monitoring.
5	So and and in other cases, it may be	5	And the second bullet is referring to the fact
6	affected by, as you say, runoff from roads. We have	6	that we what did we do? What page am I on? Excuse me
7		7	a second.
8	coordination with the City of Salinas, municipal	8	
	stormwater program, where we have up-gradient,	9	Oh, we changed the individual discharge
9	down-gradient monitoring.		monitoring toxicity test, so that they would be species
10	And we recognize that that will pick up	10	that were more indicative of pesticides like pyrethroids
11	different signals, depending on what's draining to those	11	that might become substitutes for chlorpyrifos and
12	points. So we've been dealing with that already with the	12	diazinon so that we would have a backstop for being able
13	cooperative monitoring program.	13	to track other known pesticides that are being used that
14	MR. JEFFRIES: Well, I I gave a	14	are also causing toxicity.
15	demonstration of large waterbodies. But I also used the	15	And that was in response to the comments along
16	demonstration Highway 1.	16	the lines of what we spoke about earlier, where there
17	And you got several fields of artichokes along	17	were comments that, if we just overly focused on
18	Highway 1, as well as strawberry fields, and brussel	18	chlorpyrifos and diazinon that that we weren't
19	sprouts and a number of other crops that you look at	19	considering the other sources of toxicity.
20	between here and Salinas.	20	So this is a way that monitoring helps us
21	And they're all adjacent to a state highway or	21	indicate that better.
22	a county highway. Those are not large waterbodies that	22	MR. JEFFRIES: Can you briefly say something
23	I'm talking about. But you would have runoff on those	23	about the the species?
24	particular farms.	24	Because I know there was a at least one
25	And if that chemical is commingled with their	25	comment letter that, you know, kind of criticized staff
	Page 126		Page 128
1	testing, I just want to make sure that those folks are	1	for picking a flea, you know, out of the host of types of
2	not responsible for that runoff.	2	species for testing, and commented about that.
3	MR. BRIGGS: Right.	3	MS. MC CANN: It's standard.
4	MR. JEFFRIES: That that's where I'm going	4	MR. THOMAS: We we actually use
5	with that.	5	MR. JEFFRIES: Did you guys make come up
6	MR. BRIGGS: Right. And if if any of those	6	with this list on your own, of species?
7	farmers and that's a big if were required to do	7	MR. THOMAS: No. There's a there's a
8	individual runoff monitoring from their farm and one	8	standard list of species that can be used for toxicity
9	of the common problematic constituents from roadways is	9	tests. There are fish, algae and invertebrates and that
10	copper from brake linings.	10	range of species available.
11	They're the growers would not be required to	11	We use all three categories or all three
12	analyze for copper. Another one is total petroleum	12	species; fish, invertebrate and algae. And so, the
13	hydrocarbon	13	toxicity results are based on
14	MR. JEFFRIES: Asbestos.	14	MR. JEFFRIES: Who came up with the species
15	MR. BRIGGS: from oil and grease.	15	that can be chosen?
16	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.	16	(Reporter clarification)
17	MALE: They're not required to monitor for	17	MR. BRIGGS: EPA, she said.
18	that. So it wouldn't even show up. It wouldn't be an	18	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: EPA.
19		19	
	issue.	20	MR. BRIGGS: U.S. EPA.
20	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.		MR. JEFFRIES: EPA.
21	MS. MC CANN: I think I'm going to start here	21	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There's standard test
22	on the second bullet.	22	organisms under the most commonly used ones. Sometimes
23	(Off the record)	23	others are substituted; for example, in brackish water,
		O 4	
24	CHAIR YOUNG: Go ahead.	24	where they're more appropriate.
	CHAIR YOUNG: Go ahead.  MS. MC CANN: All right. I think we left off  Page 127	24 25	where they're more appropriate.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  Page 129

1	LINIDENTIFIED CDEAKED. But thou're outromoly	1	conditions to control their individual waste discharge or
2	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But they're extremely typical test organisms used in permits throughout the	1 2	conditions to control their individual waste discharge or
3	nation.	3	pollutant loads by a specified date.  And, as I discussed in detail earlier, that the
4	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.	4	milestones are indicators of whether these conditions are
5	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And yeah.	5	being met.
6	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. Thank you.	6	And this was responsive to comments that the
7	MR. THOMAS: And, Mr. Chairman, if a particular	7	provisions related to water quality standards would
8	species of fish is used or a particular species of algae	8	require immediate compliance with all water quality
9	or an invertebrate, it is not necessarily to protect that	9	standards without regard for the time for any time
10	species. That is an indicator organism for that category	10	schedules with the other considerations that we needed to
11	and for overall biological health.	11	be making.
12	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.	12	So, in summary, we considered several options,
13	MS. MC CANN: Maybe I should have clarified,	13	the alternative proposals, as I summarized, and hundreds
14	too. In this specific change it was simply for	14	of comments, and we made lots of changes. And I only
15	indicating what type of toxicity we have. We changed	15	highlighted some of the most common in in the
16	from algae to invertebrates, which are more sensitive to	16	presentation that I just made.
17	these other types of pesticides, like pyrethroids.	17	So, I'll now turn it over to Michael to
18	So it's not the general toxicity test of all	18	conclude our staff presentation.
19	the species.	19	MR. THOMAS: Okay. Just touch on a few
20	And then we in response to lots of comments	20	misunderstandings that we have heard multiple times.
21	about the the monitoring reporting program was	21	One is that growers must drill monitoring wells
22	confusing, and some misunderstandings about some aspects	22	to meet the requirements of this order. And that's not
23	of it.	23	accurate. There is no requirement to drill wells.
24	We clarified it by separating it into the three	24	The requirement is to sample existing wells.
25	tiers so that it was really clear which monitoring and	25	That can be ag wells or domestic wells.
	Page 130		Page 132
1		1	
1	reporting requirements applied to dischargers that would	1	Another is that groundwater sampling will cost
2	fall into each of the three tiers.	2	individual growers tens of thousands of dollars per year
2	fall into each of the three tiers.  Okay. In terms of some of the common legal	2 3	individual growers tens of thousands of dollars per year per grower, per year. That's not accurate.
2 3 4	fall into each of the three tiers.  Okay. In terms of some of the common legal issues, we added language that clarified the law with	2 3 4	individual growers tens of thousands of dollars per year per grower, per year. That's not accurate. We estimate the cost for Tier 1 and Tier 2
2 3 4 5	fall into each of the three tiers.  Okay. In terms of some of the common legal issues, we added language that clarified the law with respect to confidential information, in response to	2 3 4 5	individual growers tens of thousands of dollars per year per grower, per year. That's not accurate.  We estimate the cost for Tier 1 and Tier 2 growers at \$790 for the life of the permit; and for Tier
2 3 4 5 6	fall into each of the three tiers.  Okay. In terms of some of the common legal issues, we added language that clarified the law with respect to confidential information, in response to concerns that farm plans and some of the other plans that	2 3 4 5 6	individual growers tens of thousands of dollars per year per grower, per year. That's not accurate.  We estimate the cost for Tier 1 and Tier 2 growers at \$790 for the life of the permit; and for Tier 3 growers, approximately \$2,370, also over the life of
2 3 4 5 6 7	fall into each of the three tiers.  Okay. In terms of some of the common legal issues, we added language that clarified the law with respect to confidential information, in response to concerns that farm plans and some of the other plans that would be submitted might contain proprietary information.	2 3 4 5 6 7	individual growers tens of thousands of dollars per year per grower, per year. That's not accurate.  We estimate the cost for Tier 1 and Tier 2 growers at \$790 for the life of the permit; and for Tier 3 growers, approximately \$2,370, also over the life of the permit.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	fall into each of the three tiers.  Okay. In terms of some of the common legal issues, we added language that clarified the law with respect to confidential information, in response to concerns that farm plans and some of the other plans that would be submitted might contain proprietary information. And we spoke about that quite a bit, earlier.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	individual growers tens of thousands of dollars per year per grower, per year. That's not accurate.  We estimate the cost for Tier 1 and Tier 2 growers at \$790 for the life of the permit; and for Tier 3 growers, approximately \$2,370, also over the life of the permit.  We also heard that there's a prohibition of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	fall into each of the three tiers.  Okay. In terms of some of the common legal issues, we added language that clarified the law with respect to confidential information, in response to concerns that farm plans and some of the other plans that would be submitted might contain proprietary information.  And we spoke about that quite a bit, earlier.  We deleted some prohibitions, such as the one	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	individual growers tens of thousands of dollars per year per grower, per year. That's not accurate.  We estimate the cost for Tier 1 and Tier 2 growers at \$790 for the life of the permit; and for Tier 3 growers, approximately \$2,370, also over the life of the permit.  We also heard that there's a prohibition of tile drains. And that's that because of that, land
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	fall into each of the three tiers.  Okay. In terms of some of the common legal issues, we added language that clarified the law with respect to confidential information, in response to concerns that farm plans and some of the other plans that would be submitted might contain proprietary information. And we spoke about that quite a bit, earlier.  We deleted some prohibitions, such as the one that prohibited the use of excess fertilizer. And we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	individual growers tens of thousands of dollars per year per grower, per year. That's not accurate.  We estimate the cost for Tier 1 and Tier 2 growers at \$790 for the life of the permit; and for Tier 3 growers, approximately \$2,370, also over the life of the permit.  We also heard that there's a prohibition of tile drains. And that's that because of that, land will be fallowed. There is no prohibition for tile
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	fall into each of the three tiers.  Okay. In terms of some of the common legal issues, we added language that clarified the law with respect to confidential information, in response to concerns that farm plans and some of the other plans that would be submitted might contain proprietary information.  And we spoke about that quite a bit, earlier.  We deleted some prohibitions, such as the one that prohibited the use of excess fertilizer. And we revised others into general conditions.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	individual growers tens of thousands of dollars per year per grower, per year. That's not accurate.  We estimate the cost for Tier 1 and Tier 2 growers at \$790 for the life of the permit; and for Tier 3 growers, approximately \$2,370, also over the life of the permit.  We also heard that there's a prohibition of tile drains. And that's that because of that, land will be fallowed. There is no prohibition for tile drains.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	fall into each of the three tiers.  Okay. In terms of some of the common legal issues, we added language that clarified the law with respect to confidential information, in response to concerns that farm plans and some of the other plans that would be submitted might contain proprietary information.  And we spoke about that quite a bit, earlier.  We deleted some prohibitions, such as the one that prohibited the use of excess fertilizer. And we revised others into general conditions.  So, for example, there was a prohibition on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	individual growers tens of thousands of dollars per year per grower, per year. That's not accurate.  We estimate the cost for Tier 1 and Tier 2 growers at \$790 for the life of the permit; and for Tier 3 growers, approximately \$2,370, also over the life of the permit.  We also heard that there's a prohibition of tile drains. And that's that because of that, land will be fallowed. There is no prohibition for tile drains.  Also we've also heard that everyone has to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	fall into each of the three tiers.  Okay. In terms of some of the common legal issues, we added language that clarified the law with respect to confidential information, in response to concerns that farm plans and some of the other plans that would be submitted might contain proprietary information.  And we spoke about that quite a bit, earlier.  We deleted some prohibitions, such as the one that prohibited the use of excess fertilizer. And we revised others into general conditions.  So, for example, there was a prohibition on having bare soil that could cause erosion and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	individual growers tens of thousands of dollars per year per grower, per year. That's not accurate.  We estimate the cost for Tier 1 and Tier 2 growers at \$790 for the life of the permit; and for Tier 3 growers, approximately \$2,370, also over the life of the permit.  We also heard that there's a prohibition of tile drains. And that's that because of that, land will be fallowed. There is no prohibition for tile drains.  Also we've also heard that everyone has to have a buffer strip of X feet, and that some of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	fall into each of the three tiers.  Okay. In terms of some of the common legal issues, we added language that clarified the law with respect to confidential information, in response to concerns that farm plans and some of the other plans that would be submitted might contain proprietary information.  And we spoke about that quite a bit, earlier.  We deleted some prohibitions, such as the one that prohibited the use of excess fertilizer. And we revised others into general conditions.  So, for example, there was a prohibition on having bare soil that could cause erosion and sedimentation. And we changed that to a condition that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	individual growers tens of thousands of dollars per year per grower, per year. That's not accurate.  We estimate the cost for Tier 1 and Tier 2 growers at \$790 for the life of the permit; and for Tier 3 growers, approximately \$2,370, also over the life of the permit.  We also heard that there's a prohibition of tile drains. And that's that because of that, land will be fallowed. There is no prohibition for tile drains.  Also we've also heard that everyone has to have a buffer strip of X feet, and that some of the comments we've gotten are the high end that I've heard
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	fall into each of the three tiers.  Okay. In terms of some of the common legal issues, we added language that clarified the law with respect to confidential information, in response to concerns that farm plans and some of the other plans that would be submitted might contain proprietary information.  And we spoke about that quite a bit, earlier.  We deleted some prohibitions, such as the one that prohibited the use of excess fertilizer. And we revised others into general conditions.  So, for example, there was a prohibition on having bare soil that could cause erosion and sedimentation. And we changed that to a condition that says dischargers must ensure that sediment from these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	individual growers tens of thousands of dollars per year per grower, per year. That's not accurate.  We estimate the cost for Tier 1 and Tier 2 growers at \$790 for the life of the permit; and for Tier 3 growers, approximately \$2,370, also over the life of the permit.  We also heard that there's a prohibition of tile drains. And that's that because of that, land will be fallowed. There is no prohibition for tile drains.  Also we've also heard that everyone has to have a buffer strip of X feet, and that some of the comments we've gotten are the high end that I've heard is a thousand feet and that all that land will be taken
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	fall into each of the three tiers.  Okay. In terms of some of the common legal issues, we added language that clarified the law with respect to confidential information, in response to concerns that farm plans and some of the other plans that would be submitted might contain proprietary information.  And we spoke about that quite a bit, earlier.  We deleted some prohibitions, such as the one that prohibited the use of excess fertilizer. And we revised others into general conditions.  So, for example, there was a prohibition on having bare soil that could cause erosion and sedimentation. And we changed that to a condition that says dischargers must ensure that sediment from these areas does not discharge as a waste into waterbodies and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	individual growers tens of thousands of dollars per year per grower, per year. That's not accurate.  We estimate the cost for Tier 1 and Tier 2 growers at \$790 for the life of the permit; and for Tier 3 growers, approximately \$2,370, also over the life of the permit.  We also heard that there's a prohibition of tile drains. And that's that because of that, land will be fallowed. There is no prohibition for tile drains.  Also we've also heard that everyone has to have a buffer strip of X feet, and that some of the comments we've gotten are the high end that I've heard is a thousand feet and that all that land will be taken out of production. That's not accurate.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	fall into each of the three tiers.  Okay. In terms of some of the common legal issues, we added language that clarified the law with respect to confidential information, in response to concerns that farm plans and some of the other plans that would be submitted might contain proprietary information.  And we spoke about that quite a bit, earlier.  We deleted some prohibitions, such as the one that prohibited the use of excess fertilizer. And we revised others into general conditions.  So, for example, there was a prohibition on having bare soil that could cause erosion and sedimentation. And we changed that to a condition that says dischargers must ensure that sediment from these areas does not discharge as a waste into waterbodies and negatively affect water quality.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	individual growers tens of thousands of dollars per year per grower, per year. That's not accurate.  We estimate the cost for Tier 1 and Tier 2 growers at \$790 for the life of the permit; and for Tier 3 growers, approximately \$2,370, also over the life of the permit.  We also heard that there's a prohibition of tile drains. And that's that because of that, land will be fallowed. There is no prohibition for tile drains.  Also we've also heard that everyone has to have a buffer strip of X feet, and that some of the comments we've gotten are the high end that I've heard is a thousand feet and that all that land will be taken out of production. That's not accurate.  You've we've had an extensive discussion on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	fall into each of the three tiers.  Okay. In terms of some of the common legal issues, we added language that clarified the law with respect to confidential information, in response to concerns that farm plans and some of the other plans that would be submitted might contain proprietary information.  And we spoke about that quite a bit, earlier.  We deleted some prohibitions, such as the one that prohibited the use of excess fertilizer. And we revised others into general conditions.  So, for example, there was a prohibition on having bare soil that could cause erosion and sedimentation. And we changed that to a condition that says dischargers must ensure that sediment from these areas does not discharge as a waste into waterbodies and negatively affect water quality.  This was responsive to comments that blanket	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	individual growers tens of thousands of dollars per year per grower, per year. That's not accurate.  We estimate the cost for Tier 1 and Tier 2 growers at \$790 for the life of the permit; and for Tier 3 growers, approximately \$2,370, also over the life of the permit.  We also heard that there's a prohibition of tile drains. And that's that because of that, land will be fallowed. There is no prohibition for tile drains.  Also we've also heard that everyone has to have a buffer strip of X feet, and that some of the comments we've gotten are the high end that I've heard is a thousand feet and that all that land will be taken out of production. That's not accurate.  You've we've had an extensive discussion on buffer areas this morning. So I won't go into that any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	fall into each of the three tiers.  Okay. In terms of some of the common legal issues, we added language that clarified the law with respect to confidential information, in response to concerns that farm plans and some of the other plans that would be submitted might contain proprietary information.  And we spoke about that quite a bit, earlier.  We deleted some prohibitions, such as the one that prohibited the use of excess fertilizer. And we revised others into general conditions.  So, for example, there was a prohibition on having bare soil that could cause erosion and sedimentation. And we changed that to a condition that says dischargers must ensure that sediment from these areas does not discharge as a waste into waterbodies and negatively affect water quality.  This was responsive to comments that blanket prohibitions are not authorized in waivers and that some	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	individual growers tens of thousands of dollars per year per grower, per year. That's not accurate.  We estimate the cost for Tier 1 and Tier 2 growers at \$790 for the life of the permit; and for Tier 3 growers, approximately \$2,370, also over the life of the permit.  We also heard that there's a prohibition of tile drains. And that's that because of that, land will be fallowed. There is no prohibition for tile drains.  Also we've also heard that everyone has to have a buffer strip of X feet, and that some of the comments we've gotten are the high end that I've heard is a thousand feet and that all that land will be taken out of production. That's not accurate.  You've we've had an extensive discussion on buffer areas this morning. So I won't go into that any further.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	fall into each of the three tiers.  Okay. In terms of some of the common legal issues, we added language that clarified the law with respect to confidential information, in response to concerns that farm plans and some of the other plans that would be submitted might contain proprietary information.  And we spoke about that quite a bit, earlier.  We deleted some prohibitions, such as the one that prohibited the use of excess fertilizer. And we revised others into general conditions.  So, for example, there was a prohibition on having bare soil that could cause erosion and sedimentation. And we changed that to a condition that says dischargers must ensure that sediment from these areas does not discharge as a waste into waterbodies and negatively affect water quality.  This was responsive to comments that blanket prohibitions are not authorized in waivers and that some of the specific prohibitions were specifically for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	individual growers tens of thousands of dollars per year per grower, per year. That's not accurate.  We estimate the cost for Tier 1 and Tier 2 growers at \$790 for the life of the permit; and for Tier 3 growers, approximately \$2,370, also over the life of the permit.  We also heard that there's a prohibition of tile drains. And that's that because of that, land will be fallowed. There is no prohibition for tile drains.  Also we've also heard that everyone has to have a buffer strip of X feet, and that some of the comments we've gotten are the high end that I've heard is a thousand feet and that all that land will be taken out of production. That's not accurate.  You've we've had an extensive discussion on buffer areas this morning. So I won't go into that any further.  Another is that dischargers must meet a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	fall into each of the three tiers.  Okay. In terms of some of the common legal issues, we added language that clarified the law with respect to confidential information, in response to concerns that farm plans and some of the other plans that would be submitted might contain proprietary information.  And we spoke about that quite a bit, earlier.  We deleted some prohibitions, such as the one that prohibited the use of excess fertilizer. And we revised others into general conditions.  So, for example, there was a prohibition on having bare soil that could cause erosion and sedimentation. And we changed that to a condition that says dischargers must ensure that sediment from these areas does not discharge as a waste into waterbodies and negatively affect water quality.  This was responsive to comments that blanket prohibitions are not authorized in waivers and that some of the specific prohibitions were specifically for activities that are outside the board's authority.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	individual growers tens of thousands of dollars per year per grower, per year. That's not accurate.  We estimate the cost for Tier 1 and Tier 2 growers at \$790 for the life of the permit; and for Tier 3 growers, approximately \$2,370, also over the life of the permit.  We also heard that there's a prohibition of tile drains. And that's that because of that, land will be fallowed. There is no prohibition for tile drains.  Also we've also heard that everyone has to have a buffer strip of X feet, and that some of the comments we've gotten are the high end that I've heard is a thousand feet and that all that land will be taken out of production. That's not accurate.  You've we've had an extensive discussion on buffer areas this morning. So I won't go into that any further.  Another is that dischargers must meet a standard of 1 milligrams per liter of nitrate in surface
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	fall into each of the three tiers.  Okay. In terms of some of the common legal issues, we added language that clarified the law with respect to confidential information, in response to concerns that farm plans and some of the other plans that would be submitted might contain proprietary information.  And we spoke about that quite a bit, earlier.  We deleted some prohibitions, such as the one that prohibited the use of excess fertilizer. And we revised others into general conditions.  So, for example, there was a prohibition on having bare soil that could cause erosion and sedimentation. And we changed that to a condition that says dischargers must ensure that sediment from these areas does not discharge as a waste into waterbodies and negatively affect water quality.  This was responsive to comments that blanket prohibitions are not authorized in waivers and that some of the specific prohibitions were specifically for activities that are outside the board's authority.  And, finally, we clarified that dischargers	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	individual growers tens of thousands of dollars per year per grower, per year. That's not accurate.  We estimate the cost for Tier 1 and Tier 2 growers at \$790 for the life of the permit; and for Tier 3 growers, approximately \$2,370, also over the life of the permit.  We also heard that there's a prohibition of tile drains. And that's that because of that, land will be fallowed. There is no prohibition for tile drains.  Also we've also heard that everyone has to have a buffer strip of X feet, and that some of the comments we've gotten are the high end that I've heard is a thousand feet and that all that land will be taken out of production. That's not accurate.  You've we've had an extensive discussion on buffer areas this morning. So I won't go into that any further.  Another is that dischargers must meet a standard of 1 milligrams per liter of nitrate in surface waters, which is not accurate. The order does not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	fall into each of the three tiers.  Okay. In terms of some of the common legal issues, we added language that clarified the law with respect to confidential information, in response to concerns that farm plans and some of the other plans that would be submitted might contain proprietary information.  And we spoke about that quite a bit, earlier.  We deleted some prohibitions, such as the one that prohibited the use of excess fertilizer. And we revised others into general conditions.  So, for example, there was a prohibition on having bare soil that could cause erosion and sedimentation. And we changed that to a condition that says dischargers must ensure that sediment from these areas does not discharge as a waste into waterbodies and negatively affect water quality.  This was responsive to comments that blanket prohibitions are not authorized in waivers and that some of the specific prohibitions were specifically for activities that are outside the board's authority.  And, finally, we clarified that dischargers must comply with water quality standards over time, by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	individual growers tens of thousands of dollars per year per grower, per year. That's not accurate.  We estimate the cost for Tier 1 and Tier 2 growers at \$790 for the life of the permit; and for Tier 3 growers, approximately \$2,370, also over the life of the permit.  We also heard that there's a prohibition of tile drains. And that's that because of that, land will be fallowed. There is no prohibition for tile drains.  Also we've also heard that everyone has to have a buffer strip of X feet, and that some of the comments we've gotten are the high end that I've heard is a thousand feet and that all that land will be taken out of production. That's not accurate.  You've we've had an extensive discussion on buffer areas this morning. So I won't go into that any further.  Another is that dischargers must meet a standard of 1 milligrams per liter of nitrate in surface waters, which is not accurate. The order does not require that in any way, shape or form.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	fall into each of the three tiers.  Okay. In terms of some of the common legal issues, we added language that clarified the law with respect to confidential information, in response to concerns that farm plans and some of the other plans that would be submitted might contain proprietary information.  And we spoke about that quite a bit, earlier.  We deleted some prohibitions, such as the one that prohibited the use of excess fertilizer. And we revised others into general conditions.  So, for example, there was a prohibition on having bare soil that could cause erosion and sedimentation. And we changed that to a condition that says dischargers must ensure that sediment from these areas does not discharge as a waste into waterbodies and negatively affect water quality.  This was responsive to comments that blanket prohibitions are not authorized in waivers and that some of the specific prohibitions were specifically for activities that are outside the board's authority.  And, finally, we clarified that dischargers	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	individual growers tens of thousands of dollars per year per grower, per year. That's not accurate.  We estimate the cost for Tier 1 and Tier 2 growers at \$790 for the life of the permit; and for Tier 3 growers, approximately \$2,370, also over the life of the permit.  We also heard that there's a prohibition of tile drains. And that's that because of that, land will be fallowed. There is no prohibition for tile drains.  Also we've also heard that everyone has to have a buffer strip of X feet, and that some of the comments we've gotten are the high end that I've heard is a thousand feet and that all that land will be taken out of production. That's not accurate.  You've we've had an extensive discussion on buffer areas this morning. So I won't go into that any further.  Another is that dischargers must meet a standard of 1 milligrams per liter of nitrate in surface waters, which is not accurate. The order does not

nitrate standard in receiving waters?

MR. THOMAS: It requires compliance ultimately with the basin plan standards, which is 10 milligrams per liter, which is the drinking water standard.

There are conclusions and recommendations. A couple of things I'd like to go over and in conclusion is -- one of the things I want to talk about is the severity of the problem, or emphasize the severity of the water quality problems in our region.

As I mentioned this morning, the groundwater pollution, the threat to public supply wells and the actual contamination in public supply wells, shutting down of these wells and abandoning the wells, treating water and drilling new wells is a huge problem in our region for many communities, especially disadvantage -- disadvantaged and smaller communities. And the problem is getting worse, not better.

We've heard from -- and you're going to hear today -- from some people that are affected by this water pollution. We've heard from water providers in municipalities that say their costs are staggering. And we've documented some of those in our staff report.

And one water provider said that they cannot drill water supply wells fast enough to deal with the nitrate problem. And treatment is so expensive that

Page 134

groundwater and surface water treatment that are currently not working in this arena; working in all the other arenas that the board regulates.

And you hear from those individuals on a regular basis. We have thousands and thousands of cases that are not ag related. But we have people working on those experts in the -- in the surface water and groundwater treatment -- working on those cases. And they are not bringing their expertise to bear on this issue.

If the board adopts meaningful requirements, that will happen. I think they will be working with organizations like the Strawberry Commission and other commodity groups to solve these problems.

Dischargers are accountable for the discharges of pollution from their property. We talked about -- earlier -- extensively about discharges from roadways, Caltrans, and Caltrans being responsible for those discharges. That's true.

And all property owners are responsible for the discharges of pollution from their property.

The public has a right to clean water. This something that people have actually debated us on. I have one comment letter that said the public is not -- does not have a right to clean water, that we're wrong

Page 136

they're still trying to drill new wells, even though it can cost millions of dollars to -- for the entire process of putting in a new public supply well.

The water board is the only agency with the authority and the responsibility to deal with these water pollution problems; both the groundwater problems and the surface water problems.

And we are accountable for dealing with these problems. It's our responsibility.

There are solutions. I firmly believe that solutions will be implemented, and they will be developed. And largely by the ag industry itself.

Organizations like the strawberry commission. We've met with them multiple times, and they are a very forward-thinking organization. I think they realize that there are water quality problems, and they want to deal with them.

I think that ultimately they will be the leaders -- organizations like that will be leaders in finding solution. I don't think it'll happen unless this board takes meaningful action and establishes meaningful requirements.

If the board does establish meaningful requirements, you will find -- we will all find that there are many experts in all -- various fields of

about that.

Well, actually, we do. It's one of our highest priorities. It is an established beneficial use. One of our primary responsibilities is to protect drinking water supplies and to correct the pollution of those supplies when it occurs.

And no one has a vested right to pollute public waters.

We've talked about how the order is reasonable because it has three tiers and how we've been responsive to comments. And we've changed the requirements in the order and changed the tiers - actually created the tiers and then changed them multiple times, based on comments.

There is a scale of requirements. For the lower threat dischargers, there's a lower level of requirements. For higher threat dischargers, a higher level of requirements, just like the board -- just like the approach the board has taken in every other program.

It's a well established approach with respect to reasonableness.

Urgency? How urgent is this problem? I don't know how it could be more urgent. I mentioned the domestic wells, the threat to domestic wells and the fact that we know that people in our region, in agricultural areas, drinking from domestic wells, that the water is

Page 137

1	not being treated, that they are drinking polluted water	1	So a farming operation that had multiple
2	today.	2	ranches would have additional cost.
3	When they woke up this morning, they were	3	MR. JEFFRIES: So if I had ten ranches, I'd
4	drinking polluted water. And at the end of the day, when	4	have to do the monitoring at ten ten ranches; is that
5	we're all done talking, they're going to go home and	5	correct? If I'm in Tier 3.
6	they're going to be drinking polluted water.	6	MS. SCHROETER: That is true. However, if
7	And it's our responsibility. There's no other	7	if you read the requirements in the order, it clarifies
8	agency that's responsible for it. It's us. I don't know	8	that if those ranches are contiguous or in the same
9	how it could be more urgent than that.	9	representative water bearing zone, you wouldn't have to
10	We're working on drafting notices to homeowners	10	do that.
11	right now. And we're trying to estimate the number of	11	MR. JEFFRIES: All right.
12	people that we're going to have to send these notices to.	12	My next question I know you addressed it in
13	And it may be in the 10,000 range, that number of people	13	your staff, and it's always been the requirements if
14	affected by this water pollution.	14	I'm talking about rented land, leased lands that the
15	So with that, we recommend that you adopt the	15	property owner would ultimately become the responsible
16	proposed order and that we get on to implementation. And	16	party.
17	that's something that the board has emphasized to us	17	Is that correct?
18	multiple times. That we need to get to implementation	18	MR. THOMAS: I don't I don't understand the
19	and get tangible results.	19	question.
20	And we agree. And we're not going to get there	20	MR. JEFFRIES: The question is: If if it's
21	until the board takes action and adopts an order and we	21	leased or rented lands like, for instance, I rent a
22	can start to implement it.	22	hundred acres and I rent it for one year - am I required
23	Thank you.	23	to do the monitoring if I have collectively fit in Tier
24	CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you.	24	3?
25	If we have any board comments and questions at	25	And if I don't do it, then does that fall back
20	Page 138	23	Page 140
1	this point, and then we'll do the Mr. Hodgin, any	1	to that particular property owner to make sure that's
2	comments or questions for staff at this point? No.	2	done?
3	Dr. Hunter? Okay.	3	MR. THOMAS: Okay. So if
4	Mr. Jeffries?	4	MR. JEFFRIES: Say, for instance, if that land
5	MR. JEFFRIES: Yes, I do.	5	is turned over five times within a five-year period, who
6	CHAIR YOUNG: Go ahead.	6	is the responsible person that has to turn in those
7	MR. JEFFRIES: Michael, you on Tier 3 and	7	monitoring?
8	I I don't want to keep dragging this in the ground,	8	MR. THOMAS: By "turned over," do you mean
9	but I have on Tier 3, when you have a thousand-acre	9	different lessees?
10	requirement, you you said on the average it'd be \$2370	10	MR. JEFFRIES: Yes.
11	for the monitoring.	11	MR. THOMAS: The order says that the lessee and
12	Is that did I get that correctly?	12	the property owner are responsible. So if there's a a
13	MR. THOMAS: (Nods head up and down)	13	violation and if we brought an enforcement action to the
14	MR. JEFFRIES: And if you have multiple	14	board recommend an enforcement action we would name
15	locations, were you considering that would be one	15	each of the parties; we would name each of the parties
16	thousand-acre parcel? Or are you talking about that	16	that leased the property and the property owner.
17	would be ten 100-acre locations?	17	MR. JEFFRIES: At that time?
18	Because the cost could multiply if you have	18	MR. THOMAS: Yes.
19	multiple locations.	19	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.
20	MS. SCHROETER: So, to clarify, the cost that	20	CHAIR YOUNG: Anything else?
21	Michael indicated were for groundwater sampling.	21	MR. JEFFRIES: Not right now.
22	MR. JEFFRIES: Right.	22	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.
23	MS. SCHROETER: And so, the costs are based	23	Folks, I have a few five cards for people
24	upon the one sample a minimum of one sample from	24	that wanted to speak. Some of them before 11:00 because
25	each farming operation.	25	they had to go.
	Page 139		Page 141
			~

1	MR. BRIGGS: Or 12:00.	1	livelihoods and those of our children depend on it.
2	CHAIR YOUNG: Or 12:00. So I'm going to take	2	We agree that improvements need to be made to
3	them now. And then we're probably going to break for	3	water quality. We're part of a group that created what
4	lunch, because we're going to be at about a quarter to	4	Senator Farr called a model of success.
5	12:00.	5	We have shared responsibility to improve water
6	And then because the next presentation is the	6	quality in our community. For example, we use recycled
7	farm bureau, and that's 55 minutes, so - I don't want to	7	water, both in the Castro project and
8	chop that up - so that can go all the way through.	8	That's a minute?
9	So let me call these five.	9	CHAIR YOUNG: That's a minute. But go ahead
10	Dale	10	and if you can wrap it up.
11	MR. BRIGGS: And how many minutes apiece?	11	MR. HUSS: I'll I'll hurry and wrap.
12	CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah. That's the thing. I'm	12	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.
13	going to give you a minute each. Okay? That's the	13	MR. HUSS: - and and the Pajaro Valley
14	tradeoff in going now versus waiting with everyone else.	14	Watsonville project.
15	So that's what you're giving up by taking this	15	As a grower, I'm here today to tell you that
16	opportunity now.	16	I'll be a part of those that take the lead to improve
17	So Dale Huss, Ken I think it's Bradley.	17	water quality in our community, through the approach
18	Looks like Debra Pembrooke; Kevin Merrell and Eric	18	you've listened to this morning. And that would've been
19	Lauritzen.	19	from the Farm Bureau Board.
20	MR. BRIGGS: Also, Mr. Chair there's a woman	20	And we have to blend science and practicality
21	who came up to me at the break, and was said that she	21	to improve water quality for sustainable environment and
22	had an appointment of some kind.	22	a viable farming community.
23	And I've been trying to spot you out there, and	23	The update of staff's document represents a
24	I haven't been able to see you. So if you're if	24	massive transformation and this is really important
25	you're still here, you could be part of that group, as	25	costs of which we cannot evaluate in just two weeks. It
	Page 142		Page 144
1	well.	1	does not take into account that the average grower will
1 2	well.  MR. JEFERJES: Mrs. Myrick (phonetic), were you	1 2	does not take into account that the average grower will
2	MR. JEFFRIES: Mrs. Myrick (phonetic), were you	2	not understand how to implement this waiver.
	MR. JEFFRIES: Mrs. Myrick (phonetic), were you you approached me because you didn't get a chance to		not understand how to implement this waiver.  The grower is going to be lost in a sea of
2	MR. JEFFRIES: Mrs. Myrick (phonetic), were you you approached me because you didn't get a chance to speak before. And you said you had to go back to Idaho.	2	not understand how to implement this waiver.  The grower is going to be lost in a sea of regulation that's hopelessly flawed by its own complexity
2 3 4	MR. JEFFRIES: Mrs. Myrick (phonetic), were you you approached me because you didn't get a chance to speak before. And you said you had to go back to Idaho. Is that the case? Did you leave? Maybe she left	2 3 4	not understand how to implement this waiver.  The grower is going to be lost in a sea of regulation that's hopelessly flawed by its own complexity and lack of understanding of what growing crops entails;
2 3 4 5	MR. JEFFRIES: Mrs. Myrick (phonetic), were you you approached me because you didn't get a chance to speak before. And you said you had to go back to Idaho.	2 3 4 5	not understand how to implement this waiver.  The grower is going to be lost in a sea of regulation that's hopelessly flawed by its own complexity and lack of understanding of what growing crops entails; because it's not just science, but it's art.
2 3 4 5 6	MR. JEFFRIES: Mrs. Myrick (phonetic), were you you approached me because you didn't get a chance to speak before. And you said you had to go back to Idaho. Is that the case? Did you leave? Maybe she left already. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Or the other room.	2 3 4 5 6	not understand how to implement this waiver.  The grower is going to be lost in a sea of regulation that's hopelessly flawed by its own complexity and lack of understanding of what growing crops entails; because it's not just science, but it's art.  The document ignores the risk to both personal
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. JEFFRIES: Mrs. Myrick (phonetic), were you you approached me because you didn't get a chance to speak before. And you said you had to go back to Idaho. Is that the case? Did you leave? Maybe she left already.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Or the other room. MR. JEFFRIES: Maybe she's in the other room.	2 3 4 5 6 7	not understand how to implement this waiver.  The grower is going to be lost in a sea of regulation that's hopelessly flawed by its own complexity and lack of understanding of what growing crops entails; because it's not just science, but it's art.  The document ignores the risk to both personal and financial risks that the growers undertake when
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. JEFFRIES: Mrs. Myrick (phonetic), were you you approached me because you didn't get a chance to speak before. And you said you had to go back to Idaho. Is that the case? Did you leave? Maybe she left already.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Or the other room. MR. JEFFRIES: Maybe she's in the other room. MR. BRIGGS: Okay. Well, they can hear us now.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	not understand how to implement this waiver.  The grower is going to be lost in a sea of regulation that's hopelessly flawed by its own complexity and lack of understanding of what growing crops entails; because it's not just science, but it's art.  The document ignores the risk to both personal and financial risks that the growers undertake when investing in growing a crop; for example, head lettuce
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. JEFFRIES: Mrs. Myrick (phonetic), were you you approached me because you didn't get a chance to speak before. And you said you had to go back to Idaho. Is that the case? Did you leave? Maybe she left already.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Or the other room. MR. JEFFRIES: Maybe she's in the other room. MR. BRIGGS: Okay. Well, they can hear us now. So if if that's I don't know if it's the same	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	not understand how to implement this waiver.  The grower is going to be lost in a sea of regulation that's hopelessly flawed by its own complexity and lack of understanding of what growing crops entails; because it's not just science, but it's art.  The document ignores the risk to both personal and financial risks that the growers undertake when investing in growing a crop; for example, head lettuce for a thousand dollars an acre per crop; artichokes
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. JEFFRIES: Mrs. Myrick (phonetic), were you you approached me because you didn't get a chance to speak before. And you said you had to go back to Idaho. Is that the case? Did you leave? Maybe she left already.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Or the other room. MR. JEFFRIES: Maybe she's in the other room. MR. BRIGGS: Okay. Well, they can hear us now. So if if that's I don't know if it's the same person or not, but if that one or two the one or two	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	not understand how to implement this waiver.  The grower is going to be lost in a sea of regulation that's hopelessly flawed by its own complexity and lack of understanding of what growing crops entails; because it's not just science, but it's art.  The document ignores the risk to both personal and financial risks that the growers undertake when investing in growing a crop; for example, head lettuce for a thousand dollars an acre per crop; artichokes \$5,200 per acre, per crop.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. JEFFRIES: Mrs. Myrick (phonetic), were you you approached me because you didn't get a chance to speak before. And you said you had to go back to Idaho. Is that the case? Did you leave? Maybe she left already.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Or the other room. MR. JEFFRIES: Maybe she's in the other room. MR. BRIGGS: Okay. Well, they can hear us now. So if if that's I don't know if it's the same person or not, but if that one or two the one or two people hear us over there, they can come on over.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	not understand how to implement this waiver.  The grower is going to be lost in a sea of regulation that's hopelessly flawed by its own complexity and lack of understanding of what growing crops entails; because it's not just science, but it's art.  The document ignores the risk to both personal and financial risks that the growers undertake when investing in growing a crop; for example, head lettuce for a thousand dollars an acre per crop; artichokes \$5,200 per acre, per crop.  And we and reading the staff's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. JEFFRIES: Mrs. Myrick (phonetic), were you you approached me because you didn't get a chance to speak before. And you said you had to go back to Idaho. Is that the case? Did you leave? Maybe she left already.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Or the other room. MR. JEFFRIES: Maybe she's in the other room. MR. BRIGGS: Okay. Well, they can hear us now. So if if that's I don't know if it's the same person or not, but if that one or two the one or two	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	not understand how to implement this waiver.  The grower is going to be lost in a sea of regulation that's hopelessly flawed by its own complexity and lack of understanding of what growing crops entails; because it's not just science, but it's art.  The document ignores the risk to both personal and financial risks that the growers undertake when investing in growing a crop; for example, head lettuce for a thousand dollars an acre per crop; artichokes \$5,200 per acre, per crop.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. JEFFRIES: Mrs. Myrick (phonetic), were you you approached me because you didn't get a chance to speak before. And you said you had to go back to Idaho. Is that the case? Did you leave? Maybe she left already.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Or the other room. MR. JEFFRIES: Maybe she's in the other room. MR. BRIGGS: Okay. Well, they can hear us now. So if if that's I don't know if it's the same person or not, but if that one or two the one or two people hear us over there, they can come on over.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Huss. MR. HUSS: Yeah. I have some handouts here for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	not understand how to implement this waiver.  The grower is going to be lost in a sea of regulation that's hopelessly flawed by its own complexity and lack of understanding of what growing crops entails; because it's not just science, but it's art.  The document ignores the risk to both personal and financial risks that the growers undertake when investing in growing a crop; for example, head lettuce for a thousand dollars an acre per crop; artichokes \$5,200 per acre, per crop.  And we and reading the staff's recommendations, we believe they have severely underestimated the cost that will be associated with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. JEFFRIES: Mrs. Myrick (phonetic), were you you approached me because you didn't get a chance to speak before. And you said you had to go back to Idaho. Is that the case? Did you leave? Maybe she left already.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Or the other room. MR. JEFFRIES: Maybe she's in the other room. MR. BRIGGS: Okay. Well, they can hear us now. So if if that's I don't know if it's the same person or not, but if that one or two the one or two people hear us over there, they can come on over.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Huss. MR. HUSS: Yeah. I have some handouts here for the board, please. I've got a minute?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	not understand how to implement this waiver.  The grower is going to be lost in a sea of regulation that's hopelessly flawed by its own complexity and lack of understanding of what growing crops entails; because it's not just science, but it's art.  The document ignores the risk to both personal and financial risks that the growers undertake when investing in growing a crop; for example, head lettuce for a thousand dollars an acre per crop; artichokes \$5,200 per acre, per crop.  And we and reading the staff's recommendations, we believe they have severely
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. JEFFRIES: Mrs. Myrick (phonetic), were you you approached me because you didn't get a chance to speak before. And you said you had to go back to Idaho. Is that the case? Did you leave? Maybe she left already.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Or the other room.  MR. JEFFRIES: Maybe she's in the other room.  MR. BRIGGS: Okay. Well, they can hear us now. So if if that's I don't know if it's the same person or not, but if that one or two the one or two people hear us over there, they can come on over.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Huss.  MR. HUSS: Yeah. I have some handouts here for the board, please. I've got a minute?  And I I guess I'm the lucky one.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	not understand how to implement this waiver.  The grower is going to be lost in a sea of regulation that's hopelessly flawed by its own complexity and lack of understanding of what growing crops entails; because it's not just science, but it's art.  The document ignores the risk to both personal and financial risks that the growers undertake when investing in growing a crop; for example, head lettuce for a thousand dollars an acre per crop; artichokes \$5,200 per acre, per crop.  And we and reading the staff's recommendations, we believe they have severely underestimated the cost that will be associated with the implement implementation of a flawed piece of regulation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. JEFFRIES: Mrs. Myrick (phonetic), were you you approached me because you didn't get a chance to speak before. And you said you had to go back to Idaho. Is that the case? Did you leave? Maybe she left already.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Or the other room. MR. JEFFRIES: Maybe she's in the other room. MR. BRIGGS: Okay. Well, they can hear us now. So if if that's I don't know if it's the same person or not, but if that one or two the one or two people hear us over there, they can come on over.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Huss. MR. HUSS: Yeah. I have some handouts here for the board, please. I've got a minute?  And I I guess I'm the lucky one. First of all, I appreciate a lot of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	not understand how to implement this waiver.  The grower is going to be lost in a sea of regulation that's hopelessly flawed by its own complexity and lack of understanding of what growing crops entails; because it's not just science, but it's art.  The document ignores the risk to both personal and financial risks that the growers undertake when investing in growing a crop; for example, head lettuce for a thousand dollars an acre per crop; artichokes \$5,200 per acre, per crop.  And we and reading the staff's recommendations, we believe they have severely underestimated the cost that will be associated with the implement implementation of a flawed piece of regulation.  We are evaluating whether we'll have to hire an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. JEFFRIES: Mrs. Myrick (phonetic), were you you approached me because you didn't get a chance to speak before. And you said you had to go back to Idaho. Is that the case? Did you leave? Maybe she left already.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Or the other room.  MR. JEFFRIES: Maybe she's in the other room.  MR. BRIGGS: Okay. Well, they can hear us now. So if if that's I don't know if it's the same person or not, but if that one or two the one or two people hear us over there, they can come on over.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Huss.  MR. HUSS: Yeah. I have some handouts here for the board, please. I've got a minute?  And I I guess I'm the lucky one.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	not understand how to implement this waiver.  The grower is going to be lost in a sea of regulation that's hopelessly flawed by its own complexity and lack of understanding of what growing crops entails; because it's not just science, but it's art.  The document ignores the risk to both personal and financial risks that the growers undertake when investing in growing a crop; for example, head lettuce for a thousand dollars an acre per crop; artichokes \$5,200 per acre, per crop.  And we and reading the staff's recommendations, we believe they have severely underestimated the cost that will be associated with the implement implementation of a flawed piece of regulation.  We are evaluating whether we'll have to hire an individual, estimated \$150,000, just to understand and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. JEFFRIES: Mrs. Myrick (phonetic), were you you approached me because you didn't get a chance to speak before. And you said you had to go back to Idaho. Is that the case? Did you leave? Maybe she left already.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Or the other room. MR. JEFFRIES: Maybe she's in the other room. MR. BRIGGS: Okay. Well, they can hear us now. So if if that's I don't know if it's the same person or not, but if that one or two the one or two people hear us over there, they can come on over.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Huss. MR. HUSS: Yeah. I have some handouts here for the board, please. I've got a minute?  And I I guess I'm the lucky one. First of all, I appreciate a lot of the questions here by the board this morning. My name is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	not understand how to implement this waiver.  The grower is going to be lost in a sea of regulation that's hopelessly flawed by its own complexity and lack of understanding of what growing crops entails; because it's not just science, but it's art.  The document ignores the risk to both personal and financial risks that the growers undertake when investing in growing a crop; for example, head lettuce for a thousand dollars an acre per crop; artichokes \$5,200 per acre, per crop.  And we and reading the staff's recommendations, we believe they have severely underestimated the cost that will be associated with the implement implementation of a flawed piece of regulation.  We are evaluating whether we'll have to hire an individual, estimated \$150,000, just to understand and help help us follow implement to regulation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. JEFFRIES: Mrs. Myrick (phonetic), were you you approached me because you didn't get a chance to speak before. And you said you had to go back to Idaho. Is that the case? Did you leave? Maybe she left already.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Or the other room. MR. JEFFRIES: Maybe she's in the other room. MR. BRIGGS: Okay. Well, they can hear us now. So if if that's I don't know if it's the same person or not, but if that one or two the one or two people hear us over there, they can come on over.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Huss. MR. HUSS: Yeah. I have some handouts here for the board, please. I've got a minute?  And I I guess I'm the lucky one. First of all, I appreciate a lot of the questions here by the board this morning. My name is Dale Huss. I'm the general manager of Sea Mist Farms in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	not understand how to implement this waiver.  The grower is going to be lost in a sea of regulation that's hopelessly flawed by its own complexity and lack of understanding of what growing crops entails; because it's not just science, but it's art.  The document ignores the risk to both personal and financial risks that the growers undertake when investing in growing a crop; for example, head lettuce for a thousand dollars an acre per crop; artichokes \$5,200 per acre, per crop.  And we and reading the staff's recommendations, we believe they have severely underestimated the cost that will be associated with the implement implementation of a flawed piece of regulation.  We are evaluating whether we'll have to hire an individual, estimated \$150,000, just to understand and help help us follow implement to regulation.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Huss, I'm going to have to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. JEFFRIES: Mrs. Myrick (phonetic), were you you approached me because you didn't get a chance to speak before. And you said you had to go back to Idaho. Is that the case? Did you leave? Maybe she left already.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Or the other room.  MR. JEFFRIES: Maybe she's in the other room.  MR. BRIGGS: Okay. Well, they can hear us now. So if if that's I don't know if it's the same person or not, but if that one or two the one or two people hear us over there, they can come on over.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Huss.  MR. HUSS: Yeah. I have some handouts here for the board, please. I've got a minute?  And I I guess I'm the lucky one.  First of all, I appreciate a lot of the questions here by the board this morning. My name is Dale Huss. I'm the general manager of Sea Mist Farms in Castroville. We farm several thousand acres in the lower Salinas and here in the Pajaro Valley.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	not understand how to implement this waiver.  The grower is going to be lost in a sea of regulation that's hopelessly flawed by its own complexity and lack of understanding of what growing crops entails; because it's not just science, but it's art.  The document ignores the risk to both personal and financial risks that the growers undertake when investing in growing a crop; for example, head lettuce for a thousand dollars an acre per crop; artichokes \$5,200 per acre, per crop.  And we and reading the staff's recommendations, we believe they have severely underestimated the cost that will be associated with the implement implementation of a flawed piece of regulation.  We are evaluating whether we'll have to hire an individual, estimated \$150,000, just to understand and help help us follow implement to regulation.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Huss, I'm going to have to thank you for your comments.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. JEFFRIES: Mrs. Myrick (phonetic), were you you approached me because you didn't get a chance to speak before. And you said you had to go back to Idaho. Is that the case? Did you leave? Maybe she left already.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Or the other room.  MR. JEFFRIES: Maybe she's in the other room.  MR. BRIGGS: Okay. Well, they can hear us now. So if if that's I don't know if it's the same person or not, but if that one or two the one or two people hear us over there, they can come on over.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Huss.  MR. HUSS: Yeah. I have some handouts here for the board, please. I've got a minute?  And I I guess I'm the lucky one.  First of all, I appreciate a lot of the questions here by the board this morning. My name is Dale Huss. I'm the general manager of Sea Mist Farms in Castroville. We farm several thousand acres in the lower Salinas and here in the Pajaro Valley.  On those 19 ranches, we have hundreds of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	not understand how to implement this waiver.  The grower is going to be lost in a sea of regulation that's hopelessly flawed by its own complexity and lack of understanding of what growing crops entails; because it's not just science, but it's art.  The document ignores the risk to both personal and financial risks that the growers undertake when investing in growing a crop; for example, head lettuce for a thousand dollars an acre per crop; artichokes \$5,200 per acre, per crop.  And we and reading the staff's recommendations, we believe they have severely underestimated the cost that will be associated with the implement implementation of a flawed piece of regulation.  We are evaluating whether we'll have to hire an individual, estimated \$150,000, just to understand and help help us follow implement to regulation.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Huss, I'm going to have to thank you for your comments.  MR. HUSS: That's the rest of my comments. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. JEFFRIES: Mrs. Myrick (phonetic), were you you approached me because you didn't get a chance to speak before. And you said you had to go back to Idaho. Is that the case? Did you leave? Maybe she left already.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Or the other room.  MR. JEFFRIES: Maybe she's in the other room.  MR. BRIGGS: Okay. Well, they can hear us now. So if if that's I don't know if it's the same person or not, but if that one or two the one or two people hear us over there, they can come on over.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Huss.  MR. HUSS: Yeah. I have some handouts here for the board, please. I've got a minute?  And I I guess I'm the lucky one.  First of all, I appreciate a lot of the questions here by the board this morning. My name is Dale Huss. I'm the general manager of Sea Mist Farms in Castroville. We farm several thousand acres in the lower Salinas and here in the Pajaro Valley.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	not understand how to implement this waiver.  The grower is going to be lost in a sea of regulation that's hopelessly flawed by its own complexity and lack of understanding of what growing crops entails; because it's not just science, but it's art.  The document ignores the risk to both personal and financial risks that the growers undertake when investing in growing a crop; for example, head lettuce for a thousand dollars an acre per crop; artichokes \$5,200 per acre, per crop.  And we and reading the staff's recommendations, we believe they have severely underestimated the cost that will be associated with the implement implementation of a flawed piece of regulation.  We are evaluating whether we'll have to hire an individual, estimated \$150,000, just to understand and help help us follow implement to regulation.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Huss, I'm going to have to thank you for your comments.  MR. HUSS: That's the rest of my comments. And I appreciate the opportunity to have addressed the board.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. JEFFRIES: Mrs. Myrick (phonetic), were you you approached me because you didn't get a chance to speak before. And you said you had to go back to Idaho. Is that the case? Did you leave? Maybe she left already.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Or the other room. MR. JEFFRIES: Maybe she's in the other room. MR. BRIGGS: Okay. Well, they can hear us now. So if if that's I don't know if it's the same person or not, but if that one or two the one or two people hear us over there, they can come on over.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Huss. MR. HUSS: Yeah. I have some handouts here for the board, please. I've got a minute?  And I I guess I'm the lucky one. First of all, I appreciate a lot of the questions here by the board this morning. My name is Dale Huss. I'm the general manager of Sea Mist Farms in Castroville. We farm several thousand acres in the lower Salinas and here in the Pajaro Valley.  On those 19 ranches, we have hundreds of different owners, hundreds. As growers we care very much	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	not understand how to implement this waiver.  The grower is going to be lost in a sea of regulation that's hopelessly flawed by its own complexity and lack of understanding of what growing crops entails; because it's not just science, but it's art.  The document ignores the risk to both personal and financial risks that the growers undertake when investing in growing a crop; for example, head lettuce for a thousand dollars an acre per crop; artichokes \$5,200 per acre, per crop.  And we and reading the staff's recommendations, we believe they have severely underestimated the cost that will be associated with the implement implementation of a flawed piece of regulation.  We are evaluating whether we'll have to hire an individual, estimated \$150,000, just to understand and help help us follow implement to regulation.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Huss, I'm going to have to thank you for your comments.  MR. HUSS: That's the rest of my comments. And

		1	,
1	CHAIR YOUNG: Ken Bradley.	1	Because I can actually stay. But
2	MR. BRADLEY: Hello. Thank you very much.	2	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.
3	I'll try to be real quick here.	3	MS. PEMBROOKE: Gina's name was so I
4	CHAIR YOUNG: You have a minute.	4	think that was supposed to be Gina's card.
5	MR. BRADLEY: Yes. My name is Ken Bradley.	5	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. And who's this?
6	I'm a water distribution operator, level two. And have	6	MS. LANGHOWT: Okay. My name's Gina Langhowt.
7	maintained a single well at a small Christian school,	7	CHAIR YOUNG: Did you
8	Anchorpoint Christian School in Gilroy, California.	8	MS. LANGHOWT: I have a card, as well.
9	It is a small non-profit with about 60 students	9	CHAIR YOUNG: You submitted a card?
10	on eight acres. We're surrounded on three sides by	10	MS. LANGHOWT: Yes, I did. Yes, I did.
11	agricultural land.	11	CHAIR YOUNG: Gina
12	And when I had started there, we I had to go	12	MS. LANGHOWT: Gina Langhowt.
13	and post a sign that the you do not drink the water;	13	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. So pull her
14	it's unsafe for human consumption.	14	MS. LANGHOWT: It might be under Regina.
15	I couldn't understand it and I couldn't explain	15	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Go ahead.
16	it to my community, why the water couldn't be consumed.	16	MS. LANGHOWT: Okay.
17	So we paid for we paid for the water rights,	17	So I am here today in solidarity with the
18	and when we bought the property, and we pay a fee all	18	people who live in San Jerardo. I will leave their story
19	the time whenever we pump the water out.	19	for them to tell.
20	This water normally would be safe to drink, as	20	But I wanted to say a couple of things. I have
21	it comes from the well, if people were not allowed to	21	a PhD in community psychology, which is essentially the
22	contaminate it with no regulations or sense of	22	public health area of psychology. So a few comments.
23	responsibility for their actions.	23	One, in terms of the pesticides, there are 75
24	With all the potential hazards that we've had	24	pesticides in the literature that have been shown to be
25	in my seven years of being there monitoring this well,	25	toxic. These regulations only deal with two of them
	Page 146		Page 148
1	high nitrates are the only problem that we have had	1	because the staff has determined that these are the two
2	reported.	2	that are the most robust.
3	Our well measures between 125 milligrams per	3	In the literature, however, there's a
4	liter to 140 milligrams per liter, and our potable water,	4	difference between a small literature and a literature
5	according to the Department of Public Health, can't be	5	where there is disagreement in the literature. So I
6	higher than 25 before we have to take action.	6	would encourage the staff to think about that difference.
7	CHAIR YOUNG: Can you wrap it up, Mr. Bradley,	7	Is these other 73 toxins, are they
8	please.	8	considered to be is there argument, right now, over if
9	MR. BRADLEY: Yes, I will.	9	they are toxic or not, or is the issue just that there is
10	The basic in closing, not I was going to	10	a small number of studies?
11	go into the cost of this, as well.	11	And I would encourage you to include the
12	But, as you could imagine, that if we purchase	12	literature that says that there's a small number of
13	some good, clean water, we have a glass of water, and	13	studies, but where everything is pointing in the same
14	then somebody comes to it and says, I'm going to pour	14	direction.
15	some nitrates in it, for whatever reason and then tell	15	And, finally, I want to say that in terms of
16	you and your family to drink it, we would all fight not	16	the public health issue here, this is a public health
17	to have that those nitrates put in the water.	17	issue. People's lives are at risk. And I understand
18	So that is why I support the regulation to	18	that you need to take multiple stakeholders' perspectives
19	protect the human health and the environment that will be	19	into account.
20	strong enough to restore the water back to being clean	20	I would also ask you to consider the value
21	and healthy.	21	associated with the claims that those different
22	CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.	22	stakeholders are making. The claim of a human life of
23	Debra Pembrooke. And then Kevin Merrill.	23	human lives is a very high priority claim.
24	MS. PEMBROOKE: Hello. I'm Debra Pembrooke.	24	So I would urge you to pass a set of
25	We think it is a mix-up with the cards.	25	regulations that will protect human lives. Thank you.
		I	
	Page 147		Page 149

1	CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.	1	And I urge you to look at the complexity of what is
2	Mr. Merrill. And then, last speaker would be	2	proposed here and eliminate any ambiguity, as you can.
3	Eric Lauritzen.	3	I'm also here speaking on behalf of Simon
4	MR. MERRILL: Thank you, Chairman Young. And	4	Salinas, supervisor for the third district, that takes in
5	thank you for allowing me to speak before lunch.	5	the largest part of the agricultural community acreage in
6	I'm here today representing the Santa Barbara	6	Monterey County.
7	County Farm Bureau, as we represent a diverse membership,	7	I have a letter that I'd like to submit on
8	from avocados to zucchinis, large and small growers that	8	behalf of Simon Salinas, as part of of the record.
9	farm a variety of soil types and topography. We also	9	My office was just notified last week that some
10	represent ranching families that have been a part of the	10	of the proposed aquatic buffer zones that were included
11	land for generations.	11	in the Appendix F cost considerations did not appear
12	Much like the diverse farming operations spread	12	consistent with our office's data. And we submitted a
13	out across Region 3, the key word here is diverse. Any	13	letter April of 2010 that outlined that that data.
14	regulatory program dealing with agricultural, needs to	14	Again, this letter that we have outlines
15	recognize its diversity.	15	additional inaccuracies, and we provided updated analysis
16	I was pleased to hear Chairman Young with the	16	in this letter related to the expected loss in gross
17	comments, during the board workshop in San Luis Obispo,	17	production value, based on the new proposed regulations.
18	that perhaps a more focused approach over a longer period	18	It should be noted that our GIS analysis
19	of time that would prioritize waterbodies specifically	19	indicates that between 5600 and 9500 acres depending
20	looking at diazinon, chlorpyrifos or nitrates would be	20	on the 30 or 50-foot buffer of farmland could be taken
21	beneficial.	21	out of production; not the the numbers that were
22	Limit the scope of a renewed waiver to the	22	outlined in that Appendix F.
23	highest priorities. Instead, even after several ag	23	So I'd urge you to take a look at this letter.
24	representatives met with staff to point out serious	24	I'll leave copies for you. And consider that as you make
25	problems with their initial draft, no meaningful changes	25	your final rule. Thank you.
	Page 150		Page 152
1	were made	1	CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments
1 2	were made.  In fact, staff added more regulatory language	1 2	CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. Okay I think what we should do is break now
2	In fact, staff added more regulatory language	2	Okay. I think what we should do is break now
2	In fact, staff added more regulatory language that includes storm water issues, as well.		Okay. I think what we should do is break now for lunch and come back in one hour, and then we'll start
2 3 4	In fact, staff added more regulatory language that includes storm water issues, as well.  We've done enough monitoring throughout the	2 3 4	Okay. I think what we should do is break now for lunch and come back in one hour, and then we'll start with the Farm Bureau presentation.
2 3 4 5	In fact, staff added more regulatory language that includes storm water issues, as well.  We've done enough monitoring throughout the region to know where the impaired areas are. We need to	2 3	Okay. I think what we should do is break now for lunch and come back in one hour, and then we'll start with the Farm Bureau presentation.  MR. BRIGGS: So that'd be five minutes to 1:00.
2 3 4	In fact, staff added more regulatory language that includes storm water issues, as well.  We've done enough monitoring throughout the region to know where the impaired areas are. We need to focus our resources on those areas, partner with growers	2 3 4 5	Okay. I think what we should do is break now for lunch and come back in one hour, and then we'll start with the Farm Bureau presentation.  MR. BRIGGS: So that'd be five minutes to 1:00.  CHAIR YOUNG: About five minutes to 1:00.
2 3 4 5 6 7	In fact, staff added more regulatory language that includes storm water issues, as well.  We've done enough monitoring throughout the region to know where the impaired areas are. We need to focus our resources on those areas, partner with growers and other agency to fix the problem, utilize the best	2 3 4 5 6	Okay. I think what we should do is break now for lunch and come back in one hour, and then we'll start with the Farm Bureau presentation.  MR. BRIGGS: So that'd be five minutes to 1:00.  CHAIR YOUNG: About five minutes to 1:00.  (Lunch recess taken)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	In fact, staff added more regulatory language that includes storm water issues, as well.  We've done enough monitoring throughout the region to know where the impaired areas are. We need to focus our resources on those areas, partner with growers and other agency to fix the problem, utilize the best science without regulating growers out of business.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Okay. I think what we should do is break now for lunch and come back in one hour, and then we'll start with the Farm Bureau presentation.  MR. BRIGGS: So that'd be five minutes to 1:00.  CHAIR YOUNG: About five minutes to 1:00.  (Lunch recess taken)  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Before we hear from the
2 3 4 5 6 7	In fact, staff added more regulatory language that includes storm water issues, as well.  We've done enough monitoring throughout the region to know where the impaired areas are. We need to focus our resources on those areas, partner with growers and other agency to fix the problem, utilize the best science without regulating growers out of business.  Staff proposal, as written, is far too broad	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Okay. I think what we should do is break now for lunch and come back in one hour, and then we'll start with the Farm Bureau presentation.  MR. BRIGGS: So that'd be five minutes to 1:00.  CHAIR YOUNG: About five minutes to 1:00.  (Lunch recess taken)  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Before we hear from the Farm Bureau, do we have any elected officials that would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	In fact, staff added more regulatory language that includes storm water issues, as well.  We've done enough monitoring throughout the region to know where the impaired areas are. We need to focus our resources on those areas, partner with growers and other agency to fix the problem, utilize the best science without regulating growers out of business.  Staff proposal, as written, is far too broad and cumbersome. Adopting it will not result in water	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Okay. I think what we should do is break now for lunch and come back in one hour, and then we'll start with the Farm Bureau presentation.  MR. BRIGGS: So that'd be five minutes to 1:00.  CHAIR YOUNG: About five minutes to 1:00.  (Lunch recess taken)  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Before we hear from the Farm Bureau, do we have any elected officials that would like to address this issue; any board members,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	In fact, staff added more regulatory language that includes storm water issues, as well.  We've done enough monitoring throughout the region to know where the impaired areas are. We need to focus our resources on those areas, partner with growers and other agency to fix the problem, utilize the best science without regulating growers out of business.  Staff proposal, as written, is far too broad and cumbersome. Adopting it will not result in water quality improvement.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Okay. I think what we should do is break now for lunch and come back in one hour, and then we'll start with the Farm Bureau presentation.  MR. BRIGGS: So that'd be five minutes to 1:00.  CHAIR YOUNG: About five minutes to 1:00.  (Lunch recess taken)  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Before we hear from the Farm Bureau, do we have any elected officials that would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	In fact, staff added more regulatory language that includes storm water issues, as well.  We've done enough monitoring throughout the region to know where the impaired areas are. We need to focus our resources on those areas, partner with growers and other agency to fix the problem, utilize the best science without regulating growers out of business.  Staff proposal, as written, is far too broad and cumbersome. Adopting it will not result in water quality improvement.  I urge the chairman and the board to direct	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Okay. I think what we should do is break now for lunch and come back in one hour, and then we'll start with the Farm Bureau presentation.  MR. BRIGGS: So that'd be five minutes to 1:00.  CHAIR YOUNG: About five minutes to 1:00.  (Lunch recess taken)  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Before we hear from the Farm Bureau, do we have any elected officials that would like to address this issue; any board members, supervisor, councilmen?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	In fact, staff added more regulatory language that includes storm water issues, as well.  We've done enough monitoring throughout the region to know where the impaired areas are. We need to focus our resources on those areas, partner with growers and other agency to fix the problem, utilize the best science without regulating growers out of business.  Staff proposal, as written, is far too broad and cumbersome. Adopting it will not result in water quality improvement.  I urge the chairman and the board to direct staff to focus on known areas of impairment; work	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Okay. I think what we should do is break now for lunch and come back in one hour, and then we'll start with the Farm Bureau presentation.  MR. BRIGGS: So that'd be five minutes to 1:00.  CHAIR YOUNG: About five minutes to 1:00.  (Lunch recess taken)  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Before we hear from the Farm Bureau, do we have any elected officials that would like to address this issue; any board members, supervisor, councilmen?  (Off the record)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	In fact, staff added more regulatory language that includes storm water issues, as well.  We've done enough monitoring throughout the region to know where the impaired areas are. We need to focus our resources on those areas, partner with growers and other agency to fix the problem, utilize the best science without regulating growers out of business.  Staff proposal, as written, is far too broad and cumbersome. Adopting it will not result in water quality improvement.  I urge the chairman and the board to direct staff to focus on known areas of impairment; work together with the ag community; incorporate water quality	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Okay. I think what we should do is break now for lunch and come back in one hour, and then we'll start with the Farm Bureau presentation.  MR. BRIGGS: So that'd be five minutes to 1:00.  CHAIR YOUNG: About five minutes to 1:00.  (Lunch recess taken)  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Before we hear from the Farm Bureau, do we have any elected officials that would like to address this issue; any board members, supervisor, councilmen?  (Off the record)  CHAIR YOUNG: Are we ready? Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	In fact, staff added more regulatory language that includes storm water issues, as well.  We've done enough monitoring throughout the region to know where the impaired areas are. We need to focus our resources on those areas, partner with growers and other agency to fix the problem, utilize the best science without regulating growers out of business.  Staff proposal, as written, is far too broad and cumbersome. Adopting it will not result in water quality improvement.  I urge the chairman and the board to direct staff to focus on known areas of impairment; work together with the ag community; incorporate water quality and prudent methods found in the ag proposal, along with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Okay. I think what we should do is break now for lunch and come back in one hour, and then we'll start with the Farm Bureau presentation.  MR. BRIGGS: So that'd be five minutes to 1:00.  CHAIR YOUNG: About five minutes to 1:00.  (Lunch recess taken)  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Before we hear from the Farm Bureau, do we have any elected officials that would like to address this issue; any board members, supervisor, councilmen?  (Off the record)  CHAIR YOUNG: Are we ready? Okay.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. I'm a field
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	In fact, staff added more regulatory language that includes storm water issues, as well.  We've done enough monitoring throughout the region to know where the impaired areas are. We need to focus our resources on those areas, partner with growers and other agency to fix the problem, utilize the best science without regulating growers out of business.  Staff proposal, as written, is far too broad and cumbersome. Adopting it will not result in water quality improvement.  I urge the chairman and the board to direct staff to focus on known areas of impairment; work together with the ag community; incorporate water quality and prudent methods found in the ag proposal, along with certain parts of staff proposal, and build a hybrid that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Okay. I think what we should do is break now for lunch and come back in one hour, and then we'll start with the Farm Bureau presentation.  MR. BRIGGS: So that'd be five minutes to 1:00.  CHAIR YOUNG: About five minutes to 1:00.  (Lunch recess taken)  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Before we hear from the Farm Bureau, do we have any elected officials that would like to address this issue; any board members, supervisor, councilmen?  (Off the record)  CHAIR YOUNG: Are we ready? Okay.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. I'm a field representative on behalf of the Assembly member Luis
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	In fact, staff added more regulatory language that includes storm water issues, as well.  We've done enough monitoring throughout the region to know where the impaired areas are. We need to focus our resources on those areas, partner with growers and other agency to fix the problem, utilize the best science without regulating growers out of business.  Staff proposal, as written, is far too broad and cumbersome. Adopting it will not result in water quality improvement.  I urge the chairman and the board to direct staff to focus on known areas of impairment; work together with the ag community; incorporate water quality and prudent methods found in the ag proposal, along with certain parts of staff proposal, and build a hybrid that focuses on surface water impairment only.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Okay. I think what we should do is break now for lunch and come back in one hour, and then we'll start with the Farm Bureau presentation.  MR. BRIGGS: So that'd be five minutes to 1:00.  CHAIR YOUNG: About five minutes to 1:00.  (Lunch recess taken)  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Before we hear from the Farm Bureau, do we have any elected officials that would like to address this issue; any board members, supervisor, councilmen?  (Off the record)  CHAIR YOUNG: Are we ready? Okay.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. I'm a field representative on behalf of the Assembly member Luis Alejo.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	In fact, staff added more regulatory language that includes storm water issues, as well.  We've done enough monitoring throughout the region to know where the impaired areas are. We need to focus our resources on those areas, partner with growers and other agency to fix the problem, utilize the best science without regulating growers out of business.  Staff proposal, as written, is far too broad and cumbersome. Adopting it will not result in water quality improvement.  I urge the chairman and the board to direct staff to focus on known areas of impairment; work together with the ag community; incorporate water quality and prudent methods found in the ag proposal, along with certain parts of staff proposal, and build a hybrid that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Okay. I think what we should do is break now for lunch and come back in one hour, and then we'll start with the Farm Bureau presentation.  MR. BRIGGS: So that'd be five minutes to 1:00.  CHAIR YOUNG: About five minutes to 1:00.  (Lunch recess taken)  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Before we hear from the Farm Bureau, do we have any elected officials that would like to address this issue; any board members, supervisor, councilmen?  (Off the record)  CHAIR YOUNG: Are we ready? Okay.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. I'm a field representative on behalf of the Assembly member Luis
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	In fact, staff added more regulatory language that includes storm water issues, as well.  We've done enough monitoring throughout the region to know where the impaired areas are. We need to focus our resources on those areas, partner with growers and other agency to fix the problem, utilize the best science without regulating growers out of business.  Staff proposal, as written, is far too broad and cumbersome. Adopting it will not result in water quality improvement.  I urge the chairman and the board to direct staff to focus on known areas of impairment; work together with the ag community; incorporate water quality and prudent methods found in the ag proposal, along with certain parts of staff proposal, and build a hybrid that focuses on surface water impairment only.  Thank you very much.  CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Okay. I think what we should do is break now for lunch and come back in one hour, and then we'll start with the Farm Bureau presentation.  MR. BRIGGS: So that'd be five minutes to 1:00.  CHAIR YOUNG: About five minutes to 1:00.  (Lunch recess taken)  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Before we hear from the Farm Bureau, do we have any elected officials that would like to address this issue; any board members, supervisor, councilmen?  (Off the record)  CHAIR YOUNG: Are we ready? Okay.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. I'm a field representative on behalf of the Assembly member Luis Alejo.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	In fact, staff added more regulatory language that includes storm water issues, as well.  We've done enough monitoring throughout the region to know where the impaired areas are. We need to focus our resources on those areas, partner with growers and other agency to fix the problem, utilize the best science without regulating growers out of business.  Staff proposal, as written, is far too broad and cumbersome. Adopting it will not result in water quality improvement.  I urge the chairman and the board to direct staff to focus on known areas of impairment; work together with the ag community; incorporate water quality and prudent methods found in the ag proposal, along with certain parts of staff proposal, and build a hybrid that focuses on surface water impairment only.  Thank you very much.  CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.  Eric Lauritzen.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Okay. I think what we should do is break now for lunch and come back in one hour, and then we'll start with the Farm Bureau presentation.  MR. BRIGGS: So that'd be five minutes to 1:00.  CHAIR YOUNG: About five minutes to 1:00.  (Lunch recess taken)  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Before we hear from the Farm Bureau, do we have any elected officials that would like to address this issue; any board members, supervisor, councilmen?  (Off the record)  CHAIR YOUNG: Are we ready? Okay.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. I'm a field representative on behalf of the Assembly member Luis Alejo.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He is assemblymember for the 28th Assemble District. And he is submitting a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	In fact, staff added more regulatory language that includes storm water issues, as well.  We've done enough monitoring throughout the region to know where the impaired areas are. We need to focus our resources on those areas, partner with growers and other agency to fix the problem, utilize the best science without regulating growers out of business.  Staff proposal, as written, is far too broad and cumbersome. Adopting it will not result in water quality improvement.  I urge the chairman and the board to direct staff to focus on known areas of impairment; work together with the ag community; incorporate water quality and prudent methods found in the ag proposal, along with certain parts of staff proposal, and build a hybrid that focuses on surface water impairment only.  Thank you very much.  CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.  Eric Lauritzen.  MR. LAURITZEN: Chair Young, again, thank you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Okay. I think what we should do is break now for lunch and come back in one hour, and then we'll start with the Farm Bureau presentation.  MR. BRIGGS: So that'd be five minutes to 1:00.  CHAIR YOUNG: About five minutes to 1:00.  (Lunch recess taken)  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Before we hear from the Farm Bureau, do we have any elected officials that would like to address this issue; any board members, supervisor, councilmen?  (Off the record)  CHAIR YOUNG: Are we ready? Okay.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. I'm a field representative on behalf of the Assembly member Luis Alejo.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He is assemblymember for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	In fact, staff added more regulatory language that includes storm water issues, as well.  We've done enough monitoring throughout the region to know where the impaired areas are. We need to focus our resources on those areas, partner with growers and other agency to fix the problem, utilize the best science without regulating growers out of business.  Staff proposal, as written, is far too broad and cumbersome. Adopting it will not result in water quality improvement.  I urge the chairman and the board to direct staff to focus on known areas of impairment; work together with the ag community; incorporate water quality and prudent methods found in the ag proposal, along with certain parts of staff proposal, and build a hybrid that focuses on surface water impairment only.  Thank you very much.  CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.  Eric Lauritzen.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Okay. I think what we should do is break now for lunch and come back in one hour, and then we'll start with the Farm Bureau presentation.  MR. BRIGGS: So that'd be five minutes to 1:00.  CHAIR YOUNG: About five minutes to 1:00.  (Lunch recess taken)  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Before we hear from the Farm Bureau, do we have any elected officials that would like to address this issue; any board members, supervisor, councilmen?  (Off the record)  CHAIR YOUNG: Are we ready? Okay.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. I'm a field representative on behalf of the Assembly member Luis Alejo.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He is assemblymember for the 28th Assemble District. And he is submitting a letter today. And I would like to just read a portion of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	In fact, staff added more regulatory language that includes storm water issues, as well.  We've done enough monitoring throughout the region to know where the impaired areas are. We need to focus our resources on those areas, partner with growers and other agency to fix the problem, utilize the best science without regulating growers out of business.  Staff proposal, as written, is far too broad and cumbersome. Adopting it will not result in water quality improvement.  I urge the chairman and the board to direct staff to focus on known areas of impairment; work together with the ag community; incorporate water quality and prudent methods found in the ag proposal, along with certain parts of staff proposal, and build a hybrid that focuses on surface water impairment only.  Thank you very much.  CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.  Eric Lauritzen.  MR. LAURITZEN: Chair Young, again, thank you for the opportunity to speak.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Okay. I think what we should do is break now for lunch and come back in one hour, and then we'll start with the Farm Bureau presentation.  MR. BRIGGS: So that'd be five minutes to 1:00.  CHAIR YOUNG: About five minutes to 1:00.  (Lunch recess taken)  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Before we hear from the Farm Bureau, do we have any elected officials that would like to address this issue; any board members, supervisor, councilmen?  (Off the record)  CHAIR YOUNG: Are we ready? Okay.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. I'm a field representative on behalf of the Assembly member Luis Alejo.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He is assemblymember for the 28th Assemble District. And he is submitting a letter today. And I would like to just read a portion of that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	In fact, staff added more regulatory language that includes storm water issues, as well.  We've done enough monitoring throughout the region to know where the impaired areas are. We need to focus our resources on those areas, partner with growers and other agency to fix the problem, utilize the best science without regulating growers out of business.  Staff proposal, as written, is far too broad and cumbersome. Adopting it will not result in water quality improvement.  I urge the chairman and the board to direct staff to focus on known areas of impairment; work together with the ag community; incorporate water quality and prudent methods found in the ag proposal, along with certain parts of staff proposal, and build a hybrid that focuses on surface water impairment only.  Thank you very much.  CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.  Eric Lauritzen.  MR. LAURITZEN: Chair Young, again, thank you for the opportunity to speak.  As a regulator of pesticides, I just want to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Okay. I think what we should do is break now for lunch and come back in one hour, and then we'll start with the Farm Bureau presentation.  MR. BRIGGS: So that'd be five minutes to 1:00.  CHAIR YOUNG: About five minutes to 1:00.  (Lunch recess taken)  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Before we hear from the Farm Bureau, do we have any elected officials that would like to address this issue; any board members, supervisor, councilmen?  (Off the record)  CHAIR YOUNG: Are we ready? Okay.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. I'm a field representative on behalf of the Assembly member Luis Alejo.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He is assemblymember for the 28th Assemble District. And he is submitting a letter today. And I would like to just read a portion of that.  Questions on the sustain sustainability of

approach appears to be more burdensome to agriculture
producers within the Central Coast region water quality
board area, than those created and recommended for other
regions.
This disparity in regulatory standards and

This disparity in regulatory standards and requirements may put the agricultural industry in the Central Coast at a substantial competitive disadvantage relative to other regions of the state.

The economic impacts to our local and regional econo -- economies as a result of the loss of productive agricultural land, crop production, property tax revenue and agriculture jobs could have a ripple effect throughout our region; one that is already experiencing double-digit unemployment and an escalating economic crisis.

I understand that the initial economic impact survey estimated a loss of business revenue in the Central Coast of 231 to 298 million, and estimated lost tax revenue of 19 to 25 million.

Loss of labor could potentially range from 87 to 112 million. This survey also predicts 2,500 to 3,300 job losses.

All of these losses could total as much as 470 million from the Central Coast alone. Our agricultural industry and our communities cannot afford these losses.

Page 154

community as a whole. Thank you.

CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. And thank the assemblyman for us.

4 Any other elected officials or representatives5 on behalf of elected officials?

Okay. We are now ready for the Farm Bureau presentation.

MR. MERKLEY: Good afternoon, Chairman Young and members of the board. Happy St. Patrick's Day.

Thank you for this opportunity to present the ag proposal, a proposal that when -- when adopted would be the most protective water quality program in the world.

My name is Danny Merkley. I'm director of water resources for the California Farm Bureau.

We will -- as -- as was previously stated, we'll have 55 -- or 60 minutes to present with our panel. We will reserve five minutes for the end of public testimony today to -- to close. And I've been tasked with the lovely job of keeping -- the -- our panel on time.

So I have a fresh battery in my cattle prod, and will do my best to get that done.

First up will be Brad Barbeau to present the economic assessment on the Appendix F. Brad, thank you.

Page 156

I recommend the following:

Improvements must be made to water quality standards. The proposal will do that through new technology and efficiency improvements, with special attention to environmental sustainability.

Provide incentives for farmers to improve their infrastructure and practices to better meet water quality standards.

Support the all-community stakeholders' process, established under the 2004 ag waiver.

And further examine the economic implications the draft renewal ag waiver, which states that prior to implementation of any agricultural water quality control program, an estimate of the total cost of such a program, together with an identification of potential sources of financing, shall be indicated in any regional water quality control plan.

My office happily accepts the opportunity presented by farmers for water quality to join environmental advocates, social justice champions and farmers, as they begin a community-wide dialogue to find solutions addressing rural and environmental water quality concerns.

We are look -- looking forward to finding solutions that present win-win opportunities for the  $${\tt Page}$$  155

DR. BARBEAU: Thank you very much. Good morning, Chairman Young, members of the board.

My name is Dr. Brad Barbeau. I'm a -- I am assistant professor of economics and entrepreneurship at Cal State University Monterey Bay. And I've been asked to speak to the economic impacts of the proposed waiver.

When I originally began this project, I had hoped to be able to present a full cost analysis for implementing the order. However, for multiple reasons, I have not yet completed that analysis.

First, it's a very complicated project. The requirements of the order are broad and the solutions are not known. So determining the costs are very difficult.

And, I would note that, now adding in that we may have up to 73 more pesticides to deal with is going to further complicate that as we go forward.

Second, the new order published March 2nd entailed many changes in too short a timeframe to be able to respond for this meeting. I'm still working on the analysis and I will make it available to you when it is complete.

This morning -- this afternoon, I would like to address some issues related to the economic and cost analysis contained in Appendix F, the staff's document on cost considerations.

40 (Pages 154 to 157)

The authors of Appendix F correctly identify the classic externality problem posed by water quality issues on the Central Coast.

The important point here is that these externalities impose costs on others they might not have chosen to bear and they distort economic decisions about levels of production and consumption.

Although the appendix identifies the externality issue, it does not carry this approach forward, and presents a set of observations and data, but does not present a coherent analysis of either grower costs or economic impact.

So when externalities exist, the economic goal is to minimize the distortions caused by that externality. We need to be aware that the policies designed to address the externality will have their own costs, monitoring and enforcement that need to be taken to account as further sources of distortion.

These costs, which will be borne in part by taxpayers, in part by growers, and in part by consumers, are not addressed as such by the report.

If the objective is to address and reverse the effects of the externality, we must be aware that as we attempt to drive pollution to zero -- there we go -- we reach a point where the costs of additional improvements

Page 158

is very complex - we've heard a couple of examples of that this morning - much more so than in most industries.

This is because of the interlocking relationships among landowners, growers, processors, handlers, labor and vendors. These interlocking relationships are important to maintaining a stable, productive agricultural industry in the region.

They help participants to manage risk and to weather the ups and downs that are an inherent part of the agricultural production system; they both complicate the implementation of the order and, in turn, the order creates uncertainties for the future of these relationships, uncertainties that may threaten the viability of many of the growers that we -- we might most want to protect.

And I think a concrete example that came up this morning related to: Is it the landowner or the operator who is ultimately responsible? And the lack of priority that there was around that.

The impact of the order on these relationships needs to be understood, and are not addressed in the appendix.

The appendix is largely dismissive of external threats to the region -- region's agriculture. Although

Page 160

rise rapidly and additional benefits become very expensive.

Further expenditures waste resources for little benefit. This point of diminishing returns is not known currently, but the appendix makes no acknowledgment that it even exists.

There we go. The implication is that the socially optimal level of pollution is not zero. Because there are costs involved in not polluting. Just as it is impossible to have automobiles that generate zero pollution, including electric vehicles, we would be unlikely to ban automobiles simply on the grounds that they pollute. The value of the services they provide is enough to justify some level of pollution.

I would also argue that the optimal level of pollution is not the current level. The optimization rule of economics is to pursue pollution abatement until an additional dollar spent on reducing pollution produces a dollar's worth of benefits from the reduction in pollution.

This principle should underlie the analysis in Appendix F. So let's look at some of the -- the factors that drive these tradeoffs, that are mostly not included in the appendix.

First of all, the value chain in the ag system

ag in most of the region is very healthy, it is not a closed system, and unavoidably competes with alternative crops, other growing regions and in the export/import markets. And it is worth noting that agricultural exports are very important to the California economy.

In its discussion of grower income, the appendix is not careful to distinguish between the revenue generated by growers and the returns they earn on their investment. The distinction is very important.

Grower revenue is income for the region. The labor, the fertilizer, capital investment and other costs to the grower are jobs and income for other entities in the region. But what keeps the grower in business is the return earned on invested capital.

Without earning a sufficient return, the grower is unable to maintain the levels of investment necessary to support a healthy and, I would add, a well-run agricultural operation, which is what we're after here.

One of the tasks for my economic report will be to identify the necessary rates of return and the affect of the order on them. This has not been addressed in the appendix.

While policy makers tend to look at the market or industry-level impacts and outcomes, growers see the impacts on and outcomes for their individual operations.

These are very different.

If you are a grower, you're aware of your own costs and the market prices for your commodities. Survival requires you to keep your costs in line with those market prices. An individual grower does not have the power to raise market prices.

So any additional costs that they face will threaten their profitability directly. The individual grower cannot pass on these costs up the chain.

We have to remember that we're dealing with perishable crops. At harvest, the farmer must sell it or lose it; not like a car dealership, where you can leave it on the lot and wait for prices to turn around. It's gone if it isn't sold right away. We can't store them to wait for better prices.

So to the extent that cost impacts are not evenly distributed, there will be winners and losers. The appendix nowhere acknowledges that the structure of the order will create winners and losers, nor does it attempt to identify what classes of growers might be the most at risk.

The monitoring and reporting costs are subject to economies of scale. The bigger the operation, in general, the better able the operation is to spread those costs over its output.

Page 162

This is considerably different than the staff estimates of 56 to 154 acres. The loss of gross crop production value of between a hundred and \$167 million per year would be represented by the creation of these buffers.

And, remember, that's a hundred million dollars a year not in lost profit to the growers, but absolutely in lost income to the -- to the -- this is just Monterey County data.

Appendix F, Section 3.2 contains a pretty extensive discussion of the methyl bromide ban, in an attempt to look at a parallel case to the water quality regulation issues.

In my opinion, the methyl bromide ban from -- at least, from an economic standpoint -- has every few characteristics in common with the issue at hand. And that discussion is largely irrelevant to understanding what's happening under this order.

Separate from several errors in the appendix discussion of elasticities -- which I don't have time to address here -- the appendix makes the claim that increases in prices that the growers will receive will be somewhat offset, at least, by -- I'm sorry - the -- makes the claim that increases in prices that the growers will receive will somewhat offset the cost of the order

Page 164

It is common for regulation to result in a level of consolidation in the regulated market. And it's the small companies that lose.

Small growers who lease land from large owners
-- landowners or who employ the wrong combination of risk
factors are subject to Tier 3 status and all of the costs
associated with that tier.

And further economic impact may be in shifting the patterns of land use, separate from production lost to buffers. I'll address those in a moment.

Some ground may be prohibitive -- may become prohibitively expensive to farm or become insufficiently productive under the requirements of the order. As land becomes less valuable to agriculture and, therefore, commands lower rents, owners may seek alternate -- alternative uses for the land.

No assessment of land value impacts or land use implications is contained in the -- in the appendix document.

The Monterey County Ag Commissioner's office put together, in the last few days, an analysis that was referred to by -- by Commissioner Lauritzen, that between 5600 and almost up to -- potentially up to 10,000 acres of farmland may be taken out of production for the buffers.

Page 163

to the growers.

However, we need to pay attention to the -that's indicating that those costs are going to be passed
up the line, and ultimately to the consumer. I don't
believe we should be cavalier about raising consumer food
costs further than they have been raised.

And we need to recognize that individual growers face far higher elasticities than the market as a whole. An individual grower's abilities to raise prices in response to higher costs is very limited.

The appendix does not take this into account in this discussion of the elasticities. The elasticities they have are all market elasticities.

Staff's economic and cost analysis, as is our own, is incomplete and needs to be completed. Currently, no one knows the economic impact of implementing the order on the growers or on the agricultural industry, on the region, or on the larger economy of the region.

Effective change processes include both clear goals and a roadmap for achieving those goals. Once the goals have been set, implementation planning has got to define the hows. As I read the order, the hows are not clear. The ag community needs time and resources to develop them.

So, in conclusion, the cost analysis needs to  ${\tt Page \ 165}$ 

1	be completed and then needs to be input to an economic	1	necessary for the hazard index related to the crop and
2	impact assessment.	2	the soil. I was personally involved throughout this
3	It would be a world-class contribution to the	3	process.
4	practice of environmental regulation to develop an	4	I looked at every soil profile. I looked at
5	integrated economic and ecological model for a achieving	5	every crop and everything we knew about that crop, in
6	water quality objectives.	6	putting it together, and in also wrote the
7	And finally, best management practices need	7	supplementary material that is part of that.
8	much more development to assist farmers in cost	8	And that hazard index can be found presently at
9	effectively achieving the water quality goals.	9	the site listed there.
10	Thank you very much for your time.	10	A recent development, which is very positive,
11	CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you.	11	because it required input for the soil series name - and
12	MR. JEFFRIES: Do I do have one question for	12	many farmers may not know what the soil series of any
13	the presenter.	13	particular field was; we now have a link to the U.C.
14	. CHAIR YOUNG: Go ahead.	14	Davis, where you can link into that and find out the soil
15	MR. JEFFRIES: Did you do a a study on	15	series names for any location, which then allows them to
16	for every dollar that's generated, how many times it	16	completely go through the process of of coming up with
17	turns over?	17	the hazard index.
18	For instance, in retail cities, look at retail	18	Now, the present three-tier approach is
19	sales, it turns over \$10 ten times.	19	consistent with the TAC recommendation. However, the
20	DR. BARBEAU: Correct.	20	details of information differ greatly.
21	MR. JEFFRIES: Did you do an analysis on	21	I looked at Appendix B, Table 4, which contains
22	agriculture?	22	the proposed nitrate loading risk factor criteria. It
23	DR. BARBEAU: I have I have not gotten to	23	completely guts the University of California hazard
24	that stage yet. That will be a part of the analysis.	24	index. The soil factor is completely eliminated.
25	That's an important part.	25	That's just like saying the body doesn't need
	Page 166		Page 168
	<del>-</del>		-
1	MR. MERKLEY: Okay. Next we'll have Dr. Letey	1	the heart or the lungs. Just like the heart and the
2	and then Robert Dolezal make technical comment and	2	lungs are vital organs to the body, the soil is a
3	presentation.	3	critical factor in nitrate loading.
4	DR. LETEY: Good afternoon.	4	Two major factors which contribute to the
5	Go back to the original, please.	5	loading is one is denitrofication, which completely
6	One of the key things on there was and the	6	removes nitrogen from the system.
7	reason I'm here today I can trace back to 1994. I was	7	I was interested this morning, hardly anything
8	appointed a member of the technical advisory committee by	8	was mentioned about denitrofication in this whole
9	the state water resources control board.	9	process.
10	And our charge was to cope with the very thing	10	The other is the water movement through the
11	Alexadas destina cathe a car	11	
1	they're dealing with now.	1	soil, which carries the nitrogen.
12	Is to come up with alternatives and ways to	12	soil, which carries the nitrogen.  Those are the two main factors on the load.
12 13			•
	Is to come up with alternatives and ways to	12	Those are the two main factors on the load.
13	Is to come up with alternatives and ways to reduce groundwater contamination from agricultural. It	12 13	Those are the two main factors on the load.  Both of those are intimately tied to the soil profile
13 14	Is to come up with alternatives and ways to reduce groundwater contamination from agricultural. It is on the basis of that I can trace back ultimate events	12 13 14	Those are the two main factors on the load.  Both of those are intimately tied to the soil profile characteristics, and you cannot come up with a reliable
13 14 15	Is to come up with alternatives and ways to reduce groundwater contamination from agricultural. It is on the basis of that I can trace back ultimate events to now.	12 13 14 15	Those are the two main factors on the load.  Both of those are intimately tied to the soil profile characteristics, and you cannot come up with a reliable index by neglecting the soil.
13 14 15 16	Is to come up with alternatives and ways to reduce groundwater contamination from agricultural. It is on the basis of that I can trace back ultimate events to now.  So click through. The TAC, at that time, recommended the	12 13 14 15 16	Those are the two main factors on the load.  Both of those are intimately tied to the soil profile characteristics, and you cannot come up with a reliable index by neglecting the soil.  Secondly, nitrogen in the irrigation water has
13 14 15 16 17	Is to come up with alternatives and ways to reduce groundwater contamination from agricultural. It is on the basis of that I can trace back ultimate events to now.  So click through.	12 13 14 15 16 17	Those are the two main factors on the load.  Both of those are intimately tied to the soil profile characteristics, and you cannot come up with a reliable index by neglecting the soil.  Secondly, nitrogen in the irrigation water has been added, so that the higher the nitrogen in irrigation water, the higher up the the load risk.
13 14 15 16 17 18	Is to come up with alternatives and ways to reduce groundwater contamination from agricultural. It is on the basis of that I can trace back ultimate events to now.  So click through.  The TAC, at that time, recommended the establishment of nitrogen leaching hazard as the core of	12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Those are the two main factors on the load.  Both of those are intimately tied to the soil profile characteristics, and you cannot come up with a reliable index by neglecting the soil.  Secondly, nitrogen in the irrigation water has been added, so that the higher the nitrogen in irrigation water, the higher up the the load risk.  Well, any farmer who has a high nitrogen
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Is to come up with alternatives and ways to reduce groundwater contamination from agricultural. It is on the basis of that I can trace back ultimate events to now.  So click through.  The TAC, at that time, recommended the establishment of nitrogen leaching hazard as the core of the program. The hazard was to have three components: the crop, the soil and the irrigation system.	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Those are the two main factors on the load.  Both of those are intimately tied to the soil profile characteristics, and you cannot come up with a reliable index by neglecting the soil.  Secondly, nitrogen in the irrigation water has been added, so that the higher the nitrogen in irrigation water, the higher up the the load risk.  Well, any farmer who has a high nitrogen content in their irrigation water would be a complete
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Is to come up with alternatives and ways to reduce groundwater contamination from agricultural. It is on the basis of that I can trace back ultimate events to now.  So click through.  The TAC, at that time, recommended the establishment of nitrogen leaching hazard as the core of the program. The hazard was to have three components: the crop, the soil and the irrigation system.  However, it was not possible for the board to	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Those are the two main factors on the load.  Both of those are intimately tied to the soil profile characteristics, and you cannot come up with a reliable index by neglecting the soil.  Secondly, nitrogen in the irrigation water has been added, so that the higher the nitrogen in irrigation water, the higher up the the load risk.  Well, any farmer who has a high nitrogen content in their irrigation water would be a complete idiot to allow that to increase the load to groundwater,
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Is to come up with alternatives and ways to reduce groundwater contamination from agricultural. It is on the basis of that I can trace back ultimate events to now.  So click through.  The TAC, at that time, recommended the establishment of nitrogen leaching hazard as the core of the program. The hazard was to have three components: the crop, the soil and the irrigation system.  However, it was not possible for the board to implement anything because information was lacking to	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Those are the two main factors on the load.  Both of those are intimately tied to the soil profile characteristics, and you cannot come up with a reliable index by neglecting the soil.  Secondly, nitrogen in the irrigation water has been added, so that the higher the nitrogen in irrigation water, the higher up the the load risk.  Well, any farmer who has a high nitrogen content in their irrigation water would be a complete idiot to allow that to increase the load to groundwater, rather than using it as a resource to decrease the amount
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Is to come up with alternatives and ways to reduce groundwater contamination from agricultural. It is on the basis of that I can trace back ultimate events to now.  So click through.  The TAC, at that time, recommended the establishment of nitrogen leaching hazard as the core of the program. The hazard was to have three components: the crop, the soil and the irrigation system.  However, it was not possible for the board to implement anything because information was lacking to quantify the index for the crop and the soil.	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Those are the two main factors on the load.  Both of those are intimately tied to the soil profile characteristics, and you cannot come up with a reliable index by neglecting the soil.  Secondly, nitrogen in the irrigation water has been added, so that the higher the nitrogen in irrigation water, the higher up the the load risk.  Well, any farmer who has a high nitrogen content in their irrigation water would be a complete idiot to allow that to increase the load to groundwater, rather than using it as a resource to decrease the amount of nitrogen they apply in their fields.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Is to come up with alternatives and ways to reduce groundwater contamination from agricultural. It is on the basis of that I can trace back ultimate events to now.  So click through.  The TAC, at that time, recommended the establishment of nitrogen leaching hazard as the core of the program. The hazard was to have three components: the crop, the soil and the irrigation system.  However, it was not possible for the board to implement anything because information was lacking to quantify the index for the crop and the soil.  Now, the U.C. Center for Water Resources more	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Those are the two main factors on the load.  Both of those are intimately tied to the soil profile characteristics, and you cannot come up with a reliable index by neglecting the soil.  Secondly, nitrogen in the irrigation water has been added, so that the higher the nitrogen in irrigation water, the higher up the the load risk.  Well, any farmer who has a high nitrogen content in their irrigation water would be a complete idiot to allow that to increase the load to groundwater, rather than using it as a resource to decrease the amount of nitrogen they apply in their fields.  Also, there are the impact of the sprinkler
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Is to come up with alternatives and ways to reduce groundwater contamination from agricultural. It is on the basis of that I can trace back ultimate events to now.  So click through.  The TAC, at that time, recommended the establishment of nitrogen leaching hazard as the core of the program. The hazard was to have three components: the crop, the soil and the irrigation system.  However, it was not possible for the board to implement anything because information was lacking to quantify the index for the crop and the soil.	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Those are the two main factors on the load.  Both of those are intimately tied to the soil profile characteristics, and you cannot come up with a reliable index by neglecting the soil.  Secondly, nitrogen in the irrigation water has been added, so that the higher the nitrogen in irrigation water, the higher up the the load risk.  Well, any farmer who has a high nitrogen content in their irrigation water would be a complete idiot to allow that to increase the load to groundwater, rather than using it as a resource to decrease the amount of nitrogen they apply in their fields.

1	that.	1	establish the tiers is vastly flawed and needs to be
2	Now, as after the comments this morning, I	2	fixed up.
3	had thoughts on on the crop part, but I'll pass	3	Thank you.
4	because that's not part of my prepared statement.	4	CHAIR YOUNG: I have a couple of questions for
5	Now, turning to another matter, one thing you	5	you, Dr. Letey.
6	need to recognize is the nitrate concentration in soil	6	If you could stop the clock, too.
7	below the root zone is not correlated to the load. And	7	If you could go back a slide.
8	what we're trying to do is reduce the load. What we're	8	So your suggestion is to focus on monitoring
9	trying to do is induce management to decrease the load.	9	management on the farm.
10	And, therefore, measuring that concentration is	10	DR. LETEY: That is where you're going to get
11	not even an index whether the farm management is good or	11 12	the return.
12	bad, for the purposes that we're intending it, and that		CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. And ultimately aren't you
13	is, to reduce nitrate load to the groundwater.	13	looking at trying to manage the application or use of
14	Therefore, dictating multitudes of dollars that	14	fertilizer?
15 16	are required to measure this concentration, which has	15 16	DR. LETEY: That becomes part of it.
17	really almost no meaning to what we're trying to achieve,	17	CHAIR YOUNG: And what tool do you use? DR. LETEY: What tools do we use?
18	I consider economic folly.	18	
19	And that needs to be understood, the main thing	19	CHAIR YOUNG: What tool should a farmer use, then, to know when is enough fertilizer, when is too much
	to understand, because very often we are hearing nitrate	20	
20	load and concentration being presented synonymously.	21	fertilizer, given that condition?
21	They are not. The nitrate load is the concentration	22	DR. LETEY: Okay. We have had years and years of research at the University of California.
22	times the water flow.	23	•
23 24	And what we can measure, the concentration, we	24	We have a lot of technical information related
25	cannot quantitatively measure water flow. That is extremely difficult, very expensive and, therefore, we	25	to fertilizer and irrigation management that can be utilized in terms of management.
23	Page 170	23	Page 172
	1490 170		1090 171
1	cannot quantitatively measure the thing we really want to	1	Let me now refer back to the hazard hazard
2	have. What we'd like to do is quantitate the load, but	2	index, when we have the crop. If for those for
3	we can't do it.	3	example, all the crops we have listed with high hazard,
4	So, the next best thing is to monitor let me	4	each crop has a different reason for having high hazards.
5	okay.	5	And on that hazard index, you can click to that
6	Now, I have taught environmental science	6	crop and it will tell you what it is about that crop that
7	courses for over three decades. I completely understand	7	makes it a high hazard. And it also, then, suggests
8	the significance of monitoring, dealing with enviro	8	different alternatives and practices that you might use
9	quality matters.	9	to mitigate that particular thing.
10	So it's not a question of whether do we monitor	10	And it's not going to be the same for every
11	or not monitor. The question is: What do we monitor?	11	crop.
12	What we really the thing that's going to	12	CHAIR YOUNG: Can you can you give me a
13	dictate what goes down is the farmer management. And we	13	couple of examples, for like broccoli or something else,
14	can, and should, monitor and focus attention on	14	like lettuce?
15	monitoring the farmer management. And and induce	15	DR. LETEY: Okay. There are some well,
16	those management practices that lead to reduced loading.	16	first of all, if they have a shallow root system, one of
17	And that the effort and attention be paid to to that.	17	the key things is that, because you have a shallow root
18	And sort of summing all this up, I find there	18	system, you can't really get water to flow and anything -
19	are major shortcomings in the scientific and economic	19	- anything that's carried below the root zone is gone.
20	content of the draft order that must be fixed if you	20	And so you have to really, really monitor your
21	expect that your desired goals will be achieved.	21	irrigation, timing and things, not to over irrigate at
22	First of all, going back to assigning these	22	any one given time.
23	things in the tier, if you mess up assigning them to the	23	And this is why, when you go to a sprinkler or
24 25	right tier, you have messed up everything thereafter.	24	the micro irrigation systems, it moves it down in terms
	And I propose that the criteria using to	25	of a hazard

Page 171

1	Now, there are some crops and I I don't	1	And you cannot specify concentration because,
2	remember in detail all these things that just by	2	if you do, you might actually get a counterproductive
3	necessity to grow a good harvest, means that there's	3	result from your load.
4	quite a bit of nitrogen left in the soil after the crop	4	CHAIR YOUNG: Here here's the conundrum.
5	is removed.	5	We're not specifying new concentrations or
6	And if you have that, then you can possibly	6	standards. They're in the law. We we're trying to
7	need to grow a cover crop, before the rain comes, to	7	achieve standards that have been adopted for
8	remove that nitrogen so it doesn't get leached down.	8	DR. LETEY: Okay.
9	Or, there's some crops that there's a lot of	9	CHAIR YOUNG: us to follow.
10	residual vegetative matter left on the field. And	10	So how how does management address that?
11	vegetative matter contains nitrogen. And that nitrogen	11	MR. BRIGGS: Before before you answer that,
12	will become mineralized during the year and available for	12	Mr. Chairman, I think you're doing a little bit of this,
13	next year.	13	because I believe you're talking about concentrations
14	Many farmers, in the past, ignored the	14	down below the root zone, and I believe you're talking
15	contribution of nitrogen from the residue of the previous	15	about meeting standards wherever there's a receptor; like
16	crop. That, then, can be entered into the management	16	a water well.
17	scheme. We have the knowledge of looking at each of	17	CHAIR YOUNG: Well, he the doctor had
18	these things and coming up with approaches to evolve the	18	mentioned kind of coming up with standards that may not
19	high yield.	19	be achievable.
20	And, let's make one thing straight, we are	20	MR. BRIGGS: Right. But I think your question
21	never ever - scientifically impossible to completely	21	was: Can ag be compatible with water quality standards,
22	eliminate any discharge. That is simply not	22	say, at the point of use. Say for a well.
23	scientifically possible.	23	CHAIR YOUNG: Pretty much.
24	But the key is that there are many things we	24	DR. LETEY: Oh, okay. I
25	can do to reduce it. But it's going to be very site	25	CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah.
	Page 174		Page 176
1	specific. And this is why I'm saying the focus has to be	1	DR. LETEY: There's two issues. One is the
2	on the management.	2	concentration leaving the root zone. And what,
3	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Well, can we reduce the	3	ultimately, that resorts to, as far as the
	discharge so that it's not going to exceed a receiving		
4		4	•
4 5		4   5	CHAIR YOUNG: Receipt
4 5 6	water standard?		•
5	water standard? DR. LETEY: Okay.	5	CHAIR YOUNG: Receipt DR. LETEY: well or some groundwater somewhere else.
5 6	water standard? DR. LETEY: Okay. CHAIR YOUNG: Because that's what this all	5 6	CHAIR YOUNG: Receipt DR. LETEY: well or some groundwater somewhere else. CHAIR YOUNG: Right.
5 6 7	water standard?  DR. LETEY: Okay.  CHAIR YOUNG: Because that's what this all boils down to.	5 6 7	CHAIR YOUNG: Receipt DR. LETEY: well or some groundwater somewhere else. CHAIR YOUNG: Right. DR. LETEY: Now, the load is the thing that's
5 6 7 8	water standard?  DR. LETEY: Okay.  CHAIR YOUNG: Because that's what this all boils down to.  DR. LETEY: Okay. That, then, is another I	5 6 7 8	CHAIR YOUNG: Receipt DR. LETEY: well or some groundwater somewhere else. CHAIR YOUNG: Right.
5 6 7 8 9	water standard? DR. LETEY: Okay. CHAIR YOUNG: Because that's what this all boils down to. DR. LETEY: Okay. That, then, is another I guess, what I want to say.	5 6 7 8 9	CHAIR YOUNG: Receipt DR. LETEY: well or some groundwater somewhere else. CHAIR YOUNG: Right. DR. LETEY: Now, the load is the thing that's going to affect the total groundwater. And that's why I wanted to reduce that load.
5 6 7 8 9	water standard? DR. LETEY: Okay. CHAIR YOUNG: Because that's what this all boils down to. DR. LETEY: Okay. That, then, is another I guess, what I want to say. I said that the concentration below is not an	5 6 7 8 9	CHAIR YOUNG: Receipt DR. LETEY: well or some groundwater somewhere else. CHAIR YOUNG: Right. DR. LETEY: Now, the load is the thing that's going to affect the total groundwater. And that's why I
5 6 7 8 9 10	water standard? DR. LETEY: Okay. CHAIR YOUNG: Because that's what this all boils down to. DR. LETEY: Okay. That, then, is another I guess, what I want to say. I said that the concentration below is not an indicator of good management or low management.	5 6 7 8 9 10	CHAIR YOUNG: Receipt DR. LETEY: well or some groundwater somewhere else. CHAIR YOUNG: Right. DR. LETEY: Now, the load is the thing that's going to affect the total groundwater. And that's why I wanted to reduce that load. My comment on the concentration and I think
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	water standard? DR. LETEY: Okay. CHAIR YOUNG: Because that's what this all boils down to. DR. LETEY: Okay. That, then, is another I guess, what I want to say. I said that the concentration below is not an	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	CHAIR YOUNG: Receipt DR. LETEY: well or some groundwater somewhere else. CHAIR YOUNG: Right. DR. LETEY: Now, the load is the thing that's going to affect the total groundwater. And that's why I wanted to reduce that load. My comment on the concentration and I think you picked up is specifically on that below the root
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	water standard? DR. LETEY: Okay. CHAIR YOUNG: Because that's what this all boils down to. DR. LETEY: Okay. That, then, is another I guess, what I want to say. I said that the concentration below is not an indicator of good management or low management. It is that you can have the high concentration with a very low load. Or you can have a low	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CHAIR YOUNG: Receipt DR. LETEY: well or some groundwater somewhere else. CHAIR YOUNG: Right. DR. LETEY: Now, the load is the thing that's going to affect the total groundwater. And that's why I wanted to reduce that load. My comment on the concentration and I think you picked up is specifically on that below the root zone.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	water standard? DR. LETEY: Okay. CHAIR YOUNG: Because that's what this all boils down to. DR. LETEY: Okay. That, then, is another I guess, what I want to say. I said that the concentration below is not an indicator of good management or low management. It is that you can have the high concentration with a very low load. Or you can have a low concentration with a very high load.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CHAIR YOUNG: Receipt DR. LETEY: well or some groundwater somewhere else. CHAIR YOUNG: Right. DR. LETEY: Now, the load is the thing that's going to affect the total groundwater. And that's why I wanted to reduce that load. My comment on the concentration and I think you picked up is specifically on that below the root zone. Now, you another thing is that you say,
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	water standard? DR. LETEY: Okay. CHAIR YOUNG: Because that's what this all boils down to. DR. LETEY: Okay. That, then, is another I guess, what I want to say. I said that the concentration below is not an indicator of good management or low management. It is that you can have the high concentration with a very low load. Or you can have a low	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CHAIR YOUNG: Receipt DR. LETEY: well or some groundwater somewhere else. CHAIR YOUNG: Right. DR. LETEY: Now, the load is the thing that's going to affect the total groundwater. And that's why I wanted to reduce that load. My comment on the concentration and I think you picked up is specifically on that below the root zone. Now, you another thing is that you say, well, we have regulations. And we bypassed one of my
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	water standard?  DR. LETEY: Okay.  CHAIR YOUNG: Because that's what this all boils down to.  DR. LETEY: Okay. That, then, is another I guess, what I want to say.  I said that the concentration below is not an indicator of good management or low management.  It is that you can have the high concentration with a very low load. Or you can have a low concentration with a very high load.  Well, any time you put a regulation or anything	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	CHAIR YOUNG: Receipt DR. LETEY: well or some groundwater somewhere else. CHAIR YOUNG: Right. DR. LETEY: Now, the load is the thing that's going to affect the total groundwater. And that's why I wanted to reduce that load. My comment on the concentration and I think you picked up is specifically on that below the root zone. Now, you another thing is that you say, well, we have regulations. And we bypassed one of my first lives, which you know, I'm an old man. And one
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	water standard? DR. LETEY: Okay. CHAIR YOUNG: Because that's what this all boils down to. DR. LETEY: Okay. That, then, is another I guess, what I want to say. I said that the concentration below is not an indicator of good management or low management. It is that you can have the high concentration with a very low load. Or you can have a low concentration with a very high load. Well, any time you put a regulation or anything and stipulate a concentration, you are you know, if	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CHAIR YOUNG: Receipt DR. LETEY: well or some groundwater somewhere else. CHAIR YOUNG: Right. DR. LETEY: Now, the load is the thing that's going to affect the total groundwater. And that's why I wanted to reduce that load. My comment on the concentration and I think you picked up is specifically on that below the root zone. Now, you another thing is that you say, well, we have regulations. And we bypassed one of my first lives, which you know, I'm an old man. And one of the benefits of being old is you've lived many years
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	water standard? DR. LETEY: Okay. CHAIR YOUNG: Because that's what this all boils down to. DR. LETEY: Okay. That, then, is another I guess, what I want to say. I said that the concentration below is not an indicator of good management or low management. It is that you can have the high concentration with a very low load. Or you can have a low concentration with a very high load. Well, any time you put a regulation or anything and stipulate a concentration, you are you know, if I'm a farmer and you give I can get a low	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	CHAIR YOUNG: Receipt DR. LETEY: well or some groundwater somewhere else. CHAIR YOUNG: Right. DR. LETEY: Now, the load is the thing that's going to affect the total groundwater. And that's why I wanted to reduce that load. My comment on the concentration and I think you picked up is specifically on that below the root zone. Now, you another thing is that you say, well, we have regulations. And we bypassed one of my first lives, which you know, I'm an old man. And one of the benefits of being old is you've lived many years and be able to observe.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	water standard?  DR. LETEY: Okay.  CHAIR YOUNG: Because that's what this all boils down to.  DR. LETEY: Okay. That, then, is another I guess, what I want to say.  I said that the concentration below is not an indicator of good management or low management.  It is that you can have the high concentration with a very low load. Or you can have a low concentration with a very high load.  Well, any time you put a regulation or anything and stipulate a concentration, you are you know, if I'm a farmer and you give I can get a low concentration just by pouring a lot of water through and	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CHAIR YOUNG: Receipt DR. LETEY: well or some groundwater somewhere else. CHAIR YOUNG: Right. DR. LETEY: Now, the load is the thing that's going to affect the total groundwater. And that's why I wanted to reduce that load. My comment on the concentration and I think you picked up is specifically on that below the root zone. Now, you another thing is that you say, well, we have regulations. And we bypassed one of my first lives, which you know, I'm an old man. And one of the benefits of being old is you've lived many years and be able to observe. We can write anything into law. We can write
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	water standard?  DR. LETEY: Okay.  CHAIR YOUNG: Because that's what this all boils down to.  DR. LETEY: Okay. That, then, is another I guess, what I want to say.  I said that the concentration below is not an indicator of good management or low management.  It is that you can have the high concentration with a very low load. Or you can have a low concentration with a very high load.  Well, any time you put a regulation or anything and stipulate a concentration, you are you know, if I'm a farmer and you give I can get a low concentration just by pouring a lot of water through and diluting it.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	CHAIR YOUNG: Receipt DR. LETEY: well or some groundwater somewhere else. CHAIR YOUNG: Right. DR. LETEY: Now, the load is the thing that's going to affect the total groundwater. And that's why I wanted to reduce that load. My comment on the concentration and I think you picked up is specifically on that below the root zone. Now, you another thing is that you say, well, we have regulations. And we bypassed one of my first lives, which you know, I'm an old man. And one of the benefits of being old is you've lived many years and be able to observe. We can write anything into law. We can write anything into a regulation. But if it is not consistent
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	water standard?  DR. LETEY: Okay.  CHAIR YOUNG: Because that's what this all boils down to.  DR. LETEY: Okay. That, then, is another I guess, what I want to say.  I said that the concentration below is not an indicator of good management or low management.  It is that you can have the high concentration with a very low load. Or you can have a low concentration with a very high load.  Well, any time you put a regulation or anything and stipulate a concentration, you are you know, if I'm a farmer and you give I can get a low concentration just by pouring a lot of water through and diluting it.  But you're a tremendous high load. Well, you	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIR YOUNG: Receipt DR. LETEY: well or some groundwater somewhere else. CHAIR YOUNG: Right. DR. LETEY: Now, the load is the thing that's going to affect the total groundwater. And that's why I wanted to reduce that load. My comment on the concentration and I think you picked up is specifically on that below the root zone. Now, you another thing is that you say, well, we have regulations. And we bypassed one of my first lives, which you know, I'm an old man. And one of the benefits of being old is you've lived many years and be able to observe. We can write anything into law. We can write anything into a regulation. But if it is not consistent with the basic physical chemical laws, you will not get
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	water standard? DR. LETEY: Okay. CHAIR YOUNG: Because that's what this all boils down to. DR. LETEY: Okay. That, then, is another I guess, what I want to say. I said that the concentration below is not an indicator of good management or low management. It is that you can have the high concentration with a very low load. Or you can have a low concentration with a very high load. Well, any time you put a regulation or anything and stipulate a concentration, you are you know, if I'm a farmer and you give I can get a low concentration just by pouring a lot of water through and diluting it. But you're a tremendous high load. Well, you have to back off and decide: What is the goal?	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIR YOUNG: Receipt DR. LETEY: well or some groundwater somewhere else. CHAIR YOUNG: Right. DR. LETEY: Now, the load is the thing that's going to affect the total groundwater. And that's why I wanted to reduce that load. My comment on the concentration and I think you picked up is specifically on that below the root zone. Now, you another thing is that you say, well, we have regulations. And we bypassed one of my first lives, which you know, I'm an old man. And one of the benefits of being old is you've lived many years and be able to observe. We can write anything into law. We can write anything into a regulation. But if it is not consistent with the basic physical chemical laws, you will not get the expected results.

Page 175

1	permanently fixed. And it is, until we change it.	1	In addition to that, we will add soil
2	But then we don't seem to worry about those	2	amendments and things to change the Ph, change the makeup
3	laws that are absolutely fixed, that we cannot violate.	3	of that soil to increase the the ability of of that
4	And those are the scientific, physical, chemical and	4	particular commodity to uptake those nutrients.
5	biological laws.	5	As a farmer, I know that. If you ask me much
6	And what I'm trying to point out is the	6	more, I'm going to get in trouble.
7	physical, chemical, biological laws, if you want to	7	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Thank you.
8	impose a regulation on the concentration leaving the root	8	MR. MERKLEY: Well, okay.
9	zone, will not lead you to a lower load based on these	9	MR. BRIGGS: Stop the clock, please.
10	other laws.	10	MR. DOLEZAL: Chairman Young and honorable
11	CHAIR YOUNG: Right. And I don't think that's	11	members of the board, I'm Robert Dolezal of Dolezal
12	what staff is proposing.	12	Consulting in Rocklin, California.
13	DR. LETEY: Well, I'm not	13	I'll testify today regarding my concerns about
14	CHAIR YOUNG: Well	14	many serious flaws I found in the scientific
15	DR. LETEY: I'm just pointing it out.	15	justifications provided by the staff to support the draft
16	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.	16	order.
17	DR. LETEY: I didn't say you were. I'm just	17	My 35-year career has been primarily in
	saying that if you're looking at that	18	publishing and media. As a journalist, and later as a
18		19	
19	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.	20	publishing executive for many national publishing firms,
20	DR. LETEY: that you shouldn't be.	21	I edited, fact checked and verified accuracy in hundreds
21	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.		of books, publications and wire service stories. And I
22	And then, just so I'm clear. On one of your	22	managed and evaluated the work of staff that performed
23	slides, I thought you said well, if we could go to one	23	similar duties.
24	of the first ones. It was a comment about the nitrogen	24	As vice president for Harcourt, Brace,
25	hazard index.	25	Jovanovich legal and professional publications, I oversaw
	Page 178		Page 180
1	The the committee recommendations could not	1	the accuracy of the Gilbert Law outline series and the
2	be implemented because information was lacking to	2	Herbert Constitutional Law series, as well as medical
3	quantify the the index.	3	journals for our medical division, including their peer
4	Is there a an index that's in use today?	4	review and check of citations of law.
5	DR. LETEY: Well, it's available on that site.	5	In the course of my career, I have edited
6	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.	6	hundreds of books in which highly complex and technical
7	DR. LETEY: Now, whether you're using it or	7	science, including those across many fields of expertise,
8	not, that's that's the issue.	8	had to be communicated clearly.
9	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.	9	This experience makes me especially aware of
10	DR. LETEY: You have that resource to use	10	
11			how facts and citations can be subtly manipulated and
12	today, which the board did not have in 1994.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.	11 12	twisted, while still retaining a cloak of truth, and when
	•		they cross the line and assume new meaning.
13	DR. LETEY: That's my point.	13	I brought this expertise and my skills to the
14	CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you very much.	14	work of reviewing the staff report and the draft order
15	DR. LETEY: Okay. Thank you.	15	for technical accuracy.
16	CHAIR YOUNG: All right.	16	I've also performed highly sensitive technical
17	MR. MERKLEY: Chairman Young	17	work for the government, and have previously held a top
18	CHAIR YOUNG: Yes.	18	secret code word national security clearance with a
19	MR. MERKLEY: if I could just add real quick	19	special prefix.
20	and maybe this gives you a a nutshell response to	20	In this assignment, I performed my work at the
21	your to the very first question.	21	request of the California Strawberry Commission. I
22	Growers today particularly the better	22	verified the staff report and scientific citations. I
23	growers do pedio samples, do soil samples to know what	23	also performed comparative literature searches of other
24	nitrogen, for example, in this case, needs there will	24	authoritative sources. And I randomly tested data
25	be for that particular commodity.	25	samples for accuracy.
	Page 179		Page 181

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 182

The goal of this work was to determine if the information presented by the staff was accurate and correct, and whether it was timely; that is, whether it reflected the most current understanding of science at the moment. My review -- my review found numerous distortions. Here's an example:

In one -- one place staff says that nitrogen from fertilizer applied annually in the region totals 50,449 tons. Elsewhere, they say that it causes nitrate loading to groundwater of 75,000 tons. Both are correct.

This exploits the public's ignorance of the conversion factor between nitrogen and nitrate, and allows the staff to inflate the apparent amount of pollution they can attribute to crop production.

4.425 pounds of nitrate equals 1 pound of nitrogen; the rest is oxygen. That allows the staff to claim numbers in their May 2010 presentation that appear to be over four times higher than they appear in the 1978 AMBAG chartered study, seen at the upper left.

But apparently this process was confusing. They made arithmetic calculation errors in the conversion of nitrogen here and in Appendix G of the order. And the cropland estimate for current use of the -- in the presentation does not agree with the number in the -- in

drinking water wells have present nitrate exceedances. There's no ag land nearby, just city.

Four other nitrate exceedance wells, in the upper right, provide shallow monitoring for a site with leaking underground storage tanks.

Let's look at them.

A red triangle marks that monitoring well cluster, down in the lower right. Possible contamination sources include the leaking tanks, a cemetery, an outdoor landscape materials yard, school playgrounds, and nearby Highway 101. It's unlikely that their nitrate readings are caused by agricultural.

Staff emphasize -- excuse me.

14 The staff emphasizes the possible health impact on small communities. And I share that concern.

I looked next at Sisquoc, a tiny agricultural town in the southern valley. Where the staff's map shows four wells, GAMA shows 89 wells in six clusters. The offending well is in a cleft up -- up in the hills, upstream from agricultural, but downstream from a Chevron oil field.

In GAMA that well last exceeded -- excuse me -last exceeded the health standard for nitrates more than 10 years ago. Thereafter, it failed to qualify as even elevated by the staff's own standards.

Page 184

the appendix.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Restating nitrogen as nitrate makes the public think ag's contribution to the problem is worse.

Staff presents alarming maps, like this one of Santa Maria Valley, to show drinking water wells with nitrate contamination.

But when overlaid with all public drinking water wells tested annually for nitrates by the California Department of Public Health, in blue, many more wells appear; 266 not 155.

Over the past 25 years, many wells with nitrates either improved or were taken out of the system and are no longer in the state water resources control groundwater ambient monitoring and assessment program's GeoTracker GAMA database.

A larger universe of wells means smaller percentages in the pie chart. And I could find no health standard for the yellow dot symbols used by the staff to denote elevated nitrates.

Let's take a closer look at three data points I sampled in Santa Maria: Arroyo Grande, a city in the north; Siquoc, a little hamlet in the south; and Southern Santa Maria itself.

In a single cluster in Arroyo Grande -- sorry -- in a single cluster in Arroyo Grande, three out of 112

As we've seen, many alternate causes exist. Here's another:

In Santa Maria, red dots surround a former World War II army airfield, used today as a commercial airport. Cal Fire also uses it as their base to load aerial tankers with nitrate fire retardant.

In the Salinas Valley, in northern region three, we see similar distortion. Staff shows 348 drinking water wells; GAMA has 953. And DPH requires annual testing for nitrates of each of these wells.

In this close look at -- at Castroville, which is surrounded by farms, there are 12 Department of Public Health public drinking water wells, plus 12 other drinking water wells. All are in compliance for nitrates.

If agriculture invariably leads to nitrate groundwater contamination, why not in this agricultural settina?

These findings are all troubling. Digging deeper, as this slide -- which is a bit difficult to read, for which I apologize -- the ag waiver states on the right:

Across region three, irrigated agriculture is the primary source of nitrate pollution. They cite, as a reference, a 1999 -- excuse me -- a 1990 report of the Ad Page 185

1	Hoc Salinas Valley Nitrate Advisory Committee.	1	portrayed by this staff in its report, nor do they
2	When I checked that source, it referenced only	2	provide substantiation for their prescriptive remedies.
3	the Salinas and Pajaro Valleys, not region three. It	3	In the end, we're all environmentalists and
4	said:	4	responsible stewards of the waters and soil of this
5	Agricultural operations represent the greatest	5	California. You and we deserve better science than this.
6	potential source of nitrate contamination. And that	6	Thank you. I'd be pleased to answer any
7	reference was drawn from an earlier report in 1978, the -	7	questions.
8	- the, now familiar, AMBAG Study.	8	CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah. The question I have for
9	So what did AMBAG say 33 years ago? Quoting:	9	you here:
10	Agricultural land use contributes the highest	10	Are you saying that all of the draft order's
11	quantity of nitrogen in both valleys. Other land use may	11	findings are not supported by staff's evidence and
12	have a more significant impact.	12	information, or just some of them?
13		13	-
	That's all agricultural land use, not just		MR. DOLEZAL: I said I am saying that those
14	irrigated agriculture. And they're talking about	14	that I tested
15	nitrogen at the surface, not nitrate contamination of	15	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. And those are the ones
16	groundwater.	16	MR. DOLEZAL: I I found this is just a
17	And they say, agriculture is one one among	17	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.
18	many significant sources, not the primary source.	18	MR. DOLEZAL: small sample - found
19	The staff footnote made it appear that the	19	significant difficulties in virtually every single
20	33-year-old finding was just 21 years old, and they	20	citation I looked into.
21	altered its meaning.	21	And I saw a repeated pattern of using data from
22	In the process, they also ignored millions of	22	1978, 33-year-old data, and 1980, '85, rather than use
23	dollars of research, funded by taxpayers of this state	23	information for that was readily available from 2005,
24	and industry over the last 33 years, that shed light on	24	2006, 2008 and 2009.
2.5	nitrate groundwater contamination, its sources and	25	CHAIR YOUNG: Do you have any information of
	Page 186		Page 188
_			
1	potential solutions.	1	what the other sources might be?
2	They turn 1978's nitrogen source to nitrate	2	MR. DOLEZAL: There's I've listed a number
3	groundwater pollution. They widen Pajaro and Salinas	3	of them on my earlier slides.
4	results to encompass all the Central Coast. They twisted	4	Livermore National Laboratory, U.S. Geological
5	numerous causes into an ag-only responsibility. And they	5	Survey.
6	changed agriculture's role from contributor to primary	6	For example, in responding to comments of the
7	source.	7	Strawberry Commission, there was a discussion made of
8	My sampling of these and other anomalies can be	8	U.S. Geological Survey information encompassing
9	found and read in my report, which is part of your public	9	agricultural use of lands across the entire United
10	record. My analysis of the data used by staff as	10	States.
11	scientific basis for the ag waiver led me to the	11	Why not concentrate on the two studies that
12	following conclusions:	12	were done here on the Central Coast, in the
13	The draft order findings are not supported by	13	Salinas/Santa Cruz/Pajaro area, Paso Robles area, and
14	the staff's evidence and information provided to this	14	Santa Maria/Santa Ynez areas, in 2006 and 2009, which
15	board.	15	specifically show, with a scientific grid, where the
16	The evidence, as data cited in the draft order,	16	nitrate contamination is?
17		I	
1		17	And it's substantially different than the man
18	should receive further independent review.		And it's substantially different than the map
18 19	should receive further independent review.  The board should obtain independent review of	18	you see in the staff report.
19	should receive further independent review.  The board should obtain independent review of all findings and information supporting those findings.	18 19	you see in the staff report. CHAIR YOUNG: Is it related to irrigated
19 20	should receive further independent review.  The board should obtain independent review of all findings and information supporting those findings.  In performing my work on this peer review, it's	18 19 20	you see in the staff report.  CHAIR YOUNG: Is it related to irrigated agriculture?
19 20 21	should receive further independent review.  The board should obtain independent review of all findings and information supporting those findings.  In performing my work on this peer review, it's clear that agricultural might pay play some role and	18 19 20 21	you see in the staff report.  CHAIR YOUNG: Is it related to irrigated agriculture?  MR. DOLEZAL: Some is related to irrigated
19 20 21 22	should receive further independent review.  The board should obtain independent review of all findings and information supporting those findings.  In performing my work on this peer review, it's clear that agricultural might pay play some role and bear some responsibility for measures seeking to limit	18 19 20 21 22	you see in the staff report.  CHAIR YOUNG: Is it related to irrigated agriculture?  MR. DOLEZAL: Some is related to irrigated agriculture and some is related to the kinds of causes I
19 20 21 22 23	should receive further independent review.  The board should obtain independent review of all findings and information supporting those findings.  In performing my work on this peer review, it's clear that agricultural might pay play some role and bear some responsibility for measures seeking to limit nitrate contamination of region three's groundwater.	18 19 20 21 22 23	you see in the staff report.  CHAIR YOUNG: Is it related to irrigated agriculture?  MR. DOLEZAL: Some is related to irrigated agriculture and some is related to the kinds of causes I showed showed you here today.
19 20 21 22 23 24	should receive further independent review.  The board should obtain independent review of all findings and information supporting those findings.  In performing my work on this peer review, it's clear that agricultural might pay play some role and bear some responsibility for measures seeking to limit nitrate contamination of region three's groundwater.  I think there's no one in this room that would	18 19 20 21 22 23 24	you see in the staff report.  CHAIR YOUNG: Is it related to irrigated agriculture?  MR. DOLEZAL: Some is related to irrigated agriculture and some is related to the kinds of causes I showed showed you here today.  CHAIR YOUNG: You mentioned Livermore.
19 20 21 22 23	should receive further independent review.  The board should obtain independent review of all findings and information supporting those findings.  In performing my work on this peer review, it's clear that agricultural might pay play some role and bear some responsibility for measures seeking to limit nitrate contamination of region three's groundwater.	18 19 20 21 22 23	you see in the staff report.  CHAIR YOUNG: Is it related to irrigated agriculture?  MR. DOLEZAL: Some is related to irrigated agriculture and some is related to the kinds of causes I showed showed you here today.

1	Laboratory is conducting a radiological isotope analysis	1	MR. DOLEZAL: It is a lot. It's
2	of the age of groundwater basins, and they've been	2	MR. BRIGGS: Yeah.
3	they've finished one, which is cited by the staff, over	3	MR. DOLEZAL: it's about 35, 40 pounds per
4	in the Gilroy area, that was done for the in the Santa	4	acre.
5	Clara water area.	5	MR. BRIGGS: Right. And
6	They are working on another one since their	6	MR. DOLEZAL: Irrigated
7	wells are dotted all over the place here and are in	7	MR. BRIGGS: with contaminated wells in the
8	the GAMA database. And they're working on the age of	8	same are, you think there are other more significant
9	aquifers. And many of these aquifers are 30 years old or	9	sources than that, generally speaking in the ag
10	a hundred years old.	10	agricultural areas?
11	So when you look at the specific information	11	MR. DOLEZAL: There have been a number of point
12	that you you find in the in the reports or you look	12	sources identified that specifically have added to
13	at studies that are done over in the Central Valley - on	13	nitrate and there have been a number of practices that
14	a dairy, for example, where you have absolute proof of	14	are no longer used that are represented on your map in
15	nitrate de denitrification in the soil, you've got a	15	the timeframe of '78, that are no longer no longer
16	six-foot layer of soil that's 20 38 feet deep; between	16	practical.
17	38 and 45 feet, all of the nitrate disappears, it goes	17	There there were a number of wells taken out
18	from 200 roughly 200 parts per million down to .2	18	of commission for the for because they could not
19	parts per million.	19	protect the well bed. And those wells were contaminating
20	CHAIR YOUNG: This is in the Central Valley?	20	the aquifer.
21	MR. DOLEZAL: In the Central Valley, but it	21	MR. BRIGGS: Can we run back to the Arroyo
22	shows the same process.	22	Grande slide example, that you had you had the close-
23	So there's a whole body of evidence that's not	23	up of several areas and so the Arroyo Grande one.
24	being cited in any of this reference material.	24	MR. DOLEZAL: Not this one. This is the EPA
25	CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you very much.	25	monitoring well. The one
23	Page 190	25	Page 192
	14g0 130		1490 131
1	MR. DOLEZAL: Thank you.	1	MR. BRIGGS: No. This is the Arroyo Grande
2	MR. BRIGGS: I have a couple of questions.	2	one.
3	CHAIR YOUNG: Sure.	3	MR. DOLEZAL: Yes. There's one pre this is
4	MR. BRIGGS: So you you verified our our	4	not a drinking water well. This is an EPA lust
5	figures, as you said. In the first couple of figures you	5	(phonetic) well.
6	show the tons per year of nitrogen, you said those were	6	MR. BRIGGS: Okay. You said the staff has
7	good.	7	selectively used information to portray a different
8	And we have lots of contaminated wells. You	8	picture, I guess.
9	say we didn't show all the wells. But we showed wells	9	It seems to me that the nearest, most likely
10	that are contaminated.	10	nitrogen source in this picture would be the ag field to
11	And wouldn't you agree there are too many well	11	the lower right. That's the closest thing compared
12	that are contaminated?	12	MR. DOLEZAL: That would be true of the
13	MR. DOLEZAL: Yes.	13	hydrology for the area didn't show that the high
14	MR. BRIGGS: So	14	mountainous terrain immediately to the left and up on the
15	MR. DOLEZAL: The percentage your	15	on the picture showed the water flow towards the
16	percentages are wrong.	16	the Arroyo Grande Creek in the lower right.
17	MR. BRIGGS: Okay. So with whatever the figure	17	There's also water from Arroyo Grande Creek
18	was ,	18	that is penetrating up into the area.
19	77,000 tons per year of nitrogen in contaminated	19	MR. BRIGGS: But you chose not to show that
20	wells	20	there's an ag field immediately adjacent to this
21	MR. DOLEZAL: Nitrates.	21	monitoring well?
22	MR. BRIGGS: Nitrate.	22	MR. DOLEZAL: I there it's downgrade in
23	MR. DOLEZAL: Eight-five hundred tons of	23	the in the in the aquifer.
		1	and the contract of the contra
24	_	24	MR. BRIGGS: Yeah. I don't know exactly what
	nitrogen.	24 25	MR. BRIGGS: Yeah. I don't know exactly what the gradients are, but we know that gradients
24	_	1	MR. BRIGGS: Yeah. I don't know exactly what the gradients are, but we know that gradients $ \text{Page } 193 $

		1	
1	MR. DOLEZAL: I do know what the gradients are.	1	We are very disappointed there wasn't an
2	MR. BRIGGS: We know the we know	2	afforded opportunity to really try to get together and
3	MR. DOLEZAL: The gradients are down	3	narrow the ag the very aggressive ag proposal and the
4	MR. BRIGGS: the gradients change.	4	staff proposal and has resulted in this schism of
5	MR. DOLEZAL: According to the hydrologist of	5	interested parties in front of you.
6	Arroyo Grande	6	The I was asked to point a couple of the
7	MR. BRIGGS: We know the gradients	7	most pressing of the problem areas. And I think they're
8	MR. DOLEZAL: they come from about where the	8	very limited. It calls out for the trying to resolve
9	schoolyard is up there and it goes straight southeast.	9	this.
10	MR. BRIGGS: Right. And we know that gradients	10	The the most pressing and I won't speak
11	change with pumping patterns.	11	long on this because you've heard quite a bit about it
12	If you could go to the Castroville one.	12	there is nowhere in the world there is a regulatory
13	MR. DOLEZAL: This is this is an EPA	13	program limiting fertilizer to any particular level, much
14	monitoring well. They don't pump this well.	14	less this 1.0 and 1.2, the proposal that is in this.
15	MALE: I didn't say they did. I said gradients	15	The we saw that there is a wide margin of
16	change with pumping patterns.	16	fertilizer use. I can certainly imagine some may be
17	If you could go to the Castroville one.	17	using more than would absolutely be necessary, and we
18	MR. DOLEZAL: Yes.	18	need to deal with those situations.
19	MR. BRIGGS: These now, are these just	19	But you can't just have staff pick out their
20	monitoring wells?	20	favorite fertilization level and impose it on
21	MR. DOLEZAL: Those are DPH drinking water	21	agriculture. There are reasons that there is a wide
22	wells. Plus, I believe, 12 other public drinking water	22	separation in fertilization use.
23	wells. Flus, 1 believe, 12 other public drinking water wells.	23	Staff failed to point out the other, and even
24	MR. BRIGGS: So these are pumping wells that	24	more damning, provision; says that after three years,
25	are being used.	25	that won't be the 1.0 limit, but it will be a restriction
25	Page 194	2.5	Page 196
	1490 131		
1	MR. DOLEZAL: According to GAMA.	1	to only apply nitrate to the level that was removed in
2	MR. BRIGGS: Isn't this in the seawater	2	harvest of the crop.
3	intruded area?	3	That will bring nitrogen levels way down, way
4	MR. DOLEZAL: It is in the	4	below the necessary level, the for effective plant
5	MR. BRIGGS: Wouldn't those	5	growth. The nitrate problem is an issue.
6	MR. DOLEZAL: in the sha	6	The other problem, major problem, is the
7	MR. BRIGGS: wouldn't those	7	tiering system. As has been pointed out by members of
8	MR. DOLEZAL: in the 180-foot aquifer. Yes.	8	the board, this is absolutely an arbitrary, the
9	MR. BRIGGS: Wouldn't those wells necessarily		the board, this is absolutely an arbitrary the
	Mr. bridgs. Wouldn't those wells necessarily	9	provision - arbitrary on acres, which particular
10	then be much deeper, because they want to avoid the	9	
10	•		provision - arbitrary on acres, which particular
	then be much deeper, because they want to avoid the	10	provision - arbitrary on acres, which particular chemicals you use or your location of growing.
11	then be much deeper, because they want to avoid the seawater intruding?	10 11	provision - arbitrary on acres, which particular chemicals you use or your location of growing.  If there is a tiering process, it has to be
11 12	then be much deeper, because they want to avoid the seawater intruding?  MR. DOLEZAL: I didn't see any evidence that	10 11 12	provision - arbitrary on acres, which particular chemicals you use or your location of growing.  If there is a tiering process, it has to be tied to actual risk, not just saying these are our
11 12 13	then be much deeper, because they want to avoid the seawater intruding?  MR. DOLEZAL: I didn't see any evidence that they were any deeper. They were in the 180-foot aquifer.	10 11 12 13	provision - arbitrary on acres, which particular chemicals you use or your location of growing.  If there is a tiering process, it has to be tied to actual risk, not just saying these are our favorite things, because we think big is bad and,
11 12 13 14	then be much deeper, because they want to avoid the seawater intruding?  MR. DOLEZAL: I didn't see any evidence that they were any deeper. They were in the 180-foot aquifer.  MR. BRIGGS: In the intruded 180-foot?	10 11 12 13 14	provision - arbitrary on acres, which particular chemicals you use or your location of growing.  If there is a tiering process, it has to be tied to actual risk, not just saying these are our favorite things, because we think big is bad and, therefore, we're going to say that's probably risk.
11 12 13 14 15	then be much deeper, because they want to avoid the seawater intruding?  MR. DOLEZAL: I didn't see any evidence that they were any deeper. They were in the 180-foot aquifer.  MR. BRIGGS: In the intruded 180-foot?  MR. DOLEZAL: Yes.	10 11 12 13 14 15	provision - arbitrary on acres, which particular chemicals you use or your location of growing.  If there is a tiering process, it has to be tied to actual risk, not just saying these are our favorite things, because we think big is bad and, therefore, we're going to say that's probably risk.  Tiering should be tied to water quality
11 12 13 14 15	then be much deeper, because they want to avoid the seawater intruding?  MR. DOLEZAL: I didn't see any evidence that they were any deeper. They were in the 180-foot aquifer.  MR. BRIGGS: In the intruded 180-foot?  MR. DOLEZAL: Yes.  MR. BRIGGS: Drinking water wells?	10 11 12 13 14 15 16	provision - arbitrary on acres, which particular chemicals you use or your location of growing.  If there is a tiering process, it has to be tied to actual risk, not just saying these are our favorite things, because we think big is bad and, therefore, we're going to say that's probably risk.  Tiering should be tied to water quality problems, not the size. Clearly, a 200-acre farm can
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	then be much deeper, because they want to avoid the seawater intruding?  MR. DOLEZAL: I didn't see any evidence that they were any deeper. They were in the 180-foot aquifer.  MR. BRIGGS: In the intruded 180-foot?  MR. DOLEZAL: Yes.  MR. BRIGGS: Drinking water wells?  MR. DOLEZAL: Well, you this is also an area	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	provision - arbitrary on acres, which particular chemicals you use or your location of growing.  If there is a tiering process, it has to be tied to actual risk, not just saying these are our favorite things, because we think big is bad and, therefore, we're going to say that's probably risk.  Tiering should be tied to water quality problems, not the size. Clearly, a 200-acre farm can have significant problems and a 2,000-acre farm may not.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	then be much deeper, because they want to avoid the seawater intruding?  MR. DOLEZAL: I didn't see any evidence that they were any deeper. They were in the 180-foot aquifer.  MR. BRIGGS: In the intruded 180-foot?  MR. DOLEZAL: Yes.  MR. BRIGGS: Drinking water wells?  MR. DOLEZAL: Well, you this is also an area of reclamation.	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	provision - arbitrary on acres, which particular chemicals you use or your location of growing.  If there is a tiering process, it has to be tied to actual risk, not just saying these are our favorite things, because we think big is bad and, therefore, we're going to say that's probably risk.  Tiering should be tied to water quality problems, not the size. Clearly, a 200-acre farm can have significant problems and a 2,000-acre farm may not.  The other point under tiering, the and was
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	then be much deeper, because they want to avoid the seawater intruding?  MR. DOLEZAL: I didn't see any evidence that they were any deeper. They were in the 180-foot aquifer.  MR. BRIGGS: In the intruded 180-foot?  MR. DOLEZAL: Yes.  MR. BRIGGS: Drinking water wells?  MR. DOLEZAL: Well, you this is also an area of reclamation.  MR. BRIGGS: Okay. That doesn't make sense to	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	provision - arbitrary on acres, which particular chemicals you use or your location of growing.  If there is a tiering process, it has to be tied to actual risk, not just saying these are our favorite things, because we think big is bad and, therefore, we're going to say that's probably risk.  Tiering should be tied to water quality problems, not the size. Clearly, a 200-acre farm can have significant problems and a 2,000-acre farm may not.  The other point under tiering, the and was pointed out by members though classifications of any
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	then be much deeper, because they want to avoid the seawater intruding?  MR. DOLEZAL: I didn't see any evidence that they were any deeper. They were in the 180-foot aquifer.  MR. BRIGGS: In the intruded 180-foot?  MR. DOLEZAL: Yes.  MR. BRIGGS: Drinking water wells?  MR. DOLEZAL: Well, you this is also an area of reclamation.  MR. BRIGGS: Okay. That doesn't make sense to me. Thanks.	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	provision - arbitrary on acres, which particular chemicals you use or your location of growing.  If there is a tiering process, it has to be tied to actual risk, not just saying these are our favorite things, because we think big is bad and, therefore, we're going to say that's probably risk.  Tiering should be tied to water quality problems, not the size. Clearly, a 200-acre farm can have significant problems and a 2,000-acre farm may not.  The other point under tiering, the and was pointed out by members though classifications of any tiers should be on each specific farm, not just add up
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	then be much deeper, because they want to avoid the seawater intruding?  MR. DOLEZAL: I didn't see any evidence that they were any deeper. They were in the 180-foot aquifer.  MR. BRIGGS: In the intruded 180-foot?  MR. DOLEZAL: Yes.  MR. BRIGGS: Drinking water wells?  MR. DOLEZAL: Well, you this is also an area of reclamation.  MR. BRIGGS: Okay. That doesn't make sense to me. Thanks.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Thank you.	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	provision - arbitrary on acres, which particular chemicals you use or your location of growing.  If there is a tiering process, it has to be tied to actual risk, not just saying these are our favorite things, because we think big is bad and, therefore, we're going to say that's probably risk.  Tiering should be tied to water quality problems, not the size. Clearly, a 200-acre farm can have significant problems and a 2,000-acre farm may not.  The other point under tiering, the and was pointed out by members though classifications of any tiers should be on each specific farm, not just add up all your farm acreage from Santa Maria to here, the
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	then be much deeper, because they want to avoid the seawater intruding?  MR. DOLEZAL: I didn't see any evidence that they were any deeper. They were in the 180-foot aquifer.  MR. BRIGGS: In the intruded 180-foot?  MR. DOLEZAL: Yes.  MR. BRIGGS: Drinking water wells?  MR. DOLEZAL: Well, you this is also an area of reclamation.  MR. BRIGGS: Okay. That doesn't make sense to me. Thanks.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Thank you.  MR. BILL THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, members, the	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	provision - arbitrary on acres, which particular chemicals you use or your location of growing.  If there is a tiering process, it has to be tied to actual risk, not just saying these are our favorite things, because we think big is bad and, therefore, we're going to say that's probably risk.  Tiering should be tied to water quality problems, not the size. Clearly, a 200-acre farm can have significant problems and a 2,000-acre farm may not.  The other point under tiering, the and was pointed out by members though classifications of any tiers should be on each specific farm, not just add up all your farm acreage from Santa Maria to here, the and if you hit a thousand acres, you're in Tier 3. Each
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	then be much deeper, because they want to avoid the seawater intruding?  MR. DOLEZAL: I didn't see any evidence that they were any deeper. They were in the 180-foot aquifer.  MR. BRIGGS: In the intruded 180-foot?  MR. DOLEZAL: Yes.  MR. BRIGGS: Drinking water wells?  MR. DOLEZAL: Well, you this is also an area of reclamation.  MR. BRIGGS: Okay. That doesn't make sense to me. Thanks.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Thank you.  MR. BILL THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, members, the Roger, Frances, the Bill Thomas. I represent Ocean	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	provision - arbitrary on acres, which particular chemicals you use or your location of growing.  If there is a tiering process, it has to be tied to actual risk, not just saying these are our favorite things, because we think big is bad and, therefore, we're going to say that's probably risk.  Tiering should be tied to water quality problems, not the size. Clearly, a 200-acre farm can have significant problems and a 2,000-acre farm may not.  The other point under tiering, the and was pointed out by members though classifications of any tiers should be on each specific farm, not just add up all your farm acreage from Santa Maria to here, the and if you hit a thousand acres, you're in Tier 3. Each farm should be independently evaluated.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	then be much deeper, because they want to avoid the seawater intruding?  MR. DOLEZAL: I didn't see any evidence that they were any deeper. They were in the 180-foot aquifer.  MR. BRIGGS: In the intruded 180-foot?  MR. DOLEZAL: Yes.  MR. BRIGGS: Drinking water wells?  MR. DOLEZAL: Well, you this is also an area of reclamation.  MR. BRIGGS: Okay. That doesn't make sense to me. Thanks.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Thank you.  MR. BILL THOMAS: Mr. Chairman, members, the Roger, Frances, the Bill Thomas. I represent Ocean Mist and RC Farms, that have a long history of dealing	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	provision - arbitrary on acres, which particular chemicals you use or your location of growing.  If there is a tiering process, it has to be tied to actual risk, not just saying these are our favorite things, because we think big is bad and, therefore, we're going to say that's probably risk.  Tiering should be tied to water quality problems, not the size. Clearly, a 200-acre farm can have significant problems and a 2,000-acre farm may not.  The other point under tiering, the and was pointed out by members though classifications of any tiers should be on each specific farm, not just add up all your farm acreage from Santa Maria to here, the and if you hit a thousand acres, you're in Tier 3. Each farm should be independently evaluated.  The it was pointed out by staff that there

1	Again, it has to do with risk.	1	proximity to a 303-D listed body, the use of certain
2	I would observe and thank you for the	2	pesticides as also being arbitrary criteria?
3	clarification relative to tile drains, are not affected	3	MR. BILL THOMAS: There's level of
4	here. Tile drains are very important. Our operations,	4	arbitrariness in each, frankly.
5	as Dale Huss pointed out, the do a lot of reclamation	5	The picking two pesticides and I would agree
6	the water reclaim work. And that's all present in the	6	that these pesticides because I do this water work in
7	tile drains.	7	a number of regions, the have been implicated.
8	A couple of things on the more legal side that	8	If you were starting somewhere the chlorpyrifos
9	I would like to point out to this board, is: This board	9	and diazinon, and maybe diaron and simazine, would be,
10	does not have the authority to tell a farmer the what	10	you know, on your first list.
11	particular crop you grow where or what particular	11	But it's gone further here. You've said two
12	management effort that you input to do that.	12	are terrible and everything else is fine. Pesticide
13	You can't require that, under Porter-Cologne,	13	regulation has shown that there is a great deal of risk
14	of a farmer, any more than you can tell PG&E how much	14	that comes about by just shifting pesticide use from
15	cooling water to use or Chevron how to operate a diesel	15	pesticide A to B.
16	cracker.	16	So, there are some arbitrariness there.
17	The you can't this fertilizer-specific,	17	CHAIR YOUNG: Would would you prefer that we
18	you have no specific authority in that area. And	18	just use the whole list?
19	Porter-Cologne doesn't let you get inside the operation.	19	MR. BILL THOMAS: The no, I think that we
20	It gives you unending authority to say what you can't	20	need to, on all of these things, be guided by water
21	discharge. But it doesn't say, you know, what you can	21	quality data, and deal with the specific problems where
22	input.	22	they exist.
23	The it's true also of the riparian area.	23	CHAIR YOUNG: Well, I agree with that. But I
24	You can't tell a farmer where to grow what, and where he	24	my shift in in looking at this, is we should use
25	can't grow what. The you are not the land use	25	the whole list, because each of those have been
	Page 198		Page 200
1	authority.	1	identified as potentially causing toxicity.
2	The there are certain the benefits that	2	MR. BILL THOMAS: And and
3	riparian vegetation can bring to water, there is no	3	CHAIR YOUNG: And we have data that shows
4	question about it. There is also important	4	toxicity.
5	considerations the for human health the which	5	So
6	has been brought up here, and we need to find a balance.	6	MR. BILL THOMAS: I'm not sure that we have
7	And the but clearly, you just don't have that	7	data on toxicity of that many. I think that what they
8	authority.	8	would tell you is their data shows some evidence that
9	The in the interest of time, I will end	9	there might be some presence of them.
10	there. I will say this:	10	There's a difference between president
11	You ought to fix this here in this region.	11	presence and the exceeding the water quality standard.
12	It's going to make no sense to have this controversy go	12	There's certainly more than just C and D.
13	beyond an adoption, whatever you adopt, and go to the	13	CHAIR YOUNG: Right.
14	state board. That is not the location to fix this.	14	MR. BILL THOMAS: The and that's one level
15	And certainly, going from there to a Sacramento	15	of arbitrariness.
16 17	Superior Court is not where this should be fixed. It	16	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. How about the proximity to
	should be fixed here.	17	a public water well?
18	Thank you.		MR. BILL THOMAS: The
19	CHAIR YOUNG: I have a couple of questions for	19	CHAIR YOUNG: Now
20 21	you, Mr. Thomas.	21	MR. BILL THOMAS: that's a brand new
22	MR. BILL THOMAS: Yes, sir.	22	provision.  CHAIR VOLING: Pight But it appears to be
23	CHAIR YOUNG: If you could stop the clock. With respect to the criteria in the tiering,	23	CHAIR YOUNG: Right. But it appears to be based on, not staff's favoriteness criteria, as you
24	was your comment that that the size criteria alone was	24	mentioned
25	the arbitrary factor; or were you also commenting on the	25	MR. BILL THOMAS: The
2 9	Page 199		Page 201
			<u> </u>

1 1 CHAIR YOUNG: - but on the public health However, we have not yet seen any form of what 2 2 department's criteria. that will be. We had no opportunity to review it or 3 MR. BILL THOMAS: Well, certainly this: We 3 provide any comments on it. 4 absolutely need to do things more aggressively than has 4 We have a lot of concerns about the expansion 5 been done on nitrate to water. Not just here. I deal a 5 of discretion that's been given to the executive officer 6 6 lot in Tulare County, it's a big problem there. with this new draft. And that would be their discretion 7 7 They have found there that dealing with those without any board oversight or board involvement. 8 8 things locally makes a lot more sense than having any Some of which Chairman Young -- you've already 9 9 sort of, you know, grand regulatory effort, first off. talked about earlier today - some of these inappropriate 10 10 Secondly, the -- the -- it's a very new expansions and delegations are with regards to revisions 11 11 provision that was put in, only a few days past, to have of the MRP, should they be needed; updates to the current 12 the proximity to a public water source, which I think 12 -- excuse me -- tiering criterias, what those criteria 13 13 they're using the definition that would lead you to 15 are in themselves and who would fall into what criteria. 14 14 connections. Similarly, we have concerns with additional 15 The -- there is still some arbitrariness in 15 monitoring and reporting requirements, the arbitrary 16 that. Because are you up-slope are you down-slope, et 16 nature that can go along with that, and the follow-up 17 17 cetera? All these things have level of head scratch in monitoring that could be then required; all of this 18 them, Mr. Chairman. 18 without any board involvement or any information brought 19 The -- but, again, that should only be to those 19 to the board, rather -- besides just: Look what we did 20 20 earlier. where there has been a linkage, a nexus, if you will, 21 between that well, that location and that particular 21 There are also some issues with site specific 22 impediment, which here will probably be nitrates. 22 -- site specific nitrogen balance ratios, as earlier 23 23 CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you. described, due to the fact that soil is not utilized in 24 24 MR. BILL THOMAS: Thank you. the determination, depending on where you're located and 25 25 CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. your soil type, the fact that you may need to have Page 202 Page 204 1 MS. FISHER: Good afternoon. Kari Fisher 1 additional ratio for your specific operation. 2 representing California Farm Bureau and the seven county 2 Additional concerns include the addition of 3 3 farm bureaus throughout the region. stormwater requirements in this latest draft -- draft, 4 4 Similar to Bill, I'm going to quickly go over which completely expands the breath and the scope of the 5 5 some of the legal concerns that we have, in addition to order. And also, along with that, the new riparian 6 those previously raised in oral and written comments. 6 vegetation requirements. 7 7 One big one is the fact that in this latest Some additional concerns include CEQA 8 8 draft, the notice of intent has been transformed into a compliance for the March 2011 draft, and if CEQA has been 9 9 report of waste discharge. complied with. 10 We are concerned that the notice of intent, as 10 One big concern is the fact that this new draft 11 it is the form which growers complete stating their 11 is so significantly different and deviates from the --12 intent to comply with the conditions within the order is 12 the November draft and the fall CEQA scoping notice, that 13 now being transferred into a report of waste discharge. 13 CEQA recirculation requirements have been triggered, and 14 14 As we're all aware, reports of waste discharge CEQA recirculation was not conducted. 15 in -- in themselves, require certain -- or have certain 15 Therefore, it deprives the public, at large, 16 16 conditions and requirements; specific requirements, with an opportunity to test, assess and evaluate data, 17 conditions, certifications and CEQA compliance, as well 17 and make an informed judgment as to the validity of the 18 as fees. 18 conclusions to be drawn therefrom. 19 19 Therefore, there needs to be a full-on And so, this new addition has some concern, 20 especially since no explanation is given as to why this 20 additional CEQA review period, in which all public is 21 21 -- has the opportunity to comment. addition has been added. 22 22 There's concerns with the annual compliance Additional concerns relate to retention ponds 23 23 form. Today we saw just a preview that the annual and the fact that they are being required to be lined, 24 24 compliance form will be based on the electronic notice of and how that conflicts with other portions of the order,

25

Page 203

25

intent.

Page 205

which call for groundwater percolation.

Page 207

Thus, this inherent conflict will definitely affect the ability to recharge groundwater and also, how you're going to capture stormwater if your water within your ponds is not able to be percolated.

We have concerns with groundwater and individual discharge monitoring requirements. What is -- within each of those requirements, there's a lot of uncertainty regarding your quarterly samples with your nitrates for groundwater and also, all of the individual components of the surfacewater, its use.

And then, finally, I'm going to just touch briefly on the false impressions of the order being a phased approach.

The order gives a false impression that it contains proper time schedules for compliance and it is a reasonable, phased approach.

This is a false impression, because the conditions actually apply immediately. Throughout the order itself, it specifically says that on the day that the order is adopted, these compliance schedules and time schedules are in affect.

Therefore, there really isn't a reasonable time period in which growers can actually have any time to utilize the best management practices to be -- come into compliance.

Page 206

third-party groups.

And the finding is -- is that the dischargers may comply with this order by participating in third-party groups.

We've taken that finding and have decided to help -- help all of you because we like to be helpful; talk about what would that be, and how would that work within the order.

And to that end, just so you know, if there's any interest, we have prepared complete strikeout and underlines of the draft order, an MRP, as well as a new Attachment B that we're going to talk about, that would be that functional third-party group within the confines of the order that has been put forward to you today.

We have those available, if you are interested. But, we'll go ahead and explain, at this point in time, what that includes.

Abby, help.

So in setting up the alternative, what we would propose is kind of an example of a new proposed order provision. It would go -- something that would be within the order and it would basically say that, you know, within 90 days or -- or otherwise allowed by the order, a discharger who is subject to this order could indicate their intent to join the third-party group, similar to

Page 208

So you're setting up a failure to comply. And there isn't adequate requirements built in, in which growers are produc -- protected, as the executive officer can use his discretion -- discretionary authority whenever he wants to enforce it or look the other way.

So I'm going go to conclude there.

MS. DUNHAM: While Abby is doing that, I'll go ahead. I'm Tess Dunham. I'm representing -

CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah. Your mike isn't on.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MS}}.$  DUNHAM: You want to actually hear me? No, you don't.

 $\label{eq:main_section} \mbox{My name is Tess Dunham. I'm with Somach,} \\ \mbox{Simmons and Dunn, and I'm representing the newly-formed} \\ \mbox{Farmers for Water Quality.}$ 

And now that we've had the opportunity to express all of our concerns, we do want to also provide you with some discussion as to a third-party group alternative, that, you know, like your staff we have further worked on our alternative in this time period and want to share with you what we would propose as an alternative to what you have set forth today. Or what is in the draft order.

So, first, I want to say that, you know, we do appreciate that the draft order has included a finding that recognizes that there may be an opportunity for

how it is done now with Cooperative Monitoring Program, as long as that third-party group meets the requirement specified in Attachment B.

And if they join this third-party group, they would basically no longer be subject to the Tier 2 and Tier 3 requirements within the order; and, instead, through the third-party group, we could provide for some of that monitoring and management practices and the accountability that the board is looking for, as we understand, with trying to set forth requirements in Tiers 2 and 3.

So in our Attachment B, just to kind of set it up for you, then Abby's going to talk about it, it -- it would be a whole new Attachment B. It provides -- it's a logical outgrowth from our December proposal. But, again, like - like with yours, it's been refined to better reflect what's before us today.

It implements the draft order finding, as put forward by your staff for a third-party group, it fits within the format that you currently have before you, it simplifies requirements, and it clarifies accountability.

And Abby's going to tell you all about what actually those terms and conditions would be.

MS. TAYLOR-SILVA: Hello. Abby Taylor-Silva,

Grower-Shipper Association of Central California.

So what does that mean? For the participants, and may include the owners and operators of land, who choose to participate, the third-party group would work with farmers to identify risks of operation for four categories.

These include toxicity and irrigation runoff, toxicity and sediment in stormwater, nutrients and irrigation runoff, and nitrate leaching to groundwater.

Landowners and growers would be required to implement management practices to achieve best practicable treatment on control for those areas, with medium and high-risk determinations.

They'd be subject to audit evaluations of the enhanced farm plan and management practices being implemented on their farm.

They would also be required to amend farm plans and implement management practices based on the results of their audit. And they'd be subject to termination if they fail to amend their farm plan and fail to implement management practices.

Just to reiterate, 100 percent of those who sign up will be audited, subject to termination if they fail to do what is asked of them in their audit.

Enhanced farm plans would include, for all

Page 210

practices; encourage and provide assistance for implementing collective treatment systems, such as an engineering wetland; conducting educational workshops for participants, and collaborating with a research committee.

Reports to the board would include names of participants in good standing in the group; number of operations audited in that most recent 12-month period, identification of watersheds or sub-watersheds where audits were conducted, aggregated summary of the audit results, general summary of assistance provided to participants, summary of any educational workshops conducted and a list of participants in attendance, and summary of any other activities conducted by the third-party group for the improvement of water quality.

I just want to state that, looking at these elements, this -- these are an important illustration of how this third-party group would provide the highest level of individual farm accountability of any irrigated lands program in the nation.

MS. DUNHAM: So we're always asked, well, how does this comply and -- and comport with the law in Porter-Cologne?

And we are running short of time, and hoping that the Chair might grant us an additional five minutes

Page 212

participants, irrigation management practices, pesticide management practices, sediment management practices, and nutrient management practices.

For the third-party group, they would be required to submit a notice of intent to be recognized as a third-party group. A notice of applicability would then need to be issued by the executive officer.

Within six months of receipt of said notice, the group would be required to submit a general report, outlining their process of priorities for audits. The group would be required to audit all participants within the term of the order.

They would also be required to make annual reports -- which I will further explain -- submitted to the Regional Water Quality Control Board. And they'd be required to terminate and report terminations to the board for participants not implementing management practices in good faith.

This group would also work with participants to provide technical services. Those might be in the form of aligning growers with technicians that match their management needs outlined in their audits; it might be looking for grant opportunities or bringing in experts.

It would also assist participants in updating farm plans and implementing appropriate management

for closing later on, since we -- we are going to be hardly -- highly pressed.

But -- so it does comply with Porter-Cologne.

It -- it includes conditions and participants on the third-party groups as required by Water Code Section 13.269.

It includes monitoring and it maintains the current surfacewater monitoring program, but it also includes an actual auditing, monitoring function of the management practices and their being implemented just as Dr. Letey has recommended.

It includes reporting requirements for that third party. So it, itself, has accountability directly to the board. And the executive officer maintains the authority to terminate that third-party group if it is not properly functioning.

And, at that point in time, all those participants go directly back under the regional board's order, as -- as it currently -- or however it ends up being adopted.

And it requires implementation of prac -- of management practices. But it provides that key assistance to folks to teach them how to do what they need to do. And that's something that we can do as industry, that not necessarily that the board can.

1 Big question is always: Does it include 1 submit that type of data publically to the regional water 2 accountability? 2 board. 3 Absolutely. The third-party group has to be 3 I mean, I think it's kind of interesting. I 4 approved. There's general reports that have to be 4 believe that information is proprietary for Department of 5 approved so you know what the third-party group's going 5 Public Health. So, it would seem, that you would think 6 6 to do. that information should be proprietary here, as well. 7 7 They have to submit annual reports. They have CHAIR YOUNG: And then the accountability part. 8 8 to terminate participants if they are not participating. What you're suggesting is that the growers, 9 9 And the third-party group, itself, can be terminated. themselves, are not directly accountable to the water 10 10 And, most importantly, that third-party group will -board; they're only accountable through the third party. 11 11 will audit all of those participants, which is something And --12 that the regional board administratively and functionally 12 MS. DUNHAM: They're -- well, they're --13 just can't do. 13 they're both. 14 14 And we're offering to do that, to make sure They're still accountable to both. The -- the 15 people are implementing their farm water quality 15 growers will still file a notice of intent with the 16 management plans, which is something that the board, 16 regional water board and would still be subject to --17 17 unfortunately, can't do, even with a electronic annual generally -- as laid out -- although, we don't agree with 18 compliance or notice of intent. 18 all of them - generally, with all of the conditions that 19 And, just for interest of time, I mean -- go 19 apply to Tier 1 and Tier 2 and Tier 3, or at least those 20 20 that we believe -- believe are appropriate. for it, Abby. Why don't you end it up. 21 21 MS. TAYLOR-SILVA: All right. So they would have some of that direct 22 This proposal supports our shared goal of clean 22 accountability to the regional board. The regional board 23 23 water in region three. It does not accept or endorse would still maintain all authority and discretion to go 24 staff's March 2011 draft order. And it very much 24 forward and inspect any farm. It would still take any 25 supports the third-party alternative. 25 enforcement action for any violation of the order. Page 214 Page 216 1 And with that, that concludes our panel 1 What it does do is it -- but it -- it sets up 2 presentation. And we're very happy to answer any other 2 that third party to actually -- to go out and audit on 3 questions you might have. 3 the farm, to make sure that those management plans and 4 CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Does it include a 4 those management practices are being implemented; and 5 groundwater program or element? 5 would guarantee that every participant is subject to that 6 MS. DUNHAM: Well, the -- the management 6 type of audit within the term of the order. Which I 7 practice in the farm plan would include a -- a nutrient 7 don't know is something that the regional board and their 8 8 management plan component that would be part of the audit staff, could guarantee or do within a five-year time 9 9 function. period. 10 So management practice is related to protection 10 But there would still be a dual accountability 11 of groundwater would be included. 11 between the board and the individual growers and the 12 CHAIR YOUNG: How about groundwater monitoring? 12 third-party group functioning in that fashion. 13 MS. DUNHAM: It does not include the 13 CHAIR YOUNG: Oh, okay. I think early on you 14 14 groundwater monitoring. said that if anyone enrolled in the third-party program 15 As we discussed at the workshop, we would, you 15 would automatically be dropped out of Tier 3. 16 know -- folks would be encouraged to do voluntary 16 MS. DUNHAM: They -- they -- we -- the idea 17 groundwater monitoring. 17 would be that they would not be subject to the Tier 2 or 18 But as your staff indicated -- staff counsel 18 Tier 3 requirements, as you currently have set forth in 19 indicated at the February workshop, any volunteer 19 the order. 20 groundwater monitoring that a farmer would do, if it was 20 And, in lieu of that, they would be agreeing to 21 required by your order, would have to be submitted as a -21 be subject to audits by the third-party group. They 22 - as part of the public documents and would become public 22 would be agreeing that they're going to implement 23 23 information. management practices and --24 24 And there's just not a -- an interest at this CHAIR YOUNG: But -- but the same requirements 25 25 point in time that individual domestic and ag wells within Tier 2s and 3?

Page 215

1	MS. DUNHAM: Would not apply.	1	problems and get to those growers and audit their farm
2	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right. Thank you very	2	plans and their management practices in those impaired
3	much.	3	areas to see: Who needs the help the most and who do we
4	Hello. Dr. Hunter?	4	need to work with?
5	DR. HUNTER: Thank you. Just a couple more	5	And the third-party group can then assist them
6	questions.	6	in finding out: Who are the appropriate people at
7	So Mr. Bill Thomas mentioned really	7	Cooperative Extension or the NRDC or even the regional
8	emphasized the idea that solutions need to be identified	8	board, that they should be working with to come up with
9	that are local. And I'm taking that to mean that we're	9	solutions, and what are the appropriate management
10	talking about the individual operation.	10	practices to address those high-risk impairments; whether
11	And so maybe you can help me understand how the	11	it's groundwater for one grower, and irrigation runoff
12	monitoring and the audits that you would do as in this	12	for another?
13	third-party effort which I think is an excellent idea	13	Because each every grower may have different
14	to help assist the technical support that comes with that	14	risks, based upon their operation. And so the
15	and so forth coordination and so forth.	15	third-party group would be set up to function in that
16	But how do you see the local solutions first	16	manner.
17	being identified? And if without understanding where	17	And and I don't know if Abby wants to add
18	the actual source of the worst problems are occurring,	18	in, you know, some effort has gone into start building a
19	how are you going to encourage maybe you have a group	19	base for that third-party group now so it could hit the
20	of 10 or 15 growers involved in one of these third-party	20	ground running, or at least try to get something going if
21	groups.	21	the board was to go down this path.
22	How then do you identify which one of the 10 is	22	So, Abby, I don't know if you want to add
23	going to have to do more? Where do those local solutions	23	anything on the work you guys have done.
24	come from? How do they get defined?	24	MS. TAYLOR-SILVA: Sure. We're just looking at
25	And what kind of timeframe, then, do we	25	we're also looking community partners, bringing
	Page 218		Page 220
			<del>_</del>
1	would would we see coming out of this third-party	1	community partners together and talking to different
2	process?	2	researchers, different people representing sectors of the
3	Because I don't see that happening. I see	3	community that are very, very diverse - social justice
4	monitoring of implementation of management practices,	4	organizations, people representing different watershed
5	which is a huge step and very important.	5	organizations - and bringing them together to have
6	But then where do we see what's effective and	6	discussions so that we can understand the common goals,
7	what's not effective?	7	priorities and needs for the future.
8	MS. DUNHAM: The and and we do have a lot	8	So that that would definitely be a a big
9	of detail in the strikeout and underlining and we just	9	part of these groups.
10	don't have time in order to go through all the detail	10	DR. HUNTER: Well, I really do appreciate the
11	that we have thought about.	11	idea of doing things collectively and trying to maximize
12	A couple of the things that I think go to	12	resources and then the collaboration that may come in
13	answer your question, Member Hunter, is:	13	sharing knowledge and experience.
14	So the third-party groups, first of all, could	14	But, on the other hand, it's been five years,
15	be one third-party group for the whole Central Coast, or	15	six years, seven years of seeing this program take shape,
16	it could be on a commodity basis or it could be	16	with a lot of education going into the process. And I
17	geographically.	17	think someone else also referred to Congressman Farr and
18	You could end up with a third-party group that	18	his view of the water quality coalition that's I don't
19	says, I'll take care of Monterey County. And, therefore,	19	think it's the water quality coalition but the
20	you're focusing in.	20	Monterey Bay work that's gone in with the farmers.
21	One of the things that we have built in is that	21	And yet, we don't see improvement. So on a
22	in doing the audits, the third-party group would require	22	collective level, we haven't seen that kind of targeted
23	to to conduct them, first prioritizing in the most	23	response. And I I you know, I'll be interested in
24	impaired areas.	24	seeing more detail on this new iteration.
	•	25	But, again, I think to get to the individual
25	So we can try to focus in where are the	40	but, again, I think to uct to the individual

Page 219

1 level -- and I was glad to hear Mr. Thomas say solutions 1 You're talking about individual operations. 2 2 are local. Yes, we know that individual operators need So are you talking about five years or ten 3 to be identified in these areas, whether it's because of 3 years? What is the --4 4 the soil conditions -- not necessarily bad practices, but MS. DUNHAM: What do you mean --5 5 because they are dealing with conditions that are DR. HUNTER: -- timeframe? 6 6 inherently going to result in greater contribution to MS. DUNHAM: -- a timeframe. I mean, as far as 7 7 groundwater contamination, which is one of my biggest -- I mean, we would -- if -- if the board was to adopt 8 8 concerns. this type of a program, we've built in proposed time 9 9 And I'm hearing that your program won't address schedules where the, you know, participants or those 10 10 groundwater contamination. So -wishing to choose this -- this is a voluntary 11 11 MS. DUNHAM: Well, our program -alternative. 12 DR. HUNTER: -- there's some gaps here. I 12 The grower would not have to make this choice. 13 13 think there's --But if they wanted to make this choice, then they would 14 14 MS. DUNHAM: Our program does address -have to declare their intent to the regional board within 15 DR. HUNTER: -- some gaps here. 15 90 days of adoption of the order. 16 MS. DUNHAM: -- groundwater contamination. It 16 And at the same time -- and it's a parallel 17 17 just doesn't have a requirement for groundwater process -- the third-party groups would be basically 18 monitoring. 18 declaring and putting in a notice of intent to the 19 And I think that's a key difference, is -- you 19 regional board within 90 days to say we want to be a 20 know, having a monitoring function doesn't necessarily 20 third-party group and do this function. 21 address groundwater contamination either. 21 And then a general report would have to be back 22 But the -- the program and the third-party 22 to the regional board within -- I think it's six months -23 23 group would definitely be looking at risks to groundwater - of the 90 days. And I would say you would have audits 24 24 for people's implementation of management practices. up and running within the first year, at the very end of 25 Absolutely. That is a very key component of it. 25 the first year of the order. Page 222 Page 224 1 1 And, I guess, we would also contend that in --And so, you, basically, would be auditing 25 2 in working with individuals directly, we think this 2 percent of the participants in a year, to reach 100 3 program does that probably better than what the -- than 3 percent by the term of the order in five years. 4 4 what the regional board could do on its own. So we're talking within the term of the order, 5 5 Because it is built and designed to get to every participant would be audited at least once, with 6 every participant within that term of the order. And I 6 the highest priorities going first. 7 7 DR. HUNTER: Okay. Thank you. don't think that's something that the regional board, 8 8 MS. TAYLOR-SILVA: And I -- if I may, I'd like with its resources, can do. And I'm not sure that just the, you know, 9 9 to just touch on what we've learned in the six years. 10 electronically filing of annual reports necessarily 10 So we know that in -- in 2004, the ag waiver 11 11 was created to identify, qualify, quantify and evaluate guarantees that's being done either. 12 You know, I mean, to -- this is a sit down, go 12 water quality. This proposal is really designed to 13 out, look at the grower's operation, meet with them, see 13 implement what we've learned. 14 what they're doing, tell them what they need to do 14 And it's going to blend science and 15 differently. 15 practicality to improve water quality for a sustainable 16 And that's something the third-party group can 16 environment and viable farming community. That's our 17 17 do, that I'm not sure the regional board can go out and goal. 18 inspect and say, you have a problem and you're violating 18 DR. HUNTER: So, I guess, the main difference 19 19 is creating the third-party structure and allowing -the order. 20 But they can't necessarily sit there and say 20 because I don't think creating a third-party structure is 21 you should be doing X, Y and Z instead. The third-party 21 going to change which dischargers are operating with the 22 22 group can do that. high-risk factors, that we're all concerned about. 23 23 DR. HUNTER: One last question. So what you're proposing is a way to identify 24 24 What is the timeframe? Because the -- what these high-risk operators within your own process. And 25 25 you're talking about is below the sub-watershed level. you're saying that within a five-year period those people

Page 223

1 will be identified and practices will be developed, or 1 on-the-ground improvements. 2 some alternative management practices will be designed 2 DR. HUNTER: Okay. Thank you. 3 specific to that location. 3 MR. JEFFRIES: Mr. Chair. 4 4 CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah. Mr. Jeffries. And then, what kind of information would the 5 board see in order to understand what changes were being 5 MR. JEFFRIES: I also read your letter that --6 6 from the Farm Bureau. And I thought that was an implemented, how effective they are, what kind of 7 7 projected -- you know, where will we see projected interesting concept -- concept of using that type of 8 8 changes that are significant enough to -third party. 9 9 MS. DUNHAM: Well, we --But, I'm sure you also read the staff's 10 DR. HUNTER: -- we could start to see the --10 response to that. And, you know, we talked about 11 11 the standards being met? economics and cost. 12 MS. DUNHAM: What we would anticipate would be 12 And who is going to fund this third party? And 13 that the third-party group would be required to report 13 who -- who is the third party -- the responsible people -14 14 back to the board annually, of, one -- and it would be - who are they going to be? 15 here's kind of what the annual report elements would be 15 And what is the cost? Where -- where are you 16 - but, you know: Who are our participants who would -16 going to generate the funds? 17 the operations that were audited within this last, 17 MS. DUNHAM: I'll take part of it. And then 18 18 nearest 12-month period? I'll -- I'll hit it over to Abby. 19 We -- it would be an aggregated summary of 19 I would first say that, you know, as we said 20 20 those audit results; i.e., you know, 10 percent of the early on, there -- from the December proposal that was 21 operations are implementing appropriate management 21 submitted, this keys off of that and has taken many of 22 practices for their high-risk area, 90 percent are not. 22 the elements. It has been refined, and I think it has 23 23 But, now, where the accountability -- and I tried to be responsive to some of the comments that staff 24 think it's really important to understand -- is it then 24 has made. 25 wouldn't just end there. 25 But, understand, we actually didn't get the Page 226 1 1 staff report and the responses until about two weeks ago, And the -- what we would propose is that the third-party group would work with those individuals that 2 2 so we've been a bit limited on time. So we have tried to 3 3 aren't implementing the appropriate management practices respond to some of those concerns. And we've made some -4 4 and tell them and teach them, you know, this is what you - some changes within this context, in order to be 5 5 should look to be doing. responsive to that. 6 6 And if that participant doesn't follow through 7 and doesn't look like they're going to be implementing, 7 want to --8 8 then the third-party group would terminate that person's 9 9 participation in the third-party group. 10 They could no longer participate in that group. 10 community. 11 11 And we would notify the regional board that participant X 12 is no longer participating in the third-party group in 12 13 good faith, or in good standing, and they come directly 13 all that goes with it. 14 back to you. 14 15 Which is, you know, in all honesty, is going to 15 16 be a key to the regional board staff that we got someone 16 17 17

we may need to go inspect and check out. Because, obviously, they're not wanting to implement third-party practice -- you know, get appropriate management practices.

So there is that direct accountability and reporting function back to the regional board for those that are not implementing management practices.

The idea is not to be a shield, an umbrella protection, but to really help people conduct

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 227

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

With regard to the cost and funding, Abby, you MS. TAYLOR-SILVA: Sure. This would be a -- a funding mechanism that is covered by the -- the growing The growing community that chooses to be a part of one of these groups would then fund the group and fund In terms of what would the qualifications of the people carrying out the group's orders be, that would be part of the professional requirements that would then be submitted to the executive officer.

Page 228

itself. MR. JEFFRIES: Well --MS. DUNHAM: It -- it would be self-funded, much like the Central Valley groups are self-funded, and for those participating, and it would be a similar mechanism. Probably based upon risk. Page 229

So that would be well understood, when the

executive officer makes their decision on the group

-			
1	MR. JEFFRIES: Well, if you didn't have enough	1	look at. So
2	participating, it wouldn't be worthwhile, because you	2	MR. JEFFRIES: Well, but I I think it would
3	wouldn't be able to have the funding to do the things	3	have simplified the process we're going through right
4	that you need to do.	4	today, if we'd have had some of that prior to.
5	MS. DUNHAM: Typically, yes, that	5	I mean, that's hindsight. That's
6	MR. JEFFRIES: But the letter that you sent to	6	Monday-morning quarterbacking. I understand that. But
7	us the Farm Bureau sent to us and there was a lot	7	it's not too late.
8	of signers on that are those all going to participate	8	And if, you know, the rest of us are going to
9	in this particular third party?	9	I would personally like to look at it further. I
10	MS. DUNHAM: I don't know. I don't know if	10	think it's an interesting concept.
11	if that would be the case or not, Mr. Jeffries.	11	MS. DUNHAM: We have the documents that we can
12	I mean, I think that our indication there are	12	provide to you.
13	are probably some groups that would encourage their	13	CHAIR YOUNG: Well
14	members. But it has been set up so it is a voluntary	14	MS. DUNHAM: I'll let that
15	choice choice by all individuals.	15	CHAIR YOUNG: we're we're gonna need to
16	Because as if anything, you've probably	16	discuss all these things
17	learned in your time on the board, farmers are an	17	MR. JEFFRIES: Absolutely, Mr. Chairman. I
18	independent lot.	18	CHAIR YOUNG: as to what Mr. Thomas.
19	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.	19	MR. THOMAS: I have a question for
20	MS. DUNHAM: So we've made it a voluntary	20	CHAIR YOUNG: Oh, okay.
21	choice for each individual as to whether they would want	21	MR. THOMAS: the group. If that's okay.
22	to participate in this or not.	22	MR. JEFFRIES: But, let me one one of I
23	MR. JEFFRIES: Well, you must have some idea,	23	have two, one for the staff and one back to the farm.
24	or else you wouldn't have proposed the proposal to us,	24	Michael, didn't you say that you weren't going
25	that there was a large number of of groups that were	25	to require drilling wells for groundwater monitoring?
	Page 230		Page 232
1	interested in this concent or else you wouldn't be	1	MR THOMAS: Correct The order
1 2	interested in this concept, or else, you wouldn't be	1 2	MR. THOMAS: Correct. The order
2	pursuing this.	2	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.
2	pursuing this.  MS. TAYLOR-SILVA: Well, absolutely. And we've	2 3	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. THOMAS: proposed order does not require
2 3 4	pursuing this.  MS. TAYLOR-SILVA: Well, absolutely. And we've formed a group called Farmers for Water Quality that	2 3 4	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. THOMAS: proposed order does not require that.
2 3 4 5	pursuing this.  MS. TAYLOR-SILVA: Well, absolutely. And we've formed a group called Farmers for Water Quality that includes a number of different organization; Farm	2 3 4 5	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. THOMAS: proposed order does not require that. MR. JEFFRIES: So the groundwater monitoring
2 3 4 5 6	pursuing this.  MS. TAYLOR-SILVA: Well, absolutely. And we've formed a group called Farmers for Water Quality that includes a number of different organization; Farm Bureaus, commission Strawberry Commission, Western	2 3 4 5 6	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. THOMAS: proposed order does not require that. MR. JEFFRIES: So the groundwater monitoring wouldn't require any additional cost, other than the
2 3 4 5 6 7	pursuing this.  MS. TAYLOR-SILVA: Well, absolutely. And we've formed a group called Farmers for Water Quality that includes a number of different organization; Farm Bureaus, commission Strawberry Commission, Western Growers, our grower-ship organization, grower-ship	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. THOMAS: proposed order does not require that. MR. JEFFRIES: So the groundwater monitoring wouldn't require any additional cost, other than the testing.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	pursuing this.  MS. TAYLOR-SILVA: Well, absolutely. And we've formed a group called Farmers for Water Quality that includes a number of different organization; Farm Bureaus, commission Strawberry Commission, Western Growers, our grower-ship organization, grower-ship organization in San Luis and Santa Barbara Counties.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. THOMAS: proposed order does not require that. MR. JEFFRIES: So the groundwater monitoring wouldn't require any additional cost, other than the testing. Now, are you contemplating on doing surface
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	pursuing this.  MS. TAYLOR-SILVA: Well, absolutely. And we've formed a group called Farmers for Water Quality that includes a number of different organization; Farm Bureaus, commission Strawberry Commission, Western Growers, our grower-ship organization, grower-ship organization in San Luis and Santa Barbara Counties.  So all of us together have come together to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. THOMAS: proposed order does not require that. MR. JEFFRIES: So the groundwater monitoring wouldn't require any additional cost, other than the testing. Now, are you contemplating on doing surface monitoring, surfacewater monitoring?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	pursuing this.  MS. TAYLOR-SILVA: Well, absolutely. And we've formed a group called Farmers for Water Quality that includes a number of different organization; Farm Bureaus, commission Strawberry Commission, Western Growers, our grower-ship organization, grower-ship organization in San Luis and Santa Barbara Counties.  So all of us together have come together to look at the coalition framework. And work with Tess on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. THOMAS: proposed order does not require that. MR. JEFFRIES: So the groundwater monitoring wouldn't require any additional cost, other than the testing. Now, are you contemplating on doing surface monitoring, surfacewater monitoring? MS. DUNHAM: The the end the surfacewater
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	pursuing this.  MS. TAYLOR-SILVA: Well, absolutely. And we've formed a group called Farmers for Water Quality that includes a number of different organization; Farm Bureaus, commission Strawberry Commission, Western Growers, our grower-ship organization, grower-ship organization in San Luis and Santa Barbara Counties.  So all of us together have come together to look at the coalition framework. And work with Tess on these elements that have been presented to you today.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. THOMAS: proposed order does not require that. MR. JEFFRIES: So the groundwater monitoring wouldn't require any additional cost, other than the testing. Now, are you contemplating on doing surface monitoring, surfacewater monitoring? MS. DUNHAM: The the end the surfacewater monitoring would basically remain as it currently is,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	pursuing this.  MS. TAYLOR-SILVA: Well, absolutely. And we've formed a group called Farmers for Water Quality that includes a number of different organization; Farm Bureaus, commission Strawberry Commission, Western Growers, our grower-ship organization, grower-ship organization in San Luis and Santa Barbara Counties.  So all of us together have come together to look at the coalition framework. And work with Tess on these elements that have been presented to you today.  And so, in that regard, you have a large group	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. THOMAS: proposed order does not require that. MR. JEFFRIES: So the groundwater monitoring wouldn't require any additional cost, other than the testing. Now, are you contemplating on doing surface monitoring, surfacewater monitoring? MS. DUNHAM: The the end the surfacewater monitoring would basically remain as it currently is, which would be the cooperative monitoring program.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	pursuing this.  MS. TAYLOR-SILVA: Well, absolutely. And we've formed a group called Farmers for Water Quality that includes a number of different organization; Farm Bureaus, commission Strawberry Commission, Western Growers, our grower-ship organization, grower-ship organization in San Luis and Santa Barbara Counties.  So all of us together have come together to look at the coalition framework. And work with Tess on these elements that have been presented to you today.  And so, in that regard, you have a large group of people representing the growing community, and members	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. THOMAS: proposed order does not require that. MR. JEFFRIES: So the groundwater monitoring wouldn't require any additional cost, other than the testing. Now, are you contemplating on doing surface monitoring, surfacewater monitoring? MS. DUNHAM: The the end the surfacewater monitoring would basically remain as it currently is, which would be the cooperative monitoring program. That would that does not go away, and that would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	pursuing this.  MS. TAYLOR-SILVA: Well, absolutely. And we've formed a group called Farmers for Water Quality that includes a number of different organization; Farm Bureaus, commission Strawberry Commission, Western Growers, our grower-ship organization, grower-ship organization in San Luis and Santa Barbara Counties.  So all of us together have come together to look at the coalition framework. And work with Tess on these elements that have been presented to you today.  And so, in that regard, you have a large group of people representing the growing community, and members of the growing community, who have come together to make	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. THOMAS: proposed order does not require that. MR. JEFFRIES: So the groundwater monitoring wouldn't require any additional cost, other than the testing. Now, are you contemplating on doing surface monitoring, surfacewater monitoring? MS. DUNHAM: The the end the surfacewater monitoring would basically remain as it currently is, which would be the cooperative monitoring program. That would that does not go away, and that would remain.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	pursuing this.  MS. TAYLOR-SILVA: Well, absolutely. And we've formed a group called Farmers for Water Quality that includes a number of different organization; Farm Bureaus, commission Strawberry Commission, Western Growers, our grower-ship organization, grower-ship organization in San Luis and Santa Barbara Counties.  So all of us together have come together to look at the coalition framework. And work with Tess on these elements that have been presented to you today.  And so, in that regard, you have a large group of people representing the growing community, and members of the growing community, who have come together to make this presentation, too.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. THOMAS: proposed order does not require that. MR. JEFFRIES: So the groundwater monitoring wouldn't require any additional cost, other than the testing. Now, are you contemplating on doing surface monitoring, surfacewater monitoring? MS. DUNHAM: The the end the surfacewater monitoring would basically remain as it currently is, which would be the cooperative monitoring program. That would that does not go away, and that would remain. MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	pursuing this.  MS. TAYLOR-SILVA: Well, absolutely. And we've formed a group called Farmers for Water Quality that includes a number of different organization; Farm Bureaus, commission Strawberry Commission, Western Growers, our grower-ship organization, grower-ship organization in San Luis and Santa Barbara Counties.  So all of us together have come together to look at the coalition framework. And work with Tess on these elements that have been presented to you today.  And so, in that regard, you have a large group of people representing the growing community, and members of the growing community, who have come together to make this presentation, too.  MR. JEFFRIES: Yeah. I I wish you would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. THOMAS: proposed order does not require that.  MR. JEFFRIES: So the groundwater monitoring wouldn't require any additional cost, other than the testing.  Now, are you contemplating on doing surface monitoring, surfacewater monitoring?  MS. DUNHAM: The the end the surfacewater monitoring would basically remain as it currently is, which would be the cooperative monitoring program. That would that does not go away, and that would remain.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MS. DUNHAM: There would no there would be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	pursuing this.  MS. TAYLOR-SILVA: Well, absolutely. And we've formed a group called Farmers for Water Quality that includes a number of different organization; Farm Bureaus, commission Strawberry Commission, Western Growers, our grower-ship organization, grower-ship organization in San Luis and Santa Barbara Counties.  So all of us together have come together to look at the coalition framework. And work with Tess on these elements that have been presented to you today.  And so, in that regard, you have a large group of people representing the growing community, and members of the growing community, who have come together to make this presentation, too.  MR. JEFFRIES: Yeah. I I wish you would have proposed this back in July of last year and then had	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. THOMAS: proposed order does not require that.  MR. JEFFRIES: So the groundwater monitoring wouldn't require any additional cost, other than the testing.  Now, are you contemplating on doing surface monitoring, surfacewater monitoring?  MS. DUNHAM: The the end the surfacewater monitoring would basically remain as it currently is, which would be the cooperative monitoring program. That would that does not go away, and that would remain.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MS. DUNHAM: There would no there would be no individual discharge monitoring, like there is now
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	pursuing this.  MS. TAYLOR-SILVA: Well, absolutely. And we've formed a group called Farmers for Water Quality that includes a number of different organization; Farm Bureaus, commission Strawberry Commission, Western Growers, our grower-ship organization, grower-ship organization in San Luis and Santa Barbara Counties.  So all of us together have come together to look at the coalition framework. And work with Tess on these elements that have been presented to you today.  And so, in that regard, you have a large group of people representing the growing community, and members of the growing community, who have come together to make this presentation, too.  MR. JEFFRIES: Yeah. I I wish you would have proposed this back in July of last year and then had some kind of chart that flowchart to show us how this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. THOMAS: proposed order does not require that.  MR. JEFFRIES: So the groundwater monitoring wouldn't require any additional cost, other than the testing.  Now, are you contemplating on doing surface monitoring, surfacewater monitoring?  MS. DUNHAM: The the end the surfacewater monitoring would basically remain as it currently is, which would be the cooperative monitoring program. That would that does not go away, and that would remain.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MS. DUNHAM: There would no there would be no individual discharge monitoring, like there is now being proposed for Tier 3 participants.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	pursuing this.  MS. TAYLOR-SILVA: Well, absolutely. And we've formed a group called Farmers for Water Quality that includes a number of different organization; Farm Bureaus, commission Strawberry Commission, Western Growers, our grower-ship organization, grower-ship organization in San Luis and Santa Barbara Counties.  So all of us together have come together to look at the coalition framework. And work with Tess on these elements that have been presented to you today.  And so, in that regard, you have a large group of people representing the growing community, and members of the growing community, who have come together to make this presentation, too.  MR. JEFFRIES: Yeah. I I wish you would have proposed this back in July of last year and then had some kind of chart that flowchart to show us how this would actually work and the responsible parties.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. THOMAS: proposed order does not require that. MR. JEFFRIES: So the groundwater monitoring wouldn't require any additional cost, other than the testing. Now, are you contemplating on doing surface monitoring, surfacewater monitoring? MS. DUNHAM: The the end the surfacewater monitoring would basically remain as it currently is, which would be the cooperative monitoring program. That would that does not go away, and that would remain. MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MS. DUNHAM: There would no there would be no individual discharge monitoring, like there is now being proposed for Tier 3 participants. MR. JEFFRIES: Well, I I'm also interested
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	pursuing this.  MS. TAYLOR-SILVA: Well, absolutely. And we've formed a group called Farmers for Water Quality that includes a number of different organization; Farm Bureaus, commission Strawberry Commission, Western Growers, our grower-ship organization, grower-ship organization in San Luis and Santa Barbara Counties.  So all of us together have come together to look at the coalition framework. And work with Tess on these elements that have been presented to you today.  And so, in that regard, you have a large group of people representing the growing community, and members of the growing community, who have come together to make this presentation, too.  MR. JEFFRIES: Yeah. I I wish you would have proposed this back in July of last year and then had some kind of chart that flowchart to show us how this would actually work and the responsible parties.  CHAIR YOUNG: Well, it this can be part of a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. THOMAS: proposed order does not require that. MR. JEFFRIES: So the groundwater monitoring wouldn't require any additional cost, other than the testing. Now, are you contemplating on doing surface monitoring, surfacewater monitoring? MS. DUNHAM: The the end the surfacewater monitoring would basically remain as it currently is, which would be the cooperative monitoring program. That would that does not go away, and that would remain. MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MS. DUNHAM: There would no there would be no individual discharge monitoring, like there is now being proposed for Tier 3 participants. MR. JEFFRIES: Well, I I'm also interested in the groundwater monitoring part, as well. So think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	pursuing this.  MS. TAYLOR-SILVA: Well, absolutely. And we've formed a group called Farmers for Water Quality that includes a number of different organization; Farm Bureaus, commission Strawberry Commission, Western Growers, our grower-ship organization, grower-ship organization in San Luis and Santa Barbara Counties.  So all of us together have come together to look at the coalition framework. And work with Tess on these elements that have been presented to you today.  And so, in that regard, you have a large group of people representing the growing community, and members of the growing community, who have come together to make this presentation, too.  MR. JEFFRIES: Yeah. I I wish you would have proposed this back in July of last year and then had some kind of chart that flowchart to show us how this would actually work and the responsible parties.  CHAIR YOUNG: Well, it this can be part of a recommendation	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. THOMAS: proposed order does not require that.  MR. JEFFRIES: So the groundwater monitoring wouldn't require any additional cost, other than the testing.  Now, are you contemplating on doing surface monitoring, surfacewater monitoring?  MS. DUNHAM: The the end the surfacewater monitoring would basically remain as it currently is, which would be the cooperative monitoring program. That would that does not go away, and that would remain.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MS. DUNHAM: There would no there would be no individual discharge monitoring, like there is now being proposed for Tier 3 participants.  MR. JEFFRIES: Well, I I'm also interested in the groundwater monitoring part, as well. So think about that. And we'll just go further.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	pursuing this.  MS. TAYLOR-SILVA: Well, absolutely. And we've formed a group called Farmers for Water Quality that includes a number of different organization; Farm Bureaus, commission Strawberry Commission, Western Growers, our grower-ship organization, grower-ship organization in San Luis and Santa Barbara Counties.  So all of us together have come together to look at the coalition framework. And work with Tess on these elements that have been presented to you today.  And so, in that regard, you have a large group of people representing the growing community, and members of the growing community, who have come together to make this presentation, too.  MR. JEFFRIES: Yeah. I I wish you would have proposed this back in July of last year and then had some kind of chart that flowchart to show us how this would actually work and the responsible parties.  CHAIR YOUNG: Well, it this can be part of a recommendation  MR. JEFFRIES: Well, I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. THOMAS: proposed order does not require that.  MR. JEFFRIES: So the groundwater monitoring wouldn't require any additional cost, other than the testing. Now, are you contemplating on doing surface monitoring, surfacewater monitoring?  MS. DUNHAM: The the end the surfacewater monitoring would basically remain as it currently is, which would be the cooperative monitoring program. That would that does not go away, and that would remain.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MS. DUNHAM: There would no there would be no individual discharge monitoring, like there is now being proposed for Tier 3 participants.  MR. JEFFRIES: Well, I I'm also interested in the groundwater monitoring part, as well. So think about that. And we'll just go further.  MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Thomas.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	pursuing this.  MS. TAYLOR-SILVA: Well, absolutely. And we've formed a group called Farmers for Water Quality that includes a number of different organization; Farm Bureaus, commission Strawberry Commission, Western Growers, our grower-ship organization, grower-ship organization in San Luis and Santa Barbara Counties.  So all of us together have come together to look at the coalition framework. And work with Tess on these elements that have been presented to you today.  And so, in that regard, you have a large group of people representing the growing community, and members of the growing community, who have come together to make this presentation, too.  MR. JEFFRIES: Yeah. I I wish you would have proposed this back in July of last year and then had some kind of chart that flowchart to show us how this would actually work and the responsible parties.  CHAIR YOUNG: Well, it this can be part of a recommendation  MR. JEFFRIES: Well, I  CHAIR YOUNG: to staff	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. THOMAS: proposed order does not require that.  MR. JEFFRIES: So the groundwater monitoring wouldn't require any additional cost, other than the testing.  Now, are you contemplating on doing surface monitoring, surfacewater monitoring?  MS. DUNHAM: The the end the surfacewater monitoring would basically remain as it currently is, which would be the cooperative monitoring program. That would that does not go away, and that would remain.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MS. DUNHAM: There would no there would be no individual discharge monitoring, like there is now being proposed for Tier 3 participants.  MR. JEFFRIES: Well, I I'm also interested in the groundwater monitoring part, as well. So think about that. And we'll just go further.  MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Thomas. MR. THOMAS: Thanks.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	pursuing this.  MS. TAYLOR-SILVA: Well, absolutely. And we've formed a group called Farmers for Water Quality that includes a number of different organization; Farm Bureaus, commission Strawberry Commission, Western Growers, our grower-ship organization, grower-ship organization in San Luis and Santa Barbara Counties.  So all of us together have come together to look at the coalition framework. And work with Tess on these elements that have been presented to you today.  And so, in that regard, you have a large group of people representing the growing community, and members of the growing community, who have come together to make this presentation, too.  MR. JEFFRIES: Yeah. I I wish you would have proposed this back in July of last year and then had some kind of chart that flowchart to show us how this would actually work and the responsible parties.  CHAIR YOUNG: Well, it this can be part of a recommendation  MR. JEFFRIES: Well, I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. THOMAS: proposed order does not require that.  MR. JEFFRIES: So the groundwater monitoring wouldn't require any additional cost, other than the testing. Now, are you contemplating on doing surface monitoring, surfacewater monitoring?  MS. DUNHAM: The the end the surfacewater monitoring would basically remain as it currently is, which would be the cooperative monitoring program. That would that does not go away, and that would remain.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MS. DUNHAM: There would no there would be no individual discharge monitoring, like there is now being proposed for Tier 3 participants.  MR. JEFFRIES: Well, I I'm also interested in the groundwater monitoring part, as well. So think about that. And we'll just go further.  MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Thomas.

1	And have you done an economic analysis of those	1	CHAIR YOUNG: Slow down.
2	requirements, how much it would cost.	2	MS. MC CANN: that this presentation sounds
3	MS. TAYLOR-SILVA: I can speak to that.	3	like it has the same milestones as the December 3rd
4	Yes. We are as in working with Dr.	4	submitted alternative that we evaluated, and that
5	Barbeau on the economic analysis of the staff proposal,	5	earlier, in my presentation comments, I demonstrated that
6	we will also be doing an analysis of this group	6	relative to the draft order, does not have any indicators
7	third-party group.	7	of effectiveness of management practices or pollution
8	MR. THOMAS: But you haven't done that economic	8	control reduction from individual farms included, and
9	analysis yet?	9	none of that to be reported to the regional board.
10	MS. TAYLOR-SILVA: It is in process. But it	10	Could you explain that.
11	has not been done. It is not complete.	11	MS. DUNHAM: I guess I could say, other than
12	MR. THOMAS: Okay.	12	having every individual actually having their operations
13	•	13	
14	And you mentioned that groundwater sampling is	14	audited to determine what they are actually implementing
	voluntary under your approach?		and if they are implementing appropriate and effective
15	MS. DUNHAM: As in our original proposal, we	15	management practices in conjunction with professionals, I
16	would we would not require that the groundwater	16	would consider that a fairly large milestone to make sure
17	monitoring component that you have in your draft order be	17	that people are actually implementing management
18	required.	18	practices.
19	MR. THOMAS: Okay. So you also said if I	19	So that would be a a major part of the
20	heard you correctly that this approach would allow you	20	program here. As compared to any, you know, milestone
21	to follow up on groundwater problems.	21	that has been discussed in other orders.
22	MS. DUNHAM: Absolutely.	22	MR. THOMAS: The difference being our
23	MR. THOMAS: How would you know there were	23	milestones are water quality based. The the
24	groundwater problems if you're not doing the sampling?	24	difference being our our milestones are water quality
25	MS. DUNHAM: Well, first of all, we would be	25	based, largely.
	Page 234		Page 236
1	looking at it based upon people's monitoring practices.	1	And in your proposal, they are not. They are
2	And as as been exposed previously, there are lots of	2	implementation management implementation of management
3		3	practices. And as your slide here says, for instance,
4	information data, GAMA data, et cetera, to identify areas	4	
5	where there are impairments.	5	you provide names of participants in good standing.
	And we would be able to help those in using the	6	So one of the comments we would get if this was
6	nitrate hazard index that Dr. Letey has put forward to		our proposal is: What does "good standing" mean? And
7	determine the risk to groundwater for their area, to know	7	number of operations audited in a 12-month period.
8	who is in the most vulnerable areas for groundwater, and	8	Audited for what?
9	the need to work with making sure they are implementing	9	Those are the kind of questions we would get.
10	appropriate management practices to be protective.	10	MS. DUNHAM: Well
11	MR. THOMAS: Okay.	11	MR. THOMAS: And what we have to tie it back
12	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.	12	to, is water quality standards and meeting water quality
13	MS. MC CANN: I just wanted to get	13	standards, not implementing practices.
14	clarification. I spoke earlier about the Farm Bureau	14	CHAIR YOUNG: You know, I'd like to just draw
15	proposal that was submitted on December 3rd.	15	this portion of the proceeding to a close because we have
16	And I think I shared, very clearly, that the	16	so many others to get to.
17	milestones did not include any any indicators of	17	It's important. I I think, at least, for
18	effectiveness of management practices of individual farms	18	from my perspective, I think, we're going to ask them to
19	to show control of discharges or pollution reduction.	19	submit their attachment to you so that we can have you
20	And from the proposal from the presentation	20	look at it.
21	I just heard	21	And we're going to have more opportunity to
22	(Reporter clarification)	22	discuss it, when we continue this meeting. Because we're
23	CHAIR YOUNG: Slow down.	23	not going to finish it today. There's no question about
24	MS. MC CANN: I'll start over.	24	that.
25	I just wanted to clarify that I didn't	25	I just want to get through with as many
	Page 235		Page 237
1			

,	TRANSCRIFTS OF FROCEI	LDII	NGS WARCH 17, 2011
1	presentations as we can today.	1	staff analysis says that strawberries are inelastic, that
2	So, thank you. The Strawberry Commission is	2	consumers will attempt to buy it no matter the price.
3	up.	3	I have 320 farmers that would love that to be
4	And, how is our reporter doing?	4	the truth. We all know that's not the truth.
5	(Off the record)	5	Another part of the strawberry profile, I
6	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Go ahead. If you're	6	mentioned we're 5 percent of the irrigated acreage. And
7	ready, go ahead.	7	the staff really focused on chlorpyrifos and diazinon -
8	Okay. Folks.	8	we're about 1 percent of the combined use of chlorpyrifos
9	MR. TOMLINSON: Okay. Chairman Young	9	and diazinon in the entire area.
10	CHAIR YOUNG: Yes.	10	But, to trace back, the the previous staff
11	MR. TOMLINSON: - Vice Chairman Jeffries,	11	proposals, if you'll recall, the one that came out in May
12	Member Hodgin, Dr. Hunter, for the my name is Rick	12	2010, that proposal would have eliminated all strawberry
13	Tomlinson with the California Strawberry Commission. I	13	production because it included a standard that we
14	have Dr. Michael Cahn with me today.	14	couldn't achieve.
15	We wanted to address several specific issues	15	It's since become something that is, I'll say
16	related to strawberries.	16	within the range of possibility; but, again, still many
17	First, before I even begin, I want to make	17	problems.
18	clear, we strongly support the previous coalition effort	18	Relative to the groundwater and nitrate, I'd
19	that was just described. We think there are so many	19	like to turn it over to Dr. Cahn to describe some of his
20	errors with the current staff proposal, that it is it	20	recent work.
21	is not implementable.	21	DR. CAHN: Good afternoon, Chairman and the
22	And so I'm going to point out some errors in	22	board.
23	the staff proposal that we would like specifically	23	My name's Michael Cahn. I'm a irrigation water
24	addressed regarding strawberries; but, overall, we	24	resources advisor for the Central Coast. I'm with the
25	believe that that the only workable resolution is that	25	U.C. Cooperative Extension, work with many of the growers
	Page 238		Page 240
1	coalition approach that was previously described.	1	in the room here.
2	So the first part is just on Appendix F. The	2	Because of a lack of of information on
3	staff did an economic analysis. I think you're all	3	current practices on on management of nitrogen and
4	familiar with the the profile of strawberries in	4	water in strawberries, for the modern varieties that are
5	region three. Roughly half of all the nation's	5	now grown on the Central Coast, Tim Hartz who's with
6	strawberries come out of region three.	6	U.C. Davis and myself, worked collaboratively with the
7	There's about 320 family farmers, with an	7	regional board; we received a grant from the board - to
8	average farm size of 75 acres. Out of the whole area, we	8	evaluate current practices.
9	only represent about 5 percent of irrigated acreage.	9	And one of the first aspects or objectives of
10	That's our 2011 acreage.	10	this project was to evaluate how much nitrogen is
11	In Appendix F, the staff developed a case study	11	actually uptaken by the modern varieties that are grown
12	on strawberries. We were the only commodity that they	12	in the Watsonville, Salinas and Santa Maria area.
13	did that with.	13	Through a number of fields, we commercial
14	We went to verify that case study, and the	14	fields we followed the the crop uptake through

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

first thing that we identified was that the source data that was cited doesn't exist. There is no 2010 document. There's a 1999 document.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Dr. Bardeaux (sic) also identified that there -- the -- the information that does come up on the web site that you click was not understood well and misused.

We had Dr. Richard Green, a professor at U.C. Davis further evaluate it. I have a -- a letter from him I can submit so I don't have to take the time to read it. I have some excerpts here in the presentation.

> But I think the header on the top there in the Page 239

monthly whole-plant samples. And these samples were divided in vegetative material, as well as fruit material, to determine the nitrogen content.

This data here shows, for the fields that we monitored in Santa Maria and in Watsonville, this linear uptake of nitrogen sort of peaking out at about 100 pounds of nitrogen per acre when we get to the end of the production season.

We also evaluated the amount of nitrogen that's uptaken by the fruit, exported through the fruit, and that amounts to about 92 pounds of nitrogen per acre.

		1	
1	In total, we reach about 200 pounds of nitrogen	1	But, just in summary, what we've learned so far
2	per acre through the season, through the production	2	and there's a report also available that we submitted
3	season.	3	to the board and to the staff the nitrogen uptake of
4	Then we surveyed commercial growers. We had 28	4	strawberries, the applied fertilizer and the uptake are
5	in total, about their nitrogen fertilizer use records.	5	are in balance in the majority of the fields that we
6	And this graph just shows the the variation in	6	looked at.
7	nitrogen inputs by different growers.	7	The average soil nitrate levels were below 10
8	On average they put in they used a total of	8	parts per million nitrate. And many of the fields
9	192 pounds of nitrogen per acre for the whole season.	9	actually were below 5 parts per million; suggesting,
10	This is roughly in balance with the uptake pattern of	10	again, the the crop is doing a good job of scavenging
11	strawberries.	11	most of the nitrogen that growers are applying.
12	So the nitrogen that's actually put on the	12	Applied water volumes are in check with the
13	field is being taken up in the production.	13	water use of of the crop.
14	If we look at the soil nitrate levels through	14	And so, as a whole, if you take these results,
15	the season in some of these fields, we see, once we get	15	they do indicate in their preliminary study that
16	into the main part of the production season, April	16	currently how growers are managing the fields has pretty
17	through August, the soil nitrate levels are quite low.	17	minimal risk to to nitrate loading to groundwater.
18	And this is just more evidence that what's	18	DR. HUNTER: And so what was was there
19	being put on the field, in terms of fertilizer, is quite	19	any part of your study that looked at the post-harvest
20	in balance with what's being taken up by the crop.	20	period? And I don't if you could define what that is,
21	Another question is: The vehicle for moving	21	how long a period it is.
22	this nitrate down into the aquifer is is water; right?	22	And is that does that occur during the rainy
23	Through percolation. So we wanted to know, how much	23	season? And are there factors there that we need to know
24	water a grower is applying to strawberry fields.	24	more about?
25	We worked with the industry to put flow meters	25	DR. CAHN: After harvest, that field's going to
	Page 242		Page 244
1	on roughly 34 commercial fields. And 17 of those fields	1	be rotated to another crop of either - strawberries, or
2	we more intensively monitored with data loggers and	2	it will go back to vegetables.
3	evaluated the crop water use, through ET estimates. And	3	It goes to strawberries you as you end
4	you can see the data logger right there, in the middle of	4	that crop, it has very low nitrate levels in the soil, so
5	the field.	5	there is low risk when the rainfall comes to leach what's
6	This is a summary of the data for these 34	6	in the soil.
7	fields. Roughly a average of 21 inches are used. We see	7	DR. HUNTER: And and so is there any
8	quite a range in water use. But we can put that terms	8	there's no what's the longest fallow period for a
9	in terms of crop ET, to look at what the water	9	strawberry field?
10	requirements were of the strawberry crop.	10	DR. CAHN: The longest fallow period?
11	When we put it in terms of crop ET, for the 17	11	DR. HUNTER: Yeah.
12	more-intensively monitored fields, we see, on average,	12	DR. CAHN: They they would, typically,
13	growers are applying 93 percent of crop ET; in other	13	probably plant the next put a cover crop in.
14	words, there are actually under irrigating a little bit.	14	DR. HUNTER: Hm-hmm.
15	Only a small minority are are are	15	DR. CAHN: If they're going to go strawberries,
16	applying more than 120 percent of crop ET. So, again,	16	strawberries.
17	the amount of water that's being applied	17	DR. HUNTER: Hm-hmm.
18	Do you have a question?	18	DR. CAHN: And then, probably in June or July,
19	DR. HUNTER: Yeah. Just quickly. ET.	19	at least in this area, start setting up that field for
20	DR. CAHN: Oh. Crop ET is evapotranspiration	20	planting again.
21	or the water use requirement of the crop. Okay?	21	In many cases, they're rotating with vegetable
22	So roughly what's being applied is what's being	22	crops. So it might go right into vegetables in as early
23	used, in terms of water. So that would also suggest that	23	as, you know, March or April.
24	very little drainage that's happening below the root zone	24	DR. HUNTER: Hm-hmm.
l			
25	of the strawberry fields that we evaluated.  Page 243	25	DR. CAHN: Or it could be a little bit earlier.  Page 245

1	But that soil would come with low nitrate	1	about April.
2	levels.	2	MR. JEFFRIES: And rotation of strawberry crops
3	DR. HUNTER: Hm-hmm. Okay. Okay. Thank you.	3	is what, usually three to five years? Depends the type
4	CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Jeffries.	4	of plant.
5	MR. JEFFRIES: Yes. Am I understanding that	5	DR. CAHN: Meaning how often
6	you're saying that there is no nitrates or nitrogen going	6	MR. JEFFRIES: Yes. How often do they
7	below the root zone with strawberries?	7	rotate
8	DR. CAHN: We're not saying there's nothing	8	DR. CAHN: I'll let the Strawberry Commission
9	going down. We're saying these are indicators based on	9	answer that question.
10	the criteria you the staff was talking about before,	10	MR. TOMLINSON: It's going to vary
11	that strawberry growers are already meeting.	11	dramatically, depending upon
12	Okay. The the the 1.2 balance, the	12	MR. JEFFRIES: By the type of plant.
13	majority of the growers are meeting that balance. That's	13	MR. TOMLINSON: If you're the owner and you're
14	all we're we're saying. There there could be some	14	just growing strawberries and doing a cover crop, and
15	loss of of nitrogen, because there is nitrate in that	15	just coming back in in eight months, or if you're
16	soil.	16	going immediately into vegetables, and then coming back
17	MR. JEFFRIES: Right.	17	to that ground in a couple years.
18	DR. CAHN: And we monitored for the whole	18	MR. JEFFRIES: Well, are you indicating that
19	season. I'm giving you numbers that are the average for	19	you transplant strawberry plants every year?
20	the whole season. There can be individual irrigation	20	MR. TOMLINSON: Absolutely.
21	events. You might lose a little water.	21	MR. JEFFRIES: So there's
22	But the indication here is that the current	22	MR. TOMLINSON: We we plant every year. And
23	practices growers are using in strawberries is fairly	23	it's a roughly 14-month cycle.
24	well in check with what we understand of best management	24	So there's no immediate back-to-back. You have
25	practices.	25	to constantly be rotating with something else, whether
	Page 246		Page 248
		_	
1	And, in fact, if you're asking growers to	1	that be a cover crop or whether that be with vegetables.
1 2	And, in fact, if you're asking growers to reduce their water use or their nitrogen use from where	1 2	that be a cover crop or whether that be with vegetables.  And so, we're in constant rotation with
1 2 3	reduce their water use or their nitrogen use from where		And so, we're in constant rotation with
2	reduce their water use or their nitrogen use from where they are now, in my opinion, they wouldn't be able to do	2	And so, we're in constant rotation with vegetables.
2 3 4	reduce their water use or their nitrogen use from where they are now, in my opinion, they wouldn't be able to do that without reducing yields.	2	And so, we're in constant rotation with vegetables.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.
2 3 4 5	reduce their water use or their nitrogen use from where they are now, in my opinion, they wouldn't be able to do that without reducing yields.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.	2 3 4 5	And so, we're in constant rotation with vegetables.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  MR. TOMLINSON: And and just to add; right.
2 3 4 5	reduce their water use or their nitrogen use from where they are now, in my opinion, they wouldn't be able to do that without reducing yields.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  DR. CAHN: They're already using very good	2 3 4	And so, we're in constant rotation with vegetables.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  MR. TOMLINSON: And and just to add; right.  This is an example of what Dr. Letey was talking about.
2 3 4 5	reduce their water use or their nitrogen use from where they are now, in my opinion, they wouldn't be able to do that without reducing yields.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  DR. CAHN: They're already using very good practices, is what	2 3 4 5 6	And so, we're in constant rotation with vegetables.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  MR. TOMLINSON: And and just to add; right.  This is an example of what Dr. Letey was talking about.  And why we wanted to address this as as I called it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	reduce their water use or their nitrogen use from where they are now, in my opinion, they wouldn't be able to do that without reducing yields.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  DR. CAHN: They're already using very good practices, is what  MR. JEFFRIES: The the water use you showed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	And so, we're in constant rotation with vegetables.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  MR. TOMLINSON: And and just to add; right.  This is an example of what Dr. Letey was talking about.  And why we wanted to address this as as I called it an error in the report; where the staff did not do a a
2 3 4 5 6 7	reduce their water use or their nitrogen use from where they are now, in my opinion, they wouldn't be able to do that without reducing yields.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  DR. CAHN: They're already using very good practices, is what  MR. JEFFRIES: The the water use you showed 21 inches plus.	2 3 4 5 6 7	And so, we're in constant rotation with vegetables.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  MR. TOMLINSON: And and just to add; right.  This is an example of what Dr. Letey was talking about.  And why we wanted to address this as as I called it an error in the report; where the staff did not do a a comprehensive nitrate evaluation to identify risk.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	reduce their water use or their nitrogen use from where they are now, in my opinion, they wouldn't be able to do that without reducing yields.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  DR. CAHN: They're already using very good practices, is what  MR. JEFFRIES: The the water use you showed 21 inches plus.  DR. CAHN: What's that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	And so, we're in constant rotation with vegetables.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  MR. TOMLINSON: And and just to add; right.  This is an example of what Dr. Letey was talking about.  And why we wanted to address this as as I called it an error in the report; where the staff did not do a a comprehensive nitrate evaluation to identify risk.  So what you see in the staff report is that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	reduce their water use or their nitrogen use from where they are now, in my opinion, they wouldn't be able to do that without reducing yields.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  DR. CAHN: They're already using very good practices, is what  MR. JEFFRIES: The the water use you showed 21 inches plus.  DR. CAHN: What's that?  MR. JEFFRIES: Your water use was 21 or 22	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	And so, we're in constant rotation with vegetables.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  MR. TOMLINSON: And and just to add; right.  This is an example of what Dr. Letey was talking about.  And why we wanted to address this as as I called it an error in the report; where the staff did not do a a comprehensive nitrate evaluation to identify risk.  So what you see in the staff report is that strawberries are designated as high risk for leaching
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	reduce their water use or their nitrogen use from where they are now, in my opinion, they wouldn't be able to do that without reducing yields.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  DR. CAHN: They're already using very good practices, is what  MR. JEFFRIES: The the water use you showed 21 inches plus.  DR. CAHN: What's that?  MR. JEFFRIES: Your water use was 21 or 22 inches per year; is that correct? On the average.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	And so, we're in constant rotation with vegetables.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  MR. TOMLINSON: And and just to add; right.  This is an example of what Dr. Letey was talking about.  And why we wanted to address this as as I called it an error in the report; where the staff did not do a a comprehensive nitrate evaluation to identify risk.  So what you see in the staff report is that strawberries are designated as high risk for leaching nitrate to groundwater.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	reduce their water use or their nitrogen use from where they are now, in my opinion, they wouldn't be able to do that without reducing yields.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  DR. CAHN: They're already using very good practices, is what  MR. JEFFRIES: The the water use you showed 21 inches plus.  DR. CAHN: What's that?  MR. JEFFRIES: Your water use was 21 or 22 inches per year; is that correct? On the average.  DR. CAHN: That's right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And so, we're in constant rotation with vegetables.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  MR. TOMLINSON: And and just to add; right.  This is an example of what Dr. Letey was talking about.  And why we wanted to address this as as I called it an error in the report; where the staff did not do a a comprehensive nitrate evaluation to identify risk.  So what you see in the staff report is that strawberries are designated as high risk for leaching nitrate to groundwater.  And, when, in fact, the the evidence here is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	reduce their water use or their nitrogen use from where they are now, in my opinion, they wouldn't be able to do that without reducing yields.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  DR. CAHN: They're already using very good practices, is what  MR. JEFFRIES: The the water use you showed 21 inches plus.  DR. CAHN: What's that?  MR. JEFFRIES: Your water use was 21 or 22 inches per year; is that correct? On the average.  DR. CAHN: That's right.  MR. JEFFRIES: And that was from January	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	And so, we're in constant rotation with vegetables.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  MR. TOMLINSON: And and just to add; right.  This is an example of what Dr. Letey was talking about.  And why we wanted to address this as as I called it an error in the report; where the staff did not do a a comprehensive nitrate evaluation to identify risk.  So what you see in the staff report is that strawberries are designated as high risk for leaching nitrate to groundwater.  And, when, in fact, the the evidence here is we're making it no worse. Right? This is just the first
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	reduce their water use or their nitrogen use from where they are now, in my opinion, they wouldn't be able to do that without reducing yields.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  DR. CAHN: They're already using very good practices, is what  MR. JEFFRIES: The the water use you showed 21 inches plus.  DR. CAHN: What's that?  MR. JEFFRIES: Your water use was 21 or 22 inches per year; is that correct? On the average.  DR. CAHN: That's right.  MR. JEFFRIES: And that was from January through October?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	And so, we're in constant rotation with vegetables.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  MR. TOMLINSON: And and just to add; right.  This is an example of what Dr. Letey was talking about.  And why we wanted to address this as as I called it an error in the report; where the staff did not do a a comprehensive nitrate evaluation to identify risk.  So what you see in the staff report is that strawberries are designated as high risk for leaching nitrate to groundwater.  And, when, in fact, the the evidence here is we're making it no worse. Right? This is just the first year of a study. We need more work.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	reduce their water use or their nitrogen use from where they are now, in my opinion, they wouldn't be able to do that without reducing yields.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  DR. CAHN: They're already using very good practices, is what  MR. JEFFRIES: The the water use you showed 21 inches plus.  DR. CAHN: What's that?  MR. JEFFRIES: Your water use was 21 or 22 inches per year; is that correct? On the average.  DR. CAHN: That's right.  MR. JEFFRIES: And that was from January through October?  DR. CAHN: That's correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	And so, we're in constant rotation with vegetables.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  MR. TOMLINSON: And and just to add; right.  This is an example of what Dr. Letey was talking about.  And why we wanted to address this as as I called it an error in the report; where the staff did not do a a comprehensive nitrate evaluation to identify risk.  So what you see in the staff report is that strawberries are designated as high risk for leaching nitrate to groundwater.  And, when, in fact, the the evidence here is we're making it no worse. Right? This is just the first year of a study. We need more work.  But, certainly, to characterize us as high risk
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	reduce their water use or their nitrogen use from where they are now, in my opinion, they wouldn't be able to do that without reducing yields.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  DR. CAHN: They're already using very good practices, is what  MR. JEFFRIES: The the water use you showed 21 inches plus.  DR. CAHN: What's that?  MR. JEFFRIES: Your water use was 21 or 22 inches per year; is that correct? On the average.  DR. CAHN: That's right.  MR. JEFFRIES: And that was from January through October?  DR. CAHN: That's correct.  MR. JEFFRIES: Is that including rainfall or is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	And so, we're in constant rotation with vegetables.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  MR. TOMLINSON: And and just to add; right.  This is an example of what Dr. Letey was talking about.  And why we wanted to address this as as I called it an error in the report; where the staff did not do a a comprehensive nitrate evaluation to identify risk.  So what you see in the staff report is that strawberries are designated as high risk for leaching nitrate to groundwater.  And, when, in fact, the the evidence here is we're making it no worse. Right? This is just the first year of a study. We need more work.  But, certainly, to characterize us as high risk would not be fair.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	reduce their water use or their nitrogen use from where they are now, in my opinion, they wouldn't be able to do that without reducing yields.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  DR. CAHN: They're already using very good practices, is what  MR. JEFFRIES: The the water use you showed 21 inches plus.  DR. CAHN: What's that?  MR. JEFFRIES: Your water use was 21 or 22 inches per year; is that correct? On the average.  DR. CAHN: That's right.  MR. JEFFRIES: And that was from January through October?  DR. CAHN: That's correct.  MR. JEFFRIES: Is that including rainfall or is that pumped?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	And so, we're in constant rotation with vegetables.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  MR. TOMLINSON: And and just to add; right.  This is an example of what Dr. Letey was talking about.  And why we wanted to address this as as I called it an error in the report; where the staff did not do a a comprehensive nitrate evaluation to identify risk.  So what you see in the staff report is that strawberries are designated as high risk for leaching nitrate to groundwater.  And, when, in fact, the the evidence here is we're making it no worse. Right? This is just the first year of a study. We need more work.  But, certainly, to characterize us as high risk
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	reduce their water use or their nitrogen use from where they are now, in my opinion, they wouldn't be able to do that without reducing yields.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  DR. CAHN: They're already using very good practices, is what  MR. JEFFRIES: The the water use you showed 21 inches plus.  DR. CAHN: What's that?  MR. JEFFRIES: Your water use was 21 or 22 inches per year; is that correct? On the average.  DR. CAHN: That's right.  MR. JEFFRIES: And that was from January through October?  DR. CAHN: That's correct.  MR. JEFFRIES: Is that including rainfall or is that pumped?  DR. CAHN: That's pumped water.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	And so, we're in constant rotation with vegetables.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  MR. TOMLINSON: And and just to add; right.  This is an example of what Dr. Letey was talking about.  And why we wanted to address this as as I called it an error in the report; where the staff did not do a a comprehensive nitrate evaluation to identify risk.  So what you see in the staff report is that strawberries are designated as high risk for leaching nitrate to groundwater.  And, when, in fact, the the evidence here is we're making it no worse. Right? This is just the first year of a study. We need more work.  But, certainly, to characterize us as high risk would not be fair.  MR. JEFFRIES: Let me get this straight, Mr. Tomlinson.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	reduce their water use or their nitrogen use from where they are now, in my opinion, they wouldn't be able to do that without reducing yields.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  DR. CAHN: They're already using very good practices, is what  MR. JEFFRIES: The the water use you showed 21 inches plus.  DR. CAHN: What's that?  MR. JEFFRIES: Your water use was 21 or 22 inches per year; is that correct? On the average.  DR. CAHN: That's right.  MR. JEFFRIES: And that was from January through October?  DR. CAHN: That's correct.  MR. JEFFRIES: Is that including rainfall or is that pumped?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And so, we're in constant rotation with vegetables.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  MR. TOMLINSON: And and just to add; right.  This is an example of what Dr. Letey was talking about.  And why we wanted to address this as as I called it an error in the report; where the staff did not do a a comprehensive nitrate evaluation to identify risk.  So what you see in the staff report is that strawberries are designated as high risk for leaching nitrate to groundwater.  And, when, in fact, the the evidence here is we're making it no worse. Right? This is just the first year of a study. We need more work.  But, certainly, to characterize us as high risk would not be fair.  MR. JEFFRIES: Let me get this straight, Mr.  Tomlinson.  And you're telling me that you rotate
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	reduce their water use or their nitrogen use from where they are now, in my opinion, they wouldn't be able to do that without reducing yields.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  DR. CAHN: They're already using very good practices, is what  MR. JEFFRIES: The the water use you showed 21 inches plus.  DR. CAHN: What's that?  MR. JEFFRIES: Your water use was 21 or 22 inches per year; is that correct? On the average.  DR. CAHN: That's right.  MR. JEFFRIES: And that was from January through October?  DR. CAHN: That's correct.  MR. JEFFRIES: Is that including rainfall or is that pumped?  DR. CAHN: That's pumped water.  MR. JEFFRIES: And you don't include the rainwater?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And so, we're in constant rotation with vegetables.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  MR. TOMLINSON: And and just to add; right.  This is an example of what Dr. Letey was talking about.  And why we wanted to address this as as I called it an error in the report; where the staff did not do a a comprehensive nitrate evaluation to identify risk.  So what you see in the staff report is that strawberries are designated as high risk for leaching nitrate to groundwater.  And, when, in fact, the the evidence here is we're making it no worse. Right? This is just the first year of a study. We need more work.  But, certainly, to characterize us as high risk would not be fair.  MR. JEFFRIES: Let me get this straight, Mr.  Tomlinson.  And you're telling me that you rotate strawberry plants every 14 months, and then those plants
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	reduce their water use or their nitrogen use from where they are now, in my opinion, they wouldn't be able to do that without reducing yields.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  DR. CAHN: They're already using very good practices, is what  MR. JEFFRIES: The the water use you showed 21 inches plus.  DR. CAHN: What's that?  MR. JEFFRIES: Your water use was 21 or 22 inches per year; is that correct? On the average.  DR. CAHN: That's right.  MR. JEFFRIES: And that was from January through October?  DR. CAHN: That's correct.  MR. JEFFRIES: Is that including rainfall or is that pumped?  DR. CAHN: That's pumped water.  MR. JEFFRIES: And you don't include the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	And so, we're in constant rotation with vegetables.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  MR. TOMLINSON: And and just to add; right.  This is an example of what Dr. Letey was talking about.  And why we wanted to address this as as I called it an error in the report; where the staff did not do a a comprehensive nitrate evaluation to identify risk.  So what you see in the staff report is that strawberries are designated as high risk for leaching nitrate to groundwater.  And, when, in fact, the the evidence here is we're making it no worse. Right? This is just the first year of a study. We need more work.  But, certainly, to characterize us as high risk would not be fair.  MR. JEFFRIES: Let me get this straight, Mr.  Tomlinson.  And you're telling me that you rotate
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	reduce their water use or their nitrogen use from where they are now, in my opinion, they wouldn't be able to do that without reducing yields.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  DR. CAHN: They're already using very good practices, is what  MR. JEFFRIES: The the water use you showed 21 inches plus.  DR. CAHN: What's that?  MR. JEFFRIES: Your water use was 21 or 22 inches per year; is that correct? On the average.  DR. CAHN: That's right.  MR. JEFFRIES: And that was from January through October?  DR. CAHN: That's correct.  MR. JEFFRIES: Is that including rainfall or is that pumped?  DR. CAHN: That's pumped water.  MR. JEFFRIES: And you don't include the rainwater?  DR. CAHN: No. That's just applied water. The	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	And so, we're in constant rotation with vegetables.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  MR. TOMLINSON: And and just to add; right.  This is an example of what Dr. Letey was talking about.  And why we wanted to address this as as I called it an error in the report; where the staff did not do a a comprehensive nitrate evaluation to identify risk.  So what you see in the staff report is that strawberries are designated as high risk for leaching nitrate to groundwater.  And, when, in fact, the the evidence here is we're making it no worse. Right? This is just the first year of a study. We need more work.  But, certainly, to characterize us as high risk would not be fair.  MR. JEFFRIES: Let me get this straight, Mr.  Tomlinson.  And you're telling me that you rotate strawberry plants every 14 months, and then those plants are disked up and there's a cover crop or there's another
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	reduce their water use or their nitrogen use from where they are now, in my opinion, they wouldn't be able to do that without reducing yields.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  DR. CAHN: They're already using very good practices, is what  MR. JEFFRIES: The the water use you showed 21 inches plus.  DR. CAHN: What's that?  MR. JEFFRIES: Your water use was 21 or 22 inches per year; is that correct? On the average.  DR. CAHN: That's right.  MR. JEFFRIES: And that was from January through October?  DR. CAHN: That's correct.  MR. JEFFRIES: Is that including rainfall or is that pumped?  DR. CAHN: That's pumped water.  MR. JEFFRIES: And you don't include the rainwater?  DR. CAHN: No. That's just applied water. The rainfall occurred roughly from January to March last	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	And so, we're in constant rotation with vegetables.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  MR. TOMLINSON: And and just to add; right.  This is an example of what Dr. Letey was talking about.  And why we wanted to address this as as I called it an error in the report; where the staff did not do a a comprehensive nitrate evaluation to identify risk.  So what you see in the staff report is that strawberries are designated as high risk for leaching nitrate to groundwater.  And, when, in fact, the the evidence here is we're making it no worse. Right? This is just the first year of a study. We need more work.  But, certainly, to characterize us as high risk would not be fair.  MR. JEFFRIES: Let me get this straight, Mr.  Tomlinson.  And you're telling me that you rotate strawberry plants every 14 months, and then those plants are disked up and there's a cover crop or there's another type of crop that's put in for another season, and then

MR. TOMLINSON: Yes. MR. JEFFRIES: Is that what you're telling me? MR. HODGIN: Dr. Cahn, your statement here suggests that stravberries really are not a major contribution to groundwater pollution.  But — do you have any figures on the same fields of — to know what the level of contamination is in the Watsonville/Salinas area, anywhere from, say, 21 to 24,000 plants per acre to maybe up to 30,000 plants in one are that are planted each year. And in — and in each growing region, it's at a different times because they're trying to hit different market windows, and go with the climate.  And so, yes. MR. TOMLINSON: All right? But a big — but part of that, the reason with that welf was the fertilizer that's applied. Right?  MR. HODGIN: Dr. Cahn, your statement here suggests that stravberries really are not a major contribution to groundwater?  DR. CAHN: Dr. Cahn, your statement here suggests that stravberries really are not a major contribution to groundwater?  DR. CAHN: Dr. Cahn, your statement here suggests that stravberries really are not a major contribution to groundwater?  DR. CAHN: Dr. Cahn, your statement here suggests that stravberries really are not a major contribution to groundwater?  DR. CAHN: Dr. Cahn, your statement here suggests that stravberries really are not a major contribution to groundwater?  DR. CAHN: Dr. Cahn: Dr. Valley of the groundwater in the groundwater?  DR. CAHN: Dr. Cahn: Dr. Valley of the under that - where — where I'm going is — is that an area that's — in — the local strawberry fields, is that contaminated groundwater in the groundwater where — where I'm going is — is that an area that's — in — the very pigh. The going is — is that an area that's — in — the local strawberry fields, is that contamination is in the groundwater?  DR. CAHN: Water develoated that — where — where I'm going is — is that an area that's — in — the under that are shall be the integration of — in the going is — is that an area that's — in — the local strawberry production?  DR. CAHN: Water that are planted the			ſ	<u> </u>
MR. JEFFRIES: Is that what you're telling me? MR. TOMLINSON: Yes. There's oughly — depending upon where you're at in Santa Maria or in — in the Watsonville/Salinas area, anywhere from, say, 21 to 24,000 plants per acre to maybe up to 30,000 plants in one acre that are planted each year.  And In — and in each growing region, it's at different times because they're trying to hit different market windows, and go with the climate.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  MR. JEFRIES: Okay.  MR. HODGIN: Did you evaluate that — where — where — where it strawberry fields, is that contaminated groundwater under there, which may or may not have anything to do with the strawberry production?  DR. CAINI: We did evaluate the irrigation water for intracell, in terms of the water that's coming up. There in litrogen, in terms of the water that's coming up. There in litrogen, in terms of the water that's coming up. There in litrogen, in terms of the water that's coming up. There in litrogen, in terms of the water that's coming up. There in litrogen, in terms of the water that's coming up. There in litrogen, in terms of the water that's coming up. There in litrogen, in terms of the water that's coming up. There in litrogen, in terms of the water that's coming up. There in litrogen, in terms of the water that's coming up. There in litrogen, in terms of the water that's coming up. There is low that does a good farmer do, this is an example. They don't make it any worse than what had they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what water the levels. Larry the recilied exaction to grow that in litrogen in litrogen, you where the litrogen in litrogen, you water stalling the water that's believe the come of the water has been under the levels. Larry on ideas.  They got it. Right?  It t	1	MR. TOMLINSON: Yes.	1	MR. HODGIN: Dr. Cahn, your statement here
MR. TOMLINSON: Yes. There's roughly—  2	2		2	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
depending upon where you're at in Santa Maria or in — in the Watsonville/Salinas area, anywhere from, say, 21 to 24,000 plants per acre to maybe up to 30,000 plants in one acre that are planted each year.  And in — and in each growing region, it's at different times because they're trying to hit different market windows, and go with the climate.  And so, yes.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  And So, yes.  MR. TOMLINSON: All right? But a big — but arrow first corp that can somehow absorb 100 percent of the first plant that say before in this constant rotation system. It's because were in this constant rotation system. It's because were in this constant rotation what they need. They don't apply more than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what what they need. They don't make it any worse than what what they need. They don't make it any worse than what plant they contained to the plant they don't make it any worse than what what they need. They don't make it any worse than what what they need. They don't make it any worse than what what they need. They don't make it any worse than what what they need. They don't make it any worse than what plant they contained they need. They don't make it any worse than what plant they contained they need. They don't make it any worse than what plant they contained they need. They don't make it any worse than what plant they contained the plant they need. They don't make it any worse than what plant they need. They don't make it any worse than what plant they need. They don't make it any worse than what plant they need. They don't make it any worse than what plant they need. They don't make it any worse than what plant they need. They don't apply more than what they need. They don't apply more than what they need. They don't				
the Watsonville/Salinas area, anywhere from, say, 21 to 24,000 plants per acre to maybe up to 30,000 plants in one acre that are planted each year.  And In — and in each growing region, it's at different times because they're trying to hit different market windows, and go with the climate.  And so, yes.  MR. JEFFRIES: Iday.  MR. TOMLINSON: All right? But a big — but part of that, the reason why that works is — right? — It's not a magic crop. We're not — we're not the only crop that can somehow absorb 100 percent of the fertilizer that's applied. Right?  It's because we're in this constant rotation or system. It's because maybe there might be some — some inglith be some in the residual.  What does a good farmer do, this is an example. They that does a good farmer do, this is an example. They slow risk to groundwater. Certainly, I would ask you to make — to make the changes to the order that would say we're not high risk.  MR. JEFFRIES: I was going to ask him the question, because he talked about nitrogen or nitrates for make — to make the changes to the order that would say we're not high risk.  MR. JEFFRIES: I was going to ask him the question, because he talked about nitrogen or nitrates they make — to make the changes to the order that would say we're not high risk.  MR. JEFFRIES: I was going to ask him the question, because he talked about nitrogen or nitrates fetting down past the root zone.  MR. TOMLINSON: And — and that's what he was — part of his answer — right? — is that each crop is going to have a different test of practices to try and make those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity.  For here, for strawberries, we have a drip gripation system that's highly efficien.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious.  Thank you.  Thank	4		4	
5 24,000 plants per acre to maybe up to 30,000 plants in on acre that are planted each year.  6 And in - and in each growing region, it's at different times because they're trying to hit different market windows, and go with the climate.  10 And so, yes.  11 And so, yes.  12 MR. TOMLINSON: All right? But a big - but part of that, the reason why that works is - right? - it's not a majec rop. We're not - we're not the only it's rop that can somehow absorb 100 percent of the nitrote, in terms of the water that's constant rotation system. It's because maybe there might be some - some only that we water that's constant rotation system. It's because maybe there might be some - some only that what does a good farmer do, this is an example. They don't apply more than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need as lo				
7 one acre that are planted each year. And in — and in each growing region, it's at different times because they're trying to hit different market windows, and go with the climate. And so, yes. MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. TOMLINSON: All right? But a big — but to relate the row where I'm going is — is that an area that's — in — the own that the I'm going is — is that an area that's — in — the own that the I'm going is — is that an area that's — in — the own that the I'm going is — is that an area that's — in — t				
And in and in each growing region, it's at different times because they're trying to hit different market windows, and go with the dimate.  And so, yes.  And so, yes.  MR. TOMLINSON: All right? But a big but part of that, the reason why that works is right? it's not a magic crop. We're not we're not the only crop that can somehow absorb 100 percent of the 15 rose. It's because we're in this constant rotation ysytem. It's because we're in this constant rotation 19 system. It's because maybe there might be some some 119 might be some in the residual.  When you asked questions of Danny Merkley about 22 whet what's already there. They don't apply more than what 19 wook at what's already there. They don't apply more than what 19 wook at what's already there. They don't apply more than what 19 wook at what's already there. They don't apply more than what 19 wook at what's already there. They don't apply more than what 19 wook at what's already there. They don't apply more than what 19 wook at what's already there. They don't apply more than what 19 wook at what's already there. They don't apply more than what 19 wook at what's already there. They don't apply more than what 19 wook at what's already there. They don't apply more than what 19 wook at what's already there. They don't apply more than what 19 wook at what's already there. They don't apply more than what 19 wook at what's already there. They don't apply more than what 19 wook at what's already there. They don't apply more than what 19 wook at the rotation of the we're we're within the wook 19 was 19 wook at the wook 19 wook and 19 wook 19				_
different times because they/re tyring to hit different maket windows, and go with the climate.  And so, yes.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  MR. JEFFRIES: Usay going to ask him the question, because he talked about nitrogen or nitrates usbasoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground over?  MR. TOMLINSON: And — and that's what he was part of his answer – right? — is that an area that's — in — the where — where which may or may not have anything to do with the strawberry production?  DR. CAHN: We did evaluate the irrigation water for intrate levels. I can't received. In controlled. In the strawberry production?  DR. CAHN: We did evaluate the irrigation water for intrate bevels. I can't received. In controlled there, which may or may not have and fiferent for each commodity.  The devels. But none of them were very high.  I — I mean, they were meeting the water than the strawberry light.  I — I mean, they were meeting the water than the strawberry light.  I — I mean, they were meeting the valuer of nitrate here light. In the direct water than the strawberry light.  I — I mean, they were meeting the valuer of the trawber in grain th				
market windows, and go with the climate.  And so, yes.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  MR. TOMLINSON: All right? But a big — but also a magic crop. We're not — we're not the only rop that can somehow absorb 100 percent of the fertilizer that's applied. Right?  It's not a magic crop. We're not — we're not the only crop that can somehow absorb 100 percent of the fertilizer that's applied. Right?  It's because we're in this constant rotation system. It's because we're in this constant rotation nitrogen, in terms of the water that's coming up. There might be some in the residual.  When you asked questions of Danny Merkley about what does a good farmer do, this is an example. They look at what's aiready there. They don't make it any worse than what what he wase to make — to make — to make the changes to the order that would say we're not high risk.  MR. JEFFRIES: Well, listening to Dr. Letey — Letey — is it Letey?  What JEFFRIES: I was going to ask him the question, because he talked about nitrogen or nitrates getting down past the root zone.  Would that mean to a farmer that he should over?  MR. TOMLINSON: And — and that's what he was 1 ogoing to have a different set of practices to try and reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to — to achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious.  Thank you.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious.  Thank you.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious.  Thank you.  MR. JEFRIES: That's obvious.  MR. JEFRIES: Tha				
And so, yes.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  They got it. Right?  they got it. Right?  they got it. Right?  This is an example of what I would characterize as low make — to make the changes to the order that would say we're not high in fisk.  MR. JEFFRIES: Well, listening to Dr. Letey— Letey— is it Letey?  Unoulcentries: Well will be some of the ord produced is fire going to have a different set of practices to try and reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to — to achieve those goals. But it's all going to have a different set of practices to try and reduce risk for groundwater. Pages 125  And so, yes.  MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  MR. JEFFRIES: I was going to ask him the getting down past the root zone.  Would that mean to a farmer that he should over?  MR. TOMLINSON: And — and that's what he was eging to have a different set of practices to try and reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to — to achieve those goals. But it's all going to look  different for each commodity.  Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.				·
MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.  MR. TOMLINSON: All right? But a big — but part of that, the reason why that works is — right? — 14  The part of that, the reason why that works is — right? — 14  The she cause were in this constant rotation system. It's because were in this constant rotation pays the some in the residual.  MR. HODGIN: So you were testing the water might be some — some might be some in the residual.  MR. HODGIN: So you were testing the water that's coming up. There might be some in the residual.  What does a good farmer do, this is an example. They look at what's aiready there. They don't apply more than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what he what they need. They don't make it any worse than what he wase a slow in sk to groundwater. Certainly, I would ask you to make — to make the changes to the order that would say we're not high risk.  MR. JEFFRIES: Well, listening to Dr. Letey — Letey — is it Letey?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, L-E-T-E-Y, MR. JEFFRIES: I was going to ask him the question, because he talked about nitrogen or nitrates getting down past the root zone.  Would that mean to a farmer that he should over?  MR. TOMLINSON: And — and that's what he was service those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity.  For here, for strawberries, we have a drip irrigation water forp before it on the many to that a respect to might be one a mything to do with the strawberny production?  DR. CAHN: We did evaluate the irrigation water for intrate levels. I can't recollect exactly the levels. But none of them were very high.  I - I mean, they did evaluate the irrigation water for intrate levels. I can't recollect exactly the levels. But none of them were very high.  I - I mean, they did evaluate the irrigation water for intrate levels. I can't recollect exactly the levels. But none of them were very high.  I - I mean, they did evaluate the irrigation water for intrate levels. I can't recollect exactly the levels. But none of them were very high.  I - I mean, they uide drawl				
mr. TomLinson: All right? But a big — but part of that, the reason why that works is — right?— It's not a magic crop. We're not — we're not the only crop that can somehow absorb 100 percent of the fertilizer that's applied. Right?  fertilizer that's applied. Right?  fertilizer that's applied. Right?  it's because we're in this constant rotation system. It's because maybe there might be some — some introgen, in terms of the water that's coming up. There might be some in the residual.  When you asked questions of Danny Merkley about what does a good farmer do, this is an example. They look at what's already there. They don't apply more than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what page 250  they got it. Right?  they got it. Right?  This is an example of what I would characterize as low risk to groundwater. Certainly, I would ask you to make — to make the changes to the order that would say we're not high risk.  Mr. John Linson: And — and that's what he was getting down past the root zone.  Would that mean to a farmer that he should subside every year and bring that up, turn the ground as uson is every permitted. It have no idea.  With the strawberry production?  Dr. CAHN: We did evaluate the irrigation water for nitrate levels. But none of them were verly high.  I — I — mean, they were meeting the water that's being used to irrigate the fields?  Dr. CAHN: That were were shortly have related the water that's being used to irrigate the fields?  Dr. CAHN: That were were shortly have related that are shallows.  MR. HODGIN: So you were testing the water that's being used to irrigate the fields?  Dr. CAHN: That's right. So I don't know if there were other wells around that are shallows.  MR. HODGIN: Thank you.  Page 250  MR. TOMLINSON: Member Hodgin, your question is a excellent question. Because it's an example of why I say, even strawberries here, with the low risk that we're describing to you, how challenging it would be for us to comply.  MR. TOMLINSON: And — and that's what he was going to have a dif				
part of that, the reason why that works is right? it's not a magic crop. We're not r- we're not the only crop that can somehow absorb 100 percent of the fertilizer that's applied. Right?  It's because we're in this constant rotation system. It's because maybe there might be some some introgen, in terms of the water that's coming up. There might be some in the residual.  What does a good farmer do, this is an example. They look at what's already there. They don't make it any worse than what what they need. They don't make it any worse than what solow risk to groundwater. Certainly, I would ask you to make to make the changes to the order that would say we're not high risk.  MR. JEFFRIES: Well, listening to Dr. Letey Letey is it Letey?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER; Yeah. L-E-T-E-V. MR. JEFFRIES: I was going to ask him the question, because he talked about nitrogen or nitrates getting down past the root zone.  Would that mean to a farmer that he should subsoil every year and bring that up, turn the groun over?  MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was feeting for brave and bring that up, turn the groun over?  MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was feeting for brave and bring that up, turn the groun over?  MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was feeting for brave a different set of practices to try and reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to to achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity. For here, for strawberries, we have a drip irrigation system that's highly efficient.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious. Thank you.  MR. TOMLINSON: I think if you look at the GAMA  They were weeting the water levels. Bu tonone of them were very high.  I - I mean, they derich exically in the drinking water standards of 10 parts per milition, you know, in these fields.  MR. HODGIN: Thank you.  MR. TOMLINSON: Member Hodgin, your question is a excellent question. Because it's an example of why I a excellent question. Because it's an example of why I a excellent quest		·		
it's not a magic crop. We're not — we're not the only crop that can somehow absorb 100 percent of the fertilizer that's applied. Right?  It's because we're in this constant rotation shirts in the some in the residual.  When you asked questions of Danny Merkley about what does a good farmer do, this is an example. They look at what's already there. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what does a good farmer do, this is an example. They look at what's already there. They don't apply more than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what hey need. They don't make it any worse than what a gave in the residual.  This is an example of what I would characterize as low risk to groundwater. Certainly, I would ask you to make — to make the changes to the order that would say we're not high risk.  MR. JEFRIES: Well, listening to Dr. Letey — Letey — is it Letey?  Letey — is it Letey — is it Letey — Would that mean to a farmer that he should suspoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground going to wor?  MR. TOMLINSON: And — and that's what he was reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to — to achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity.  For here, for strawberries, we have a drip irrigation system that's highly efficient.  MR. JEFRIES: That's obvious.  Thank you.  To Hard You have a different set of practices to try and reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to — to achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity.  For here, for strawberries, we have a drip irrigation system that's highly efficient.  MR. JEFRIES: That's obvious.  Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.				
crop that can somehow absorb 100 percent of the fertilizer that's applied. Right?  18 It's because we're in this constant rotation system. It's because maybe there might be some some nitrogen, in terms of the water that's coming up. There might be some in the residual.  20 mitrogen, in terms of the water that's coming up. There might be some in the residual.  21 When you asked questions of Danny Merkley about what does a good farmer do, this is an example. They look at what's already there. They don't apply more than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what a law a sold what they need. They don't make it any worse than what as a low risk to groundwater. Certainly, I would ask you to make to make the changes to the order that would say we're not high risk.  2 If when you asked questions of Danny Merkley about what they need. They don't apply more than what Page 250  1 they got it. Right?  2 This is an example of what I would characterize as low risk to groundwater. Certainly, I would ask you to make to make the changes to the order that would say we're not high risk.  3 MR. JEFFRIES: Well, listening to Dr. Letey Letey is it Letey?  4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. L.E-T-E-Y.  5 MR. JEFFRIES: I was going to ask him the question, because he talked about nitrogen or nitrates getting down past the root zone.  4 Would that mean to a farmer that he should subsoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground over?  5 MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was repaired for the water that we're the groundwater below has nitrate in it from produce risk for groundwater because we all need to to achieve those goals. But it's all going to look and fifterent for each commodity.  5 For here, for strawberries, we have a drip irrigation system that's highly efficient.  4 MR. TOMLINSON: I think'if you look at the felds?  5 DR. CAHN: That's right. So I don't know if that rewere other wells around that are shallower. They that's ratio as we're not high risk.  6 MR. JEFFRIES: Well, listening to Dr. Le				
17 fertilizer that's applied. Right? 18 It's because we're in this constant rotation 19 system. It's because maybe there might be some some 10 nitrogen, in terms of the water that's coming up. There 11 might be some in the residual. 12 When you asked questions of Danny Merkley about 13 what does a good farmer do, this is an example. They 14 look at what's already there. They don't apply more than 15 what they need. They don't apply more than 16 as low risk to groundwater. Certainly, I would ask you 17 to make to make the changes to the order that would 18 say we're not high risk. 19 MR. JEFFRIES: Well, listening to Dr. Letey 19 Letey is it Letey? 10 MR. JEFFRIES: I was going to ask him the 10 question, because he talked about nitrogen or nitrates 11 getting down past the root zone. 11 would that mean to a farmer that he should 12 subsoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground 13 subsoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground 14 over? 15 MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was repaired from the reduce to fractices to try and reduce to resist for groundwater because we all need to to achieve those goals. But it's all going to look 19 different for each commodity. 19 For here, for strawberries, we have a drip 19 irrigation system that's highly efficient. 20 CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin. 21 Heave the dirking water standards of 10 parts per million, you know, in these fields. 22 MR. HODGIN: So you were testing the water that's being used to irrigate the fields? 22 DR. CAHN: That's right. So I don't know if there were other wells around that are shallower. They might be one what shallower. They might be revere othigh rivate being water that fields? 24 DR. CAHN: That's right the fields? 25 DR. CAHN: That's right he fields? 26 DR. CAHN: That's right he water that's being used to irrigate the fields? 27 DR. CAHN: That's right here were other wells around that are shallower. They might be revere other wells around that are shallower. They might being value there were other wells around that's				•
It's because we're in this constant rotation system. It's because maybe there might be some some introgen, in terms of the water that's coming up. There might be some in the residual.  When you asked questions of Danny Merkley about what does a good farmer do, this is an example. They look at what's already there. They don't apply more than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what beage 250  they got it. Right?  This is an example of what I would characterize as low risk to groundwater. Certainly, I would ask you to make to make the changes to the order that would say we're not high risk.  MR. TOMLINSON: Member Hodgin, your question is accused the visit and so, mR. JEFFRIES: I was going to ask him the question, because he talked about nitrogen or nitrates would that mean to a farmer that he should subsoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground over?  MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was repart of his answer - right? - is that each crop is going to have a different set of practices to try and reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to - to achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity. For here, for strawberries, we have a drip irrigation system that's highly efficient.  MR. TOMLINSON: I think if you look at the GAMA  In the water that's being used to irrigate the fields?  MR. HODGIN: Op. CAHIN: That's right. So of you were testing the water that's being used to irrigate the fields?  DR. CAHIN: That's right. So I don't know if there were other wells around that are shallower. They that's being used to irrigate the fields?  DR. CAHIN: That's right. So I don't know if there were other wells around that are shallower. They might have higher nitrate. I have no idea.  MR. HODGIN: So you were testing the water that's being used to irrigate the fields?  DR. CAHIN: That's right. So I don't know if there were other wells around that are shallower. They described water that's being used to irrigate the fields?  DR. CAHIN: That's right. So I don't kn		·		
system. It's because maybe there might be some some nitrogen, in terms of the water that's coming up. There might be some in the residual.  When you asked questions of Danny Merkley about what does a good farmer do, this is an example. They look at what's already there. They don't apply more than what hat already there. They don't apply more than what they need. They don't apply more than what they need. They don't apply more than what hat are shallower. They don't apply more than what hat a leady there. They don't apply more than what hat a leady there. They don't apply more than what hat a leady they need. They don't apply more than what hat a leady they need. They don't apply more than what hat a leady they need. They don't and what is an example of what I would characterize as low risk to groundwater. Certainly, I would ask you to make to make the changes to the order that would say we're not high risk.  MR. JEFFRIES: Well, listening to Dr. Letey Letey is it Letey?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. L-E-T-E-Y. MR. JEFFRIES: I was going to ask him the question, because he talked about nitrogen or nitrates getting down past the root zone.  Would that mean to a farmer that he should subsoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground over?  MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was part of his answer right? - is that each crop is going to have a different set of practices to try and reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to to achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity.  For here, for strawberries, we have a drip irrigation system that's highly efficient.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious.  Thank you.  Thank you.  MR. TOMLINSON: Mr. Hodgin.  AMR. TOMLINSON: Mr. Hodgin.  They they eight a risk that's being used to irrigate the fields?  DR. CAHN: That's light. So I don't know if there were other wells around that are shallower. They might have higher nitrate. I have higher hirds: I have higher nitrate. I have higher hirds: burnel savelent was excellent q		· · · · · ·		
nitrogen, in terms of the water that's coming up. There might be some in the residual.  When you asked questions of Danny Merkley about they look at what's already there. They don't apply more than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what Page 250  they got it. Right?  This is an example of what I would characterize as low risk to groundwater. Certainly, I would ask you to make to make the changes to the order that would say we're not high risk.  MR. JEFFRIES: Well, listening to Dr. Letey Letey is it Letey?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. L-E-T-E-Y. MR. JEFFRIES: I was going to ask him the question, because he talked about nitrogen or nitrates getting down past the root zone.  Would that mean to a farmer that he should subsoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground over?  MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to to achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious.  AR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious.  This is an example of what I would characterize as low risk to groundwater and that's what he was remained that produce and the man to a farmer that he should subsoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious.  This is an example of what I would characterize as low risk to groundwater and that swhat he was remained that guestion. Because it's an example of why I say, even strawberries here, with the low risk that we're describing to you, how challenging it would be for us to comply.  MR. TOMLINSON: Member Hodgin, your question is a excellent question. Because it's an example of why I say, even strawberries here, with the low risk that we're describing to you, how challenging it would be for us to comply.  MR. TOMLINSON: an an example of why I say, even strawberries here, with the low risk that we're describing to you, how challenging it would be for us to comply.  MR.				
might be some in the residual.  When you asked questions of Danny Merkley about what does a good farmer do, this is an example. They look at what's already there. They don't apply more than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what Page 250  they got it. Right?  This is an example of what I would characterize as on the wisk to groundwater. Certainly, I would ask you to make — to make the changes to the order that would say we're not high risk.  MR. JEFFRIES: Well, listening to Dr. Letey — Letey — is it Letey?  Would that mean to a farmer that he should subsoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground over?  MR. TOMLINSON: Member Hodgin, your question is a excellent question. Because it's an example of why I as a went strawberrise here, with the low risk that we're describing to you, how challenging it would be for us to comply.  Because the vast majority — 70, 80 percent of strawberrig farmers — are leasing their ground. They're constantly moving.  And so, in any given year, they might be on a forwing that up, turn the ground over?  MR. TOMLINSON: And — and that's what he was — part of his answer — right? — is that each crop is going to have a different set of practices to try and reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to — to achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity.  For here, for strawberriges, we have a drip irrigation system that's highly efficient.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious.  Thank you.  They don't make it any worse than what and that are shallower. They might have higher nitrate. I have no idea.  MR. HODGIN: Thank you.  MR. TOMLINSON: Member Hodgin, your question is a excellent question. Because it's an example of why I as a excellent question. Because it's an example of why I as excellent question. Because it's an example of why I as excellent question. Because it's an example of why I as excellent question. Decause it's an example of why I as excellent question. Decause it's an example of why I as excellent question. Decause it's an exa				
When you asked questions of Danny Merkley about what does a good farmer do, this is an example. They look at what's already there. They don't apply more than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what Page 250  1 they got it. Right? 2 This is an example of what I would characterize as low risk to groundwater. Certainly, I would ask you to make — to make the changes to the order that would say we're not high risk. 6 MR. JEFFRIES: Well, listening to Dr. Letey — Letey — is it Letey? 8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. L-E-T-E-Y. 9 MR. JEFFRIES: I was going to ask him the question, because he talked about nitrogen or nitrates getting down past the root zone. 10 Would that mean to a farmer that he should subsoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground over? 11 MR. TOMLINSON: And — and that's what he was -part of his answer - right? — is that each crop is going to have a different set of practices to try and reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to — to achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity. 12 For here, for strawberries, we have a drip irrigation system that's highly efficient. 13 MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious. 14 This is an example. They don't apply more than what be was 10 make — to make the changes to the order that would as excellent question. Because it's an example of why I are excellent question. Because it's an example of why I are excellent question. Because it's an example of why I are excellent question. Because it's an example of why I are excellent question. Because it's an example of why I are excellent question. Because it's an example of why I are excellent question. Because it's an example of why I are excellent question. Because it's an example of why I are excellent question. Because it's an example of why I are excellent question. Because it's an example of why I are excellent question. Because it's an example of why I are excellent question. Because it's an example of why I are excellent question. Because it's an example of why I are ex				· · · · · ·
what does a good farmer do, this is an example. They look at what's already there. They don't apply more than what hat they need. They don't make it any worse than what page 250  they got it. Right?  This is an example of what I would characterize as low risk to groundwater. Certainly, I would ask you to make to make the changes to the order that would say we're not high risk.  MR. JEFFRIES: Well, listening to Dr. Letey Letey is it Letey?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. L-E-T-E-Y. MR. JEFFRIES: I was going to ask him the question, because he talked about nitrogen or nitrates getting down past the root zone.  Would that mean to a farmer that he should subsoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground over?  MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was for going to have a different set of practices to try and reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to to achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity.  For here, for strawberries, we have a drip irrigation system that's highly efficient.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious. They might have higher nitrate. I have no idea.  MR. HODGIN: Thank you.  MR. TOMLINSON: Member Hodgin, your question is a excellent question. Because it's an example of why I say, even strawberries here, with the low risk that we're describing to you, how challenging it would be for us to comply.  Because the vast majority 70, 80 percent of strawberry farmers are leasing their ground. They're constantly moving.  And so, in any given year, they might be on a farm where the groundwater below has nitrate in it from production practices 20 or 30 or 40 years ago, that have no correlation to them or maybe even the crop before it or what was going on.  So trying to tie that correlation to suggesting that measuring groundwater and somehow suggesting that that there's a correlation between that farm and that groundwater.  CHAIR YOUNG: If if I'm not mistaken, I thou		-		
look at what's already there. They don't apply more than what they need. They don't make it any worse than what Page 250  they got it. Right? This is an example of what I would characterize as low risk to groundwater. Certainly, I would ask you to make — to make the changes to the order that would say we're not high risk.  MR. JEFFRIES: Well, listening to Dr. Letey — Letey — is I Letey? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. L-E-T-E-Y. MR. JEFFRIES: I was going to ask him the question, because he talked about nitrogen or nitrates getting down past the root zone. Would that mean to a farmer that he should subsoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground over?  MR. TOMLINSON: Member Hodgin, your question is a excellent question. Because it's an example of why I say, even strawberries here, with the low risk that we're describing to you, how challenging it would be for us to comply.  Because the vast majority — 70, 80 percent of strawberry farmers — are leasing their ground. They're constantly moving.  And so, in any given year, they might be on a farm where the groundwater below has nitrate in it from production practices 20 or 30 or 40 years ago, that have no correlation to them or maybe even the crop before it or what was going on.  MR. TOMLINSON: Member Hodgin, your question is a excellent question. Because it's an example of why I say, even strawberries here, with the low risk that we're describing to you, how challenging it would be for us to comply.  Because the vast majority — 70, 80 percent of strawberry farmers — are leasing their ground. They're constantly moving.  And so, in any given year, they might be on a farm where the groundwater abelow has nitrate in it from production practices 20 or 30 or 40 years ago, that have no correlation to them or maybe even the crop before it or what was going on.  So trying to tie that correlation. That's why a whole-systems approach is more effective than an individual farm measuring groundwater and somehow suggesting that — that there's a correlation between that farm and				
they got it. Right?  they got it. Right?  they got it. Right?  This is an example of what I would characterize as low risk to groundwater. Certainly, I would ask you to make to make the changes to the order that would say we're not high risk.  MR. JEFFRIES: Well, listening to Dr. Letey  Letey is it Letey?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. L-E-T-E-Y.  MR. JEFFRIES: I was going to ask him the question, because he talked about nitrogen or nitrates getting down past the root zone.  Would that mean to a farmer that he should subsoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground over?  MR. TOMLINSON: Member Hodgin, your question is a excellent question. Because it's an example of why I say, even strawberries here, with the low risk that we're describing to you, how challenging it would be for us to comply.  Because the vast majority 70, 80 percent of strawberry farmers are leasing their ground. They're constantly moving.  And so, in any given year, they might be on a farm where the groundwater below has nitrate in it from production practices 20 or 30 or 40 years ago, that have no correlation to them or maybe even the crop before it or what was going on.  MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was part of his answer - right? - is that each crop is going to have a different set of practices to try and reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to to achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity.  For here, for strawberries, we have a drip irrigation system that's highly efficient.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious.  Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.				•
they got it. Right?  This is an example of what I would characterize as low risk to groundwater. Certainly, I would ask you to make to make the changes to the order that would say we're not high risk.  MR. JEFFRIES: Well, listening to Dr. Letey Letey is it Letey?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. L-E-T-E-Y.  MR. JEFFRIES: I was going to ask him the question, because he talked about nitrogen or nitrates getting down past the root zone.  Would that mean to a farmer that he should subsoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground over?  MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was part of his answer - right? - is that each crop is going to have a different set of practices to try and reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to to achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious.  Thank you.  MR. TOMLINSON: Member Hodgin, your question is a excellent question. Because it's an example of why I say, even strawberries here, with the low risk that we're describing to you, how challenging it would be for us to comply.  Because the vast majority 70, 80 percent of strawberries here, with the low risk that we're describing to you, how challenging it would be for us to comply.  Because the vast majority 70, 80 percent of strawberries here, with the low risk that we're describing to you, how challenging it would be for us to comply.  Because the vast majority 70, 80 percent of strawberries here, with the low risk that we're describing to you, how challenging it would be for us to comply.  Because the vast majority 70, 80 percent of strawberries here, with the low risk that we're describing to you, how challenging it would be for us to comply.  Because the vast majority 70, 80 percent of strawberries here, with the low risk that we're describing to you, how challenging it would be for us to comply.  Because the vast majority 70, 80 percent of strawberries here, with the low risk that we're describing to you, how challenging it wo				
they got it. Right?  This is an example of what I would characterize as low risk to groundwater. Certainly, I would ask you to make to make the changes to the order that would say we're not high risk.  MR. JEFFRIES: Well, listening to Dr. Letey Letey is it Letey?  NR. JEFFRIES: I was going to ask him the question, because he talked about nitrogen or nitrates getting down past the root zone.  Would that mean to a farmer that he should subsoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground over?  MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was part of his answer - right? - is that each crop is achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious.  MR. TOMLINSON: Member Hodgin, your question is a excellent question. Because it's an example of why I say, very strawberries here, with the low risk that we're describing to you, how challenging it would be for us to comply.  Because the vast majority 70, 80 percent of strawberry farmers are leasing their ground. They're constantly moving.  And so, in any given year, they might be on a farm where the groundwater below has nitrate in it from production practices 20 or 30 or 40 years ago, that have no correlation to them or maybe even the crop before it or what was going on So trying to tie that correlation to groundwater and then what's going on on top, it doesn't there isn't that immediate correlation. That's why a whole-systems approach is more effective than an individual farm measuring groundwater and somehow suggesting that that there's a correlation between that farm and that groundwater.  CHAIR YOUNG: If if I'm not mistaken, I thought staff put up a a slide that showed that the increasing year by year.  MR. TOMLINSON: I think if you look at the GAMA	25		23	
This is an example of what I would characterize as low risk to groundwater. Certainly, I would ask you to make to make the changes to the order that would say we're not high risk.  MR. JEFFRIES: Well, listening to Dr. Letey Letey is it Letey?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. L-E-T-E-Y. MR. JEFFRIES: I was going to ask him the question, because he talked about nitrogen or nitrates getting down past the root zone.  Would that mean to a farmer that he should subsoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground over?  MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was part of his answer - right? - is that each crop is going to have a different set of practices to try and reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to to achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.  2 a excellent question. Because it's an example of why I say, yeven strawberries here, with the low risk that we're describing to you, how challenging it would be for us to comply.  Because the vast majority 70, 80 percent of strawberry farmers are leasing their ground. They're constantly moving.  And so, in any given year, they might be on a farmer that he should subsoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground over?  MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was required to them or maybe even the crop before it or what was going on.  So trying to tie that correlation to groundwater and then what's going on on top, it doesn't there isn't that immediate correlation. That's why a whole-systems approach is more effective than an individual farm measuring groundwater and suggesting that that there's a correlation between that farm and that groundwater.  CHAIR YOUNG: If if I'm not mistaken, I thought staff put up a slide that showed that the nitrate levels in groundwater in this area were intreasing year by year.  MR. TOMLINSON: I think if you look at the GAMA				
as low risk to groundwater. Certainly, I would ask you to make to make the changes to the order that would say we're not high risk.  MR. JEFFRIES: Well, listening to Dr. Letey Letey is it Letey?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. L-E-T-E-Y. MR. JEFFRIES: I was going to ask him the question, because he talked about nitrogen or nitrates getting down past the root zone.  Would that mean to a farmer that he should subsoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground over?  MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was part of his answer - right? - is that each crop is going to have a different set of practices to try and reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to to achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious.  Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.	1	they got it. Right?	1	
to make to make the changes to the order that would say we're not high risk.  MR. JEFFRIES: Well, listening to Dr. Letey Letey is it Letey?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. L-E-T-E-Y.  MR. JEFFRIES: I was going to ask him the question, because he talked about nitrogen or nitrates getting down past the root zone.  Would that mean to a farmer that he should subsoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground over?  MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was part of his answer - right? - is that each crop is going to have a different set of practices to try and reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to to achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious.  MR. TOMLINSON: I think if you look at the GAMA	2	This is an example of what I would characterize	2	a excellent question. Because it's an example of why I
say we're not high risk.  MR. JEFFRIES: Well, listening to Dr. Letey Letey is it Letey?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. L-E-T-E-Y. MR. JEFFRIES: I was going to ask him the question, because he talked about nitrogen or nitrates getting down past the root zone.  Would that mean to a farmer that he should subsoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground over?  MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was regoing to have a different set of practices to try and reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to to achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious. Thank you. CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.  So trying to tie that vast majority 70, 80 percent of strawberry farmers are leasing their ground. They're constantly moving. And so, in any given year, they might be on a farm where the groundwater below has nitrate in it from production practices 20 or 30 or 40 years ago, that have no correlation to them or maybe even the crop before it or what was going on.  So trying to tie that correlation to groundwater and then what's going on on top, it doesn't there isn't that immediate correlation. That's why a whole-systems approach is more effective than an individual farm measuring groundwater and somehow suggesting that that there's a correlation between that farm and that groundwater.  CHAIR YOUNG: If if I'm not mistaken, I thought staff put up a a slide that showed that the nitrate levels in groundwater in this area were increasing year by year.  MR. TOMLINSON: I think if you look at the GAMA	3	as low risk to groundwater. Certainly, I would ask you	3	say, even strawberries here, with the low risk that we're
MR. JEFFRIES: Well, listening to Dr. Letey Letey is it Letey?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. L-E-T-E-Y. MR. JEFFRIES: I was going to ask him the question, because he talked about nitrogen or nitrates getting down past the root zone.  Would that mean to a farmer that he should subsoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground over?  MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was MR. Tomuson: And and that's what he was moging to have a different set of practices to try and meduce risk for groundwater because we all need to to achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity. For here, for strawberries, we have a drip irrigation system that's highly efficient. MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious. Thank you. CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.  MR. TOMLINSON: I was going to n. Letey To strawberry farmers are leasing their ground. They're constantly moving.  And so, in any given year, they might be on a farm where the groundwater below has nitrate in it from production practices 20 or 30 or 40 years ago, that have no correlation to them or maybe even the crop before it or what was going on.  So trying to tie that correlation to groundwater and then what's going on on top, it doesn't there isn't that immediate correlation. That's why a whole-systems approach is more effective than an individual farm measuring groundwater and somehow suggesting that that there's a correlation between that farm and that groundwater.  CHAIR YOUNG: If if I'm not mistaken, I thought staff put up a a slide that showed that the nitrate levels in groundwater in this area were increasing year by year.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.  MR. TOMLINSON: I think if you look at the GAMA	4	to make to make the changes to the order that would	4	describing to you, how challenging it would be for us to
Letey is it Letey?  UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. L-E-T-E-Y.  MR. JEFFRIES: I was going to ask him the question, because he talked about nitrogen or nitrates getting down past the root zone.  Would that mean to a farmer that he should subsoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground over?  MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to to achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity.  For here, for strawberries, we have a drip irrigation system that's highly efficient.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious.  Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.  Take strawberry farmers are leasing their ground. They're constantly moving.  And so, in any given year, they might be on a farm where the groundwater below has nitrate in it from production practices 20 or 30 or 40 years ago, that have no correlation to them or maybe even the crop before it or what was going on.  So trying to tie that correlation to groundwater and then what's going on on top, it doesn't there isn't that immediate correlation. That's why a whole-systems approach is more effective than an individual farm measuring groundwater and somehow suggesting that that there's a correlation between that farm and that groundwater.  CHAIR YOUNG: If if I'm not mistaken, I thought staff put up a a slide that showed that the nitrate levels in groundwater in this area were increasing year by year.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.	5	say we're not high risk.	5	comply.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. L-E-T-E-Y.  MR. JEFFRIES: I was going to ask him the question, because he talked about nitrogen or nitrates getting down past the root zone.  Would that mean to a farmer that he should subsoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground over?  MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was moint to have a different set of practices to try and moint reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to to achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity.  For here, for strawberries, we have a drip irrigation system that's highly efficient.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious. Thank you. CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.  MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was going to have a different set of practices to try and achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.  MR. TOMLINSON: I think if you look at the GAMA	6	MR. JEFFRIES: Well, listening to Dr. Letey	6	Because the vast majority 70, 80 percent of
9 MR. JEFFRIES: I was going to ask him the 10 question, because he talked about nitrogen or nitrates 11 getting down past the root zone. 12 Would that mean to a farmer that he should 13 subsoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground 14 over? 15 MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was 16 part of his answer - right? - is that each crop is 17 going to have a different set of practices to try and 18 reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to to 19 achieve those goals. But it's all going to look 20 different for each commodity. 21 For here, for strawberries, we have a drip 22 irrigation system that's highly efficient. 23 MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious. 24 Thank you. 25 CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.  9 And so, in any given year, they might be on a 10 farm where the groundwater begow has nitrate in it from production practices 20 or 30 or 40 years ago, that have no correlation to them or maybe even the crop before it or what was going on. 14 So trying to tie that correlation to 15 groundwater and then what's going on on top, it doesn't there isn't that immediate correlation. That's why a whole-systems approach is more effective than an individual farm measuring groundwater and somehow suggesting that that there's a correlation between that farm and that groundwater. 26 CHAIR YOUNG: If if I'm not mistaken, I thought staff put up a a slide that showed that the nitrate levels in groundwater in this area were increasing year by year. 27 CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.	7	Letey is it Letey?	7	strawberry farmers are leasing their ground. They're
question, because he talked about nitrogen or nitrates getting down past the root zone.  Would that mean to a farmer that he should subsoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground over?  MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to to different for each commodity. For here, for strawberries, we have a drip irrigation system that's highly efficient.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious. That's work and that's work and that's on the mor maybe even the crop before it production practices 20 or 30 or 40 years ago, that have no correlation to them or maybe even the crop before it production practices 20 or 30 or 40 years ago, that have no correlation to them or maybe even the crop before it production practices 20 or 30 or 40 years ago, that have no correlation to them or maybe even the crop before it production practices 20 or 30 or 40 years ago, that have no correlation to them or maybe even the crop before it or what was going on.  So trying to tie that correlation to groundwater and then what's going on on top, it doesn't there isn't that immediate correlation. That's why a whole-systems approach is more effective than an individual farm measuring groundwater and somehow suggesting that that there's a correlation between that farm and that groundwater.  CHAIR YOUNG: If if I'm not mistaken, I thought staff put up a a slide that showed that the nitrate levels in groundwater in this area were increasing year by year.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.	8	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. L-E-T-E-Y.	8	constantly moving.
getting down past the root zone.  Would that mean to a farmer that he should subsoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground over?  MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was or part of his answer - right? - is that each crop is going to have a different set of practices to try and reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to to different for each commodity.  For here, for strawberries, we have a drip irrigation system that's highly efficient.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.  In production practices 20 or 30 or 40 years ago, that have no correlation to them or maybe even the crop before it or what was going on.  So trying to tie that correlation to groundwater and then what's going on on top, it doesn't there isn't that immediate correlation. That's why a whole-systems approach is more effective than an individual farm measuring groundwater and somehow suggesting that that there's a correlation between that farm and that groundwater.  CHAIR YOUNG: If if I'm not mistaken, I thought staff put up a a slide that showed that the nitrate levels in groundwater in this area were increasing year by year.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.	9	MR. JEFFRIES: I was going to ask him the	9	And so, in any given year, they might be on a
Would that mean to a farmer that he should subsoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground over?  MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was part of his answer - right? - is that each crop is going to have a different set of practices to try and reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to to achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity.  For here, for strawberries, we have a drip irrigation system that's highly efficient.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious. Thank you. CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.  12 no correlation to them or maybe even the crop before it or what was going on.  So trying to tie that correlation to 14 So trying to tie that correlation to 15 groundwater and then what's going on on top, it doesn't there isn't that immediate correlation. That's why a 17 whole-systems approach is more effective than an 18 individual farm measuring groundwater and somehow 19 suggesting that that there's a correlation between 19 that farm and that groundwater. CHAIR YOUNG: If if I'm not mistaken, I 10 thought staff put up a a slide that showed that the 11 nitrate levels in groundwater in this area were 12 increasing year by year. 13 or what was going on. 14 So trying to tie that correlation to 15 groundwater and then what's going on on top, it doesn't there isn't that immediate correlation. That's why a 17 whole-systems approach is more effective than an 18 individual farm measuring groundwater and somehow 19 suggesting that that there's a correlation between 19 that farm and that groundwater.  CHAIR YOUNG: If if I'm not mistaken, I 19 thought staff put up a a slide that showed that the 19 nitrate levels in groundwater in this area were 19 increasing year by year. 20 MR. TOMLINSON: I think if you look at the GAMA	10	question, because he talked about nitrogen or nitrates	10	farm where the groundwater below has nitrate in it from
subsoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground over?  MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was part of his answer - right? - is that each crop is going to have a different set of practices to try and reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to to achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity.  For here, for strawberries, we have a drip irrigation system that's highly efficient.  MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was part of his answer - right? - is that each crop is groundwater and then what's going on on top, it doesn't there isn't that immediate correlation. That's why a whole-systems approach is more effective than an individual farm measuring groundwater and somehow suggesting that that there's a correlation between that farm and that groundwater.  CHAIR YOUNG: If if I'm not mistaken, I thought staff put up a a slide that showed that the nitrate levels in groundwater in this area were increasing year by year.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.	11	getting down past the root zone.	11	production practices 20 or 30 or 40 years ago, that have
over?  MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was  reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to to achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity.  For here, for strawberries, we have a drip irrigation system that's highly efficient.  MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was  15 groundwater and then what's going on on top, it doesn't there isn't that immediate correlation. That's why a  whole-systems approach is more effective than an individual farm measuring groundwater and somehow suggesting that that there's a correlation between that farm and that groundwater.  CHAIR YOUNG: If if I'm not mistaken, I  thought staff put up a a slide that showed that the nitrate levels in groundwater in this area were increasing year by year.  MR. TOMLINSON: I think if you look at the GAMA		Would that mean to a farmer that he should	12	no correlation to them or maybe even the crop before it
MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was part of his answer - right? - is that each crop is going to have a different set of practices to try and reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to to achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity.  For here, for strawberries, we have a drip irrigation system that's highly efficient.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious. Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.  MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was  groundwater and then what's going on on top, it doesn't there isn't that immediate correlation. That's why a whole-systems approach is more effective than an individual farm measuring groundwater and somehow suggesting that that there's a correlation between that farm and that groundwater.  CHAIR YOUNG: If if I'm not mistaken, I thought staff put up a a slide that showed that the nitrate levels in groundwater in this area were increasing year by year.  MR. TOMLINSON: I think if you look at the GAMA	13	subsoil every year and bring that up, turn the ground	13	or what was going on.
part of his answer - right? - is that each crop is going to have a different set of practices to try and reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to to achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity.  For here, for strawberries, we have a drip irrigation system that's highly efficient.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious. Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.  16 there isn't that immediate correlation. That's why a whole-systems approach is more effective than an individual farm measuring groundwater and somehow suggesting that that there's a correlation between that farm and that groundwater.  CHAIR YOUNG: If if I'm not mistaken, I thought staff put up a a slide that showed that the nitrate levels in groundwater in this area were increasing year by year.  MR. TOMLINSON: I think if you look at the GAMA		over?	14	So trying to tie that correlation to
going to have a different set of practices to try and reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to to achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity.  For here, for strawberries, we have a drip irrigation system that's highly efficient.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious.  Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.  Mhole-systems approach is more effective than an individual farm measuring groundwater and somehow suggesting that that there's a correlation between that farm and that groundwater.  CHAIR YOUNG: If if I'm not mistaken, I thought staff put up a a slide that showed that the nitrate levels in groundwater in this area were increasing year by year.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.	15	MR. TOMLINSON: And and that's what he was	15	groundwater and then what's going on on top, it doesn't
reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to to achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity.  For here, for strawberries, we have a drip irrigation system that's highly efficient.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious. Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.  Individual farm measuring groundwater and somehow suggesting that that there's a correlation between that farm and that groundwater.  CHAIR YOUNG: If if I'm not mistaken, I thought staff put up a a slide that showed that the nitrate levels in groundwater in this area were increasing year by year.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.	16	part of his answer - right? - is that each crop is	16	there isn't that immediate correlation. That's why a
achieve those goals. But it's all going to look different for each commodity.  For here, for strawberries, we have a drip irrigation system that's highly efficient.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious.  Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: If if I'm not mistaken, I  thought staff put up a a slide that showed that the nitrate levels in groundwater in this area were increasing year by year.  MR. TOMLINSON: I think if you look at the GAMA	17	going to have a different set of practices to try and	17	whole-systems approach is more effective than an
different for each commodity.  For here, for strawberries, we have a drip irrigation system that's highly efficient.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious.  Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: If if I'm not mistaken, I thought staff put up a a slide that showed that the nitrate levels in groundwater in this area were increasing year by year.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.  MR. TOMLINSON: I think if you look at the GAMA	18	reduce risk for groundwater because we all need to to	18	individual farm measuring groundwater and somehow
For here, for strawberries, we have a drip irrigation system that's highly efficient.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious.  Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: If if I'm not mistaken, I 22 thought staff put up a a slide that showed that the 23 nitrate levels in groundwater in this area were 24 increasing year by year.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.  21 CHAIR YOUNG: If if I'm not mistaken, I 22 thought staff put up a a slide that showed that the 23 nitrate levels in groundwater in this area were 24 increasing year by year.	19	achieve those goals. But it's all going to look	19	suggesting that that there's a correlation between
irrigation system that's highly efficient.  23 MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious.  24 Thank you.  25 CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.  26 thought staff put up a a slide that showed that the nitrate levels in groundwater in this area were increasing year by year.  26 MR. TOMLINSON: I think if you look at the GAMA	20	different for each commodity.	20	that farm and that groundwater.
irrigation system that's highly efficient.  Hand MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious.  MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious.  Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.  Let thought staff put up a a slide that showed that the nitrate levels in groundwater in this area were increasing year by year.  MR. TOMLINSON: I think if you look at the GAMA	21		21	CHAIR YOUNG: If if I'm not mistaken, I
23 MR. JEFFRIES: That's obvious. 24 Thank you. 25 CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin. 28 nitrate levels in groundwater in this area were 29 increasing year by year. 20 MR. TOMLINSON: I think if you look at the GAMA	22	<del>-</del>	22	thought staff put up a a slide that showed that the
Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin.  24 increasing year by year.  25 MR. TOMLINSON: I think if you look at the GAMA	23		23	nitrate levels in groundwater in this area were
25 CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin. 25 MR. TOMLINSON: I think if you look at the GAMA	24		24	increasing year by year.
	25	-	25	MR. TOMLINSON: I think if you look at the GAMA
	i			Page 253

1 database, what you'll find is that varies dramatically 1 groundwater basin public supply well study, which is 2 well by well. And it's shifting. 2 these deeper wells, which is these -- what we call mezo 3 3 I think the -- you had testimony at your (phonetic) maps showing you here on the screen. 4 4 previous workshop that suggested that it was shifting. There is special studies, which are focused on 5 5 And, certainly, in some wells it's increasing in some contaminants, typically, like nitrate, like - which is 6 6 areas. In some areas it may be decreasing, as well. what the Lawrence Livermore studies are doing. 7 7 CHAIR YOUNG: Well, shifting in what way? And then there's domestic well studies; for 8 8 Well, I know shifting means moving. But I mean example, those studies that detect a - high levels of 9 9 going up and down. Okay. nitrates; for example, in Tulare County. 10 10 So how -- what about if you're looking at the The groundwater public supply well analyses, 11 11 groundwater basin, and you averaged all these wells so those are all deep public supply wells, typically from 12 you were taking into consideration the ups and the downs? 12 older groundwater, and so it takes some amount of time, 13 MR. TOMLINSON: I think that would've been an 13 because they're deeper wells, for contamination to reach 14 14 excellent analysis for the staff to do. But, instead, them. 15 what they presented to you was the highest level of 15 What is missing from that data -- database, is 16 detection ever in 25 years. 16 the shallow wells. And so we don't see the shallow well 17 And so they presented you data that, in some 17 impact; although, the special studies part of GAMA has 18 cases, was decades old. So you're left with the 18 looked at shallow wells and has found that nitrate 19 impression that all of these wells are above drinking 19 impacts are happening in shallow groundwater within the 20 20 water standard. last two to ten years, so in the current timeframe. 21 21 When, in fact, you go to the GAMA database In addition, what the GAMA data set is 22 today, and it'll show that the vast majority are not. 22 challenged by is that as wells are abandoned -- because 23 23 And if you go to those USGS studies, that were done just they go out of service due to high levels of nitrate 24 a few years ago, it'll show that -- that the vast 24 contamination, for example -- they drop off the radar 25 majority of wells are in compliance. 25 screen. Page 254 Page 256 1 1 That, yes, there is nitrate in groundwater; And what DPH presented to the state board last 2 yes, it needs to be addressed; yes, we need to work on 2 month, is that those wells are no longer represented. 3 3 it. But it's not the picture that you've been presented. It's an artifact of the data set. It does not mean that 4 CHAIR YOUNG: Well, are there nitrate levels 4 groundwater is getting cleaned up. 5 5 And, in fact, most of those wells -- if you that are exceeding drinking water standards? 6 MR. TOMLINSON: I'm sure there are. And some 6 sampled on a -- a bore right next to where the well used 7 of it, I'm -- I would estimate -- I -- I'm not a 7 to be, is still high levels of nitrate. 8 8 groundwater hydrologist. But I would estimate that Nitrate pollution doesn't assimilate very 9 9 agriculture has contributed at some point. Maybe quickly. And so that's the complicate -- some of the 10 currently. 10 complication of the data set. 11 There are many other sources, as well. 11 MR. THOMAS: I would -- I would agree that the 12 CHAIR YOUNG: Let me -- I just want to ask 12 situation is not exactly as we presented it. In the 13 staff: 13 sense that it's worse than we presented it. 14 14 It is worse than we presented it. Old wells What's with the GAMA data? I mean, we're 15 hearing people claim that staff has kind of picked and 15 that are contaminated go out of production and they are 16 choosed data, you know, ignored GAMA data. 16 not sampled any longer, they are abandoned. 17 I mean, can you guys clarify what we're 17 New wells come into play. And if you sample 18 hearing. 18 those new wells, it's going to present a picture of 19 MS. SCHROETER: I -- I can --19 cleaner water than is actually there. 20 MR. HODGIN: Go ahead. 20 CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. I -- I think his name --21 21 MS. SCHROETER: Let me try and answer that. is it, Dolezal? Mr. Dolezal had presented two side-by-22 22 And maybe Matt can provide some additional clarification, side slides comparing the Santa Maria area. 23 if necessary. 23 Yours was on the left, his was on the right. 24 24 So the -- what -- what the GAMA data set is --There was a marked difference in the number of blue dots, 25 25 and there's -- there's several parts to GAMA. There is a if you want to just characterize it that way.

Page 255

1 What's the difference, from your perspective, 1 2 2 on the presentation of those two data sets? One suggests 3 that you didn't include a whole bunch of wells and, 3 4 4 therefore, the percentage of contaminated wells from his 5 presentation should be much lower than what you 5 6 presented. 6 7 7 MS. SCHROETER: We -- we would have to look at 8 the data sets side by side. I -- you know, the slide's 9 no longer here in front of me. And I'd have to look at 10 10 it in greater detail. 11 11 However, it would depend upon which wells were 12 being represented in each study, at which time period. 13 So in any given five-year timeframe, there's whole 14 14 different set of wells that come into play. 15 CHAIR YOUNG: Well, he had the same timeframes, 15 16 from what I remember; at least, it was a number of years 16 17 17 compared identically, if I'm not mistaken. 18 MS. SCHROETER: I think what's important here 18 19 to remember, is that the fact that there's a nitrate 19 20

groundwater pollution problem is not being debated.

We can talk about the level of pollution that there is. But I can show you several slides from presentations and technical service providers, just recently, which are all conveying the same thing about the nitrate groundwater pollution problem.

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 258

22

23

24

25

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

-- of natural rainfall or the rate of flow from a subsequent crop.

And then you'd have a certain amount -- I think the studies that the -- the staff have cited, about half, that gets through a natural denitrification process.

CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. You -- you guys still have six minutes.

8 MR. TOMLINSON: And -- yes. If I could just 9 add one more thing. Because you asked

CHAIR YOUNG: You have six minutes, so --

MR. TOMLINSON: Okay. 12 CHAIR YOUNG: -- ahead and --

13 MR. TOMLINSON: Well, the -- okay, I will.

Thank you.

One of the questions that you had asked previously was about the Dolezal report. I was concerned that if we were going to present that information to you today, that we triple-checked it.

We hired a groundwater hydrology firm to peer 20 review Mr. Dolezal's work, his memo. And I'll read a 21 quick sentence:

> We agree with the conclusion of the Dolezal report that the presentation -- the staff presentation -distorts the facts related to the source, degree and extent of nitrate contamination in groundwater. And that

Page 260

What we don't have great data about, is the shallow groundwater pollution that's going on, which would be representative of current practices. And the data that we do have also shows a problem.

I am interested in the Strawberry Commission's data, and taking a closer look at that. And what I'm also interested in understanding is:

For those growers who do not meet the nitrate balance ratio of 1.2, for example, what amount of nitrate loading is coming from those -- those fields?

DR. CAHN: There was a very small minority that were above that 1.2, I believe maybe 5 out of the 34 fields. So it's a small, small number. I think it came out to about 12 percent.

MR. TOMLINSON: And I think previous reports that the staff has cited would suggest that about half of nitrate that might go below the root zone gets -- goes through a denitrification process naturally.

And so, the amount that then leaches to the groundwater is going to be a function of the amount of surfacewater applied. So it would be a combination of a grower, one, having excess fertilizer, and then, two, overwatering.

If those two things didn't happen, if you just had the excess fertilizer, then it would be the rate that Page 259 1 additional unbiased analysis is needed to support policy 2 decision and development of best management practices for 3 nitrate sources to groundwater. 4

I'll offer that, as well, to you.

If I could return to the presentation.

So in regards to nitrate, we would ask that you please correct the order, if you move forward with this version or any other version, regarding the designation of strawberries as high risk for loading to groundwater for nitrates.

Also, I wanted to talk briefly about the tiering criteria. And this would be a typical strawberry farmer.

So if -- if you consider the square box a strawberry farm and the blue line on the bottom a river - let's say that's the Parajo River, let's say the left is some tributary, let's say the right is the Lower Parajo with a levee on it - that -- that would be a typical strawberry farmer who would be in Tier 1.

If you happen to have that same strawberry farmer -- whether he had an organic field or a conventional field -- that, again, was not applying chlorpyrifos or diazinon, who was 500 feet away from that river -- maybe even a river that's got a levee on it, or maybe, instead of 25-foot buffer or 30 or 50-foot buffer,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

they decided to put a berm or a ditch or a retention pond - it wouldn't matter - that farmer would be Tier 2. Same farm.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If that farmer happened to be in a co-op, and that co-op had other farmers that were over a thousand acres, they would now be in Tier 3, even if they were 2,000 feet away from the river; same farm, no chlorpyrifos, no diazinon.

This is an example of the arbitrary nature of the currently proposed tiering criteria, where the overwhelming focus on toxicity, the evidence that's currently been accumulated over the last five to six years, is that chlorpyrifos and diazinon are the -- the two pesticides that are the primary source of -- of toxicity.

What the others are, what the detection versus toxicity, I don't know. But, clearly, the staff has identified that these two have.

But when you look at how the criteria applies to a farmer that doesn't use them, you could have the same farmer be a Tier 1, 2 or 3. And -- and that just doesn't make sense to us.

That's an example of why I was saying, at the beginning, Dr. Hunter, about why this is just so problematic for us.

Page 262

Page 263

away or a thousand feet away?

Again, there's other tools they can use besides buffers to -- to come into compliance.

Also, a lot of the sediment management requirements are all in Tier 1. So there's not some big dramatic difference there between Tier 2 and Tier 1 in terms of sediment management.

So if you remove the 1,000 foot from -- from Tier -- from Tier 1, that would allow some of those folks from Tier 2 to move back down into Tier 1.

The last thing you might do is look at Tier 2, A and B, and then look at Tier 3. If you just simply removed the Tier 3 language for surfacewater down to Tier 2, that's what your -- what the staff is identifying as something that they're trying to address, which is, they're trying to address an immediate discharger, someone who's immediately discharging water with chlorpyrifos and diazinon into a waterbody.

Again, our -- we would suggest that the overall coalition approach is much better. I'm just saying, if you're going to move forward with the order that's been presented to you, these are the type of changes that need to occur.

CHAIR YOUNG: And do -- do the other farms that are not using these two chemicals - are they using

Page 264

You could then have another strawberry farmer -- because I -- remember, I mentioned we represent about 1 percent. There are some farms -- some farms about 6 percent, Mr. Jeffries.

You asked about crops going back to back. About 6 percent of the strawberry crops stay in the ground for two years. Those folks have a higher pest pressure. They might resort to something like chlorpyrifos and diazinon to deal with that. That would be a very important product for them to be able to use.

They might be 3,000 feet away from the river. They'd be in Tier 2.

So if you were to stick with the current staff order, the one thing that you might do is delete the definition of operation. And everywhere it appears in the order, just simply replace it with landowner or farm.

And that eliminates all those Tier 3 people who, you know, would otherwise be just fine, having no risk but somehow being captured in this def -- this definition of operation.

Another thing that you might do is, if you look at your tiering criteria for 1A and 1B, about not using chlorpyrifos and diazinon. If you're not using it, if those are the primary source of toxicity, then what does it really matter whether that farm not using is 500 feet

another pesticide in that list?

MR. TOMLINSON: I'm sure -- I'm sure some of them are. I'm sure some of them are.

But the -- the data, again, is not conclusive on what is -- is it a detection? Is it toxicity? But these are the examples why a coalition -- when we would look at an audit for a coalition approach, we would be looking at all of the pesticides.

We wouldn't just be looking at chlorpyrifos and diazinon.

11 CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right. 12

You've got about another minute and 15 seconds. 13 MR. TOMLINSON: All right.

14

This is a summary of the changes that I've 15 described.

16 CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah.

17 MR. TOMLINSON: First tool regarding Attachment 18 A, Page 13, Paragraph 51, and Attachment A, Page 48, 19 Paragraph 10, regarding the -- the nitrate component.

20 The other two are in regards to the

21 surfacewater, the changes to the tiering criteria. 22 The last one, which is Page 13, Paragraph 12,

23 this is a brand-new paragraph that just emerged two weeks 24 ago that would give the executive officer authority to --25

to completely change the tiers at any time, over the next

1	five years.	1	ten-minute break.
2	We can't live with that type of	2	(Recess taken)
3	unpredictability. Whether it's adding the next 10, the	3	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Coastkeeper is up.
4	next 73, adding five more tiers, collapsing two tiers or	4	Folks, please take your seats. If you want to
5	whatever, that type of unpredictability is is just	5	continue talking, you can do so outside.
6	we can't live with that.	6	No no more cards. Okay. Well water
7	And so, we would ask that you strike that	7	standard for groundwater
8	paragraph, too.	8	Is it is it in Spanish? The NOI.
9	Lastly, I would just say, relative to the	9	Okay. Just, Steve, before you start, question
10	coalition approach, if you think about what was described	10	for Lisa and staff. I think this is a good question
11	to you in terms of audits, I would I would suggest	11	someone just submitted on a card here.
12	that you look at the other clause that referenced the	12	Is the NOI form and the annual form any
13	sustainability program because it is very, very similar.	13	reporting forms are they also available in Spanish?
14	So if it's good enough for a wine grape grower	14	MS. SCHROETER: That is a great question.
15	to move from Tier 3 to Tier 1 or Tier 2 to Tier 1, why	15	The NOI form the annual compliance form is
16	isn't good enough for any of the other commodities?	16	not yet developed.
17	CHAIR YOUNG: Are there other commodities that	17	CHAIR YOUNG: Right. I
18	have developed sustainability certifications?	18	MS. SCHROETER: It's included as part of
19	MR. TOMLINSON: There are we are there	19	CHAIR YOUNG: How about the
20	are many other commodities working on those right now.	20	MS. SCHROETER: the order.
21	There's a a sustainability stewardship index.	21	CHAIR YOUNG: NOI?
22	And, in addition to that, though, if you just	22	MS. SCHROETER: The NOI is complete. Fourteen
23	simply look at the the practices that are required,	23	hundred of the 1,700 operations have already submitted an
24	the coalition approach is very similar to what that	24	update via the electronic NOI.
25	sustainability program looks like.	25	The instructions are all in Spanish. We have
23	Page 266	23	Page 268
	1490 200		
1	In fact, there's no groundwater monitoring in	1	provided assistance to Spanish growers in three different
2	the sustainability program. And the staff recommended	2	opportunities, now. Also, they have come to our office.
3	that as a vehicle for a wine grape grower to move from	3	The form, itself, on-line is not yet in
4	Tier 3 or Tier 2 into Tier 1.	4	Spanish. But we plan to put it on-line in Spanish.
5	So, again, if you if you just simply look at	5	CHAIR YOUNG: It might be helpful. I mean, I
6	that, you'll find that what we've proposed to you is what	6	I think people should be responding in English. I
7	the staff has said is acceptable in other situations.	7	mean, submitting forms in English.
8	CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you.	8	But I think that there should be maybe
9	Frances, did you have a question or comment?	9	something on the form, itself, that lets them know that
10	MS. McCHESNEY: I just have a request that	10	they can get explanatory information that's in Spanish.
11	and maybe it's already happened that you leave your	11	And where that is.
12	Power Point presentation with the staff.	12	MS. McCANN: On the transmittal form there is a
13	And, Tess, the same with yours your Power	13	number that you call
14	Point presentation is	14	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.
			The state of the s
15	•	15	MS. McCANN: if you need Spanish assistance.
15 16	Okay. We just need it need it for the		MS. McCANN: if you need Spanish assistance.  As well as the instruction form that's in Spanish.
15 16 17	Okay. We just need it need it for the record.	15 16 17	As well as the instruction form that's in Spanish.
16 17	Okay. We just need it need it for the record.  MR. TOMLINSON: Okay. And did you want me to	16 17	As well as the instruction form that's in Spanish.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.
16 17 18	Okay. We just need it need it for the record.  MR. TOMLINSON: Okay. And did you want me to leave these three letters?	16 17 18	As well as the instruction form that's in Spanish.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.  Mr. Shimek, 24 minutes.
16 17 18 19	Okay. We just need it need it for the record.  MR. TOMLINSON: Okay. And did you want me to leave these three letters?  MS. McCHESNEY: You can give them to Michael.	16 17 18 19	As well as the instruction form that's in Spanish.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.  Mr. Shimek, 24 minutes.  MR. SHIMEK: Good afternoon everyone.
16 17 18 19 20	Okay. We just need it need it for the record.  MR. TOMLINSON: Okay. And did you want me to leave these three letters?  MS. McCHESNEY: You can give them to Michael.  MR. TOMLINSON: Okay.	16 17 18 19 20	As well as the instruction form that's in Spanish.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.  Mr. Shimek, 24 minutes.  MR. SHIMEK: Good afternoon everyone.  My name is Steve Shimek. And I'm here
16 17 18 19 20 21	Okay. We just need it need it for the record.  MR. TOMLINSON: Okay. And did you want me to leave these three letters?  MS. McCHESNEY: You can give them to Michael.  MR. TOMLINSON: Okay.  CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah. Okay.	16 17 18 19 20 21	As well as the instruction form that's in Spanish.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.  Mr. Shimek, 24 minutes.  MR. SHIMEK: Good afternoon everyone.  My name is Steve Shimek. And I'm here representing a a kind of a collective group of
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Okay. We just need it need it for the record.  MR. TOMLINSON: Okay. And did you want me to leave these three letters?  MS. McCHESNEY: You can give them to Michael.  MR. TOMLINSON: Okay.  CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah. Okay.  Thank you for your presentation.	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	As well as the instruction form that's in Spanish.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.  Mr. Shimek, 24 minutes.  MR. SHIMEK: Good afternoon everyone.  My name is Steve Shimek. And I'm here representing a a kind of a collective group of comments, although, some of these people will be offering
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Okay. We just need it need it for the record.  MR. TOMLINSON: Okay. And did you want me to leave these three letters?  MS. McCHESNEY: You can give them to Michael.  MR. TOMLINSON: Okay.  CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah. Okay.  Thank you for your presentation.  Coastkeeper is next.	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	As well as the instruction form that's in Spanish.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.  Mr. Shimek, 24 minutes.  MR. SHIMEK: Good afternoon everyone.  My name is Steve Shimek. And I'm here representing a a kind of a collective group of comments, although, some of these people will be offering individual comments.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Okay. We just need it need it for the record.  MR. TOMLINSON: Okay. And did you want me to leave these three letters?  MS. McCHESNEY: You can give them to Michael.  MR. TOMLINSON: Okay.  CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah. Okay.  Thank you for your presentation.  Coastkeeper is next.  We've given 24 minutes to you.	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	As well as the instruction form that's in Spanish.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.  Mr. Shimek, 24 minutes.  MR. SHIMEK: Good afternoon everyone.  My name is Steve Shimek. And I'm here representing a a kind of a collective group of comments, although, some of these people will be offering individual comments.  So I'm here representing Environmental Defense
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Okay. We just need it need it for the record.  MR. TOMLINSON: Okay. And did you want me to leave these three letters?  MS. McCHESNEY: You can give them to Michael.  MR. TOMLINSON: Okay.  CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah. Okay.  Thank you for your presentation.  Coastkeeper is next.	16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	As well as the instruction form that's in Spanish.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.  Mr. Shimek, 24 minutes.  MR. SHIMEK: Good afternoon everyone.  My name is Steve Shimek. And I'm here representing a a kind of a collective group of comments, although, some of these people will be offering individual comments.

1 Monterey Coastkeeper, Santa Barbara Channelkeeper and 1 aguifer are above drinking water standard; 28 percent. 2 environments in the public interest. 2 CHAIR YOUNG: Are the public wells or --3 First of all, just very quickly. Times have 3 MR. SHIMEK: So, it's not clear. And we could 4 changed. Things are no longer the way that they used to 4 not get clarity. They -- it is a mix -- I believe, it is 5 be. But there used to be a lot of water in areas like 5 a mix -- so what the statement reads in the report is 6 6 the Lower Salinas and some of these other watersheds. that some are domestic wells, some are irrigation wells. 7 7 The watersheds have changed a lot. There is no breakout of what -- how many of 8 8 Some of the -- the way that the landscape each. 9 9 looked, it used to be able to -- it was much more We also know that we had a economist up 10 10 resilient. And, in some ways, what - with new earlier. And he talked about the impact of nitrates to 11 11 regulation what we're trying to do, is not go back in the -- and -- and resolving this problem to farmers. 12 way-back machine. We can't do that. 12 Well, I want to make the point that there is 13 13 But we are trying to restore some of the impact on people, as well. And this presents real costs. 14 14 function of our watersheds. There are also uses that no This is a study that was literally just released. I have 15 longer exist on some of our rivers and streams. 15 copies of the executive summary that I can leave, I 16 And, again, the rivers and streams, they just 16 guess, with Michael, is what I've heard. And for you to 17 17 don't look the way they used to and they just don't have. 18 function the way that they used to. 18 But, basically, it's talking about costs in the 19 This is Tembladero Slough. This is not the 19 millions and millions and millions of dollars. And this 20 Salinas River. But that's the condition that we have on 20 isn't cleanup. This is to treat the water so that it is 21 21 some of our waterways today. in a drinkable situation. 22 You have lots of algae. You have rodent traps. 22 When we set out on this process, the goals were 23 23 You have bare earth banks. You have farming very near quite simple. The goals were to eliminate toxic 24 24 the waterway. discharges of ag pesticides to surface and groundwaters, 25 Just as a note, this is a dead sea otter. I 25 reduce -- and I want to emphasize that word -- nutrients Page 270 Page 272 1 kind of, as you know, I -- I represent environmental 1 discharged to surfacewaters, reduce nutrient discharges 2 interests to a great extent. And last year, 26 dead sea 2 to groundwater, minimize sediment, protect aquatic 3 3 otters washed ashore and they died of microcystis habitat. 4 4 poisoning. Frankly, I believe, that these are goals that 5 5 Microcystis is a freshwater algae that becomes can be embraced by everyone. These are the goals that 6 toxic and blooms in high nitrate conditions, washes into 6 were set out in the letter that was sent out in 2008. 7 7 the ocean, is concentrated by mussels and bivalves, the These are still the goals that we're trying to achieve 8 8 otters eat it and die. today. 9 9 So, in other words, the toxicity that we're There is sometimes a lot of rhetoric that talks 10 seeing in our -- and -- and high nitrates that we're 10 about the fact that we can't do this tomorrow. 11 11 No one's asking anyone to do this tomorrow. seeing in our freshwater is reaching into the ocean. 12 I'm about -- I think, in retrospect, I'm about 12 That is pure rhetoric. 13 to add some -- to some of the confusion on wells and --13 So if you look at no regulation versus total 14 and water. But this slide existed before I showed up 14 regulation -- now, this is my opinion -- but the 2004 15 15 waiver was kind of a three, you know. here today. 16 In the Salinas Valley, in Monterey County, as 16 So then there was the February 2010 waiver, 17 17 some of you know, we have been trying to work which I think was somewhere right around a seven. Then 18 cooperatively -- although, it has not turned that way --18 there was the November 2010 waiver, which I think was 19 with Monterey County Water Resources Agency, trying to 19 right in the middle. And then there was the March 2011 20 get their well water data. 20 waiver, which I think, again, was somewhere right in the

21

22

23

24

25

Page 271

middle of regulation.

in the -- in the room.

21

22

23

24

25

The data that we have received is old data.

But it's essen -- but essentially, 28 percent

of the wells in Monterey County in the -- in the Salinas

This data does exist by aquifer. So I do have that. I

don't have it on this slide.

69 (Pages 270 to 273)

Page 273

But, I think, this misses the point. This is

the slide that you saw earlier. And this is the elephant

Where are you -- if -- if that 2011 draft

1 agricultural order is a slider, where are you going to 1 Backstop that. 2 2 put it? That's the elephant in the room. Also, as it goes to tiering, order -- the order 3 And I would suggest it needs to be further out 3 adds proximity to public water supply wells. I think, 4 4 to the right. Agriculture would suggest it needs to be here's one of our most serious concerns. 5 5 further to the left. That's the tension. That's the You, basically, move those people that are near 6 reality. public supply wells with high risk from Tier 1 to Tier 2. 7 7 But if you compare it to the other programs, I But if -- if you remember the statements made by staff, 8 8 think -- I -- I think that it needs to be at least as Tier 2 does about the same as the old order. 9 9 much as what the municipal -- what you're asking So, was the old order adequate to deal with 10 municipal cities and stormwater permits to do; at least 10 nitrate pollution? And I would say the 2004 order was 11 11 at that same level. not enough to deal with nitrate pollution. 12 You're asking the cities to do it. Why aren't 12 I would suggest to you that it's Tier 3 where 13 13 you asking ag to do it? people actually need to do things. In other words, 14 14 So our organizations continue to support there's additional reporting requirements in Tier 2, but 15 adoption of the February 2010 draft order, as it is the 15 there's very little that people need to actually 16 most protective. It's the one that basically says the 16 functionally do on the ground to change their practice. 17 17 long list of -- of toxic chemicals, everybody needs to do They need to report where their -- their 18 individual monitoring, everybody needs to do the same 18 nitrate loading or their nitrate index. They need to 19 thing. 19 report some things. They need to do very little. 20 20 So what's our suggestion? Occasionally, this We need to do a lot, and we need to do a lot 21 21 board has challenged me to - instead of just say I don't more. 22 22 like it, to say: What are the changes that I want? Our organizations do support the -- this order 23 23 -- this current draft with certain conditions. So my So what we're saying is, that these should be 24 24 -- this requirement should essentially be stricken from talk is about to get very dense, and I'm sorry. 25 So tiering. According to Table 5 on Page 23 of 25 Tier 2, and put in Tier 3. Page 274 Page 276 1 1 the staff report, Tier 3 is expected to include about 54 So, in other words, you have a new requirement 2 percent of the acreage, 13 percent of the farms. 2 for Tier 3 if the discharger grows crop types with high 3 3 So how do we keep that from sliding if people potential to discharge nitrogen to groundwater and the 4 4 -- if it either doesn't capture enough because the staff operation totally irrigated acreage is less than a 5 5 estimates are slightly off, or if people start to maybe thousand acres - because if they're in -- if they're 6 gain the system a little bit or change the pesticides 6 over a thousand acres, they're already in Tier 3; right? 7 that they use? 7 - and they're within a -- and they're near a 8 8 How do we backstop and make sure that we contaminated well, they get moved to Tier 3. 9 9 capture enough people in Tier 3? This deals with groundwater. Moving them from 10 So we are suggesting -- this is all going to be 10 Tier 1 to Tier 2 does not. 11 in underline/strikeout form, underline being new 11 So now, moving on. I do want to say, please 12 language. 12 stop me if you want to dwell on some of these. I should 13 This order shall be scaled adequately to 13 say that. 14 regulate discharges to impaired surfacewater and to 14 So now I'm going to be talking about, kind of, 15 groundwater. And then it basically says, after one year, 15 some vocabulary. And I'm jumping around in a numbering 16 if you don't have 40 percent of the total acreage or 10 16 system because I'm kind of dealing with things as far as 17 percent of the growers in Tier 3, the executive officer 17 tiering, toxicity and aquatic life. Okay? 18 can -- can adjust that tiering structure. 18 So the -- the numbering system -- I'm not 19 19 following the numbering system. We think that's appropriate. There's some 20 people out there saying, oh, no, we can't live with that 20 But you've changed language from the November 21 21 draft to this March draft. And it basically says uncertainty. 22 22 Well, I'm saying: Well, what happens if people effectively control. I can find no definition of what in 23 23 start to gain the system? How do you backstop that? And the heck "effectively control" means. That bothers me.

24

25

Page 275

24

25

I'm saying that this is reasonable.

You've set an expectation of 54 and 13.

Page 277

And I want to know what "effectively control" means.

And especially if we go back to the slide over

what are the goals. There is a fundamental difference between how we are dealing with toxicity and how we are dealing with those things that we want to reduce and minimize.

We want to eliminate toxic discharges. I don't know if "effectively control," when it's applied equally to toxicity, groundwater, surfacewater, that makes it all seem the same, where there were fundamental differences in the goals, and we are supposedly eliminating toxic discharges to surface and groundwaters.

So, the vocabulary change is:

On Tier 3, dischargers must effectively -- must eliminate -- I'm sorry -- individual waste discharges of pesticides and toxic substances to waters of the United States.

"Effectively control," I don't know what the means. I don't know that anyone knows what it means. And you're applying it to nitrates and toxics. I don't think they're equal, under the law. Not a lawyer.

Toxicity. Continuing along the line of toxicity - this is going to get a little confusing, but applies -- we are worried about this chlorpyrifos and diazinon thing.

Let me make it clear that we prefer going back to the February solution of including the entire list.

Page 278

also accomplishes that idea that we offered up, that you liked a while back, that basically said, you know, if they don't have to show their data - because, remember, these guys are not doing individual monitoring. These guys are in Tier 2.

But then what happens is that they don't eliminate toxicity and they move to Tier 3. So this is a way to backstop, again, them just switching to something equally toxic.

Again, I'll reiterate that our group prefers the February solution of the entire list. This is an alternative to that.

Vegetated buffers and aquatic life. This is kind of the way -- this is the way it reads now. This is cut and pasted.

And, basically, it says, you know, that -- that -- there's a couple paragraphs here. And it talks about the basin plan. And it talks about how there's -- construction needs to have 30 feet.

Again, we don't really understand what making a plan really does and what the requirement is.

And -- and we also have to keep in mind where we have moved from. The environmental folks came into this room saying that aquatic life was one of our core concerns, partly because of the environmental things that

Page 280

We prefer that solution.

The problem with that solution, frankly, is that it will throw a whole bunch of people into Tier 3. It'll throw almost everybody into Tier 3.

And I'm not sure that -- that -- that Regional Water Quality Control Board staff is prepared to handling -- to handle all the growers being in Tier 3.

So that's the tiering structure. How do we concentrate on some people?

But let's say this another way. How do we, again, backstop this idea so that we eliminate toxicity? How do we disincentivise (phonetic) switching to a toxic pesticide?

And so here's our suggestion -

Now, the reason that this is confusing is, remember, we had this proximity to contaminated well being a new 3C. So, in order to keep everything on this slide, I just kind of noted that.

But here's what we're saying:

After October 1st, any operation that discharges to a waterbody impaired for toxicity and continues to show water or sediment toxicity in the previous two toxicity tests, immediately moves to Tier 3.

In other words, if your water continues to be toxic after two and a half years -- and, remember, this  ${\tt Page} \ \ 279$ 

we represent.

But also because we don't think that you can improve water quality if you don't restore the vegetation between the receiving water and the pollution source.

We think that having rip -- healthy riparian, healthy wetlands, vegetated buffers is essential to excess -- to -- is essential to success. Thank you.

So in the February draft order you had 70 -- or 100, 75 and 50-foot buffers. In November it went down to 30 feet, just around impaired waters.

We don't see -- maybe we missed it. But we don't see any requirement in this order. It basically says that you'll have a plan. And you'll basically talk about, you know, how -- how you're going to protect.

But we don't see an actual, you know, specific buffer. And we think that that is important.

So we basically eliminate all the chit-chat. And we, basically, say a vegetated buffer stip of at least 30 feet shall be maintained. Now, tier here, means something different.

Tier 2 and 3 streams based on the National Hydro -- Hyd -- Hydrography Data Set -- Data Set Plus. And a vegetated buffer strip of at least 50 feet shall be maintained along lakes, wetlands, estuaries and other natural bodies of standing water.

		ſ	,
1	We simply believe that without a buffer	1	With the cost of public water service added,
2	regulation, you're not going to be able to protect water	2	the average total household water costs constitute 4.6
3	from sediment, the toxics that are attached to that	3	percent of the median household income, more than three
4	sediment. We think this requirement is essential.	4	times the affordable threshold for drinking water
5	Let me basically end and I think I'm well	5	recommended by the U.S. EPA.
6	within my time so I'll do kind of what Mr. Merkley	6	I'll para take another quote:
7	said - not that it will happen - but that's that I will	7	Currently, 100 projects this is within that
8	reserve time for after everyone has gone, to make	8	region to address nitrate contamination in community
9	remarks. That's what he asked for. If I have some time,	9	water systems are on the CDPH waiting list, with a total
10	I'll do the same thing.	10	cost of \$150 million, and an average project cost of just
11	CHAIR YOUNG: We're not going to have time	11	over one million.
12	today for that.	12	These are costs that that the discharger is
13	MR. SHIMEK: I	13	not having to bear. Other people that cannot afford it
14	CHAIR YOUNG: So	14	are having to bear these costs. There is a fundamental
15	MR. SHIMEK: agree.	15	right to clean drinking water.
16	CHAIR YOUNG: if there's anything you want	16	There is a big portion of your population, in
17	to say today, you better say it now.	17	the Central Coast, that is not realizing that fundamental
18	MR. SHIMEK: I will.	18	right.
19	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay?	19	Thank you.
20	MR. SHIMEK: Let me, basically, say that	20	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Thank you.
21	that that, you know, there's a difference of approach.	21	MR. SHIMEK: Any questions?
22	One approach is: Look, let us install some	22	CHAIR YOUNG: Any questions for Mr. Shimek?
23		23	Okay.
24	management practices. Let us go out there and do some	24	MR. SHIMEK: Come on. You asked questions of
25	good things.	25	
23	One of the things that you've heard from the Page 282	23	everybody else.  Page 284
	1490 101		
1	growers is that they need certainty.	1	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.
2	You know, frankly, I think, that regulatory	2	MR. JEFFRIES: I'll ask you one question.
3	certainty is one of the best things that you can offer	3	You had stricken out part of it and put in
4	these guys. That's my opinion.	4	eliminate
5	I know that they don't like that idea. But to	5	MR. SHIMEK: Yes.
6	have a set of baseline regulations that say here is what	6	MR. JEFFRIES: contamination. And if you
7	we're to achieve, you know, go out and do it.	7	can't achieve that elimination totally, even if you lay
8	That, to me, is your role. Your role is not to	8	the land fallow and don't farm it, and you don't still
9	protect lettuce. Your role is not to protect	9	don't achieve the elimination, what is your suggestion
10	agriculture. Your role is to protect water.	10	then?
11	And I agree that protecting agriculture is	11	MR. SHIMEK: Well, I think, first of all, part
12	important. It's a value that we all share. If that land	12	of the suggestion is in the language there. Because if
13	moves from agriculture, it could potentially be	13	it goes fallow, you're you're going to be dealing with
14	developed. That doesn't serve my conservation interest	14	legacy contaminants; right?
15	well, either. And it probably doesn't serve water	15	And it basically excludes it says, look, if
16	quality well, either.	16	you can show that it's legacy contaminants, you're out.
17	But groundwater, it's hurting people. Surface	17	You don't have to deal with it.
18	waters, it's hurting otters. It's things out in the	18	And or I'm sorry. That was probably a
19	ocean. It's certainly hurting the toxicity is hurting	19	different place.
20	the streams themselves.	20	So you do have to but let me answer it a
21	Let me just finish up by by quoting from	21	different way.
22	this study, which which is what I have copies for you.	22	I'm not a lawyer. But I believe that it is
23	And this is for the Central Valley.	23	within the law that basically says toxic discharges are
		I	
24		24	illegal, you can't do it.
24	But it says and it's peer reviewed. Both	24 25	illegal, you can't do it. So I think we have to find a middle ground. I
		l	illegal, you can't do it.  So I think we have to find a middle ground. I  Page 285

1	think the goal that we are setting for this five-year	1	below the root zone, I can't grow strawberries. That's
2	period is to eliminate toxic discharges.	2	what he said.
3	I don't think we will achieve that every place	3	Flush salts. That's a discharge.
4	along the Central Coast. The goal for that goal of	4	Now, I'm not saying that we need to send
5	eliminating toxic discharges is fundamentally different	5	everybody to jail. I'm simply saying that I think that
6	from the other goals of reduce and minimize.	6	that the list of high risk is appropriate right now.
7	MR. JEFFRIES: Well, I think the strawberry	7	And I think that there's abil the ability for,
8	people were pointing out that with their use, they	8	especially in an industry as progressive as the
9	wouldn't be adding to or causing the problem and so,	9	Strawberry Commission, to prove their way out of Tier 3.
10	consequently, they shouldn't be totally responsible for	10	And I hope they have take that opportunity
11	what's there.	11	and will do just that.
12	MR. SHIMEK: I I	12	•
13			MR. JEFFRIES: Well, I got you one question,
14	MR. JEFFRIES: And and just to follow that	13	anyway.
	up		CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.
15	MR. SHIMEK: I'm sorry.	15	MR. SHIMEK: All right.
16	MR. JEFFRIES: it it and I know	16	CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you very much.
17	somebody said it's going to take a hundred years to	17	MR. SHIMEK: The drinking water stuff is
18	probably achieve everything that we'd like to achieve.	18	this is also the letter that that you received from
19	It probably took us 150 years to get to this	19	California Department of Public Health.
20	point in time today	20	I think that reinforces the importance of
21	MR. SHIMEK: Right.	21	dealing with something about nitrates.
22	MR. JEFFRIES: - with the problem.	22	Thank you so much.
23	So it's obvious that we can't sure all this	23	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Is Ms. McCarthy here? She
24	overnight. And it's going to take a long period of time.	24	leave already? Mibs McCarthy (phonetic). Okay. All
25	It may not take it may take more than five years. It	25	right.
	Page 286		Page 288
1		1	MP PRIORE OF CO. 11 I
1	may take more than 10 years. It may take more than 50	1	MR. BRIGGS: Okay. So want to keep going on
2	years.	2	with our list of
3	I don't know. I'm not a scientist.	3	CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah. Next would be the
4	MR. SHIMEK: So, I guess I would I would	4	Environmental Justice Coalition for Coalition for
5	just answer that in two ways.	5	Water.
6	First of all, I think, that you we need to	6	(Off the record)
7	parse out the difference between toxicity and nutrients.	7	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.
8	Toxicity, you're talking about half-lives of	8	MS. BHATNAGAR: A lot of people that came with
9	the current pesticides in use being weeks and months.	9	me, have left. They were not able to stay the whole day.
10	Certainly, they can adhere to sediments and last a little	10	Unfortunately, they have been here since 8:15,
11	bit longer. But we're not talking years.	11	as, of course, a lot of other people have.
12	And, with nitrates, it's a much literally	12	But I will try my best to represent their
13	deeper problem. And will be with us for a long time.	13	comments, and the people that are remaining will try
14	I don't I think the growers would say, the	14	their best to do so, as well.
15	toxicity is a much easier problem to deal with.	15	Thank you for this opportunity to speak.
16	The second place, that I would say as far as	16	My name is Dipti Bhatnagar. I work with the
17	the Strawberry Commission goes, is, if you recall, at the	17	Environmental Justice Coalition for Water. And, I wanted
18	meeting in this room the last time we had when we	18	to stand up here and speak because the energy, I thought,
19	had the public meeting, you had one of the larger	19	was going a little low. And I I have a colleague to
20	strawberry growers in the region stand up and say and	20	help change slides. I hope that's okay.
21	this is where the the question from Ms. Hunter is very	21	CHAIR YOUNG: Yes.
22	appropriate - what happens during not during the	22	MS. BHATNAGAR: Next, please.
~ ~			mo, briathadan, mext, picase.
23		23	The Environmental Justice Coalities for Water
23	growing season, but in between?	23	The Environmental Justice Coalition for Water
24	growing season, but in between?  And he stood up here and said: If I don't have	24	is a statewide coalition of more than 80 groups. Which
	growing season, but in between?		

1 community-based organizations, as well as Native American 1 to clean up nitrate contamination before providing it to 2 2 tribes. cities. 3 3 And our mandate is to focus on water justice Really, what I am here to focus on is the 4 4 statewide. And that looks like different things in smaller systems. And there are thousands of such small 5 different places. And it has become really clear to you, 5 systems in the Central Coast region. And these are the 6 6 I'm sure, that in the Central Coast of California, water ones that are most vulnerable. 7 7 justice has to do with drinking water contamination Next, please. 8 8 issues. So we made a public records request to Monterey 9 9 County Environmental Health, just as a -- just as an So that's what we've been focusing on in this 10 10 example. And we didn't look at 10-year-old data or region. 11 11 Next, please. 20-year-old data. We looked at their latest data source, 12 We convened a -- a -- a water and climate 12 which was 2009 to 2010. 13 13 justice, convening in Oakland last week. And one of the And we looked at their data for nitrate 14 14 conclusions that the group came to was that irrigated contamination for all the wells that they sampled in this 15 agriculture in California uses 80 percent of California's 15 particular year. We made a public records request, and 16 developed water, which means, it's a very significant 16 then we also found out the information is available on 17 17 greenhouse gas polluter, as well. the web site. So that link is up for anyone to see. 18 The reason that I'm bringing this up and the 18 They found 83 water systems with nitrates that 19 reason that I'm in the room today is that I care very 19 were over 45 milligrams per liter. 20 20 much about agriculture in the Central Coast and in the Next, please. 21 rest of California. 21 But I wanted to point out two additional facts 22 And I'm here because I want it to stay and I 22 about the data. One of those is up on your screen right 23 23 want it to become sustainable. And part of how it will now. And I want you to see the scale of the problem. 24 24 become sustainable is what I'm going to talk about next. So the red bars represent 83 different water 25 But I wanted to set that up, that it's not just the water 25 systems. And the 23 in the first bar are actually in Page 290 Page 292 1 quality issues, it's also irrigated ag, as a whole, 1 addition. They are 40 to 45, 45hich means, they're also 2 that's very unsustainable currently. 2 very close to the limit. 3 Next, please. 3 And I want you to see that this goes all the 4 This has been talked about before, but I wanted 4 way till 300-plus. This is the extent of the problem 5 5 to reiterate it because these are the people that I that we were talking about a little while ago. 6 represent and it's my responsibility to bring up that 6 Next, please. 7 these are real impacts happening to real people. 7 And this is the other thing I wanted you to 8 8 And the last line of this statement is the -focus on. It's a scatter plot looking at how many 9 9 is what I wanted to focus your attention on; that the connections were -- was that particular well feeding 10 disproportionate burden of nitrate-contaminated water is 10 versus the nitrate contamination. 11 11 falling on the most vulnerable; the babies, the infants As you can see, the most severe nitrate 12 12 contamination is in the wells with the least amount of and the elderly. 13 And it is very much an issue that needs to be 13 connections. Which means that it's -- as I was saying 14 addressed. 14 earlier -- it's the small systems that are being very 15 15 Next, please. negatively impacted. 16 16 And I wanted to focus -- so there's been a lot And the cost of treating every single 17 17 of conversation, I know, about well data and all of that individual, small system, as you can imagine, would be 18 other stuff. There's been some kind of -- some efforts 18 very high. And I'll come to that in a second. 19 19 to raise confusion. But I don't think there is Next, please. 20 confusion. 20 So this is it. How do small communities get 21 21 I think that the nitrate contamination problem clean water? We don't have a lifeline water rate in 22 and its effects on people is very clear. And I wanted to 22 California. And you've heard people come up here and 23 23 follow up on something that Angela said, which is that, talk to you about either drinking contaminated water, 24 24 even if the date that we're looking at is public supply paying a whole lot for replacement water or -- what was 25 25 wells, which cost a lot of money to drill really deep and the third thing? -- paying very high water rates.

Page 291

And you'll hear, hopefully, testimony on all
three of those today.
And I wanted to bring up one fact, which is not
in the slides. Because I also just received this

in the slides. Because I also just received this information. It's an extension of the report that Steve Shimek just showed to you, which was for the Central Valley.

But I had the Pacific Institute look at the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, and see how many applications were pending for nitrate cleanup drinking water projects for the Central Coast region. And that number is 61.4 million.

These are just the people who have applied. And we use the Clean Water State Revolving Fund quite a bit. If we encounter a small community that does not have a safe drinking water source, we would try and apply to that fund.

So, actually, it's very interesting the point that -- that got brought up earlier -- Dr. Hunter brought it up - about acting at the local level. And we have this phrase, think global, act local, which means, keep your think -- encompass everything while you're thinking about the problem and then you act locally on it.

So we are acting locally with small communities that don't have clean drinking water right now. Because

Page 294

with ag representatives about it. And I have been told that we cannot meet water quality standards.

Hence, there are -- there are no water quality standards in the plan because we cannot meet them. Which -- which tells me, when I think about eyes on the prize: What is the ultimate reason why we're here in this room?

We want to clean up water. We want to have acceptable water quality standards and for the water to meet it.

And if I'm being told that we cannot meet it, hence, there are no water quality standards, it is not acceptable to me, which is why I do not support that draft at all and I do not support the process that has been outlined here, because it does not have that element of groundwater monitoring and then following up to see how to improve that data that has been received.

And I wanted to take it a little bit broader to what's going on at the state level. Because we're a statewide organization, we have those perspectives, we are working in different regions on the same irrigated lands issues.

The human right to water bill has been filed in the legislature. And it's actually a package of bills that works to ensure water justice.

And one of my colleagues from the Central

Page 296

we think that's unpardonable.

At the same time, I'm here to tell you that this is what it costs. Right now, the applications pending with the Clean Water State Revolving Fund for nitrate-contaminated water in the Central Coast is 61.4 million.

So when we are talking about undue financial burden, I think that would count at undue financial burden to the state and to everyone of the state, as well.

Next, please.

So I wanted to address which draft provides true environmental justice. Which means, which draft will be truly protective of groundwater quality and of the people that depend on it.

We truly support the February 2010 draft as the most protective of groundwater and surface water quality. And there have been many rollbacks since last year's draft.

But we do still support the March 2011 draft, but with the required revisions that you heard Steve Shimek just talk about. We are signed on to that letter as well. And we support those -- we support the March 2011 draft with those required revisions.

The ag alternative. I have had conversations  ${\tt Page} \ \ {\tt 295}$ 

Valley said that declaring a human right to water is one thing; figuring out -- figuring out how to guarantee access to it is essential. And I think that's where this board comes in.

Next, please.

And the reason I bring this up, is that I feel what's happening -- this -- this process that's being undertaken by the regional board is very much in line with this positive water policy that's being worked at at the state level, and including elements of environmental justice.

This is happening at the state level. So the fact that it's happening in your ag order process is very important.

And I want to say that your task is very difficult. As we've heard in the room today, there's been tons of heartbreaking testimony. There's been tons of very angry, very difficult testimony. And I -- I -- I know that your task is very difficult and very politically charged, not to mention.

But it's really commendable. And I think there have been some attacks on the staff today. And I want to say that we stand with staff and we support their -- the work that they've been able to do in prioritizing human health and drinking water concerns.

1	And you are a regulatory agency. So I would	1	We are based in Ventura County but we serve the
2	really urge you to do exactly that, to regulate; and to	2	six-county Central Coast region. For us, the Central
3	regulate ag, in this case.	3	Coast region includes Ventura up through Santa Cruz
4	There are I was listening to the radio in	4	County.
5	the morning. And there are really big things happening	5	For the purposes of this presentation, I'm
6	in the world. There is earthquakes and tsunamis and	6	sharing information about the Central Coast, as you
7	nuclear threat in Japan; there is god only knows	7	identify it geographically, from Santa Barbara up through
8	what's happening in Libya. And Jean-Bertrand Aristide is	8	Santa Cruz County.
9	going home to Haiti today, which is a really big step.	9	And I want to share also, as well, that
10	And for us to have to worry about whether or	10	separately I'm a retired city council member and mayor of
11	not the water that we drink or that we feed our babies	11	a coastal community in Ventura County and served on the
12	will kill us or will impact us in the long term, I think	12	Ventura Council of Governments and was a representative
13	is is something - we deserve more than that.	13	from that body to the Southern California Association of
14	And I really urge you to accept the staff to	14	Governments.
15	the March 2011 draft with the required revisions, in the	15	So for us at CAUSE, our mission is to realize
16	interest of environmental justice and drinking water	16	social, economic and environmental justice. And these
17	protection. Thank you.	17	eight minutes will focus on that.
18		18	This board, this body is a is a public
19	CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.	19	•
20	Any board questions?	20	board. And, as such, its constituents, per se, are the
21	Okay. Thank you very much.	21	public. And we spent much of today focusing on from
	Next speaker is with the Coastal Alliance. And	22	my perspective on the concerns of a hundred growers
22	then, Channelkeeper after that. And then the Central	23	that may or may not fall into Tier 3.
23	Coast Alliance versus	24	This body's constituents as, again, I see it,
24	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm with the Central		are the 1.2 million people that are in the Central Coast
25	Coast Alliance. Is there a different Coastal Alliance?  Page 298	25	Water Board region.  Page 300
	raye 230		raye 300
1	CHAIR YOUNG: It says Coastal Alliance.	1	In particular, there is the low income
2	Roger?	2	communities of color in this region. And I'm going to
3	MR. BRIGGS: There are two. Yes.	3	share some 2010 census data for the Central Coast Water
4	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.	4	Board region, with regards to water quality, agricultural
5	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's 16 minutes. I'm	5	and people.
6	asking I'm with the Coastal Alliance United for a	6	And, for me, this visual is very powerful
7	Sustainable Economy. But I don't know if somehow that	7	because it's showing what is pitted against one another,
8	got, maybe, written	8	unfortunately, and what we have to resolve.
9	MR. BRIGGS: Okay. Maybe that's a shortcut.	9	But in the middle, ultimately, it's children
10	Eight minutes.	10	and families. And more and more in our communities, it's
11	Yes. Eight. Right.	11	children, such as this little girl she's from Oaxaca;
12	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sixteen.	12	so indigenous, low-income and and people of color.
13	MR. BRIGGS: I saw right through it.	13	As has been said before, there are many issues
14		14	to address, one of which is our coastal resources. The
15	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think there's only one	15	·
16	Coastal Alliance in the room.	16	300 miles of the California coastline, covered by this
17	CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah.	17	board, accounts for about 27 percent of the total
	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is there two?		coastline.
18	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.	18	And that, too, has an impact on the economy
19	MR. BRIGGS: All right.	19	locally. And to the extent that beaches are closed or
20	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. That one.	20	that people cannot enjoy that recreation, that is an
21	MS. MORALES: Good afternoon, members of the	21	economic impact to the community, as well.
22	board.	22	So the Central Coast accounts for 8 percent of the
23	My name is Maricela Morales and I serve as	23	state's total land area, but 26 percent of the state's
24		24	crop market value - and this information came from LISC's
	deputy executive director of the Central Coast Alliance		crop market value - and this information came from USC's
25	United for a Sustainable Economy; CAUSE, for short.  Page 299	25	program for environmental and regional equity - so 26  Page 301

percent of the state's crop market value.

Nevertheless, we see food justice. So access to these foods is no -- no more difficult or easier in the Central Coast than it is for other parts of California.

So these very same communities that are low income, many of them farmworker families concentrated in the Central Coast, who are working these fields, are not having access to the very fruits and vegetables that they're growing, for -- for health.

And, yet again, there is a large percentage of the wealth, in terms of crop market value, in this region.

So on top of not having access to the very fruits of their labor, literally, they are pressed with the environmental concerns that then become very personal, physical health concerns for them, including pregnant women; and that being pesticides.

And we've talked about the impacts of pesticides to waters. But I want to point out that these communities are facing not only that, but on top of that the exposure directly when they are working in the fields; the majority, 86 percent, being Latino.

So, I'll read just some of these. These are directly from the report. It's a -- it's a litany. And

it's only part of the litany of the impacts.

-- Central Coast is now 47.8 percent people of color. And that includes Latino, Black, Asian Pacific Islander and Native American; do almost half, one out of two.

But if we look at the communities in which the concentrated contamination is, they are over-represented by people of color; 69 percent in Hollister, and in the Salinas Valley, the community of Chualar, which I've heard since 2001 has had difficulties with health -- quality water - almost 100 percent people of color; Gonzales, 91 percent; Santa Maria, 76 percent; Salinas, 83 percent. Salinas is, by far, the largest city in the region; 150,000 people. The next largest city is 100,000, and that's Santa Maria.

So, by far, the people impacted are the poorest, and people of color.

Median income. Central Coast it ranges
anywhere from 58,000 to 66,000. Nevertheless, again,
poverty in -- concentrated in these areas, you know, as
low as 41,000. That's 20,000 -- 25,000 actually -- less
than the -- the high median income.

Big, big differences. And these are the very communities that are having to pay out of pocket or the municipalities, where they are concentrated in, having to pay, somehow find the revenue in order to cover the costs.

Page 304

Page 302

The concentration in the Salinas Valley and Santa Maria, in the Hollister groundwater basin, the California Department of Public Health has identified over half of the drinking water supplies there is vulnerable to -- because of discharges from agriculture-related activities; the costs of groundwater pollution, as has been stated before. The excessive concentrations of nitrate or nitrite in drinking water being hazardous to human health.

Moreso -- these are more statistics from the report - 82 percent of the worst water quality sites are in the Salinas and Santa Maria areas.

So that gets us to the concentrated poverty, so the people that are dealing with these problems.

In this community, there has been prosperity for some. But the lowest income workers -- and, again, the farmworkers would fall into this -- have seen losses in -- in income, while the wealthiest in the region have seen gains.

And while I understand that growers have a short -- or a small profit margin, I doubt that they're in the lowest 10 percentile. And that's where these families are at.

So this community -- this is 2010 census data  ${\tt Page \ 303}$ 

The point being that we continually hear from the industry: Where is the money?

And yet, you know, we haven't seen here today that the people have had the money to -- to pay for studies from universities, to pay for attorneys, to pay for independent scientists to come here, because these folks don't have the money to do that. They don't have the money to defend themselves. And that's why we're here today.

So to end, echoing what has been said by the Monterey Coastkeeper Coalition, as well as the Environmental Justice Coalition, we -- our first choice is the February 2010. But if -- if not that, then the current version, with the modifications communicated by the Mon -- Monterey Coastkeeper.

One recommendation. You know, little has been said about small farms. But in speaking with Dr. Steven Gliessman, the chair of agroecology at U.C. Santa Cruz, he saw a need to further actually look at the impacts to small, sustainable farms.

And so, that would be a recommendation.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.

MR. JEFFRIES: Mr. Chair, can I ask her where

she got her data from?

1	MS. MORALES: Yes. Which which data was	1	director with Santa Barbara Channelkeeper.
2	that?	2	I run our water quality monitoring programs.
3	MR. JEFFRIES: Well, you gave percentages of	3	We've been doing watershed monitoring in our area since
4	cities. Then you gave this is the median income.	4	2001. I'm quite familiar with water quality issues in
5	Where did you get that information?	5	our area.
6	MS. MORALES: Yes. So this is from the U.S.	6	I also served as a member on the stakeholder
7	census for the larger communities. But communities that	7	panel that met from December 2008 to September 2009. And
8	are either under 20,000 or under 50,000, you have to go	8	I followed this issue closely throughout this entire
9	to the American Community Survey, ACS, data.	9	process and throughout the multiple drafts and revisions
10	And that's a survey that's done either every	10	that have been made.
11	three years for the cities over 20,000 or every five	11	Because of these experiences, I feel as though
12	years for communities under 20,000.	12	I have earned some perspective, that I want to offer
13	MR. JEFFRIES: So was this taken off the 2000	13	today. I think it's important to consider perspective,
14	census, or the 2010 census?	14	given some of the reoccurring themes that I keep hearing
15	MS. MORALES: For actually, for what is	15	from the agricultural community, who has been largely
16	available for the larger communities is 2008 data.	16	opposed to this process.
17	Again, what is available for smaller	17	And one of those themes what what I keep
18	communities, it's the American Community Survey, which is	18	hearing is that the agricultural community has not
19	done it's a survey that's done either on a three-year	19	been represented and that their concerns have not been
20		20	·
21	basis or on a five-year basis.  So that's that's most current information	21	considered by staff or incorporated into the order.  Now, what I want to do with my time here, is
22		22	•
	available.	23	just briefly do some comparisons of early versions of the
23	MR. JEFFRIES: That's so Salinas on this is		order and the current draft and give some examples of
24	the only one that meets the large city? It's the only	24	what the latest draft will actually mean for growers in
25	one that's over a hundred thousand.  Page 306	25	my area.  Page 308
	raye 300		raye 300
1	MS. MORALES: Right.	1	And when we do this, what I'm I'm hoping
2	Well, let's see. Yes. Yes.	2	that this will help some people realize just far how
3	Santa Maria might have fallen into into	3	far we have actually come since that first draft and, for
4	that. They're at about a hundred thousand right now.	4	better or worse, how much the agricultural community's
5	But most most of the Salinas Valley, with	5	input actually has been incorporated.
6	the exception of Salinas, that information came from ACS	6	And I think what you'll see is that this draft
7	data.	7	proposed today is is very far from the broad brush
8	MR. JEFFRIES: And your previous slide to this	8	stroke set of regulations that the ag community has
9	one, where does that data come from?	9	has voiced concern about.
10	MS. MORALES: That that comes from 2010	10	And, in fact, the reality is that the latest
11	census data.	11	draft will likely not pose any significant additional
12	MR. JEFFRIES: 2010.	12	requirements on growers in my area at all and, in some
13	MS. MORALES: Yes.	13	cases, might even make things less stringent.
14	CHAIR YOUNG: Any board comments or questions?	14	So my area my work covers the watersheds
15	MR. JEFFRIES: Thank you.	15	from Point Concepcion east to for this region's sake
16	CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you very much for your	16	Rincon Creek or the edge of Santa Barbara County. We
17		17	do some work in the Ventura River, but that's the L.A.
18	comments.	18	
	Okay. Channelkeeper.		region.
19	So, folks, this is our last, kind of, group	19	We cover the frontal rain. So these are the
20	presentation, if you want to call it that, or extended	20	coastal streams that drain to the Pacific, not the Santa
21	presentation. And then, we'll talk about how to divvy up	21	Ynez River. There are many more streams than are
22	the rest of our time with whatever's left.	22	actually shown here on this map. But it gives you a
23	MR. PITTERLE: Okay.	23	sense of of the area.
24	Thank you and good afternoon.	24	And we do have significant agriculture.
25	I'm Ben Pitterle. I'm the watershed programs	25	Primarily, in the Goleta and Carpenteria vallies.
1 - 3	Page 307		Page 309

So let's talk about the tiering system we're all familiar with by now. There are three tiers. Now, a useful comparison that's been made by staff and others is how the tier system compares to the existing 2004 order.

Tier 1 is less stringent. Tier 2 is about the same, and we can expect that Tier 3 growers will likely have more requirements than -- than they do today.

Now, back in February, we didn't have such a thing as a Tier 1 category. But there was something called low risk. And I want to look closely at what it took to get into that low risk category.

Growers A had to eliminate all tailwater. B they had to be more than a thousand feet from any impaired surface waterbody.

So today, Tier 1 -- it's actually much easier to get into Tier 1 today. Growers do not need to eliminate all of the - their tailwater. They can't use chlorpyrifos or diazinon. They have to be more than a thousand feet from these specific types of impairments.

And if they grow high nitrate risk crops, then they have to be less than a thousand acres and more than a thousand feet from a public supply well.

This is important. Tier 1 is less stringent than the existing 2004 order primarily because they won't be required to submit annual compliance forms.

Page 310

and say that these things actually aren't agri -- agricultural contaminants. But that actually just isn't true.

We know salts can be. And the fact is, that un -- uncomposted or -- or partially composted cow manure is a source of fecal bacteria. And studies have shown that pathogenic organisms can persist for long periods of time, up to almost a year, even in properly composted manure.

Okay. I'm really not here to argue whether or not these specific impairments are caused by ag or not. And -- and I will give them this, that where there's smoke does not necessarily mean that there's fire.

But it doesn't mean that there, necessarily, isn't. Okay? And if this -- you wouldn't simply ignore a smoke alarm if it went -- if it went off in your house.

And if you look at this map, you look where our monitoring site's located, and you look at the condition of this stream, are we really prepared to put this type of operation in Tier 1? And are we really ready to do that without considering, in fact, a single thing about what actual practices are occurring?

All that we're considering, all that we know, is that they're not using two specific pesticides.

Please keep in mind, that this isn't a

Page 312

Now, I want to give you an example of what this could mean for a -- our area. So this is San Jose Creek. This is an aerial photo, and you can see there, that yellow tack represents one of our monitoring sites.

You can see from this photo, there's really not a whole lot in the way of development upstream of that monitoring site.

If you zoom in a little closely, you see there is some development, and it's pretty much, entirely agricultural development. And it's highlighted here in orange.

Now, these operations are not high-risk crops. They are not within a thousand feet of a nutrient, sediment, pesticide, toxicity or turbidity-impaired water.

And the first thing I would expect a grower to do, is if they're using chlorpyrifos or diazinon, they're probably going to switch to effectively put themselves into Tier 1.

Now, San Jose Creek isn't listed for those specific impairments. But it is listed for many water quality impairments. And you can see what they are here. They're -- they're displayed.

And I know that there are probably several people in this room that will immediately start arguing

discussion about requiring more of this operation. What we're actually talking about is putting them in a category where there will be less required. And, frankly, we think that's extremely generous to the agricultural community.

And, in fact, we think it's neither wise or appropriate. We think Tier 1 should be reserved for sustainability in practice certified or other certified programs approved by the executive officer or, at a minimum, require elimination of tailwater.

And I want to run, quickly, through some of the other requirements. So individual discharge monitoring. In February, all dischargers were going to be required to do discharge monitoring. Today, it's reserved only for Tier 3 growers.

Milestones. Back in February, all dischargers were required to eliminate discharges to any waterbody from toxicity, sediment, turbidity, nutrients and salts.

Today, only Tier 3 dischargers are actually required to demonstrate reduction through actual monitoring, and the percentage of production has been reduced from all to 75 percent for turbidity and sediment and 50 percent for nutrient loads.

Nutrient and irrigation management. Back in February, all dischargers through any waterbody were Page 313

1 required to include very specific irrigation and nutrient 1 each grower along these toxic streams will simply switch 2 2 management information in the farm plan. pesticides to avoid additional regulation. 3 3 Today --They will not use chlorpyrifos or diazinon. 4 4 (Reporter clarification) And, as a result, we will have no individual discharge 5 MR. PITTERLE: I'm sorry. I'm trying to -- I'm 5 monitoring requirements in our area. 6 6 trying to get through my presentation. Now, will this solve the toxicity problem in 7 7 Well, today, only Tier 3 dischargers are our area? Probably not. And we think this is another 8 8 actually required to submit nutrient -- irrigation and huge gap. And to fill this gap, in addition to the 9 9 language that was presented earlier by Monterey nutrient management plans. 10 10 Coastkeeper, we feel as though pyrethroid pesticides, at It's -- it's apparent that Tier 3 is very 11 11 important in this order. So I want to look closely to a minimum, should be added to the Tier 3 criteria. 12 what it actually takes to get into Tier 3. 12 So ag's own CMP study found that pyrethroid 13 13 We're familiar, at this point, I think, with pesticides were the most prevalent and severe sources of 14 14 toxic -- of toxicity to sediments in the region. the -- the two things that will get you there. First, 15 the growers who grow high nitrogen-risk crops and are 15 So why would you link Tier 3 requirements 16 greater than a thousand acres in operation size. 16 solely to two other pesticides? We don't know why, 17 17 Or, B, they apply chlorpyrifos and diazinon, because it really doesn't make sense. and they discharge to a 303(d) waterbody listed for 18 18 Finally, I want to speak quickly about riparian toxicity or pesticides. 19 19 buffers. 20 20 In February, all growers were going to be So I want -- I'd like to look at one more --21 21 required to have 50-foot buffers, minimum. another example. 22 This is a list of waterbodies in our area that 22 Today, only growers adjacent to sediment 23 23 are officially impaired by either nutrients -- and turbidity temperature-impaired waterbodies must develop a 24 24 water quality buffer plan. That's not the same thing as they're shown there on the left -- or pesticides or 25 toxicity, shown on the right. 25 a minimum buffer. Page 314 Page 316 1 1 And now, the first thing you'd notice, if you And I should add to this -- it's not shown --2 tour our area, and that you might notice if you take a 2 but you almost must be in a Tier 3 discharger. 3 3 careful look at this background image, is that we don't So what does this mean for our area? Here's 4 have a lot of high nitrate risk crops, as defined by 4 the list of all major waterbodies in our area that have 5 staff. 5 irrigated agricultural activities, and how many of these 6 We have nutrient impairments. But most of the 6 waterbodies will be subject to the riparian buffer plan 7 ag activity in our area is actually orchards. It's --7 requirements based on today's draft. 8 8 it's citrus and avocados, and they aren't on the list. There's one. 9 9 We do have some row crops. But, again, if you So, again, this idea that the board is taking 10 look closely at this example, which has some parcel 10 broad-brush strokes that are going to significantly 11 boundaries drawn, we do not have operations anywhere near 11 affect the agricultural community at large is simply not 12 a thousand acres. 12 accurate. 13 What does that mean for Tier 3, in terms of 13 And, again, this is my -- my main point. I --14 nutrient requirements? It means we don't have any. Not 14 it isn't that I think all of these operations should be 15 a single operation will be enrolled as Tier 3 for 15 heavy -- heavily regulated. But it's that board staff 16 nutrient risk from the Gaviota Coast to Ventura County. 16 has taken great pains to incorporate the concerns of 17 17 And that means there will not be any irrigation agricultural community into this draft. 18 and nutrient management plans and no nitrogen balance 18 And, in our opinion, the proposed order swings 19 19 even too far in the oper -- in the opposite direction it ratio targets. 20 We still do have pesticides and we have 20 -- to be effective. 21 toxicity listings. So we should expect that there will 21 This draft has so many loopholes and is so 22 22 be some additional requirements. selective in how it applies its protections, that there 23 23 Except, to be honest, what I'm fully expecting will be very large areas throughout the region that will 24 24 and what I guess many people in this room, either not benefit at all from the additional accountability and

25

Page 315

25

publically or secretly, expect is that within two years,

Page 317

enforceabil -- enforceability that was intended.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

To wrap it up, this is my son Wyatt. And this is a picture of him in our backyard on Carpinteria Creek. The creek runs through our property. And we're near the bottom, near the -- near the ocean.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And you can tell from this photo that Wyatt is very concerned. You can tell by that look on his face -that's his concerned look. And he's concerned because he found out that Carpinteria Creek is polluted and he feels like he should be able to play in a creek that runs through his own backyard, on his own property, without having to worry about pollution.

And, frankly, I'm concerned, too. So are a great many other people. And we're concerned that if this process keeps dragging on - which is how it looks like it may - if it keeps going the way it's been going, pretty soon this order is going to be so watered down and it'll be so toothless, that there will essentially be no change at all.

I -- I think that's just the way ag wants it. Frankly, I'm surprised -- I've been surprised so many folks even bothered showing up today. I think they've already won, and they don't even know it.

You know, in conclusion, I -- I ask you, please consider what's been presented here, consider how far this thing has swung since February.

Page 318

meeting. And it would be sooner than the next board meeting. Now, the next board meeting would be May 5th in San Luis Obispo.

But we've spent a lot of time on this now. And I think we're hopefully beginning -- at least, the board is beginning to kind of narrow down some things in -- in its mind, as to what it would like to see addressed by -by staff.

I -- I'm thinking we should have a board 10 meeting just to deal with the balance of this -- whatever 11 we can't finish today -- sometime in April. Because 12 there's -- I don't trust that we can really finish this 13 if we, you know, attach this to another board meeting.

14 So I thought we were doing pretty good today, 15 just allocating one day for this. And look how wrong I 16 turned out to be. And we started at 8:15.

So we're going to need to think about another day, Mr. Briggs and staff, as to when we could continue this. What I would like to do is finish as much of the public comment that we can today.

And then we'll talk about how much -- how we're going to allocate that time. And I think we're going to end up completing that -- the continuation of this board meeting -- and then we'll have board deliberation and comment and recommendations.

Page 320

We don't think farmers are bad people. We really don't. We -- we do strongly disagree about what it's going to take to solve our water quality problems. And we believe our water quality problems are -- are very serious.

It's really time we move this thing along. And we hope that you'll consider incorporating our recommendations into the draft and -- and you recommend its approval.

Thank you.

CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.

Any questions for Channelkeeper?

Okay. Thank you very much.

I thought Wyatt was actually saying, hey, Dad, I'm hungry. Where -- where's the snack you promised me.

Okay. Folks, we have not enough time to give everybody three minutes. There's no question about that. We don't have enough time for that.

We don't have enough time for staff -- I mean, for the board to even kind of deliberate and decide what, if any, recommendations to give.

And so those are both two very important functions that have to get completed. I don't really want to short circuit either of them.

I am thinking that we need to continue this

Page 319

So -- and just for the public, what would then happen -- because they're -- because there would be 2 3 another board meeting after that.

So once we get staff recommendations, staff is going to need to do what it does, make changes, analyze, possibly receive more public comment on that. And then there would be another board meeting.

So that's what I'm thinking. Does that make sense, Mr. Briggs?

MR. BRIGGS: Well, it makes sense. Although, the part about additional public comments -- my understanding is that would be if there was something that was significantly outside the realm of what we've been discussing.

If it's -- if it's something within the scope of the various options and alternatives that have been already talked about and in our written materials, then that would not necessarily prompt another round of public comments.

20 CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Well, we'll see --21 MR. BRIGGS: Right. Because of the --22 CHAIR YOUNG: -- after we get through --23 MR. BRIGGS: -- because of the nature --24 CHAIR YOUNG: -- the next --25 MR. BRIGGS: And then -- and then what that Page 321

1	would also allow is in April, then, essentially, you	1	be able to come to another board meeting
2	would hope that assuming we don't have another board	2	Well, it would be in San Luis Obispo. Okay.
3	member that then the panel would be able to vote in	3	When? In April?
4	terms of bringing a recommendation to the full board.	4	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.
5	And that would be direction of staff, in terms	5	CHAIR YOUNG: You want us to pick a date now?
6	of what you want to see in that bringing that to the	6	Does that help everyone's decisionmaking?
7	full board.	7	(Multiple speakers)
8	CHAIR YOUNG: Right.	8	CHAIR YOUNG: Can't do that now?
9	MR. BRIGGS: Right. Okay.	9	MR. THOMAS: Mr. Chairman?
10	CHAIR YOUNG: So	10	
11		11	CHAIR YOUNG: Yes.
	Any board comments or suggestions? Or you	12	MR. THOMAS: One one consideration is that
12	don't like, you like, you want it different?		you instead of adding a board meeting in April, add a
13	DR. HUNTER: I agree, that there's no way to	13	day to the May meeting
14	finish today. And and to try to squeeze it into	14	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.
15	another regular board hearing, I don't think is doable	15	MR. THOMAS: in San Luis Obispo.
16	either.	16	MR. BRIGGS: May 4th, for example, 6th.
17	I agree with you completely. So we need to	17	CHAIR YOUNG: Well, May 4th is a Wednesday.
18	find another time	18	What's that? You like Friday better.
19	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.	19	MR. HODGIN: If we do it with the May board
20	DR. HUNTER: to do that between now and	20	meeting, then there won't be a chance for staff to make
21	then.	21	adjustments after the panel discusses and and makes
22	CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Hodgin, any thoughts on	22	suggestions.
23	MR. HODGIN: I'm concerned that we use as much	23	CHAIR YOUNG: Well, see
24	time as possible for those who are here that want to	24	MR. HODGIN: So we won't be able to bring
25	speak to let's let's get that on.	25	anything to the board for approval.
	Page 322		Page 324
1	And then containly welve going to have to	1	CHAID VOUNCE That's right. I mapped the May
1 2	And then, certainly, we're going to have to	1 2	CHAIR YOUNG: That's right. I mean, at the May
	have another meeting.		meeting what would happen is, we would only be able to
3	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right. Mister	3	tell staff the recommendations we think are appropriate.
4	MR. JEFFRIES: Well, I agree with that, Mr.	4	And then, they still have to come back at a
5	Chair. But I I think that another question would be,	5	later board meeting.
6	since this order is going to terminate on the end of	6	
7	March, then what happens? That hasn't been addressed		The question, really, is just: When do we have
		7	the next board meeting to finish this?
8	today.	8	the next board meeting to finish this?  Do it, like, on May 4th or 6th, or do we do it
9	today.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Briggs is going to have to	8 9	the next board meeting to finish this?  Do it, like, on May 4th or 6th, or do we do it in April?
	today.	8	the next board meeting to finish this?  Do it, like, on May 4th or 6th, or do we do it in April?  And I'd rather get this over with be just
9 10 11	today.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Briggs is going to have to	8 9	the next board meeting to finish this?  Do it, like, on May 4th or 6th, or do we do it in April?  And I'd rather get this over with be just because this is taking a lot of time. And I have a lot
9 10	today.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Briggs is going to have to deal with that in an administrative function.	8 9 10	the next board meeting to finish this?  Do it, like, on May 4th or 6th, or do we do it in April?  And I'd rather get this over with be just
9 10 11	today.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Briggs is going to have to deal with that in an administrative function.  MR. JEFFRIES: Yeah.	8 9 10 11	the next board meeting to finish this?  Do it, like, on May 4th or 6th, or do we do it in April?  And I'd rather get this over with be just because this is taking a lot of time. And I have a lot
9 10 11 12	today.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Briggs is going to have to deal with that in an administrative function.  MR. JEFFRIES: Yeah.  CHAIR YOUNG: We can't vote on it.	8 9 10 11 12	the next board meeting to finish this?  Do it, like, on May 4th or 6th, or do we do it in April?  And I'd rather get this over with be just because this is taking a lot of time. And I have a lot of thoughts in my mind right now. And now, I've got to
9 10 11 12 13	today.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Briggs is going to have to deal with that in an administrative function.  MR. JEFFRIES: Yeah.  CHAIR YOUNG: We can't vote on it.  MR. JEFFRIES: No. We can't vote on it.	8 9 10 11 12 13	the next board meeting to finish this?  Do it, like, on May 4th or 6th, or do we do it in April?  And I'd rather get this over with be just because this is taking a lot of time. And I have a lot of thoughts in my mind right now. And now, I've got to reduce it to writing.
9 10 11 12 13 14	today.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Briggs is going to have to deal with that in an administrative function.  MR. JEFFRIES: Yeah.  CHAIR YOUNG: We can't vote on it.  MR. JEFFRIES: No. We can't vote on it.  CHAIR YOUNG: It's not in our hands. No.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the next board meeting to finish this?  Do it, like, on May 4th or 6th, or do we do it in April?  And I'd rather get this over with be just because this is taking a lot of time. And I have a lot of thoughts in my mind right now. And now, I've got to reduce it to writing.  And, you know, the the immediacy of it
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	today.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Briggs is going to have to deal with that in an administrative function.  MR. JEFFRIES: Yeah.  CHAIR YOUNG: We can't vote on it.  MR. JEFFRIES: No. We can't vote on it.  CHAIR YOUNG: It's not in our hands. No.  MR. JEFFRIES: I agree.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the next board meeting to finish this?  Do it, like, on May 4th or 6th, or do we do it in April?  And I'd rather get this over with be just because this is taking a lot of time. And I have a lot of thoughts in my mind right now. And now, I've got to reduce it to writing.  And, you know, the the immediacy of it leaves a little bit. And I don't want to wait too long
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	today.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Briggs is going to have to deal with that in an administrative function.  MR. JEFFRIES: Yeah.  CHAIR YOUNG: We can't vote on it.  MR. JEFFRIES: No. We can't vote on it.  CHAIR YOUNG: It's not in our hands. No.  MR. JEFFRIES: I agree.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Briggs will have to figure out with Frances what can be done about it.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the next board meeting to finish this?  Do it, like, on May 4th or 6th, or do we do it in April?  And I'd rather get this over with be just because this is taking a lot of time. And I have a lot of thoughts in my mind right now. And now, I've got to reduce it to writing.  And, you know, the the immediacy of it leaves a little bit. And I don't want to wait too long to complete this part of it. And I want to give staff
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	today.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Briggs is going to have to deal with that in an administrative function.  MR. JEFFRIES: Yeah.  CHAIR YOUNG: We can't vote on it.  MR. JEFFRIES: No. We can't vote on it.  CHAIR YOUNG: It's not in our hands. No.  MR. JEFFRIES: I agree.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Briggs will have to figure out with Frances what can be done about it.  MR. BRIGGS: Go to the mountaintop.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the next board meeting to finish this?  Do it, like, on May 4th or 6th, or do we do it in April?  And I'd rather get this over with be just because this is taking a lot of time. And I have a lot of thoughts in my mind right now. And now, I've got to reduce it to writing.  And, you know, the the immediacy of it leaves a little bit. And I don't want to wait too long to complete this part of it. And I want to give staff direction.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	today.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Briggs is going to have to deal with that in an administrative function.  MR. JEFFRIES: Yeah.  CHAIR YOUNG: We can't vote on it.  MR. JEFFRIES: No. We can't vote on it.  CHAIR YOUNG: It's not in our hands. No.  MR. JEFFRIES: I agree.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Briggs will have to figure out with Frances what can be done about it.  MR. BRIGGS: Go to the mountaintop.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the next board meeting to finish this?  Do it, like, on May 4th or 6th, or do we do it in April?  And I'd rather get this over with be just because this is taking a lot of time. And I have a lot of thoughts in my mind right now. And now, I've got to reduce it to writing.  And, you know, the the immediacy of it leaves a little bit. And I don't want to wait too long to complete this part of it. And I want to give staff direction.  But if you if you want to back it up to the May board meeting, then just tell me.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	today.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Briggs is going to have to deal with that in an administrative function.  MR. JEFFRIES: Yeah.  CHAIR YOUNG: We can't vote on it.  MR. JEFFRIES: No. We can't vote on it.  CHAIR YOUNG: It's not in our hands. No.  MR. JEFFRIES: I agree.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Briggs will have to figure out with Frances what can be done about it.  MR. BRIGGS: Go to the mountaintop.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.  Now, here's what I'm thinking about with the	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the next board meeting to finish this?  Do it, like, on May 4th or 6th, or do we do it in April?  And I'd rather get this over with be just because this is taking a lot of time. And I have a lot of thoughts in my mind right now. And now, I've got to reduce it to writing.  And, you know, the the immediacy of it leaves a little bit. And I don't want to wait too long to complete this part of it. And I want to give staff direction.  But if you if you want to back it up to the May board meeting, then just tell me.  Mr. Hodgin?
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	today.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Briggs is going to have to deal with that in an administrative function.  MR. JEFFRIES: Yeah.  CHAIR YOUNG: We can't vote on it.  MR. JEFFRIES: No. We can't vote on it.  CHAIR YOUNG: It's not in our hands. No.  MR. JEFFRIES: I agree.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Briggs will have to figure out with Frances what can be done about it.  MR. BRIGGS: Go to the mountaintop.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.  Now, here's what I'm thinking about with the speakers. We've got how many? 70. We have 70	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the next board meeting to finish this?  Do it, like, on May 4th or 6th, or do we do it in April?  And I'd rather get this over with be just because this is taking a lot of time. And I have a lot of thoughts in my mind right now. And now, I've got to reduce it to writing.  And, you know, the the immediacy of it leaves a little bit. And I don't want to wait too long to complete this part of it. And I want to give staff direction.  But if you if you want to back it up to the May board meeting, then just tell me.  Mr. Hodgin?  MR. HODGIN: Well, I just have to comment that
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	today.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Briggs is going to have to deal with that in an administrative function.  MR. JEFFRIES: Yeah.  CHAIR YOUNG: We can't vote on it.  MR. JEFFRIES: No. We can't vote on it.  CHAIR YOUNG: It's not in our hands. No.  MR. JEFFRIES: I agree.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Briggs will have to figure out with Frances what can be done about it.  MR. BRIGGS: Go to the mountaintop.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.  Now, here's what I'm thinking about with the speakers. We've got how many? 70. We have 70 cards. I don't know how many are still here.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the next board meeting to finish this?  Do it, like, on May 4th or 6th, or do we do it in April?  And I'd rather get this over with be just because this is taking a lot of time. And I have a lot of thoughts in my mind right now. And now, I've got to reduce it to writing.  And, you know, the the immediacy of it leaves a little bit. And I don't want to wait too long to complete this part of it. And I want to give staff direction.  But if you if you want to back it up to the May board meeting, then just tell me.  Mr. Hodgin?  MR. HODGIN: Well, I just have to comment that the May board meeting is also the National Day of Prayer.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	today.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Briggs is going to have to deal with that in an administrative function.  MR. JEFFRIES: Yeah.  CHAIR YOUNG: We can't vote on it.  MR. JEFFRIES: No. We can't vote on it.  CHAIR YOUNG: It's not in our hands. No.  MR. JEFFRIES: I agree.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Briggs will have to figure out with Frances what can be done about it.  MR. BRIGGS: Go to the mountaintop.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.  Now, here's what I'm thinking about with the speakers. We've got how many? 70. We have 70 cards. I don't know how many are still here.  I would like to make this suggestion, that	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the next board meeting to finish this?  Do it, like, on May 4th or 6th, or do we do it in April?  And I'd rather get this over with be just because this is taking a lot of time. And I have a lot of thoughts in my mind right now. And now, I've got to reduce it to writing.  And, you know, the the immediacy of it leaves a little bit. And I don't want to wait too long to complete this part of it. And I want to give staff direction.  But if you if you want to back it up to the May board meeting, then just tell me.  Mr. Hodgin?  MR. HODGIN: Well, I just have to comment that the May board meeting is also the National Day of Prayer. That that may
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	today.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Briggs is going to have to deal with that in an administrative function.  MR. JEFFRIES: Yeah.  CHAIR YOUNG: We can't vote on it.  MR. JEFFRIES: No. We can't vote on it.  CHAIR YOUNG: It's not in our hands. No.  MR. JEFFRIES: I agree.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Briggs will have to figure out with Frances what can be done about it.  MR. BRIGGS: Go to the mountaintop.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.  Now, here's what I'm thinking about with the speakers. We've got how many? 70. We have 70 cards. I don't know how many are still here.  I would like to make this suggestion, that those of you that cannot make a continuation of this,	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the next board meeting to finish this?  Do it, like, on May 4th or 6th, or do we do it in April?  And I'd rather get this over with be just because this is taking a lot of time. And I have a lot of thoughts in my mind right now. And now, I've got to reduce it to writing.  And, you know, the the immediacy of it leaves a little bit. And I don't want to wait too long to complete this part of it. And I want to give staff direction.  But if you if you want to back it up to the May board meeting, then just tell me.  Mr. Hodgin?  MR. HODGIN: Well, I just have to comment that the May board meeting is also the National Day of Prayer. That that may  CHAIR YOUNG: Maybe we can do that instead.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	today.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Briggs is going to have to deal with that in an administrative function.  MR. JEFFRIES: Yeah.  CHAIR YOUNG: We can't vote on it.  MR. JEFFRIES: No. We can't vote on it.  CHAIR YOUNG: It's not in our hands. No.  MR. JEFFRIES: I agree.  CHAIR YOUNG: Mr. Briggs will have to figure out with Frances what can be done about it.  MR. BRIGGS: Go to the mountaintop.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.  Now, here's what I'm thinking about with the speakers. We've got how many? 70. We have 70 cards. I don't know how many are still here.  I would like to make this suggestion, that	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the next board meeting to finish this?  Do it, like, on May 4th or 6th, or do we do it in April?  And I'd rather get this over with be just because this is taking a lot of time. And I have a lot of thoughts in my mind right now. And now, I've got to reduce it to writing.  And, you know, the the immediacy of it leaves a little bit. And I don't want to wait too long to complete this part of it. And I want to give staff direction.  But if you if you want to back it up to the May board meeting, then just tell me.  Mr. Hodgin?  MR. HODGIN: Well, I just have to comment that the May board meeting is also the National Day of Prayer. That that may

1	hotwoon now and then anyway	1	make this fair
1 2	between now and then, anyway.	1 2	make this fair.
3	MR. BRIGGS: It's also Cinco de Mayo. So we've	3	So who can't make San Luis Obispo?
	got to have a party.		Okay. Good.
4	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. So I need some help, you	4	So let me and you've all submitted cards to
5	guys. And it's the board that's going to, kind of,	5	me? So I have cards? Okay.
6	decide this, somewhat.	6	So let's do this.
7	You guys want to do it in April. April? Can	7	MR. BRIGGS: I'm sure have them
8	we can we find a date, Roger, and	8	CHAIR YOUNG: Line up.
9	MR. BRIGGS: I don't think we can do that right	9	MR. BRIGGS: have about five line up and
10	now.	10	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.
11	CHAIR YOUNG: Can't do that right now?	11	MR. BRIGGS: say their name, and we'll pull
12	MR. JEFFRIES: For a continuance?	12	them out.
13	CHAIR YOUNG: Well	13	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. So let's do that.
14	Yeah. I think they're trying to	14	What I'd like to do - we'll we'll try this.
15	MR. BRIGGS: Why don't we go go ahead with	15	You'll get I think we can do three minutes
16	comments.	16	each; on the hands that I saw.
17	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.	17	So if people could line up and I'm not going
18	MR. BRIGGS: So we	18	to call names. I'm just going to let you come up, just
19	CHAIR YOUNG: Well, okay.	19	five at a time, and when there's five and you can line
20	MR. JEFFRIES: And how much time do we have	20	up all the way to the back, if you want. But however
21	left?	21	you want to do it, and that'll expedite this.
22	CHAIR YOUNG: How how about it it can	22	MR. BRIGGS: What we'll do is we'll just write
23	we say that we can do this either the week of April 18th	23	we'll write their names down. We can't we can't
24	or 25th?	24	sift through these every time.
25	Can we find a day to do this during the weeks	25	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.
	Page 326		Page 328
1	of April 18th or April 25th? Can't do those two weeks?	1	MR. BRIGGS: So we'll just write their names
1 2	of April 18th or April 25th? Can't do those two weeks? You're out of town.	1 2	MR. BRIGGS: So we'll just write their names down.
			down. CHAIR YOUNG: All right.
2 3 4	You're out of town.  MR. BRIGGS: The difficulty with trying to do it now is we have to	2 3 4	down.  CHAIR YOUNG: All right.  MR. JEFFRIES: Bob, that's the quickest I've
2	You're out of town.  MR. BRIGGS: The difficulty with trying to do	2	down.  CHAIR YOUNG: All right.  MR. JEFFRIES: Bob, that's the quickest I've seen you move in a long time.
2 3 4	You're out of town.  MR. BRIGGS: The difficulty with trying to do it now is we have to  CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah.  MR. BRIGGS: compare a lot of schedules.	2 3 4 5 6	down.  CHAIR YOUNG: All right.  MR. JEFFRIES: Bob, that's the quickest I've seen you move in a long time.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.
2 3 4 5	You're out of town.  MR. BRIGGS: The difficulty with trying to do it now is we have to  CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah.	2 3 4 5	down.  CHAIR YOUNG: All right.  MR. JEFFRIES: Bob, that's the quickest I've seen you move in a long time.
2 3 4 5 6	You're out of town.  MR. BRIGGS: The difficulty with trying to do it now is we have to  CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah.  MR. BRIGGS: compare a lot of schedules.	2 3 4 5 6	down.  CHAIR YOUNG: All right.  MR. JEFFRIES: Bob, that's the quickest I've seen you move in a long time.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7	You're out of town.  MR. BRIGGS: The difficulty with trying to do it now is we have to  CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah.  MR. BRIGGS: compare a lot of schedules.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	down.  CHAIR YOUNG: All right.  MR. JEFFRIES: Bob, that's the quickest I've seen you move in a long time.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.  MR. MARTIN: Thank you very much. I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	You're out of town.  MR. BRIGGS: The difficulty with trying to do it now is we have to  CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah.  MR. BRIGGS: compare a lot of schedules.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.  So that's not going to work.  So it will be in San Luis Obispo. That's all I can tell you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	down.  CHAIR YOUNG: All right.  MR. JEFFRIES: Bob, that's the quickest I've seen you move in a long time.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.  MR. MARTIN: Thank you very much. I appreciate  CHAIR YOUNG: Hold hold on, one second. Okay. So what staff is going to do is write
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	You're out of town.  MR. BRIGGS: The difficulty with trying to do it now is we have to  CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah.  MR. BRIGGS: compare a lot of schedules.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.  So that's not going to work.  So it will be in San Luis Obispo. That's all I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	down.  CHAIR YOUNG: All right.  MR. JEFFRIES: Bob, that's the quickest I've seen you move in a long time.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.  MR. MARTIN: Thank you very much. I appreciate  CHAIR YOUNG: Hold hold on, one second.  Okay. So what staff is going to do is write your names down. And that's what we're going to keep
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	You're out of town.  MR. BRIGGS: The difficulty with trying to do it now is we have to  CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah.  MR. BRIGGS: compare a lot of schedules.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.  So that's not going to work.  So it will be in San Luis Obispo. That's all I can tell you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	down.  CHAIR YOUNG: All right.  MR. JEFFRIES: Bob, that's the quickest I've seen you move in a long time.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.  MR. MARTIN: Thank you very much. I appreciate  CHAIR YOUNG: Hold hold on, one second. Okay. So what staff is going to do is write
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	You're out of town.  MR. BRIGGS: The difficulty with trying to do it now is we have to  CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah.  MR. BRIGGS: compare a lot of schedules.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.  So that's not going to work.  So it will be in San Luis Obispo. That's all I can tell you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Okay. April 7th is out.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	down.  CHAIR YOUNG: All right.  MR. JEFFRIES: Bob, that's the quickest I've seen you move in a long time.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.  MR. MARTIN: Thank you very much. I appreciate  CHAIR YOUNG: Hold hold on, one second.  Okay. So what staff is going to do is write your names down. And that's what we're going to keep
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	You're out of town.  MR. BRIGGS: The difficulty with trying to do it now is we have to  CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah.  MR. BRIGGS: compare a lot of schedules.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.  So that's not going to work.  So it will be in San Luis Obispo. That's all I can tell you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Okay. April 7th is out.  But so we'll have to come back with a date,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	down.  CHAIR YOUNG: All right.  MR. JEFFRIES: Bob, that's the quickest I've seen you move in a long time.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.  MR. MARTIN: Thank you very much. I appreciate  CHAIR YOUNG: Hold hold on, one second.  Okay. So what staff is going to do is write your names down. And that's what we're going to keep track of. Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	You're out of town.  MR. BRIGGS: The difficulty with trying to do it now is we have to  CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah.  MR. BRIGGS: compare a lot of schedules.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.  So that's not going to work.  So it will be in San Luis Obispo. That's all I can tell you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Okay. April 7th is out.  But so we'll have to come back with a date, and notice it. But so let's do this:  I'd like to give people that cannot make it to San Luis Obispo and that are here as much time as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	down.  CHAIR YOUNG: All right. MR. JEFFRIES: Bob, that's the quickest I've seen you move in a long time. CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. MR. MARTIN: Thank you very much. I appreciate CHAIR YOUNG: Hold hold on, one second. Okay. So what staff is going to do is write your names down. And that's what we're going to keep track of. Okay. So the cards, I'm not going to be looking at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	You're out of town.  MR. BRIGGS: The difficulty with trying to do it now is we have to  CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah.  MR. BRIGGS: compare a lot of schedules.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.  So that's not going to work.  So it will be in San Luis Obispo. That's all I can tell you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Okay. April 7th is out.  But so we'll have to come back with a date, and notice it. But so let's do this:  I'd like to give people that cannot make it to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	down.  CHAIR YOUNG: All right.  MR. JEFFRIES: Bob, that's the quickest I've seen you move in a long time.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.  MR. MARTIN: Thank you very much. I appreciate  CHAIR YOUNG: Hold hold on, one second.  Okay. So what staff is going to do is write your names down. And that's what we're going to keep track of. Okay.  So the cards, I'm not going to be looking at now.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	You're out of town.  MR. BRIGGS: The difficulty with trying to do it now is we have to  CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah.  MR. BRIGGS: compare a lot of schedules.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.  So that's not going to work.  So it will be in San Luis Obispo. That's all I can tell you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Okay. April 7th is out.  But so we'll have to come back with a date, and notice it. But so let's do this:  I'd like to give people that cannot make it to San Luis Obispo and that are here as much time as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	down.  CHAIR YOUNG: All right.  MR. JEFFRIES: Bob, that's the quickest I've seen you move in a long time.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.  MR. MARTIN: Thank you very much. I appreciate  CHAIR YOUNG: Hold hold on, one second.  Okay. So what staff is going to do is write your names down. And that's what we're going to keep track of. Okay.  So the cards, I'm not going to be looking at now.  MR. JEFFRIES: Just give your name and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	You're out of town.  MR. BRIGGS: The difficulty with trying to do it now is we have to  CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah.  MR. BRIGGS: compare a lot of schedules.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.  So that's not going to work.  So it will be in San Luis Obispo. That's all I  can tell you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Okay. April 7th is out.  But so we'll have to come back with a date, and notice it. But so let's do this:  I'd like to give people that cannot make it to  San Luis Obispo and that are here as much time as possible. Okay? I don't know how many there are of you in that category.  So maybe you could give me a show of hands of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	down.  CHAIR YOUNG: All right.  MR. JEFFRIES: Bob, that's the quickest I've seen you move in a long time.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.  MR. MARTIN: Thank you very much. I appreciate  CHAIR YOUNG: Hold hold on, one second.  Okay. So what staff is going to do is write your names down. And that's what we're going to keep track of. Okay.  So the cards, I'm not going to be looking at now.  MR. JEFFRIES: Just give your name and  CHAIR YOUNG: Just give your name.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	You're out of town.  MR. BRIGGS: The difficulty with trying to do it now is we have to  CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah.  MR. BRIGGS: compare a lot of schedules.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.  So that's not going to work.  So it will be in San Luis Obispo. That's all I  can tell you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Okay. April 7th is out.  But so we'll have to come back with a date, and notice it. But so let's do this:  I'd like to give people that cannot make it to  San Luis Obispo and that are here as much time as possible. Okay? I don't know how many there are of you in that category.  So maybe you could give me a show of hands of those that aren't going to show up in San Luis Obispo.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	down.  CHAIR YOUNG: All right. MR. JEFFRIES: Bob, that's the quickest I've seen you move in a long time. CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. MR. MARTIN: Thank you very much. I appreciate CHAIR YOUNG: Hold hold on, one second. Okay. So what staff is going to do is write your names down. And that's what we're going to keep track of. Okay. So the cards, I'm not going to be looking at now.  MR. JEFFRIES: Just give your name and CHAIR YOUNG: Just give your name. MR. MARTIN: Yeah. CHAIR YOUNG: All right. MR. MARTIN: Thank you. My name is Bob Martin,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	You're out of town.  MR. BRIGGS: The difficulty with trying to do it now is we have to  CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah.  MR. BRIGGS: compare a lot of schedules.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.  So that's not going to work.  So it will be in San Luis Obispo. That's all I  can tell you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Okay. April 7th is out.  But so we'll have to come back with a date, and notice it. But so let's do this:  I'd like to give people that cannot make it to  San Luis Obispo and that are here as much time as possible. Okay? I don't know how many there are of you in that category.  So maybe you could give me a show of hands of those that aren't going to show up in San Luis Obispo.  And, let me just say this, we're I'm going	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	down.  CHAIR YOUNG: All right.  MR. JEFFRIES: Bob, that's the quickest I've seen you move in a long time.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.  MR. MARTIN: Thank you very much. I appreciate  CHAIR YOUNG: Hold hold on, one second.  Okay. So what staff is going to do is write your names down. And that's what we're going to keep track of. Okay.  So the cards, I'm not going to be looking at now.  MR. JEFFRIES: Just give your name and  CHAIR YOUNG: Just give your name.  MR. MARTIN: Yeah.  CHAIR YOUNG: All right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	You're out of town.  MR. BRIGGS: The difficulty with trying to do it now is we have to  CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah.  MR. BRIGGS: compare a lot of schedules.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.  So that's not going to work.  So it will be in San Luis Obispo. That's all I  can tell you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Okay. April 7th is out.  But so we'll have to come back with a date, and notice it. But so let's do this:  I'd like to give people that cannot make it to  San Luis Obispo and that are here as much time as possible. Okay? I don't know how many there are of you in that category.  So maybe you could give me a show of hands of those that aren't going to show up in San Luis Obispo.  And, let me just say this, we're I'm going to keep these cards. So that, you know, if you get the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	down.  CHAIR YOUNG: All right.  MR. JEFFRIES: Bob, that's the quickest I've seen you move in a long time.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.  MR. MARTIN: Thank you very much. I appreciate  CHAIR YOUNG: Hold hold on, one second.  Okay. So what staff is going to do is write your names down. And that's what we're going to keep track of. Okay.  So the cards, I'm not going to be looking at now.  MR. JEFFRIES: Just give your name and  CHAIR YOUNG: Just give your name.  MR. MARTIN: Yeah.  CHAIR YOUNG: All right.  MR. MARTIN: Thank you. My name is Bob Martin, general manager or Rio Farms in King City.  I just wanted to comment on on some of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	You're out of town.  MR. BRIGGS: The difficulty with trying to do it now is we have to  CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah.  MR. BRIGGS: compare a lot of schedules.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.  So that's not going to work.  So it will be in San Luis Obispo. That's all I  can tell you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Okay. April 7th is out.  But so we'll have to come back with a date, and notice it. But so let's do this:  I'd like to give people that cannot make it to  San Luis Obispo and that are here as much time as possible. Okay? I don't know how many there are of you in that category.  So maybe you could give me a show of hands of those that aren't going to show up in San Luis Obispo.  And, let me just say this, we're I'm going to keep these cards. So that, you know, if you get the time to speak now, this is just a continuation of this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	down.  CHAIR YOUNG: All right.  MR. JEFFRIES: Bob, that's the quickest I've seen you move in a long time.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.  MR. MARTIN: Thank you very much. I appreciate  CHAIR YOUNG: Hold hold on, one second.  Okay. So what staff is going to do is write your names down. And that's what we're going to keep track of. Okay.  So the cards, I'm not going to be looking at now.  MR. JEFFRIES: Just give your name and  CHAIR YOUNG: Just give your name.  MR. MARTIN: Yeah.  CHAIR YOUNG: All right.  MR. MARTIN: Thank you. My name is Bob Martin, general manager or Rio Farms in King City.  I just wanted to comment on on some of the things that we've done in the past and where we're going.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	You're out of town.  MR. BRIGGS: The difficulty with trying to do it now is we have to  CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah.  MR. BRIGGS: compare a lot of schedules.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.  So that's not going to work.  So it will be in San Luis Obispo. That's all I  can tell you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Okay. April 7th is out.  But so we'll have to come back with a date, and notice it. But so let's do this:  I'd like to give people that cannot make it to  San Luis Obispo and that are here as much time as possible. Okay? I don't know how many there are of you in that category.  So maybe you could give me a show of hands of those that aren't going to show up in San Luis Obispo.  And, let me just say this, we're I'm going to keep these cards. So that, you know, if you get the time to speak now, this is just a continuation of this board meeting.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	down.  CHAIR YOUNG: All right.  MR. JEFFRIES: Bob, that's the quickest I've seen you move in a long time.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.  MR. MARTIN: Thank you very much. I appreciate  CHAIR YOUNG: Hold hold on, one second.  Okay. So what staff is going to do is write your names down. And that's what we're going to keep track of. Okay.  So the cards, I'm not going to be looking at now.  MR. JEFFRIES: Just give your name and  CHAIR YOUNG: Just give your name.  MR. MARTIN: Yeah.  CHAIR YOUNG: All right.  MR. MARTIN: Thank you. My name is Bob Martin, general manager or Rio Farms in King City.  I just wanted to comment on on some of the things that we've done in the past and where we're going.  Over the past 15 years or so, our operation,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	You're out of town.  MR. BRIGGS: The difficulty with trying to do it now is we have to  CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah.  MR. BRIGGS: compare a lot of schedules.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.  So that's not going to work.  So it will be in San Luis Obispo. That's all I  can tell you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Okay. April 7th is out.  But so we'll have to come back with a date, and notice it. But so let's do this:  I'd like to give people that cannot make it to  San Luis Obispo and that are here as much time as possible. Okay? I don't know how many there are of you in that category.  So maybe you could give me a show of hands of those that aren't going to show up in San Luis Obispo.  And, let me just say this, we're I'm going to keep these cards. So that, you know, if you get the time to speak now, this is just a continuation of this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	down.  CHAIR YOUNG: All right.  MR. JEFFRIES: Bob, that's the quickest I've seen you move in a long time.  CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.  MR. MARTIN: Thank you very much. I appreciate  CHAIR YOUNG: Hold hold on, one second.  Okay. So what staff is going to do is write your names down. And that's what we're going to keep track of. Okay.  So the cards, I'm not going to be looking at now.  MR. JEFFRIES: Just give your name and  CHAIR YOUNG: Just give your name.  MR. MARTIN: Yeah.  CHAIR YOUNG: All right.  MR. MARTIN: Thank you. My name is Bob Martin, general manager or Rio Farms in King City.  I just wanted to comment on on some of the things that we've done in the past and where we're going.

1	King City area.	1	At a recent nutrient and irrigation management
2	As technology brings us information that we can	2	seminar and this is the one, I think, staff referred
3	use to lessen negative impacts on water quality, we	3	to as all CCAs were there. No. They were all farmers.
4	listen, we learn and we improvise.	4	And there was a there was about two or three CCAs
5	The shear size of our operation allows us to	5	there - Dr. Thomas Harter, foremost authority on
6	experiment and utilize improved methods. If they've	6	groundwater in California, showed some very interesting
7	proved successful, we're not shy in in sharing these	7	slides. And one, I grasped I grabbed onto real
8	results with fellow farmers.	8	quickly.
9	I have 15 growers that are raising onions for	9	There's a graph showing nitrate changes of
10	for our company, right now. And I I share	10	shallow or young water in Monterey County.
11	everything with them.	11	Now, understand, young young water is
12	Quick nitrate soil testing has been in our	12	shallow water in sandy areas that can be reflected from
13	program for close to 15 years now. Backflow prevention	13	which you're applying, on the surface, to where you're
14	devices have been in all of our wells for as long as I	14	pumping from in a matter of a year to five years. That's
15	can remember.	15	considered young water.
16	I can't understand why our large operation is	16	It showed a marked improvement regarding
17	singled out in the draft staff's proposal, as the	17	nitrate contamination in each of these three 5-year
18	highest risk category.	18	samples taken.
19	As if that isn't bad enough, your proposal	19	What does this show?
20	doesn't allow for any possibility for operations over a	20	It was pretty obvious to me that whoever was
21	thousand acres to move into a different tier, without the	21	farming in that vicinity was was had made mark
22	exclusive written permission of your executive officer.	22	marked improvements in their fertilizer and irrigation
23	Where is the incentive for someone in Tier 3 to	23	management practices.
24	improve their impacts on surface and groundwater?	24	CHAIR YOUNG: Can you can you wrap it up,
25	I submit, that allowing for a true assessment	25	Mr. Martin.
	Page 330		Page 332
		_	
1	of an operation's impact on water quality can only be	1	MR. MARTIN: So that that's it. I I
2	made objectively by a comprehensive review process of an	2	got more.
3	audit committee offered in the ag proposal.	3	But you have the copy you have the the
4	Over the past 15 years, I have impressed upon	4	the graph from Dr. Thomas Harter. And if you need more
5	farmers the need to contain and capture their irrigation	5	information, you can probably contact him to find out
6	tailwater. This hasn't been discussed here, yet, today.	6	what it's all about.
7	In staff's proposal, all of these ponds must be	7	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.
8	lined to not allow for percolation of this tailwater back	8	Thank you for your comments
9	into the groundwater.	9	MR. MARTIN: Thank you very much.
10	Typically, these ponds will contain a fair	10	MR. HARTMAN: I'm Dick Hartman, president of
11	amount of sediment that must be cleaned out at least	11	Biosphere and Enhancement Corporation out of Portland,
12	annually. If they are lined, that doesn't allow for that	12	Oregon.
13	activity. Can't do it.	13	I have patents throughout the United through
14	First first of all, how does staff know that	14	United States patents and throughout the world regards
15	the quality of the water that what is the quality	15	clean water fertilizer additive.
16	of the water in that pond? Why are they taking for	16	I drove eleven hours to get here. This 25
17	granted that it is laden with nutrient nutrients and	17	years, this is a culmination of wanting people to want to
18	pesticides?	18	be interested in this concept.
19	Even if there are some nutrients in that water,	19	Submit, follow the money. Regards current
20	why do they believe that the same constituents and at	20	incentives to reduce the costs of government.
21	those concentrations will penetrate multiple clay	21	If I were a grower here, I think I'd say:
22	layers above deep aquifers over a period of 30 to 50	22	What? The nitrogen I paid that much money for is getting
23			
	years, to contaminate that deep groundwater?	23	on my neighbor's place? What?
24 25		23 24 25	

Page 331

they did as kids because they're concerned about don't want to lose lit—any money on it. They don't want to lose lit—any money on it. They don't want to lose that to anybody.  These—there's somewhat of a rumor that a upcoming congressman, or something, said maybe change the EPA to the EHA, the environmental help association—I mean, agency.  The 50 - NRCS 501/590 program for best manages — management programs just learned is offering \$36 per acre to any farmer who will try enhanced efficiency of fertilizers and — check strips that can be checked. Now, I submit a thought. When you monitorize the activity that this staff is going to have, all your time, all the groups here, and for the next five years — when you monitorize that, I just submit a simple thought: The Farm Bureau supported independent operation here to look over things. What if they had a small function—small portion of the money that's going to be and made an incentive to growers, to say, if you'll do a nitrogen and/or pesticide improvement tools, one of which would be ours, then you will be able to get an incentive apay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar – acre farm would be 25 gage 334  I glad to implement any modern tools that can — can take care of that. So I submit that it will only take one person about a year, with these incentives out here, to have the growers know that that's possible to implement. And that then would be accounted for easily by saying, here's the record of all the growers who have done these improvements. So Lest leve. Thank you. CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr. Hartman. CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr. Hartman. CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas. CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  The could as kids because they lead to be a ranch land in the headwaters and that is converting to row crop. And that is converting to row crop. And now there's sediment prolems canting that the increase of row crop and they have no recause. Now, It's directly related to all officials in their area, an
don't want to lose it any money on it. They don't want to lose that to anybody.  The see - there's somewhat of a rumor that a proming congressman, or somewhat of a rumor that a proming congressman, or somewhat help association I mean, agency.  The 50 - NRCS 501/590 program for best manages management programs just learned is offering \$36 per acre to any farmer who will try enhanced efficiency refitizers and check strips that can be checked. Now, I submit a thought. When you monitorize the activity that this staff is going to have, all your time, all the groups here, and for the next five years when you monitorize that, I just submit a simple thought: The Farm Bureau supported independent operation here to look over things. What if they had a small function small portion of the money that's going to be spent, in following something up as nebulous as nitrogen and made an incentive to growers, to say, if you'll do a nitrogen and/or pesticide improvement tools, one of which would be ours, then you will be able to get an incentive pay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar - acre farm would be \$36,000.  I glad to implement any modern tools that can can take a care of that.  So I submit that it will only take one person about a year, with these incentives out here, to have the growers know that thist's possible to implement. And that then would be accounted for easily by saying, here's the record of all the growers who have done these improvements.  Submit that would be cost effective and totally effective. Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr. Hartman.  MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas.  CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  2 don't want to lose the kis highly degraded by ag runoff. There used to be ranch land in the headwaters and that its converting to row crop. And with the increase of row crop and greate and greate and what thae is converting to row crop. And with the increase of row crop and there the test expendence there. The crew And the they was no recurse.  Now, it's directly rela
want to lose that to anybody.  These - there's somewhat of a rumor that a upcoming congressman, or something, said maybe change the EPA to the EHA, the environmental help association — I and that is converting to row crop.  The 50 - NRCS 501/590 program for best manages are to any farmer who will try enhanced efficiency fertilizers and — check strips that can be checked. Now, I submit a thought. When you monitorize that, I just submit a simple thought: The Farm Bureau supported independent operation here to look over things. What if they had a small function — small portion of the money that's going to be an introgen and/or pesticide improvement tools, one of which would be ours, then you will be able to get an incentive app? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar – acre farm would be \$36,000.  I think they could gladly — and they will be growers know that that's possible to implement. And that then would be accounted for easily by saying, here's the record of all the growsers who have done these improvements.  Me also want to do some creek restoration work on the — they're now crop.  And with the increase of row crop acreage, the — the — the degradation has gotten greater and greater an
These - there's somewhat of a rumor that a upcoming congressman, or something, said maybe change the EPA to the EHA, the environmental help association - I mean, agency.  The 50 - NRCS 501/590 program for best manages - management programs just learned is offering \$36 per acre to any farmer who will try enhanced efficiency fertilizers and - check strips that can be checked.  Now, I submit a thought. When you monitorize the activity that this staff is going to have, all your time, all the groups here, and for the next five years - when you monitorize that, I just submit a simple thought: The Farm Bureau supported independent operation here to look over things. What if they had a small function - small portion of the money that's going to be would be ours, then you will be able to get an incentive and amade an incentive to growers, to say, if you'll do a nitrogen and/or pesticide improvement tools, one of which would be ours, then you will be able to get an incentive and about a year, with these incentives out here, to have the growers know that that's possible to implement. And that then would be accounted for easily by saying, here's the record of all the growers who have done these improvements.  So I submit that it will only take one person about a year, with these incentives out here, to have the growers know that that's possible to implement. And that then would be accounted for easily by saying, here's the record of all the growers who have done these improvements.  Submit that would be cost effective and totally effective. Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr. Hartman.  MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas.  CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  Hartman.  CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  And whith the increased to be an interate and put trees of mor crop acreage, the the the the degradation has gotten and greate and prester and greate and prester and greate and put trees and that was once ranch range land.  So what recurse of sediment runoff from irrigated and through stormwater and irrigat
by upcoming congressman, or something, said maybe change the EPA to the EHA, the environmental help association — I mean, agency.  The 50 - NRCS 501/590 program for best manages — management programs just learned is offering \$36 per acre to any farmer who will try enhanced efficiency 10 acre to any farmer who will try enhanced efficiency 11 fertilizers and — check strips that can be checked.  Now, I submit a thought. When you monitorize 12 the activity that this staff is going to have, all your 13 time, all the groups here, and for the next five years — when you monitorize that, I just submit a simple thought: 16 The Farm Bureau supported independent operation 17 here to look over things. What if they had a small 18 function — small portion of the money that's going to be 19 spent, in following something up as nebulous as nitrogen and/or pesticide improvement tools, one of which 21 would be ours, then you will be able to get an incentive 22 apay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar – acre farm would be 23 s36,000.  1 glad to implement any modern tools that can — can take 2 care of that.  3 So I submit that it will only take one person a out a year, with these incentives out here, to have the 5 growers know that that's possible to implement. And that 6 then would be accounted for easily by saying, here's the record of all the growers who have done these improvements.  9 Submit that would be cost effective and totally effective. Thank you.  10 CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr. Hartman.  11 GHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  12 Hartman.  13 MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinass. 14 CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  14 Hartman.
6 EPA to the EHA, the environmental help association — I mean, agency. 8 The 50 ~ NRCS 501/590 program for best manages 9 — management programs just learned is offering \$36 per acre to any farmer who will try enhanced efficiency 10 acre to any farmer who will try enhanced efficiency 11 fertilizers and — check strips that can be checked. 12 Now, I submit a thought. When you monitorize 13 the activity that this staff is going to have, all your 14 time, all the groups here, and for the next five years—15 when you monitorize that, I just submit a simple thought: 15 here to look over things. What if they had a small 16 function — small portion of the money that's going to be 20 spent, in following something up as nebulous as nitrogen 21 nitrogen and/or pesticide improvement tools, one of which 22 would be ours, then you will be able to get an incentive 23 pay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar — acre farm would be 25 s 1 submit that it will only take one person 26 about a year, with these incentives out here, to have the growers know that that's possible to implement. And that then would be accounted for easily by saying, here's the record of all the growers who have done these improvements.  9 Submit that would be cost effective and totally effective. Thank you.  10 CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  11 And with the increase of row crop acreage, the — the — the degradation has gotten greater and greate And now there's sediment problems causing flooding and damage. And the — and the people I've talked to, they've talked to all damage. And then — and the people I've talked to, they've talked to all damage. And then — and they have no recourse.  12 Now, it's directly related to the sediment coming off the row crop land - irrigated row crop land that was once ranch — range land.  13 So what recourse these people have that now they're getting damage to their property and their structures because of sediment runoff from irrigated are all that was once ranch — range land.  14 So what recourse these people have that now they're gettin
7 mean, agency. 8 The 50 - NRCS 501/590 program for best manages 9 management programs just learned is offering \$36 per 10 acre to any farmer who will try enhanced efficiency 11 fertilizers and check strips that can be checked. 12 Now, I submit a thought. When you monitorize 13 the activity that this staff is going to have, all your 14 time, all the groups here, and for the next five years 15 when you monitorize that, I just submit a simple thought: 16 The Farm Bureau supported independent operation 17 here to look over things. What if they had a small 18 function small portion of the money that's going to be 19 spent, in following something up as nebulous as nitrogen 20 and made an incentive to growers, to say, if you'll do a 21 nitrogen and/or pesticide improvement tools, one of which 22 would be ours, then you will be able to get an incentive 23 pay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar - acre farm would be 24 \$36,000. 25 I think they could gladly and they will be 26 Page 334  1 glad to implement any modern tools that can can take 2 care of that. 3 So I submit that it will only take one person 4 about a year, with these incentives out here, to have the 5 growers know that that's possible to implement. And that 6 then would be accounted for easily by saying, here's the 7 record of all the growers who have done these 8 improvements. 9 Submit that would be cost effective and totally 9 effective. Thank you. 10 CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr. 11 Hartman. 12 Hartman. 13 MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas. 14 CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name? 15 when you mentative of the sediment coming of the row crop land that was once ranch range land. 16 The recourse these people have that now they're getting damage to their property and their structures because of sediment runoff from irrigated agent that was once ranch range land. 16 The recourse these people have that now they're getting damage to their property and their structures because of sediment transports all manner of other things with it. 1
The 50 - NRCS 501/590 program for best manages - management programs just learned is offering \$36 per do acre to any farmer who will try enhanced efficiency fertilizers and check strips that can be checked. Now, I submit a thought. When you monitorize the activity that this staff is going to have, all your time, all the groups here, and for the next five years when you monitorize that, I just submit a simple thought: The Farm Bureau supported independent operation here to look over things. What if they had a small function small portion of the money that's going to be spent, in following something up as nebulous as nitrogen spent, in following something up as nebulous as nitrogen and/or pesticide improvement tools, one of which would be ours, then you will be able to get an incentive would be ours, then you will be able to get an incentive gapy? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar - acre farm would be \$23 pay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar - acre farm would be \$24 \$36,000.  25 I think they could gladly and they will be  Page 334  1 glad to implement any modern tools that can can take care of that. 3 So I submit that it will only take one person 4 about a year, with these incentives out here, to have the growers know that that's possible to implement. And that then would be accounted for easily by saying, here'sh record of all the groups who have done these improvements.  Submit that would be cost effective and totally effective. Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr. Hartman.  MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas.  CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  And now there's sediment problems causing flooding and damage. And the and they all efficals in their area, and they have no recourse.  Now, It's directly talked to, they've talked to all officials in their area, and they have no recourse.  Now, It's directly talked to, they've talked to all officials in their area, and they have no recourse.  Now, It's directly talked to, the valked to lall fictals in their area, and they have no recourse.  Now,
9 management programs just learned is offering \$36 per acre to any farmer who will try enhanced efficiency 1 fertilizers and check strips that can be checked. 12 Now, I submit a thought. When you monitorize the activity that this staff is going to have, all your 1 time, all the groups here, and for the next five years 1 when you monitorize that activity that this staff is going to have, all your 1 time, all the groups here, and for the next five years 1 when you monitorize that activity that this staff is going to have, all your 1 time, all the groups here, and for the next five years 1 when you monitorize that activity that this staff is going to have, all your 1 time, all the groups here, and for the next five years 1 when you monitorize that, I just submit a simple thought: 1 So what recourse these people have that now 1 that was once ranch range land. 1 So So what recourse these people have that now 1 that was once ranch range land. 1 that was once ranch range land
acre to any farmer who will try enhanced efficiency fertilizers and check strips that can be checked.  Now, I submit a thought. When you monitorize the activity that this staff is going to have, all your time, all the groups here, and for the next five years when you monitorize that, I just submit a simple thought: The Farm Bureau supported independent operation here to look over things. What if they had a small function small portion of the money that's going to be spent, in following something up as nebulous as nitrogen and made an incentive to growers, to say, if you'll do a nitrogen and/or pesticide improvement tools, one of which would be ours, then you will be able to get an incentive 23 pay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar - acre farm would be \$36,000.  I think they could gladly and they will be Page 334  glad to implement any modern tools that can can take care of that.  So I submit that it will only take one person about a year, with these incentives out here, to have the fin provements.  So I submit that it will only take one person about a year, with these incentives out here, to have the fin provements.  So Submit that would be accounted for easily by saying, here's the record of all the growers who have done these improvements.  So Submit that would be cost effective and totally effective. Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr. Hartman.  MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas.  CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?
and they have no recourse.  Now, I submit a thought. When you monitorize that this staff is going to have, all your the activity that this staff is going to have, all your the activity that this staff is going to have, all your the activity that this staff is going to have, all your the activity that this staff is going to have, all your the activity that this staff is going to have, all your the activity that this staff is going to have, all your the activity that this staff is going to have, all your the activity that this staff is going to have, all your the activity that this staff is going to have, all your the activity that the staff is going to have, all your monitorize that, I just submit a simple thought:  The Farm Bureau supported independent operation here to look over things. What if they had a small function - small portion of the money that's going to be spent, in following something up as nebulous as nitrogen and made an incentive to growers, to say, if you'll do a nitrogen and/or pesticide improvement tools, one of which would be ours, then you will be able to get an incentive 22 would be ours, then you will be able to get an incentive 23 pay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar - acre farm would be \$436,000.  I think they could gladly and they will be Page 334  glad to implement any modern tools that can can take 2 care of that.  So I submit that it will only take one person about a year, with these incentives out here, to have the 5 growers know that that's possible to implement. And that then would be accounted for easily by saying, here's the 7 record of all the growers who have done these 8 improvements.  So Submit that would be cost effective and totally 2 effective. Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr. 14 Hartman.  CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  And they have no recourse land - irrigated row crop land that was once ranch range land.  So what recourse these people have that now they're getting damage to their property and their structures because of sediment runnoff. In
Now, I submit a thought. When you monitorize the activity that this staff is going to have, all your time, all the groups here, and for the next five years — when you monitorize that, I just submit a simple thought:  The Farm Bureau supported independent operation frunction — small portion of the money that's going to be spent, in following something up as nebulous as nitrogen and made an incentive to growers, to say, if you'll do a nitrogen and/or pesticide improvement tools, one of which would be ours, then you will be able to get an incentive 23 pay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar - acre farm would be 24 \$36,000.  I think they could gladly — and they will be Page 334  glad to implement any modern tools that can — can take 2 care of that.  So I submit that it will only take one person 4 about a year, with these incentives out here, to have the growers know that that's possible to implement. And that then would be accounted for easily by saying, here's the record of all the growers who have done these improvements.  So I submit that would be cost effective and totally effective. Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr.  Hartman.  CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  Now, it's directly related to the sediment coming off the row crop land — irrigated ow crop land that was one ranch — range land.  Now, it's directly related to the sediment coming off the row crop land — irrigated row crop land that was one ranch — range land.  Now and recover these people have that now they're getting damage to their property and their structures because of sediment runoff from irrigated and land through stormwater and irrigated water runoff.  It used to be an intermittent stream. Now it's perennial, because agr runoff. And every time the water hits the stream, it's carrying massive amount of sediment.  So what recourse these — odo we have with this.  So what recourse these — odo we have with this.  So what recourse these — odo we have with this sediment.  So what recourse these — odo we have with this.  So what recourse th
the activity that this staff is going to have, all your time, all the groups here, and for the next five years — when you monitorize that, I just submit a simple thought: The Farm Bureau supported independent operation here to look over things. What if they had a small function — small portion of the money that's going to be spent, in following something up as nebulous as nitrogen and/or pesticide improvement tools, one of which and they will be able to get an incentive would be ours, then you will be able to get an incentive and made an incentive to growers, to say, if you'll do a nitrogen and/or pesticide improvement tools, and they will be all thinks they could gladly — and they will be about a year, with these incentives out here, to have the growers know that that's possible to implement. And that then would be accounted for easily by saying, here's the record of all the growers who have done these improvements.  Submit that would be cost effective and totally effective. Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr. Hartman.  MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas.  CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?
time, all the groups here, and for the next five years when you monitorize that, I just submit a simple thought: The Farm Bureau supported independent operation here to look over things. What if they had a small function small portion of the money that's going to be spent, in following something up as nebulous as nitrogen and made an incentive to growers, to say, if you'll do a nitrogen and/or pesticide improvement tools, one of which would be ours, then you will be able to get an incentive pay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar - acre farm would be \$36,000.  I think they could gladly and they will be  Page 334  glad to implement any modern tools that can can take care of that.  So what recourse these people have that now they're getting damage to their property and their structures because of sediment runoff from irrigated at land through stormwater and irrigated water runoff. It used to be an intermittent stream. Now it's perennial, because ag runoff. And every time the water hits the stream, it's carrying massive amount of sediment.  And then, we know sediment transports all manner of other things with it.  So what recourse these people have that now they're getting damage to their property and their structures because of sediment runoff from irrigated at land through stormwater and irrigated aveter runoff. It used to be an intermittent stream. Now it's perennial, because ag runoff. And every time the water hits the stream, it's carrying massive amount of sediment.  So what recourse these people have that now they're getting damage to their property and their structures because of sediment runoff from irrigated at land through stormwater and irrigated aveter runoff.  It used to be an intermittent stream. Now it's perennial, because ag runoff. And every time the water hits the stream, it's carrying massive amount of sediment.  So what recourse these people have that now they're getting damage to their property and their structures because of sediment runoff from irrigated at land through stormwater and i
when you monitorize that, I just submit a simple thought: The Farm Bureau supported independent operation for the follok over things. What if they had a small function small portion of the money that's going to be spent, in following something up as nebulous as nitrogen and made an incentive to growers, to say, if you'll do a nitrogen and/or pesticide improvement tools, one of which would be ours, then you will be able to get an incentive pay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar - acre farm would be \$\frac{2}{3}\$ pay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar - acre farm would be \$\frac{2}{3}\$ flows \$\frac{2}{3}\$ pay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar - acre farm would be \$\frac{2}{3}\$ flows \$\frac{2}{3}\$ pay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar - acre farm would be \$\frac{2}{3}\$ flows \$\frac{2}{3}\$ pay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar - acre farm would be \$\frac{2}{3}\$ flows \$\frac{2}{3}\$ pay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar - acre farm would be \$\frac{2}{3}\$ flows \$\frac{2}{3}\$ pay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar - acre farm would be \$\frac{2}{3}\$ flows \$\frac{2}{3}\$ pay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar - acre farm would be \$\frac{2}{3}\$ flows \$\frac{2}{3}\$ pay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar - acre farm would be \$\frac{2}{3}\$ flows \$\frac{2}{3}\$ pay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar - acre farm would be \$\frac{2}{3}\$ flows \$\frac{2}{3}\$ pay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar - acre farm would be \$\frac{2}{3}\$ flows \$\frac{2}{3}\$ pay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar - acre farm would be \$\frac{2}{3}\$ flows \$\frac{2}{3}\$ pay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar - acre farm would be \$\frac{2}{3}\$ pay flows \$\frac{2}{3}\$ pay f
The Farm Bureau supported independent operation here to look over things. What if they had a small function small portion of the money that's going to be spent, in following something up as nebulous as nitrogen and made an incentive to growers, to say, if you'll do a nitrogen and/or pesticide improvement tools, one of which would be ours, then you will be able to get an incentive pay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar - acre farm would be \$36,000.\$  I think they could gladly and they will be Page 334  glad to implement any modern tools that can can take care of that.  So I submit that it will only take one person about a year, with these incentives out here, to have the growers know that that's possible to implement. And that then would be accounted for easily by saying, here's the record of all the growers who have done these improvements.  Submit that would be cost effective and totally effective. Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr. Hartman.  MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas.  CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  The Farm Bureau supported independent operation of the money that's going to be land through stormwater and irrigated water runoff.  It hey're getting damage to their property and their structures because of sediment runoff from irrigated and land through stormwater and irrigated water runoff.  It used to be an intermittent stream. Now it's prevail and through stormwater and irrigated water runoff.  It used to be an intermittent stream. Now it's the water to be an intermittent stream. Now it's prevaintly and through stormwater and irrigated water runoff.  It used to be an intermittent stream. Now it's carrying massive amount of sediment.  So what then, we know sediment transports all manner of other things with it.  So what recourse these do we have with this sediment.  So I submit that it will only take one person about a year, with these incentives out here, to have the sediment.  Hert there is necurse of the sediment.  The they're getting damage to their priorite and
here to look over things. What if they had a small function small portion of the money that's going to be spent, in following something up as nebulous as nitrogen and made an incentive to growers, to say, if you'll do a nitrogen and/or pesticide improvement tools, one of which would be ours, then you will be able to get an incentive pay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar acre farm would be \$36,000.  I think they could gladly and they will be Page 334  glad to implement any modern tools that can can take care of that.  So I submit that it will only take one person about a year, with these incentives out here, to have the growers know that that's possible to implement. And that then would be accounted for easily by saying, here's the record of all the growers who have done these improvements.  Submit that would be cost effective and totally effective. Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr. Hartman.  MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas.  CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  17  Structures because of sediment runoff from irrigated at land through stormwater and irrigated water runoff.  18  It used to be an intermittent stream. Now it's perennial, because ag runoff. And every time the water hits the stream, it's carrying massive amount of sediment.  So what recourse these do we have with this sediment.  So what recourse these do we have with this sediment.  So what recourse these do we have with this sediment.  So what recourse these do we have with this sediment.  So what recourse these do we have with this sediment.  So what recourse these do we have with this sediment.  If we could vegetate and put trees up to keep the the growth down in the creek channel, we wouldr have an issue. But we can't do that because they have dredge the sediment.  So what are auroped to do? I'd like to know if there's recourse, and this and what you're you're proposing to this tiered system that you're you're proposing to pass.  CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  10  10  11  12  13  14  15  15
function small portion of the money that's going to be spent, in following something up as nebulous as nitrogen and made an incentive to growers, to say, if you'll do a nitrogen and/or pesticide improvement tools, one of which would be ours, then you will be able to get an incentive pay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar - acre farm would be \$36,000.  I think they could gladly and they will be  Fage 334  glad to implement any modern tools that can can take care of that.  So I submit that it will only take one person about a year, with these incentives out here, to have the growers know that that's possible to implement. And that then would be accounted for easily by saying, here's the record of all the growers who have done these improvements.  Submit that would be cost effective and totally effective. Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr. Hartman.  MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas.  CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  It used to be an intermittent stream. Now it's perennial, because ag runoff. And every time the wate hits the stream, it's carrying massive amount of sediment.  So what trecourse these do we have with this.  So what recourse these do we have with this.  So what recourse these do we have with this.  So what recourse these do we have with this.  So what recourse these do we have with this.  So what recourse these do we have with this  The there. And we can't do it because of the sediment. The they're now requiring dredging becaus of West Nile virus.  If we could vegetate and put trees up to keep the the growth down in the creek channel, we wouldr have an issue. But we can't do that because they have dredge the sediment.  So what are supposed to do? I'd like to know if there's recourse, and this and what you're proposing to this tiered system that you're you're proposing to this tiered system that?  Chair Young: Your last name?
spent, in following something up as nebulous as nitrogen and made an incentive to growers, to say, if you'll do a nitrogen and/or pesticide improvement tools, one of which would be ours, then you will be able to get an incentive pay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar - acre farm would be \$36,000.\$  I think they could gladly and they will be \$Page 334\$  glad to implement any modern tools that can can take care of that.  So I submit that it will only take one person about a year, with these incentives out here, to have the growers know that that's possible to implement. And that then would be accounted for easily by saying, here's the record of all the growers who have done these improvements.  Submit that would be cost effective and totally effective. Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr. Hartman.  MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas.  CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  It used to be an intermittent stream. Now it's perennial, because ag runoff. And every time the wate hits the stream, it's carrying massive amount of sediment.  21 hits the stream, it's carrying massive amount of sediment.  22 hits the stream, it's carrying massive amount of sediment.  23 And then, we know sediment transports all manner of other things with it.  24 So what recourse these do we have with this Page 334  1 Sediment issue?  We also want to do some creek restoration work on the there. And we can't do it because of the sediment. The they're now requiring dredging because of West Nile virus.  If we could vegetate and put trees up to keep the the growth down in the creek channel, we wouldned have an issue. But we can't do that because they have dredge the sediment.  So what are supposed to do? I'd like to know if there's recourse, and this and what you're proposing to this tiered system that you're you're proposing to this tiered system that?
and made an incentive to growers, to say, if you'll do a nitrogen and/or pesticide improvement tools, one of which would be ours, then you will be able to get an incentive pay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar - acre farm would be \$36,000.  I think they could gladly and they will be Page 334  glad to implement any modern tools that can can take care of that.  So I submit that it will only take one person about a year, with these incentives out here, to have the growers know that that's possible to implement. And that then would be accounted for easily by saying, here's the record of all the growers who have done these improvements.  Submit that would be cost effective and totally effective. Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr.  MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas.  CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  and made an incentive to growers, it say, if you'll do a hits the stream, it's carrying massive amount of sediment.  And then, we know sediment transports all manner of other things with it.  So what recourse these do we have with this Page 33  sediment.  We also want to do some creek restoration work on the there. And we can't do it because of the sediment. The they're now requiring dredging because of West Nile virus.  If we could vegetate and put trees up to keep the the growth down in the creek channel, we wouldr have an issue. But we can't do that because they have dredge the sediment.  So what recourse these do we have with this Page 33  sediment.  I we also want to do some creek restoration work on the there. And we can't do it because of the sediment.  If we could vegetate and put trees up to keep the the growth down in the creek channel, we wouldn have an issue. But we can't do that because they have dredge the sediment.  So what are supposed to do? I'd like to know if there's recourse, and this and what you're proposing to this tiered system that you're you're proposing to this tiered system that you're you're proposing to pass.
nitrogen and/or pesticide improvement tools, one of which would be ours, then you will be able to get an incentive pay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar - acre farm would be \$36,000.  I think they could gladly and they will be Page 334  glad to implement any modern tools that can can take care of that.  So I submit that it will only take one person about a year, with these incentives out here, to have the growers know that that's possible to implement. And that then would be accounted for easily by saying, here's the record of all the growers who have done these improvements.  Submit that would be ocst effective and totally effective. Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr. Hartman.  And then, we know sediment transports all manner of other things with it.  So what recourse these do we have with this sediment.  So what recourse these do we have with this sediment.  So what recourse these do we have with this sediment.  So what recourse these do we have with this sediment.  So we also want to do some creek restoration work on the there. And we can't do it because of the sediment. The they're now requiring dredging because of West Nile virus.  If we could vegetate and put trees up to keep the the growth down in the creek channel, we wouldr have an issue. But we can't do that because they have dredge the sediment.  So what are supposed to do? I'd like to know if there's recourse, and this and what you're proposing to this tiered system that you're you're proposing to this tiered system that you're you're proposing to pass.  CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  And then, we know sediment transports all manner of other things with it.  So what recourse these do we have with this sediment.  So what recourse these do we have with this sediment.  So what are supposed to do? I'd like to know if there's recourse, and this and what you're proposing to pass.  CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?
would be ours, then you will be able to get an incentive pay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar - acre farm would be \$36,000.  I think they could gladly and they will be Page 334  glad to implement any modern tools that can can take care of that.  So I submit that it will only take one person about a year, with these incentives out here, to have the growers know that that's possible to implement. And that then would be accounted for easily by saying, here's the mimprovements.  Submit that would be cost effective and totally effective. Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr.  MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas. CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  Sediment.  And then, we know sediment transports all manner of other things with it.  So what recourse these do we have with this Page 334  sediment.  So what recourse these do we have with this Page 334  sediment.  So what recourse these do we have with this Page 334  fruit issue?  We also want to do some creek restoration work on the there. And we can't do it because of the sediment.  If we could vegetate and put trees up to keep the the growth down in the creek channel, we wouldr have an issue. But we can't do that because they have dredge the sediment.  So what are supposed to do? I'd like to know if there's recourse, and this and what you're proposing to this tiered system that you're you're proposing to this tiered system that you're you're proposing to this tiered system that?
pay? This \$36 on a 1,000-dollar - acre farm would be \$36,000.  I think they could gladly and they will be Page 334  glad to implement any modern tools that can can take care of that.  So I submit that it will only take one person about a year, with these incentives out here, to have the growers know that that's possible to implement. And that then would be accounted for easily by saying, here's the record of all the growers who have done these improvements.  Submit that would be cost effective and totally offective. Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr.  MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas.  CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  And then, we know sediment transports all manner of other things with it.  So what recourse these do we have with this Page 33  And then, we know sediment transports all manner of other things with it.  So what recourse these do we have with this Page 33  I glad to implement any modern tools that can can take 2
\$36,000.  I think they could gladly and they will be  Page 334  glad to implement any modern tools that can can take care of that.  So I submit that it will only take one person about a year, with these incentives out here, to have the growers know that that's possible to implement. And that then would be accounted for easily by saying, here's the record of all the growers who have done these improvements. Submit that would be cost effective and totally offective. Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr.  MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas.  CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  And they will be Page 334  So what recourse these do we have with this Page 33  the sediment issue? We also want to do some creek restoration work on the there. And we can't do it because of the sediment. The they're now requiring dredging becaus of West Nile virus.  If we could vegetate and put trees up to keep the the growth down in the creek channel, we wouldre have an issue. But we can't do that because they have dredge the sediment.  So what are supposed to do? I'd like to know if there's recourse, and this and what you're proposing to this tiered system that you're you're proposing to pass.  Can can someone answer me that?
I think they could gladly and they will be Page 334  glad to implement any modern tools that can can take care of that.  So I submit that it will only take one person about a year, with these incentives out here, to have the growers know that that's possible to implement. And that then would be accounted for easily by saying, here's the record of all the growers who have done these improvements.  Submit that would be cost effective and totally offective. Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr.  MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas.  CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  So what recourse these do we have with this Page 33  So what recourse these do we have with this Page 33  So what recourse these do we have with this Page 33  So what recourse these do we have with this Page 33  So what recourse these do we have with this Page 33  So what recourse these do we have with this Page 33  So what recourse these do we have with this Page 33  So what recourse these do we have with this Page 33  So what recourse these do we have with this Page 33  I glad to implement any modern tools that can can take Sediment issue?  We also want to do some creek restoration work on the there. And we can't do it because of the sediment. The they're now requiring dredging because of West Nile virus.  If we could vegetate and put trees up to keep the the growth down in the creek channel, we wouldr have an issue. But we can't do that because they have dredge the sediment.  So what are supposed to do? I'd like to know if there's recourse, and this and what you're proposing to this tiered system that you're you're proposing to this tiered system that you're you're proposing to pass.  CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?
Page 334  1 glad to implement any modern tools that can can take 2 care of that. 3 So I submit that it will only take one person 4 about a year, with these incentives out here, to have the 5 growers know that that's possible to implement. And that 6 then would be accounted for easily by saying, here's the 7 record of all the growers who have done these 8 improvements. 9 Submit that would be cost effective and totally 10 effective. Thank you. 11 CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr. 12 Hartman. 13 MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas. 14 CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name? 1 sediment issue? 2 We also want to do some creek restoration work 3 on the there. And we can't do it because of the 4 sediment. The they're now requiring dredging because of West Nile virus. 6 If we could vegetate and put trees up to keep 7 the the growth down in the creek channel, we wouldredge the sediment. 9 Submit that would be cost effective and totally of there's recourse, and this and what you're proposing to this tiered system that you're you're proposing to pass. 14 Can can someone answer me that?
glad to implement any modern tools that can can take care of that.  So I submit that it will only take one person about a year, with these incentives out here, to have the growers know that that's possible to implement. And that then would be accounted for easily by saying, here's the record of all the growers who have done these improvements.  Submit that would be cost effective and totally effective. Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr.  MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas.  CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  Jour Mealso want to do some creek restoration work on the there. And we can't do it because of the sediment. The they're now requiring dredging because of West Nile virus.  If we could vegetate and put trees up to keep the the growth down in the creek channel, we wouldr have an issue. But we can't do that because they have dredge the sediment.  So what are supposed to do? I'd like to know if there's recourse, and this and what you're proposing to this tiered system that you're you're proposing to pass.  CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  Also Can can someone answer me that?
2 care of that. 3 So I submit that it will only take one person 4 about a year, with these incentives out here, to have the 5 growers know that that's possible to implement. And that 6 then would be accounted for easily by saying, here's the 7 record of all the growers who have done these 8 improvements. 9 Submit that would be cost effective and totally 10 effective. Thank you. 11 CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr. 12 Hartman. 13 MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas. 14 CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name? 2 We also want to do some creek restoration work 3 on the there. And we can't do it because of the 4 sediment. The they're now requiring dredging becaus 6 of West Nile virus. 6 If we could vegetate and put trees up to keep 7 the the growth down in the creek channel, we wouldr 8 have an issue. But we can't do that because they have 9 dredge the sediment. 10 So what are supposed to do? I'd like to know 11 if there's recourse, and this and what you're 12 proposing to this tiered system that you're you're 13 proposing to pass. 14 Can can someone answer me that?
3 So I submit that it will only take one person 4 about a year, with these incentives out here, to have the 5 growers know that that's possible to implement. And that 6 then would be accounted for easily by saying, here's the 7 record of all the growers who have done these 8 improvements. 9 Submit that would be cost effective and totally 10 effective. Thank you. 11 CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr. 12 Hartman. 13 MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas. 14 CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name? 3 on the there. And we can't do it because of the 4 sediment. The they're now requiring dredging because of West Nile virus. 6 If we could vegetate and put trees up to keep 7 the the growth down in the creek channel, we wouldn's have an issue. But we can't do that because they have dredge the sediment. 10 So what are supposed to do? I'd like to know if there's recourse, and this and what you're proposing to this tiered system that you're you're proposing to pass. 14 Can can someone answer me that?
about a year, with these incentives out here, to have the growers know that that's possible to implement. And that then would be accounted for easily by saying, here's the record of all the growers who have done these improvements.  Submit that would be cost effective and totally effective. Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr.  MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas.  CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  And that sediment. The they're now requiring dredging because of West Nile virus.  If we could vegetate and put trees up to keep the the growth down in the creek channel, we wouldre have an issue. But we can't do that because they have dredge the sediment.  So what are supposed to do? I'd like to know if there's recourse, and this and what you're proposing to this tiered system that you're you're proposing to pass.  Can can someone answer me that?
growers know that that's possible to implement. And that then would be accounted for easily by saying, here's the record of all the growers who have done these improvements.  Submit that would be cost effective and totally effective. Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr.  MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas.  CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  of West Nile virus.  If we could vegetate and put trees up to keep the the growth down in the creek channel, we wouldn's have an issue. But we can't do that because they have dredge the sediment.  So what are supposed to do? I'd like to know if there's recourse, and this and what you're proposing to this tiered system that you're you're  Proposing to pass.  Can can someone answer me that?
then would be accounted for easily by saying, here's the record of all the growers who have done these improvements.  Submit that would be cost effective and totally effective. Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr.  MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas.  CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  The proposing to this tiered system that you're the proposing to pass.  If we could vegetate and put trees up to keep the the growth down in the creek channel, we wouldre have an issue. But we can't do that because they have dredge the sediment.  So what are supposed to do? I'd like to know if there's recourse, and this and what you're proposing to this tiered system that you're you're proposing to pass.  Can can someone answer me that?
7 record of all the growers who have done these 8 improvements. 9 Submit that would be cost effective and totally 10 effective. Thank you. 11 CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr. 12 Hartman. 13 MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas. 14 CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  7 the the growth down in the creek channel, we wouldr 8 have an issue. But we can't do that because they have 9 dredge the sediment. 10 So what are supposed to do? I'd like to know 11 if there's recourse, and this and what you're 12 proposing to this tiered system that you're you're 13 proposing to pass. 14 Can can someone answer me that?
8 improvements. 9 Submit that would be cost effective and totally 10 effective. Thank you. 11 CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr. 12 Hartman. 13 MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas. 14 CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  8 have an issue. But we can't do that because they have dredge the sediment.  9 So what are supposed to do? I'd like to know if there's recourse, and this and what you're proposing to this tiered system that you're you're proposing to pass. 14 Can can someone answer me that?
9 Submit that would be cost effective and totally 10 effective. Thank you. 11 CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr. 12 Hartman. 13 MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas. 14 CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name? 9 dredge the sediment. 10 So what are supposed to do? I'd like to know 11 if there's recourse, and this and what you're 12 proposing to this tiered system that you're you're 13 proposing to pass. 14 Can can someone answer me that?
effective. Thank you.  CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr.  Hartman.  MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas.  CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  10 So what are supposed to do? I'd like to know if there's recourse, and this and what you're proposing to this tiered system that you're you're proposing to pass.  Can can someone answer me that?
11 CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Mr. 11 if there's recourse, and this and what you're 12 Hartman. 12 proposing to this tiered system that you're you're 13 MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas. 14 Can can someone answer me that?
12Hartman.12proposing to this tiered system that you're you're13MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas.13proposing to pass.14CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?14Can can someone answer me that?
MS. LEE: Robin Lee. I'm from Salinas.  14 CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name?  13 proposing to pass.  14 Can can someone answer me that?
14 CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name? 14 Can can someone answer me that?
15 MS. LEE: Lee. 15 CHATR YOUNG: Well, we can't answer that now
16 CHAIR YOUNG: Lee? L-E-E-? 16 What I would suggest to you because I think
17 MS. LEE: Correct. 17 those are great questions that you, maybe, contact
Well, I want to I'd like to know that 18 staff when we're not dealing with this particular item.
19 that the creek I live on is Santa Rita Creek. It's close 19 Because I don't think there's anything in the
20 to north Salinas. 20 order that's going to address the issues you're raising.
21 And it's been very I've seen a death it's 21 MR. BRIGGS: It does, as far as sediment.
22 in the throes of death from the last, I guess, 20 or 30 22 CHAIR YOUNG: Well, it does
23 years. 23 MS. LEE: Well, this is
People I've talked to, who grew upon the creek, 24 CHAIR YOUNG: but it sounds
25 will no longer let their children play in the creek that 25 MS. LEE: it's a 303(d) stream.
Page 335

		1	·
1	CHAIR YOUNG: Right. But it sounds like she	1	see what your particular issue is. And if
2	has some specific issues with property owners receiving	2	MS. LEE: It's it's doing two things:
3	sediment.	3	Structural damage preventing restoration for recreational
4	MS. LEE: Yes. And causing	4	and habitat purposes.
5	CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah.	5	CHAIR YOUNG: Right. You should talk to staff,
6	MS. LEE: flooding and structural inudation	6	though. And they should they can talk to you about
7	(phonetic), actually.	7	that.
8	CHAIR YOUNG: Frances?	8	We just can't get into a individual solution
9	MR. BRIGGS: The order does include sediment.	9	right here to this. But it's a legitimate problem.
10	CHAIR YOUNG: Right.	10	I don't want to de - minimize that by anything
11	MS. McCHESNEY: You're I I think you're	11	I've said. But and and who knows what's going to
12	correct that this isn't appropriate to answer the	12	happen with this permit, or what it's going to look like
13	questions, and that they should call staff or me.	13	and whether it's going to take care of the issues that's
14	You can call me and	14	that are going to satisfy you.
15	MS. LEE: I thought the Tier 1 had a sediment	15	That I don't know, either, at this point. So
16	component to it, to control the sediment coming off the	16	but talk to staff after this meeting. And they can
17	property.	17	help you more directly.
18	MS. McCHESNEY: Well, all the tier they have	18	Okay. Next.
19	a sediment they have to do sediment management in part	19	MS. BENNETT: Good evening. I'm just here
20	of their farm plan, correct. Yeah.	20	because I care. And
21	MS. LEE: And they have to implement	21	CHAIR YOUNG: Pardon me.
22	MS. McCHESNEY: Yes.	22	MS. BENNETT: My name is Joan Bennett
23	MS. LEE: So then it should be if if I	23	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.
24	were to contact staff and say, look, they're they're	24	MS. BENNETT: from Salinas.
25	discharging sediment, they're dis they're not meeting	25	And I like to eat. So I like the farmers. But
	Page 338		Page 340
1	their normit, then they should be able to go and talk to	1	aven hady have what a many mantal task
1 2	their permit, then they should be able to go and talk to	2	everybody here what a monumental task.
3	them, to get them to do what they're supposed to do; if	3	You know, we're I've been told that there's
4	not, then it'd be fines.	4	supposed to cover crop all around us in Salinas. I've
5	Isn't that what would happen?	5	seen two farms with cover crop. If we can't even get the
6	CHAIR YOUNG: Do you do you live in the City	6	people to put the cover crop, how are you going to solve
7	of Salinas?  MS. LEE: Yes.	7	this issue?
8	CHAIR YOUNG: You do.	8	But, anyway, think about this: The Salinas River. We have these rubber dams so that we can collect
9		9	
	Well, you have an issue there, you know. I		water and use that water to irrigate. But then there's
10	mean, if someone is discharging sediment onto your	10	other areas of the Salinas River where we don't have the
11 12	property, that's a trespass.	11	dam because the water is so polluted, they won't let it
13	MS. McCHESNEY: Well, you know, I don't	12	go into the rubber dam area and it has to go into the
14	CHAIR YOUNG: It would	13	river, so it goes into the bay.
15	MS. McCHESNEY: think we should give her	14   15	Well, if I had 100 trucks of polluted water and
16	legal advice about it.		sprayed it on a farmer's property, I would get thrown in
17	CHAIR YOUNG: I'm not	16	jail or fined. If I did the same thing and took it to
	MS. McCHESNEY: She should talk	17	the bay and sprayed it in the bay, I would get thrown in
18 19	CHAIR YOUNG: No. It's	18	jail or fined.
	MS. McCHESNEY: to the staff. And see if	19	We all want to have a winning situation. I'm
20	they can address the problem.	20	just saying, please, maybe somebody should start thinking
21	MS. LEE: But I thought it'd be tied into	21	with their heart a little bit and not just their
22	this	22	pocketbook.
23	CHAIR YOUNG: Yeah. But I don't	23	Think of a little scenario. Your child is
24	MS. McCHESNEY: You've made your comment. And	24	dying from cancer. We know that the the children and
25	we really have to move on. But you can talk to staff to	25	the senior people, they're more susceptible to
	Page 339		Page 341

1	carcinogenic substances.	1	somewhere.
2	This diazinon, I I've heard that 83 percent	2	If the feedback today is dominated by large
3	is used in the Salinas Valley, out of the entire state of	3	farm families and corporations, instead of individuals,
4	California. Well, that's a lot of carcinogenic	4	like myself, keep in mind that they are effectively paid
5	substances.	5	millions of future dollars for every public health
6	I'm not saying this farm's doing it, that	6	concession they can wrest from you today.
7	farm's doing it. I'm just saying, this is an issue.	7	I, for missing a whole day's worth of work, I'm
8	We're all trying to resolve it.	8	out \$800 instantly. But it's worth it to me, and I'd do
9	But just think, if your son looked at you and	9	it again, because the health of children and the health
10	said, Dad, I'm 10, my sister's 4, I don't want any more	10	of the marine life that floats our tourism economy is
11	chemotherapy because I'm dying? And they say this is	11	worth every penny to me.
12	this is why it's happening. Can't you do something	12	I beg of you to stand behind monitoring and
13	better, so maybe my sister won't die?	13	reporting of nitrates and any toxin suspected of
14	So I'm just saying, when you're thinking about	14	affecting the health of communities larger than 100
15	all this and you're you're figuring, okay, how much	15	people, and I specifically ask you to go back to the
16	money, how much profit I'm making, are you really making	16	draft standards prior, two years ago, that had a lot more
17	that much profit, if your child is dying.	17	chemicals for monitoring.
18	Thank you.	18	And I ask you to add those back. And I ask you
19	CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you, Mrs. Bennett, for your	19	to make a place for citizens, who are affected, to get in
20	comments.	20	the system and ask for monitoring of specific chemicals
21	MS. WARD: My name is Elizabeth Ward. I	21	that they suspect.
22	appreciate the chance to speak. I live in Monterey.	22	Thank you for listening. That I'm done.
23	We live in a free market, but not a	23	CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments, Ms.
24	free-for-all. The public has the right to set conditions	24	Ward.
25	for use of shared resources, like water.	25	MS. GUZMAN: Good afternoon. My name is Martha
	Page 342		Page 344
1	And growers have the choice of whether and what	1	Guzman. And I work with the California Rural Legal
2	to grow, given the conditions set. In the end, the cost	2	Assistance Foundation.
3	of monitoring is borne by the public through free market	3	And I wanted to speak on behalf of some of the
4	prices. And that is a cost I'm willing to bear for	4	communities I've had the privilege of working with in the
5	health.	5	past 10 years or so, and some of the folks that were here
6	Stopping the public from deciding how shared	6	today, but they couldn't wait around, and other folks
7	water is to be protected is as repressive as stopping	7	work.
8	farmers from choosing what to grow.	8	One was mentioned earlier today, Chualar, Camp
9	The farm lobbyists working to weaken the draft	9	Jimenez, Campora, San Gerardo, San Lucas. And San Lucas
10	standards to a level where there's no individual	10	and these are communities that are groundwater-
11	reporting or progress milestones, would gut the public's	11	dependent. They can afford one well, and struggle for
12	ability to protect public health.	12	the financing of additional wells because, frankly, they
13	Without individual progress, there can be no	13	don't have the option of much more than drilling a little
14	collective progress.	14	deeper.
15	I support working with farmers to ameliorate	15	There is actually more than just a drinking
16	the financial and logistical impact of testing, but I	16	water situation that is impacted by not having water. In
17	cannot support reliance on the creators of toxicity,	17	San Lucas, there's an affordable housing project that is
18	themselves, to investigate their own impacts.	18	being held up because of the water situation.
19	Please stand up for taxpayers by supporting our	19	So it's not just drinking water and health
20	right to set conditions for health and independently	20	impacts. It's actually, you know, habitability. And
21	monitor compliance by the largest-scale users of shared	21	having people have decent housing, is a big piece of
22	water.	22	this, as well.
23	You start with the large-scale users. If you	23	I want to mention more of my comments were
24	find that a lot of the impact is not done by them, then	24	on the nitrates. But I will say that we are very
25	you go to the smaller scale. But you got to start	25	concerned. Although, we agree that diazinon and
	,		

Page 343

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 chlorpyrifos are some of the worst acting pesticides, 2 we're very concerned with the swap effect, if you will. 3 So we do prefer the February 2010 proposal for 4 that, and other, reasons. 5 Returning to the nitrate situation on these 6 communities -- and it's really, you know, hard to explain 7 to people sometimes about how this is not just a simple 8 fix about drilling a -- a new well. 9 Sometimes it is. And that lasts for about 5 to 10 10 years. And sometimes you have to go really far out 11 and put in a big pipeline. 12 So one of the clear solutions that is in this 13 proposal -- and maybe it is for the long term -- is the 14 nitrogen management plans and giving farmers the tools to 15 know, you know, how -- how overcompensating is sometimes 16 not even cost effective for them or not necessarily 17 yields anything -- well, that's probably not true. 18 But the point being is that they could have 19 this more efficient tool. And you can go about it two 20 ways. 21 22 23 Tier 2 to having these nutrient management plans.

I think Steve was recommending that it go into Tier 3. But you could conversely require everyone from

And it's something that is so basic from our perspective, to have a nutrient management plan, that we

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 346

share with you a cartoon about Moses.

There's a cartoon with Moses, and he's looking at the burning bush. And in his hand is a fire extinguisher. And the -- the comment at the bottom says: Moses blows the job interview.

Moses blows the job interview. You all here, and those in this valley and all along the Central Coast, in a certain way, have been called into a moment in history, where we're facing climate change; where we're looking at the human right to water; where we're seeing the difficulties that farmers face, and the terrible problems faced by the communities that don't have access to safe, affordable water.

And you are being asked in your regulatory authority to step into a very, very important moment in history. And an important moment in time.

I applaud the staff for their work, others who have made their presentations, and I wish you well in coming to your discernment.

I do want to say that, in addition to all of the challenges and -- and costs that growing food in an unsustainable way creates to our water systems, our health, the abilities of communities to get loans, there's also a cost to the fabric of community that we see here; sectors torn apart, one from the other.

Page 348

don't think it -- it's -- you know, some of the other triggers, other than really having this trigger universally for Tier 2 and Tier 3, especially, because we're concerned about how the swapping will work, and how a farmer will move from one tier to the other.

And finally, something that has been loosely mentioned is -- is really addressing this drinking water problem now and having some way that this order is going to provide for that mitigation today.

So that in the interim of 20, 50 or a hundred years, when we can, once again, drill into a well without treatment, you actually have an alternative for these communities today. I mean, you wouldn't need this regulation if people could drink from their groundwater wells.

So we really hope that the industry could support us in that and really focusing on a solution for potable water today.

CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. REV. RAMSDEN: Good afternoon. I'm Reverend Lindi Ramsden. I'm the senior minister and executive director of the Unitarian Universalist Legislative Ministry in California.

And, since I don't think I'll be able to make it on the day of prayer, to your meeting, I will at least

But I think that we can't turn a blind eye to what is going on. And those of us who are consumers of food, need to start realizing that we have to pay a lot more at the grocery store. In a sense, we've been getting off cheap for what food really costs.

We need to be able to get the right price signals from the market for those of us to seek to live an ethical life, about what the actual cost is of what we

And it's very important that those who are creating waste are the ones that end up taking responsibility for that waste, rather than putting the costs on the lowest income members of our community.

Implementing strong agricultural regulations will help to assure that responsible growers will not be at a competitive disadvantage with those who take less care to avoid polluting our water.

Education is important, and voluntary farm plans are important, but they're not sufficient. It's only through the regulation of pollution with measurable outcomes, timelines and enforcement that a whole industry can make the move to the next level of safety, accountability and predictability.

Unitarian Universalists in California have been active in efforts to realize the human right to water.

Page 349

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

24

25

Page 350

1 In early March, we were privileged to accompany the 2 United Nations' independent expert on the human right to 3 water and sanitation during her mission to the United 4 States. 5 She learned about the situation in the Central 6 Coast and visited several similarly affected communities 7 in the Central Valley. 8 At the end of her mission, she gave an initial 9 report to the U.S. Government at the Lantos Commission 10 for Human Rights. She'll be giving a complete report in 11 September in Geneva. 12 Protecting drinking water from agricultural 13 runoff is, indeed, a part of realizing the human right to 14 water. And what you decide here will be felt throughout 15 California, and throughout the state -- excuse me --16 throughout the nation and throughout the world. 17 Thank you for your efforts. We wish you well. 18 Godspeed. 19 CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you, Reverend, for your 20 comments. 21 Okay. 22 MR. OVEREEM: Mr. Chairman, members of the 23 board. My name is Eric Overeem, O-V-E-R-E-E-M. 24 I'm a licensed pest control advisor, a 25 certified crop advisor, and I've had the opportunity of

formulation of chlorpyrifos.

2 This is kind of an interesting situation, where they have spent the money, made the effort to come into compliance with potential runoff issues; but yet, through another regulatory agency, are forced to use a somewhat undesirable pesticide in that situation.

That -- that'll summarize. That'll wrap up my comments. Thank you.

CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you.

MS. CHAVEZ-WYATT: Good afternoon, Chairman Young, honorable board, staff and fellow concerned community members. My name is Christina Chavez-Wyatt.

I am past chairman of the Central Coast Young Farmers and Ranchers. And I'm here today to offer you the opinion of the San Benito County Chamber of Commerce, as the organization's government relations committee chairman.

The San Benito County Chamber represents 450 business and community members. We feel that staff's proposal is unduly oppressive, discretionary, baseless, fiscally and practically infeasible.

If implemented, it would result in the -- in the removal of hundreds of acres from production of our county alone, not to mention the increased production costs and resulting job losses. And the lost ability to

Page 352

working in the Salinas Valley for almost 30 years, now.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In my experience, there have been substantial changes to the overall nutrient management, to grow some of the cash crops that we do.

Tissue and soil tests; a quick nitress test, prior to sidedress; suction lysimeters to determine what's in the root zone, et cetera, et cetera, I think these have all gone a long ways to improve the nitrogen

Also, the adoption of irrigation monitoring programs and drip irrigation have significantly improved the -- the irrigation use efficiency in this valley.

These are all practices that a -- that growers have adopted to this point. And I think the Farm Bureau ag alternative will continue to encourage growers to make these changes on their farms.

I have many other things to say, but I wanted to bring your attention a -- a potential conundrum with one of the growers I work with. They are a -- a container nursery in the Salsipuedes area of Watsonville.

Their operation is entirely self-contained, as far as irrigation runoff and stormwater runoff, for that matter. However, due to the quarantine imposed on them from the light brown apple moth, they are required to spray their operation with Dursban, which is a commercial

compete with foreign imports.

We understand staff's intentions to protect water resources.

However, the proposal is not based on scientific standards; contains inadequate discretion on best management practices to meet goals; is devoid of necessary metrics to analyze impacts post-implementation; and is not amenable to alteration or modification in the event of ineffectiveness.

We believe that the agricultural coalition alternative recognizes and satisfies the aforementioned concerns and is a far superior program for actual monitoring, testing, treating, improving regional water quality.

We urge you to adopt the agricultural alternative and hope that you will consider a multitude of individuals, agencies and businesses, who feel that the alternative is a superior and effective means of improving water -- water quality.

Thank you.

21 CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. 22 MS. KAY: My name is Margie Kay. And I live 23 near the Elkhorn Slough.

> As a volunteer, who attends many meetings on water supply and water quality, I keep asking: How much Page 353

will it cost to clean up, and who will pay? Who will pay 1 of complexity on economics. But water is the fundamental 2 the public health costs? How many San Gerardos are 2 liquid of life. 3 there? 3 So we need to take care of it. And I know you 4 4 I was invited a few years ago to join Salinas guys have a -- a very hard -- you know, a very hard 5 Valley farmworkers and health care providers in a water 5 decision that you guys got to make because there's two 6 6 quality seminar, to learn more about it. From that, many sides. 7 7 of us made appointments to meet two county supervisors; And I'm in both sides. So I can -- the only 8 8 Fernando Armenta and Simon Salinas, separately, and we thing that I -- I wish, is that you guys find a good 9 9 solution for the well-being of humans and all the living also met with Assemblywoman Ana Caballero. 10 10 It was obvious to us that the assemblywoman and organisms that they need water. 11 11 Supervisor Fernando Armenta did not understand the issues Thank you. 12 or what was needed to get the water better. Simon 12 CHAIR YOUNG: Well, we're -- we're going to try 13 13 Salinas advised us to go to you. to get to that solution. 14 14 Here we are. I support the Monterey County MR. MESQUITA: Good. 15 Coastkeepers and Environmental Justice Coalition for 15 CHAIR YOUNG: And everyone's input helps us to 16 Water comments. I support regulations to protect human 16 try to get to that solution. So thank you for your 17 health and the environment and that will be strong enough 17 comments. 18 to restore clean water. 18 MR. MESQUITA: Thank you. 19 Dipti said it: Keep your eye on the prize and 19 MS. ARAJO: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair, board 20 20 what it will take us to get us there. members. I'm Karen Arajo, a lifelong resident of 21 21 Salinas, fifth generation, native of what is now Monterey Thank you. 22 CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. 22 23 23 MR. MESQUITA: Good afternoon. My name is And I, like most -- most all folks in this room 24 Horacio Mesquita. And I'm with the San Gerardo 24 -- I love this area, and I care about its future. No 25 Cooperative. 25 one's paying me to be here today. I lost a day's work -Page 354 Page 356 1 less than \$200, but a day's work and very important, As you may know, there's 300 -- 350 people 1 2 there, 64 families, and a child care center. 2 nonetheless - to be here. 3 3 There's -- there's been pollution there since I'm so grateful to have the opportunity to 4 4 1990. There -- there's three wells that been already speak to you. 5 disappeared because of high nitrates and the people there 5 Someone jokingly, as I interacted with someone 6 were getting very, very sick; you know, skin rashes, hair 6 wearing a green button here, referred to me as the enemy. 7 7 falling down, a lot of red spots on their skin. I checked that joke and found that he was serious. 8 8 And, until we prove to them -- you know, they I call no one here enemy. I believe everyone 9 9 almost took their clothes off and prove to the here cares deeply about the community. We just have very 10 supervisors that there was a big problem there. 10 different strategies and fears and ways of moving 11 The supervisors put in a filtration system. 11 forward. And we're going to do this together. 12 And as soon as they put it in, the sicknesses were gone. 12 And thank you for -- for what you're doing. 13 It -- it cost around a million dollars, just 13 It's very important. I commend you on this process. 14 for the filtration system. And then, the community got a 14 I support regulations that benefit a 15 grant because of the federal stimulus act of five 15 sustainable economy and protect human health and the 16 16 million. And it cost five million dollars just to get a environment -- maintaining the environment. 17 17 new -- a new well, two miles away from the community. Tourism and ag are very important to this 18 If this next well that is -- right now, that we 18 region. A key factor to such good regulation is that we 19 19 must be -- they must be strong enough to restore clean tapping in the community there -- gets polluted, then 20 there's going to be more problems. 20 water for the community use; the whole community, not 21 21 just one distinct part or one industry. That's key. I'm a farmer. I've been farming all my life. 22 22 And I think that we should put water first because water It's a common denominator. And I think this 23 23 is -- is the main source of -- of life. And we should board, for all your great work, is moving forward. And I 24 24 take care of the water. look forward to a very sound outcome at the end of this 25 25 I know that farming is hard and there's a lot process.

Page 355

I serve on the planning commission for the City of Salinas, the largest municipality in this region. And I was saddened and shocked when an applicant came before us, the water company, asking for a drill permit to go down to 1500 feet.

In the presentation, it was noted that the first two higher layers were contaminated and unusable -- made unusable, primarily because of nitrate

contamination, perfectly good water.

We don't have any more water coming to this planet. This is it, folks. And while it is true that the damage has not occurred just by folks who are here trying to earn a living and do the right thing now - that's true - generations of error, much of the error done in ignorance and, quite frankly, much by choice for short-term profit - just because that was done in the past, we don't have to do it now.

I'm sorry that those of us who are now have to shoulder this heavy burden. But it's us, folks. Your job is probably a lot more cumbersome than the board that came before you because this is a critical time.

Batter up. It's you. It's us. It's this community. It's this ag community. It's these environmentalists. It's these residents. It's this community now that has to make this tough choice.

Page 358

After that visit, I went in my dentist's office. And one of the women who worked as a dental assistant asked me what I'd done over the weekend. And when I told her about the visit, she shared with me that she lived in a winery in Gilroy that has well water.

Her landlord had told her that the water coming out of her tap had very high levels of nitrates, and what that meant was that she shouldn't give the water to infants or small animals.

She followed that direction. And -- because she didn't have children that were that small. But because that was the only information she had, she continued to drink the water herself, and to give it to her two children.

When I asked her further about this, she said that she knew that she had the option of buying bottled water but that it was a hassle and, also, that it was very expensive. She said maybe that's why I'm having all these gastric problems.

I wanted to share this story with you because when we don't take steps to protect people's water, these individuals and these families often don't have the information, let alone the financial resources, to be able to take -- to protect their own safety.

That's why I'm here. I'm here to -- I want to
Page 360

I support the -- the plan that was put forward by Mr. Shimek, the Coastkeepers and the Environmental Justice Group. I loved what you did in February of 2010. I thought that was great. I was so excited.

But I understand we're not going to get that.

Okay. Let's take -- let's take what we've got now. I hope people will be happy with the compromises that are being made.

Thank you very much for all of your hard work.

CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.

MS. PEMBROKE: I want to say thank you to the board and the staff. My name is Debra PEMBROKE.

CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you.

MS. PEMBROKE: I'm a member of the Unitarian Universalist Fellowship of Santa Cruz County. And I'm a resident of the Live Oak neighborhood of San -- in Santa Cruz.

There were about -- there were two other members of our congregation and a Monterey congregation that had to leave, so I just wanted to share with you that -- that they -- they had comments they wanted to share but weren't able to stay.

So members of our two congregations and a few others recently went to visit San Gerardo to learn more about nitrates and how that affected their community.

say, specifically, I -- I support the proposal -- the amendments that were put forward by the Coastkeepers and the Environmental Justice Coalition for Water.

And I support regulation that protects humans' health, the environment and will be strong enough to restore clean water.

Thank you.

CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.
MS. STANFORD: Good afternoon. My name is
Pallas Stanford. I'm another Unitarian Universalist. I
am the minister at the Unitarian Universalist Fellowship
of Santa Cruz County, which is over in Aptos.

I, personally, live in Watsonville.

And you've heard a lot of great testimony in just the last few minutes. I don't want to repeat it. I want to affirm it and emphasize that -- and I'm coming here as a faith leader, as a religious person, but most of all, just as a human being.

As Unitarian Universalists, we -- we -- we support the right of human beings to live on this planet and to enjoy the fruits of the planet together, and emphasize that it is our responsibility, as a human community and as a human family, to come together and figure out how we're going to share our resources for the benefit of all of us.

Page 359

### TRANSCRIPTS OF PROCEEDINGS **MARCH 17, 2011**

A5018B3 1 As has been said, you have an incredibly 1 2 difficult job in front of you. You are facing a question 2 3 that is of immense complexity at a time of -- of what is 3 4 a looming crisis for us, as a planet, in terms of our 4 5 5 ability to have adequate access to clean, fresh water. 6 6 So I just want to say to you, please, as you 7 7 are deliberating, as you are working, I know that you're 8 8 committed to your task. But remember that most of the 9 9 values that are being lifted up, when people are talking 10 10 about this issue from the perspective of agriculture, are 11 11 business values, values of profit and values of -- you 12 know, that have to do with how to -- how to do business. 12 13 Those are important values. But those values 13 14 14 are ultimately trumped by the value of -- of human life 15 and the value of life on this planet. 15 16 And we -- as someone said before, water is the 16 17 17 fundamental thing. We have to have water before we can 18 have anything else. Only air is more important than 18 lands. 19 water to our ability to sustain our life together, here 19 20 20 on the planet. 21 21 So I -- I urge you, when you -- when you're 22 22 deliberating, to remember to lift up the value of human 23 23 life as being the ultimate priority, and the life or our 24 24 ecosystem. 25 25 And also, to remember, as someone has said Page 362 1 also, the burdens of our unsustainable system fall 1 2 unfairly on the shoulders of those who are not here 2 3 3 today, those who don't have the ability to hire 4 high-priced consultants and put together, you know, great 4 5 5 Power Point presentations for you. urban control. 6 So, remember, that those are the folks that, 6 7 7 you know, we are trying to speak for in our -- in our 8 8

small way, when we are here.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And also, I want to say to the members -- to you and also to the members of the agricultural community, we love our farmers, we love agriculture. We think it -- I mean, it's an absolutely essential industry. It's an honorable and -- and -- and historic lifestyle. We want to be in support and in solidarity with -- with those folks.

But we absolutely believe that the regulation of this issue cannot fall on the industry itself. Just as in any other industry like in the mortgage banking crisis or, you know, in the oil industry; you don't leave the reg -- the matter of regulation to the people who are actually -- you know, have an economic interest in it.

So that's your -- your responsibility. And I thank you for taking it on and look forward to the solutions that you come up with.

CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.

25 Page 363

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MS. NIGGEMEYER: Chairman Young and fellow members of the board. My name is Heidi Niggemeyer. I just wanted to thank you for staying late and listening to all of us. I really appreciate that because I know you all have a long drive.

I'm here representing the City of Monterey and Monterey Regional Stormwater Program.

This letter is from Fred Muir, from the City of Monterey. And he says:

Dear Chair Young:

I am writing to ask you, as you and your fellow board members consider this item during your meeting on March 14th, 2011, that you also keep in mind striking a reasonable balance between what you're requiring the urban areas to do under their stormwater NPDES permits and the pollutant loads resulting from urban areas and the pollutant loads that are received from agricultural

Urban areas, such as Monterey, are being required to comply with ever stringent requirements, including the extreme requirements of the ASBS, special protections, which is going to require a 1.2 million-dollar monitoring program over the next five years for just the peninsula cities.

> Yet, recent research conducted by the State Page 364

Water Resource Control Board and SCCWRP, which is the Southern California Coast Water Research Program, has disclosed that in most cases the ocean waters off our coast are being polluted from sources outside of our

Agricultural is one of those sources. Both agricultural interests and the municipal permitees should be held to the same maximum extent practical standard.

Sincerely, Fred Muir.

Some other comments that I'd like for you to consider simply is coming from the regional stormwater program manager, which I am.

I just learned today about the collaborative approach that was being presented by the grower-shipper association. And just some comments that I have on that.

First of all, how can the grower-shipper association involve the public, via outreach, to work together to develop solutions to problem areas, if the public cannot even access their data to see what the issue is or where the problem is?

And if the growers have the money to fund third-party oversight, why can't they just use that money for groundwater monitoring?

How can a third party be objective and enforce the process, if that third party is also being paid by Page 365

1	the growers they oversee?	1	small operator with trees on drip. I don't think there's
2	There are no numeric action limits or numeric	2	anything I can do to improve my operation. But I would
3	goals to achieve and measure effectiveness by. Third	3	appreciate an independent audit.
4	party only audits once a year for implementation actions.	4	And, so far I mean, I don't think that's
5	How do they determine the B & Ps they are using	5	going to happen from the Regional Water Quality Control
6	are effective or not, since there isn't any groundwater	6	Board, if they think I'm in compliance.
7	monitoring or any method for effectiveness assessment, as	7	So I would appreciate someone coming and
8	the rest of us that are regulated have to do?	8	talking to me on my farm to tell me what I could do
9	Reporting is done on a group basis by	9	better.
10	percentage, instead of reporting who is noncompliant. So	10	The second thing I would say, is I have become
11	they'll tell you 10 percent didn't follow the rules, but	11	alarmed by what the strawberry people said today because
12	you don't know who those are.	12	I think I am now Tier 3. And I have gone along, thinking
13	Tier levels should be congruent with risk	13	that if I have 40 acres of walnuts on drip irrigation, I
14	level, not size. The construction general permit use	14	am Tier 1.
15	risk levels I'm sorry the construction general	15	But I happen to own some other property, with
16	permit uses risk levels for construction projects.	16	my husband, that lease is leased by another operator;
17	And the new phase 2 permit, may be assigning	17	small property. Fifty-five miles from my home, my sister
18	risk levels to watersheds. There should be similar risk	18	and I own a very, very small property with four very,
19	levels for ag.	19	very small operators.
20	Ag and your report should be should include	20	We do a kind of a rotation, a dry land
21	effectiveness assessments. Phase 1 and 2 MS4s have this	21	irrigated, and for one of those irrigators, I write the
22	requirement.	22	farm plan. Okay. I'm still Tier 1.
23	Monitoring should be equal across the board;	23	It just occurred to me, that a hundred and
24	ag, MS4s, everyone. The the regional water board, the	24	sixty miles from my home, but still in this region and
25	region three has a vision for watershed health. I'm	25	I hate to divulge this stuff in public I because I
	Page 366		Page 368
1	not sure if it was the 2020 or but they have a vision	1	don't think it's any of your business.
2	for watershed health.	2	But I own over a thousand acres of irrigated
3	And it's very difficult for those of us who are	3	property, a minority interest - a minority interest -
4	already regulated. You've got industrial. You've got	4	with my cousin and other family members. But that
5	commercial. You've got Phase 1 and Phase 2 MS4s.	5	probably puts my 45 acres of walnuts into Tier 3.
6	The only loophole is ag. So you're trying to	6	That's not fair. That is not fair. And it's
7	have watershed health. And you get all of these great	7	something you haven't been thinking about. And I don't
8	programs going throughout the watershed. And you've got	8	want to be burdened with it. So I don't know how that
9	these big holes, and they're called agriculture.	9	happens.
10	And I think it's just about time that we	10	But I will read my prepared remarks, to the
11	leveled out the playing field and everybody had the same	11	extent that my minutes remain.
12	requirements.	12	For many of us who appeared before you today,
13	Thank you.	13	we are representing ourselves, paying our own way, giving
14	CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.	14	our own time. To help this board and staff understand
15	, ,	15	the impact of your actions.
16	MS. MYHRE: Good evening, afternoon, members of	16	We typically operate small acreages and we are
17	the board. I am Ann Myhre, M-Y-H-R-E, from San Ardo.	17	in very limited income. And we are going to be required
18	Running late. I'm facilitating a meeting at	18	to absorb additional expenses and take on additional
19	7:00. So I'm not too happy to be so late.	19	duties without compensation, dependent upon your actions.
20	I have prepared some written statements for	20	As such a person, I am responsible for farm
21	you, but I want to deviate from that for a moment.	21	plans required by the current ag waiver program. I can
22	First, I would say that I will participate in	22	honestly say, that I resent the time I spend formalizing
23	some sort of monitoring program that is cooperative, if	23	these plans, because, to my way of thinking, they serve
24	that is available.	24	absolutely no purpose.
25	I'm a very small grower. I consider myself a	25	That is not to say that I am not mindful of the

Page 367

1 unique characteristics of my property; that I have been 1 is going to be skewed by the fact that it's sort of a 2 2 continuously developing and revising informal management self-selected group. 3 3 plans in my mind, since I attended my first conservation The other difficulty is one of the -- one of 4 4 the purposes of the GAMA program was to develop a trend meeting in 1955. 5 5 Certainly, water quality is among the things I analysis, like: Which way is water quality going, and 6 6 consider. whether we have to worry about it? 7 7 However, I oppose staff recommendations to But, you know, between all the funding 8 8 change the current plans and process. And it would be problems, we never got to the trend piece of it; we're 9 9 helpful if this board would exercise restraint when just barely getting through the first set of data. 10 10 considering modifications to that expiring plan. So I should say that I've been active in the 11 11 The properties I represent are not going to be Central Valley ag waiver process. And one thing that I 12 better managed because of these new demands. 12 worked with Pacific Institute on, for that process, was 13 13 Furthermore, I cannot justify additional to do a regression analysis. 14 14 management expense. And still, under this order, it So what we took from the GAMA data, is we took 15 seems designed to impact my operation in just that way. 15 wells for which we had a significant amount of data over 16 Requiring more time, more money and the intent ultimately 16 10 to 20 years. And we took a look at what the nitrate 17 17 being that it take away my historic use of this property, concentrations were and how they -- and how they sort of 18 18 some of which has been irrigated since 1900. penciled out if you kept drawing the line. 19 Would somebody like my written comments? 19 And I have no idea -- I'm sure it's not 20 20 CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Sure. Thank you for your scientifically accurate. But it's the best we could do, 21 21 comments. in the form of trend analysis. 22 MS. CLARY: Thank you. My name is Jennifer 22 And under that analysis, it looked like -- we 23 23 Clary. I'm with Clean Water Action and Clean Water Fund. just did Kern County because it has -- it had the biggest 24 24 And I hope to stun you with my brevity. nitrate problem. And it showed that the number of wells 25 I want to speak in support of the Monterey 25 exceeding the drinking water standard would double in the Page 370 Page 372 1 Baykeeper and Environmental Justice Coalition for Water 1 next 10 years. 2 proposal. 2 And I think that's something that we have to 3 3 And I also had a chance to listen to the -- to understand as part of putting this program in, is we 4 4 the Farm Bureau's new proposal. Unfortunately, it -- it don't just want to solve the problems we have; we want to 5 5 sounded a lot like the one that they presented in prevent the problems that are coming up. 6 November. And, I think, the big -- my biggest concern is 6 And so, one way we have to do that, is we have 7 7 to have a strong monitoring program. And the biggest groundwater. 8 8 I should tell you that I come from a drinking shortcoming of the Farm Bureau proposal is that it 9 9 water perspective. I serve on a -- on several doesn't have that information. 10 stakeholder groups representing drinking water interests. 10 And voluntary groundwater monitoring doesn't work because it isn't going to go into the GAMA database, 11 11 And one of the stakeholder groups I've served on for 12 years is the GAMA Public Advisory Committee. 12 you're not going to be able to do trend analysis. 13 So I just -- just wanted to clarify a few 13 And if they're concerned about information 14 14 misconceptions about the GAMA database. getting out, that shouldn't get out, I should tell you 15 GAMA database is a collection of -- of the data 15 that the GAMA program doesn't reveal well location. And 16 that several public agencies gathered. It has data from 16 it wouldn't reveal well location for any of the 17 17 drinking water supply wells, DPR data, state water board monitoring done here, as well. 18 monitoring wells, and it does have some data about --18 Thank you. 19 19 from USGS. CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you. Thank you for your 20 USGS has been doing monitoring for the GAMA 20 comments. 21 program for several years. And one problem with that 21 MS. DAMRON: Good evening. My name is Sarah 22 22 monitoring program -- it's a great program, we've got Damron. And I'm speaking on behalf of the five Surfrider 23 23 lots of information -- but it is voluntary. The Foundation chapters here in the region three.

24

25

Page 371

name, again.

24

25

participants elect to do it.

So there's always been a concern that the data

Page 373

CHAIR YOUNG: Could -- could you repeat your

1	MS. DAMRON: Sorry. Sarah Damron.	1	substances that cause toxicity, when toxicity is really
2	CHAIR YOUNG: Sarah. Okay.	2	what we're seeking to eliminate here.
3	MS. DAMRON: Thanks.	3	And, in doing so, we feel like as a number
4	And I kind of foresaw this moment coming, so I	4	of speakers on all sides have pointed out that people
5	actually have typed statements. But I will paraphrase.	5	are just going to switch to other pesticides. And that's
6	So, obviously, our members care about the	6	not what any of us, I don't think, want to do.
7	protection of coastal ocean ecosystems, which are	7	So there are a couple options. You could
8	impacted by aquatic conditions, and the ability of people	8	expand Tier 3 to be more inclusive of operations that
9	to use and enjoy coastal waters beneficially.	9	discharge into 303(d)-listed waterbodies, that also
10	So that's the context in which I'm making	10	include the broader list of pesticides that have been
11	comments today.	11	identified as harmful or that are causing toxicity in
12	We really care about what's in front of us,	12	these waterbodies.
13	which is the continued impairment of our coastal	13	Or, you could extend individual discharge
14	waterbodies and groundwater that's occurring by irrigated	14	monitoring requirement to Tier 2. Or, we could go back
15	agriculture as a class.	15	to the February 2010 option.
16	We realize it's, you know some folks are	16	Just putting some things out there for you.
17	doing really well, and some folks maybe aren't.	17	But, basically, we support what we're trying I think,
18	We do appreciate the fact that a number of	18	what we're all trying to do here, which is eliminate
19	folks really have taken it upon themselves to make	19	toxicity, reduce pollution.
20	improvements. But that's not why we're here today.	20	So, thank you for the opportunity to comment.
21	We're here because there is continued impairment of our	21	CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.
22	waterbodies.	22	MR. OMPA: Roy Ompa. I live in Hollister; farm
23	And, specifically, waterbodies that are	23	in Fresno, Merced and San Benito County.
24	identified as supporting other beneficial uses, such as	24	CHAIR YOUNG: And that was Roy and the last
25	contact recreation, fishing, drinking water, these types	25	name?
	Page 374		Page 376
1	of things, need to be protected and cleaned up to support	1	MR. OMPA: Yeah.
2	those uses.	2	CHAIR YOUNG: Your last name, sir?
3	So we believe those efforts need to to	3	MR. OMPA: O-M-P-A.
4	prevent and remediate pollution should be implemented,	4	I would like to make a couple of proposals.
5	and in as timely a manner as possible, to support those	5	Number one, if all these people that have been
6	other beneficial uses.	6	here speaking today, that eat the the chow that we
7	We do support the change from the existing	7	produce, think that we're doing such a bad job keeping
8	waiver to the proposed waiver that does require	8	them fed, I suggest that they all be they're not
9	individual discharge monitoring because we do agree that	9	calling this a tax. They're calling it a fee.
10	it will facilitate a measure of changes; both, you know,	10	So I think they all should pay a fee to be sure
11	what where are the problems, exactly, and and how	11	that we can afford to keep the water the way they think
12	are we doing better, and let us know that, you know,	12	it should be. I'd like to remind them, also, that a lot
13	are we doing better, and let us know that, you know,		,,
	these management practices that we're putting into place,	13	of our nitrogen comes from thunder showers, from God's
14		13 14	
15	these management practices that we're putting into place,	14 15	of our nitrogen comes from thunder showers, from God's
	these management practices that we're putting into place, actually are succeeding. Or maybe they're failing.  And we appreciate that that's included for Tier 3 dischargers. But we feel that this really is the, kind	14	of our nitrogen comes from thunder showers, from God's domain, that nobody's talked about.
15 16 17	these management practices that we're putting into place, actually are succeeding. Or maybe they're failing.  And we appreciate that that's included for Tier 3 dischargers. But we feel that this really is the, kind of, a bottom rung. This is the very least amount of	14 15	of our nitrogen comes from thunder showers, from God's domain, that nobody's talked about.  Also, this watershed starts in San Benito County, in the San Benito River, Pajaros, about 28 miles west of Coalingo (phonetic). And between here and
15 16 17 18	these management practices that we're putting into place, actually are succeeding. Or maybe they're failing.  And we appreciate that that's included for Tier 3 dischargers. But we feel that this really is the, kind	14 15 16	of our nitrogen comes from thunder showers, from God's domain, that nobody's talked about.  Also, this watershed starts in San Benito County, in the San Benito River, Pajaros, about 28 miles west of Coalingo (phonetic). And between here and Coalingo and I'll be nice I'll say feces from the
15 16 17	these management practices that we're putting into place, actually are succeeding. Or maybe they're failing.  And we appreciate that that's included for Tier 3 dischargers. But we feel that this really is the, kind of, a bottom rung. This is the very least amount of	14 15 16 17	of our nitrogen comes from thunder showers, from God's domain, that nobody's talked about.  Also, this watershed starts in San Benito County, in the San Benito River, Pajaros, about 28 miles west of Coalingo (phonetic). And between here and
15 16 17 18	these management practices that we're putting into place, actually are succeeding. Or maybe they're failing.  And we appreciate that that's included for Tier 3 dischargers. But we feel that this really is the, kind of, a bottom rung. This is the very least amount of individual discharge monitoring that should occur if	14 15 16 17 18	of our nitrogen comes from thunder showers, from God's domain, that nobody's talked about.  Also, this watershed starts in San Benito County, in the San Benito River, Pajaros, about 28 miles west of Coalingo (phonetic). And between here and Coalingo and I'll be nice I'll say feces from the
15 16 17 18 19	these management practices that we're putting into place, actually are succeeding. Or maybe they're failing.  And we appreciate that that's included for Tier 3 dischargers. But we feel that this really is the, kind of, a bottom rung. This is the very least amount of individual discharge monitoring that should occur if we're really looking to to solve the problem.	14 15 16 17 18 19	of our nitrogen comes from thunder showers, from God's domain, that nobody's talked about.  Also, this watershed starts in San Benito County, in the San Benito River, Pajaros, about 28 miles west of Coalingo (phonetic). And between here and Coalingo and I'll be nice I'll say feces from the cattle and the horses, the deer and the pigs, create a
15 16 17 18 19 20	these management practices that we're putting into place, actually are succeeding. Or maybe they're failing.  And we appreciate that that's included for Tier 3 dischargers. But we feel that this really is the, kind of, a bottom rung. This is the very least amount of individual discharge monitoring that should occur if we're really looking to to solve the problem.  We're generally concerned that the tiering	14 15 16 17 18 19 20	of our nitrogen comes from thunder showers, from God's domain, that nobody's talked about.  Also, this watershed starts in San Benito County, in the San Benito River, Pajaros, about 28 miles west of Coalingo (phonetic). And between here and Coalingo and I'll be nice I'll say feces from the cattle and the horses, the deer and the pigs, create a hell of a lot of nitrogen. And water runs downhill, and
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	these management practices that we're putting into place, actually are succeeding. Or maybe they're failing.  And we appreciate that that's included for Tier 3 dischargers. But we feel that this really is the, kind of, a bottom rung. This is the very least amount of individual discharge monitoring that should occur if we're really looking to to solve the problem.  We're generally concerned that the tiering criteria might be too narrow. Tier 3 is not necessarily	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	of our nitrogen comes from thunder showers, from God's domain, that nobody's talked about.  Also, this watershed starts in San Benito County, in the San Benito River, Pajaros, about 28 miles west of Coalingo (phonetic). And between here and Coalingo and I'll be nice I'll say feces from the cattle and the horses, the deer and the pigs, create a hell of a lot of nitrogen. And water runs downhill, and we're on the bottom.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	these management practices that we're putting into place, actually are succeeding. Or maybe they're failing.  And we appreciate that that's included for Tier 3 dischargers. But we feel that this really is the, kind of, a bottom rung. This is the very least amount of individual discharge monitoring that should occur if we're really looking to to solve the problem.  We're generally concerned that the tiering criteria might be too narrow. Tier 3 is not necessarily inclusive of all operations that could be significant	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	of our nitrogen comes from thunder showers, from God's domain, that nobody's talked about.  Also, this watershed starts in San Benito County, in the San Benito River, Pajaros, about 28 miles west of Coalingo (phonetic). And between here and Coalingo and I'll be nice I'll say feces from the cattle and the horses, the deer and the pigs, create a hell of a lot of nitrogen. And water runs downhill, and we're on the bottom.  And nobody's addressed that. And that water,
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	these management practices that we're putting into place, actually are succeeding. Or maybe they're failing.  And we appreciate that that's included for Tier 3 dischargers. But we feel that this really is the, kind of, a bottom rung. This is the very least amount of individual discharge monitoring that should occur if we're really looking to to solve the problem.  We're generally concerned that the tiering criteria might be too narrow. Tier 3 is not necessarily inclusive of all operations that could be significant contributors of pollutants to 303(d)-listed waterbodies.	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of our nitrogen comes from thunder showers, from God's domain, that nobody's talked about.  Also, this watershed starts in San Benito County, in the San Benito River, Pajaros, about 28 miles west of Coalingo (phonetic). And between here and Coalingo and I'll be nice I'll say feces from the cattle and the horses, the deer and the pigs, create a hell of a lot of nitrogen. And water runs downhill, and we're on the bottom.  And nobody's addressed that. And that water, basically, on light years, what little when the river

1	above that.	1	Excuse me. I'm a little congested.
2	And that would be my recommendation; that all	2	I'm with the Environmental Defense Center. And
3	these people, who've got all these good ideas in town,	3	I'm basically exactly who we all want to see at 6:00 at
4	contribute to see that we have this done.	4	night. I'm an attorney about to talk about process.
5	The other thing is, there's two other possible	5	And I can guarantee that no one else has
6	solutions. In Fresno County, where I farm, these part	6	brought up these points today. So at least it's a little
7	of these same people, the environmentalists and the fish	7	refreshing.
8	and game, are proposing within the next 12 years to take	8	The current order the current, existing
9	out 1.5 million acres out of production. And put it back	9	agricultural waiver, R3 2010-0040, expires on March 31st.
10	in habitat.	10	The section of the water code, 13269 subsection F, that
11	So if we took 1.5 million acres out of	11	refers to renewal of conditional waivers, says that those
12		12	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	production here in Salinas, put it back to habitat, their		decisions must be made at a hearing; which means that if
13	water would be beautiful. That would be one proposal I'd	13	you continue today's hearing, you cannot make that
14	make.	14	decision probably prior to March 31st, which means, that,
15	And the other one is, that nobody's mentioned	15	defacto, this order is going to expire.
16	only that some sea otter ate some moss out there and	16	Now, I've also heard a a consideration of a
17	died that's because the sea otter have ate all the	17	a, quote-unquote, administrative renewal of this
18	clams and abalone there is for 50 miles up and down the	18	process. And I refer back to the water code. Section
19	coast.	19	13223 authorizes your board to delegate some authority to
20	Because I'm 84 years old, and I used to come	20	the executive officer. However, it contains several
21	over here clamming all the time and catch some beautiful	21	enumerated exceptions.
22	six and eight-inch clams, abalone. There's none around.	22	One, is that the executive officer may not
23	The sea otters ate them all.	23	promulgate any regulation. And I think a lot of these
24	So I think that somebody on that committee	24	folks would be surprised to hear someone say that the ag
25	should check into see how much influence Monterey Bay	25	waiver is not a regulation.
	Page 378		Page 380
1	Aquarium and that lab whatever they call it at Moss	1	In fact, the government code, which defines
2	Landing is input is having in inputting it in to	2	such thing, says that a regulation is essentially any
3	blame the farmers for putting all this nitrogen in the	3	order that comes from an agency, which implements the
4	water.	4	laws that that agency is tasked to enforce.
5	They don't want it in there. And they're	5	So by that plain definition, the waiver is, in
6	passing it off as screwing up your drinking water. If	6	fact, regulation. Even if you were to operate under the
7	the truth was really found out, you'd find out that they	7	fiction that it's not, the second enumerated exception
8	have a big input in what's going on here today.	8	says that the executive officer may not issue, modify or
9	Thank you very much.	9	revoke any waste discharge requirement.
10	CHAIR YOUNG: Sir, I didn't sir sir?	10	Now, it's nonsensical to me that the executive
11	I didn't catch your over here.	11	officer is prohibited from doing those things and, yet,
12	MR. OMPA: Well, it don't make any difference.	12	has some authority to waive a waste discharge
13	I'm alive and well. Thank you.	13	requirement.
14	CHAIR YOUNG: No. Wait wait a minute.	14	And that's exactly what a conditional waiver
15		15	•
16	Okay.	16	is. It's a waiver of waste discharge requirements. I've
	MR. BRIGGS: I think we got it close enough.		seen these green buttons that says, waive or don't
17	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay.	17	waive agriculture. If you take that literally, that
18	MR. BRIGGS: And we'll remember him.	18	means everyone has to get a WDR.
19	CHAIR YOUNG: I just wanted his last name.	19	So that doesn't really make sense to me.
20	That's all.	20	Anyway, bottom line is, the only way for you to
21	MS. MC CANN: I heard O-M-P-A.	21	renew this waiver is for your board to constitute a full
22	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. Okay.	22	quorum and make a decision at a hearing, after notice.
23	Last speaker. Go ahead.	23	Now, what's the import of this? Well, after
24	MR. ALLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name	24	March 31st, there's no more waiver, there's no more
10 =	ic Nathan Alloy, just like the howling alloy	25	waiver of waste discharge requirements.
25	is Nathan Alley, just like the bowling alley.	= 0	Page 381

Page 379

1	That means that everybody who's discharging or	1	MR. BRIGGS: Once once we do have a day,
2	threatening discharge has to file under 13260 a report of	2	we'll post that on our web site. And the a lot of you
3	waste discharge requirements. And then your board has	3	are familiar with the ag page that we have on our web
4	to, under 13263, prescribe waste discharge requirements.	4	site. So we'll post it there.
5	Now, none of us really wanted to get to this	5	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. We're done for today.
6	point, where every single individual discharger enrolled	6	Thank you very much.
7	under the waiver has to file for a WDR. Unfortunately,	7	(WHEREUPON, the proceedings were adjourned at
8	it's been two years or more since we've been in this	8	6:00 p.m.)
9	process.	9	
10	And things have been renewed and renewed and	10	
11	renewed - inappropriately, I might add - and,	11	
12	unfortunately for everybody involved, we've kind of	12	
13	backed ourselves into a corner.	13	
14	And so I am looking forward to this requirement	14	
15	being implemented on April 1st. Funny day for it. But	15	
16	until you can renew the waiver i.e., until your board	16	
17	constitutes a quorum I'm looking forward to all these	17	
18	reports of waste discharge, and I'm looking forward to	18	
19	you guys issuing waste discharge requirements.	19	
20	Thank you very much.	20	
21	CHAIR YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.	21	
22	MR. ALLEY: You're welcome.	22	
23	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. That concludes our public	23	
24	comment session for today. We will give notice, as soon	24	
25	as possible, as to when we're going to continue this	25	
23	Page 382	23	Page 384
1	meeting.	1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2	Speak up louder? Okay.	2	
3	We're going to give notice, as soon as we can,	3	I, TONIA L. WEBB, CSR NO. 4588, Certified
4	as to when this meeting is going to be continued.	4	Shorthand Reporter, certify;
5	And we have some idea, Mr. Briggs, as to when	5	That the foregoing proceedings were taken
6	we can do that? At least, when we can make the decision.	6	before me at the time and place therein set forth;
7	MR. BRIGGS: Well, we'll do that as soon as	7	That the proceedings were recorded
8	possible. I don't know if I'll be able to check	8	stenographically by me and were thereafter transcribed;
9	everybody's schedules tomorrow. But possibly Monday.	9	That the foregoing is a true and correct
10	CHAIR YOUNG: Okay. All right.	10	transcript of my shorthand notes so taken.
11	And I just want to thank everybody who spoke	11	I further certify that I am not a relative or
12	today, even those that have left, that can't hear my	12	employee of any attorney or of any of the parties, nor
13	comments.	13	financially interested in the action.
14	But it we've been through a couple of years	14	I declare under penalty of perjury under the
15	of this already. And I appreciate everyone's input into	15	laws of the State of California that the foregoing is
16	this. We do have some divergent perspectives on how to	16	true and correct.
17	deal with what the issues are.	17	
18	And I'm grateful for being in involved in	18	Dated .
19	the process at this point in time. I look to being	19	·
20	I'm grateful for being involved in the solution to this.	20	
21	And the board is going to ferret out everything	21	TONIA L. WEBB, CSR NO. 4588
22	and deliberate and come up with recommendations for staff	22	
23	to consider. And I anticipate, maybe in the summer,	23	
24	we'll be ready to really have a vote on something, that	24	
25	has been through a lengthy review.	25	
	THE DESTRUCTION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERT		
23	Page 383		Page 385

A
abalone 378:18,22 abandoned 26:3 256:22
257:16
abandoning 33:10
134:13 abatement 63:18 159:17
Abby 207:7 208:18
209:25 214:20 220:17
220:22 228:18 229:6 <b>Abby's</b> 209:13,23
abil 288:7
abilities 165:9 348:23
<b>ability</b> 94:8 180:3 206:2 288:7 343:12 352:25
362:5,19 363:3 374:8
able 10:2 13:25 80:19
91:3 112:1 113:22
117:1 128:12 142:24 157:8,18 162:24
177:18 206:4 230:3
235:5 247:3 263:10
270:9 282:2 289:9 297:24 318:9 322:3
324:1,24 325:2 327:24
334:22 339:1 347:24
349:6 359:22 360:24 373:12 383:8
about 7:12 11:4 12:21
13:2 15:17 16:3 20:3,4
22:22 23:11,24 26:14 26:19 27:12,19 28:3
35:6,17,19,23,25 36:2
36:3.3.5 39:9.14 50:18
52:7,25 55:11 56:22 57:19 58:17 59:24
60:25 61:1 65:13,18
66:19 67:5 68:15 69:1
70:6 72:12,14,16 74:6 75:7 77:16,17,20,24
78:1,3 80:6,18 82:4
83:18,22 84:6,8 85:14
88:7 91:13 101:2 104:16 106:16 108:4
112:4 114:6,14 116:2
117:21 118:3 119:6
122:18 123:2,7 126:23
128:16,23 129:2 130:21,22 131:8 134:7
136:16,17 137:1,9 139:16 140:14 142:4
139:16 140:14 142:4 143:24 146:9 149:6
153:6 158:6 165:5
168:5 169:8 173:6
176:13,15 178:2,24 180:13 186:14 192:3
194:8 196:11 199:4
200:14 201:16 204:4,9
208:7,12 209:13,23
215:12 218:10 219:11 223:25 224:1,2 225:22
228:10 229:1 233:21
235:14 237:23 239:7,9
240:8 241:20,25 242:1 242:5 244:24 246:10
248:1 249:6 250:22
251:10 254:10 258:21
258:24 259:1,14,16 260:4,16 261:11
262:24 263:2,3,5,6,22
265:12 266:10 268:19

271:12,12 272:10,18 273:10 274:24 275:1 276:8 277:14 278:22 280:17,18 281:14 287:8 288:21 290:20 290:24 291:4,17 292:22 293:5,23 294:20,23 295:7,22 296:1,5 298:10 300:6 301:16 302:19 305:17 307:4,21 309:9 310:1,5 312:21 313:1,2 316:18 318:11 319:2,17 320:17,21 321:11,17 323:17,20 326:22 328:9 332:4 333:6 335:4 336:1 339:15 340:6 341:7 342:14 346:7,8,9,19 347:4 348:1 349:8 350:5 354:6 356:24 357:9 359:18,25 360:4,15 362:10 365:13 367:10 369:7 371:14.18 372:6 373:13 374:6,12 377:14,16 380:4,4 above 38:5 84:22 254:19 259:12 272:1 331:22 378:1 absence 107:24 Absent 9:7 absolute 190:14 absolutely 164:7 178:3 196:17 197:8 202:4 214:3 222:25 231:3 232:17 234:22 248:20 363:12,16 369:24 absorb 250:16 369:18 accept 9:25 214:23 acceptable 81:4 107:8 267:7 296:8,12 accepted 75:25 121:21 accepts 155:18 access 73:6 87:2 297:3 302:2,9,14 348:12 362:5 365:19 accessible 70:10 accompany 350:1 accomplish 80:24 accomplishes 280:1 accordance 8:17 according 37:7,8 88:10 147:5 194:5 195:1 274.25 accordingly 5:23 account 10:2 41:14 56:3 81:8 85:3 145:1 149:19 158:18 165:11 accountability 107:2 209:9,21 212:19 213:13 214:2 216:7,22 217:10 226:23 227:21 317:24 349:23 accountable 17:25 135:8 136:15 216:9,10,14 accounted 335:6 accounts 301:16.22 accumulated 262:12 287:25 accuracy 180:20 181:1

181:15,25 accurate 88:9 132:23 133:3,16,22 182:2 317:12 372:20 accurately 187:25 achievable 176:19 achieve 56:15 57:15 69:18 110:8 111:15 112:2 170:16 176:7 210:11 240:14 251:19 273:7 283:7 285:7,9 286:3,18,18 366:3 achieved 71:5,6 111:5,9 111:23 171:21 achieving 65:19 165:20 166:5,9 acknowledges 162:18 acknowledgment 159:5 acre 31:19 54:8.8.15 60:22 94:25 145:10,11 192:4 241:21,25 242:2 242:9 250:6,7 334:10 334:23 acreage 36:2.3.4 77:3 96:8,9 98:6,18 99:2 114:16 152:5 197:21 239:9.10 240:6 275:2 275:16 277:4 336:6 acreages 369:16 acres 36:1,5 38:20 41:20 44:2,21 45:1 61:2,3,3 61:14 92:23 94:19.24 95:6,7,9,11,13,15,17 95:18,19,21 96:11,16 96:19,20,21 98:14 100:8,11,15 101:11 102:17 140:22 143:20 146:10 152:19 163:23 164:2 197:9,22 239:8 262:6 277:5,6 310:21 314:16 315:12 329:25 330:21 352:23 368:13 369:2.5 378:9.11 across 150:13 181:7 185:23 189:9 366:23 across-the-board 67:21 ACS 306:9 307:6 act 9:3 16:10 74:16 294:21,23 355:15 acting 294:20,24 346:1 action 26:13 58:2,7 63:16,17,24 67:22 135:21 138:21 141:13 141:14 147:6 216:25 366:2 370:23 385:13 actions 24:12 26:15 35:7 63:21.25 64:14 68:4 146:23 366:4 369:15 369:19 active 31:18 349:25 372:10 activities 17:22 20:21 21:7 118:13 131:21 212:14 303:7 317:5 activity 315:7 331:13 334:13 actual 25:13 30:19 110:12 134:12 197:12

213:9 218:18 281:15

312:22 313:20 349:8

353:12

actually 11:20 12:21 13:2 14:5 17:7 20:4 26:16 30:8 53:13 66:14 74:3 86:17 88:18 89:7 96:13 103:23 111:20 114:5 115:17 117:10 129:4 136:23 137:2,12 148:1 176:2 206:18,23 207:10 209:24 217:2 228:25 231:19 236:12 236:13,17 241:11 242:12 243:14 244:9 257:19 276:13,15 292:25 294:18 296:23 304:19 305:19 306:15 308:24 309:3,5,22 310:15 312:1,2 313:2 313:19 314:8,12 315:7 319:14 338:7 345:15 345:20 347:12 363:21 374:5 375:14 Ad 58:6 185:25 adapt 56:7 adaptive 110:1 add 11:4 34:8 37:10 58:19 62:10 74:9 80:8 107:7 115:23 125:11 161:17 179:19 180:1 197:20 220:17,22 249:5 260:9 271:13 317:1 324:12 344:18 382:11 added 34:24 114:9 115:22 116:1 131:4 151:2 169:17 192:12 203:21 284:1 316:11 adding 157:14 266:3,4 286.9 324.12 addition 30:11 38:4 42:9 51:16 52:13,15 71:19 105:1 180:1 203:5,19 203:21 205:2 256:21 266:22 293:1 316:8 348:20 additional 6:7 13:8 22:21 24:9,11 35:10 41:7 50:4 52:25 58:1,6,25 63:16,17,23 64:13 84:9 91:10 140:2 152:15 158:25 159:1,18 162:7 204:14 205:1,2,7,20,22 212:25 233:6 255:22 261:1 276:14 292:21 309:11 315:22 316:2 317:24 321:11 345:12 369:18,18 370:13 additionally 16:11 122:11 additive 333:15 address 6:4 7:6 9:13 32:10 121:4 153:10 157:23 158:16,22 163:10 164:21 176:10 220:10 222:9,14,21 238:15 249:7 264:15 264:16 284:8 295:12 301:14 337:20 339:20 addressed 140:12 145:23 158:21 160:22 161:21 238:24 255:2 291:14 320:7 323:7

377:22 addressing 5:15 107:1 155:22 347:7 adds 276:3 adequate 21:17,18 207:2 276:9 362:5 adequately 115:16 275.13 adhere 287:10 adjacent 69:24 72:2 98:13,18 99:20 115:10 115:11,15 126:21 193:20 316:22 adjourned 384:7 adjust 85:12 169:25 . 275:18 adjustments 324:21 administrative 323:10 380.17 administratively 214:12 adopt 9:5 138:15 199:13 224:7 353:15 adopted 19:21 156:11 176:7 206:20 213:20 351:14 Adopting 151:10 adoption 8:5 199:13 224:15 274:15 351:10 adopts 37:5,5 136:11 138:21 advance 9:18 advice 339:15 advise 68:19 advised 77:9 95:3 354:13 advisers 53:10 69:5 advisor 52:2 240:24 350.24 25 advisors 51:14 advisory 167:8 186:1 371:12 advocates 155:20 aerial 45:22 185:6 311:3 Aerovista 1:2 2:3 affairs 6:15 affect 42:5 51:1 56:3 82:23 131:17 161:20 177:9 206:2,21 317:11 affected 25:8 117:23 125:20 126:6 134:19 138:14 198:3 344:19 350:6 359:25 affecting 115:18 344:14 affects 117:10 affirm 361:16 afford 154:25 284:13 345:11 377:11 affordable 284:4 345:17 348:13 afforded 196:2 aforementioned 353:11 after 10:21 11:22 40:11 97.13 103.18 111.8 150:23 161:18 170:2 174:4 196:24 244:25 275:15 279:20,25 282:8 298:22 321:3,22 324:21 340:16 360:1 381:22,23 afternoon 5:22 11:10

12:11 156:8 157:22

allowed 9:17 33:2 73:11

allowing 7:1 79:25 150:5

allows 56:6 61:24 73:24

85:2 87:6 116:22

168:15 182:14,17

all-community 155:9

330:5

allude 102:1

146:21 208:23

225:19 330:25

167:4 203:1 240:21
269:19 299:21 307:24
344:25 347:20 352:10
354:23 356:19 361:9
367:16
ag 12:21 26:8 30:10
60:21 73:14,14 78:15 78:21 81:8 119:22
132:25 135:12 136:6
150:23 151:14,15
153:24 155:10,12
156:11 159:25 161:1
163:20 165:23 176:21
184:2 185:21 187:11 192:9 193:10,20 196:3
196:3 215:25 225:10
272:24 274:13 291:1
295:25 296:1 297:13
298:3 309:8 312:11
315:7 318:19 331:3
336:3,17,20 351:15
357:17 358:23 366:19
366:20,24 367:6
369:21 372:11 380:24
384:3 again 12:16 18:25 21:21
30:4,11 46:2 47:1 49:9
50:1 52:19 53:8 69:15
69:22 71:2,22 75:15
76:5 105:21 111:12,24
113:12 115:16 117:3
117:20 118:25 151:21 152:14 198:1 202:19
209:16 221:25 240:16
743 10 744 10 743 70
243:16 244:10 245:20 249:25 261:22 264:2
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5 270:16 273:20 279:11
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5 270:16 273:20 279:11 280:8,10,20 300:23
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5 270:16 273:20 279:11 280:8,10,20 300:23 302:11 303:17 304:17
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5 270:16 273:20 279:11 280:8,10,20 300:23 302:11 303:17 304:17
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5 270:16 273:20 279:11 280:8,10,20 300:23 302:11 303:17 304:17 306:17 315:9 317:9,13 344:9 347:11 373:25
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5 270:16 273:20 279:11 280:8,10,20 300:23 302:11 303:17 304:17 306:17 315:9 317:9,13 344:9 347:11 373:25 against 124:16 301:7
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5 270:16 273:20 279:11 280:8,10,20 300:23 302:11 303:17 304:17 306:17 315:9 317:9,13 344:9 347:11 373:25
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5 270:16 273:20 279:11 280:8,10,20 300:23 302:11 303:17 304:17 306:17 315:9 317:9,13 344:9 347:11 373:25 against 124:16 301:7 age 190:2,8 agencies 19:10 24:19 78:23 79:21 80:4
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5 270:16 273:20 279:11 280:8,10,20 300:23 302:11 303:17 304:17 306:17 315:9 317:9,13 344:9 347:11 373:25 against 124:16 301:7 age 190:2,8 agencies 19:10 24:19 78:23 79:21 80:4 353:17 371:16
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5 270:16 273:20 279:11 280:8,10,20 300:23 302:11 303:17 304:17 306:17 315:9 317:9,13 344:9 347:11 373:25 against 124:16 301:7 age 190:2,8 agencies 19:10 24:19 78:23 79:21 80:4 353:17 371:16 agency 22:11 24:3 79:8
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5 270:16 273:20 279:11 280:8,10,20 300:23 302:11 303:17 304:17 306:17 315:9 317:9,13 344:9 347:11 373:25 against 124:16 301:7 age 190:2,8 agencies 19:10 24:19 78:23 79:21 80:4 353:17 371:16 agency 22:11 24:3 79:8 135:4 138:8 151:7
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5 270:16 273:20 279:11 280:8,10,20 300:23 302:11 303:17 304:17 306:17 315:9 317:9,13 344:9 347:11 373:25 against 124:16 301:7 age 190:2,8 agencies 19:10 24:19 78:23 79:21 80:4 353:17 371:16 agency 22:11 24:3 79:8 135:4 138:8 151:7 271:19 298:1 334:7
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5 270:16 273:20 279:11 280:8,10,20 300:23 302:11 303:17 304:17 306:17 315:9 317:9,13 344:9 347:11 373:25 against 124:16 301:7 age 190:2,8 agencies 19:10 24:19 78:23 79:21 80:4 353:17 371:16 agency 22:11 24:3 79:8 135:4 138:8 151:7
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5 270:16 273:20 279:11 280:8,10,20 300:23 302:11 303:17 304:17 306:17 315:9 317:9,13 344:9 347:11 373:25 against 124:16 301:7 age 190:2,8 agencies 19:10 24:19 78:23 79:21 80:4 353:17 371:16 agency 22:11 24:3 79:8 135:4 138:8 151:7 271:19 298:1 334:7 352:5 381:3,4 agenda 5:16 40:11 aggregate 100:1
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5 270:16 273:20 279:11 280:8,10,20 300:23 302:11 303:17 304:17 306:17 315:9 317:9,13 344:9 347:11 373:25 against 124:16 301:7 age 190:2,8 agencies 19:10 24:19 78:23 79:21 80:4 353:17 371:16 agency 22:11 24:3 79:8 135:4 138:8 151:7 271:19 298:1 334:7 352:5 381:3,4 agenda 5:16 40:11 aggregate 100:1 aggregated 212:10
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5 270:16 273:20 279:11 280:8,10,20 300:23 302:11 303:17 304:17 306:17 315:9 317:9,13 344:9 347:11 373:25 against 124:16 301:7 age 190:2,8 agencies 19:10 24:19 78:23 79:21 80:4 353:17 371:16 agency 22:11 24:3 79:8 135:4 138:8 151:7 271:19 298:1 334:7 352:5 381:3,4 agenda 5:16 40:11 aggregate 100:1 aggregated 212:10 226:19
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5 270:16 273:20 279:11 280:8,10,20 300:23 302:11 303:17 304:17 306:17 315:9 317:9,13 344:9 347:11 373:25 against 124:16 301:7 age 190:2,8 agencies 19:10 24:19 78:23 79:21 80:4 353:17 371:16 agency 22:11 24:3 79:8 135:4 138:8 151:7 271:19 298:1 334:7 352:5 381:3,4 agenda 5:16 40:11 aggregated 212:10 226:19 aggressive 196:3
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5 270:16 273:20 279:11 280:8,10,20 300:23 302:11 303:17 304:17 306:17 315:9 317:9,13 344:9 347:11 373:25 against 124:16 301:7 age 190:2,8 agencies 19:10 24:19 78:23 79:21 80:4 353:17 371:16 agency 22:11 24:3 79:8 135:4 138:8 151:7 271:19 298:1 334:7 352:5 381:3,4 agenda 5:16 40:11 aggregate 100:1 aggregated 212:10 226:19 aggressive 196:3 aggressively 202:4
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5 270:16 273:20 279:11 280:8,10,20 300:23 302:11 303:17 304:17 306:17 315:9 317:9,13 344:9 347:11 373:25 against 124:16 301:7 age 190:2,8 agencies 19:10 24:19 78:23 79:21 80:4 353:17 371:16 agency 22:11 24:3 79:8 135:4 138:8 151:7 271:19 298:1 334:7 352:5 381:3,4 agenda 5:16 40:11 aggregated 212:10 226:19 aggressive 196:3
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5 270:16 273:20 279:11 280:8,10,20 300:23 302:11 303:17 304:17 306:17 315:9 317:9,13 344:9 347:11 373:25 against 124:16 301:7 age 190:2,8 agencies 19:10 24:19 78:23 79:21 80:4 353:17 371:16 agency 22:11 24:3 79:8 135:4 138:8 151:7 271:19 298:1 334:7 352:5 381:3,4 agenda 5:16 40:11 aggregated 212:10 226:19 aggressive 196:3 aggressively 202:4 ago 12:22,25 36:25 184:24 186:9 229:1 253:11 254:24 265:24
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5 270:16 273:20 279:11 280:8,10,20 300:23 302:11 303:17 304:17 306:17 315:9 317:9,13 344:9 347:11 373:25 against 124:16 301:7 age 190:2,8 agencies 19:10 24:19 78:23 79:21 80:4 353:17 371:16 agency 22:11 24:3 79:8 135:4 138:8 151:7 271:19 298:1 334:7 352:5 381:3,4 agenda 5:16 40:11 aggregated 212:10 226:19 aggressive 196:3 aggressively 202:4 ago 12:22,25 36:25 184:24 186:9 229:1 253:11 254:24 265:24 293:5 344:16 354:4
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5 270:16 273:20 279:11 280:8,10,20 300:23 302:11 303:17 304:17 306:17 315:9 317:9,13 344:9 347:11 373:25 against 124:16 301:7 age 190:2,8 agencies 19:10 24:19 78:23 79:21 80:4 353:17 371:16 agency 22:11 24:3 79:8 135:4 138:8 151:7 271:19 298:1 334:7 352:5 381:3,4 agenda 5:16 40:11 aggregate 100:1 aggregated 212:10 226:19 aggressive 196:3 aggressively 202:4 ago 12:22,25 36:25 184:24 186:9 229:1 253:11 254:24 265:24 293:5 344:16 354:4 agree 24:6 33:10 65:6
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5 270:16 273:20 279:11 280:8,10,20 300:23 302:11 303:17 304:17 306:17 315:9 317:9,13 344:9 347:11 373:25 against 124:16 301:7 age 190:2,8 agencies 19:10 24:19 78:23 79:21 80:4 353:17 371:16 agency 22:11 24:3 79:8 135:4 138:8 151:7 271:19 298:1 334:7 352:5 381:3,4 agenda 5:16 40:11 aggregate 100:1 aggregated 212:10 226:19 aggressive 196:3 aggressively 202:4 ago 12:22,25 36:25 184:24 186:9 229:1 253:11 254:24 265:24 293:5 344:16 354:4 agree 24:6 33:10 65:6 68:16 138:20 144:2
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5 270:16 273:20 279:11 280:8,10,20 300:23 302:11 303:17 304:17 306:17 315:9 317:9,13 344:9 347:11 373:25 against 124:16 301:7 age 190:2,8 agencies 19:10 24:19 78:23 79:21 80:4 353:17 371:16 agency 22:11 24:3 79:8 135:4 138:8 151:7 271:19 298:1 334:7 352:5 381:3,4 agenda 5:16 40:11 aggregated 212:10 226:19 aggressive 196:3 aggressively 202:4 ago 12:22,25 36:25 184:24 186:9 229:1 253:11 254:24 265:24 293:5 344:16 354:4 agree 24:6 33:10 65:6 68:16 138:20 144:2 182:25 191:11 200:5
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5 270:16 273:20 279:11 280:8,10,20 300:23 302:11 303:17 304:17 306:17 315:9 317:9,13 344:9 347:11 373:25 against 124:16 301:7 age 190:2,8 agencies 19:10 24:19 78:23 79:21 80:4 353:17 371:16 agency 22:11 24:3 79:8 135:4 138:8 151:7 271:19 298:1 334:7 352:5 381:3,4 agenda 5:16 40:11 aggregate 100:1 aggregated 212:10 226:19 aggressive 196:3 aggressively 202:4 ago 12:22,25 36:25 184:24 186:9 229:1 253:11 254:24 265:24 293:5 344:16 354:4 agree 24:6 33:10 65:6 68:16 138:20 144:2 182:25 191:11 200:5 200:23 216:17 257:11
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5 270:16 273:20 279:11 280:8,10,20 300:23 302:11 303:17 304:17 306:17 315:9 317:9,13 344:9 347:11 373:25 against 124:16 301:7 age 190:2,8 agencies 19:10 24:19 78:23 79:21 80:4 353:17 371:16 agency 22:11 24:3 79:8 135:4 138:8 151:7 271:19 298:1 334:7 352:5 381:3,4 agenda 5:16 40:11 aggregate 100:1 aggregated 212:10 226:19 aggressive 196:3 aggressively 202:4 ago 12:22,25 36:25 184:24 186:9 229:1 253:11 254:24 265:24 293:5 344:16 354:4 agree 24:6 33:10 65:6 68:16 138:20 144:2 182:25 191:11 200:5 200:23 216:17 257:11 260:22 282:15 283:11 322:13,17 323:4,15
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5 270:16 273:20 279:11 280:8,10,20 300:23 302:11 303:17 304:17 306:17 315:9 317:9,13 344:9 347:11 373:25 against 124:16 301:7 age 190:2,8 agencies 19:10 24:19 78:23 79:21 80:4 353:17 371:16 agency 22:11 24:3 79:8 135:4 138:8 151:7 271:19 298:1 334:7 352:5 381:3,4 agenda 5:16 40:11 aggregate 100:1 aggregate 100:1 aggressive 196:3 aggressive 196:4 aggressive 196:4 aggressive 196:4 aggressive 196:4 aggressive 1
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5 270:16 273:20 279:11 280:8,10,20 300:23 302:11 303:17 304:17 306:17 315:9 317:9,13 344:9 347:11 373:25 against 124:16 301:7 age 190:2,8 agencies 19:10 24:19 78:23 79:21 80:4 353:17 371:16 agency 22:11 24:3 79:8 135:4 138:8 151:7 271:19 298:1 334:7 352:5 381:3,4 agenda 5:16 40:11 aggregate 100:1 aggregate 100:1 aggregate 100:1 aggressive 196:3 aggressively 202:4 ago 12:22,25 36:25 184:24 186:9 229:1 253:11 254:24 265:24 293:5 344:16 354:4 agree 24:6 33:10 65:6 68:16 138:20 144:2 182:25 191:11 200:5 200:23 216:17 257:11 260:22 282:15 283:11 322:13,17 323:4,15 345:25 375:9 agreed 114:18
249:25 261:22 264:2 264:19 265:4 267:5 270:16 273:20 279:11 280:8,10,20 300:23 302:11 303:17 304:17 306:17 315:9 317:9,13 344:9 347:11 373:25 against 124:16 301:7 age 190:2,8 agencies 19:10 24:19 78:23 79:21 80:4 353:17 371:16 agency 22:11 24:3 79:8 135:4 138:8 151:7 271:19 298:1 334:7 352:5 381:3,4 agenda 5:16 40:11 aggregate 100:1 aggregate 100:1 aggressive 196:3 aggressive 196:4 aggressive 196:4 aggressive 196:4 aggressive 196:4 aggressive 1

```
agri 312:1
agricultural 15:21 17:4
  18:4 31:11 32:8 41:4,8
  41:22 42:1 50:3,14
  51:18 81:19 104:7
  106:9,22 108:5,7
  109:19 110:9 112:8
  117:24 118:13 122:6
  137:24 146:11 150:14
  152:5 154:6,11,24
  155:13 160:8,11 161:4
  161:18 165:17 167:13
  184:12.16.20 185:17
  186:5,10,13 187:21
  189:9 192:10 274:1
  301:4 308:15,18 309:4
  311:10 312:2 313:5
  317:5,11,17 349:14
  350:12 353:10.15
  363:10 364:17 365:6,7
agriculture 14:11 17:15
  22:8,10 37:22 41:21
  81:9 122:23 125:20
  154:1,12 160:25
  163:14 166:22 185:16
  185:23 186:14,17
  189:20,22 196:21
  255:9 274:4 283:10,11
  283:13 290:15.20
  309:24 362:10 363:11
  367:9 374:15 381:17
agriculture's 187:6
agriculture-related
  303:7
agriculturist 7:13
agriculturists 17:23
agroecology 305:18
ag's 183:3 316:12
ag-only 187:5
ahead 69:14 88:21,24
  127:24 139:6 143:13
  144:9 148:15 166:14
  207:8 208:16 238:6,7
  255:20 260:12 326:15
  379:23
ain't 121:24
air 362:18
airfield 185:4
airport 185:5
alarm 312:16
alarmed 368:11
alarming 183:4
Alejo 153:17
algae 129:9,12 130:8,16
  270:22 271:5
aligning 211:21
alive 379:13
alley 379:24,25,25
  382.22
Alliance 3:9 10:12,14
  298:21,23,25,25 299:1
  299:6,15,24
allocate 7:4 10:2 320:22
allocated 7:7
allocating 320:15
allow 9:15 10:23 75:15
  117:9 169:21 234:20
  264:9 322:1 323:25
  330:20 331:8,12
```

allowable 116:4

```
almost 29:23 62:4
  163:23 170:16 279:4
  304:3,9 312:8 317:2
  351:1 355:9
alone 100:13 154:24
  199:24 352:24 360:23
along 13:10 44:12 65:15
  115:25 119:9 126:17
  128:15 151:15 204:16
  205:5 278:20 281:24
  286:4 316:1 319:6
  329:24 348:7 368:12
already 7:6 15:1,2 33:13
  38:15.16 86:24 91:22
  114:6,14 117:12
  125:21 126:12 143:6
  154:13 204:8 246:11
  247:6 250:24 267:11
  268:23 277:6 288:24
  318:22 321:17 355:4
  367:4 383:15
alteration 353:8
altered 186:21
alternate 163:15 185:1
alternative 27:2.8 52:17
  71:20 80:23 98:2 106:6
  106:11,18 107:4,5,15
  108:4 112:23,24 113:5
  132:13 161:2 163:16
  207:18,19,21 208:19
  214:25 224:11 226:2
  236:4 280:12 295:25
  347:12 351:15 353:11
  353:16,18
Alternatively 44:4 99:14
alternatives 66:21 104:8
  105:25 106:8,25
  167:12 173:8 321:16
although 14:4 33:2 158:8
  160:25 216:17 256:17
  269:22 271:18 321:10
  345:25
always 40:4 140:13
  212:21 214:1 371:25
AMBAG 182:20 186:8.9
ambient 15:6,7 18:10
  29:7 39:25 183:14
ambiguity 152:2
ameliorate 343:15
amenable 353:8
amend 210:17,20
amendments 180:2
  361.2
American 290:1 304:3
  306:9,18
among 160:5 186:17
  370:5
amount 5:23 13:9 29:17
  31:8 32:12 49:23 50:25
  53:16 60:22 84:2 95:15
  102:11 114:16 169:22
```

```
182:14 241:23 243:17
  256:12 259:9,19,20
  260:3 293:12 331:11
  336:21 372:15 375:17
amounts 42:10 55:18
  105:15 241:25
ample 66:20
Ana 354:9
analyses 88:16 256:10
analysis 49:12 56:11
  88:22 152:15,18 157:8
  157:10,20,24 158:11
  159:21 163:21 165:14
  165:25 166:21,24
  187:10 190:1 234:1,5,6
  234:9 239:3 240:1
  254:14 261:1 372:5,13
  372:21,22 373:12
analyze 123:21 127:12
  321:5 353:7
Anchorpoint 146:8
and/or 73:21 113:19
  334:21
Angela 2:23 18:2.3.16
  35:18 39:8,11 41:1,3
  55:12 82:6 89:7 99:15
  99:18 116:2 291:23
angry 297:18
animals 360:9
Ann 367:17
announce 10:1
announced 4:18
announcement 6:10
  11:22
announcements 11:12
annual 34:13 35:21
  36:23 53:7 70:21 98:21
  185:10 203:22.23
  211:13 214:7,17
  223:10 226:15 268:12
  268:15 310:25
annually 182:9 183:8
  226:14 331:12
anomalies 187:8
another 9:8 25:8 40:9
  66:8 80:14 98:13
  100:14 102:7 119:5
  127:12 133:1,20 170:5
  175:9 177:14 185:2
  190:6 220:12 240:5
  242:21 245:1 249:22
  249:23 263:1,21 265:1
  265:12 279:10 284:6
  301:7 314:21 316:7
  320:13,17 321:3,7,18
  322:2,15,18 323:2,5
  324:1 352:5 361:10
  368:16
answer 37:11 38:10,11
  58:20 72:20 90:5
  118:23,25 120:17
  123:25 176:11 188:6
  215:2 219:13 248:9
  251:16 255:21 285:20
  287:5 337:14,15
  338:12
answered 118:14
answering 35:6
answers 11:7 14:24
anticipate 72:6 226:12
  383:23
```

anticipated 24:11 anybody 116:24 334:3 anyone 9:12 217:14 273:11 278:17 292:17 anything 87:25 90:16 100:9 107:12 141:20 167:22 169:7 173:18 173:19 175:16 177:19 177:20 220:23 230:16 252:12 282:16 324:25 337:19 340:10 346:17 362:18 368:2 anyway 12:6 39:13 107:21 288:13 326:1 341:7 381:20 anywhere 122:14 250:5 304:17 315:11 apart 348:25 apiece 142:11 apologize 112:9 185:21 apparent 182:14 314:10 apparently 182:21 appear 117:22 152:11 . 182:18.19 183:10 186:19 **APPEARANCES** 2:15 appeared 369:12 appears 59:15 154:1 201:22 263:15 appendix 40:15,17 109:2 152:11,22 156:25 157:24 158:1.8 159:5 159:22,24 160:23,24 161:7,22 162:18 163:18 164:10,19,21 165:11 168:21 182:23 183:1 239:2,11 applaud 348:17 apple 92:10 351:24 applicability 211:6 applicant 75:10,12,15,22 76:3,3 358:3 application 53:25 54:4 . 54:11,19,22,25 55:2,5 93:2 110:12 172:13 applications 66:24 294:10 295:3 applied 31:18 38:2 52:6 . 52:9 53:11 56:14 92:13 98:21 131:1 182:9 243:17,22 244:4,12 247:22 250:17 259:21 278:6 294:13 applies 103:15 262:19 278:22 317:22 apply 47:4,13,20 48:1,4,8 49:14 51:8 53:15 54:1 66:14 69:22 82:16 83:12 96:12,13 103:11 109:6 169:23 197:1 206:18 216:19 218:1 250:24 294:16 314:17 applying 47:2 87:10 100:4 242:24 243:13 243:16 244:11 261:22 278:18 332:13 appointed 167:8 appointment 142:22 appointments 354:7 appreciate 6:6 11:23 . 143:17 145:23 207:24

221:10 329:8 342:22
364:4 368:3,7 374:18
375:15 383:15
approach 42:22 45:8 59:10 88:23 100:25
137:18,19 144:17
150:18 154:1 158:9
168:18 206:13,16
234:14,20 239:1 253:17 264:20 265:7
266:10,24 282:21,22
365:14
approached 143:3
approaches 174:18 approaching 112:14
appropriate 14:17 58:14
58:18 129:24 211:25
216:20 220:6,9 226:21
227:3,19 235:10 236:14 275:19 287:22
288:6 313:7 325:3
338:12
approval 319:9 324:25
approved 214:4 5 313:0
approved 214:4,5 313:9 approximately 35:25
41:20,21 45:25 46:14
48:15 49:7 52:21 69:16
71:24 133:6
<b>April</b> 152:13 242:16 245:23 248:1 320:11
322:1 324:3,12 325:9
326:7,7,23 327:1,1,11
382:15
Aptos 361:12 Aquarium 29:3 379:1
aquatic 16:6 29:13 70:2
152:10 273:2 277:17
280:13,24 374:8
aquifer 192:20 193:23 195:8,13 242:22
271:22 272:1
aquifers 190:9,9 331:22
377:24
Arajo 356:19,20 arbitrariness 200:4,16
201:15 202:15
201:15 202:15 arbitrary 197:8,9 199:25
200:2 204:15 262:9
Ardo 367:17 area 5:5 17:5 25:16 28:4
28:7,13 29:2 31:15
45:10.12.23 46:1.7.13
46:25 47:3,12,19,25
48:3,18 49:4,6,13
57:22,23,24 60:2,3,4 60:13 61:3 63:6,7,7,9
68:22 72:19 78:10 82:8
92:11 113:7 120:23
123:13 148:22 154:3
189:13,13 190:4,5 193:13,18 195:3,17
198:18,23 226:22
235:7 239:8 240:9
241:12 245:19 250:5
252:10 253:23 257:22
301:23 308:3,5,25 309:12.14.23 311:2
309:12,14,23 311:2 314:22 315:2,7 316:5,7
317:3,4 330:1 336:10
341:12 351:20 356:24

```
areas 26:8,16,17,19 27:3
                             74:18 166:8 211:24
  30:10 31:20 32:1,7,8
                             218:14 220:5
  32:11 43:4 63:13,13
                          assistance 69:1,10
  67:25 72:17 73:2
                             212:1,11 213:23 269:1
  119:17 131:16 133:18
                             269:15 345:2
                          assistant 2:22 5:7 157:4
  137:25 151:5,6,13
  189:14 192:10,23
                             360:3
  196:7 210:12 219:24
  220:3 222:3 235:3,8
  254:6,6 270:5 303:13
  304:18 317:23 332:12
  341:10 364:15,16,19
  365:18
arena 136:2
arenas 136:3
argue 121:21,23 159:15
  312:10
arguing 311:25
argument 9:8 149:8
Aristide 298:8
arithmetic 182:22
Armenta 354:8,11
army 185:4
around 24:17 29:18 30:4
  30:10 114:2 160:20
  162:13 252:23 273:17
  277:15 281:10 341:3
  345:6 355:13 378:22
arrive 8:25
arrow 20:12
Arroyo 2:18 183:21,24
  183:25 192:21.23
  193:1,16,17 194:6
art 145:6
artichokes 126:17
  145:10
artifact 257:3
Asbestos 127:14
ASBS 364:21
ashore 271:3
Asian 304:2
asked 46:16 75:14,18
  77:20 89:1 157:5 196:6
  210:24 212:21 250:22
  260:9,15 263:5 282:9
  284:24 348:14 360:3
  360:15
asking 27:23 79:3
  118:11 247:1 273:11
  274:9,12,13 299:6
  353:25 358:4
aspects 14:10,21 50:11
  50:13 130:22 241:9
Assemble 153:20
Assembly 153:16
assemblyman 156:3
assemblymember
  153:19
assemblywoman 354:9
  354:10
assess 87:10 205:16
assessment 17:12 18:10
  49:14 156:25 163:17
  166:2 183:14 330:25
  366:7
assessments 366:21
assigning 171:22,23
```

366:17

assignment 181:20

assist 6:23 16:16,18

assimilate 257:8

```
assisting 40:4
associated 21:22 145:14
  149:21 163:7
association 210:1
  300:13 334:6 365:15
  365:17
assume 55:16 110:25
  111:21 181:12
assumed 122:6
assuming 61:12 75:24
  322:2
assurances 73:13
assure 349:15
assuring 74:19
astronomical 27:17
ate 378:16,17,23
ATKINSON-BAKER 1:21
attach 320:13
attached 282:3
attachment 208:12 209:3
  209:12,14 231:25
  237:19 265:17,18
attacks 297:22
attempt 69:18 158:24
  162:20 164:12 240:2
attempted 68:23 98:7
  100:3 103:14 104:21
  121:5.6
attendance 212:13
attended 69:4 104:25
  370:3
attends 353:24
attention 24:16 153:25
  155:5 165:2 171:14,17
  291:9 351:18
attorney 76:18 78:25
79:8 120:7,21 125:6
  380:4 385:12
attorneys 305:5
attribute 182:15
audience 7:18,18 9:12
audio 11:19
audit 210:14,19,24
  211:11 212:10 214:11
  215:8 217:2,6 220:1
  226:20 265:7 331:3
  368:3
audited 210:23 212:8
  225:5 226:17 236:13
  237:7.8
auditing 213:9 225:1
auditors 79:15
audits 211:10,22 212:10
  217:21 218:12 219:22
  224:23 266:11 366:4
August 242:17
authoritative 181:24
authority 131:21 135:5
  198:10,18,20 199:1,8
  207:4 213:15 216:23
  265:24 332:5 348:15
  380:19 381:12
authorized 131:19
authorizes 380:19
```

authors 158:1 automatic 121:13 automatically 95:1 217:15 automobiles 159:10.12 available 9:24 11:14,16 11:19,23 14:25 16:2,18 39:19 54:12 69:9 84:10 105:24 129:10 157:20 174:12 179:5 188:23 208:15 244:2 268:13 292:16 306:16,17,22 367:24 average 30:14 31:6 55:4 55:5 139:10 145:1 239:8 242:8 243:7,12 244:7 246:19 247:12 284:2,10 averaged 254:11 avocado 93:14 avocados 150:8 315:8 avoid 10:3 195:10 316:2 349:17 aware 24:24.25 30:17 158:15,23 162:2 181:9 203:14 away 24:17 47:24 82:21 115:20 162:14 233:13 261:23 262:7 263:11 264:1.1 355:17 370:17 a.m 2:10 4:1 A5018B3 1:25 В

**B** 100:14 168:21 200:15 208:12 209:3,12,14 231:25 264:12 310:12 314:17 366:5 babies 291:11 298:11 baby 27:12 back 5:10,12 9:24 10:17 11:14,18 16:12,13 24:18 34:12 39:14 59:23 89:9 94:16 106:3 114:25 140:25 143:4 147:20 153:3 167:5,7 167:14 171:22 172:7 173:1 175:22 192:21 213:18 224:21 226:14 227:14,22 231:17 232:23 237:11 240:10 245:2 248:15,16 249:24,24 263:5,5 264:10 270:11 277:25 278:24 280:2 310:8 313:16,24 325:4,18 327:12 328:20 331:8 344:15,18 376:14 378:9,12 380:18 backed 382:13 backflow 34:10 117:6 330:13 background 41:7 315:3 backstop 128:12 275:8

275:23 276:1 279:11

backwards 82:7 87:24

backyard 318:2,10

back-to-back 248:24

bacteria 79:20,25 117:19

280.8

312:6

bad 170:12 197:13 222:4 319:1 330:19 377:7 balance 52:6,8 53:1,3,5 53:6,8,10,12 54:10,17 54:20,22,25 55:5 56:14 56:23,24 57:3 62:3,6 69:19 71:4 199:6 204:22 242:10,20 244:5 246:12,13 259:9 315:18 320:10 364:14 ban 159:12 164:11,14 **banking** 363:18 banks 270:23 banned 86:13,15 bar 292:25 Barbara 2:17 3:11 150:6 231:8 270:1 300:7 308:1 309:16 Barbeau 156:24 157:1,3 166:20,23 234:5 Bardeaux 239:18 bare 78:12 79:15 131:13 270:23 **barely** 372:9 Barricarte 15:19 bars 292:24 base 185:5 220:19 based 5:24 42:25 43:10 45:12 47:21 48:11 49:6 49:16 56:10 81:14 83:12 85:13 88:23 95:24 96:13 102:23 105:6,18,23 110:5 121:12 129:13 137:13 139:23 152:17 178:9 201:23 203:24 210:18 220:14 229:25 235:1 236:23,25 246:9 281:21 300:1 317:7 353:4 baseless 352:20 baseline 117:2 283:6 basic 87:22 147:10 177:21 346:24 basically 59:10 124:13 208:22 209:5 224:17 225:1 233:11 272:18 274:16 275:15 276:5 277:21 280:2,16 281:12,13,17,18 282:5 282:20 285:15,23 376:17 377:23 380:3 basin 70:5 80:15 134:3 254:11 256:1 280:18 303.3 **basins** 190:2 basis 106:1 136:5 167:14 187:11 219:16 306:20 306:20 366:9 Batter 358:22 **battery** 156:22 bay 5:2,4 17:14,15 29:2 46:11 157:5 221:20 341:13,17,17 378:25 Baykeeper 371:1 beaches 301:19 bear 136:9 158:6 187:22 284:13,14 343:4 bearing 140:9 beautiful 378:13,21

**became** 17:19

#### A5018B3 TRANSCRIPTS OF PROCEEDINGS

50:18 52:7 61:9 102:5

113:24 114:23 131:8

169:25 174:4 176:12

185:20 196:11 229:2

h 04 40 04 400 44	040:04 044:7 0 040:7
become 24:10,24 120:14 128:11 140:15 159:1	243:24 244:7,9 246:7 253:10 259:17 288:1
163:11,12 174:12	Ben 307:25
215:22 240:15 290:5	beneficial 24:2 70:4
290:23,24 302:16	108:9 137:3 150:21
368:10	374:24 375:6
<b>becomes</b> 69:9 84:10,11 163:14 172:15 271:5	beneficially 374:9 benefit 159:4 317:24
bed 192:19	357:14 361:25
before 2:10 7:1 8:8 20:5	benefits 159:1,19 177:17
20:6 25:20 27:12 38:17	199:2
39:11 55:12 58:10 64:5	Benito 352:15,18 376:23
64:19 67:23 68:5,9,10 76:8 78:14 82:5 90:1,2	377:15,16 <b>Bennett</b> 340:19,22,22,24
102:21 114:24 141:24	342:19
143:4 147:6 150:5	<b>benzine</b> 119:21
153:8 174:7 176:11,11	berm 262:1
209:17,20 238:17	besides 204:19 264:2
246:10 253:12 268:9 271:14 291:4 292:1	best 17:18 41:13 42:14 42:15 151:7 156:23
301:13 303:8 358:3,21	166:7 171:4 206:24
362:16,17 369:12	210:11 246:24 261:2
385:6	283:3 289:12,14 334:8
beg 344:12	353:6 372:20
began 157:7 begin 11:1 155:21	better 48:19 86:6 102:5 102:13 122:1 128:21
238:17	134:17 155:7 162:15
beginning 99:7 102:24	162:24 179:22 188:5
262:24 320:5,6	209:17 223:3 264:20
behalf 152:3,8 153:16	282:17 309:4 324:18
156:5 345:3 373:22 behind 15:19 344:12	342:13 354:12 368:9 370:12 375:12
being 8:8 13:20 32:12	between 77:14,15 78:10
34:5 55:23 60:17 62:15	78:12 79:5 80:1,3
65:24 79:7 86:7 99:25	112:8 119:8 126:20
100:1 102:3 117:17	147:3 149:4 152:19
118:12 120:7 128:12 128:13 132:5 136:18	161:7 163:22 164:3 182:13 190:16 197:25
138:1 146:25 147:20	201:10 202:21 217:11
170:20 177:17 190:24	253:19 264:6 278:2
194:25 200:2 203:13	281:4 287:7,23 322:20
205:23 206:12 210:15	326:1 364:14 372:7
213:10,20 217:4 218:17 223:11 226:5	377:17 beyond 84:22 122:12
226:11 233:18 236:22	199:13
236:24 242:13,19,20	Bhatnagar 289:8,16,22
243:17,22,22 252:21	bickering 67:5
258:12,20 263:19	big 82:21 127:7 197:13
275:11 279:7,17 287:9 293:14 296:10 297:7,9	202:6 203:7 205:10 214:1 221:8 250:13
302:18,23 303:10	264:5 284:16 298:5,9
305:1 345:18 346:18	304:21,21 345:21
348:14 359:8 361:18	346:11 355:10 367:9
362:9,23 364:19 365:4	371:6 379:8
365:14,25 370:17 382:15 383:18,19,20	bigger 114:23 162:23 biggest 222:7 371:6
beings 361:20	372:23 373:7
believe 7:8 11:5 19:3	bill 195:22,23 199:21
58:23 94:8 119:10	200:3,19 201:2,6,14,18
121:2 135:10 145:13	201:20,25 202:3,24
165:5 176:13,14 194:22 216:4,20,20	203:4 218:7 296:22 bills 296:23
238:25 259:12 272:4	binder 72:15
273:4 282:1 285:22	biological 28:14 29:14
319:4 331:20 353:10	32:6 130:11 178:5,7
357:8 363:16 375:3	Biosphere 333:11
belong 94:6	bit 13:3 23:11 26:14

below 25:11.23 34:9

64:16 91:9 170:7

173:19 175:11 176:14

177:12 197:4 223:25

```
243:14 245:25 275:6
  287:11 294:15 296:17
  325:15 341:21
bivalves 271:7
Black 304:2
blame 379:3
Blanco 29:25 60:2,13
  61.2
blanket 131:18
blend 144:20 225:14
blended 25:22
blind 349:1
blink 34:20
blooms 271:6
blows 348:5,6
blue 27:12 46:9 183:9
  257:24 261:15
board 1:1 2:1,16,21 3:4
  4:5,6,22,22,24 5:2,2,15
  6:4,14 7:6,9 8:10,11,14
  8:16 9:2,2,5,9,12,15
  10:4,7 11:7 12:11 13:6
  13:8,16,16,21,22,23,24
  17:1,2,13,13 18:6,7,9
  18:23 19:20 20:2,6,19
  20:21 21:15 27:7,9
  33:8 34:4,15,16 35:22
  36:8,10,15,17 37:5,5
  42:16,19 48:22 57:18
  63:17 64:6,14,22 65:15
  65:16 66:15 67:23 68:5
  68:9 71:9 73:1.3.5.11
  74:13 76:15 79:6 80:2
  81:15 102:6 135:4,21
  135:23 136:3.11
  137:17,18 138:17,21
  138:25 141:14 143:15
  143.18 144.19 145.23
  150:17 151:12 153:10
  154:3 156:9 157:2
  167:9,21 179:11
  180:11 187:15,18
  197:8 198:9.9 199:14
  204:7,7,18,19 209:9
  211:15,17 212:6
  213:14,25 214:12,16
  216:2,10,16,22,22
  217:7,11 220:8,21
  223:4,7,17 224:7,14,19
  224:22 226:5,14
  227:11,16,22 230:17
  236:9 240:22 241:7,7
  244:3 257:1 276:21
  279:6 297:4,8 298:19
  299:22 300:18,19,25
  301:4,16 307:14 317:9
  317:15 319:20 320:1.2
  320:5,9,13,23,24 321:3
  321:7 322:2,4,7,11,15
  324:1,12,19,25 325:5,7
  325:19,22 326:5
  327:23 350:23 352:11
  356:19 357:23 358:20
  359:12 364:2,12 365:1
  366:23,24 367:17
  368:6 369:14 370:9
  371:17 380:19 381:21
  382:3.16 383:21
boards 76:18
board's 21:4 29:5 31:24
```

64:16 77:17 131:21

```
213:18
Bob 329:4,19
bodies 281:25
body 124:17 168:25
  169:2 190:23 200:1
  300:13,18
body's 300:23
boil 102:9
boils 175:8
books 180:21 181:6
booth 6:9
bore 257:6
borne 158:19 343:3
both 14:15 16:15 17:3
  26:2 45:8 108:18,24
  109:6 120:7 135:6
  144:7 145:7 160:11
  165:19 169:13 182:11
  186:11 216:13,14
  283:24 319:22 356:7
  365:6 375:10
bothered 318:21
bothers 277:23
bottled 360:16
bottom 46:10 261:15
  318:4 348:4 375:17
  377:21 381:20
bought 146:18
boundaries 315:11
bowling 379:25
box 86:22 261:14
boxes 72:9
Brace 180:24
brackish 129:23
Brad 156:24,25 157:3
Bradley 142:17 146:1,2,5 146:5 147:7,9
brake 127:10
brand 201:20
brand-new 265:23
break 10:1 103:18 142:3
  142:21 153:2 267:25
  268:1
breakout 272:7
breath 205:4
brevity 370:24
brief 18:16
briefly 28:3 104:8 107:6
  128:22 206:12 261:11
  308:22
Briggs 2:22 4:9,11,13,15
  4:17,20 5:4,13 6:7 7:21
  7:23 8:3 11:2,3 39:11
  125:11,18 127:3,6,15
  129:17,19 142:1,11,20
  143:9 153:5 176:11,20
  180:9 191:2.4.14.17.22
  191:25 192:2,5,7,21
  193:1,6,19,24 194:2,4
  194:7,10,19,24 195:2,5
  195:7,9,14,16,19
  233:22 289:1 299:3,9
  299:13,19 320:18
  321:9,10,21,23,25
  322:9 323:9,16,18
  324:16 326:2,9,15,18
  327:3,6 328:7,9,11,22
  329:1 337:21 338:9
  379:16,18 383:5,7
  384.1
```

bring 19:22 60:25 66:15

68:22 76:4 93:17 197:3 199:3 251:13 291:6 294:3 297:6 324:24 351:18 bringing 27:6 136:9 211:23 220:25 221:5 290:18 322:4,6 brings 330:2 broad 14:21 83:11 113:17 151:9 157:12 309.7 broadened 116:9 broader 58:14 296:17 376:10 broadness 14:18 broad-brush 317:10 broccoli 173:13 bromide 164:11,14 brought 78:14 92:8 141:13 153:25 181:13 199:6 204:18 294:19 294:19 380:6 brown 351:24 brush 309:7 brussel 126:18 budget 5:24 budgeting 52:4 **buffer** 35:12 38:7 44:12 50:16 69:22 70:2,12 71:8,14,14,15,23 72:5 72:19 77:21,21 78:2,10 78:20.22 79:9 80:9.12 80:13,22 81:2 98:2 133:13,18 152:10,20 261:25,25 281:16,18 281:23 282:1 316:24 316:25 317:6 buffers 77:25 78:2,16 163:10,25 164:5 264:3 280:13 281:6,9 316:19 316:21 build 33:6 106:25 151:16 building 33:9 220:18 **builds** 34:24 built 88:18 207:2 219:21 223:5 224:8 bullet 127:22 128:1,5 bunch 258:3 279:3 burden 35:24 81:17 87:11 93:11 123:15 291:10 295:8,9 358:19 burdened 369:8 **burdens** 363:1 burdensome 21:5 83:11 99:10 116:20 154:1 bureau 3:5 10:9,19 51:17 106:9.19 107:4.7 108:18 109:1,8,17 110:15 111:5 112:4,9 112:20 142:7 144:19 150:7 153:4,9 156:6,15 203:2 228:6 230:7 235:14 334:16 351:14 373:8 bureaus 106:10 203:3 231:6 Bureau's 371:4 burning 348:3 bush 348:3 business 151:8 154:17 161:13 352:19 362:11

362:12 369:1 businesses 353:17 button 357:6 buttons 381:16 buy 79:12 240:2 buyers 79:10,14 80:2 buying 349:9 360:16 bypassed 177:15

С C 86:23 89:1 201:12 Caballero 354:9 Cahn 238:14 240:19.21 240:23 243:20 244:25 245:10,12,15,18,25 246:8,18 247:6,10,13 247:16,19,22 248:5,8 252:1.7.14.22 259:11 Cal 157:5 185:5 calculate 56:14 calculating 52:6 61:5 calculation 60:16 182:22 California 1:1,2,14 2:1,3 2:10 10:10 16:9 23:19 31:1 51:17 106:8 146:8 156:15 161:5 168:23 172:22 180:12 181:21 183:9 188:5 203:2 210:1 238:13 288:19 290:6,15,21 293:22 300:13 301:15 302:5 303:4 332:6 342:4 345:1 347:23 349:24 350:15 365:2 385:15 California's 290:15 call 4:8 5:17 142:9 205:25 256:2 269:13 307:20 328:18 338:13 338:14 357:8 379:1 called 23:19 144:4 231:4 249:7 310:10 348:8 367:9 calling 377:9,9 calls 196:8 Caltrans 119:11,13 120:10,11 123:14 136:18,18 came 18:6 84:20 103:10 129:14 142:21 160:17 240:11 259:13 280:23 289:8 290:14 301:24 307:6 358:3,21 Camp 345:8 **Campora** 345:9 cancer 27:15 341:24 CANN 62:8,10 78:3 103:20,23 104:4 115:2 115:6,9 117:14 118:7 118:16,20,22 119:10 119:25 121:25 127:21

127:25 128:3 129:3

130:13 235:13.24

capture 206:3 275:4,9

carcinogenic 342:1,4

card 5:11,17 9:14,24

236:2 379:21

capital 161:11,14

captured 263:19

caps 21:17

331:5

car 162:12

12:19 148:4,8,9 268:11 cards 5:14,20,25 6:1,2 7:1 9:25 12:15 141:23 147:25 268:6 323:22 327:21 328:4,5 329:13 care 143:23 219:19 290:19 335:2 340:13 340:20 349:17 354:5 355:2,24 356:3,24 374:6,12 career 180:17 181:5 careful 161:7 315:3 cares 357:9 Carpenteria 309:25 Carpinteria 318:2,8 **carried** 173:19 carries 169:11 carrot 96:24 97:13 carrots 96:20 100:8,15 carry 158:9 carrying 229:15 336:21 cartoon 348:1,2 cascading 28:14 case 12:18 30:8 36:16 46:24 48:7,25 54:21,24 63:3 65:10 67:23,24 72:4 116:5 143:5 164:12 179:24 230:11 239:11,14 298:3 cases 20:22 22:5 27:2.6 27:10 30:1 58:5 63:25 126:5 136:5.8 245:21 254:18 309:13 365:3 cash 351:4 Castro 144:7 Castroville 28:5 143:20 185:11 194:12,17 catch 378:21 379:11 categories 129:11 210:6 category 130:10 310:9 310:11 313:3 327:17 330:18 cattle 79:19 156:22 377.19 cause 43:12,20 47:17 83:15 84:4,7 85:17 101:3 131:13 299:25 300:15 376:1 caused 158:14 184:12 312:11 causes 182:10 185:1 187:5 189:22 causing 32:18 84:24 86:7 88:14,15,18 89:23 115:24 121:3 122:25 128:14 201:1 286:9 336:8 338:4 376:11 cavalier 165:5 Cazurco 6:16 **CCAMP** 15:6,8 31:23 39:24 122:11 CCAs 332:3,4 **CDPH** 284:9 cease 63:18 cemetery 184:9 census 301:3 303:25 306:7,14,14 307:11 center 167:24 269:25

355:2 380:2

Central 1:1 2:2,16 3:9

4:4 8:9 10:13 15:7

23:14 26:7 29:6 31:2 39:25 41:17,19 43:9 47:10 51:15,21 54:13 54:18 81:21 83:9,16 84:5 116:6 154:2,7,18 154:24 158:3 187:4 189:12 190:13,20,21 210:1 219:15 229:23 240:24 241:5 283:23 284:17 286:4 290:6,20 292:5 294:6,11 295:5 296:25 298:22,24 299:24 300:2,2,6,24 301:3,22 302:4,8 304:1 304:16 348:7 350:5,7 352:13 372:11 CEQA 16:9 203:17 205:7 205:8,12,13,14,20 certain 66:7 126:1 151:16 199:2 200:1 203:15,15 260:3 274:23 348:8 certainly 80:19 196:16 199:15 201:12 202:3 249:16 251:3 254:5 283:19 287:10 323:1 370:5 certainty 283:1,3 **CERTIFICATE** 385:1 certification 44:8.11 116:2,3 certifications 116:10 203:17 266:18 certified 38:5 44:5,7 46:24,25 51:14 52:2 69:4 116:5 313:8,8 350:25 385:3 certify 385:4,11 cetera 32:4 37:22 202:17 235:3 351:7,7 chain 159:25 162:9 chair 2:17 3:3 4:3,4,19 5:2.3.20 6:25 7:17.20 7:22,24 8:4,11 11:4 12:9,15 38:17,23,25 39:3,6 55:11 56:15,18 57:6 58:6,13,16,21 59:13 62:19 64:4,11,15 64:19,21 65:7,21 66:13 67:2,4,9 68:3,13,16 70:12,18 75:7,20 76:1 76:13,24 77:2,6,11,19 80:22 81:6 82:5,14,19 82:21,25 83:20 84:14 85:8,11,16,19 86:11,21 87:13,16,21,23 88:5,24 89:5.12.14.18.22 90:23 91:12,23 92:2,7 93:23 98:9 99:4,15,18,22 100:5,19,22 101:5,7,12 101:17 102:7 103:17 103:22 104:3 117:12 127:24 138:24 139:6 141:20,22 142:2,12,20 143:13 144:9,12 145:20,24 146:1,4 147:7,22 148:2,5,7,9 148:11,13,15 150:1 151:19,21 153:1,6,8,14 153:18 156:2 166:11 166:14 172:4,12,16,18

173:12 175:3,7 176:4,9 176:17,23,25 177:4,7 178:11,14,16,19,21 179:6,9,12,14,16,18 180:7 188:8,15,17,25 189:19,24 190:20,25 191:3 195:21 199:19 199:22 200:17,23 201:3,13,16,19,22 202:1,23,25 207:9 212:25 215:4,12 216:7 217:13,24 218:2 228:3 228:4 231:20,23,25 232:13,15,18,20 235:12,23 236:1 237:14 238:6,10 246:4 251:25 253:21 254:7 255:4,12 257:20 258:15 260:6.10.12 264:24 265:11,16 266:17 267:8,21 268:3 268:17,19,21 269:5,14 269:17 272:2 282:11 282:14,16,19 284:20 284:22 285:1 288:14 288:16,23 289:3,7,21 298:18 299:1,4,16,18 305:18,23,24 307:14 307:16 319:11 321:20 321:22,24 322:8,10,19 322:22 323:3,5,9,12,14 323:16.19 324:5.8.10 324:14,17,23 325:1,24 326:4,11,13,17,19,22 327:5,7,11 328:8,10,13 328:25 329:3,6,9,16,18 332:24 333:7 335:11 335:14,16 337:15,22 337:24 338:1,5,8,10 339:5,8,13,16,18,23 340:5,21,23 342:19 344:23 347:19 350:19 352:9 353:21 354:22 356:12,15,19 359:10 359:13 361:8 363:25 364:10 367:14 370:20 373:19,24 374:2 376:21,24 377:2 379:10,14,17,19,22 382:21,23 383:10 384.5 chairman 11:3 18:22 58:19 77:12 91:18 92:18 130:7 150:4,16 151:12 156:8 157:2 176:12 179:17 180:10 195:22 202:18 204:8 232:17 238:9,11 240:21 324:9 350:22

352:10,13,17 364:1

379:24

276:21

challenge 42:13

challenged 256:22

challenges 348:21

challenging 253:4

Chambers 2:9

Chamber 352:15,18

champions 155:20

342:22 371:3

chance 143:3 324:20

change 34:19,21 37:8 59:16,17 66:7,7 85:3 107:11 116:24 130:14 165:19 178:1 180:2,2 194:4,11,16 225:21 265:25 275:6 276:16 278:11 289:20 318:18 334:5 348:9 370:8 375:7 changed 66:16 115:13 128:8 130:15 131:14 137:11,12,13 187:6 270:4,7 277:20 changes 13:10 37:9 132:14 150:25 157:18 226:5,8 229:4 251:4 264:22 265:14,21 276:22 321:5 332:9 351:3,16 375:10 channel 10:13 337:7 Channelkeeper 3:11 270:1 298:22 307:18 308:1 319:12 chapter 110:10 chapters 373:23 characteristics 37:20 41:16 42:5 45:7 61:11 81:10 164:16 169:14 370.1 characterize 50:25 249:16 251:2 257:25 characterizes 44:6 charge 167:10 **charged** 297:20 chart 25:4 183:17 231:18 chartered 182:20 Chavez-Wyatt 352:10,12 **cheap** 349:5 check 35:1 181:4 227:17 244:12 246:24 334:11 378:25 383:8 checkboxes 87:6 checked 34:4 180:20 186:2 334:11 357:7 checklist 34:3 35:2 chemical 83:14 87:12 126:25 177:21 178:4,7 chemicals 31:8,12,12 43:12,19 47:19 82:17 83:8,9,13 84:7,11,23 85:15 86:6 87:1,10 88:10,15,18,20,25 92:15,24 110:6 118:3 118:10 121:7 122:25 123:1,13 197:10 264:25 274:17 344:17 344:20 chemotherapy 342:11 Chevron 184:20 198:15 child 341:23 342:17 355:2 children 144:1 301:9,11 335:25 341:24 344:9 360:11,14 chit-chat 281:17 chlorpy 83:2 chlorpyrifos 43:13,21 44:15 45:1 47:18.20 48:1,4,8,12 51:4 83:2 83:19 86:3 87:7 100:17

115:25 128:11,18

#### A5018B3 TRANSCRIPTS OF PROCEEDINGS

150:20 200:8 240:7,8 261:23 262:8,13 263:9
263:23 264:18 265:9
278:22 310:18 311:17
314:17 316:3 346:1 352:1
choice 224:12,13 230:15
230:15,21 305:12 343:1 358:15,25
choose 52:16 71:19 91:8
107:21,21 210:4 224:10
choosed 255:16
chooses 229:11 choosing 343:8
chop 142:8
chose 193:19 chosen 129:15 158:6
chow 377:6
Chris 40:5 Christian 146:7,8
Christina 352:12
Chualar 304:7 345:8 Cinco 326:2
circuit 319:24
circumstances 9:7 citation 188:20
citations 181:4,10,22
cite 185:24 cited 187:16 190:3.24
239:16 259:16 260:4
cites 62:12 cities 166:18 274:10,12
292:2 306:4,11 364:24
citizens 344:19 citrus 315:8
city 2:9 11:24 12:1,2,7
45:23 46:8 119:3 126:7 183:21 184:2 300:10
304:11,12 306:24
329:20 330:1 339:5 358:1 364:6,8
claim 149:22,23 164:21
164:24 182:18 255:15 claims 149:21
clamming 378:21
clams 378:18,22 Clara 190:5
clarification 115:22
123:19 129:16 198:3 235:14,22 255:22
314:4
clarifications 113:8 clarified 116:21 130:13
130:24 131:4,22
clarifies 140:7 209:21 clarify 118:17 120:9
139:20 235:25 255:17
371:13
clarity 151:25 272:4 Clary 370:22,23
class 374:15
classes 162:20 classic 158:2
classifications 197:19
clause 266:12 clay 60:3,5 331:21
Clayburn 6:15
clean 136:22,25 147:13 147:20 214:22 284:15
292:1 293:21 294:9,14

294:25 295:4 296:7 333:15 354:1,18 357:19 361:6 362:5 370:23,23 cleaned 257:4 331:11 375:1 **cleaner** 257:19 cleanup 15:17 63:18 118:6 272:20 294:10 clear 5:16 53:12 61:22 77:9 113:8 114:7 116:23 122:2 130:25 165:19,23 178:22 187:21 238:18 272:3 278:24 290:5 291:22 346:12 clearance 181:18 clearly 62:7 73:2,24 181:8 197:16 199:7 235:16 262:17 cleft 184:19 **clerk** 9:14 click 167:16 173:5 239:20 climate 250:10 290:12 348:9 climates 14:12 cloak 181:11 clock 172:6 180:9 199:22 close 8:23 11:8 55:6 156:19 185:11 192:22 237:15 293:2 330:13 335:19 379:16 closed 76:2 161:2 301:19 closely 308:8 310:10 311:8 314:11 315:10 closer 47:22 102:6 183:20 259:6 **closest** 193:11 closing 10:19 147:10 213:1 closure 76:4 **clothes** 355:9 cluster 183:24,25 184:8 **clusters** 184:18 **CMP** 316:12 Coalingo 377:17,18 **coalition** 3:8 10:12 221:18,19 231:10 233:25 238:18 239:1 264:20 265:6,7 266:10 266:24 269:25 289:4,4 289:17,23,24 305:11 305:12 353:10 354:15 361:3 371:1 coalitions 107:8 coast 1:1 2:2,16 3:9 4:4 8:9 10:11,13 15:7 23:14 26:7 29:6 31:2 39:25 41:17,19 43:9 47:10 51:21 54:13,18 81:21 83:9,16 84:5 116:6 154:2,7,18,24 158:3 187:4 189:12 219:15 240:24 241:5 358:10 360:6 361:16 284:17 286:4 290:6,20 365:11 368:7 373:5 292:5 294:11 295:5 374:4 commands 163:15 298:23,25 299:24

300:2,3,6,24 301:3,22

302:4,8 304:1,16

commencing 2:10 **commend** 357:13

315:16 348:7 350:6 commendable 297:21 352:13 365:2,4 378:19 commensurate 102:9 coastal 10:12 298:21,25 299:1,6,15 300:11 301:14 309:20 374:7,9 374.13 Coastkeeper 3:7 106:13 267:23 268:3 270:1 305:11,15 316:10 Coastkeepers 354:15 359:2 361:2 coastline 301:15,17 code 72:21 76:13 90:6 90:15,21 181:18 213:5 380:10,18 381:1 coherent 158:11 coincide 32:7 Cojo 121:16 collaborating 212:4 collaboration 221:12 collaborative 365:13 collaboratively 241:6 collapsing 266:4 colleague 289:19 colleagues 296:25 collect 29:6 341:8 collected 64:24 collecting 95:15 collection 371:15 collective 212:2 221:22 269:21 343:14 collectively 95:15 99:24 101:11 140:23 221:11 color 301:2,12 304:1,6,9 304:15 combination 163:5 259:21 combined 240:8 come 12:17 18:24 68:4,9 75:12 80:24 85:14 87:4 121:7,9 124:2 129:5 143:12 153:3 167:12 169:14 194:8 206:24 218:24 220:8 221:12 227:13 231:9,14 239:6 239:19 246:1 249:24 257:17 258:14 264:3 269:2 284:24 293:18 293:22 305:6 307:9 309:3 324:1 325:4 327:12 328:18 352:3 361:23 363:24 371:8 378:20 383:22 comes 19:25 67:23 85:3 85:13 114:19 120:19 126:2 146:21 147:14 174:7 200:14 218:14 245:5 297:4 307:10 377:13 381:3 coming 11:21 28:15 39:20 88:20 118:3,11 122:14 168:16 174:18 176.18 219.1 248.15 248:16 250:20 259:10 336:13 338:16 348:19

comment 59:14 65:23 84:8 99:9 113:10,11,14 125:11 128:25 136:24 167:2 177:11 178:24 199:24 205:21 267:9 320:20,25 321:6 325:21 327:25 329:21 339:24 348:4 376:20 382:24 commented 129:2 commenting 199:25 commentors 96:1 comments 3:3,12 5:22 10:3,5,15,21,25 13:9 18:18 36:12 40:14,16 104:12 113:12,15,17 113:23,25 114:1,18 116:3,19 117:3,8,20 118:18,20 121:25 128:4,4,15,17 130:20 131:18 132:6,14 133:14 137:11,13 138:25 139:2 145:21 145:22 147:22 148:22 150:1,17 151:19 153:1 156:2 170:2 189:6 203:6 204:3 228:23 236:5 237:5 269:22.23 289:13 298:18 305:23 307:14.17 319:11 321:11,19 322:11 326:16 333:8 335:11 342:20 344:23 345:23 347:19 350:20 352:8 353:21 354:16,22 356:17 359:10,21 361:8 363:25 365:10 365:15 367:14 370:19 370:21 373:20 374:11 376:21 382:21 383:13 Commerce 352:15 commercial 185:4 241:13 242:4 243:1 351:25 367:5 commingled 126:25 **commission** 3:6 10:10 27:23 135:13 136:13 181:21 189:7 192:18 231:6,6 238:2,13 248:8 287:17 288:9 350:9 358:1 Commissioner 163:22 Commissioner's 163:20 Commission's 259:5 committed 362:8 committee 167:8 179:1 186:1 212:5 331:3 352:16 371:12 378:24 commodities 162:3 266:16,17,20 commodity 136:14 179:25 180:4 219:16 239:12 251:20 common 74:12 76:21 113:25 114:1 127:9 131:3 132:15 163:1 164:16 221:6 357:22 commonly 129:22 communicated 181:8

305:14 communities 27:21 134:15,16 154:25 184:15 293:20 294:24 301:2,10 302:6,21 304:4,22 306:7,7,12,16 306:18 344:14 345:4 345:10 346:6 347:13 348:12,23 350:6 community 51:18 65:3 91:19 144:6,17,22 146:16 148:21 151:14 152:5 156:1 165:23 220:25 221:1,3 225:16 229:10,11 231:13,14 284:8 289:25 294:15 300:11 301:21 303:16 303:25 304:7 306:9,18 308:15,18 309:8 313:5 317:11,17 348:24 349:13 352:12,19 355:14,17,19 357:9,20 357:20 358:23,23,25 359:25 361:23 363:11 community's 309:4 community-based 290:1 community-wide 155:21 companies 163:3 company 330:10 358:4 comparable 109:16 comparative 181:23 compare 21:2 108:6 110:16 274:7 327:6 compared 20:4 21:20 23:6 31:19 47:24 106:21,24 193:11 236:20 258:17 compares 310:4 comparing 112:7 257:22 comparison 21:1 108:25 310:3 comparisons 308:22 compatible 176:21 compensation 369:19 compete 353:1 competes 161:2 competitive 154:7 349:16 complete 10:25 157:21 169:20 203:11 208:10 234:11 268:22 325:16 350:10 completed 37:20 157:10 165:15 166:1 319:23 completely 96:18 168:16 168:23,24 169:5 171:7 174:21 205:4 265:25 322:17 completing 320:23 complex 42:17 45:19 48:23 160:1 181:6 complexity 81:9 145:4 152:1 356:1 362:3 compliance 34:13 35:21 36:23 38:19 50:6 70:4 70:21 98:21 108:20,21 113:9 122:4 132:8 134:2 185:14 203:17 203:22,24 205:8 206:15,20,25 214:18

254:25 264:3 268:15

	Ī
310:25 343:21 352:4	conclu 81:7
368:6	conclude 81:8 132:18
complicate 157:16	207:6
160:11 257:9 complicated 157:11	concluded 24:1,12 concludes 23:20 215:1
complication 257:10	382:23
complied 205:9	conclusion 10:21 18:20
complies 113:8	28:19 134:6 165:25
comply 32:22 52:22 59:3	260:22 318:23
70:3 71:25 74:25 80:15	conclusions 23:21 134:5
90:15,21 103:7 105:12	187:12 205:18 290:14
105:17 107:9 108:8 111:20 131:23 203:12	conclusive 265:4 concrete 160:17
207:1 208:3 212:22	concurrent 15:9
213:3 253:5 364:20	condition 25:2 34:2
complying 125:3	62:11,12 94:7,8 103:15
component 215:8	108:8,15 131:14
222:25 234:17 265:19	172:20 270:20 312:18
338:16	conditional 1:4 2:5 7:25
components 87:17 112:25 167:19 206:10	19:21 21:1,3 22:20 32:14,16,25 33:24
comport 212:22	34:19 106:3,17 380:11
composted 312:5,8	381:14
comprehensive 20:16	conditions 21:3 28:3
21:5 35:15 63:20 249:9	33:12 35:10 41:10,15
331:2	43:9 45:9 50:2 55:18
comprehensiveness	57:22 59:23 63:22
20:11 compromises 359:7	67:12,15,24 79:6 80:2 85:9 98:8 103:11
concentrate 189:11	108:12,22 111:20
279:9	116:14 122:4 131:11
concentrated 271:7	132:1,4 203:12,16,17
302:7 303:14 304:5,18	206:18 209:24 213:4
304:23	216:18 222:4,5 271:6
concentration 25:11 28:21 30:13,14 110:16	274:23 342:24 343:2 343:20 374:8
110:20,23 111:1,2,6,8	conduct 10:24 50:20
111:10 112:5 170:6,10	52:16 85:24 97:18 99:7
170:15,20,21,23	219:23 227:25
175:11,13,15,17,19	conducted 69:10 205:14
176:1 177:2,11 178:8	212:10,13,14 364:25
303:2 concentrations 25:24	conducting 190:1 212:3 confidential 72:25 73:4
26:9 28:8,22,25 29:4,9	73:10,14,15 74:14,15
29:11,15,20,20 30:3,7	75:16 76:16,16,22
30:9 32:13 63:11 176:5	131:5
176:13 303:9 331:21	confidentiality 77:16
372:17	confines 208:13
Conception 309:15 concept 19:1 32:22	<b>conflict</b> 8:15 79:5 80:1,3 206:1
228:7,7 231:1 232:10	conflicts 205:24
333:18	confluence 125:18
conceptual 99:22	confused 123:7
concern 21:24 101:25	confusing 130:22 182:21
123:7,8 184:15 203:19	278:21 279:15
205:10 309:9 371:6,25 concerned 58:17 117:4	<b>confusion</b> 101:4 271:13 291:19,20
203:10 225:22 260:16	congested 380:1
318:6,7,7,12,13 322:23	congregation 359:19,19
336:1 345:25 346:2	congregations 359:23
347:4 352:11 373:13	congressman 221:17
375:20	334:5
concerns 131:6 155:23	congruent 366:13
180:13 203:5,22 204:4 204:14 205:2,7,22	conjunction 80:23 106:9 236:15
204.14 205.2,7,22	230.15

206:5 207:16 222:8

229:3 276:4 280:25

353:12

concession 344:6

297:25 300:21 302:16

302:17 308:19 317:16

57:13

connected 38:19

connection 115:15

connections 115:6.7

202:14 293:9,13

consequence 55:22

```
consequently 60:7
  101:18 286:10
conservation 23:18
  283:14 370:3
consider 8:5 9:12 10:5
  42:13,22 66:20 67:16
  67:19,24 84:12 149:20
  152:24 170:17 236:16
  261:14 308:13 318:24
  318:24 319:7 353:16
  364:12 365:11 367:25
  370:6 383:23
considerably 164:1
consideration 13:18
  254:12 324:11 380:16
considerations 132:10
  152:11 157:25 199:5
considered 24:2 40:18
  50:12 72:22 75:2 83:3
  83:4 99:14 104:9
  105:20 117:25 132:12
  149:8 308:20 332:15
considering 128:19
  139:15 312:21,23
  370:10 375:25
considers 41:12 115:17
consistent 13:13 152:12
  168:19 177:20
consolidation 163:2
constant 249:2 250:18
constantly 248:25 253:8
constituent 120:19
constituents 86:13,14
  86:16 117:21 119:21
  122:3,5,8,19 127:9
  300:19,23 331:20
constitute 95:11 284:2
  381:21
constitutes 382:17
Constitutional 181:2
construction 116:22,25
  280:19 366:14,15,16
consultants 51:14 69:5
  363.4
consultation 51:12 53:9
Consulting 180:12
consumed 146:16
consumer 165:4,5
consumers 158:20 240:2
  349.2
consumption 146:14
  158:7
contact 333:5 337:17
  338:24 374:25
contain 69:23 72:1 107:5
  108:19 131:7 331:5,10
contained 109:2 157:24
  163:18
container 351:20
contains 164:10 168:21
  174:11 206:15 353:5
  380:20
contaminants 21:23.23
  256:5 285:14,16 312:2
contaminate 34:12
  146:22 331:23
contaminated 19:15
  25:7,18,21 26:11 191:8
  191:10,12,19 192:7
  252:11 257:15 258:4
```

277:8 279:16 293:23

```
358:7
contaminating 192:19
contamination 19:13
  23:22,24 27:4,10 30:24
  78:22 134:12 167:13
  183:6 184:8 185:17
  186:6,15,25 187:23
  189:16 222:7,10,16,21
  252:5 256:13,24
  260:25 284:8 285:6
  290:7 291:21 292:1,14
  293:10,12 304:5
  332:17 358:9
contemplate 59:4
contemplating 233:8
contend 223:1
content 33:11 169:20
  171:20 241:17
context 20:2 23:10 229:4
  374:10
contiguous 140:8
continually 305:1
continuance 326:12
continuation 320:23
  323:24 327:22
continue 117:9 122:23
  125:22 237:22 268:5
  274:14 319:25 320:18
  351:15 380:13 382:25
continued 360:13 374:13
  374:21 383:4
continues 69:10.11
  279:22,24
Continuing 278:20
continuously 370:2
contribute 86:16 169:4
  378:4
contributed 255:9
contributes 186:10
contributing 32:18 88:1
  111:19
contribution 122:24
  166:3 174:15 183:3
  222:6 252:3
contributor 187:6
contributors 375:23
control 1:1 2:1 4:5,22
  8:10 15:3,12,20 16:8
  17:17 23:18 105:14
  107:16 108:13,16
  110:7 113:6 119:16
  120:12 124:23 132:1
  155:13,17 167:9
  183:13 210:12 211:15
  235:19 236:8 277:22
  277:23,24 278:6,16
  279:6 338:16 350:24
  365:1,5 368:5
controlling 108:1,10
  109:24 131:24
controversial 22:23
controversy 19:25 77:13
  199.12
conundrum 176:4
  351:18
convened 290:12
convening 290:13
conventional 261:22
conversation 76:7
  291:17
conversations 105:2
```

295:25 conversely 346:22 conversion 182:13,22 **convert** 110:14 converting 336:5 conveying 258:24 cooling 198:15 cooperative 15:9 112:16 125:16 126:13 209:1 220:7 233:12 240:25 354:25 367:23 cooperatively 271:18 coordination 126:7 218:15 coordinator 15:4 cope 167:10 copies 36:16 152:24 272:15 283:22 copper 127:10,12 copy 36:7,9 333:3 core 167:18 280:24 **Corinne** 16:12,12 corner 382:13 Corporation 333:11 corporations 344:3 correct 55:25 61:6,12,14 62:25 63:1 73:8 81:5 85:25 94:17,21 115:4 137:5 140:5,17 166:20 182:3.11 233:1 247:12 247:16 261:7 335:17 338:12.20 385:9.16 corrections 40:19 correctly 6:17 139:12 158:1 234:20 correlated 170:7 correlation 253:12,14,16 253:19 cost 16:3 27:25 101:24 116:19 133:1,4 135:2 139:18,20 140:2 145:14 147:11 152:11 155:14 157:8.23.25 162:16 164:25 165:14 165:25 166:8 228:11 228:15 229:6 233:6 234:2 284:1,10,10 291:25 293:16 335:9 343:2,4 346:16 348:24 349:8 354:1 355:13,16 costly 24:6 costs 27:17,19 117:21 134:21 139:23 144:25 157:13 158:5,12,17,19 158:25 159:9 161:11 162:3,4,7,9,22,25 163:6 165:3,6,10 272:13,18 284:2,12,14 295:3 303:7 304:25 333:20 348:21 349:5 349:13 352:25 354:2 council 2:9 300:10,12 councilmen 153:11 counsel 2:23 4:21 77:17 93:18 215:18 count 295:8 counterproductive 176:2 counties 117:14,15 231:8

county 23:18 24:16

damage 336:9,16 340:3

Damron 373:21,22 374:1

358:12

374:1.3

dams 341:8

damning 196:24

49:18 106:10 119:2 123:14 126:22 150:7 152:6 163:20 164:9
202:6 203:2 219:19 256:9 271:16,19,25 292:9 300:1,4,8,11
309:16 315:16 332:10 352:15,18,24 354:7,14 356:22 359:15 361:12
372:23 376:23 377:16 378:6 <b>couple</b> 11:11 39:12,15
39:22 82:6 121:25 134:6 148:20 160:1 172:4 173:13 191:2,5 196:6 198:8 199:19
218:5 219:12 248:17 280:17 376:7 377:4 383:14
course 15:7 86:16 96:25 181:5 289:11 courses 171:7
court 1:22 8:19 199:16 cousin 369:4 cover 18:18 174:7
245:13 248:14 249:1 249:22 304:24 309:19 341:3,4,5
covered 93:19 119:11,12 119:14 229:9 301:15 covers 117:16 309:14
cow 312:5 co-managing 18:1 co-op 262:4,5
cracker 198:16 create 162:19 377:19 created 8:19 137:12
144:3 154:3 225:11 creates 160:13 348:22 creating 225:19,20 349:11
creation 164:4 creators 343:17 creek 29:19,23 30:6 48:9
97:4,23 98:4 121:17 125:14 193:16,17 309:16 311:2,20 318:2
318:3,8,9 335:19,19,24 335:25 336:3 337:2,7 creeks 44:12 46:9
crisis 154:15 362:4 363:19 criteria 41:9 43:10,18
44:14,23 46:3 49:9,11 81:11 83:12 84:13 85:4 85:6,12 88:3,9 92:17
94:3,4,16 102:20 114:2 114:4,11 115:10,23 168:22 171:25 199:23
199:24 200:2 201:23 202:2 204:12,13 246:10 261:12 262:10
262:19 263:22 265:21 316:11 375:21 criterias 94:20 204:12 criterion 114:12 115:12
116:12 critical 24:10 169:3 358:21
criticized 128:25 crop 49:18 51:14 52:2,5

```
52:9 53:9,11,15 54:11
  54:12,13,14 56:1,4,7,8
  56:11,13,22 59:17,20
  60:23 61:15 65:23 66:2
  68:20 69:4 96:8 9 97:6
  145:9,10,11 154:11
  164:2 167:20,23 168:1
  168:5,5 170:3 173:2,4
  173:6,6,11 174:4,7,16
  182:15 197:2 198:11
  241:14 242:20 243:3,9
  243:10,11,13,16,20,21
  244:10,13 245:1,4,13
  248:14 249:1,22,23,24
  250:15,16 251:16
  253:12 260:2 277:2
  301:24 302:1,12 336:5
  336:6,13,13 341:3,4,5
  350.25
cropland 182:24
cropping 53:5
crops 14:12 42:9 43:11
  43:25 44:19,24 51:14
  53:7.14 57:9 60:19
  61:23 66:7 78:12 94:24
  126:19 145:5 161:3
  162:11 173:3 174:1,9
  245:22 248:2 263:5,6
  310:20 311:12 314:15
  315:4.9 351:4
cross 181:12
crossed 35:2
crowd 11:13
Cruz 300:3,8 305:18
  359:15,17 361:12
Cruz/Pajaro 189:13
CSR 1:24 2:10 385:3,21
culmination 333:17
cumbersome 151:10
  358:20
current 37:7 41:22 42:1
  71:9 85:24 110:25
  112:16 159:16 182:4
  182:24 204:11 213:8
  238:20 241:3,8 246:22
  256:20 259:3 263:13
  274:23 287:9 305:14
  306:21 308:23 333:19
  369:21 370:8 380:8,8
currently 5:2 26:10,18
  30:20 41:21 52:21
  71:25 73:22 82:13
  86:20 125:15 136:2
  159:5 165:15 209:20
  213:19 217:18 233:11
  244:16 255:10 262:10
  262:12 284:7 291:2
  331:24
cut 10:17 12:15 280:15
cycle 248:23
           D
D 40:17 86:23 89:1 109:3
  201:12
Dad 319:14 342:10
```

daily 16:8 17:21 40:7

Dale 142:10,17 143:19

122:17

dairy 190:14

198:5

dam 341:11,12

```
Danny 156:14 250:22
dark 32:1
data 15:8,10 26:5 29:2,5
  29:6 30:18,20 31:24
  45:11 49:6,13 53:24
  54:12,16 55:7 87:2,3,3
  87:4 125:25 152:12.13
  158:10 164:9 181:24
  183:20 187:10,16
  188:21,22 200:21
  201:3,7,8 205:16 216:1
  235:3,3 239:15 241:18
  243:2,4,6 254:17
  255:14,16,16,24
  256:15,21 257:3,10
  258:2,8 259:1,4,6
  265:4 271:20,21,21,22
  280:3 281:22.22
  291:17 292:10,11,11
  292:13,22 296:16
  301:3 303:25 305:25
  306:1,9,16 307:7,9,11
  331:24 365:19 371:15
  371:16,17,18,25 372:9
  372:14,15
database 36:18.19.22
  37:3 49:18 57:18
  183:15 190:8 254:1,21
  256:15 371:14,15
  373:11
date 9:4 37:19 113:11
  132:2 291:24 324:5
  326:8 327:12
dated 40:13 385:18
dates 108:15
Dave 6:15 39:23 40:2,4
David 2:18 4:15 8:13
Davis 168:14 239:22
  241:6
day 4:6 12:12 104:1,2
  138:4 156:9 206:19
  289:9 320:15,18
  324:13 325:22 326:25
  347:25 382:15 384:1
days 163:21 202:11
  208:23 224:15,19,23
day's 344:7 356:25 357:1
DDT 30:13
de 58:3 190:15 326:2
  340:10
dead 270:25 271:2
deal 14:3,15 22:11 26:4
  27:20,24 73:9,22,23
  75:5 76:22 102:18
  134:24 135:5,16
  148:25 151:25 157:15
  196:18 200:13,21
  202:5 263:9 276:9,11
  285:17 287:15 320:10
  323:10 383:17
dealership 162:12
dealing 7:1 26:21 126:12
  135:8 150:14 162:10
  167:11 171:8 195:24
  202:7 222:5 277:16
```

278:2,3 285:13 288:21 303:15 337:18 deals 277:9 dealt 14:20 **Dean** 15:16 **Dear** 364:10 death 335:21,22 debated 136:23 258:20 Debra 142:18 147:23,24 359:12 decade 28:12 decades 28:11 171:7 254:18 **December** 12:24 51:16 209:15 228:20 235:15 236:3 308:7 decent 345:21 decide 175:22 319:20 326:6 350:14 decided 14:22 208:5 262:1 deciding 85:7 343:6 decision 8:25 229:19 261:2 356:5 380:14 381:22 383:6 decisionmaking 324:6 decisions 77:18 158:6 380:12 declare 224:14 385:14 declaring 224:18 297:1 decrease 112:15 169:22 170:9 decreased 50:8 decreasing 20:12,14 254:6 dedicated 24:15 deep 190:16 256:11 291:25 331:22.23 deeper 25:14 185:20 195:10,13 256:2,13 287:13 345:14 deeply 357:9 deer 377:19 def 263:19 defacto 380:15 defend 76:9 305:8 Defense 106:12 269:24 380:2 define 102:5 165:22 244:20 defined 218:24 315:4 defines 123:5 381:1 defining 88:3,9 definitely 67:18 77:16 206:1 221:8 222:23 definition 33:23 115:1 202:13 263:15.20 277:22 381:5 degradation 24:8 32:6 336.7 degraded 32:7 336:3 degree 20:3,8,10 21:6,19 21:21 22:17 85:22 106:14,20,23 260:24 delegate 380:19

delegations 204:10

deliberate 319:20 383:22

deliberation 9:15 320:24

deliberating 362:7,22

delete 263:14

deleted 131:9

demands 370:12 demonstrate 32:11 45:6 91:3,15 102:12 313:20 demonstrated 116:5 236:5 demonstration 126:15 126:16 denitrification 190:15 259:18 260:5 denitrofication 169:5,8 denominator 357:22 denote 183:19 dense 274:24 dental 360:2 dentist's 360:1 **Department** 31:13 84:19 86:25 147:5 183:9 185:12 216:4 288:19 303.4 department's 202:2 depend 58:3 144:1 258:11 295:15 dependent 345:11 369:19 depending 9:21 37:4 126:11 152:19 204:24 248:11 250:4 depends 19:2,7 100:16 248:3 deprives 205:15 deputy 299:24 describe 71:11 93:6,9,11 240:19 described 47:8 70:22 72:7 204:23 238:19 239:1 265:15 266:10 describes 33:17 describing 69:6 93:7 105:21 253:4 description 71:5 72:9 93:15 95:3 deserve 188:5 298:13 design 19:22 designated 249:11 designation 261:8 designed 21:17 158:16 223:5 225:12 226:2 370:15 desired 171:21 desist 63:19 detail 35:18 39:9 40:16 52:25 61:9 132:3 174:2 219:9,10 221:24 258:10 detailed 14:24 110:10 details 13:12 41:13 42:18 45:20 48:24 56:21 81:12 168:20 detect 256:8 detected 47:13,15 82:13 83:9 119:22 detection 254:16 262:16 265.5 detections 31:16 determination 74:3 75:12,21 204:24 determinations 210:13 determine 56:9.10.13 60:20 88:14,17,19,22 182:1 235:7 236:13

241:17 351:6 366:5

#### A5018B3 TRANSCRIPTS OF PROCEEDINGS

determined 113:9 149:1 determining 157:13 develop 33:18 51:7 52:20 61:19 69:17,21 71:23 97:8 106:21 165:24 166:4 167:25 316:23 365:18 372:4 developed 16:3 18:9 36:25 38:15 51:12 53:9 135:12 226:1 239:11 266:18 268:16 283:14
290:16
developing 26:24 40:2 83:5 104:9 370:2
development 17:20 18:2 97:15 166:8 168:10 261:2 311:6,9,10
deviate 367:21
deviates 205:11 devices 117:7 330:14
devoid 353:6
devote 12:12 diabetes 27:16
dialogue 155:21
diaron 200:9 diazinon 43:13,21 44:15
45:1 47:18,20 48:1,4,8
48:13 51:5 83:2,19 86:3 87:7 100:17
115:25 128:12,18
150:20 200:9 240:7,9
261:23 262:8,13 263:9 263:23 264:18 265:10
278:23 310:18 311:17
314:17 316:3 342:2 345:25
Dick 333:10
dictate 59:20 61:22 171:13
dictating 170:14
die 271:8 342:13
died 271:3 378:17 dieldrin 30:13
diesel 198:15
differ 168:20 difference 60:16 101:23
149:4,6 201:10 222:19
225:18 236:22,24 257:24 258:1 264:6
278:1 282:21 287:7
379:12 differences 109:4 197:25
278:8 304:21
different 14:12,22 19:16 21:7 22:16 42:7,9,10
42:11,12 45:7 60:18
75:12 78:18 80:3,4
85:10 92:4 95:9 96:16 96:18 99:19 104:19
122:20 123:1 126:11
141:9 143:23 149:21 162:1 164:1 173:4,8
189:17 193:7 205:11
220:13 221:1,2,4 231:5 242:7 250:9,9 251:17
251:20 258:14 269:1
281:20 285:19,21 286:5 290:4,5 292:24
296:20 298:25 322:12

```
difficult 157:13 170:25
  185:20 297:16,18,19
  302:3 362:2 367:3
difficulties 188:19 304:8
  348:11
difficulty 327:3 372:3
Digging 185:19
diluting 175:20
diminishing 159:4
Dipti 289:16 354:19
direct 37:21 38:10
  151:12 216:21 227:21
direction 20:13 65:18.20
  149:14 317:19 322:5
  325:17 360:10
directly 110:17 115:21
  117:11,23 162:8
  213:13,18 216:9 223:2
  227:13 302:22,25
  336:12 340:17
director 156:14 299:24
  308:1 347:22
dis 28:6 338:25
disadvantage 134:15
  154:7 349:16
disadvantaged 134:16
disagree 76:3 187:25
  319:2
disagreement 77:14,15
  149.5
disappeared 355:5
disappears 190:17
disappointed 196:1
discernment 348:19
discharge 1:5 2:6 7:25
  8:6 37:21 38:23 42:5
  42:25 43:15 45:2 48:14
  50:20,24 51:2,3 57:11
  62:17 63:19 70:3 71:15
  89:21,23,25 90:7,10,11
  90:12,16,17,19 91:4
  93:19,21 94:14 97:11
  107:20 110:3 112:21
  118:1 120:15 128:8
  131:16 132:1 174:22
  175:4 198:21 203:9,13
  203:14 206:6 233:17
  277:3 288:3 313:12,14
  314:18 316:4 375:9,18
  376:9,13 381:9,12,15
  381:25 382:2,3,4,18,19
discharged 32:12 55:23
  62:15 117:23 273:1
discharger 58:24 73:1
  74:5 77:14,15 121:3
  208:24 264:16 277:2
  284:12 317:2 382:6
dischargers 22:25 33:14
  33:18 35:12 37:19 43:6
  50:19,20 52:15,19 53:2
  59:3 69:21 71:19,22
  78:5 108:8,13,13 109:8
  109:11 116:15 120:25
  123:2 131:1,15,22,25
  133:20 136:15 137:15
  137:16 208:2 225:21
  278:12 313:13,16,19
  313:25 314:7 375:16
discharges 1:5 2:6 8:1,6
  32:17,18 37:21,22 43:2
  70:1 78:7 80:10 105:14
```

```
107:16 108:1,11,16,16
  108:24 109:7,25
  117:24 119:1 120:11
  120:13 122:6 123:3
  124:23 131:24 136:15
  136:17,19,21 235:19
  272:24 273:1 275:14
  278:5,10,13 279:21
  285:23 286:2,5 303:6
  313:17
discharging 38:21 57:8
  78:5,11,19 80:16 87:25
  90:6 92:5 93:8 105:10
  115:14,21 264:17
  338:25 339:10 382:1
disclosed 365:3
disclosing 76:23
discourse 75:14
discretion 204:5,6 207:4
  216:23 353:5
discretionary 207:4
  352:20
discuss 8:24 41:8 50:15
  65:18 66:20 104:8
  232:16 237:22
discussed 13:14,15
  132:3 215:15 236:21
  331:6
discusses 324:21
discussing 104:13,15
  321:14
discussion 58:8.14 64:6
  64:22 65:5 66:24 68:10
  68:14 74:6 75:11
  133:17 161:6 164:11
  164:17,20 165:12
  189:7 207:17 313:1
discussions 7:16 221:6
disincentivise 279:12
disked 249:22
dismissive 160:24
disparity 154:5
displayed 311:23
disproportionate 291:10
disrupters 21:24
disruption 27:16
dissolved 32:3
distinct 357:21
distinction 161:9
distinguish 161:7
distort 158:6
distortion 158:18 185:8
distortions 158:14 182:7
distorts 260:24
distribute 73:25
distributed 162:17
distributing 104:6
distribution 146:6
district 23:18 152:4
  153:20
ditch 28:6 262:1
ditches 38:21
divergent 19:18 383:16
diverse 150:7,12,13
  221:3
diversity 150:15
divide 5:22
divided 52:9 53:11
  241:16
division 181:3
divulge 368:25
```

```
divvy 307:21
doable 322:15
doctor 176:17
document 94:9 144:23
  145:7 157:24 163:19
  239:16,17
documentation 36:6,7
  56:10
documented 24:6 27:13
  47:16 83:15 84:11
  134:22
documents 16:10 36:9
  36:13 215:22 232:11
doing 13:18 19:24 33:5
  41:18 59:5,6 68:14,21
  99:20 101:14 176:12
  207:7 219:22 221:11
  223:14,21 227:5 233:8
  234:6.24 238:4 244:10
  248:14 256:6 280:4
  308:3 320:14 340:2
  342:6,7 357:12 371:20
  374:17 375:12 376:3
  377:7 381:11
Dolezal 167:2 180:10,11
  180:11 188:13,16,18
  189:2,21,25 190:21
  191:1,13,15,21,23
  192:1,3,6,11,24 193:3
  193:12.22 194:1.3.5.8
  194:13,18,21 195:1,4,6
  195:8.12.15.17 257:21
  257:21 260:16,22
Dolezal's 260:20
dollar 159:18 166:16
dollars 27:21 133:2
  135:2 145:10 164:6
  170:14 186:23 272:19
  344:5 355:13,16
dollar's 159:19
domain 377:14
domestic 25:15 26:6,7,8
  57:24 63:8.11.12 79:18
  132:25 137:23,23,25
  215:25 256:7 272:6
dominated 344:2
Dominic 15:24,24,25
  16:4
donation 12:7
done 21:9,12 27:9 36:21
  36:21 37:23 49:10 60:8
  64:14 66:16 68:6 84:22
  86:4 88:17 99:1 102:14
  138:5 141:2 151:4
  156:23 189:12 190:4
  190:13 202:5 209:1
  220:23 223:11 234:1.8
  234:11 254:23 306:10
  306:19,19 323:17
  329:22 335:7 343:24
  344:22 358:15,16
  360:3 366:9 373:17
  378:4 384:5
door 11:18 39:21 100:14
dot 183:18
dots 42:3 46:12 185:3
  257:24
dotted 190:7
```

double 372:25

doubt 303:22

double-digit 154:14

down 10:18 12:1,5 30:2 30:11 34:12 39:14,19 64:5 65:4 67:6 68:11 93:25 102:9 103:10 111:6.10 121:22 134:13 139:13 171:13 173:24 174:8 175:8 176:14 184:8 190:18 194:3 197:3 220:21 223:12 235:23 236:1 242:22 246:9 251:11 254:9 264:10,13 281:9 318:16 320:6 328:23 329:2,11 337:7 355:7 358:5 377:24 378:18 downgrade 193:22 downhill 377:20 downs 160:10 254:12 downstream 184:20 down-gradient 126:9 down-slope 202:16 dozen 39:18 DPH 185:9 194:21 257:1 **DPR** 31:13.13 371:17 **DPR's** 83:7 Dr 4:9,10,13,14 7:8,10,13 7:19 8:15 139:3 157:1 157:3 166:20,23 167:1 167:4 172:5,10,15,17 172:21 173:15 175:6.9 176:8,24 177:1,5,8 178:13.15.17.20 179:5 179:7,10,13,15 213:11 218:4,5 221:10 222:12 222:15 223:23 224:5 225:7,18 226:10 228:2 234:4 235:6 238:12,14 239:18,21 240:19,21 243:19,20 244:18,25 245:7,10,11,12,14,15 245:17,18,24,25 246:3 246:8,18 247:6,10,13 247:16.19.22 248:5.8 249:6 251:6 252:1,7,14 252:22 259:11 262:24 294:19 305:17 322:13 322:20 332:5 333:4 draft 8:1 13:11 22:13 37:7 40:20 41:7,9,12 42:17,22,24 43:1,5,9 45:6,18 46:6,19 48:21 49:2 50:19 53:1,4 54:2 56:21 69:20 71:10 81:8 84:9,20 86:4,9,19 95:23 98:7 104:7,7,9 104:12,13 106:5,22 108:5.7.18 109:1.6.10 109:14,19 110:4,9 111:9 112:8,14 113:1,2 113:13 122:4,12 150:25 153:24 155:12 171:20 180:15 181:14 187:13 16 188:10 203:8 204:6 205:3,3,8 205:10,12 207:22,24 208:11 209:18 214:24 234:17 236:6 273:25 274:15.23 277:21.21 281:8 295:12,13,16,19 295:20,24 296:13 298:15 308:23,24

309:3,6,11 317:7,17,21
319:8 330:17 343:9
344:16
drafted 95:22 drafting 83:17 138:10
drafts 308:9
dragging 139:8 318:14 drain 29:25 48:9 309:20
drainage 60:10 119:9
243:24
draining 126:11 drains 133:9,11 198:3,4
198:7
dramatic 264:6 dramatically 248:11
254:1
draw 237:14
drawing 372:18 drawn 186:7 205:18
315:11
dredge 337:9
dredging 337:4 drill 26:3 27:24 116:24
132:21,23 134:24
135:1 291:25 347:11 358:4
drilling 134:14 232:25
345:13 346:8
<b>drink</b> 146:13,20 147:16 298:11 347:14 360:13
drinkable 272:21
drinking 19:15 20:21
22:5 24:1,5 25:11,13 25:21,24 26:11 27:9
29:10.12.21 50:5 63:12
105:7,8 110:18 112:12 114:2,10 116:13 134:4
137:4,25 138:1,4,6
183:5,7 184:1 185:9,13
185:14 193:4 194:21 194:22 195:16 252:18
254:19 255:5 272:1
284:4,15 288:17 290:7
293:23 294:10,16,25 297:25 298:16 303:5,9
345:15,19 347:7
350:12 371:8,10,17
372:25 374:25 379:6 <b>drip</b> 60:14 92:21,23
96:24 251:21 351:11
368:1,13 drive 158:24 159:23
364:5
drop 256:24
dropdowns 72:8 dropped 217:15
drove 333:16
dry 368:20
dual 217:10 due 19:13 21:10 22:9
27:11 30:25 50:10
204:23 256:23 351:23 <b>Dunham</b> 207:7,8,10,12
212:21 215:6,13
216:12 217:16 218:1
219:8 222:11,14,16 224:4,6 226:9,12
228:17 229:22 230:5
230:10,20 232:11,14
233:10,16,24 234:15

234:22,25 236:11

```
237:10
Dunn 207:13
during 119:19 150:17
  174:12 244:22 287:22
  287:22 326:25 327:24
  350:3 364:12
Dursban 351:25
duties 180:23 369:19
dwell 277:12
dying 341:24 342:11,17
dynamic 65:11
           Ε
```

each 6:1 7:2 10:8 22:16

34:5 35:17 42:4,6,9

99:25 131:2 139:25

173:4 174:17 185:10

206:7 220:13 230:21

250:7,8 251:16,20

328:16 332:17

258:12 272:8 316:1

earlier 6:20 57:19 63:14

128:16 131:8 132:3

136:17 186:7 189:3

204:9,20,22 235:14

316:9 345:8

earn 161:8 358:13

earthquakes 298:6

easier 287:15 302:3

eat 271:8 340:25 377:6

economic 154:9,14,16

155:11 156:25 157:6

157:23 158:6,12,13

161:19 163:8 164:15

165:14,16 166:1,5

234:8 239:3 300:16

301:21 363:21

228:11 356:1

economies 154:10

economist 272:9

economy 3:10 10:14

ecosystem 362:24

ecosystems 374:7

edge 78:10 309:16

edited 180:20 181:5

education 34:7 221:16

162:23

**earning** 161:15

earth 270:23

ease 116:23

310:15

easily 335:6

east 61:3 309:15

echoing 305:10

ecological 166:5

econo 154:10

earned 161:14 308:12

early 7:7 42:19 104:5

236:5 245:25 272:10

105:4 217:13 228:20

245:22 308:22 350:1

85:5 106:2 116:2

45:7 67:24 93:2,2

141:15,15 142:13

E 40:15

# 366:6 366:3.7.21 291:22 351:9,12 197:20,22,25 200:4,25 352:3 **EHA** 334:6 273:23 293:14 294:19 **elderly** 291:12 elect 371:24 156:5 electric 159:11 223:10 170:17 171:19 234:1,5 economics 157:4 159:17 161:5 165:18 299:7,25 eleven 333:16 301:18 344:10 357:15

```
349:18
educational 212:3,12
effect 83:21 114:23
  154:12 346:2
effective 78:9 81:23
  151:24 165:19 197:4
  219:6,7 226:6 236:14
  253:17 317:20 335:9
  335:10 346:16 353:18
effectively 108:1 166:9
277:22,23,24 278:6,12
  278:16 311:18 344:4
effectiveness 35:8 52:14
  125:3 235:18 236:7
effects 105:6 158:23
efficiency 155:4 334:10
efficient 53:15 55:2,17
  251:22 346:19
effort 24:15 66:18 76:25
  171:17 198:12 202:9
  218:13 220:18 238:18
efforts 291:18 349:25
  350:17 375:3
eight 146:10 248:15
  299:10,11 300:17
Eight-five 191:23
eight-inch 378:22
either 72:8 118:16
  158:11 183:12 222:21
  223:11 245:1 275:4
  283:15,16 293:23
  306:8,10,19 314:23
  315:24 319:24 322:16
  326:23 340:15
elaborate 77:21,23 108:3
elasticities 164:20 165:8
  165:12.12.13
elected 10:8 153:9 156:4
electroconductivity 51:4
electronic 45:14 48:12
  49:7,17 70:23 203:24
  214:17 268:24
electronically 73:24
element 33:20,21,21,22
  215:5 296:14
elements 33:19 38:6
  39:10 51:25 70:19,19
  71:3,12,13 72:7 74:7
  98:21 107:10,14 113:4
  212:17 226:15 228:22
  231:11 297:10
elephant 273:23 274:2
elevated 183:19 184:25
elevations 126:1
eliminate 89:20 152:2
  174:22 272:23 278:5
  278:13 279:11 280:7
  281:17 285:4 286:2
  310:12,17 313:17
```

```
376:2,18
eliminated 168:24
  240:12
eliminates 263:17
eliminating 278:9 286:5
elimination 285:7,9
  313:10
Elizabeth 342:21
Elkhorn 17:5 28:4,13,18
  28:18 46:10 121:16
  125:13 353:23
elsewhere 30:15 182:10
else's 124:24
embraced 273:5
emerged 265:23
emerging 21:23
emphasize 134:8 184:13
  272:25 361:16,22
emphasized 138:17
  218:8
emphasizes 184:14
employ 163:5
employee 385:12
employs 42:11 45:7
empty 39:14,16
encompass 187:4
  294:22
encompassing 77:2,3
  189:8
encounter 294:15
encourage 149:6,11
  212:1 218:19 230:13
  351:15
encouraged 9:10 215:16
end 6:21 8:23 10:25 16:7
  21:2 23:3,4,5 57:7
  80:25 103:22,24 119:5
  133:14 138:4 156:18
  188:3 199:9 208:9
  214:20 219:18 224:24
  226:25 233:10 241:21
  245:3 282:5 305:10
  320:23 323:6 343:2
  349:11 350:8 357:24
endocrine 21:24 27:16
endorse 214:23
ends 213:19
enemy 357:6,8
energy 289:18
enforce 62:22,22 124:16
  207:5 365:24 381:4
enforceabil 317:25
enforceability 317:25
enforceable 108:21
enforcement 15:3 40:22
  59:5,9 63:21 65:4
  67:22 68:4.8 121:12.13
  125:6 141:13,14
  158:17 216:25 349:21
engaged 76:19
engages 76:15
engineer 15:3,13,20 16:8
  17:1
engineered 81:2
engineering 2:23 15:25
  18:3 41:3 212:3
English 269:6,7
enhanced 210:15.25
```

334:10

Enhancement 333:11

enjoy 301:20 361:21

374:9 enough 10:16 134:24 147:20 151:4 159:14 172:19 226:8 230:1 266:14,16 275:4,9 276:11 319:16,18,19 330:19 354:17 357:19 361:5 379:16 enroll 33:16 90:18 enrolled 41:22,25 52:22 69:17 71:25 91:20 217:14 315:15 382:6 enrollment 49:17 ensure 32:17 33:4 71:17 78:4 131:15 296:24 ensuring 78:7 entailed 157:18 entails 18:17 145:5 **entered** 174:16 Enterprises 106:7,18 entire 74:21 83:7 135:2 189:9 240:9 278:25 280:11 308:8 342:3 entirely 65:8 311:9 351:21 **entities** 161:12 entrepreneurship 157:4 enumerated 380:21 381:7 **enviro** 171:8 **environment** 19:9 91:16 110:6 144:21 147:19 225:16 354:17 357:16 357:16 361:5 environmental 2:24 3:8 10:11 15:5 16:5,10 17:9 21:10 106:11,12 107:5 112:22.24 113:5 155:5,20,22 166:4 171:6 175:24,24 269:24,25 271:1 280:23,25 289:4,17,23 292:9 295:13 297:10 298:16 300:16 301:25 302:16 305:12 334:6 354:15 359:2 361:3 371:1 380:2 environmentalists 188:3 358:24 378:7 environments 270:2 **EPA** 129:17,18,19,20 192:24 193:4 194:13 284:5 334:6 equal 278:19 366:23 equally 107:24 278:6 280:9 equals 182:16 equity 301:25 equivalent 62:13 71:21 110:23 116:10 Eric 142:18 150:3 151:20 350:23 eroding 33:22 erosion 17:17 113:6 123:12 131:13 error 249:8 358:14,14 errors 164:19 182:22 238:20.22 errs 375:24 escalating 154:14 especially 43:6 47:17

#### A5018B3 TRANSCRIPTS OF PROCEEDINGS

05.0.0.0.0.404.45	
65:2,9 96:3 134:15 181:9 203:20 277:25	
288:8 347:3	
essen 271:24	
essential 281:6,7 282:4 297:3 363:12	
essentially 99:1 148:21	
271:24 276:24 318:17	
322:1 381:2 establish 17:25 135:23	١.
172:1	
established 137:3,19	
155:10 establishes 135:21	
establishment 167:18	
estimate 38:20 52:12	
133:4 138:11 155:14 182:24 255:7,8	
estimated 145:18 154:17	
154:18	
<b>estimates</b> 48:15 52:20 69:16 71:24 164:2	
243:3 275:5	
estimation 101:4	
<b>estuaries</b> 122:21 281:24 <b>estuary</b> 28:18,24 30:4	
et 32:4 37:22 202:16	
235:3 243:3,9,11,13,16	
243:19,20 351:7,7 ethical 349:8	
evaluate 46:16,23 47:2	
47:25 52:16 54:17	
61:25 97:6 98:19 121:2 121:10 124:21 125:2	١,
144:25 205:16 225:11	
239:22 241:8,10 252:7 252:9,14	
evaluated 47:6,10,18	ľ
64:25 82:15 94:13	
99:25 100:1 102:22 121:12 180:22 197:23	
236:4 241:23 243:3,25	
evaluating 45:16 46:5	
48:19 87:3 106:24 145:17	
evaluation 49:3,11 97:14	
98:24 249:9	
evaluations 210:14 evapotranspiration	
243:20	
even 11:6 22:5 76:19	
82:17 91:8 127:18 135:1 150:23 159:6	
170:11 184:24 196:23	
214:17 220:7 238:17 253:3,12 261:24 262:6	
285:7 291:24 309:13	
312:8 317:19 318:21	
318:22 319:20 331:19 341:4 346:16 365:19	
381:6 383:12	
evening 340:19 367:16	١
373:21 evenly 162:17	
event 353:9	
events 104:19,20,25	

105:3 116:17,18

exceedances 184:1

exceedences 32:19

184.23

exceeded 57:2 184:22

. 135:25 136:7 211:23

**expire** 380:15

**expires** 380:9

expiring 370:10

167:14 246:21

254:16 364:20

every 19:4 67:23 87:11

ever 58:10 174:21

```
93:13 120:24 137:18
                           exceeding 30:8 31:17
                             201:11 255:5 372:25
  164:15 166:16 168:4,5
                           excellent 218:13 253:2
  173:10 188:19 217:5
  220:13 223:6 225:5
                             254:14
  236:12 248:19,22
                           except 90:2 315:23
                           exception 307:6 381:7
  249:21 251:13 286:3
  293:16 306:10,11
                           exceptions 380:21
  328:24 336:20 344:5
                           excerpts 239:24
                           excess 131:10 259:22,25
  344:11 382:6
everybody 4:3,5 6:3
                             281:7
  72:13 99:17 274:17,18
                           excessive 303:8
  279:4 284:25 288:5
                           exchange 75:22
                           excited 359:4
  319:17 341:1 367:11
  382:1,12 383:11
                           excludes 285:15
everybody's 383:9
                           exclusive 330:22
everyone 5:23 10:16
                           excuse 99:18 109:13
  19:5,6 88:7 133:12
                             128:6 184:13,22
  142:14 269:19 273:5
                             185:25 204:12 350:15
  282:8 295:9 346:22
                             380.1
  357:8 366:24 381:18
                           executive 2:22,22 5:7
everyone's 66:18 324:6
                             85:2 88:12 115:22
  356:15 383:15
                             116:11 124:11 180:19
everything 98:14 149:13
                             204:5 207:3 211:7
  168:5 171:24 200:12
                             213:14 229:17.19
  279:17 286:18 294:22
                             265:24 272:15 275:17
  330:11 383:21
                             299:24 313:9 330:22
everywhere 263:15
                             347:21 380:20,22
evidence 9:8,11 27:14
                             381:8,10
  83:18 96:7 111:25
                           exercise 370:9
  116:5.6 187:14.16
                           exist 158:13 185:1
                             200:22 239:16 270:15
  188:11 190:23 195:12
  201:8 242:18 249:13
                             271:22
                           existed 271:14
  262:11
evidenced 62:6
                           existing 24:13 49:17
                             50:13 85:22 106:2
evolve 174:18
ex 51:13
                             116:22 125:22 132:24
exacerbate 79:23
                             310:4,24 375:7 380:8
exact 69:2 99:20
                           exists 159:6 331:24
exactly 53:15 103:23
                           expand 376:8
  122:13 123:22 193:24
                           expands 205:4
  252:15 257:12 298:2
                           expansion 204:4
  375:11 380:3 381:14
                           expansions 204:10
examine 155:11
                           expect 66:14 68:13.14
example 37:13 38:20,24
                             111:14,17 171:21
  38:25 39:2 41:11 42:6
                             310:6 311:16 315:21
  43:13 44:11 45:4,15
                             315:25
  46:2 48:17 53:22 55:7
                           expectation 275:25
  57:1 61:20 62:2 63:11
                           expected 124:14 152:16
  70:20 71:4 83:7 94:13
                             .
177:22 275:1
  96:10,15 97:21 98:5
                           expecting 315:23
  103:12 108:15 109:5
                           expects 49:19
  114:21 126:1 129:23
                           expedite 328:21
  131:12 144:6 145:9
                           expenditures 159:3
  160:17 173:3 179:24
                           expense 370:14
                           expenses 369:18
  182:7 189:6 190:14
  192:22 208:20 249:6
                           expensive 134:25 159:2
                             163:12 170:25 334:1
  250:23 251:2 253:2
  256:8,9,24 259:9 262:9
                             360.18
  262:23 292:10 311:1
                           experience 181:9 221:13
  314:21 315:10 324:16
                             351.2
  375:24
                           experiences 308:11
examples 100:24 105:24
                           experiencing 154:13
                           experiment 330:6
  125:12 160:1 173:13
  265:6 308:23
                           expert 350:2
exceed 29:16 55:9 56:24
                           expertise 14:22 136:9
  63:12 114:10 175:4
                             181:7,13
exceedance 184:3
                           experts 51:13 53:9
```

explain 65:17 93:23 108:5 109:4 146:15 208:16 211:14 236:10 346:6 explained 93:18 explanation 66:22 203:20 explanatory 38:19 269:10 explicitly 122:18 exploits 182:12 exported 241:24 exports 161:5 export/import 161:3 exposed 235:2 **exposure** 302:22 **express** 207:16 expressed 112:25 expression 110:20 112:6 **extend** 376:13 extended 307:20 extension 220:7 240:25 294:5 extensive 86:1 133:17 164:11 extensively 136:17 extent 47:6 162:16 260:25 271:2 293:4 301:19 365:8 369:11 external 160:24 externalities 158:5,13 externality 158:2,9,15,16 158:23 extinguisher 348:4 extra 9:17,18 100:9 extraordinarily 28:22 extraordinary 9:7 **extreme** 364:21 extremely 76:11 130:1 170:25 313:4 eye 349:1 354:19 eyes 296:5 F 152:11,22 156:25

#### 164:10 239:2.11 380:10 fabric 348:24 face 162:7 165:8 318:6 348:11 faced 348:12 facilitate 375:10 facilitating 367:18 facility 11:24 facing 302:21 348:9 362:2 fact 56:8 73:23 90:16,19 98:11 99:8 100:9 113:18 115:17 128:5 137:23 151:2 180:20 203:7 204:23.25 205:10,23 247:1 249:13 254:21 257:5 258:19 267:1 273:10 294:3 297:13 309:10 312:4,21 313:6 372:1 374:18 381:1,6 factor 56:1 97:7,7 101:5 168:22,24 169:3 182:13 199:25 357:18

157:24 158:1 159:22

factored 55:13,15 factors 41:13 42:14 45:20 48:24 51:11,19 56:3,12 71:5 96:21 159:22 163:6 169:4,12 225:22 244:23 facts 181:10 260:24 292.21 fail 210:20,20,24 failed 184:24 196:23 failing 375:14 failure 207:1 fair 101:6 249:17 328:1 331:10 369:6,6 fairly 7:4 55:6 236:16 246:23 fairness 19:1,2,3,6,25 101:5 faith 211:18 227:13 361:17 fall 22:13 48:16 49:19 61:16 104:17 131:2 140:25 204:13 205:12 300:22 303:18 363:1 363:17 fallen 307:3 falling 291:11 355:7 fallow 245:8,10 285:8,13 fallowed 133:10 falls 22:15 106:22 false 206:12,14,17 familiar 24:3 186:8 239:4 308:4 310:2 314:13 384:3 families 150:10 301:10 302:7 303:24 344:3 355:2 360:22 family 147:16 239:7 361:23 369:4 far 20:8,10,13 102:13 106:23 151:9 165:8 177:3 224:6 244:1 277:16 287:16 304:11 304:14 309:2,3,7 317:19 318:24 337:21 346:10 351:22 353:12 368.4 farm 3:5 10:9,19 33:18 33:19,23,23,25 34:5 37:20 42:4,7,9 47:22 47:24 51:17 61:2,6 70:12,14,16,17,20 89:14 92:20 94:19 95:5 95:5,8,9,12,13,17 96:5

96:19,19,20,23,24 97:5

99:19,19,20 100:7,8,14

97:13,21,25 98:10,13

101:11 102:3 103:11

103:16 106:8,10,19

107:4,7,17 108:18

109:1,8,17 110:15

111:5 112:3,9,20

119:23 120:3,14

127:8 131:6 142:7

153:4,9 156:6,15

210:20,25 211:25

121:19 124:2,11,23,24

143:20 144:19 150:7,9

197:16,17,20,21,23,25

203:2,3 210:15,16,17

163:12 170:11 172:9

## A5018B3 TRANSCRIPTS OF PROCEEDINGS

212:19 214:15 215:7 216:24 217:3 220:1 228:6 230:7 231:5 232:23 235:14 239:8 253:10,18,20 261:15 262:3,7 263:16,25 285:8 314:2 329:25
333:25 334:16,23 338:20 343:9 344:3 349:18 351:14 368:8 368:22 369:20 371:4 373:8 376:22 378:6
farmer 19:8 57:25 59:20 60:14 80:24 89:14 120:20 121:19 123:16 124:10 162:11 169:19
171:13,15 172:18 175:18 180:5 198:10 198:14,24 215:20 250:23 251:12 261:13 261:19,21 262:2,4,20 262:21 263:1 334:10
347:5 355:21 farmers 45:13 52:23 57:21 68:18 79:11 93:15 127:7 155:6,19
155:21 166:8 168:12 174:14 207:14 210:5 221:20 230:17 231:4 239:7 240:3 253:7
262:5 272:11 319:1 330:8 331:5 332:3 340:25 343:8,15 346:14 348:11 352:14 363:11 379:3
farmer's 341:15 farming 33:17 41:16,21 41:24,25 42:20 43:16
49:15 61:7 65:3 66:6 95:16 101:14 106:7 139:25 140:1 144:22 150:12 225:16 270:23 332:21 355:21,25
farmland 152:20 163:24 farms 41:25 42:2,14 43: 45:7,25 46:12,14,16,1
46:21 47:2,3,12,20,21 48:1,3,6,8,15 49:1,1,1 49:7,8,8 50:21 51:10 55:9,16 57:7 61:1 62:7 72:1 80:18 81:17,21
82:8,15 96:3,16,17 98:6,12 99:2,9,25 102:10 103:1,2,3,3,6 103:13 109:12,16 111:19 116:7 121:7
124:15 126:24 143:19 185:12 195:24 235:18 236:8 263:3,3 264:24 275:2 305:17,20 329:20 341:4 351:16
farmworker 302:7 farmworkers 303:18 354:5
farm's 342:6,7 farm-relevant 98:8 Farr 144:4 221:17 farther 47:24 115:20 fashion 217:12 fast 25:1 134:24
fate 110:6

```
favorite 196:20 197:13
                              242:24 243:1,1,7,12,25
favoriteness 201:23
                              244:5,8,16 252:5,11,19
fears 357:10
                              252:21 259:10,13
features 107:5
                              302:8,23
February 13:9 60:25 69:8
                           field's 244:25
  84:20 95:2 102:2 106:4
                           fifteen 115:4,5,6,7
  113:1 215:19 273:16
                           fifth 356:21
  274:15 278:25 280:11
                           Fifty-five 368:17
  281:8 295:16 305:13
                           Fifty-six 31:3
                           fight 147:16
  310:8 313:13,16,25
  316:20 318:25 346:3
                           figure 7:2 80:20 102:24
  359:3 376:15
                              122:10 191:17 323:16
fecal 312:6
                              361:24
feces 377:18
                           figures 191:5,5 252:4
fed 377:8,25
                           figuring 297:2,2 342:15
federal 32:19 73:17
                           file 1:25 33:15 90:24
  355:15
                             95:12 216:15 382:2,7
Federation 51:17 106:9
                           filed 91:1,2 296:22
  106:19
                           filing 93:2 223:10
fee 12:2 146:18 377:9,10
                           fill 9:13 34:16 316:8
                           filled 11:17 37:1,2
feed 298:11
                           filtration 355:11.14
feedback 42:19 344:2
feeding 293:9
                           final 152:25
feel 91:21 297:6 308:11
                           finally 131:22 149:15
  316:10 352:19 353:17
                              166:7 206:11 316:18
  375:16 376:3
feels 91:19 318:8
                           financial 123:15 145:8
fees 203:18
                              295:7,8 343:16 360:23
                           financially 385:13
feet 43:22 44:2,16,20
  48:2.5 80:13 133:13.15
                           financing 155:16 345:12
                           find 31:25 57:14 63:9
  190:16,17 261:23
  262:7 263:11.25 264:1
                              122:7.14 135:24.24
                              155:21 168:14 171:18
  280:19 281:10,19,23
  310:13,19,22 311:13
                              183:17 190:12 199:6
  358:5
                              254:1 267:6 277:22
fellow 330:8 352:11
                              285:25 304:24 322:18
  364:1,11
                              326:8,25 333:5 343:24
Fellowship 359:15
                              356:8 379:7
  361:11
                           finding 32:15,21,25
felt 83:11 350:14
                              65:17 84:8 135:20
FEMALE 72:25
                              155:24 186:20 207:24
Fernando 354:8,11
                              208:2,5 209:18 220:6
ferret 383:21
                           findings 33:12 86:19
fertilization 196:20,22
                              185:19 187:13,19,19
fertilizer 131:10 161:11
                              188:11
  172:14,19,20,24 182:9
                           fine 67:5 200:12 263:18
  196:13,16 242:5,19
                           fined 341:16,18
  244:4 250:17 259:22
                           fines 339:3
  259:25 332:22 333:15
                           finish 237:23 283:21
fertilizers 42:10 68:19
                              320:11,12,19 322:14
  334:11
                              325:7
fertilizer-specific 198:17
                           finished 190:3
few 10:16 24:25 34:8,17
                           fire 185:5,6 312:13 348:3
  35:18 40:19 45:5 47:16
                           firm 260:19
  64:16 69:13 132:19
                           firmly 135:10
  141:23 148:22 163:21
                           firms 180:19
  164:15 202:11 254:24
                           first 6:21 8:3 10:7 12:23
  354:4 359:23 361:15
                              24:21 32:15,21 40:8
  371:13
                              46:21 106:1 112:11
fewer 6:1
                              116:17 122:2 123:25
fiction 381:7
                              143:17,25 156:24
field 51:13 78:12 79:10
                              157:11 159:25 171:22
  153:15 168:13 174:10
                              173.16 177.16 178.24
  184:21 193:10,20
                              179:21 191:5 200:10
  242:13,19 243:5 245:9
                              202:9 207:23 218:16
  245:19 261:21,22
                              219:14,23 224:24,25
  367:11
                              225:6 228:19 234:25
fields 35:5 37:10 53:24
                              238:17 239:2.15 241:9
  54:6 55:5 126:17,18
                              249:14 265:17 270:3
  135:25 169:23 181:7
                              285:11 287:6 292:25
                              305:12 309:3 311:16
  241:13,14,18 242:15
```

```
314:14 315:1 331:14
  331:14 355:22 358:7
  365:16 367:22 370:3
  372:9
fiscally 352:21
fish 19:13 30:21,23
  129:9,12 130:8 378:7
Fisher 203:1,1
fisherman 19:10
fishing 19:11 30:17
  374:25
fit 92:17 94:4 105:9
  119:18 124:11 140:23
fits 209:19
five 29:12 43:10 93:13
  111:11,16 112:13
  141:5,23 142:9 153:5,6
   156:18 212:25 221:14
  224:2 225:3 248:3
  262:12 266:1,4 286:25
  306:11 328:9,19,19
  332:14 334:14 355:15
  355:16 364:23 373:22
five-year 93:5 110:2,21
  141:5 217:8 225:25
  258:13 286:1 306:20
fix 151:7 199:11,14 346:8
fixed 171:20 172:2 178:1
  178:3 199:16,17
Flaco 30:12,21
Flago 19:12
flawed 145:4,15 172:1
flaws 180:14
flea 129:1
flexibility 105:12,17
  107:3 110:1
floats 344:10
Flood 23:18
flooding 336:9 338:6
Floor 2:9
flow 51:3 110:22 170:22
   170:24 173:18 193:15
  242:25 260:1
flowchart 231:18
flush 287:25 288:3
fly 13:19
focus 41:13 45:15 46:2
  50:11 113:23 114:1
  151:6,13 171:14 172:8
  175:1 219:25 262:11
  290:3 291:9,16 292:3
  293:8 300:17
focused 128:17 150:18
  240:7 256:4
focuses 151:17
focusing 16:1 42:18
  45:20 46:15 47:1 48:18
  48:24 81:11 219:20
  290:9 300:20 347:17
  375:24
folks 6:18,25 11:13,17
  11:20 78:18 123:9,19
  127:1 141:23 213:23
  215:16 238:8 263:7
  264:9 268:4 280:23
  305:7 307:19 318:21
  319:16 345:5,6 356:23
  358:11,12,19 363:6,15
  374:16,17,19 380:24
follow 57:25 65:22 86:12
  88:13 145:19 176:9
```

177:25 227:6 234:21 286:13 291:23 333:19 366:11 followed 10:7 18:15 241:14 308:8 360:10 following 10:1 43:10 52:1,8 122:18 155:1 187:12 277:19 296:15 334:19 follows 10:6 followup 60:11 63:13 122:10 125:5 follow-up 88:14,19 105:1 204:16 folly 170:17 food 78:15,21 79:5,24 165:5 302:2 348:21 349:3,5 foods 302:3 foot 264:8 footnote 186:19 forced 352:5 foregoing 385:5,9,15 foreign 353:1 foremost 143:25 332:5 foresaw 374:4 forgetting 83:22,22 form 34:3,16 35:22 36:20 36:22,23 37:6,15 38:9 38:13,14,20 70:21 71:2 98:22 133:23 203:11 203:23.24 204:1 211:20 268:12,12,15 268:15 269:3,9,12,16 275:11 372:21 formal 13:7 formalizing 369:22 format 209:20 formations 126:3 formed 231:4 former 185:3 forms 36:10 67:18 68:8 268:13 269:7 310:25 formulate 12:22 formulation 352:1 forth 9:18 61:4 95:19 119:2 125:14 207:21 209:10 217:18 218:15 218:15 385:6 Forty 25:23 forums 104:19 forward 25:1 155:24 157:16 158:10 208:14 209:19 216:24 235:6 261:7 264:21 357:11 357:23,24 359:1 361:2 363:23 382:14.17.18 forward-thinking 135:15 found 47:7,9 82:18 83:10 84:24 86:7 107:11 108:3 151:15 168:8 180:14 182:6 187:9 188:16 18 202:7 256:18 292:16,18 316:12 318:8 357:7 379:7 Foundation 28:18 345:2 373:23 four 182:19 184:3,18 210:5 368:18 Fourteen 268:22

Fourth 2:9 framework 14:17 231:10 Frances 2:23 4:21,23 195:23 267:9 323:17 338:8
Francisco 5:1,4 Frank 6:8,9 frankly 200:4 273:4 279:2 283:2 313:4 318:12,20 345:12
358:15 Fred 364:8 365:9 free 342:23 343:3 free-for-all 342:24 frequency 116:15
fresh 156:22 362:5 freshwater 271:5,11 Fresno 376:23 378:6 Friday 324:18 from 1:5 2:6 4:21,22 5:1 6:14,18 7:15 8:1,6 18:6
18:6 19:9 21:7 22:2 23:25 24:5 25:21 26:6 26:11 29:2,4 31:23,24 31:24 32:17 35:24 40:22 45:11 48:25
49:16 50:23 51:15,22 53:24 54:14,16 55:7 60:1 61:6 66:23 69:3 87:23 88:20 93:14 96:1 99:16,19 105:23
109:12,16 112:15 117:2,17,23,25 119:1 119:16 120:11 121:7,9 122:6,14,18 123:12 124:23,23,24,24 126:2 126:3,6 127:8,9,10,15
130:16 131:15 134:18 134:19,20 136:4,16,17 136:21 137:25 139:24 144:19 146:21 150:8 153:8 154:20,24
159:19 163:4,9 164:14 164:15,19 167:13 169:6 174:15 175:23 176:3 182:9 184:20,20 186:7 187:6 188:21,23
190:18 193:17 194:8 197:21 199:15 200:14 205:11 209:15 218:24 228:6,20 235:20,20 236:8 237:18 239:22
241:7 247:2,14,23 250:5 253:10 256:11 256:15 258:1,4,16,22 259:10 260:1 261:23 262:7 263:11 264:8,8,9
264:10 266:15 267:3 275:3 276:6,24 277:9 277:20 280:23 282:3 282:25 283:13,21 286:6 287:21 288:18 296:25 300:7,13,20
301:11,24 302:25 303:6,11 304:17 305:1 305:5,25 306:6 307:6,9 307:10 308:7,15 309:7 309:15 310:13,19,22
311:5 313:18,22 315:16 317:24 318:5 332:12,14 333:4

335:13,22 336:17 340:24 341:24 343:6,8 344:6 346:22,24 347:5 347:14 348:25 349:7 350:12 351:24 352:23 354:6 355:17 362:10 364:8,8,16,17 365:4,11 367:17,21 368:5,17,24 371:8,16,19 372:14 375:7 377:13,13,18,25 381:3,11 front 4:23 5:6 32:24 34:23 37:6 39:10 95:23 96:10 196:5 258:9 362:2 374:12 frontal 309:19 fruit 241:16,24,24 fruits 302:9,15 361:21 full 9:5.9.11 13:21.23 15:22 157:8 322:4,7 381:21 fully 10:4 315:23 full-blown 68:14 full-on 205:19 function 213:9 215:9 220:15 222:20 224:20 227:22 259:20 270:14 270:18 323:10 334:18 functional 208:13 functionally 71:21 214:12 276:16 functioning 213:16 217:12 **functions** 319:23 fund 228:12 229:12.12 294:9,14,17 295:4 365:21 370:23 fundamental 278:1,8 284:14,17 356:1 362:17 fundamentally 286:5 funded 186:23 funding 229:6,9 230:3 372.7 funds 228:16 Funny 382:15 further 47:6 55:12 75:21 89:3 121:11 133:19 155:11 157:16 158:18 159:3 163:8 165:6 187:17 200:11 207:19 211:14 232:9 233:21 239:22 274:3,5 305:19 360:15 385:11 Furthermore 370:13 future 9:2 24:14 27:6 160:13 221:7 344:5

# G

356:24

G 182:23 gain 275:6,23 gains 303:20 GAMA 18:11 183:15 184:18,22 185:9 190:8 195:1 235:3 253:25 254:21 255:14,16,24 255:25 256:17,21 371:12,14,15,20 372:4 372:14 373:11,15 game 378:8

gamut 60:18 68:25 gap 117:16 119:18 316:8 316:8 gaps 222:12,15 gas 290:17 gastric 360:19 gather 86:9 gathered 371:16 gave 93:15 105:21 126:14 306:3,4 350:8 **Gaviota** 315:16 general 42:17 48:23 61:10 70:11 78:4 94:3 94:3 108:7 109:4 122:11 130:18 131:11 143:19 162:24 211:9 212:11 214:4 224:21 329:20 366:14,15 generally 192:9 216:17 216:18 375:20 generate 159:10 228:16 generated 118:12 161:8 166:16 generation 356:21 generations 150:11 358:14 generous 313:4 Geneva 350:11 geographically 219:17 300.7 Geological 189:4,8 geologist 2:23 15:25 18:4 41:3 George 6:16,17 GeoTracker 183:15 Gerardo 345:9 354:24 359:24 Gerardos 354:2 gets 5:23 6:3 75:20,22 90:1,2 259:17 260:5 303:14 355:19 getting 6:19,22 11:12 12:18 13:12 16:25 26:21 59:23 134:17 251:11 257:4 333:22 336:16 349:5 355:6 372:9 373:14 **Gilbert** 181:1 Gilroy 146:8 190:4 360:5 Gina 148:6,11,12 Gina's 148:3,4 girl 301:11 **GIS** 152:18 give 73:14 89:2 108:22 109:4 115:1 142:13 173:12 175:18 265:24 267:19 308:23 311:1 312:12 319:16,21 325:16 327:14,18 329:15,16 339:14 360:8,13 382:24 383:3 given 45:9 49:20 50:23 51:20 70:1 81:24 109:22 172:20 173:22 203:20 204:5 253:9

258:13 267:24 308:14

142:15 246:19 346:14

gives 179:20 198:20

206:14 309:22

giving 76:9 125:12

343:2

350:10 369:13 glad 222:1 335:1 gladly 334:25 glass 147:13 Gliessman 305:18 global 294:21 go 10:7 13:1,23 24:9,17 39:9 64:8 65:3,15,18 65:20 68:11 69:14,14 82:7 89:5 93:1 95:3 98:23 109:3 111:6,10 114:24,25 120:20 125:6 127:24 133:18 134:6 138:5 139:6 141:25 142:8 143:4,13 144:9 146:12 147:11 148:15 157:16 158:24 159:7 166:14 167:5 168:16 169:25 172:7 173:23 178:23 194:12 194:17 199:12,13 203:4 204:16 207:6,7 208:16,21 213:18 214:19 216:23 217:2 219:10,12 220:21 223:12,17 227:17 233:13,21 238:6,7 245:2,15,22 250:10 254:21,23 255:20 256:23 257:15 259:17 270:11 277:25 282:23 283:7 306:8 323:18 326:15,15 339:1 341:12,12 343:25 344:15 346:10,19,21 354:13 358:4 373:11 376:14 379:23 goal 53:17 61:23 62:5,15 62:23 158:13 175:22 182:1 214:22 225:17 286:1,4,4 goals 105:14 165:20,20 165:21 166:9 171:21 221:6 251:19 272:22 272:23 273:4,5,7 278:1 278:9 286:6 353:6 366:3 god 298:7 Godspeed 350:18 God's 377:13 goes 55:12 60:9 64:5 84:1,21 114:21 171:13 190:17 194:9 229:13 245:3 259:17 276:2 285:13 287:17 293:3 341:13 going 5:22 6:3 7:2,10 10:17 13:2 16:21,25 17:5 18:13,14,18 22:22 27:22 28:2 33:6 34:8 34:19,21 37:15 39:8,9 41:6 46:2 50:11 53:21 55:21 23 56:18 57:10 57:13 60:15 62:22 63:3 64:9 65:3 66:19 67:6 67:22 69:1 73:18 75:18 78:19 84:14 89:9 92:19 94:16 101:3 104:1.4

109:3 113:23 114:5

120:20,21 121:17,21

122:1 124:16 125:5,21

125:24 127:4,21 134:18 138:5,6,12,20 142:2,3,4,13,14 145:3 145:20 147:10,14 157:15 165:3 171:12 171:22 172:10 173:10 174:25 175:4 177:9 180:6 197:14 199:12 199:15 203:4 206:3,11 207:6 208:12 209:13 209:23 213:1 214:5 217:22 218:19,23 220:20 221:16 222:6 225:6,14,21 227:7,15 228:12,14,16 230:8 232:3,8,24 237:18,21 237:23 238:22 244:25 245:15 246:6,9 248:10 248:16 251:9 17 19 252:10 253:13,15 254:9 257:18 259:2,20 260:17 263:5 264:21 274:1 275:10 277:14 278:21.24 281:14 282:2.11 285:13 286:17,24 289:1,19 290:24 296:18 298:9 301:2 311:18 313:13 316:20 317:10 318:15 318:15,16 319:3 320:17,22,22 321:5 323:1.6.9.25 326:5 327:8,19,20,24 328:17 328:18 329:10,11,13 329:22 333:25 334:13 334:18 337:20 340:11 340:12,13,14 341:5 347.8 349.2 355.20 356:12 357:11 359:5 361:24 364:22 367:8 368:5 369:17 370:11 372:1,5 373:11,12 376:5 379:8 380:15 382:25 383:3,4,21 Goleta 309:25 gone 13:10 162:14 173:19 200:11 220:18 221:20 282:8 351:8 355:12 368:12 gonna 232:15 Gonzales 304:10 good 4:3 14:23 16:24 18:22 41:2 104:1 147:13 156:8 157:1 167:4 170:11 174:3 175:12 191:7 203:1 211:18 212:7 227:13 227:13 237:4,6 240:21 244:10 247:6 250:23 266:14,16 268:10 269:19 282:24 299:21 307:24 320:14 328:3 340:19 344:25 347:20 352:10 354:23 356:8 356:14,19 357:18 358:9 361:9 367:16 373:21 378:3 good-sized 11:12 gotten 133:14 166:23 336.7 government 73:17

291:7 297:7,12,13

298:5,8 342:12

181:17 333:20 350:9 352:16 381:1 **Governments** 300:12,14 grabbed 332:7 gradients 193:25,25 194:1,3,4,7,10,15 grand 202:9 Grande 2:18 183:21,24 183:25 192:22,23 193:1,16,17 194:6 grant 211:23 212:25 241:7 355:15 granted 331:17 grants 18:7 grape 92:22 266:14 267:3 grapes 96:21 graph 20:5 242:6 332:9 333.4 graphic 69:3 grasped 332:7 grateful 357:3 383:18,20 grease 127:15 great 93:10 200:13 259:1 268:14 271:2 317:16 318:13 337:17 357:23 359:4 361:14 363:4 367:7 371:22 greater 44:25 55:23 96.11 109.19 222.6 258:10 314:16 336:7,7 greatest 22:25 23:1 43:3 46:17 79:17 186:5 greatly 168:20 green 42:3 46:12 239:21 357:6 381:16 greenhouse 290:17 grew 335:24 grid 189:15 grocery 349:4 gross 152:16 164:2 ground 14:16 79:15 139:8 163:11 220:20 248:17 251:13 253:7 263:7 276:16 285:25 grounds 159:12 groundwater 14:9 15:14 15:16,17 17:3 18:10,11 19:14 23:19.25 26:10 27:4 34:10,13 50:5 51:20,24 52:12,16 53:14,16,18 55:3,10,24 57:4,8,11,14,23 60:5 61:16,24,25 63:2 65:25 66:3 67:14 90:1 94:25 107:18 109:15,17 112:21 114:3.12.13 116:14,15,20,21 133:1 134:10 135:6 136:1,8 139:21 167:13 169:21 170:13 177:5,9 182:11 183:14 185:17 186:16 186:25 187:3,23 190:2 205:25 206:2,5,9 210:9 215:5,11,12,14,17,20 220:11 222:7,10,16,17 222:21,23 232:25 233:5.20 234:13.16.21 234:24 235:7,8 240:18 244:17 249:12 251:3 251:18 252:3,6,11

253:10,15,18,20,23 254:11 255:1,8 256:1 256:10,12,19 257:4 258:20,25 259:2,20 260:19,25 261:3,9 267:1 268:7 273:2 275:15 277:3,9 278:7 283:17 295:14,17 296:15 303:3,7 330:24 331:9,23 332:6 345:10 347:14 365:23 366:6 371:7 373:10 374:14 groundwaters 272:24 278:10 group 7:6 48:16 106:11 112:4 142:25 144:3 207:17 208:13,25 209:2,4,7,19 210:4 211:4,6,9,11,19 212:7 212:15,18 213:15 214:3,9,10 217:12,21 218:19 219:15,18,22 220:5,15,19 222:23 223:16.22 224:20 226:13 227:2,8,9,10,12 229:12,19 231:4,12 232:21 234:6,7 269:21 280:10 290:14 307:19 359:3 366:9 372:2 groups 73:14 104:18 136:14 208:1,4 213:5 218:21 219:14 221:9 224:17 229:12,23 230:13,25 289:24 334:14 371:10,11 group's 214:5 229:15 grow 44:19 53:16 57:10 61:15 94:24 174:3,7 198:11,24,25 288:1 310:20 314:15 343:2,8 351:3 grower 39:5 56:6 67:13 67:17 94:9 107:20 133:3 144:15 145:1,3 158:11 161:6,10,12,13 161:15 162:2,5,9 220:11,13 224:12 233:25 242:24 259:22 266:14 267:3 311:16 316:1 333:21 367:25 growers 34:16 35:3,21 35:25 36:2,4,7,13,20 37:1,11,14 38:15 64:25 65:10,12 67:25 69:17 82:17 83:12 85:10 86:24 105:11 107:9 109:23 122:10 127:11 132:21 133:2,5,6 143:23 145:8 150:8 151:6,8 158:20 160:5 160:15 161:8,24 162:20 163:4 164:7,22 164:24 165:1,8,17 179:22,23 203:11 206:23 207:3 210:10 211:21 216:8,15 217:11 218:20 220:1 231:7 240:25 242:4,7 243:13 244:11,16 246:11,13,23 247:1,25 259:8 269:1 275:17

279:7 283:1 287:14,20 300:21 303:21 308:24 309:12 310:6,12,16 313:15 314:15 316:20 316:22 330:9 334:20 335:5,7 343:1 349:15 351:13,15,19 365:21 366.1 grower's 93:8 165:9 223:13 grower-ship 231:7,7 grower-shipper 210:1 365:14 16 growing 27:14 43:25 59:18,21 66:2 145:5,9 161:3 197:10 229:9,11 231:13,14 248:14 250:8 287:23 302:10 348.21 grown 61:23 65:24 241:5 241:11 grows 42:9 277:2 growth 197:5 337:7 guarantee 217:5,8 297:2 380.5 guarantees 223:11 guess 58:7 143:16 175:10 193:8 223:1 225:18 236:11 272:16 287:4 315:24 335:22 guided 200:20 aut 343:11 guts 168:23 guys 129:5 220:23 255:17 260:6 280:4,5 283:4 326:5,7 356:4,5 356:8 382:19 Guzman 344:25 345:1

H
habitability 345:20
habitat 16:6 273:3 340:4
378:10,12
hair 355:6
Haiti 298:9
half 12:22,24 14:20
18:25 104:16 239:5
259:16 260:4 279:25

303:5 304:3

half-lives 287:8 hamlet 183:22 hand 9:14 39:8,16 78:21 164:16 221:14 348:3 handle 119:1 279:7 handled 119:3 handlers 160:6 handling 279:6 handouts 143:14 hands 323:14 327:18

328:16

happen 56:18 58:17 64:4 64:12,16 66:10,12,12 67:6 76:23 115:18 123:16 135:20 136:12 259:24 261:20 282:7 321:2 325:2 339:4 340:12 368:5,15 happened 76:19 262:4

267:11 happening 14:16 164:18 219:3 243:24 256:19 happens 57:16 64:19 75:5 76:12 95:13 100:9 119:24 275:22 280:6 287:22 323:7 369:9 happily 155:18 happy 118:23 156:9 215:2 359:7 367:19 Harcourt 180:24 hard 36:7,9,16 346:6 355:25 356:4,4 359:9 hardly 169:7 213:2 harmful 376:11 harping 94:15 Harter 332:5 333:4 Hartman 333:10,10 335:12 Hartz 241:5 harvest 162:11 174:3 197:2 244:25 harvesting 20:9,14 21:8 21:11,12 Harvey 5:9,11,13 15:2 16:15 40:22 hassle 360:17 hate 368:25 having 16:24 17:4 27:20 32:22 37:23 76:7 82:22 91:16 99:24 100:8 116:7 131:13 173:4 202:8 222:20 236:12 236:12 259:22 263:18 281:5 284:13,14 302:9 302:14 304:22.23 318:11 345:16,21 346:23 347:2,8 360:18 379.2 Hayashi 2:18 4:17 8:15 hazard 167:18,19 168:1 168:8,17,23 173:1,1,3 173:5,7,25 178:25 235:6 hazardous 303:10

hazards 146:24 173:4 head 139:13 145:9 202:17 header 239:25 headwaters 336:4 health 20:24 22:7 27:11 30:16 58:5 64:1 82:2 105:7,8 130:11 147:5 147:19 148:22 149:16 149:16 183:9,17 184:14,23 185:13 199:5 202:1 216:5 288:19 292:9 297:25 302:10,17 303:4,10 304:8 343:5,12,20 344:5,9,9,14 345:19 348:23 354:2,5,17 357:15 361:5 366:25 367:2.7

367:2,7 healthy 147:21 161:1,17 281:5,6 hear 80:5 134:18 136:4 143:9,12 150:16 153:8 207:10 222:1 294:1 305:1 380:24 383:12

heard 26:14 27:12 96:1 105:5 132:20 133:8,12

133:14 134:18,20 160:1 196:11 234:20 235:21 272:16 282:25 293:22 295:21 297:16 304:8 342:2 361:14 379:21 380:16 hearing 8:5,8,19,22,23 9:5 10:6,24 13:21 170:19 222:9 255:15 255:18 308:14,18 322:15 380:12,13 381:22 heart 169:1.1 341:21 heartbreaking 297:17 heavily 20:22,25 22:6 28:13 317:15 heavy 317:15 358:19 heck 277:23 Hector 16:11,15,15 Heidi 364:2 held 8:8 13:20 181:17 345:18 365:8

Hector 16:11,15,15
Heidi 364:2
held 8:8 13:20 181:17
 345:18 365:8
hell 377:20
Hello 146:2 147:24
 153:15 209:25 218:4
help 11:21 12:16 26:25
 40:2 53:20 69:11 96:22
 145:19,19 160:9 208:6
 208:6,18 218:11,14
 220:3 227:25 235:5
 289:20 309:2 324:6
 326:4 334:6 340:17
 349:15 369:14
helpful 208:6 269:5
 370:9
helping 12:1 16:13

helps 86:9 128:20 356:15 hence 296:3,11 her 4:25,25 18:3 120:22 148:13 305:24,25 339:14 350:3,8 360:4,6 360:6,7,14,15

Herbert 181:2 **Hernandez** 16:11,15 herself 360:13 hey 121:20 319:14 **hiding** 15:19 high 21:25 26:9 27:3 28:22 30:3,7,9 43:25 44:19,24 51:9 52:23 53:2 61:18 94:24 96:7 96:9 97:7,24 133:14 147:1 149:23 169:19 173:3,4,7 174:19 175:13,15,21 193:13 249:11,16 251:5 252:16 256:8,23 257:7 261:9 271:6,10 276:6 277:2 288:6 293:18,25 304:20 310:20 314:15 315:4 355:5 360:7

higher 30:14 43:11 46:19 47:23 49:2 55:18 61:15 96:8 99:13 105:10 137:16,16 147:6 165:8 165:10 169:17,18 182:19 252:24 263:7 358:7

highest 22:19 24:2,4 26:12,13 28:8,23 30:12

## A5018B3 TRANSCRIPTS OF PROCEEDINGS

31:3,15,16,18 43:2 64:1 105:7 137:2 150:23 186:10 212:18 225:6 254:15 330:18
highlighted 132:15 311:10
highly 20:20 22:22 31:4 31:5 181:6,16 213:2
251:22 336:3 highway 119:7,9,10 120:3,10,11 123:13
126:16,18,21,22 184:11
highways 118:1,4 119:2 high-nitrate 51:21
high-priced 363:4 high-risk 26:16,17 97:5 210:13 220:10 225:22
225:24 226:22 311:12 hills 184:19
<b>him</b> 40:5 239:22 251:9 318:2 333:5 379:18
himself 4:18 hindsight 232:5 hire 120:21 121:22 125:6
145:17 363:3 <b>hired</b> 260:19
historic 363:13 370:17 historically 92:10
history 195:24 348:9,16 hit 197:22 220:19 228:18
250:9 <b>hits</b> 336:21 <b>Hmm</b> 58:6
<b>Hm-hmm</b> 58:12 89:4 100:21 245:14,17,24
246:3 Hoc 186:1
Hodgin 2:18 4:15,16 8:13 139:1 238:12 251:25 252:1,9,20,25
253:1 255:20 322:22 322:23 324:19,24
325:20,21 hold 329:9,9
holes 367:9 Hollister 303:3 304:6 376:22
<b>home</b> 138:5 298:9 368:17,24
homeowners 26:18,25 27:9 138:10
honest 315:23 honestly 369:22 honesty 227:15
honorable 180:10 352:11 363:13
hope 114:6 288:10 289:20 319:7 322:2
347:16 353:16 359:7 370:24 hoped 157:8
hopefully 294:1 320:5 hopelessly 145:4
hoping 12:4 212:24 309:1 Horacio 354:24
HOROWITZ 2:24 horses 377:19
host 129:1 hour 153:3

hours 11:5 333:16 house 312:16 household 284:2,3 housing 345:17,21 hows 165:22,22 Huckaby 16:12 huge 13:9 66:18 76:24 134:14 219:5 316:8 human 22:7 27:11 58:5 105:7,8 146:14 147:19 149:22,23,25 177:25 199:5 296:22 297:1,24 303:10 348:10 349:25 350:2,10,13 354:16 357:15 361:18,20,22 361:23 362:14,22 humans 356:9 361:4 hundred 29:21,23,25 30:4.7 36:4 54:5.5 72:14 95:19 140:22 164:3,6 190:10 191:23 268:23 286:17 300:21 306:25 307:4 347:10 368:23 hundreds 36:14 132:13 143:22,23 180:20 181:6 352:23 hungry 319:15 Hunter 2:19 4:13,14 8:13 139:3 218:4,5 219:13 221:10 222:12,15 223:23 224:5 225:7.18 226:10 228:2 238:12 243:19 244:18 245:7 245:11,14,17,24 246:3 262:24 287:21 294:19 322:13,20 hurry 144:11 hurting 283:17,18,19,19 husband 368:16 Huss 142:17 143:13,14 143:19 144:11,13 145:20.22.25 198:5 hybrid 151:16 Hyd 281:22 hydro 16:1 281:22 hydrocarbon 127:13 hydrocarbons 119:21 Hydrography 281:22 hydrologist 194:5 255:8 hydrology 193:13 260:19

Idaho 143:4 idea 14:23 47:22 86:6 217:16 218:8,13 221:11 227:24 230:23 252:24 279:11 280:1 283:5 317:9 372:19 383.5 ideas 378:3 identically 258:17 identification 48:14 52:5 88:16 155:15 212:9 identified 26:17 82:11 86:14 192:12 201:1 218:8,17 222:3 226:1 239:15,18 262:18 303:4 374:24 376:11 identifies 158:8 identify 37:21 48:6 80:9

158:1 161:20 162:20 210:5 218:22 225:11 225:23 235:3 249:9 300:7 identifying 26:16,18 46:23 122:20 264:14 idiot 169:21 ignorance 182:12 358:15 ignore 312:15 ignored 24:17 174:14 186:22 255:16 ignores 145:7 II 185:4 illegal 285:24 illustrate 45:16 46:4 96:22 illustrated 106:2 illustrates 98:5 illustration 36:6 212:17 im 59:6 image 31:23 41:17,19 46:13 315:3 imagine 23:3 147:12 196:16 293:17 immediacy 325:14 immediate 59:4 132:8 248:24 253:16 264:16 immediately 193:14,20 206:18 248:16 264:17 279:23 311:25 **immense** 362:3 impact 21:20 22:7 23:1 59:7 90:7,9,20 91:16 116:7 154:16 158:12 160:21 163:8 165:16 166:2 169:24 184:14 186:12 256:17 272:10 272:13 298:12 301:18 301:21 331:1 343:16 343:24 369:15 370:15 impacted 28:13 32:2 . 44:20 293:15 304:14 345:16 374:8 impacts 17:4 21:7,10,10 22:2,2,9,11 27:11 28:15 29:15 43:12 51:20 70:1 82:1 114:2 154:9 157:6 161:24,25 162:16 163:17 256:19 291:7 302:19 303:1 305:19 330:3,24 343:18 345:20 353:7 impaired 43:3,14,22 44:17 45:2 47:23 48:2 48:5,9 69:24 72:2 78:5 78:13 97:4 115:11,14 115:20 151:5 219:24 220:2 275:14 279:21 281:10 310:14 314:23 impairing 122:15,19

impairment 47:17 83:15

220:10 235:4 310:19

311:21,22 312:11

impairments 84:10

impediment 202:22

implement 34:1 35:7

51:7 52:11,20 61:19,20

374.21

315:6

**imple** 97:8

. 84:5 151:13,17 374:13

69:21 71:23 97:8 138:22 145:2,15,19 167:22 210:11,18,20 217:22 225:13 227:18 335:1,5 338:21 implementable 238:21 implementation 44:8 . 71:16 97:16 105:16 138:16,18 145:15 155:13 160:12 165:21 213:21 219:4 222:24 237:2,2 366:4 implemented 34:5 70:20 112:1 135:11 179:2 210:16 213:10 217:4 226:6 352:22 375:4 382:15 implementing 71:7 . 157:9 165:16 211:17 211:25 212:2 214:15 226:21 227:3,7,23 233:25 235:9 236:13 236:14,17 237:13 349:14 implements 42:12 209:18 381:3 implicated 200:7 implication 159:7 implications 155:11 163·18 import 381:23 importance 288:20 important 12:13 23:2 . 24:22 41:13 42:18 45:20 48:24 77:8 81:12 144:24 158:4 160:7 161:5,9 166:25 175:25 198:4 199:4 212:17 219:5 226:24 237:17 258:18 263:10 281:16 283:12 297:14 308:13 310:23 314:11 319:22 348:15.16 349:10.18 349:19 357:1,13,17 362:13,18 importantly 214:10 imports 353:1 impose 158:5 178:8 . 196:20 imposed 21:16 24:11 59:1 98:15 351:23 imposing 87:11 impossible 159:10 174:21 impressed 331:4 impression 206:14,17 . 254:19 impressions 206:12 **improve** 17:23 50:6 53:17 59:6,11 79:24 110:3 144:5,16,21 155:6 225:15 281:3 296:16 330:24 351:8 368:2 improved 183:12 330:6 351:11

improvement 53:19

332:16 334:21

improvements 32:11

. 65:19.20 69:12 109:20

151:11 212:15 221:21

108:24 144:2 155:2,4 158:25 228:1 332:22 335:8 374:20 improving 33:4 353:13 353:19 improvise 330:4 inaccuracies 152:15 inadequate 108:2,3 353:5 inappropriate 204:9 inappropriately 68:6 382:11 **INC** 1:21 incentive 91:14 330:23 334:20,22 incentives 155:6 333:20 335:4 inches 243:7 247:9,12 include 33:25 43:18 44:14,23 49:21,23 52:1 52:3 71:14 84:12 86:4 107:15 149:11 165:19 184:9 205:2,7 210:3,7 210:25 212:6 214:1 215:4,7,13 235:17 247:20 258:3 275:1 314:1 338:9 366:20 376:10 included 33:22 34:1,6 40:17 50:4 63:20 72:18 84:8 94:7 104:18,24 152:10 159:23 207:24 215:11 236:8 240:13 268:18 375:15 includes 17:11 35:11 36:2 43:1 51:3 81:22 108:7,12 109:8,15 151:3 208:17 213:4.7.9 213:12 231:5 289:25 300:3 304:2 including 17:3 26:21 27:15 83:24 106:12 159:11 181:3.7 247:17 278:25 297:10 302:17 364:21 inclusive 375:22 376:8 income 161:6,10,12 164:8 284:3 301:1 302:7 303:17,19 304:16,20 306:4 349:13 369:17 incomplete 165:15 incorporate 151:14 317:16 incorporated 113:4 308:20 309:5 incorporating 319:7 increase 28:20 169:21 180:3 336:6 increased 33:2 43:1 44:22 48:7 49:24 50:9 50:10,23 78:2 81:25 113.6 352.24 increases 27:24 71:15 164:22,24 increasing 19:9 20:18 22:3 25:12 28:10,11,12 29:1,3,9 253:24 254:5 incredibly 362:1 indeed 350:13

independent 187:17,18

230:18 305:6 334:16
350:2 368:3
independently 100:1
197:23 343:20
index 3:1 29:13 167:23
168:1,8,17,24 169:15
170:11 173:2,5 178:25
179:3,4 235:6 266:21
276:18
indi 50:1
indicate 128:21 208:24
244:15
indicated 42:19 50:1
86:19 139:21 155:16
215:18,19
indicates 20:12,12 55:7
110:5 152:19
indicating 55:1 79:11
130:15 165:3 248:18
indication 62:16 63:2
108:23 230:12 246:22
indications 109:11 indicative 114:20 128:10
indicator 112:13 130:10
175:12
indicators 107:16,17
108:20,21 109:24
111:13 132:4 235:17
236:6 246:9
indigenous 301:12
individual 6:2 11:9 19:4
19:5 35:12 41:16,25
42:2,4,7,14,20 45:25
46:12,14 47:9 50:15,20
50:24 51:2,10 61:7,18
63:3,4 67:24 81:10
87:16 95:24 96:13
97:11,18 100:10,23
102:23 103:1 3 107:8
107:17,19 108:13
109:7.11.16 112:20
123:15 127:8 128:8
132:1 133:2 145:18
161:25 162:5,8 165:7,9
206:6,9 212:19 215:25
217:11 218:10 221:25
222:2 224:1 230:21
233:17 235:18 236:8
236:12 246:20 253:18
269:23 274:18 278:13
280:4 293:17 313:12
316:4 340:8 343:10,13
375:9,18 376:13 382:6
individually 103:7,8 individuals 80:20 104:18
105:2 113:19 136:4
223:2 227:2 230:15
344:3 353:17 360:22
induce 170:9 171:15
industrial 367:4
industries 160:3
industry 23:23 24:23,24
135:12 154:6.25 160:8
135:12 154:6,25 160:8 165:17 186:24 213:25
242:25 288:8 305:2
347:16 349:21 357:21
363:13,17,18,19
industry-level 161:24
ineffectiveness 353:9
ineffectiveness 353:9 inelastic 240:1
ineffectiveness 353:9

infeasible 352:21 inflate 182:14 influence 45:21 48:25 378:25 influencing 71:5 info 35:21 inform 49:4 74:17 109:24 122.4 informal 370:2 information 6:19,20,22 8:14 15:10 16:3,14 17:23 23:15 34:13 35:4 35:5.22 36:9.17 37:2 37:12,14,18,19,23 38:2 38:8,11 39:4 41:12 45:5,13 48:11 49:4,16 49:18 50:6 54:1 56:22 57:2,17,20 63:5,6 64:24 65:14 67:18 69:9 72:16,22 73:3,15,18,22 74:4,13,16 75:2,21 76:7,8 77:7 84:3,9,14 85:3,13 86:2,10 89:2 94:10,14 110:5,9 115:24 117:2 121:1,2 121:12 124:22 125:9 131:5,7 167:22,25 168:20 172:23 179:2 182:2 187:14,19 188:12,23,25 189:8 190:11 193:7 204:18 215:23 216:4.6 226:4 235:3 239:19 241:2 260:17 269:10 292:16 294:5 300:6 301:24 306:5,21 307:6 314:2 330:2 333:5 360:12,23 371:23 373:9.13 informed 66:19 205:17 infrastructure 155:7 ingredients 31:18 inherent 160:10 206:1 inherently 222:6 inhibitions 27:15 initial 150:25 154:16 350:8 initially 120:20 inject 55:12 input 42:19 82:4 104:5,6 104:15,21,22 105:5,23 166:1 168:11 198:12 198:22 309:5 356:15 379:2,8 383:15 inputs 242:7 inputting 379:2 inside 198:19 insightful 114:7 inspect 216:24 223:18 install 117:6 282:22 instance 21:16 60:13 95:5 140:21 141:4 166:18 237:3 instantly 344:8 instead 89:1 103:9,25 150:23 209:6 223:21 254:14 261:25 276:21 324:12 325:24 344:3 366:10 Institute 29:3 294:8 372:12

instruction 269:16 instructions 268:25 insufficiently 163:12 integrated 166:5 intend 75:13 80:10 90:7 intended 49:21 317:25 intending 116:24 170:12 intensely 32:1 intensively 243:2 intent 32:16 33:15,16 36:24,25 37:4 38:14 45:14 49:17 70:23 86:21 87:6 93:4 203:8 203:10,12,25 208:25 211:5 214:18 216:15 224:14,18 370:16 intentions 353:2 interacted 357:5 interest 199:9 208:10 214:19 215:24 270:2 283:14 298:16 363:21 369:3,3 interested 5:14 6:19 113:21 169:7 196:5 208:15 221:23 231:1 233:19 259:5,7 333:18 385:13 interesting 216:3 228:7 232:10 294:18 332:6 352.2 interests 271:2 365:7 371:10 interim 347:10 interlocking 160:4,6 intermittent 336:19 interpret 123:22 interrupt 62:8 72:11 interruption 11:6 23:7 **interview** 348:5,6 intimately 169:13 introduced 11:25 39:23 introducing 5:8 introduction 106:16 introductions 3:2 4:19 4:20 6:7 intruded 195:3,14 intruding 195:11 inudation 338:6 invariably 185:16 invertebrate 129:12 130:9 invertebrates 129:9 130:16 invested 161:14 167:25 investigate 343:18 investing 145:9 investment 161:9.11.16 invited 354:4 involve 17:22 365:17

involved 14:11 19:17

383:20

204:7,18

involving 82:8

irrelevant 164:17

irrigate 92:11 173:21

247:25 252:21 341:9

irrigated 1:5 2:6 7:14 8:1

73:17 79:13 121:18

218:20 382:12 383:18

123:1 159:9 168:2

involvement 64:7,17,23

8:7 12:21 22:8,10 26:8 30:9 32:7,17 41:20 81:9 118:12 122:23 185:23 186:14 189:19 189:21 192:6 212:19 239:9 240:6 277:4 290:14 291:1 296:20 317:5 336:13,17,18 368:21 369:2 370:18 374:14 irrigating 101:13 243:14 irrigation 15:23 17:17 33:20 35:14 38:5 42:11 50:17,21 51:7,23,25 52:14,17 53:23 56:5,20 60:12,14,15 69:17 70:24 71:1 92:12 97:1 97:8,12,16,19,25 98:24 103:14 167:20 169:16 169:17,20 172:24 173:21,24 210:7,9 211:1 220:11 240:23 246:20 251:22 252:14 272:6 313:24 314:1.8 315:17 331:5 332:1,22 351:10,11,12,22 368:13 irrigators 368:21 Irwin 11:25 Islander 304:2 isotope 190:1 issue 14:2.18.21 19:24 65:13 69:2 74:23 75:4 76:20,22 78:14 87:13 88:5 92:6 94:16 100:2 119:5 120:24 127:19 136:10 149:9,16,17 153:10 158:9 164:16 179:8 197:5 291:13 308:8 337:1,8 339:9 340:1 341:6 342:7 362:10 363:17 365:20 381:8 **issued** 211:7 issues 14:9 16:2,6 17:3,3 21:22 75:6 77:4 79:5 114:3,6 131:4 151:3 157:23 158:3 164:13 177:1 195:25 204:21 238:15 290:8 291:1 296:21 301:13 308:4 337:20 338:2 340:13 352:4 354:11 383:17 **issuing** 382:19 item 5:8,15 7:22 9:19 12:9,13,13,20 14:1 40:10 337:18 364:12 items 12:11 14:3 38:5 iteration 221:24 it'd 60:5 139:10 339:3,21 it'll 38:10 69:11 73:1 135:20 254:22,24 279:4 318:17 i.e 226:20 382:16

J jail 288:5 341:16,18 January 113:11 247:14 247:23 Japan 298:7 Jean-Bertrand 298:8

Jean-Pierre 2:19 4:9 7:9 8:15 Jeff 4:3 8:11 JEFFREY 2:17 Jeffries 2:17 4:11,12,12 8:12 59:13,15 67:11 68:16 69:7,14 70:6,10 70:14 72:10,24 73:5,13 74:1,10 75:24 77:20,24 78:14 79:2 80:5,7 86:11 91:18 92:6,8 93:12,14,20 94:15,22 95:2,5,17 101:3,6,8,13 101:18 114:24 115:4,8 117:25 118:14,19,21 118:24 119:19 120:5 120:16 121:8,14,19 123:4,6,8,18 124:3,5,8 124:19 125:8,12,17 126:14 127:4,14,16,20 128:2,22 129:5,14,20 129:25 130:4,6,12 133:25 139:4,5,7,14,22 140:3,11,20 141:4,10 141:17,19,21 143:2,8 166:12,15,21 228:3,4,5 229:21 230:1,6,11,19 230:23 231:16,22,24 232:2,17,22 233:2,5,15 233:19 238:11 246:4,5 246:17 247:5,8,11,14 247:17.20 248:2.6.12 248:18,21 249:4,18 250:2,12 251:6,9,23 263:4 285:2,6 286:7,13 286:16,22 288:12 305:24 306:3,13,23 307:8.12.15 323:4.11 323:13,15 325:25 326:12,20 329:4,15 Jennifer 370:22 Jerardo 148:18 Jill 16:4 **Jimenez** 345:9 Joan 340:22 job 66:14 121:24 154:22 156:20 244:10 348:5,6 352:25 358:20 362:2 377.7 jobs 154:12 161:12 **John** 2:18 4:17,25 5:10 8:14 join 7:18 14:23 90:18 155:19 208:25 209:4 354:4 ioke 357:7 jokingly 357:5 Jose 311:2,20 journalist 180:18 journals 181:3 Jovanovich 180:25 judgment 205:17 July 231:17 245:18 jump 124:15 jumping 277:15 June 245:18 jurisdictions 78:18 just 5:15 6:3 11:4 13:5 20:6 25:11,23 31:5

37:17 38:20 40:12,24

55:12 57:14 58:17

62:10,18 64:17,23 66:17 67:5 68:7,9 69:8 69:13 72:12 74:9 75:22 76:14,18 79:2 80:7 81:7 84:3,20 86:23 87:14 88:5,6,8 90:13 92:1,8 93:17 94:25 95:12 99:22,23 100:2,5 101:1 102:9,22 109:3 112:6,19 113:23 115:14,18 125:8,10,20 127:1 128:17 132:16 132:19 137:17.17 144:25 145:6,18 149:9 151:23 152:9 153:21 159:9 164:8 168:25 169:1 174:2 175:19 178:15,17,22 179:19 184.2 186.13 20 188:12,16 194:19 196:19 197:12,20 199:7 200:14,18 201:12 202:5 203:23 204:19 206:11 208:9 209:12 210:22 212:16 213:10 214:13,19 215:24 218:5 219:9 220:24 222:17 223:9 225:9 226:25 233:21 235:13.21.25 237:14 237:25 238:19 239:2 242:6.18 243:19 244:1 247:22 248:14,15 249:5,14 254:23 255:12 257:25 258:23 259:24 260:8 262:21 262:24 263:16,18 264:12.20 265:9.23 266:5,9,22 267:5,10,15 268:9,11 270:3,16,17 270:25 272:14 276:21 279:18 280:8 281:10 283:21 284:10 286:13 287:5 288:11 290:25 292:9,9 294:4,6,13 295:22 302:24 308:22 309:2 312:2 318:19 320:10,15 321:1 325:6 325:10,19,21 327:20 327:22 328:18,18,22 329:1,15,16,21 333:24 334:9,15 340:8,19 341:20,21 342:7,9,14 345:15,19 346:7 355:13,16 357:9,21 358:12,16 359:20 361:15,18 362:6 363:17 364:3,24 365:13,15,22 367:10 368:23 370:15 371:13 371:13 372:9,23 373:4 376:5,16 379:19,25 383:11 justice 3:8 10:11 155:20 221:3 269:25 289:4,17 289:23 290:3,7,13 295:13 296:24 297:11 298:16 300:16 302:2 305:12 354:15 359:3 361:3 371:1

justifications 180:15

justify 159:14 370:13 justifying 83:24

Karen 15:5.19 39:24

#### Κ

85:25 356:20 Karen's 15:11 39:24 Kari 203:1 Kay 353:22,22 Keeling 15:12 16:7 keep 53:2 73:4 74:15 . 75:1 76:15,21 92:20 94:15.16 139:8 162:4 275:3 279:17 280:22 289:1 294:21 308:14 308:17 312:25 327:21 329:11 337:6 344:4 353:25 354:19 364:13 377:11 Keeper 10:11,13 keeping 156:20 377:7 keeps 74:13 161:13 318:14,15 Ken 142:17 146:1,5 kept 70:7 72:25 73:10,15 73:19 75:16 372:18 Kern 372:23 Kevin 142:18 147:23 key 41:10 71:3 81:22 105:5,5,5 150:13 167:6 173:17 174:24 213:22 222:19,25 227:16 357:18,21 kevs 228:21 kids 336:1 kill 298:12 kind 13:18 14:14 37:14 55:15 59:9,16 60:10 73:13,17 78:20 92:18 100:2 105:5 128:25 142:22 176:18 208:20 209:12 216:3 218:25 221:22 226:4,6,15 231:18 237:9 255:15 269:21 271:1 273:15 277:14,16 279:18 280:14 282:6 291:18 307:19 319:20 320:6 326:5 352:2 368:20 374:4 375:16 382:12 kinds 70:15 121:7 189:22 King 329:20 330:1 knew 120:17 168:5 360:16 know 5:17 6:16 7:5 10:18 11:22 20:18 22:15

26:10,25 27:3 55:16

57:3 58:10 59:8,19

60:1,3,20 62:2 67:4,10

74:18,22 75:10,17 76:2

76:12,17 77:5,13 78:17

88:21.24 91:7.10.13.14

68:7,9,18 73:9,16,18

81:1 85:7,16 87:25

91:15,23,24 92:9,21

93:16 95:14 101:19

102:19 103:21 114:21

118:2 119:7,20 123:19

129:1 137:22,24 138:8

123:20,21 128:24,25

140:12 143:10 151:5 168:12 172:19 175:17 177:16,25 179:23 180:5 193:24,25 194:1 194:2,2,7,10 198:21 200:10 202:9 207:18 207:23 208:9,22 214:5 215:16 217:7 220:17 220:18,22 221:23 222:2,20 223:9,12 224:9 225:10 226:7,16 226:20 227:4,15,19 228:10.19 230:10.10 232:8 234:23 235:7 236:20 237:14 240:4 242:23 244:23 245:23 252:5,19,22 254:8 255:16 258:8 262:17 263:18 269:9 271:1,17 272:9 273:15 277:24 278:6,16,17 280:2,16 281:14,15 282:21 283:2,5,7 286:16 287:3 291:17 297:19 299:7 304:18 305:3,16 311:24 312:4,23 316:16 318:22,23 320:13 323:22 325:14 327:16,21 331:14 335:5.18 336:23 337:10 339:9,12 340:15 341:2.24 345:20 346:6,15,15 347:1 355:1,6,8,25 356:3,4 362:7,12 363:4 363:7,19,21 364:5 366:12 369:8 372:7 374:16 375:10,12,12 383:8 221:13

knowledge 174:17

known 28:9 43:11,12,19 68:10 84:4.10.15 110:6 128:13 151:13 157:13 159:4

L

knows 165:16 278:17 298:7 340:11

L 1:24 2:10 385:3,21

lab 379:1 labor 154:20 160:6 161:11 302:15 Laboratory 189:4 190:1 lack 145:5 160:19 241:2 lacking 167:22 179:2 laden 331:17 lagoon 28:9 laid 99:23 216:17 lake 19:12,12 30:12,16 30:22 lakes 281:24 land 57:10 90:2 99:24 133:9,15 140:14 141:4 146:11 150:11 154:11 163:4,9,13,16,17,17 184:2 186:10,11,13 198:25 210:3 283:12 285:8 301:23 336:4,13 336:13,14,18 368:20 landfills 20:25 21:14,16

Landing 379:2 landlord 360:6 landowner 102:16 160:18 263:16 landowners 160:5 163:5 210.10 lands 1:5 2:6 8:1,7 17:16 32:17 140:14,21 189:9 212:20 296:21 364:18 landscape 184:10 270:8 Langhowt 148:6,6,8,10 148:12,12,14,16 language 123:4 131:4 151:2 264:13 275:12 277:20 285:12 316:9 Lantos 350:9 large 13:6 45:6 54:4 96:8 98:6 126:15,22 150:8 163.4 205.15 230.25 231:12 236:16 302:11 306:24 317:11,23 330:16 344:2 largely 135:12 160:24 164:17 236:25 308:15 larger 86:5 96:4 99:12 165:18 183:16 287:19 306:7,16 344:14 largest 79:19 152:5 304:11,12 358:2 largest-scale 343:21 large-scale 343:23 last 13:14 40:18 103:25 122:16 150:2 152:9 163:21 184:22,23 186:24 223:23 226:17 231:17 247:23 256:20 257:1 262:12 264:11 265:22 271:2 287:10 287:18 290:13 291:8 295:18 307:19 335:14 335:22 361:15 376:24 377:2 379:19,23 **Lastly 266:9** lasts 346:9 late 13:14 232:7 364:3 367:18,19 lately 18:1 later 39:20 180:18 213:1 325.5 latest 203:7 205:3

292:11 308:24 309:10 Latino 302:23 304:2 launches 68:5 Lauritzen 142:19 150:3 151:20,21 163:22 law 8:17 66:15 74:23 75:1,3 76:15 120:6 125:2 131:4 176:6 177:19,25 181:1,2,4 212:22 278:19 285:23 Lawrence 256:6 laws 151:25 177:21 178:3,5,7,10 381:4 385:15 lawyer 278:19 285:22 lay 285:7 layer 190:16 layers 60:4,6 331:22 358:7 leach 245:5

leached 174:8

leaches 259:19 leaching 167:18 210:9 249:11 lead 2:21 144:16 171:16 178:9 202:13 leader 40:6,7 361:17 leaders 135:19,19 leadership 24:16 leads 121:11 185:16 leaking 184:5,9 leaks 73:16 learn 330:4 354:6 359:24 learned 225:9,13 230:17 244:1 334:9 350:5 365:13 learning 65:11,12 lease 95:10 163:4 368:16 leased 140:14,21 141:16 368:16 leasing 253:7 least 20:9 21:4,5 22:18 47:13 49:23 75:14 76:4 81:18 90:3 128:24 164:15.23 216:19 220:20 225:5 237:17 245:19 258:16 274:8 274:10 281:19.23 293:12 320:5 331:11 347:25 375:17 380:6 383.6 leave 143:5 148:18 152:24 162:12 267:11 267:18 272:15 288:24 359:20 363:19 leaves 325:15 leaving 177:2 178:8 led 17:20 104:13 107:7 187.11 Lee 335:13,13,15,15,16 335:17 337:23.25 338:4,6,15,21,23 339:7 339:21 340:2 left 4:20 8:13 45:24 46:10 54:7 127:25 143:5 174:4,10 182:20 193:14 254:18 257:23 261:16 274:5 289:9 307:22 314:24 326:21 383:12 legacy 285:14,16 legal 95:3 114:3 121:22 123:20 131:3 180:25 198:8 203:5 339:15 345:1

Legislative 347:22

legislature 296:23

legitimate 340:9

legitimately 94:5

lengthy 13:6 113:16

less 9:21 22:19 44:1,21

310:5,21,23 313:3

lesser 46:18 85:21 91:8

let 11:22 45:4 71:11 75:7

349:16 357:1

lessee 141:11

**lessees** 141:9

lessen 330:3

99:7 163:14 196:14

277:4 304:19 309:13

length 23:24

383:25

90:5 111:12 120:9 142:9 171:4 173:1 198:19 232:14,22 248:8 249:18 255:12 255:21 278:24 282:5 282:20,22,23 283:21 285:20 327:20 328:4 328:18 335:25 341:11 360:23 375:12 Letey 167:1,4 172:5,10 172:15,17,21 173:15 175:6,9 176:8,24 177:1 177:5,8 178:13,15,17 178:20 179:5,7,10,13 179:15 213:11 235:6 249:6 251:6,7,7 lets 269:9 letter 12:23 112:25 128:25 136:24 152:7 152:13,14,16,23 153:21 228:5 230:6 239:22 273:6 288:18 295:22 364:8 letters 72:12,14 79:21 84:8 93:14 99:9 113:10 113:11,14,16,18,20 118:2 267:18 **lettuce** 53:6,24 54:3,5,12 54:14,17,21 55:8 56:2 96:19.23 98:14 145:9 173:14 283:9 let's 12:8 55:16 65:23 82:21 89:9,14 91:1,1 96:23 97:1,3 98:9 100:7 159:22 174:20 183:20 184:6 261:16 261:16,17 267:25 279:10 307:2 310:1 322:25,25 327:13 328:6,13 359:6,6 levee 261:18,24 level 42:5,25 43:2 58:13 62:16 64:6.22 68:8 81:20 91:15 102:8,11 103:10 107:18 110:3 112:2 137:15,17 146:6 159:8,14,15,16 163:2 196:13,20 197:1,4 200:3 201:14 202:17 212:19 221:22 222:1 223:25 252:5,7 254:15 258:21 274:11 294:20 296:18 297:10,12 343:10 349:22 366:14 leveled 367:11 levels 14:22 27:4 31:17 116:21 117:2 158:7 161:16 197:3 242:14 242:17 244:7 245:4 246:2 252:15,16 253:23 255:4 256:8,23 257:7 360:7 366:13,15 366:16,18,19 levity 92:6 liaison 4:23 Libya 298:8 licensed 350:24 lieu 217:20 life 70:2 133:5,6 149:22 277:17 280:13,24 344:10 349:8 355:21

355:23 356:2 362:14 362:15,19,23,23 lifeline 293:21 **lifelong** 356:20 lifestyle 363:14 lift 362:22 lifted 362:9 light 186:24 351:24 377:23 like 4:5 5:9,14 6:12 9:11 11:9 12:14 18:13 19:10 19:11 21:23 23:4,5 34:15 36:13 37:19 38:9 38:20 39:19 53:6,7 55:8,21 62:2 63:6 64:4 64:21 69:5 75:9,17 86:11 88:2 91:13 93:24 117:4 120:10 128:10 130:17 134:6 135:13 135:19 136:13 137:17 137:17 140:21 142:18 150:12 152:7 153:10 153:21 157:22 162:12 168:25 169:1 171:2 173:13,14 176:15 183:4 198:9 207:18 208:6 209:16,16 225:8 227:7 229:23 232:9 233:17 236:3 237:14 238:23 240:19 256:5,5 263:8 266:25 270:5 276:22 283:5 286:18 290:4 314:20 318:9,15 320:7,19 322:12,12 323:23 324:18 325:8 327:14 328:14 335:18 337:10 338:1 340:12 340:25,25 342:25 344:4 356:23 363:18 365:10 370:19 371:5 372:5,22 376:3 377:4 377:12 379:25 liked 280:2 likelihood 78:11 likely 55:9 97:13,14 193:9 309:11 310:6 limit 9:16 150:22 187:22 196:25 293:2 limited 165:10 196:8 229:2 369:17 **limiting** 196:13 limits 366:2 Lindi 347:21 line 29:10 37:2 59:15 64:5 67:6 121:22 162:4 165:4 181:12 261:15 278:20 291:8 297:8 328:8,9,17,19 372:18 381:20 linear 241:19 lined 106:14 205:23 331:8,12 lines 128:16 lining 21:18 linings 127:10 link 168:13,14 292:17 316:15 linkage 202:20 **liquid** 356:2 Lisa 2:24 13:2 17:7,7 35:18 50:17 82:3,5

89:5 103:17 114:24 58:4 61:16,19,24 62:5 268:10 62:13,16,24 63:2,4,9 Lisa's 18:5,18 102:21 list 32:2 33:11 34:8,18 83:7,10 86:1,22 88:25 104:24 106:20,23 113:17 129:6,8 200:10 200:18,25 212:13 265:1 274:17 278:25 280:11 284:9 288:6 289:2 314:22 315:8 317:4 376:10 listed 11:4 168:9 173:3 189:2 200:1 311:20,21 314:18 listen 88:6 330:4 371:3 **listened** 144:18 listening 118:19 251:6 298:4 344:22 364:4 listings 315:21 lists 94:8,10 litany 302:25 303:1 liter 29:14,16,21,24 30:1 30:5 110:19 111:1.7.8 111:10,15,15,18,22 112:5,13 133:21 134:4 147:4,4 292:19 literally 272:14 287:12 302:15 381:17 literature 28:10,24 56:11 79:14,18,22 83:18 148:24 149:3,4,4,5,12 181:23 little 12:4 13:3 16:25 23:11 26:14 50:18 52:7 61:9 89:3 92:6 97:1 102:5,6 113:24 114:23 159:3 169:25 176:12 183:22 243:14,24 245:25 246:21 275:6 276:15,19 278:21 287:10 289:19 293:5 296:17 301:11 305:16 311:8 325:15 341:21 341:23 345:13 377:23 380:1,6 live 148:18 266:2,6 275:20 335:19 339:5 342:22,23 349:7 353:22 359:16 361:13 361:20 376:22 lived 177:17 360:5 livelihood 59:21,22 livelihoods 144:1 Livermore 189:4,24,25 256:6 lives 149:17,23,25 177:16 living 19:8 356:9 358:13 load 15:23 16:8 17:21 53:16 61:25 62:6,14 66:3 96:2,4 110:15,22 122:18 169:12,18,21 170:7,8,9,13,20,21 171:2 175:14,15,21,25 176:3 177:8,10 178:9 185:5 loaded 122:6

loading 17:24 51:21

52:12,17,24 53:2,14,18

55:2,9 56:25 57:4 58:1

A5018B3

TRANSCRIPTS OF PROCEEDINGS

65:24 67:14 94:25 96:6 97:6,14 98:19 99:3 108:2 109:15 111:19 122:22 131:25 168:22 169:3,5 171:16 182:11 244:17 259:10 261:9 276:18 loads 40:7 112:15 132:2 313:23 364:16,17 loans 348:23 lobbyists 343:9 local 41:15 154:9 218:9 218:16,23 222:2 252:11 294:20,21 locally 202:8 294:23,24 301:19 located 43:21 44:16 48:4 204:24 312:18 location 9:4 42:8 47:22 60:9 63:4 101:15 168:15 197:10,25 199:14 202:21 226:3 373:15,16 locations 101:10,19 139:15,17,19 logger 243:4 loggers 243:2 logical 209:15 logistical 343:16 logistics 12:8 16:14 long 104:24 195:24 196:11 209:2 244:21 274:17 286:24 287:13 298:12 312:7 325:15 329:5 330:14 346:13 351:8 364:5 longer 35:3 150:18 183:13 192:14,15,15 209:5 227:10,12 257:2 257:16 258:9 270:4,15 287:11 335:25 longest 245:8,10 look 5:14 19:16 21:6 34:18 55:4 57:22 59:5 63:3,4 68:1 94:13 98:9 100:7 102:5,6 113:22 121:14 126:19 152:1 152:23 155:24 159:22 161:23 164:12 166:18 183:20 184:6 185:11 190:11,12 204:19 207:5 223:13 227:5,7 231:10 232:1,9 237:20 242:14 243:9 250:24 251:19 253:25 258:7.9 259:6 262:19 263:21 264:11,12 265:7 266:12,23 267:5 270:17 273:13 282:22 285:15 292:10 294:8 304.4 305.19 310.10 312:17,17,18 314:11 314:20 315:3,10 318:6 318:7 320:15 334:17 338:24 340:12 357:24 363:23 372:16 383:19 looked 48:8 83:7,8,14 106:3,6 168:4,4,21 184:16 188:20 244:6

244:19 256:18 270:9 292:11,13 342:9 372:22 looking 25:6 27:5 60:21 61:7 62:23 67:6 89:3 120:23 150:20 155:24 172:13 174:17 178:18 200:24 209:9 211:23 212:16 220:24,25 222:23 235:1 254:10 265:8,9 291:24 293:8 329:13 348:2,10 375:19 382:14,17,18 looks 11:9 55:21 142:18 266:25 290:4 318:14 **looming** 362:4 loop 76:2 loophole 367:6 loopholes 317:21 loosely 347:6 Los 2:19 lose 162:12 163:3 246:21 334:2,3 losers 162:17.19 loss 152:16 154:10,17,20 164:2 246:15 losses 154:22,23,25 303:18 352:25 lost 145:3 154:18 163:9 164:7.8 352:25 356:25 lot 11:14 13:9 15:8 19:17 40:2 60:2 65:10 77:2.3 77:3,3 95:18 99:24 101:4,22 104:21 105:21 116:3,25 143:17 162:13 172:23 174:9 175:19 191:25 192:1 198:5 202:6,8 204:4 206:7 219:8 221:16 230:7,18 264:4 270:5,7 273:9 274:20 274:20 289:8,11 291:16.25 293:24 311:6 315:4 320:4 325:11,11,25 327:6 342:4 343:24 344:16 349:3 355:7,25 358:20 361:14 371:5 377:12 377:20 380:23 384:2 lots 130:20 132:14 191:8 235:2 270:22 371:23 louder 383:2 love 240:3 356:24 363:11 363:11 loved 359:3 lovely 156:20 low 21:1,8,11 43:7 44:7 97:15 175:12,14,14,18 242:17 245:4,5 246:1 251:3 253:3 289:19 301:1 302:6 304:19 310:10,11 lower 23:4 25:2,7 28:22 45:12,22,24 46:19,22 47:3,12,19,25 48:3,17 49:3,13 59:24,25 63:6 68:7 94:9 111:3 137:15 137:15 143:20 163:15 178:9 184:8 193:11,16 258:5 261:17 270:6

lowest 43:17 55:4

#### 106:19 303:17,23 349:13 low-income 301:12 Lucas 345:9,9,17 lucky 143:16 Luis 1:2 2:3,19 150:17 153:16 231:8 320:3 324:2,15 327:9,15,19 327:25 328:2 lunch 10:1 142:4 150:5 153:3,7 lungs 169:1,2 lust 193:4 lysimeters 351:6 **L-E-E** 335:16 L-E-T-E-Y 251:8 L.A 309:17

```
М
M 2:17
machine 12:5 270:12
made 40:20 106:4
  116:16 117:7 132:14
  132:16 144:2 151:1
  155:2 182:22 186:19
  189:7 228:24 229:3
  230:20 276:7 292:8,15
  308:10 310:3 331:2
  332:21 334:20 339:24
  348:18 352:3 354:7
  358:8 359:8 380:12
Madeline 6:8
Madeline's 6:9
Madonna 92:11
magic 250:15
magnitude 43:8 82:1
main 2:9 169:12 170:18
  225:18 242:16 317:13
  355:23
mainly 110:10
maintain 161:16 216:23
maintained 146:7 281:19
  281.24
maintaining 40:3 160:7
  357:16
maintains 24:7 213:7,14
maintenance 71:16
major 20:23 21:9 22:6
  54:13 125:12 169:4
  171:19 197:6 236:19
  252:2 317:4
majority 37:1 38:15
  64:13 81:21 244:5
  246:13 253:6 254:22
  254:25 302:23
make 9:1 10:23 11:11
  12:14 19:8 37:9 58:2
  60:16 66:17 74:3 75:7
  75:9 76:1 77:17 101:22
```

113:8 116:23 121:25

123:16 125:8 127:1

129:5 141:1 152:24

157:20 167:2 174:20

195:19 199:12 205:17

211:13 214:14 217:3

236:16 238:17 250:25

251:4,4 262:22 272:12

309:13 316:17 321:5,8

275:8 278:24 282:8

323:23,24 324:20

224:12,13 231:14

```
103:16 159:5 164:21
  164:24 173:7 181:9
  183:2 202:8 229:19
  278:7 321:10 324:21
makeup 180:2
making 6:10 12:6 68:9
  108:23 122:21 123:11
  132:11 149:22 235:9
  249:14 280:20 342:16
  342:16 374:10
MALE 127:17 194:15
man 177:16
manage 36:19 160:9
  172:13
managed 18:7,9 180:22
  370.12
management 15:23
  16:14 17:17,18,24
  33:20,21,21,22 34:1,2
  34:4 35:1,2,7,14 38:6
  42:12 44:9 50:17 51:8
  51:23 52:14,18 53:23
  56:5 58:25 69:18 70:20
  70:24 71:1 81:22 97:9
  97:16 98:1,24 103:14
  107:25 110:2 112:1
  121:11 124:22 166:7
  170:9,11 171:13,15,16
  172:9,24,25 174:16
  175.2 12 12 176.10
  198:12 206:24 209:8
  210:11,15,18,21 211:1
  211:2,2,3,17,22,25
  213:10,22 214:16
  215:6,8,10 217:3,4,23
  219:4 220:2,9 222:24
  226:2,21 227:3,19,23
  235:10,18 236:7,15,17
  237:2,2 241:3 246:24
  261:2 264:4,7 282:23
  313:24 314:2,9 315:18
  332:1,23 334:9 338:19
  346:14,23,25 351:3
  353:6 370:2,14 375:13
manager 2:24 17:9,20
  39:25 40:6 41:4 143:19
  329:20 365:12
manages 15:6 17:9 18:4
  334:8
managing 36:18 244:16
mandate 290:3
manipulated 181:10
manner 87:5 220:16
  336:24 375:5
manure 312:5,9
many 5:24 7:5 14:9 17:16
  17:20 19:19,23 26:1,8
  26:10 33:8 36:19,19
  47:2,15 55:9 63:17
  84:7.7 96:1 103:2
  113:15,18 134:15
  135:25 142:11 143:25
  157:18 160:15 166:16
```

327:14 328:1,2 344:19

347:24 349:22 351:15

356:5 358:25 374:19

377:4 378:14 379:12

380:13 381:19,22

383.6

makers 161:23

makes 49:20 75:21

```
168:12 174:14,24
  177:17 180:14,19
  181:7 183:9,11 185:1
  186:18 190:9 191:11
  201:7 228:21 237:16
  237:25 238:19 240:16
  240:25 244:8 245:21
  255:11 266:20 272:7
  293:8 294:9 295:18
  301:13 302:7 309:21
  311:21 315:24 317:5
  317:21 318:13,20
  323:21,22 327:16
  329:24 351:17 353:24
  354:2,6 369:12
map 26:2,3 28:4 46:7
  184:17 189:17 192:14
  309:22 312:17
maps 26:2 48:14 49:18
  183:4 256:3
March 1:13 2:10 4:1,7
  40:13,19,21 157:17
  205:8 214:24 245:23
  247:23 273:19 277:21
  295:20,23 298:15
  323:7 350:1 364:13
  380:9,14 381:24
Margie 353:22
margin 123:9 196:15
  303:22
Maria 25:16 26:2 30:2,3
  30:6 111:3 183:5.21.23
  185:3 197:21 241:12
  241:19 250:4 257:22
  303:3,13 304:10,13
  307:3
Maria/Santa 189:14
Maricela 299:23
marine 17:15 344:10
mark 73:2,24 74:5,21
  332:21
marked 75:10 257:24
  332:16.22
market 161:23 162:3,5,6
  163:2 165:8,13 250:10
  301:24 302:1,12
  342:23 343:3 349:7
markets 161:4
marks 184:7
Martha 344:25
Martin 329:7,17,19,19
  332:25 333:1.9
massive 144:24 336:21
match 211:21
material 38:19 168:7
  190:24 241:16,17
materials 40:11.25
  184:10 321:17
Matt 15:12 255:22
matter 7:11 8:16,24 9:3
  170:5 174:10,11 240:2
  262:2 263:25 332:14
  351:23 363:20
matters 171:9
maximize 53:19 221:11
maximum 16:8 17:21
  40:7 54:7,22 122:17
  365:8
```

may 8:15 9:5,21 28:23

33:3 43:6 48:6 51:1

52:15,15 56:3 58:18

```
138:13 154:6 157:15
  160:14 163:8,11,11,15
  163:24 168:12 176:18
  182:18 186:11 196:16
  197:17 204:25 207:25
  208:3 210:3 220:13
  221:12 225:8 227:17
  240:11 252:12,12
  254:6 286:25,25 287:1
  287:1 300:22,22
  318:15 320:2 324:13
  324:16,17,19 325:1,8
  325:19,22,23 355:1
  366:17 380:22 381:8
maybe 12:5 39:15 58:19
  96:21,24 100:25 102:5
  118:19 130:13 143:5,8
  179:20 200:9 218:11
  218:19 250:6,19
  253:12 255:9.22
  259:12 261:24,25
  267:11 269:8 275:5
  281:11 299:8,9 325:24
  327:18 334:5 337:17
  341:20 342:13 346:13
  360:18 374:17 375:14
  383:23
Mavo 326:2
mayor 300:10
MC 62:8,10 78:3 103:20
  103:23 104:4 115:2,6,9
  117:14 118:7,16,20,22
  119:10,25 121:25
  127:21,25 128:3 129:3
  130:13 235:13,24
  236:2 379:21
McCANN 2:24 13:2 17:7
  50:17 82:3 103:25
  269:12.15
McCarthy 288:23,24
McCHESNEY 2:23 4:21
  58:19,22 62:18,20
  72:20 73:8 74:9,11
  75:19 76:5,14 77:1,5,8
  80:7 90:5 91:5 120:9
  120:24 121:9 123:6,17
  123:24 124:4,7,9,20
  267:10,19 338:11,18
  338:22 339:12,14,17
  339:19,24
mean 55:13 59:2 60:18
  62:20 66:22 72:10
  74:11 76:17 87:17.23
  89:1 91:12 92:17
  100:12,25 102:15
  141:8 210:2 214:19
  216:3 218:9 223:12
  224:4,6,7 230:12 232:5
  237:6 251:12 252:17
  254:8 255:14,17 257:3
  269:5,7 308:24 311:2
  312:13,14 315:13
  317:3 319:19 325:1
  334:7 339:10 347:13
  363:12 368:4
meaning 27:3 170:16
  181:12 186:21 248:5
```

66:6 71:19 77:7 83:22

84:11 86:11 90:19 92:4

100:22 101:10 126:5

94:4,5 96:4,17,17

meaningful 135:21,21,23 136:11 150:25 means 19:2 31:5 34:11 35:13 107:8 174:3 183:16 254:8 277:23 277:24 278:17,17 281:19 290:16 293:1 293:13 294:21 295:13 315:14,17 353:18 380:12,14 381:18 382:1 meant 112:10 360:8 measurable 65:19 349:20 measure 117:1 170:15 170:23,24 171:1 366:3 375:10 measured 110:7 125:15 measurement 60:8 measurements 116:23 measures 147:3 187:22 measuring 170:10 253:18 mechanism 229:9.25 media 6:19 180:18 median 284:3 304:16,20 306:4 medical 181:2,3 medium 21:14,19 210:13 meet 33:14 59:1,17 62:12,21,24 66:3,8 67:7 92:25 101:20 105:14 112:5 117:5 131:25 132:22 133:20 155:7 223:13 259:8 296:2,4,9,10 353:6 354:7 meeting 4:6 6:21 9:2 12:11 13:8,13,20 53:23 57:21 59:12 67:13,21 68:1,23 69:4 90:3 111:14 157:19 176:15 237:12.22 246:11.13 252:17 287:18,19 320:1,2,2,10,13,24 321:3,7 323:2 324:1,12 324:13,20 325:2,5,7,19 325:22 327:23 338:25 340:16 347:25 364:12 367:18 370:4 383:1,4 meetings 13:16 104:20 105:2 353:24 meets 101:19 209:2 306:24 member 4:24 5:2 7:9 8:16 13:24 153:16 167:8 219:13 238:12 253:1 300:10 308:6 322:3 359:14 members 2:16 8:9,14 10:4 13:24 16:16 18:22 51:18 153:10 156:9 157:2 180:11 195:22 197:7,19 230:14 231:13 299:21 349:13 350:22 352:12,19 356:20 359:19,23 363:9.10 364:2.12 367:16 369:4 374:6 membership 150:7

memo 40:22 260:20

## A5018B3 TRANSCRIPTS OF PROCEEDINGS

	400,40 45 40 04 440,4
mention 12:18 40:12,24 85:23 102:22 107:6	109:12,15,18,21 110:4 110:8,12 111:13 112:7
297:20 345:23 352:24	112:20 132:4 235:17
mentioned 15:2 28:25	236:3,23,24 313:16
33:13 38:13 39:24 41:6	343:11
49:12 69:3 83:4 125:13	milligram 29:14,16
134:10 137:22 169:8	milligrams 29:21,24,25
176:18 189:24 201:24	30:4,8 110:18 111:1,7
218:7 233:24 234:13 240:6 263:2 345:8	111:8,10,15,15,18,21 112:5,12 133:21 134:3
347:7 378:15	147:3,4 292:19
menus 38:9	million 154:18,19,21,24
Merced 376:23	164:3,6 190:18,19
merit 24:15	244:8,9 252:19 284:10
Merkley 156:8,14 167:1	284:11 294:12 295:6
179:17,19 180:8	300:24 355:13,16,16
250:22 282:6 Merrell 142:18	378:9,11 millions 27:20 135:2
Merrill 147:23 150:2,4	186:22 272:19,19,19
Mesquita 354:23,24	344:5
356:14,18	million-dollar 364:23
mess 171:23	min 125:25
messed 171:24	mind 57:15 58:9,18 92:9
met 7:8 27:18 104:17	280:22 312:25 320:7
132:5 135:14 150:24 226:11 308:7 354:9	325:12 344:4 364:13 370:3
meters 242:25	mindful 369:25
method 366:7	mineral 125:25
methodology 283:25	mineralized 174:12
methods 151:15 330:6	minimal 43:7 81:16
methyl 164:11,14	116:7 244:17
metrics 353:7	minimize 51:23 81:17
mezo 256:2 Mibs 288:24	158:14 273:2 278:4 286:6 340:10
Michael 2:22 5:6 16:21	minimum 54:9,24 71:14
17:1,8 18:14,19,20	80:22 139:24 313:10
38:17 41:6 49:12 50:1	316:11,21,25
70:22 103:23,24 106:2	minister 347:21 361:11
106:15 132:17 133:25 139:7,21 232:24	Ministry 347:23 minority 243:15 259:11
238:14 240:23 267:19	369:3,3
272:16	minus 35:20
micro 173:24	minute 142:13 143:15
microcystis 271:3,5	144:8,9 146:4 265:12
microphone 23:8	379:14
middle 22:18 45:23 46:8 243:4 273:19,21	minutes 9:21 10:8,9,10 10:11,12,13,13,14,17
285:25 301:9	10:20 11:5 34:17 35:18
might 6:20 12:17 61:2	142:7,11 153:5,6
87:25 101:15,21	156:17,18 212:25
104:23 114:7 119:18	260:7,10 267:24
122:14,17 124:2	269:18 299:5,10
128:11 131:7 148:14 158:5 160:15 162:20	300:17 319:17 328:15 361:15 369:11
173:8 176:2 187:21	misconceptions 371:14
189:1 201:9 211:20.22	mismatch 118:10
212:25 215:3 245:22	miss 34:20
246:21 250:19,21	missed 39:22 40:8,9
252:24 253:9 259:17	281:11
263:8,11,14,21 264:11	misses 273:22
269:5 307:3 309:13 315:2 375:21 382:11	missing 256:15 344:7 mission 300:15 350:3,8
mike 207:9	Mist 143:19 195:24
miles 301:15 355:17	mistaken 253:21 258:17
368:17,24 377:16	Mister 85:5 323:3
378:18	misunderstandings
milestone 109:17 110:15	130:22 132:20

110:17,21 111:9

milestones 108:2,4,5,19

108:19,25 109:6,9,10

236:16,20

misused 239:20

mitigation 347:9

mix 272:4,5

mitigate 24:13 173:9

```
mix-up 147:25
model 144:4 166:5
moderate 44:13 49:22
modern 241:4,11 335:1
modification 16:1 353:8
modifications 305:14
  370:10
modified 66:16
modify 9:6 37:4,6,8
  88:23 381:8
modifying 34:11
moment 50:18 61:9,21
  163:10 182:5 348:8.15
  348:16 367:21 374:4
Mon 305:15
Monday 383:9
Monday-morning 232:6
money 102:17 116:25
291:25 305:2,4,7,8
  333:19,22 334:2,18
  342:16 352:3 365:21
  365:22 370:16
Monica 2:19 4:13 8:13
  15:19
monitor 35:13 121:1
  124:14 127:17 171:4
  171:10,11,11,14
  173:20 343:21
monitored 118:11 122:3
  241:19 243:2.12
  246:18
monitoring 15:6,7,9,14
  17:12 18:10 29:2,7
  33:3 34:7 35:12 38:1
  39:25 50:16,21,25 51:2
  52:16 71:18 85:24 86:6
  88:14,19 97:11,18,20
  97:20 100:23 101:23
  101:24 105:16 107:14
  107:19,20,23 112:16
  113:5 114:3 116:20
  117:19 119:20 120:19
  121:6,15 122:7,13
  124:1,10,12 125:2,4,16
  125:19 126:9,13 127:8
  128:4,9,20 130:21,25
  132:21 139:11 140:4
  140:23 141:7 146:25
  151:4 158:17 162:22
  171:8,15 172:8 183:14
  184:4,7 192:25 193:21
  194:14,20 204:15,17
  206:6 209:1,8 213:7,8
  213:9 215:12,14,17,20
  218:12 219:4 222:18
  222:20 232:25 233:5,9
  233:9,11,12,17,20
  234:17 235:1 267:1
  274:18 280:4 296:15
  308:2,3 311:4,7 312:18
  313:12,14,21 316:5
  343:3 344:12,17,20
  351:10 353:13 364:23
  365:23 366:7,23
  367:23 371:18,20,22
  373:7,10,17 375:9,18
  376:14
monitorize 334:12.15
monitors 120:25 122:12
```

Monterey 3:7 17:15

23:17 28:4 29:2 46:11

```
106:13 152:6 157:5
  163:20 164:8 219:19
  221:20 270:1 271:16
  271:19,25 292:8
  305:11,15 316:9
  332:10 342:22 354:14
  356:21 359:19 364:6,7
  364:9,19 370:25
  378:25
month 257:2
monthly 241:15
months 36:25 211:8
  224:22 248:15 249:21
  287.9
monumental 341:1
Morales 299:21,23 306:1
  306:6,15 307:1,10,13
more 6:1,2 14:24 17:25
  19:18,20,25 20:16
  22:24 24:24 30:18,19
  31:5 32:5 35:14.18
  39:9,13 40:16 42:2
  47:8 50:13,18 52:7
  53:24 54:5 55:1.20
  61:9,13 63:19 67:5
  69:9,13 71:20 80:5
  82:3 86:17 94:20,24
  96:22 102:16,17,17,25
  113:2,15,15,24 114:22
  115:16 125:19 128:10
  129:24 130:16 137:22
  138:9 150:18 151:2
  154:1 157:15 160:2
  166:8 167:24 180:6
  183:10 184:23 186:12
  192:8 196:17,24 198:8
  198:14 201:12 202:4,8
  218.5 23 221.24
  237:21 242:18 243:2
  243:16 244:24 249:15
  250:24 253:17 260:9
  266:4 268:6 270:9
  274:21 284:3 286:25
  287:1,1 289:24 298:13
  301:10,10 302:3
  303:11 309:21 310:7
  310:13,18,21 313:1
  314:20 321:6 333:2,4
  340:17 341:25 342:10
  344:16 345:13,15,23
  346:19 349:4 354:6
  355:20 358:10,20
  359:24 362:18 370:16
  370:16 376:8 381:24
  381:24 382:8
Moreso 303:11
more-intensively 243:12
morning 4:3,8 6:8 18:22
  41:2 104:1 133:18
  134:10 138:3 143:18
  144:18 157:2,22 160:2
  160:18 169:7 170:2
  298.5
Moro 121:16
Morro 17:14
mortgage 363:18
Moses 348:1,2,5,6
moss 378:16 379:1
most 7:8 19:19 20:20
  22:10 23:13 24:21
  31:10 32:1,7 41:13
```

42:18 43:3 45:20 48:24 49:19 59:25 79:19 81:12 105:10,10 107:13,13 109:14,18 114:1 117:14 123:19 129:22 132:15 149:2 153:24 156:12 160:2 160:15 161:1 162:21 182:4 193:9 196:7,10 212:8 214:10 219:23 220:3 235:8 244:11 257:5 274:16 276:4 291:11 292:6 293:11 295:17 306:21 307:5,5 315:6 316:13 356:23 356:23 361:17 362:8 365:3 mostly 159:23 moth 351:24 Mount 92:11 mountainous 193:14 mountaintop 323:18 move 93:24 261:7 264:10.21 266:15 267:3 276:5 280:7 319:6 329:5 330:21 339:25 347:5 349:22 moved 277:8 280:23 movement 169:10 moves 173:24 279:23 283:13 moving 30:2,11 48:25 112:22 242:21 253:8 254:8 277:9,11 357:10 357:23 MRP 204:11 208:11 MS4s 366:21,24 367:5 much 6:13 7:2 12:12 19:18,20 20:19 24:24 31:5,19 32:5 55:1 56:24 68:19 83:23 113:14 117:9 143:23 145:24 146:2 150:12 151:18 154:23 157:1 160:2 166:8,10 172:19 176:23 179:14 180:5 190:25 195:10 196:13 198:14 214:24 218:3 229:23 234:2 241:10 242:23 258:5 264:20 270:9 274:9 287:12,15 288:16,22 290:20 291:13 297:8 298:20 300:20 305:22 307:16 309:4 310:15 311:9 319:13 320:19,21 322:23 326:20 327:15 329:7 333:9,22 342:15 342:16,17 345:13 353:25 358:14,15 359:9 377:25 378:25 379:9 382:20 384:6 Muir 364:8 365:9 Muller 4:25 multiple 19:9 29:1,17 41:24 42:13 53:5 98:6 101:10 104:19 113:17 113:19 119:8 132:20 135:14 137:13 138:18 139:14,19 140:1 149:18 157:9 308:9

324:7 331:21
multiply 139:18
multitude 105:18 353:16
multitudes 170:14
municipal 20:20 21:19
21:22 119:14,15 126:7
274:9,10 365:7
municipalities 134:21
304:23
municipality 358:2
municipality's 119:15
mussels 271:7
must 34:13 37:19 44:1
51:6 52:2,3,11,12
90:10 108:15 131:15
131:23,25 132:21
133:20 155:2 158:23
162:11 171:20 230:23
278:12,12 316:23
317:2 331:7,11 357:19
357:19 380:12
Myhre 367:16,17
Myrick 143:2
myself 7:15 241:6 344:4
367:25
<b>M-Y-H-R-E</b> 367:17
N

name 5:18 41:2 103:25 141:14,15 143:18 146:5 148:3 156:14 157:3 168:11 207:12 238:12 257:20 269:20 289:16 299:23 328:11 329:15,16,19 335:14 340:22 342:21 344:25 350:23 352:12 353:22 354:23 359:12 361:9 364:2 370:22 373:21 373:25 376:25 377:2 379:19.24 names 168:15 212:6 237:4 328:18,23 329:1 329:11 name's 148:6 240:23 narrow 196:3 320:6 375:21 narrowly 88:2,9 Nathan 379:25 nation 130:3 212:20 350:16 national 17:15 180:19 181:18 189:4,25 281:21 325:22 Nations 350:2 nation's 239:5 native 290:1 304:3 356:21 Natividad 29:23 natural 92:12 126:2 260:1,5 281:25 naturally 259:18 nature 50:25 113:22 204:16 262:9 321:23 near 270:23 276:5 277:7 315:11 318:3,4,4 353:23 nearby 115:19 184:2,10 nearest 193:9 226:18 **nebulous** 334:19 necessarily 62:24

111:14 114:19 130:9 195:9 213:25 222:4,20 223:10,20 312:13,14 321:18 346:16 375:21 necessary 9:16 12:12 14:24 16:19 50:4 81:22 81:24 109:21,23 161:16,20 168:1 196:17 197:4 255:23 353:7 necessity 174:3 need 27:24 32:9,10,11 40:20 58:25 64:8 80:14 93:22 103:19 105:11 138:18 144:2 149:18 151:5 158:15,17 165:2 165:7 166:7 168:25 170:6 174:7 196:18 199:6 200:20 202:4 204:25 211:7 213:24 218:8 220:4 222:2 223:14 227:17 230:4 232:15 235:9 244:23 249:15 250:25 251:18 255:2 264:22 267:15 267:15 269:15 274:20 274:20 276:13,15,17 276:18,19 283:1 287:6 288:4 305:19 310:16 319:25 320:17 321:5 322:17 326:4 331:5 333:4 347:13 349:3.6 356:3,10 375:1,3 needed 24:12 33:18 105:17 132:10 204:11 261:1 354:12 needs 52:5,10 53:11,16 54:11,12,14 56:1,4,13 56:23 102:4 125:4 150:14 160:22 165:15 165:23,25 166:1 169:25 170:18 172:1 179:24 205:19 211:22 220:3 221:7 255:2 274:3,4,8,17,18 280:19 291:13 negative 330:3 negatively 131:17 293·15 neglecting 169:15 neighbor 5:1 100:14 neighborhood 359:16 neighbor's 333:23 neither 79:2 313:6 never 60:4,5 174:21 372:8 Nevertheless 302:2 304:17 new 13:24 23:16 26:3 27:25 32:21,23 50:13 75:4 85:3,13 86:10 115:24 116:24 117:5 134:14 135:1,3 152:17 155:3 157:17 176:5 181:12 201:20 202:10 203:19 204:6 205:5,10 208:11,20 209:14

221:24 257:17,18

270:10 275:11 277:1

279:17 346:8 355:17

355:17 366:17 370:12

371:4 newest 7:9 newly-formed 207:13 next 4:25 11:18 12:17 16:4 17:8 18:3 39:16 39:21,23 40:5 41:1 45:5 65:1 97:3,22 98:3 100:14 103:17 140:12 142:6 167:1 171:4 174:13 184:16 245:13 257:6 265:25 266:3,4 267:23 289:3,22 290:11,24 291:3,15 292:7,20 293:6,19 295:11 297:5 298:21 304:12 320:1,2 321:24 325:7 334:14 340:18 349:22 355:18 364:23 373:1 378:8 nexus 202:20 ni 44:24 112:15 nice 377:18 Niggemeyer 364:1,2 night 380:4 Nile 337:5 nine 39:14 nitr 52:7 nitrate 15:22 23:22,24 24:5,10,22 25:11,18 26:4.9 27:11 28:8.21 28:22 29:8 51:4 52:12 52:17.24 53:2.10.13.18 55:2 60:4,22 61:19,23 62:3,5,6 94:24 96:6 97:6,14 98:19 99:3 109:15 110:18 111:1 111:19 112:7,15 114:10 133:21 134:1 134:25 168:22 169:3 170:6,13,19,21 182:10 182:13,16 183:2,6 184:1,3,11 185:6,16,24 186:1.6.15.25 187:2.23 189:16 190:15,17 191:22 192:13 197:1,5 202:5 210:9 235:6 240:18 242:14,17,22 244:7,8,17 245:4 246:1 246.15 249.9 12 252.7 252:15,24 253:10,23 255:1,4 256:5,18,23 257:7,8 258:19,25 259:8,9,17 260:25 261:3,6 265:19 271:6 276:10,11,18,18 284:8 291:21 292:1,13 293:10.11 294:10 303:9 310:20 315:4 330:12 332:9,17 346:5 358:8 372:16,24 nitrates 23:19 25:8,9 27:18 28:14 30:9 32:3 32:4 60:16 66:3 68:20 147:1,15,17 150:20 183:8,12,19 184:23 185:10,15 191:21 202:22 206:9 246:6 251:10 256:9 261:10 271:10 272:10 278:18 287:12 288:21 292:18

344:13 345:24 355:5

359:25 360:7 nitrate's 57:4 nitrate-contaminated 291:10 295:5 nitrate-loading 43:11 44:1,19,25 51:9,11,19 51:24 96:8,9 97:5,24 nitrate-related 49:11 **nitress** 351:5 nitrite 303:9 nitrogen 38:2 52:5,6,8,9 53:1,3,5,6,8,10,11,12 53:25 54:4,10,11,17,19 54:20,22,22,24,25 55:4 55:5,17,20,23 56:3,8 56:13,14,23,24,24 57:3 57:8 61:15 66:23 69:19 71:4 98:20 167:18 169:6,11,16,17,19,23 174:4,8,11,11,15 178:24 179:24 182:8 182:13,17,23 183:2 186:11,15 187:2 191:6 191:19.24 193:10 197:3 204:22 241:3,10 241:17,20,21,23,25 242:1,5,7,9,12 244:3 244:11 246:6,15 247:2 250:20 251:10 277:3 315:18 333:22 334:19 334:21 346:14 351:8 377:13.20 379:3 nitrogen-risk 314:15 nobody's 377:14,22 378:15 Nods 139:13 NOI 48:12 49:7 268:8,12 268:15,21,22,24 non 24:7 59:10 noncompliant 366:10 none 236:9 252:16 378:22 382:5 nonetheless 357:2 nonsensical 381:10 non-point 17:19 58:22 124:20 non-profit 146:9 289:25 noon 5:21 6:6 7:1 9:25 11:8 12:16 normal 76:6 normally 65:9 146:20 north 5:1 13:7 16:4 183:22 335:20 northern 185:7 nosebleed 93:2 notably 17:4 note 112:19 157:14 270:25 noted 40:20 152:18 279:18 358:6 notes 385:10 nothing 90:1,2 246:8 notice 9:18 33:15 35:1 36:24,24 37:4 38:14 45:14 49:17 54:3 70:23 86:21 87:5 93:4 203:8 203:10,24 205:12 211:5.6.8 214:18 216:15 224:18 315:1,2

327:13 381:22 382:24

383:3

notices 26:19 138:10,12 notified 9:4 152:9 notify 227:11 noting 161:4 November 104:7 113:12 205:12 273:18 277:20 281:9 371:6 nowhere 162:18 196:12 **NPDES** 364:15 **NRCS** 334:8 NRDC 220:7 nuclear 298:7 nuisance 108:10 number 7:22 8:2 9:21 14:4 45:6,19 48:23 62:22,25 82:9 87:9 92:2 94:8 96:19,20,20 97:5,21 98:10,10 99:19 100.7 8 116.18 126.19 138:11,13 149:10,12 182:25 189:2 192:11 192:13,17 200:7 212:7 230:25 231:5 237:7 241:13 257:24 258:16 259:13 269:13 294:12 372:24 374:18 376:3 377:5 numbering 277:15,18,19 numbers 30:19 49:16 152:21 182:18 246:19 numeric 32:19 366:2,2 numerous 104:17 105:1 182:6 187:5 nursery 351:20 nutrient 15:23 17:17 33:21 35:14 38:6 50:17 51:7,23 52:1,4,14,18 53:23 55:1 56:5 20 69:18 70:24 71:1 97:8 97:16 98:1,24 103:14 108:16 211:3 215:7 273:1 311:13 313:23 313:24 314:1.8.9 315:6 315:14,16,18 331:17 332:1 346:23,25 351:3 nutrients 28:15 43:23 44:18 108:14 180:4 210:8 272:25 287:7 313:18 314:23 331:17 331.19 nutrification 28:14 nutshell 179:20

0 Oak 359:16 **Oakland** 290:13 Oaxaca 301:11 Obispo 1:2 2:3,19 150:17 320:3 324:2,15 327:9,15,19,25 328:2 objective 158:22 365:24 objectively 331:2 objectives 166:6 241:9 obligated 80:15 90:17 obligates 90:21 obligation 59:2 90:15 119:16 observation 100:6 observations 158:10 observe 177:18 198:2 obtain 187:18

obvious 20:23 251:23
286:23 332:20 354:10
<b>obviously</b> 11:21 19:24 31:10 91:19 227:18
374:6
Occasionally 276:20
occur 28:15 53:14
244:22 264:23 375:18 occurred 247:23,24
358:12 368:23
occurring 218:18 312:22
374:14
occurs 137:6 ocean 195:23 271:7,11
283:19 318:4 365:3
374:7
October 108:16 247:15 279:20
off 12:16 17:6 18:14 34:4
84:4 90:2 118:3 120:3
123:13 124:2 127:23
127:25 153:13 175:22 202:9 228:21 238:5
256:24 275:5 289:6
306:13 312:16 336:13
338:16 349:5 355:9 365:3 379:6
offending 184:19
offer 261:4 283:3 308:12
352:14
offered 280:1 331:3 offering 214:14 269:22
334:9
office 6:14 152:9 155:18
163:20 269:2 360:2 officer 2:22 5:7 85:2
88:13 115:23 116:11
124:12 204:5 207:3
211:7 213:14 229:17 229:19 265:24 275:17
313:9 330:22 380:20
380:22 381:8,11
Officer/Ombudsman 2:22
office's 152:12
official 8:18,21
officially 314:23 officials 10:8 153:9
156:4,5 336:10
offset 164:23,25
often 74:21 170:19 248:5
248:6 360:22 <b>oh</b> 16:23 89:7 124:15
128:8 176:24 177:24
217:13 232:20 243:20
275:20 oil 127:15 184:21 363:19
ointment 13:19
okay 7:20,24 8:4 23:9,10
39:3,6 58:21 59:13
62:19 65:7,21 66:2,2 69:7 70:18 74:1,10
77:11.19 81:6 82:14.19
82:22,25 83:20 93:23 94:22 100:23 103:15
103:17,20 104:3
112:22 113:10 114:4
115:8,9 116:13 117:17 118:21 123:17,24
125:8 127:16,20
129:25 130:4,6,12

```
131:3 132:19 139:3
  141:3,19,22 142:13
  143:9,13 144:12 148:2
  148:5,6,13,15,16 153:2
  153:8,14,18 156:6
  167:1 171:5 172:12,21
  173:15 175:3,6,9 176:8
  176:24 178:16,19,21
  179:6,9,12,15 180:7,8
  188:15,17 191:17
  193:6 195:19,21
  201:16 202:25 215:4
  217:13 218:2 225:7
  228:2 230:19 232:20
  232:21 233:2,15
  234:12,19 235:11,12
  238:6,8,9 243:21 246:3
  246:3,12 247:5 249:4
  250:12 254:9 257:20
  260:6,11,13 265:11
  267:15,17,20,21 268:3
  268:6,9 269:14,17
  277:17 282:19 284:20
  284:23 285:1 288:14
  288:23,24 289:1,7,20
  298:20 299:4,9,18,20
  307:18,23 312:10,15
  319:13,16 321:20
  322:9,19 323:3,19
  324:2.14 326:4.17.19
  327:7,11,11,16 328:3,5
  328:10.13.25 329:6.10
  329:12 333:7 340:18
  340:23 342:15 350:21
  359:6 368:22 370:20
  374:2 379:15,17,22,22
  382:23 383:2,10 384:5
old 28:7 29:9 91:20
  177:16,17 186:20
  190:9,10 254:18
  257:14 271:21 276:8,9
  378:20
older 256:12
Ompa 376:22,22 377:1,3
  379:12
once 13:21 75:9 93:5
  165:20 225:5 242:15
  321:4 336:14 347:11
  366:4 384:1.1
one 5:15 7:13 12:13 13:7
  13:7 18:24 20:9,20
  21:4 23:22 24:4,21
  30:8 31:7,10 33:7
  36:12 40:13 46:23
  47:13 61:24 62:10,21
  62:25 63:3 65:22 72:4
  85:23 94:20 95:7.8.16
  95:18 96:15,19 97:5
  98:10 99:19 101:9,11
  101:14,19 105:9
  107:13 109:5 113:8
  117:8 118:2 119:20
  127:8.12 128:24 131:9
  132:21 134:7,23
  136:24 137:2,3,7
  139:15,24,24 140:22
  143:11,11,16 148:23
  153:3 154:13 161:19
  165:16 166:12 167:6
  169:5 170:5 173:16,22
  174:20 177:1,15,16
```

```
178:22.23 182:8.8
                           operates 95:17
  183:4 186:17,17
                           operating 225:21
  187:24 190:3,6 192:23
                           operation 33:17 41:24
  192:24,25 193:2,3
                             43:16,19,21 44:1,5,15
  194:12,17 201:14
                             44:16 56:6 61:2,11,13
  203:7,7 205:10 218:20
                             93:6,7,11 95:16,25
  218:22 219:15,21
                             96:11,15 98:6 101:10
  220:11 222:7 223:23
                             101:20 103:3,10,13,13
  226:14 229:12 232:22
                             106:7 114:18 139:25
                             140:1 161:18 162:23
  232:22,23,23 237:5
  240:11 241:9 250:7
                             162:24 198:19 205:1
  258:2 259:22 260:9,15
                             210:5 218:10 220:14
  263:14 265:22 274:16
                             223:13 263:15.20
  275:15 276:4 280:24
                             277:4 279:20 312:20
  282:22,25 283:3
                             313:1 314:16 315:15
                             329:23 330:5,16
  284:11 285:2 287:19
  288:12 290:13 292:22
                             334:16 351:21,25
  294:3 296:25 297:1
                             368:2 370:15
  299.14 20 301.7 14
                           operations 38:3 41:16
  304:3 305:16 306:24
                             41:22,25 42:20 43:17
  306:25 307:9 308:17
                             44:13,18,22,24 45:1,11
  311:4 314:20 317:8
                             46:24 49:15,19,21,24
  320:15 324:11,11
                             50:24 51:6,9,22 52:22
  329:9 332:2.7 334:21
                             61:7 62:3 69:23 71:25
  335:3 345:8,11 346:12
                             94:5,5 99:6,12 102:25
  347:5 348:25 351:19
                             103:6 105:19 115:17
  357:8,21,21 360:2
                             150:12 161:25 186:5
  365:6 368:21 371:5,11
                             198:4 212:8 224:1
  371:21 372:3,3,11
                             226:17,21 236:12
  373:6 377:5 378:13,15
                             237:7 268:23 311:12
  380:5,22
                             315:11 317:14 330:20
ones 82:22 86:18 129:22
                             375:22 376:8
  178:24 188:15 292:6
                           operation's 331:1
  349:11
                           operator 146:6 160:19
one's 93:11 273:11
                             368:1.16
  356:25
                           operators 210:3 222:2
one-size-fits-all 42:21
                             225:24 368:19
ongoing 30:23 84:16
                           opinion 67:21 92:5 93:8
onions 330:9
                             106:17 164:14 247:3
only 7:4 51:10 52:19,23
                             273:14 283:4 317:18
  55:19 61:18 71:22 72:1
                             352:15
  91:20 97:20 102:15
                           opportunities 155:25
  103:15.15 107:20
                             211:23 269:2
                           opportunity 6:4 9:8
  109:8 116:22 132:14
  135:4 147:1 148:25
                             10:22 76:4,9 142:16
  151:17 186:2 197:1
                             145:23 151:22 155:18
  202:11,19 216:10
                             156:10 196:2 204:2
  238:25 239:9,12
                             205:16,21 207:15,25
  243:15 250:15 298:7
                             237:21 287:25 288:10
  299:14 302:21 303:1
                             289:15 350:25 357:3
  306:24,24 313:14,19
                             376:20
                           oppose 370:7
  314:7 316:22 325:2
  327:25 331:1 335:3
                           opposed 308:16 375:25
  349:20 356:7 360:12
                           opposite 317:19
  362:18 366:4 367:6
                           oppressive 352:20
  378:16 381:20
                           optimal 159:8,15
onto 54:1 118:4 120:3
                           optimization 159:16
  332:7 339:10
                           option 107:20 345:13
on-line 31:25 34:14,16
                             360:16 376:15
  35:4,22 36:10,18,24
                           options 17:25 26:20
  37:15 38:1,9 50:7 70:8
                             40:18 63:17 66:20 83:5
  70:22 71:2 72:8 73:6,9
                             105:20,22 106:24
  269:34
                             132:12 321:16 376:7
on-the-ground 228:1
                           oral 203:6
Oop 41:18
                           orange 311:11
                           orchards 92:10,14 315:7
oops 41:18 42:1
op 44:22
                           Orcutt 30:6
opening 3:3 16:22 18:15
                           order 1:5 2:6 8:2 12:20
oper 317:19
                             13:25 18:2,16 22:13,16
operate 123:9 198:15
                             23:3 24:7 32:9,15,22
  369:16 381:6
                             32:24 33:3,5,6,10,12
```

33:13,16 34:22,23 35:3 37:5,7,7,8 39:10 40:20 41:8,9,12,23 42:1,17 42:17,23,24 43:1,5,10 45:6,18 46:6,19 47:8 48:21 49:2 50:2,3,14 50:19 53:1,4 54:2 56:21 58:23 61:22 62:11 63:21,22 64:3 66:8 69:20 70:5 71:10 80:8 81:8,11,13,20 83:17 84:9 85:1 86:4,9 86:19 88:11,13,19 89:17,19 90:4 91:5,21 94:2,3 95:23 98:7 104:7,10,13,16 106:5 106:22,25 107:9 108:6 108:7,18,22 109:1,6,10 109:13,14,19 110:3,4,9 110:14,16 112:8,10,15 113:1,2,13 117:1 122:4 122:7,13 123:5 124:1 125:7,9,22 132:22 133:22 137:9.12 138:16,21 140:7 141:11 153:24 157:9 157:12,17 160:12,12 160:21 161:21 162:19 163:13 164:18,25 165:17.22 171:20 180:16 181:14 182:23 187:13.16 203:12 205:5,24 206:12,14,19 206:20 207:22,24 208:3,8,11,14,20,22,23 208:24 209:6,18 211:12 213:19 214:24 215:21 216:25 217:6 217:19 219:10 223:6 223:19 224:15,25 225:3,4 226:5 229:4 233:1,3 234:17 236:6 251:4 261:7 263:14.16 264:21 268:20 274:1 274:15,22 275:13 276:2,2,8,9,10 279:17 281:8,12 297:13 304:24 308:20,23 310:4,24 314:11 317:18 318:16 323:6 337:20 338:9 347:8 370:14 380:8,15 381:3 orderly 10:24 orders 13:10 48:23 63:18 63:19 119:4 229:15 236:21 order's 111:9 188:10 ordinances 117:15 Oregon 333:12 organic 261:21 organism 130:10 organisms 129:22 130:2 312.7 356.10 organization 135:15 231:5,7,8 296:19 organizations 29:1 106:10,12 113:19 135:13,19 136:13 221:4,5 274:14,22 289:25 290:1

organization's 352:16

organs 169:2
original 167·5 234·15
originally 116:16 117:7 117:22 157:7
117:22 157:7 ortho-phosphates 32:3
Oso 19:11 30:12,21
Osos 2:19
OSR 106:7,18 other 5:7 11:11 16:14
19:5,19,19 20:4 21:4,9
21:20 23:5 24:18 27:9
27:14 30:24 31:20 38:21 39:12 42:16
46:18 48:22 50:13
56:12 60:11 67:11
68:17 72:6 73:21 78:21 79:21 81:15 82:6 83:23
84:6,11,23 86:12 88:25
92:13 94:2,12 98:12
106:9 107:10 116:10 122:8,25 123:1,11,13
126:5.19 128:13.19
130:17 131:6 132:10
136:3,13 137:18 138:7 143:7,8 149:7 151:7
154:3,8 156:4 161:3,11
161:12 169:10 178:10
181:23 184:3 185:13 186:11 187:8 189:1
192:8 194:22 196:23
197:6,18 205:24 207:5
212:14 215:2 221:14 233:6 236:11,21
243:13 252:23 255:11
261:8 262:5 264:2,24
265:20 266:12,16,17 266:20 267:7 270:6
271:9 274:7 276:13
277:1 279:24 281:24
284:13 286:6 289:11 291:18 293:7 302:4
313:8,12 316:16
318:13 336:24 341:10
345:6 346:4 347:1,2,5 348:25 351:17 359:18
363:18 365:10 368:15
369:4 372:3 374:24 375:6 376:5 378:5,5,15
others 106:13 114:22
116:9 129:23 131:11
158:5 237:16 262:16 310:3 323:25 329:24
348:17 359:24
otherwise 208:23 263:18
otter 270:25 378:16,17 otters 271:3,8 283:18
378:23
ought 199:11
ourselves 369:13 382:13 out 7:2,3 9:13 11:21 12:1
12:16,23 13:5,15 16:13
24:9 34:16 35:2 37:1,2 39:20 40:11 57:14
58:24 67:12 69:16 79:5
80:18,20,20 84:20
85:13,14 89:10,11 90:4 90:14 92:2 99:23 100:6
101:1,9 112:10 122:10
123:20 126:2 129:1

133:16 142:23 146:19

150:13,24 151:8,24

152:21 163:24 168:14 178:6,15 183:12,25 192:17 196:8,19,23 197:7,19,24 198:5,9 216:17 217:2,15 219:1 220:6 223:13,17 227:17 229:15 238:22 239:6,8 240:11 241:20 256:23 257:15 259:12 259:14 272:22 273:6,6 274:3 275:20 282:23 283:7,18 285:3,16 286:8 287:7 288:9 292:16,21 297:2,2 302:20 304:3,22 318:8 320:16 323:17 327:2 327:11 328:12 330:17 331:11 333:5,11 335:4 342:3 344:8 346:10 360:7 361:24 367:11 372:18 373:14,14 376:4,16 378:9,9,11,16 379:7,7 383:21 outcome 357:24 outcomes 81:23 104:5 105:3 161:24,25 349:21 outdoor 184:9 outgrowth 209:15 outline 181:1 outlined 152:13,22 211:22 296:14 **outlines** 152:14 outlining 211:10 output 162:25 outreach 104:24 365:17 outside 131:21 268:5 321:13 365:4 over 6:15 11:15,19 14:19 16:7 18:8,24,25 20:14 20:18 24:25 25:1 26:7 28:12 29:9,12,25 39:8 39:15 53:19.24 54:23 95:8 96:8 98:6 100:10 101:15 108:10 109:3 109:20 110:13,21 112:13 115:4,6 131:23 132:17 133:6 134:6 141:5,8 143:12,12 149:8 150:18 162:25 166:17,19 171:7 173:21 182:19 183:11 186:24 190:3,7,13 203:4 228:18 235:24 240:19 251:14 262:5 262:12 265:25 277:6 277:25 284:11 292:19 303:5 306:11,25 325:10 329:23,25 330:20 331:4,22 334:17 360:3 361:12 364:23 369:2 372:15 378:21 379:11 overall 31:22 32:6,13 36:2 57:22 130:11 238:24 264:19 351:3

overcompensating

Overeem 350:22,23

overlaid 54:1 183:7

overly 83:11 99:10

346:15

128:17 66:9 67:8,10,11 71:2 overnight 286:24 84:12 114:21 123:25 oversaw 180:25 142:25 144:3,16 oversee 366:1 150:10 152:5,8 158:19 oversees 20:21 158:20,20 160:10 oversight 20:13,17 22:4 166:24,25 168:7 170:3 66:9 204:7 365:22 170:4 172:15 187:9 overview 18:15 215:8,22 216:7 221:9 overwatering 259:23 228:17 229:11,16 231:20 233:20 236:19 overwhelming 84:2 239:2 240:5 242:16 262:11 over-represented 304:5 244:19 250:14 251:16 own 26:22.22 29:6 56:11 256:17 268:18 285:3 77:18 84:6 95:10 129:6 285:11 290:23 303:1 145:4 158:16 162:2 165:15 184:25 223:4 225:24 316:12 318:10 318:10 343:18 360:24 368:15,18 369:2,13,14 owned 100:10 owner 98:11 99:24 140:15 141:1,12,16 248:13 owners 136:20 143:23 163:4,15 210:3 338:2 oxygen 32:3 182:17 O-M-P-A 377:3 379:21 O-V-E-R-E-M 350:23 Р Pacific 294:8 304:2 309:20 372:12 package 296:23 Packard 5:9,12 15:2 16:16 40:22 page 3:1 128:6 265:18 265:18,22 274:25 384:3 pages 105:21 paid 123:21 146:17,17 171:17 333:22 344:4 365:25 pains 317:16 Pajaro 143:21 144:13 186:3 187:3 **Pajaros** 377:16 Pallas 361:10 panel 8:8,12,24,25 9:6 9:11.13.15 10:9 13:20 13:22 156:17,20 215:1 308:7 322:3 324:21 para 284:6

paragraph 265:18,19,22

116:17 122:16 123:2

parameters 32:2 117:17

118:8,9 122:12,14

parcel 139:16 315:10

265:23 266:8

Parajo 261:16,18

parallel 114:12,13

164:12 224:16

paraphrase 374:5

Parcello 6:8

Pardon 340:21

Paredes 39:23

Parkinson's 27:15

part 6:25 7:6,14 35:3

40:18,24 45:13 64:2

parking 12:2

parse 287:7

paragraphs 280:17

321:11 325:16 338:19 350:13 357:21 373:3 378:6 partially 98:17 312:5 participant 217:5 223:6 225:5 227:6,11 participants 160:9 210:2 211:1,11,17,19,24 212:4,7,12,13 213:4,18 214:8.11 224:9 225:2 226:16 233:18 237:4 371:24 participate 8:16 210:4 227:10 230:8,22 367:22 participated 104:25 participating 7:10 93:16 208:3 214:8 227:12 229:24 230:2 participation 227:9 particular 46:13 47:19 60:3,4,23 63:6 65:4,23 66:2,17 67:15 94:6 95.4 101.14 103.6 105:3 121:3 126:24 130:7,8 141:1 168:13 173:9 179:25 180:4 196:13 197:9 198:11 198:11 202:21 230:9 292:15 293:9 301:1 337:18 340:1 particularly 179:22 particulars 68:2 parties 14:4,5 27:8 120:7 141:15,15 196:5 231:19 385:12 partly 280:25 partner 151:6 partners 220:25 221:1 parts 30:24 95:9 151:16 190:18,19 244:8,9 252:19 255:25 302:4 party 140:16 208:4 212:15 213:13 216:10 217:2 228:8,12,13 230:9 326:3 365:24,25 366:4 Paso 189:13 pass 27:25 149:24 162:9 170:3 337:13 passed 165:3 passing 379:6 past 18:25 20:14,18 24:25 28:11,12 53:24 84:22 174:14 183:11 202:11 251:11 329:22 329:23 331:4 345:5

352:13 358:17 pasted 280:15 patents 333:13,14 path 65:4 220:21 pathogenic 312:7 paths 68:11 Patrick's 4:6 104:2 156:9 pattern 188:21 242:10 patterns 163:9 194:11,16 pay 146:18 165:2 187:21 304:22,24 305:4,5,5 334:23 349:3 354:1,1 377:10 paying 293:24,25 356:25 369:13 peaking 241:20 pedio 179:23 peer 181:3 187:20 260:19 283:24 25 **PEMBROKE** 359:11,12 359:14 Pembrooke 142:18 147:23,24,24 148:3 penalty 37:12 385:14 penciled 372:18 pending 294:10 295:4 penetrate 331:21 penetrating 193:18 peninsula 364:24 penny 344:11 people 7:5 10:16 11:21 12:17 19:3.6 25:21 26:10 27:5 30:17 33:7 39:13 57:21 60:1 65:12 66:11 67:7 68:19 74:12 77:2,3 79:10 86:22 91:1,14 112:1 115:7 117:4 123:12 124:14 134:19 136:6,23 137:24 138:12,13 141:23 143:12 146:21 148:18 214:15 220:6 221:2.4 225:25 227:25 228:13 229:15 231:13 236:17 255:15 263:17 269:6,22 272:13 275:3 275:5,9,20,22 276:5,13 276:15 279:3,9 283:17 284:13 286:8 289:8,11 289:13 291:5,7,22 293:22 294:13 295:15 300:24 301:5,12,20 303:15 304:1,6,9,12,14 304:15 305:4 309:2 311:25 315:24 318:13 319:1 327:14 328:17 333:17 335:24 336:9 336:15 341:5,25 344:15 345:21 346:7 347:14 355:1,5 359:7 362:9 363:20 368:11 374:8 376:4 377:5 378:37 people's 149:17 222:24 235:1 360:21 per 29:14,16,21,24 30:1

30:4 31:19 54:7,8,14

111:10,15,15,18,22

134:3 145:10,11,11

112:5,13 133:2,3,3,21

60:22 110:19 111:1,7,8

147:3,4 164:4 190:18
190:19 191:6,19 192:3 241:21,25 242:2,9
244:8,9 247:12 250:6
252:19 292:19 300:19
334:9 percent 25:6,8,10,17,23
31:4,4,15 36:1,3,4
53:15 68:18 91:19,20 91:21 110:23 112:17
210:22 225:2,3 226:20
226:22 239:9 240:6,8 243:13,16 247:24
250:16 253:6 259:14
263:3,4,6 271:24 272:1 275:2,2,16,17 284:3
290:15 301:16,22,23
302:1,23 303:12 304:1 304:6,9,10,10,11
313:22,23 342:2
366:11 percentage 31:3,17
191:15 258:4 302:11
313:21 366:10 percentages 183:17
191:16 306:3
percentile 303:23
percolated 206:4 percolates 377:24
percolation 205:25
242:23 331:8 377:25 perennial 336:20
perfection 53:13
perfectly 358:9 performed 180:22
181:16,20,23
performing 187:20 perhaps 89:2 123:14
150:18 323:25
period 87:14 93:5 105:4 141:5 150:18 205:20
206:23 207:19 212:8
217:9 225:25 226:18 237:7 244:20,21 245:8
245:10 258:12 286:2
286:24 331:22 periods 312:7
perishable 162·11
perjury 37:12 385:14 permanently 178:1
permission 330:22
permit 87:9 93:22 119:11 120:12 133:5,7 339:1
340:12 358:4 366:14
366:16,17 permitees 365:7
permits 130:2 274:10
364:15 permitting 15:13 87:1
persist 312:7
<b>person</b> 19:14 67:13,13 74:14 76:9 90:6 141:6
143:11 335:3 361:17
369:20 personal 145:7 302:17
personal 145:7 302:17 personally 168:2 232:9
361:13
PERSONNEL 2:21 persons 9:17
person's 227:8
perspective 40:23

```
237:18 258:1 300:21
  308:12,13 346:25
  362:10 371:9
perspectives 149:18
  296:19 383:16
pest 263:7 350:24
pesticide 31:14 33:20
  47:13 49:18 83:6 84:19
  86:25 87:9 114:19
  200:12,14,15 211:1
  265:1 279:13 311:14
  334:21 352:6
pesticides 19:13 30:21
  30:25 42:11 43:23
  44:18 45:3,16 46:3,15
  47:1,2,4,5,7,9,11,15
  48:10,18 49:10 82:9,11
  82:12,16 84:17 86:1,5
  86:22 108:14 114:17
  114:22 115:12,23
  128:10,13 130:17
  148:23,24 151:23
  157:15 200:2,5,6
  262:14 265:8 272:24
  275:6 278:14 287:9
  302:18,20 312:24
  314:19,24 315:20
  316:2,10,13,16 331:18
  333:24 346:1 375:25
  376.5 10
pesticide-impaired
  43:15
petroleum 127:12
PG&E 198:14
Ph 51:3 180:2
phase 366:17,21 367:5,5
phased 206:13,16
phasing 99:11
PhD 148:21
phone 105:2
phonetic 39:23 143:2
  193:5 256:3 279:12
  288:24 338:7 377:17
photo 37:25 71:17 311:3
  311:5 318:5
photograph 19:11
phrase 294:21
physical 177:21 178:4,7
  302:17
pick 126:10 196:19 324:5
picked 177:12 255:15
picking 92:20 129:1
  200:5
picture 19:16 67:11
  193:8,10,15 255:3
  257:18 318:2
pie 25:4 183:17
piece 145:15 345:21
  372:8
pigs 79:19 377:19
pipeline 346:11
pitted 301:7
Pitterle 307:23,25 314:5
place 1:2 2:3 8:4 22:13
  22:15 64:17 68:8 182:8
  190:7 285:19 286:3
  287:16 333:23 344:19
  375:13 385:6
placed 85:10
places 29:17 58:4 290:5
plain 381:5
```

```
plan 17:16 33:18.19.23
  33:23,25 35:12,14
  37:20 38:6,7 50:16,17
  51:8,23 52:1,2,11,14
  52:18,20 56:5,7,12,21
  61:20 69:18,22 70:3,5
  70:14,17,20,24 71:1,3
  71:8,12,14,23 72:5,7
  73:2,2 80:9,15,21 87:1
  97:9,16 98:1,2,25
  103:14 134:3 155:17
  210:15,20 215:7,8
  269:4 280:18.21
  281:13 296:4 314:2
  316:24 317:6 338:20
  346:25 359:1 368:22
  370:10
planet 358:11 361:20,21
  362:4,15,20
planning 17:10,12
  165:21 358:1
plans 17:21 70:7,12,13
  70:15 131:6,6 210:17
  210:25 211:25 214:16
  217:3 220:2 314:9
  315:18 346:14,23
  349:19 369:21,23
  370:3,8
plant 197:4 245:13 248:4
  248.12.22
planted 250:7
planting 54:3,8 245:20
plants 248:19 249:21,21
  250:6,6
play 187:21 257:17
  258:14 318:9 335:25
playgrounds 184:10
playing 367:11
please 6:5 9:13,23 10:3
  39:17 143:15 147:8
  167:5 180:9 261:7
  268:4 277:11 289:22
  290:11 291:3.15 292:7
  292:20 293:6,19
  295:11 297:5 312:25
  318:23 341:20 343:19
  362:6
pleased 150:16 188:6
plot 95:7 293:8
plus 35:10 185:13
  194:22 247:9 281:22
pocket 304:22
pocketbook 341:22
podium 16:19
point 10:18 13:5 18:20
  56:12 59:10 68:17 75:8
  88:6.10 99:5 101:9
  111:12 122:16 139:1,2
  150:24 151:24 158:4
  158:25 159:4 175:23
  176:22 178:6 179:13
  192:11 196:6,23
  197:18 198:9 208:16
  213:17 215:25 238:22
  255:9 267:12,14
  272:12 273:22 286:20
  292:21 294:18 302:20
  305:1 309:15 314:13
  317:13 340:15 346:18
  351:14 363:5 382:6
  383:19
```

```
pointed 67:11 79:5 197:7
  197:19,24 198:5 376:4
pointing 100:6 101:1
  149:13 178:15 286:8
points 48:14 105:5
  125:18 126:12 183:20
  380:6
poisoning 271:4
policies 158:15
policy 24:8 58:23 59:11
  124:21 161:23 261:1
  297:9
politically 297:20
pollutant 57:13 96:4
  132:2 364:16,17
pollutants 96:3 119:13
  375:23
pollute 137:7 159:13
polluted 44:3 57:23
  138:1,4,6 318:8 341:11
  341:14 355:19 365:4
polluter 290:17
polluting 159:9 349:17
pollution 17:24 20:22
  22:5 23:13,16 24:19
  32:12 34:11 43:12,20
  107:17 108:1 109:11
  109:22,25 110:6 120:3
  120:4 131:24 134:11
  134:20 135:6 136:16
  136:21 137:5 138:14
  158:24 159:8.11.14.16
  159:17,18,20 182:15
  185:24 187:3 235:19
  236:7 252:3 257:8
  258:20,21,25 259:2
  276:10,11 281:4 303:8
  318:11 336:2 349:20
  355:3 375:4 376:19
pond 262:1 331:16
ponds 205:22 206:4
  331:7,10
poorest 304:15
popping 122:8
popular 104:12
population 284:16
Porter-Cologne 198:13
  198:19 212:23 213:3
portion 89:6 122:24
  153:21 237:15 284:16
  334:18
portions 205:24
Portland 333:11
portray 193:7
portrayed 188:1
pose 46:16,17,22 81:17
  102:10 309:11
posed 158:2
poses 23:22 24:22
position 59:20 79:15
  91:22
positive 168:10 297:9
possibility 240:16
  330:20
possible 19:23 55:8,17
  78:22 100:17,18,19,22
  167:21 174:23 184:8
  184:14 322:24 327:16
  335:5 375:5 378:5
  382:25 383:8
possibly 91:2 102:17
```

174:6 321:6 383:9 post 146:13 384:2,4 posted 19:12 30:16 113:20 post-harvest 244:19 post-implementation 353:7 pot 44:17 potable 147:4 347:18 potential 22:2 24:13 96:6 99:3 146:24 155:15 186:6 187:1 277:3 351:18 352:4 potentially 99:13 154:20 163:23 201:1 283:13 pound 182:16 pounds 31:18 54:7,8,14 182:16 192:3 241:21 241:25 242:1,9 pour 147:14 pouring 175:19 poverty 303:14 304:18 power 162:6 267:12,13 363:5 powerful 301:6 prac 213:21 practicable 210:12 practical 192:16 365:8 practicalities 120:18 practicality 144:20 225:15 practically 352:21 practice 34:3 35:2 44:6,7 76:14,17 81:23 88:17 116:1 117:9 120:7 166:4 215:7,10 227:19 276:16 313:8 practices 14:11 17:18.24 34:1,4 35:7,8 42:12 44:9 52:11 58:25 59:11 66:6 70:20 71:6 107:25 110:7 112:1 121:11 124:22 155:7 166:7 171:16 173:8 192:13 206:24 209:8 210:11 210:15,18,21 211:1,2,2 211:3,18 212:1 213:10 213:22 217:4,23 219:4 220:2,10 222:4,24 226:1,2,22 227:3,20,23 235:1,10,18 236:7,15 236:18 237:3,13 241:3 241:8 246:23,25 247:7 251:17 253:11 259:3 261:2 266:23 282:23 312:22 332:23 351:13 353:6 375:13 prayer 325:22 347:25 **pre** 193:3 predictability 349:23 predicts 154:21 prefer 200:17 278:24 279:1 346:3 prefers 280:10 prefix 181:19 pregnant 302:18 preliminary 18:19 106:5 113:1 244:15 prepared 40:12 75:5 . 170:4 208:10 279:6 312:19 367:20 369:10

prescribe 56:8
prescriptive 188:2 presence 48:13 201:9,11
present 4:10,12,14,16
9:10 20:23 43:7 155:25 156:10,17,24 157:8
158:11 168:18 184:1 198:6 257:18 260:17
presentation 3:4,5,6,7,8
3:10,11 11:1,6 13:4 16:20,21 41:8 102:22
103:18 132:16,18 142:6 153:4 156:7
167:3 182:18,25 215:2
231:15 235:20 236:2,5 239:24 258:2,5 260:23
260:23 261:5 267:12
267:14,22 300:5 307:20,21 314:6 358:6
presentations 238:1 258:23 348:18 363:5
presented 9:1 53:22
155:19 170:20 182:2 231:11 254:15,17
255:3 257:1,12,13,14 257:21 258:6 264:22
316:9 318:24 365:14
371:5 presenter 166:13
presenting 63:10
presently 168:8 presents 21:25 158:10
183:4 272:13 president 180:24 201:10
333:10
pressed 213:2 302:15 pressing 196:7,10
pressure 263:8 pretty 5:16 11:8,12
133:24 164:10 176:23
244:16 311:9 318:16 320:14 332:20
prevalent 316:13
prevent 70:3 71:15 80:10 108:9 373:5 375:4
preventing 340:3 prevention 34:10 117:7
330:13
preview 203:23 previous 174:15 238:18
240:10 254:4 259:15 279:23 307:8
previously 156:16
181:17 203:6 235:2 239:1 260:16
price 240:2 349:6
<b>prices</b> 162:3,5,6,13,15 164:22,24 165:9 343:4
primarily 180:17 309:25 310:24 358:8
primary 47:16,17 137:4
185:24 186:18 187:6 262:14 263:24
principle 159:21 prior 104:6 155:12 232:4
344:16 351:6 380:14
priorities 24:4 41:15 137:3 150:23 211:10
221:7 225:6 prioritize 47:21 49:1 58:5
63:13 105:6 150:19

```
prioritizing 219:23
  297:24
priority 26:12,13 46:19
  46:20 47:24 49:2 105:8
  149:23 160:20 362:23
private 75:3
privilege 345:4
privileged 350:1
prize 296:5 354:19
pro 94:2
probably 39:18 63:15
  142:3 197:14 202:22
  223:3 229:25 230:13
  230:16 245:13,18
  283:15 285:18 286:18
  286:19 311:18,24
  316:7 333:5 346:17
  358:20 369:5 380:14
problem 24:14,20 26:4,5
  32:5,6 79:24,24 99:23
  121:3 134:8,14,16,25
  137:21 147:1 151:7
  158:2 183:3 196:7
  197:5.6.6 202:6 223:18
  258:20,25 259:4
  272:11 279:2 286:9,22
  287:13,15 291:21
  292:23 293:4 294:23
  316:6 339:20 340:9
  347:8 355:10 365:18
  365:20 371:21 372:24
  375:19
problematic 79:20,25
  127:9 262:25
problems 23:12 24:13
  30:20,25 31:21,22
  32:10 82:1 107:2 134:9
  135:6.6.7.9.16 136:14
  150:25 197:16,17
  200:21 218:18 220:1
  234:21,24 240:17
  303:15 319:3,4 336:8
  348:12 355:20 360:19
  372:8 373:4,5 375:11
proceed 7:20 10:6
proceeding 7:7 237:15
proceedings 1:12 2:9
  4:2 384:7 385:5,7
process 12:21,23 13:2,3
  13:6 19:18,23 45:16,17
  45:19 46:5,6 48:19,20
  48:23 76:6 87:1 98:24
  104:5 119:20 123:2
  135:2 155:10 168:3,16
  169:9 182:21 186:22
  190:22 197:11 211:10
  219:2 221:16 224:17
  225:24 232:3 234:10
  259:18 260:5 272:22
  296:13 297:7,13 308:9
  308:16 318:14 331:2
  357:13,25 365:25
  370:8 372:11.12 380:4
  380:18 382:9 383:19
processes 165:19
processors 160:5
prod 156:22
produc 207:3
produce 36:13 74:19
  79:12,13 377:7
```

producers 154:2

```
produces 159:18
                           prompt 321:18
product 263:10
                           promptly 9:13
production 24:9 133:16
                           promulgate 380:23
                           proof 38:5 190:14
  152:17,21 154:11
                           proper 206:15
  158:7 160:11 163:9.24
  164:3 182:15 240:13
                           properly 213:16 312:8
  241:22 242:2,13,16
                           properties 370:11
                           property 7:14 136:16,20
  252:13 253:11 257:15
  313:21 352:23,24
                             136:21 140:15 141:1
                             141:12,16,16 146:18
  378:9,12
productive 31:10 154:10
                             154:11 318:3,10
  160:8 163:13
                             336:16 338:2,17
productivity 55:19
professional 52:3 68:19
  180:25 229:16
                             370:17
professionals 68:22
                           proposal 51:16 107:7,11
  236:15
                             108:19 109:1,8,17
professions 7:14
professor 157:4 239:21
                             151.9 15 16 155.3
profile 168:4 169:13
                             156:11,11 196:3,4,14
  239:4 240:5
profit 164:7 303:22
                             228:20 230:24 234:5
  342:16,17 358:16
                             234:15 235:15,20
  362:11
                             237:1.6 238:20.23
profitability 162:8
                             240:12 330:17,19
program 2:24 14:6,7
                             331:3,7 346:3,13
  15:6,7,10,11,17,21,22
                             352:20 353:4 361:1
  16:1 17:9,20 18:5,7,8
                             371:2,4 373:8 378:13
  18:10 26:24 29:7 39:25
                           proposals 132:13 240:11
  40:1.3.3.6 41:4.5 42:16
                             377.4
  73:21 94:3 119:15
                           propose 71:20 80:14
  121:1.6 122:11.17.18
                             208:20 227:1
  124:10 125:16 126:8
  126:13 130:21 137:18
                           proposed 8:25 32:24
  150:14 155:14.14
  156:12 167:19 196:13
                             107:14 108:4 110:8
                             112:3 124:1 138:16
  209:1 212:20 213:8
  215:5 217:14 221:15
  222:9,11,14,22 223:3
                             157:6 168:22 208:20
  224:8 233:12 236:20
                             224:8 230:24 231:17
  266:13,25 267:2
  301:25 330:13 334:8
                             309:7 317:18 375:8
  353:12 364:7.23 365:2
                           proposes 51:18
  365:12 367:23 369:21
                           proposing 38:18 73:9
  371:21,22,22 372:4
                             82:25 178:12 225:23
  373:3,7,15
                             337:12,13 378:8
programs 14:5 17:16,22
                           proprietary 72:16,23
  18:12 20:4,9 21:4,20
                             73:3,21 74:4,7,13,20
  36:19 39:12 48:22
  81:15 94:12 151:24
                             131:7 216:4,6
  274:7 307:25 308:2
                           prosperity 303:16
  313:9 334:9 351:11
                           protect 41:14 42:15 44:9
  367:8
program's 183:14
                             137:4 143:24 147:19
progress 69:11 111:13
  112:13 343:11,13,14
                             273:2 281:14 282:2
progressive 288:8
                             283:9.9.10 343:12
prohibited 131:10
                             353:2 354:16 357:15
                             360:21,24
  381:11
prohibition 131:12 133:8
                           protected 207:3 343:7
  133:10
                             375:1
                           protecting 105:8 283:11
prohibitions 131:9,19,20
prohibitive 163:11
                             350:12
prohibitively 163:12
                           protection 16:2,6 17:10
project 19:1 144:7,14
                             17:11 71:17 114:3
  157:7,11 241:10
  284:10 345:17
                             329:25 374:7
projected 226:7.7
                           protections 113:7
projects 19:19,20 284:7
                             317:22 364:22
  294:11 366:16
                           protective 113:2 114:12
promised 319:15
                             156:12 235:10 274:16
```

```
295:14,17
                        protects 361:4
                        prove 93:21 120:22
                           288:9 355:8,9
                        proved 330:7
                        provide 9:8 14:24 18:14
                           18:19 27:8 39:5 41:6
                           41:11 45:4 56:22 57:2
                           58:25 74:24 75:1 94:11
                           106:19 155:6 159:13
                           184:4 188:2 204:3
                           207:16 209:7 211:20
339:11 341:15 368:15
                           212:1,18 232:12 237:4
368:17,18 369:3 370:1
                           255:22 347:9
                        provided 10:22 25:20
                           40:10 69:11 92:14
                           110:1 152:15 180:15
111:5 112:9,20 125:23
                           187:14 212:11 269:1
                        provider 134:23
                        providers 134:20 258:23
209:15 214:22 225:12
                           354:5
                        provides 40:2 49:4 72:21
                           87:8 209:14 213:22
                           295:12
                        providing 16:22 60:21,22
                           65:14,16 105:13 107:2
                           292:1
                        provision 196:24 197:9
                           201:21 202:11 208:21
                        provisions 71:16 132:7
                        proximity 43:13 47:23
125:22 171:25 207:20
                           114:9 115:19 200:1
                           201:16 202:12 276:3
                           279:16
33:5 51:11 63:21 80:8
                        prudent 151:15
                        Ps 366:5
                        psychology 148:21,22
152:2,10,17 153:24,25
                        public 3:12 5:21 6:14 8:5
                           9:18,20 10:2,15 13:16
                           16:17 18:18 20:23 25:3
                           25:6,20 27:23 42:19
233:3,18 262:10 267:6
                           43:14 44:3,20 64:1,6
                           65:2 70:11 74:16.24
                           75:1 82:1,4 104:4,6
                           114:9,25 115:2 134:11
                           134:12 135:3 136:22
                           136:24 137:7 147:5
                           148:22 149:16,16
74:22 75:2,11,13 76:10
                           156:18 183:2,7,9
                           185:12,13 187:9
                           194:22 201:17 202:1
                           202:12 205:15,20
50:4 81:12 108:9 130:9
                           215:22,22 216:5 256:1
                           256:10,11 270:2 272:2
149:25 160:16 192:19
                           276:3,6 284:1 287:19
                           288:19 291:24 292:8
                           292:15 300:18.20
                           303:4 310:22 320:20
                           321:1,6,11,18 327:25
                           342:24 343:3,6,12
                           344:5 354:2 365:17,19
                           368:25 371:12,16
                           382.23
                        publically 73:25 74:19
                           104:6 216:1 315:25
215:10 227:25 298:17
                        publications 180:21,25
                        public's 64:22 182:12
                           343:11
                        published 23:17 28:17
                           157:17
                        publishing 180:18,19,19
```

pull 26:6 83:1 148:13			
328:11			
pulled 98:10			
pull-down 38:9			
pump 146:19 194:14			
pumped 247:18,19			
pumping 194:11,16,24			
332:14			
purchase 147:12			
pure 273:12			
purpose 50:24 51:22			
70:2 369:24			
purposes 170:12 300:5			
340:4 372:4			
pursue 159:17			
pursuing 27:2 231:2			
purveyors 27:18,19,22			
put 68:20 87:5 96:21			
147:17 154:6 163:21			
175:16 202:11 208:14			
209:18 235:6 242:8,12			
242:19,25 243:8,11			
245:13 249:23 253:22			
262:1 269:4 274:2			
276:25 285:3 311:18			
312:19 337:6 341:5			
346:11 355:11,12,22			
359:1 361:2 363:4			
378:9,12			
puts 123:15 369:5			
putting 135:3 168:6			
224:18 313:2 349:12			
373:3 375:13 376:16			
379:3			
pyrethroid 31:16 316:10			

## Q

316:12

130.17

p.m 384:8

pyrethroids 128:10

Quail 29:19 121:17 125:14 qualifications 229:14 qualified 52:3 qualify 44:4 115:21 184:24 225:11 qualifying 115:12 116:12 quality 1:1 2:1 4:4 8:9 14:9 15:10,14,17 16:10 17:23 21:7,15,20 22:1 22:7,9 23:1,11 26:20 27:1 31:22 32:10,20,23 33:4.14 35:11 38:7 41:14,15 42:6,15 43:1 43:3,7,9,18 44:10,14 44:23 45:9,17,21 46:5 46:17,22 47:6 48:7,20 48:25 49:22,25 50:5,10 50:16 51:1 53:17,19 58:4 59:3 64:1 66:8 69:12.21 70:2.4 71:8 71:13,17,23 72:4 81:12 81:15,18,25 82:1 90:8 90:8,9,14,20 91:3 98:2 105:6,11,14 107:2 108:9,23 109:19 110:17 112:12 113:3 114:13,15,20 115:18 116:8 117:10 131:17 131:23 132:7,8 134:9

```
135:16 143:24 144:3,6
  144:17,21 151:11,14
  154:2 155:2,7,13,17,19
  155:23 156:12 158:2
  164:12 166:6,9 171:9
  175:24 176:21 195:25
  197:15 200:21 201:11
  207:14 211:15 212:15
  214:15 221:18,19
  225:12,15 231:4
  236:23,24 237:12,12
  252:18 279:6 281:3
  283:16 291:1 295:14
  295:17 296:2,3,8,11
  301:4 303:12 304:9
  308:2,4 311:22 316:24
  319:3,4 329:24 330:3
  331:1,15,15 353:14,19
  353:25 354:6 368:5
  370:5 372:5
quantify 167:23 179:3
  225:11
quantitate 171:2
```

quantity 186:11 quarantine 351:23 quarter 142:4 quarterbacking 232:6 quarterly 116:16 206:8 question 22:12 38:17 39:1 46:21 55:11 59:14 60:11 77:20,23 79:3 98:9 118:15,23,24 120:2 123:25 140:12 140:19,20 166:12 171:10,11 176:20 179:21 188:8 199:4 214:1 219:13 223:23 232:19 237:23 242:21 243:18 248:9 251:10 253:1,2 267:9 268:9,10 268:14 285:2 287:21 288:12 319:17 323:5

quantitatively 170:24

171:1

325:6 362:2 questioning 59:16 102:2 questions 11:7 14:25 16:3 35:6 37:11,11 38:11,12 46:4,16 82:6 114:8 138:25 139:2 143:18 153:23 172:4 188:7 191:2 199:19 215:3 218:6 237:9 250:22 260:15 284:21 284:22,24 298:19 307:14 319:12 337:17 338:13 quick 146:3 179:19 260:21 330:12 351:5 quickest 329:4 quickly 87:6,9 203:4

243:19 257:9 270:3 313:11 316:18 332:8 quite 39:18 64:16 113:17 131:8 174:4 196:11 242:17,19 243:8 272:23 294:14 308:4 358:15

quorum 9:3 13:19,22 381:22 382:17 quote 24:21 284:6 quotes 23:25 quote-unquote 380:17 quoting 186:9 283:21

R radar 256:24 radio 298:4 radiological 190:1 rain 174:7 309:19 rainfall 92:14 245:5 247:17,23,24 260:1 rainwater 247:21 rainy 244:22 raise 19:24 39:16 162:6 165:9 291:19 raised 165:6 203:6 raising 165:5 330:9 337:20 Ramsden 347:20,21 ran 97:24 ranch 48:14 61:18 96:14 103:2,10,11 336:4,14 Ranchers 352:14 ranches 61:13,18 81:10 102:23 119:8 123:10 140:2,3,4,8 143:22 ranching 150:10

ranching 150:10 randomly 181:24 range 54:4,9,17,19,20 56:2 63:23 66:23 105:20 129:10 138:13 154:20 240:16 243:8 336:14 375:25 ranges 54:14 304:16

rapidly 159:1 rare 76:11,22 rashes 355:6 rate 27:23 31:18 112:3 259:25 260:1 293:21 rates 161:20 293:25 rather 59:5 115:14 169:22 188:22 204:19 325:10 349:12

rapian 72:16

ratio 53:1,5,6,10,12 54:10,22,25 55:5 56:14 56:16,23,24 57:3,15 62:4,6 69:19 71:4 205:1 259:9 315:19 rationale 102:15

ratios 52:6,8 53:3,8 54:17,20 62:12,13,16 204:22 RC 195:24

re 23:23 reach 60:5 68:21 111:6 158:25 225:2 242:1 256:13

reaches 122:20 reaching 271:11 read 8:3 37:16 72:13 140:7 153:21 165:22 185:21 187:9 228:5,9 239:23 260:20 302:24 369:10

369:10 readily 105:24 188:23 reading 145:12 readings 184:11 reads 272:5 280:14 ready 7:20 153:14 156:6 238:7 312:20 383:24 real 53:22 55:7 64:2 66:9 146:3 179:19 272:13 291:7,7 332:7 reality 274:6 309:10 realization 23:15 realize 23:2 135:15 300:15 309:2 349:25 374:16 realizing 284:17 349:3 350:13 really 14:2 130:25

144:24 170:16 171:1 171:12 173:18.20.20 196:2 206:22 218:7 221:10 225:12 226:24 227:25 240:7 252:2 263:25 280:20,21 290:5 291:25 292:3 297:21 298:2.5.9.14 311:5 312:10,19,20 316:17 319:2,6,23 320:12 325:6 339:25 342:16 346:6,10 347:2 347:7,16,17 349:5 364:4 374:12,17,19 375:16,19 376:1 379:7 381:19 382:5 383:24

381:19 382:5 383:24 realm 321:13 reason 6:25 31:7 44:6 101:9 121:2 147:15 167:7 173:4 250:14 279:15 290:18,19 296:6 297:6 reasonable 45:8 62:14

reasonable 45:8 62:14 65:8 81:13,20 100:3 101:1 105:12,13,15 111:17,21 137:9 206:16,22 275:24 364:14 reasonableness 84:1

107:3 137:20 reasonably 110:5 122:5 reasons 20:23 31:8 57:5 143:25 157:9 196:21 346:4

recall 104:23 122:17 240:11 287:17 receipt 177:4 211:8 receive 90:11 164:22,25 187:17 321:6 received 74:17 104:21

113:10 117:8 241:7 271:21 288:18 294:4 296:16 364:17 receiving 23:3 32:13

84:18, 24 85:25 86:5 87:19 88:12 90:3 108:24 109:7,9 112:17 117:18,19 118:11 122:13 125:15 134:1 175:4 281:4 338:2 recent 30:18,19 45:13 53:22 69:4 153:24 168:10 212:8 240:20

332:1 364:25 recently 167:25 258:24 359:24 receptor 176:15

recess 153:7 268:2 recharge 206:2 recirculation 205:13,14 reclaim 198:6 reclamation 28:6 195:18 198:5

recognize 5:9 94:4 96:2 96:3 99:8 125:24 126:10 150:15 165:7 170:6

recognized 24:18,19 211:5

recognizes 43:5 53:13 207:25 353:11 recognizing 19:4 47:5

recollect 252:15 recommend 138:15

141:14 155:1 319:8 recommendation 7:24

9:1,6 10:23 107:12 168:19 231:21 305:16 305:21 322:4 378:2 recommendations 13:22

106:4 107:1 134:5 145:13 179:1 319:8,21 320:25 321:4 325:3 370:7 383:22

recommended 8:25 41:7 154:3 167:17 213:11 267:2 284:5

recommending 27:7 122:3 346:21 record 8:18,21,24 13:25 40:25 127:23 152:8 153:13 187:10 238:5

267:16 289:6 335:7 recorded 28:23 385:7 recorder 8:20

recording 8:20 15:14,18 recordings 8:21 records 74:16,24 75:1

242:5 292:8,15 recourse 336:11,15,25 337:11

recreation 301:20 374:25

recreational 340:3 recuse 7:15 recusing 4:18 recycled 144:6

red 25:5 26:1 29:10 32:1 184:7 185:3 292:24 355:7

reduce 6:3 17:24 24:13 57:25 58:2 59:6 61:23 62:5,24 124:12 167:13 170:8,13 174:25 175:3 177:10 247:2 251:18 272:25 273:1 278:3 286:6 325:13 333:20 376:19

reduced 55:2 116:14 171:16 313:22 reducing 53:18 108:1 131:24 159:18 247:4

reduction 15:23 35:24 62:13,14 107:17 109:12 110:16,23,24 111:11,18 112:2,3 159:19 235:19 236:8

reductions 112:21 refer 173:1 380:18 reference 79:20 185:25

313:20

221:17 332:2 357:6
referring 68:4 86:18 128:5
refers 380:11
refined 209:16 228:22
reflect 209:17
reflected 182:4 332:12
refreshing 380:7
reg 363:20
regard 132:9 229:6
231:12
regarding 40:22 180:13
206:8 238:24 261:8
265:17,19 332:16
regardless 115:19
regards 204:10 261:6
265:20 301:4 333:14
333:19
Regina 148:14 region 1:1 2:2 5:3,4 21:9
23:12 29:18 30:10 31:9
41:17,19 43:9 47:10
51:15,21 54:13,18
81:21 83:16 84:5 106:8
117:15 134:9,15
137:24 150:13 151:5
154:2.13 160:8.25
161:1,10,13 165:18,18 182:9 185:7,23 186:3
182:9 185:7,23 186:3
187:23 195:25 199:11
203:3 214:23 239:5,6
250:8 284:8 287:20
290:10 292:5 294:11
300:2,3,25 301:2,4
302:13 303:19 304:12 309:18 316:14 317:23
357:18 358:2 366:25
368:24 373:23
regional 1:1 2:1,21 3:4
4:4,22 5:2 8:9,11 9:2
10:7 17:12 32:19 154:9
155:16 211:15 213:18
214:12 216:1,16,22,22
217:7 220:7 223:4,7,17
224:14,19,22 227:11
227:16,22 236:9 241:7
279:5 297:8 301:25
353:13 364:7 365:11 366:24 368:5
regions 21:9 31:11 154:4
154:8 161:3 200:7
296:20
regionwide 49:15
region's 17:19 160:25
309:15
regression 372:13
regul 175:24 177:24
regular 13:8 65:16 136:5
322:15
regulate 32:17 275:14
298:2,3
regulated 20:9,21,22,25
22:6 163:2 317:15 366:8 367:4
regulates 136:3
regulating 151:8
regulation 20:3,8,10
235

186:7 190:24

references 40:15

referred 85:6 163:22

221:17 332:2 357:6

referenced 186:2 266:12

```
21:15,21 22:3,17 31:14
  66:9 79:9 84:19 86:25
  102:8,12 106:15,20,23
  145:4,16,19 147:18
  163:1 164:13 166:4
  175:16 177:20,23
  178:8 200:13 270:11
  273:13,14,21 282:2
  316:2 347:14 349:20
  357:18 361:4 363:16
  363:20 380:23,25
  381:2,6
regulations 19:9 20:11
  20:17 21:5 24:11
  123:22 146:22 148:25
  149:25 151:25 152:17
  177:15 283:6 309:8
  349:14 354:16 357:14
regulator 151:23
regulatory 14:17 15:21
  17:25 18:4,11 41:4
  58:1,6 63:16,17,24
  64:13 150:14 151:2
  153:25 154:5 196:12
  202:9 283:2 298:1
  348:14 352:5
reinforces 288:20
reiterate 210:22 280:10
  291.5
reject 9:6
relate 110:11 205:22
related 46:3 48:12 49:9
  83:5 111:24 116:14
  117:23 128:3,4 132:7
  136:6 152:16 157:23
  160:18 168:1 172:23
  189:19,21,22 215:10
  238:16 260:24 336:12
relates 45:17 46:6 48:20
relations 352:16
relationships 160:5,7,14
  160:21
relative 20:3.8 21:6
  50:23 61:25 96:2
  106:20 114:17 154:8
  198:3 236:6 240:18
  266:9 385:11
relatively 21:11,25 47:23
release 75:13 76:6
released 75:18,22
  272:14
relevant 51:10
reliable 169:14
reliance 343:17
relied 15:8
religious 361:17
reluctant 79:11
relying 19:14
remain 233:11,14 369:11
remaining 289:13
remarks 16:22 18:15
  282:9 369:10
remediate 375:4
remedies 188:2
remember 54:10,20
  102:24 162:10 164:6
  174:2 258:16,19 263:2
  276:7 279:16.25 280:3
  330:15 362:8,22,25
  363:6 379:18
```

remind 20:7 111:12

```
377:12
removal 24:5 352:23
remove 174:8 264:8
removed 114:16 117:17
  174:5 197:1 264:13
removes 169:6
removing 79:23 118:7,9
renew 32:9 381:21
  382:16
renewal 155:12 380:11
  380:17
renewed 150:22 382:10
  382:10.11
rent 140:21,22
rented 140:14,21
rents 163:15
reoccurring 308:14
repeat 77:22 361:15
  373.24
repeated 188:21
repeatedly 33:8
repetition 10:4
replace 263:16
replaced 115:9
replacement 293:24
report 23:17,23,25 24:7
  28:17 31:1 52:11 56:13
  71:3 74:21 79:22 83:4
  84:20 85:1 86:25 87:6
  87:8,11 90:10,17 98:20
  101:24 104:23 105:22
  109:2 110:10 134:22
  158:21 161:19 181:14
  181:22 185:25 186:7
  187:9 188:1 189:18
  203:9,13 211:9,16
  224:21 226:13,15
  229:1 244:2 249:8,10
  260:16,23 272:5 275:1
  276:17,19 294:5
  302:25 303:12 350:9
  350:10 366:20 382:2
reported 1:24 70:21
  147.2 236.9
reporter 8:19 129:16
  235:22 238:4 267:25
  314:4 385:4
reporters 1:22 6:18
REPORTER'S 385:1
reporting 33:3 50:6,8,10
  52:5 71:2 72:6 81:22
  93:3 105:16 107:14,18
  107:19,22 124:10
  130:21 131:1 162:22
  204:15 213:12 227:22
  268:13 276:14 343:11
  344:13 366:9.10
reports 65:16 79:22
  .
94:13 190:12 203:14
  211:14 212:6 214:4,7
  223:10 259:15 382:18
represent 21:14 22:6,25
  43:17 44:13,22 49:21
  91:25 109:19 113:14
  150:7,10 186:5 195:23
  239:9 263:2 271:1
  281:1 289:12 291:6
  292:24 370:11
representation 121:23
representative 140:9
```

153:16 259:3 300:12

```
representatives 51:15
                             234:2 243:10 264:5
  150:24 156:4 296:1
                             276:14 309:12 310:7
represented 42:2 164:4
                             313:12 315:14,22
  192:14 257:2 258:12
                             316:5,15 317:7 364:20
  308:19
                             364:21 367:12 381:15
representing 49:24
                             381:25 382:3,4,19
  150:6 203:2 207:8,13
                           requires 31:11,12 33:13
  221:2,4 231:13 269:21
                             44:8,11 50:19 53:1,4
  269:24 364:6 369:13
                             69:20 88:11 90:6 103:5
  371:10
                             124:1,21 125:2 134:2
represents 36:1,4 62:17
                             162:4 185:9 213:21
  144:23 311:4 352:18
                           requiring 78:16 124:13
                             313:1 337:4 364:14
repressive 343:7
request 10:24 68:10
                             370:16
  74:16,17,18 124:11
                           research 28:19 29:3 69:1
  181:21 267:10 292:8
                             69:10 105:23 172:22
  292:15
                             186:23 212:4 364:25
requested 9:17 72:22
                             365:2
requests 77:7
                           researchers 221:2
require 97:15 98:7
                           resent 369:22
  105:15 117:15 123:11
                           reserve 28:19 156:18
  132:8 133:23,25
                             282:8
  198:13 203:15 219:22
                           reserved 313:7,14
                           resident 356:20 359:16
  232:25 233:3.6 234:16
  313:10 346:22 364:22
                           residents 358:24
                           residual 174:10 250:21
  375.8
required 33:3 73:10
                           residue 174:15
  74:23 76:15 95:12
                           resilient 270:10
  116:22 117:18 122:12
                           resolution 238:25
  127:7.11.17 140:22
                           resolve 196:8 301:8
  168:11 170:15 204:17
                             342:8
                           resolving 272:11
  205:23 210:10.17
  211:5,9,11,13,16 213:5
                           resort 263:8
  215:21 226:13 234:18
                           resorts 177:3
  266:23 295:21,24
                           resource 6:22 15:3,12,20
                             16:7 143:25 169:22
  298:15 310:25 313:3
                             179:10 365:1
  313:13,17,20 314:1,8
  316:21 351:24 364:20
                           resources 151:6 156:15
  369:17,21
                             159:3 165:23 167:9,24
                             167:25 183:13 221:12
requirement 34:2,6,7
  50:9 52:13,23 70:17,25
                             223:8 240:24 271:19
  72:1 78:4 79:8 83:1,25
                             301:14 342:25 353:3
                             360:23 361:24
  85:6 99:6 116:18 117:5
  117:6,13 132:23,24
                           respect 25:3 131:5
  139:10 209:2 222:17
                             137:19 199:23
  243:21 276:24 277:1
                           respond 104:21 118:20
  280:21 281:12 282:4
                             122:15 157:19 229:3
  366:22 376:14 381:9
                           responded 117:3
  381:13 382:14
                           responding 189:6 269:6
requirements 1:5 2:6 8:1
                           response 38:12 43:8
                             84:6 110:2 113:24
  8:6 21:2 22:21,24
  34:10,25 35:11,15
                             116:19 118:17 128:3
  42:21 43:1 50:4,8,12
                             128:15 130:20 131:5
  51:8,12 54:2 59:17
                             165:10 179:20 221:23
  61:17 63:19,20 68:23
                             228:10
  69:22 78:15 79:6 80:2
                           responses 18:19 40:14
  80:3 81:11.14.16.20
                             40:16 114:8 229:1
                           responsibilities 123:12
  83:5 85:9 90:11,12
  91:8 92:25 96:12,13
                             137:4
  98:15 99:7,9,11,16
                           responsibility 120:22
  100:4 103:7 104:16
                             121:20 135:5,9 138:7
  105:9,16,18 106:15,24
                             144:5 146:23 187:5,22
  113.6 7 131.1 132.22
                             291:6 349:12 361:22
  135:22,24 136:11
                             363:22
  137:11,14,16,17 140:7
                           responsible 27:8 45:8
                             81:24 118:5 119:22,23
  140:13 154:6 157:12
  163:13 203:16,16
                             120:4,8,13,14 122:21
  204:15 205:3.6.13
                             122:24 123:14 127:2
  206:6,7 207:2 209:6,10
                             136:18,20 138:8
  209:21 213:12 217:18
                             140:15 141:6,12
                             160:19 188:4 228:13
  217:24 229:16 233:24
```

231:19 286:10 349:15
369:20 responsive 106:25
117:20 118:8 131:18 132:6 137:10 228:23
229:5
rest 9:20 12:10 101:20 145:22 182:17 232:8
290:21 307:22 366:8
restate 118:22 Restating 183:2
restoration 337:2 340:3 restore 147:20 270:13
281:3 354:18 357:19
361:6 restraint 370:9
restricted 83:8 restriction 196:25
result 56:25 57:7,11
80:25 151:10 154:10 163:1 176:3 222:6
316:4 352:22
resulted 196:4 resulting 352:25 364:16
results 88:23 107:18,19 107:22 125:25 129:13
138:19 177:22 187:4
210:18 212:11 226:20 244:14 283:25 330:8
retail 166:18,18
retaining 181:11 retardant 185:6
retention 205:22 262:1 retired 300:10
retrospect 271:12
return 161:14,15,20 172:11 261:5
Returning 346:5 returns 159:4 161:8
<b>REV</b> 347:20
reveal 373:15,16 revenue 102:18 154:11
154:17,19 161:8,10 304:24
Reverend 347:20 350:19
reverse 158:22 review 13:24 36:15 57:20
104:4,11 181:4 182:6,6 187:17,18,20 204:2
205:20 260:20 331:2
383:25 reviewed 10:4 75:10
283:24,25 reviewing 32:14 105:24
181:14
revise 124:12 revised 131:11
revising 370:2 revisions 204:10 295:21
295:24 298:15 308:9
revoke 381:9 Revolving 294:9,14
295:4 rhetoric 273:9,12
Richard 239:21
Rick 238:12 right 4:25 6:15,17 7:23
8:13 15:11,15,18 26:14 64:15 72:15 77:1,8
85:8,11 92:7 98:16
99.4 21 101.12 17 17

99:4,21 101:12,17,17

```
101:17 103:22 120:5
  124:9 125:17 127:3,6
  127:25 128:2 136:22
  136:25 137:7 138:11
  139:22 140:11 141:21
  141:22 149:8 162:14
  171:24 176:20 177:7
  178:11,19 179:6,16
  184:4,8 185:22 191:25
  192:5 193:11,16
  194:10 201:13,22
  214:21 218:2 232:3
  242:22 243:4 245:22
  246:17 247:13 249:5
  249:14 250:13,14,17
  251:1,16 252:22 257:6
  257:23 261:17 265:11
  265:13 266:20 268:17
  269:17 273:17 19 20
  274:4 277:6 284:15,18
  285:14 286:21 288:6
  288:15,25 292:22
  294:25 295:3 296:22
  297:1 299:11.13.18.19
  307:1,4 314:25 321:21
  322:8,9 323:3,19 325:1
  325:12 326:9,11 327:7
  329:3,18 330:10 338:1
  338:10 340:5,9 342:24
  343:20 348:10 349:6
  349:25 350:2,13
  355:18 358:13 361:20
  383:10
rights 146:17 350:10
Rincon 309:16
Rio 329:20
Rios 6:8
rip 281.5
riparian 16:2,5 17:11
  72:17 77:25 79:16
  80:13 113:7 198:23
  199:3 205:5 281:5
  316:18 317:6
ripple 154:12
rise 159:1
rising 25:25
risk 44:1,19,22,25 51:9
  51:11,19,22 52:24 53:2
  61:15,19 63:10 64:1
  79:13,17 96:8 97:6,7
  97:14 98:19 99:13,18
  99:20 145:7 149:17
  160:9 162:21 163:5
  168:22 169:18 197:12
  197:14 198:1 200:13
  229:25 235:7 244:17
  245.5 249.9 11 16
  251:3,5,18 253:3 261:9
  263:19 276:6 288:6
  310:10,11,20 315:4,16
  330:18 366:13,15,16
  366:18,18
risks 27:14 145:8 210:5
  220:14 222:23
Rita 335:19
river 28:5,7,9,23,24 29:8
  29:10 30:2,4,6 31:15
  45:24 46:9 61:3 111:3
  111:3,6 112:4 121:15
  261:15,16,24,24 262:7
  263:11 270:20 309:17
```

```
309:21 341:8,10,13
  377:16,23
rivers 46:8 270:15,16
road 117:25 119:12,14
roadmap 165:20
roads 119:2,16,17
  121:10 122:25 124:24
  126.6
roadways 119:1 127:9
  136:17
Robert 167:2 180:11
Robertson 5:10
Robin 335:13
Robles 189:13
robust 86:3 149:2
rock 126:3
Rocklin 180:12
rodent 270:22
Roger 2:22 18:21 195:23
  299:2 326:8
role 187:6,21,25 283:8,8
  283:9,10
roll 4:8 13:15
rollbacks 295:18
room 5:10 7:3 9:24 11:18
  16:12 39:21 143:7,8
  187:24 241:1 273:24
  274:2 280:24 287:18
  290:19 296:6 297:16
  299:15 311:25 315:24
  356:23
root 170:7 173:16.17.19
  176:14 177:2,12 178:8
  243:24 246:7 251:11
  259:17 288:1 351:7
Roques 15:24
Rose 40:5
rotate 248:7 249:20
rotated 245:1
rotating 245:21 248:25
rotation 248:2 249:2
  250:18 368:20
roughly 190:18 239:5
  242:10 243:1,7,22
  247:23 248:23 250:3
round 321:18
routinely 27:22
row 4:23 78:12 315:9
  336:5,6,13,13
Roy 376:22,24
rubber 341:8,12
rule 152:25 159:17
rules 123:22 366:11
rumor 334:4
run 39:20 192:21 308:2
  313:11 377:24
rung 375:17
running 212:24 220:20
  224:24 367:18
runoff 35:13 50:22 60:8
  60:9 92:15,24 97:1,12
  97:20 109:12 119:13
  119:16 126:6,23 127:2
  127:8 210:7,9 220:11
  336:4,17,18,20 350:13
  351:22,22 352:4
runs 120:3 318:3,9
  377:20
rural 17:16 119:17,17
  155:22 345:1
Russ 4:11,12
```

```
Russell 2:17 8:12
                             352:15,18 354:2,24
R3 380:9
                             359:16,24 367:17
R3-2011-0006 1:5 2:6 8:2
                             376:23 377:15,16
                          Sanctuary 17:15
                          sandy 332:12
           S
                          sanitation 350:3
S 2:17,19
                          Santa 2:17 3:11 25:16
Sacramento 199:15
                             26:2 30:2,3,6 111:3
saddened 358:3
                             150:6 183:5,21,23
safe 146:20 294:16
                             185:3 189:14 190:4
  348:13
                             197:21 231:8 241:12
safeguards 73:19
                             241:19 250:4 257:22
safety 79:5,24 349:22
                             270:1 300:3.7.8 303:3
  360:24
                             303:13 304:10,13
Saiz 16:13
                             305:18 307:3 308:1
sake 309:15
                             309:16,20 335:19
sales 166:19
                             359:15,16 361:12
Salinas 2:17 23:19 25:2
                           Sarah 373:21 374:1,2
  25:7 26:2 28:5.5.7.23
                          satisfies 353:11
  29:8,10 31:15 45:12,22
                          satisfy 340:14
  45:23,24 46:8,9,13
                          saw 188:21 196:15
  47:3,12,19,25 48:3,18
                             203:23 273:23 299:13
  49:4,13 59:24,25,25
                             305:19 328:16
  60:1 61:3 63:7 82:8
                          saying 24:22 68:6,7
  95:8,9 101:15 111:3
                             90:13 101:1 104:1
  119:8 121:15 126:7,20
                             119:19 120:2 121:20
  143:21 152:4,8 185:7
                             168:25 175:1 178:18
  186:1,3 187:3 241:12
                             188:10,13 197:12
  270:6,20 271:16,25
                             225:25 246:6,8,9,14
  303:2,13 304:7,10,11
                             262:23 264:20 275:20
  306:23 307:5,6 335:13
                             275:22,24 276:23
  335:20 339:6 340:24
                             279:19 280:24 288:4.5
  341:3,7,10 342:3 351:1
                             293:13 319:14 335:6
  354:4,8,13 356:21
                             341:20 342:6,7,14
  358:2 377:25 378:12
                          says 34:19 62:11 81:1
Salinas/Santa 189:13
                             88:12 108:15 124:5,5
Salsipuedes 351:20
                             124:10 125:10 131:15
salts 287:25 288:3 312:4
                             141:11 147:14 149:12
  313:18
                             182:8 196:24 206:19
same 5:23 19:6 25:16
                             219:19 237:3 240:1
  29:17 38:14 40:18 46:7
                             274:16 275:15 277:21
  51:19 80:24 81:3 83:1
                             280:16 281:13 283:24
  93:15 96:17 98:14,15
                             285:15.23 299:1 348:4
  99:16.20 102:11
                             364:9 380:11 381:2,8
  110:22 140:8 143:10
                             381:16
  149:13 173:10 190:22
                          scale 21:2 22:8,9,14 23:5
  192:8 217:24 224:16
                             23:6 125:19 137:14
  236:3 252:4 258:15,24
                             162:23 292:23 343:25
  261:20 262:3,7,21
                          scaled 81:14 275:13
  267:13 274:11.18
                          scatter 293:8
  276:8 278:8 282:10
                          scavenging 244:10
  295:2 296:20 302:6
                          SCCWRP 365:1
  310:6 316:24 331:20
                          scenario 341:23
  341:16 365:8 367:11
                          schedule 13:14 71:16
  378:7
                          schedules 33:25 35:16
sample 54:5 132:24
                             50:18 107:25 132:10
  139:24,24 188:18
                             206:15.20.21 224:9
  257:17
                             327:6 383:9
sampled 183:21 257:6
                          scheme 174:17
  257:16 292:14
                          schism 196:4
samples 179:23,23
                          school 146:7,8 184:10
  181:25 206:8 241:15
                          schoolyard 194:9
  241:15 332:18
                          Schroeter 2:23 18:2 39:9
sampling 26:22 84:21
                             41:1,2,3 55:25 56:17
  88:11,22 116:15,18
                             56:20 61:8 62:9 68:25
  133:1 139:21 187:8
                             69:8,15 70:9,16,19
  234:13,24
                             73:20 74:2 77:22 81:5
San 1:2 2:3,19 5:1,4
                             81:7 82:12.15.20.24
  148:18 150:17 231:8
                             83:3 84:1 85:18,21
  311:2,20 320:3 324:2
                             86:15,24 89:11,13,16
  324:15 327:9,15,19,25
```

89:20 94:1,21,23 95:22

328:2 345:9,9,9,17

00.17 00.5 16 21 100.3	,
98:17 99:5,16,21 100:3 100:16,21 102:21	)
139:20,23 140:6	
255:19,21 258:7,18	
268:14,18,20,22	
science 144:20 145:6	
151:8 171:6 181:7	
182:4 188:5 225:14	
scientific 28:24 171:19	
178:4 180:14 181:22	
187:11 189:15 353:5	
scientifically 174:21,23	
372:20	
scientist 15:5 16:5 287:3	3
scientists 305:6	
scope 14:14 150:22	
205:4 321:15	
scoping 205:12	
Scotts 2:18	
scratch 202:17 screen 16:24 25:5 256:3	
256:25 292:22	
screens 38:18	
screwing 379:6	
se 300:19	
sea 143:19 145:3 270:25	
271:2 378:16,17,23	
searches 181:23	
season 241:22 242:2,3,9	)
242:15,16 244:23	
246:19,20 249:23	
287:23	
seasonal 53:25	
seat 39:16	
seated 4:23,25 16:4 17:8	,
18:3 39:23 40:5	
seats 11:14,14,15,16 39:14,19,21 268:4	
seawater 195:2,11	
second 120:7 127:22	
128:1,5,7 157:17	
287:16 293:18 329:9	
368:10 381:7	
Secondly 169:16 202:10	
seconds 265:12	
secret 181:18	
secretly 315:25	
secrets 72:23 75:3	
section 17:10,10 18:5	
40:6 103:20 109:2	
164:10 213:5 380:10	
380:18	
sectors 221:2 348:25	
security 181:18 sediment 43:23 44:18	
69:24 72:3 78:6 97:22	
98:3 108:14 113:6	
131:15 210:8 211:2	
264:4,7 273:2 279:22	
282:3,4 311:14 313:18	
313:22 316:22 331:11	
336:8,12,17,22,23	
337:1,4,9,21 338:3,9	
338:15,16,19,19,25	
339:10	
sedimentation 30:23	

131:14

316:14

sediments 97:4 287:10

25:4 26:1 28:4 29:11

371:11

service 124:20 180:21

see 10:16 11:14 12:8

29:14,19 30:3 32:2 37:17 39:14,15 45:23 45:24 46:8 54:7 56:1 57:20 64:23 80:3 83:24 95:23 102:15 142:24 161:24 185:8 189:18 195:12 218:16 219:1,3 219:3,6 220:3 221:21 223:13 226:5,7,10 242:15 243:4,7,12 249:10 256:16 281:11 281:12,15 292:17,23 293:3.11 294:9 296:15 300:23 302:2 307:2 309:6 311:3,5,8,22 320:7 321:20 322:6 324:23 339:19 340:1 348:25 365:19 378:4 378:25 380:3 seeing 22:1 221:15,24 271:10,11 348:10 seek 163:15 349:7 seeking 104:15 187:22 376:2 seem 23:4 55:14 177:24 178:2 216:5 278:8 seems 23:5 87:13 88:2 193:9 370:15 seen 20:5 102:13 182:20 185:1 204:1 221:22 303:18,20 305:3 329:5 335:21 341:4 381:16 selective 21:13 317:22 selectively 193:7 self-contained 351:21 self-funded 229:22,23 self-selected 372:2 sell 162:11 seminar 332:2 354:6 Senator 144:4 send 26:19 138:12 288:4 senior 2:23,23 18:3 41:3 341:25 347:21 sense 49:20 103:16 146:22 195:19 199:12 202:8 257:13 262:22 309:23 316:17 321:9 321:10 349:4 381:19 sensitive 130:16 181:16 sent 12:23 72:14 230:6,7 273:6 sentence 260:21 separate 40:21 163:9 . 164:19 separately 300:10 354:8 separating 130:24 separation 196:22 September 308:7 350:11 series 46:4,16 72:8 168:11,12,15 181:1,2 serious 21:22 22:10 27:12 31:21 150:24 180:14 276:4 319:5 357:7 seriously 329:25 serve 283:14,15 299:23 300:1 358:1 369:23 371:9 served 300:11 308:6

256:23 258:23 284:1 services 159:13 211:20 serving 8:12 session 382:24 set 9:18 58:23 73:21 91:5 149:24 158:10 165:21 207:21 209:10,12 217:18 220:15 230:14 251:17 255:24 256:21 257:3,10 258:14 272:22 273:6 275:25 281:22,22 283:6 290:25 309:8 342:24 343:2,20 372:9 385:6 sets 217:1 258:2,8 **Setter** 106:13 setting 42:7 185:18 207:1 208:19 245:19 286.1 seven 146:25 203:2 221:15 273:17 several 14:19,20 18:11 20:14,18 28:11 30:14 33:19 36:25 72:12 95:9 99:9 104:18,19 107:10 111:2 117:8 126:17 132:12 143:20 150:23 164:19 192:23 238:15 255:25 258:22 311:24 350:6 371:9.16.21 380:20 severe 22:10 23:13 84:4 293:11 316:13 severely 32:7 145:13 severity 43:8 45:9 51:20 70:1 81:25 109:22 134:7,8 sha 195.6 shallow 25:15 26:6 27:4 173:16,17 184:4 256:16,16,18,19 259:2 332:10,12 shallower 252:23 Shanta 16:7 shape 133:23 221:15 **share** 184:15 207:20 283:12 300:9 301:3 330:10 348:1 359:20 359:22 360:20 361:24 shared 144:5 214:22 235:16 342:25 343:6 343:21 360:4 sharing 113:24 221:13 300:6 330:7 shear 330:5 shed 186:24 sheet 40:19.22 **sheets** 40:10 She'll 350:10 shield 227:24 shift 200:24 shifting 163:8 200:14 254:2,4,7,8 Shimek 269:18,19,20 272:3 282:13,15,18,20 284:21,22,24 285:5,11 286:12,15,21 287:4 288:15,17 294:6 295:22 359:2 **shocked** 358:3

short 157:18 212:24

299:25 303:22 319:24 shortcoming 373:8 shortcomings 171:19 shortcut 299:9 shorter 109:20.23 **shorthand** 385:4,10 short-term 358:16 shoulder 358:19 shoulders 363:2 should've 39:22 show 34:17 45:5 53:21 61:20 79:23 81:3 89:22 107:16,17,25 110:11 112:10 127:18 183:5 189:15 191:6,9 193:13 193:19 231:18 235:19 254:22,24 258:22 279:22 280:3 285:16 327.18 19 332.19 showed 20:6 31:13,14 102:24 189:23,23 191:9 193:15 247:8 253:22 271:14 294:6 332:6.16 372:24 **showers** 377:13 showing 29:8 30:20 36:11 45:11 256:3 301:7 318:21 332:9 shown 42:3 46:9 85:20 148:24 200:13 309:22 312:6 314:24,25 317:1 **shows** 25:6 29:3 31:2 53:23 79:18 84:23 96:7 96:10 184:17,18 185:8 190:22 201:3,8 241:18 242:6 259:4 **shutting** 134:12 shy 330:7 sic 239:18 sick 355:6 sicknesses 355:12 side 39:15 61:3,4 102:10 102:10 198:8 257:22 258.88 sidedress 351:6 sides 146:10 356:6,7 376.4 side-by 257:21 side-by-side 108:25 sift 328:24 sign 12:4 146:13 210:23 signals 122:9 125:25 126:11 349:7 signed 113:18 295:22 signers 230:8 significance 24:19 171:8 significant 22:24 23:20 23:21 28:20 35:23 43:12 83:18 96:4 186:12,18 188:19 192:8 197:17,25 226:8 290:16 309:11,24 372:15 375:22 significantly 109:14,18 205:11 247:25 317:10 321:13 351:11 simazine 200:9 similar 22:20 29:5 36:24 48:22 49:10,12 50:3,13 70:23,25 73:20 81:15 81:19 94:12 102:12

106:19 110:8 122:25 180:23 185:8 203:4 208:25 229:24 266:13 266:24 366:18 similarly 52:3 204:14 350.6 **Simmons** 207:13 Simon 152:3,8 354:8,12 simple 272:23 334:15 346:7 simplified 232:3 simplifies 42:17 45:19 48:23 81:10 209:21 simply 33:10 52:9 87:24 98:11 100:12 130:14 159:12 174:22 263:16 264:12 266:23 267:5 282:1 288:5 312:15 316:1 317:11 365:11 since 11:12 17:2,13 28:21 59:24 92:9 103:25 190:6 203:20 213:1 240:15 289:10 295:18 304:8 308:3 309:3 318:25 323:6 347:24 355:3 366:6 370:3,18 382:8 Sincerely 365:9 single 87:11 146:7 183:24.25 188:19 293:16 312:21 315:15 382:6 singled 330:17 SIP 44:8,11 46:24,25 116:5 Siquoc 183:22 sir 199:21 377:2 379:10 379:10 10 **Sisquoc** 184:16 sister 342:13 368:17 sister's 342:10 sit 12:17 39:19 223:12,20 site 31:24 40:15 56:6 113:21 168:9 174:25 179:5 184:4 204:21,22 239:20 292:17 311:7 384:2,4 sites 31:3,4,16,17 112:16 112:17 303:12 311:4 site's 312:18 site-specific 42:4 67:12 71.20 situation 24:10,15 25:17 29:17 42:18 65:11 74:12 257:12 272:21 341:19 345:16,18 346:5 350:5 352:2.6 situations 196:18 267:7 six 184:18 211:8 221:15 224:22 225:9 260:7,10 262:12 378:22 Sixteen 299:12 sixty 368:24 six-county 300:2 six-foot 190:16 size 42:7 43:16 102:3 105:9 114:16,18 197:16 199:24 239:8 314:16 330:5 366:14 **skewed** 372:1 skills 181:13

skin 355:6,7	l
slide 49:13 50:2 52:8	
53:22 54:1 95:22 172:7	
185:20 192:22 237:3 253:22 271:14,23	
273:23 277:25 279:18	
307:8	
slider 274:1 slides 45:5 69:13 82:7	
178:23 189:3 257:22	
258:22 289:20 294:4	
332:7	
slide's 258:8 sliding 275:3	
slightly 22:19 275:5	
slim 123:9	
<b>slough</b> 17:5 28:5,13,16 28:18,18 46:10 121:16	
125:13 270:19 353:23	
Slow 235:23 236:1	
small 27:21 81:17 92:22	
96:9 146:7,9 149:4,10 149:12 150:8 163:3,4	
184:15 188:18 243:15	
259:11,13,13 292:4	
293:14,17,20 294:15	
294:24 303:22 305:17 305:20 334:17,18	
360:9,11 363:8 367:25	
368:1,17,18,19 369:16	
smaller 43:6 96:3 99:2,6	
99:8 134:16 183:16 292:4 306:17 343:25	
smoke 312:13,16	
snack 319:15	
social 155:20 221:3 300:16	
socially 159:8	
soil 14:12 55:13,14,14,18	
55:22 56:1,16 57:9	
59:23 126:3 131:13 150:9 167:20,23 168:2	
168:4,11,12,14,24	
169:2,11,13,15 170:6	
174:4 179:23 180:1,3 188:4 190:15,16	
204:23,25 222:4	
242:14,17 244:7 245:4	
245:6 246:1,16 330:12	
351:5 sold 162:14	
solely 316:16	
solidarity 148:17 363:14	:
solution 135:20 278:25	
279:1,2 280:11 340:8 347:17 356:9,13,16	
383:20	
solutions 135:10,11	
155:22,25 157:12	:
187:1 218:8,16,23 220:9 222:1 346:12	
363:24 365:18 378:6	
solve 136:14 316:6 319:3	
341:5 373:4 375:19 Somach 207:12	١,
some 6:22 19:3 21:22	ľ
22:21 23:11,13,20,20	
26:15 28:8 30:1,7 34:24 35:10,12 37:13	
39:10 43:6 53:16 55:18	
57:12 59:4 9 60:8 9 24	

57:12 59:4.9 60:8.9.24

```
62:3,7,24 64:15 71:11
  78:20 82:7,17 86:13
  89:2 91:9,13 92:24
  93:14 94:5 95:10,10
  96:21,22 101:25 103:2
  103:3,19 104:11
  105:24 107:5 108:22
  109:4 113:4,16,22,24
  114:3,5,5,7,8,22 117:1
  117:12,17,21 121:13
  123:13 125:4 126:1
  128:4 130:22,22 131:3
  131.6 9 19 132.15
  133:13,24 134:19,22
  141:24 142:22 143:14
  147:13,15 152:9
  157:23 159:14,22
  163:11 173:15 174:1,9
  177:5 187:21,22
  188:12 189:21,22
  196:16 200:16 201:8,9
  202:15 203:5,19 204:8
  204:9,21 205:7 207:17
  209:7 216:21 220:18
  222:12,15 226:2
  228:23 229:3,3,4
  230:13,23 231:18
  232:4 238:22 239:24
  240:19 242:15 246:14
  250:19,19,21 254:5,5,6
  254:17 255:6,9,22
  256:12 257:9 261:17
  263:3,3 264:5,9 265:2
  265:3 269:22 270:6,8
  270:10,13,15,21
  271:13,13,17 272:6,6
  275:19 276:19 277:12
  277:15 279:9 282:9,22
  282:23 291:18,18
  297:22 301:3 302:24
  303:17 308:12,14,22
  308:23 309:2,12,17
  311:9 313:11 315:9.10
  315:22 320:6 326:4
  329:21 331:19 332:6
  337:2 338:2 345:3,5
  346:1 347:1,8 351:3
  365:10,15 367:20,23
  368:15 370:18 371:18
  374:16,17 376:16
  378:16,16,21 380:19
  381:12 383:5,16
somebody 118:25
  124:24 147:14 286:17
  341:20 370:19 378:24
somehow 75:23 122:9
  250:16 253:18 263:19
  299:7 304:24
someone 19:11 81:1
  90:24 221:17 227:16
  264:17 268:11 330:23
  337:14 339:10 357:5,5
  362:16,25 368:7
  380:24
something 16:24 26:13
  58:16 66:15 81:2 89:7
  90:19,25 91:12 93:5
  101:2 102:4 111:22
  128:22 136:23 138:17
  173:13 208:21 213:24
  214:11,16 217:7
```

```
220:20 223:7,16
  240:15 248:25 263:8
  264:15 269:9 280:8
                             379:23
  281:20 288:21 291:23
  298:13 310:9 321:12
  321:15 334:5,19
                             376:4
  342:12 346:24 347:6
                          speaker's 7:2
  369:7 373:2 383:24
sometime 320:11
sometimes 129:22 273:9
  346:7,9,10,15
somewhat 93:15 164:23
                             364:21
  164:25 326:6 334:4
                          specialists 69:5
  352.5
somewhere 121:22
  177:6 200:8 273:17,20
  333:25 344:1
                             130:10,19
son 318:1 342:9
soon 318:16 355:12
  382:24 383:3,7
sooner 320:1
sorry 25:4 40:7 41:18
  72:10 94:23 97:18
  103:4 164:23 183:24
  274:24 278:13 285:18
  286:15 314:5 358:18
  366:15 374:1
sort 171:18 202:9 241:20
  367:23 372:1,17
sorts 14:12
sound 24:3 357:24
sounded 117:4 371:5
sounds 236:2 337:24
  338:1
source 17:19 19:15
  58:22 59:10 79:19
  122:10 185:24 186:2,6
  186:18 187:2.7 193:10
  202:12 218:18 239:15
  260:24 262:14 263:24
                          specifics 96:22
  281:4 292:11 294:16
  312:6 355:23
sources 27:6 50:5
                             94:3
  122:20,22,25 128:19
                          specify 176:1
  155:15 158:18 181:24
  184:9 186:18,25 189:1
  192:9,12 255:11 261:3
  316:13 365:4,6
south 13:7 30:2,11
                             352:3
  183:22
southeast 194:9
southern 183:22 184:17
                             383:11
  300:13 365:2
                          spot 142:23
space 87:8
                          spots 355:7
Spanish 6:11 268:8,13
  268:25 269:1,4,4,10,15
  269.16
Spanish-speaking 16:16
                             162:24
spanned 113:17
                          spring 54:3,8
spe 104:11
                          springs 92:14
speak 9:23 82:3 114:5
  141:24 143:4 150:5
  151:22 157:6 196:10
                             173.23
  234:3 289:15,18
                          sprouts 126:19
  316:18 322:25 327:22
                          square 261:14
  327:24 342:22 345:3
                          squeeze 322:14
  357:4 363:7 370:25
                          ss 375:25
  383:2
speaker 6:2 7:1 9:14,23
                          stable 160:7
  9:25 129:18,21 130:1,5
```

143:7 150:2 153:15,19

```
251:8 298:21,24 299:5
  299:12,14,17,20 324:4
speakers 9:16,22 10:3
  11:9 323:21 324:7
speaking 152:3 192:9
  305:17 373:22 377:6
special 24:16 155:4
  181:19 256:4,17
specializing 51:13
species 128:9,23 129:2,6
  129:8,10,12,14 130:8,8
specific 24:12 35:5,5,6
  37:10 38:11 44:9 45:5
  50:11 51:25 53:3 56:6
  56:7,22 61:17 71:13
  77:22 81:9 88:10 94:7
  94:10 103:11 104:12
  108:12.15 115:23
  121:6 123:4 124:1
  125:1,9 130:14 131:20
  131:25 175:1 190:11
  197:20 198:18 200:21
  203:16 204:21,22
  205:1 226:3 238:15
  281:15 310:19 311:21
  312:11.24 314:1 338:2
  344:20 375:25
specifically 50:15 53:4
  53:25 62:11 72:21
  118:9 124:8 131:20
  150:19 177:12 189:15
  192:12 206:19 238:23
  344:15 361:1 374:23
specified 132:2 209:3
specifies 56:21 84:9
specifying 176:5
spend 116:25 369:22
spent 20:19 159:18
  300:20 320:4 334:19
spoke 114:13 116:2
  128:16 131:8 235:14
spray 92:16 351:25
sprayed 341:15,17
spread 101:15 150:12
spring-fed 92:12
sprinkler 60:15 169:24
St 4:6 104:2 156:9
stack 5:12,13
staff 2:21,23 3:4 5:7 7:24
```

10:7,22 11:6,20 14:19 14:20,23 15:1 16:21 24:6 36:15 39:22 40:5 42:22 44:6 46:15 47:6 47:10,18 48:14 49:10 49:19 51:12 52:20 54:1 58:17 61:6 64:5,14,24 64:25,25 65:1,3 66:1 66:14 68:5,13 69:15 70:8 71:24 73:5,11 74:2 75:5,9,11,20 77:9 77:15 79:21 80:19 83:3 83:4,4 84:15 87:2,9 102:4,22 104:23 105:22,23 107:7 109:2 110:10 118:25 121:5 121:21 123:20 128:25 132:18 134:22 139:2 140:13 149:1,6 150:24 151:2,9,13,16 164:1 178:12 180:15,22 181:14,22 182:2,8,14 182:17 183:4,18 184:13,14 185:8 186:19 187:10 188:1 189:18 190:3 193:6 196:4,19,23 197:24 207:18 209:19 215:18 215:18 217:8 227:16 228:23 229:1 231:23 232:23 234:5 238:20 238:23 239:3.11 240:1 240:7,10 244:3 246:10 249:8,10 253:22 254:14 255:13,15 259:16 260:4,23 262:17 263:13 264:14 267:2,7,12 268:10 275:1,4 276:7 279:6 297:22,23 298:14 308:20 310:3 315:5 317:15 319:19 320:8 320:18 321:4.4 322:5 324:20 325:3,16 329:10 331:14 332:2 334:13 337:18 338:13 338:24 339:19,25 340:5,16 348:17 352:11 359:12 369:14 370:7 383:22 staff's 11:1 26:12 41:7 45:16 46:5 48:19 49:14 53:17 84:6 106:17 110:17 144:23 145:12 153:24 157:24 165:14 184:17,25 187:14 188:11 201:23 214:24 228:9 330:17 331:7,25 352:19 353:2 stage 58:13 166:24 staggering 134:21 stakeholder 308:6 371.10 11 stakeholders 19:17,23 33:9 104:18 105:23 107:1 149:18,22 155:9 stand 11:15,18 287:20 289:18 297:23 343:19 344:12 standard 25:12,24 29:11 29:12,14,22 32:20 52:4

57:21 59:1 63:12 66:4
78:9 87:18 88:17 94:14
110:18 112:12 114:10
129:3,8,21 133:21
134:1,4 175:5 183:18
184:23 201:11 240:13
254:20 268:7 272:1
365:8 372:25
standards 32:23 33:14
59:3,12 66:8 68:1 70:4
80:15 89:24 90:4,9,14
91:4 108:9 131:23

91:4 108:9 131:23 132:7,9 134:3 154:5 155:3,8 176:6,7,15,18 176:21 184:25 226:11 237:12,13 252:18,18 255:5 296:2,4,8,11 343:10 344:16 353:5 standing 11:13 39:13

100:13 212:7 227:13 237:4,6 281:25 standpoint 164:15 Stanford 361:9,10 start 64:17 84:4 89:2,6

123:11 127:21 138:22 153:3 220:18 226:10 235:24 245:19 268:9 275:5,23 311:25 341:20 343:23,25 349:3

started 12:21 60:25 87:23 102:2 146:12 320:16

starting 17:6 18:13 99:12 104:17 200:8

104:17 200:8 starts 39:11 82:5 377:15 state 4:21,22,24 6:14 8:17 18:7,9 24:7,17 30:24 31:1,20 32:19 80:11 90:10,20 119:12 126:21 154:8 157:5 167:9 183:13 186:23 199:14 212:16 257:1 294:9,14 295:4,9,9 296:18 297:10,12 342:3 350:15 364:25 371:17 385:15

371:17 385:15 **stated** 102:7 156:16 303:8

statement 10:19 170:4 252:1 272:5 291:8 statements 276:7 367:20

374:5 **states** 23:14 30:13,15 155:12 185:21 189:10 278:15 333:14 350:4

statewide 31:3,14 289:24 290:4 296:19 state's 301:23,23 302:1 stating 203:11

statistics 303:11 status 163:6 stay 148:1 263:6 289:9 290:22 359:22

staying 364:3 stays 110:22 stenographically 385:8 step 65:1 219:5 298:9

348:15 steps 53:18 360:21 Steve 16:13 268:9 269:20 294:5 295:21 346:21

Steven 305:17 stewards 188:4 stewardship 266:21 stick 263:13 still 22:6 29:1 61:5 80:15 83:10 08:19 20 107:1

till 22:6 29:1 61:5 80:15 83:10 98:19,20 107:1 123:6 135:1 142:25 157:19 181:11 202:15 216:14,15,16,23,24 217:10 240:16 257:7 260:6 273:7 285:8 295:20 315:20 323:22 325:4 368:22,24

370:14 stimulus 355:15 stip 281:18 stipulate 175:17 stood 287:24 stop 65:24 172:6 18

stop 65:24 172:6 180:9 199:22 277:12 stopping 343:6,7

storage 184:5 store 162:14 349:4 stories 180:21 storm 14:6 15:25 17:11

20:16 21:25 22:2 151:3 stormwater 50:22 97:12 97:20 119:7,11,13,14 119:15 120:12 126:8 205:3 206:3 210:8 274:10 336:18 351:22 364:7,15 365:11

story 148:18 360:20 straight 174:20 194:9 249:18

straightforward 38:10 strategies 357:10 strawberries 53:7 92:20 238:16,24 239:4,6,12 240:1 241:4 242:11 244:4 245:1.3.15.16

244:4 245:1,3,15,16 246:7,23 248:14 249:11 251:21 252:2 253:3 261:9 288:1 strawberry 3:6 10:10

60:14 92:19 126:18 135:13 136:13 181:21 189:7 231:6 238:2,13 240:5,12 242:24 243:10,25 245:9 246:11 248:2,8,19 249:21,24 252:11,13 253:7 259:5 261:12,15 261:19,20 263:1,6 286:7 287:17,20 288:9 368:11

stream 72:2 78:8,13 102:18 110:12,25 112:17 312:19 336:19 336:21 337:25

streams 31:2 44:12 122:21 270:15,16 281:21 283:20 309:20 309:21 316:1

Street 2:9 streets 119:3 stricken 276:24 285:3 strike 266:7 strikeout 208:10 219:9 striking 364:13 stringent 309:13 310:5 310:23 364:20 strip 133:13 281:23 strips 334:11 stroke 309:8 strokes 317:10 strong 147:20 349:14 354:17 357:19 361:5

373:7 strongly 238:18 319:2 structural 338:6 340:3 structure 162:18 225:19 225:20 275:18 279:8 structures 336:17 strungle 345:11

struggle 345:11 struggling 19:8 students 146:9

studies 84:16 85:14,19 149:10,13 189:11 190:13 254:23 256:4,6 256:7,8,17 260:4 305:5 312:6

study 31:13,14,16 54:16 166:15 182:20 186:8 239:11,14 244:15,19 249:15 256:1 258:12 272:14 283:22 316:12

stuff 288:17 291:18 368:25

stuff's 334:1 stun 370:24 sub 36:14

subject 59:9 80:19 84:21 120:11 162:22 163:6 208:24 209:5 210:14 210:19,23 216:16 217:5,17,21 317:6 submit 5:17 9:23 34:2

35:21 36:8,9,14 37:12 37:14,15,18,19 38:1,2 38:5 67:17 70:17,22,25 72:22 74:12 80:8 90:10 90:17 152:7 211:5,9 214:7 216:1 237:19 239:23 310:25 314:8 330:25 333:19 334:12 334:15 335:3,9

submittal 113:11 submittals 10:5 submitted 5:21 6:5 34:3 34:14,14,15,15 36:10 36:17,17 38:8 45:13 48:11 49:6 51:17 57:18

48:11 49:6 51:17 57:18 63:5 65:15 70:7 71:9 72:5,8 74:15 104:8 105:25 106:6,8,11,18 112:24 116:10 131:7 148:9 152:12 211:14 215:21 228:21 229:17 235:15 236:4 244:2 268:11,23 328:4

submitter 76:8 submitting 35:4 37:23 73:2 153:20 269:7 subsection 380:10 subsequent 15:9 260:2 subset 37:25 38:4 51:6.8

52:19 69:20,23 71:22

subsoil 251:13 substances 108:14 278:14 342:1,5 376:1 substantial 23:23 24:23 154:7 351:2 substantially 189:17 substantiation 188:2

substituted 129:23 substitutes 128:11 subtly 181:10 sub-watershed 223:25

sub-watersheds 212:9 succeeding 375:14 success 144:4 281:7 successful 330:7

successfully 110:7 suction 351:6 suddenly 124:15 125:5 suffer 55:22

sufficient 161:15 349:19 suggest 243:23 259:16 264:19 266:11 274:3,4

276:12 337:16 377:8 suggested 254:4 suggesting 57:12 58:16

90:24 216:8 244:9 253:19 275:10 suggestion 75:7 172:8

276:20 279:14 285:9 285:12 323:23 suggestions 113:15

322:11 324:22 suggests 173:7 252:2 258:2

suite 1:2 2:3 86:5 117:2 summarize 10:3,22 41:10 104:5 352:7 summarized 132:13

summarizes 49:13 50:2 summary 18:16 40:14 48:17 105:4 132:12 212:10,11,12,14 226:19 243:6 244:1 265:14 272:15

summer 383:23 summing 171:18 superior 199:16 353:12 353:18

supervising 15:2 supervisor 152:4 153:11 354:11

supervisors 354:7 355:10,11

supplemental 40:10,19 40:21 supplementary 168:7

supplementary 168:7 supplies 24:5 25:14 137:5,5 303:5 supply 25:3,17 114:9,25

115:2 134:11,12,24 135:3 256:1,10,11 276:3,6 291:24 310:22 353:25 371:17 support 65:12 79:14

112:25 147:18 155:9 161:17 180:15 218:14 238:18 261:1 274:14 274:22 295:16,20,23 295:23 296:12,13 297:23 343:15,17

347:17 354:14,16 357:14 359:1 361:1,4 361:20 363:14 370:25 375:1,5,7 376:17 supported 187:13 188:11 334:16 supporting 187:19

343:19 374:24 supports 115:24 214:22 214:25 331:24

supposed 123:23 148:4 337:10 339:2 341:3

supposedly 278:9 sure 12:14 58:2 66:17 74:25 75:9 76:1 80:5 120:1 125:8 127:1 141:1 191:3 201:6

214:14 217:3 220:24 223:9,17 228:9 229:8 235:9 236:16 255:6 265:2,2,3 275:8 279:5 286:23 290:6 328:7 367:1 370:20 372:19

377:10 surely 118:25

surface 14:10 17:3 19:25 28:2,3,8 29:15,20 31:22 34:6 38:23 43:20 43:22 44:17 45:2 47:7 47:9,14,16 50:20 51:2 82:13,20,23 83:21 86:7 111:2,19 112:7,8 114:15 117:18,18 122:19 133:21 135:7 136:1,7 151:17 186:15 233:8 272:24 278:10 283:17 295:17 310:14

330:24 332:13 **surfacewater** 51:24 206:10 213:8 233:9,10 259:21 264:13 265:21

259:21 264:13 265:2 275:14 278:7 surfacewaters 273:1 Surfrider 373:22

surprised 318:20,20 380:24 surround 185:3 surrounded 146:10

185:12 survey 154:17,21 189:5 189:8 306:9,10,18,19 surveyed 242:4

Survival 162:4 susceptible 341:25 suspect 344:21 suspected 344:13 sustain 153:23 362:19

sustainability 153:23 155:5 266:13,18,21,25 267:2 313:8

sustainable 3:10 10:14 44:5,6 116:1 144:21 225:15 290:23,24 299:7,25 305:20 357:15

swap 346:2 swapping 347:4 swings 317:18 switch 28:2 38:18 311:18 316:1 376:5 switching 39:12 279:12 280:8

swung 318:25 symbols 183:18

syndrome 27:12 synonymously 170:20 system 27:16 28:9 43:14 50:7 95:24 159:25 160:11 161:2 167:20 169:6 173:16,18 183:12 197:7 250:19 251:22 275:6,23 277:16,18,19 293:17 310:1,4 337:12 344:20 355:11,14 363:1 systems 53:5 173:24 212:2 284:9 292:4,5,18 292:25 293:14 348:22
Т
T 2:18 table 104:24 112:6 168:21 274:25 TAC 167:17 168:19 tack 311:4 tailwater 48:13 96:24,25 97:2,10,17,19,22 98:14 100:15 310:12,17 313:10 331:6,8 take 4:8 11:8 46:4 53:18 58:1 63:24 64:17 67:22 68:8 82:21 85:2 102:6 103:18 112:4 113:22 119:7 121:15,15,16,17 142:2 144:16 145:1
147:6 149:18 152:23 165:11 183:20 216:24 219:19 221:15 228:17 231:25 239:23 244:14 267:25 268:4 284:6 286:17,24,25,25 287:1 287:1 288:10 296:17 315:2 319:3 335:1,3 340:13 349:16 354:20 355:24 356:3 359:6,6 360:21,24 369:18 370:17 378:8 381:17 <b>taken</b> 2:9 63:24 133:15 137:18 152:20 153:7 158:17 163:24 183:12 192:17 208:5 228:21 242:13,20 268:2

306:13 317:16 329:24

332:18 374:19 385:5

135:21 138:21 152:4

142:15 218:9 254:12

331:16 349:11 363:23

talk 13:2 20:2 23:11 28:2

50:18 52:7 72:12,16

258:21 261:11 274:24

281:13 290:24 293:23

295:22 307:21 310:1

320:21 339:1,17,25

talked 23:24 27:19 57:19

61:1 106:15 114:6

118:3 136:16 137:9

204:9 228:10 251:10

177:24

tension 274:5

tens 111:18 133:2

340:5,6,16 380:4

91:13 101:2 134:7

208:7.12 209:13

259:6 317:9 325:11

takes 45:6 56:2 81:8

256:12 314:12

taking 26:13,15 41:14

385:10

```
272:10 291:4 302:19
  321:17 335:24 336:10
  336:10 377:14
talking 19:3 20:4 22:22
  23:9 35:17,19,23 59:24
  77:16,24 78:1,3 119:6
  126:23 138:5 139:16
  140:14 176:13,14
   186:14 218:10 221:1
  223:25 224:1,2 225:4
  246:10 249:6 268:5
  272:18 277:14 287:8
  287:11 293:5 295:7
  313:2 362:9 368:8
talks 273:9 280:17,18
tangible 32:11 65:20
   138:19
tankers 185:6
tanks 14:6 184:5,9
tap 360:7
tape 8:20,20
tapping 355:19
target 54:12,21,23 55:1,6
  55:8,9 61:24 62:1 67:4
  67:14,22 71:4,6
targeted 221:22
targets 53:20 69:19
  315:19
task 297:15,19 341:1
  362.8
tasked 156:19 381:4
tasks 161:19
taught 171:6
tax 154:11,19 377:9
taxpayers 158:20 186:23
  343:19
Taylor-Silva 209:25,25
  214:21 220:24 225:8
  229:8 231:3 234:3,10
teach 213:23 227:4
team 116:6
technical 51:13 53:9
  65:12 69:1 110:5 167:2
  167:8 172:23 181:6,15
  181:16 211:20 218:14
  258:23
technicians 211:21
technology 155:4 330:2
tell 12:3 57:2 74:5,14
  75:15 144:15 147:15
   148:19 173:6 198:10
  198:14,24 201:8
  209:23 223:14 227:4
  295:2 318:5,6 325:3,19
  327:10 334:1 366:11
  368:8 371:8 373:14
telling 78:18,21 249:20
  250:2
tells 296:5
Tembladero 270:19
temperature 51:3 69:25
  72:2 78:6
temperature-impaired
  316:23
ten 18:8 139:17 140:3,4
   140:4 166:19 224:2
  256:20
tend 25:14 161:23
```

```
ten-minute 268:1
term 109:24 110:2 115:9
  211:12 217:6 223:6
  225:3,4 298:12 346:13
terminate 211:16 213:15
  214:8 227:8 323:6
terminated 214:9
termination 210:19,23
terminations 211:16
terms 6:22 13:11,14,17
  14:2,4,8,14,15,17
  16:20 20:17 27:17
  33:12 57:15 64:7 66:23
  96:6 105:13 106:14
  107:6 113:5 114:4
  125:3 131:3 148:23
  149:15 172:25 173:24
  209:24 229:14 242:19
  243:8,9,11,23 250:20
  264:7 266:11 302:12
  315:13 322:4,5 362:4
terrain 193:14
terrible 200:12 348:11
Tess 207:8,12 231:10
  267:13
test 128:9 129:21 130:2
  130:18 205:16 351:5
tested 26:25 181:24
  183:8 188:14
testify 180:13
testimony 5:11,13 8:18
  10:21 12:15.19 156:19
  254:3 294:1 297:17,18
  361:14
testing 26:24 120:19
  127:1 129:2 185:10
  233:7 252:20 330:12
  343.16 353.13
tests 129:9 279:23 351:5
text 34:9
thank 6:13 7:19 11:3
  12:6 18:21 72:13 130:6
  138:23.24 145:21.24
  145:25 146:2 147:22
  149:25 150:1,4,5
  151:18,19,21 152:25
  153:1 156:1,2,3,10,25
  157:1 166:10,11 172:3
  179:14,15 180:7 188:6
  190:25 191:1 195:21
  198:2 199:18 202:23
  202:24 218:2,5 225:7
  228:2 238:2 246:3
  251:24 252:25 260:14
  267:8,22 281:7 284:19
  284:20 288:16,22
  289:15 298:17.18.20
  305:22,23 307:15,16
  307:24 319:10,11,13
  329:7,19 333:8,9
  335:10,11 342:18,19
  344:22,23 347:19
  350:17,19 352:8,9
  353:20,21 354:21,22
  356:11,16,18 357:12
  359:9,10,11,13 361:7,8
  363:23,25 364:3
  367:13,14 370:20,22
  373:18,19,19 376:20
  376:21 379:9,13,24
```

382:20,21 383:11

```
384:6
thanks 40:4 195:20
  233:23 374:3
that'd 115:19 153:5
their 12:2 23:9 26:22.22
  26:25 28:19 31:14
  33:17 35:7,13 37:21
  38:2 55:17,22 56:6,7
  56:11,13,16,22,23
  57:10 68:20 87:9 91:4
  92:14 97:6,11 101:19
  103:6 108:10 109:25
  109:25 110:3 115:19
  116:25,25 118:4 119:3
  119:4 122:24 123:2,10
  123:21 126:25 127:8
  131:24 132:1 134:21
  136:9,16,21 146:23
  148:18 150:25 155:6
  158:16 161:9,25 162:8
  169:20,23 181:3
  182:18 184:11 185:5
  188:2 190:6 196:19
  201:8 203:11 204:6
  208:25 210:16,19,20
  210:24 211:10,21,22
  213:10 214:15 217:7
  220:1,2,14 224:14
  226:22 229:19 230:13
  231:25 235:7 236:12
  237:19 242:5 244:15
  247:2.2 253:7 271:20
  276:16,17,17,18 280:3
  286:8 288:9 289:12,14
  292:11,13 297:23
  302:15 308:19 310:17
  328:11,23 329:1
  330:24 331:5 332:22
  335:25 336:10,16,16
  338:20 339:1 341:21
  341:21 343:18 347:14
  348:17,18 351:16,21
  351:25 355:7.9 359:25
  360:24 364:15 365:19
  378:12
themes 308:14,17
themselves 56:9 108:20
  113:14 203:15 204:13
  216:9 283:20 305:8
  311:18 343:18 374:19
theory 331:25
therefrom 205:18
they'd 60:12 101:23
  210:14,19 211:15
  263:12
thing 40:9 62:10 68:17
  81:3 99:20 142:12
  167:10 170:5,18 171:1
  171:4,12 173:9 174:20
  177:8,14 193:11
  239:15 258:24 260:9
  263:14,21 264:11
  274:19 278:23 282:10
  293:7,25 297:2 310:9
  311:16 312:21 315:1
  316:24 318:25 319:6
  341:16 356:8 358:13
  362:17 368:10 372:11
  378:5 381:2
things 18:24 33:7 34:8
```

37:13,24 39:12 68:15

73:17 78:18 80:4 85:23 121:9 124:14 134:6,7 148:20 167:6 171:23 173:17,21 174:2,18,24 180:2 197:13 198:8 200:20 202:4,8,17 219:12,21 221:11 230:3 232:16 259:24 270:4 276:13,19 277:16 278:3 280:25 282:24,25 283:3,18 290:4 298:5 309:13 312:1 314:14 320:6 329:22 334:17 336:24 340:2 351:17 370:5 375:1 376:16 381:11 382:10 think 12:24 20:5 24:21 24:23 26:14 35:23 55:15 58:10 64:8 65:1 65:3 66:11 69:9 75:16 77:6 80:17 82:10 83:20 86:17 92:18 93:10 96:7 100:24 101:3 102:4,7 102:11 111:17 116:16 118:14,16 120:24 121:5 123:15,17,24 125:13 127:21,25 135:15,18,20 136:12 142:17 147:25 148:4 149:6 153:2 160:17 176:12.20 177:11 178:11 183:3 187:24 192:8 196:7 197:13 200:19 201:7 202:12 216:3,5 217:13 218:13 219:12 221:17,19,25 222:13.19 223:2.7 224:22 225:20 226:24 228:22 230:12 232:2 232:10 233:20 235:16 237:17,18 238:19 239:3.25 253:25 254:3 254:13 257:20 258:18 259:13,15 260:3 266:10 268:10 269:6,8 271:12 273:17,18,20 273:22 274:8,8 275:19 276:3 278:19 281:2,5 281:16 282:4,5 283:2 285:11,25 286:1,3,7 287:6,14 288:5,7,20 291:19,21 294:21,22 295:1,8 296:5 297:3,21 298:12 299:14 308:13 309:6 313:4,6,7 314:13 316:7 317:14 318:19 318:21 319:1 320:5,17 320:22 322:15 323:5 325:3,25 326:9,14 328:15 332:2 333:21 334:25 337:16,19 338:11 339:14 341:7 341:23 342:9 346:21 347:1,24 349:1 351:7 351:14 355:22 357:22 363:12 367:10 368:1,4 368:6.12 369:1 371:6 373:2 376:6,17 377:7 377:10,11 378:24 379:16 380:23

thinking 84:6 91:24	
294:22 319:25 320:9	
321:8 323:20 341:20	
342:14 368:12 369:7	
369:23	
thinks 58:18 66:15	
third 17:7 152:4 208:3	
212:14 213:13 216:10	
217:2 228:8,12,13	
230:9 293:25 365:24	
365:25 366:3	
third-party 207:17 208:1	
208:13,25 209:2,4,7,19	
210:4 211:4,6 212:18	
213:5,15 214:3,5,9,10	
214:25 217:12,14,21	
218:13,20 219:1,14,15	
219:18,22 220:5,15,19	
222:22 223:16,21	
224:17,20 225:19,20	
226:13 227:2,8,9,12,18	
234:7 365:22	
<b>Thomas</b> 2:22 5:6 15:16	
16:21 18:14,20,21 23:8	
38:22,24 39:1,4,7 50:1	
57:17 58:12,15 63:1 64:10,12,18,20 65:6,8	
64:10,12,18,20 65:6,8	
65:22 67:1,3,8,10 68:3	
68:12 70:22 77:12	
78:25 79:4 84:16 85:9	
85:12 87:15,20,22 88:4	
88:8 89:4 92:1,4 93:4	
93:13,18,22 120:1,6	
129:4,7 130:7 132:19	
134:2 139:13 140:18	
141:3,8,11,18 195:22	
195:23 199:20,21	
200:3,19 201:2,6,14,18	
201:20,25 202:3,24	
218:7 222:1 232:18,19	
232:21 233:1,3,22,23	
234:8,12,19,23 235:11	
236:22 237:11 257:11	
324:9,11,15 332:5	
333:4	
though 20:25 22:5 73:5	
80:1 135:1 197:19	
266:22 308:11 316:10	
340:6	
thought 178:23 219:11	
228:6 253:22 289:18	
319:14 320:14 334:12	
334:15 338:15 339:21	

359:4

325:12

thoughts 170:3 322:22

thousand 43:22 44:2.2

44:16,20,21,25 48:2,5

95:7,11,17,20 96:11

100:10 101:11 102:16

133:15 143:20 145:10

277:5,6 306:25 307:4

311:13 314:16 315:12

197:22 262:5 264:1

310:13,19,21,22

thousands 14:5 36:14

thousand-acre 61:1

95:18 139:9.16

133:2 136:5,5 292:4

330:21 369:2

```
81:25 102:9,11 114:13
                           114:14,20 134:11
                           137:15,16,23 298:7
                        threaten 91:2 160:14
                           162:8
                        threatening 105:11
                           382.2
                         threatens 117:10
                        threats 160:25
                        three 9:20 10:8,17 22:16
                           31:19 42:24 52:21 62:4
                           93:13 96:16,20 97:21
                           117:7 129:11,11
                           130:24 131:2 137:10
                           146:10 167:19 171:7
                           183:20,25 185:8,23
                           186:3 196:24 214:23
                           239:5,6 248:3 267:18
                           269:1 273:15 284:3
                           294:2 306:11 310:2
                           319:17 328:15 332:4
                           332:17 355:4 366:25
                           373.23
                        three's 187:23
                        three-tier 168:18
                        three-year 306:19
                        threshold 91:9,10 284:4
                        throes 335:22
                        through 13:1 29:6 46:4
                           72:8 86:25 93:1 98:23
                           104:20 125:15 142:8
                           144:17 155:3 167:16
                           168:16 169:10 175:19
                           209:7 216:10 219:10
                           227:6 232:3 237:25
                           241:13,14,24 242:2,2
                           242:14,17,23 243:3
                           247:15 259:18 260:5
                           299:13 300:3,7 313:11
                           313:20,25 314:6 318:3
                           318:10 321:22 328:24
                           333:13 336:18 343:3
                           349:20 352:4 372:9
                           383:14,25
                        throughout 130:2 151:4
                           154:13 168:2 203:3
                           206:18 308:8,9 317:23
                           333:13,14 350:14,15
                           350:16,16 367:8
                        throw 279:3 4
                        thrown 341:15,17
61:14 94:19,23,25 95:5
                        thunder 377:13
                        Thursday 1:13 2:10
                        thyroid 27:15
                        tie 237:11 253:14
                        tied 169:13 197:12,15
                           339:21
                        tier 22:15,16,18,18,19,19
                           22:20,24 34:22,23 35:9
                           35:9,9,10,11,11,15,20
                           35:20,20,21,24,25 36:2
                           36:3 37:18,19,25,25
                           38:4 43:17,18 44:5,13
                           44:22 49:7,8,8,20,20
```

threat 20:23 21:14 22:1,7

22:25 23:23 24:23

43:3,7,17 44:7,13

25:13 26:20 42:6,25

45:17 46:5,17,18,22

47:5 48:7,20 49:22,25

50:10,23 58:3 81:14,18

```
49:23 50:2,8,9,12,15
  50:19,23 51:6,9,22
  52:15,19 53:1 60:25
  61:11,16 69:20,23
  71:19,22 78:4 81:16,19
  81:24 89:9,10,13 91:6
  91:6,7,7 93:24,25 94:6
  94:10,17 95:1,20 96:11
  98:6,10,18 100:13,19
  101:19,20,21 103:6,9
  103:12 108:12 109:7
  114:11 116:12,15
  131:25 133:4,4,5 139:7
  139:9 140:5,23 163:6,7
  171:23,24 197:22
  209:5,6 216:19,19,19
  217:15,17,18,25
  233:18 261:19 262:2,6
  262:21 263:12 17
  264:5,6,6,9,9,10,10,11
  264:12,13,13 266:15
  266:15,15,15 267:4,4,4
  275:1,9,17 276:6,6,8
  276:12.14.25.25 277:2
  277:6,8,10,10 278:12
  279:3,4,7,23 280:5,7
  281:19,21 288:9
  300:22 310:4,5,5,6,9
  310:15,16,23 311:19
  312:20 313:7.15.19
  314:7,10,12 315:13,15
  316:11.15 317:2
  330:21,23 338:15,18
  346:22,23 347:3,3,5
  366:13 368:12,14,22
  369:5 375:15,21,24
  376:8,14
tiered 42:22 337:12
tiering 41:9 45:8 81:11
  81:13,14 83:12 84:13
  95:24 102:23 114:2,4
  114:11 197:7,11,15,18
  199:23 204:12 261:12
  262:10 263:22 265:21
  274:25 275:18 276:2
  277:17 279:8 310:1
  375:20
tiers 22:16 41:9 42:24,24
  43:10 45:18 46:6 48:21
  49:5,14 89:9 114:4
  130:25 131:2 137:10
  137:12,12 172:1
  197:20 209:11 265:25
  266:4,4 310:2
tile 133:9,10 198:3,4,7
tiling 60:2,7,9
till 293:4
Tim 241:5
timber 20:8,13 21:8,10
  21.12
time 5:23,24,24 6:1,3 7:2
  7:4,7 8:4 9:5,15,16,17
  9:18 10:2,25 12:12
  15:22 20:19 29:9 33:2
  35:15 40:8 50:18 53:19
  65:4 66:20 68:15 75:5
  83:17 88:10,21,24 93:2
  93:3 95:4 107:24
  108:10 110:13 117:9
  131:23 132:9,9 141:17
  146:19 150:19 156:21
```

```
167:17 173:22 175:16
  199:9 206:15,20,22,23
  207:19 208:16 212:24
  213:17 214:19 215:25
  217:8 219:10 224:8,16
  229:2 230:17 239:23
  256:12 258:12 265:25
  282:6,8,9,11 286:20,24
  287:13,18 295:2
  307:22 308:21 312:8
  319:6,16,18,19 320:4
  320:22 322:18.24
  325:11 326:20 327:15
  327:22 328:19,24
  329:5 334:14 336:20
  348:16 358:21 362:3
  367:10 369:14,22
  370:16 378:21 383:19
  385:6
timeframe 110:21
  157:18 192:15 218:25
  223:24 224:5,6 256:20
  258:13
timeframes 105:13
  109:20,21 110:8
  258:15
timelines 349:21
timely 87:5 182:3 375:5
timer 10:23
times 11:4,7 29:12,13,16
  29:21 30:14 31:19 62:4
  132:20 135:14 137:13
  138:18 141:5 166:16
  166:19 170:22 182:19
  250:9 270:3 284:4
timing 173:21
tiny 184:16
tissue 19:13 30:12,21,24
  56:11 351:5
title 34:20,20
TMDL 16:9 18:8
TMDLs 40:7
today 5:15,16 6:21,23
  8:21,23 9:10,13 11:25
  12:2,10,12 13:11,13,18
  13:20 14:19,23 16:20
  19:8 21:15 25:2 34:23
  37:6 39:10 40:25 80:6
  104:14 134:19 138:2
  144:15 148:17 150:6
  153:21 156:19 167:7
  179:4,11,22 180:13
  185:4 189:23 203:23
  204:9 207:21 208:14
  209:17 231:11 232:4
  237:23 238:1.14
  254:22 260:18 270:21
  271:15 273:8 282:12
  282:17 286:20 290:19
  294:2 297:16,22 298:9
  300:20 305:3,9 308:13
  309:7 310:7,15,16
  313:14,19 314:3,7
  316:22 318:21 320:11
  320:14,20 322:14
  323:8 331:6 344:2,6
  345:6,8 347:9,13,18
  352:14 356:25 363:3
  365:13 368:11 369:12
  374:11,20 377:6 379:8
```

164:20 165:23 166:10

380:6 382:24 383:12 384:5 today's 5:8 7:15 13:13 13:20 317:7 380:13 together 78:24 151:14 155:15 163:21 168:6 196:2 221:1,5 231:9,9 231:14 357:11 361:21 361:23 362:19 363:4 365:18 told 64:25 296:1,10 341:2 360:4,6 Tomlinson 238:9,11,13 248:10,13,20,22 249:5 249:19 250:1,3,13 251:15 253:1,25 254:13 255:6 259:15 260:8,11,13 265:2,13 265:17 266:19 267:17 267:20 tomorrow 273:10,11 383:9 Tonia 1:24 2:10 385:3,21 tons 182:10,11 191:6,19 191:23 297:17,17 tool 172:16,18 265:17 346:19 tools 52:4 172:17 264:2 334:21 335:1 346:14 toothless 318:17 top 22:9,14 34:18 46:10 101:8 104:1 181:17 239:25 253:15 302:14 302:21 topic 116:13 topics 113:18 topography 150:9 topwater 60:15 torn 348:25 total 16:8 17:20 38:2 40:7 52:5,9 53:11 54:11 56:13 61:13 82:10 98:20 122:17 127:12 154:23 155:14 177:9 242:1,5,8 273:13 275:16 284:2,9 301:16 301:23 totally 277:4 285:7 286:10 335:9 totals 61:13 182:9 touch 60:24 132:19 206:11 225:9 tough 358:25 tour 315:2 tourism 344:10 357:17 toward 53:18 towards 46:10 69:12 193:15 town 184:17 327:2 378:3 toxic 31:3,4,5,5,5,17 43:15 82:23 83:21 108:14 114:22 148:25 149:9 271:6 272:23 274:17 278:5,9,14 279:12,25 280:9 285:23 286:2,5 316:1 316:14 toxicity 30:25 31:1,7,21 32:5 43:20,23 44:17 45:3,15 46:3,15 47:1 47:17 48:9,18 49:10

51:5 83:6,15 84:4,7,17 84:24 85:14,17 86:8,16 87:14 88:1,11,15,15,16 115:11,25 128:9,14,19 129:8,13 130:15,18 201:1,4,7 210:7,8 262:11,15,17 263:24 265:5 271:9 277:17 278:2,7,20,21 279:11 279:21,22,23 280:7 283:19 287:7,8,15 311:14 313:18 314:19 314:25 315:21 316:6 316:14 343:17 376:1,1 376:11,19 toxics 278:18 282:3 toxin 344:13 toxins 149:7 trace 167:7,14 240:10 track 13:17 128:13 329:12 trade 72:23 75:2
trade 72.23 75.2 tradeoff 142:14
tradeoffs 159:23
transcribed 385:8 transcript 2:9 385:10
TRANSCRIPTS 1:12
transferred 203:13 transformation 144:24
transformed 203:8
translators 6:10 16:18 transmittal 269:12
transplant 248:19
249:24 transport 79:25
transports 336:23
traps 270:22 travel 34:12
treat 272:20
treated 19:5 25:19,20,22 138:1
treating 19:6 26:21 27:18
134:13 293:16 353:13 treatment 26:22 27:24
134:25 136:1,8 210:12
212:2 347:12 trees 337:6 368:1
tremendous 175:21
trend 62:23 372:4,8,21 373:12
trespass 339:11
triangle 184:7 tribes 290:2
tributary 261:17
tried 19:22 102:1 228:23 229:2
trigger 347:2
triggered 125:7 205:13 triggers 347:2
triple-checked 260:18
trouble 16:25 180:6 troubling 185:19
trucks 341:14
<b>true</b> 88:8 98:17 136:19 140:6 193:12 198:23
295:13 312:3 330:25
346:17 358:11,14 385:9,16
truly 75:2 76:16 295:14
295:16 trumped 362:14

```
251:17 255:21 289:12
  289:13 294:16 322:14
  328:14 334:10 356:12
  356:16
trying 12:22 55:16 99:8
  135:1 138:11 142:23
  170:8,9,16 172:13
  176:6 178:6 196:8
  209:10 221:11 250:9
  253:14 264:15,16
  270:11,13 271:17,19
  273:7 314:5,6 326:14
  327:3 342:8 358:13
  363:7 367:6 376:17,18
tsunamis 298:6
Tulare 202:6 256:9
turbidity 32:3 43:24
  44:18 69:24 72:3 78:6
  92:15 97:4 313:18.22
  316:23
turbidity-impaired 97:23
  98:4 311:14
turn 132:17 141:6 160:12
  162:13 187:2 240:19
  251:13 349:1
turned 141:5,8 271:18
  320:16
turning 170:5
turns 166:17,19
twenty 11:5
twenty-plus 72:14
Twenty-seven 25:17
twice 76:19
twisted 181:11 187:4
two 5:3,4 7:12 11:5 12:22
  12:24 13:6 14:19 18:25
  78:17,17,18,23 80:4
  82:21 83:23 84:3.4
  96:20 98:12 100:7,8,24
  102:10 104:16 110:12
  116:17 118:2 143:11
  143:11 144:25 146:6
  148:25 149:1 169:4,12
  177:1 189:11 200:5,11
  229:1 232:23 256:20
  257:21 258:2 259:22
  259:24 262:14,18
  263:7 264:25 265:20
  265:23 266:4 279:23
  279:25 287:5 292:21
  299:3,17 304:3 312:24
  314:14 315:25 316:16
  319:22 327:1 332:4
  340:2 341:4 344:16
  346:19 354:7 355:17
  356:5 358:7 359:18,23
  360:14 375:24 378:5
  382.8
type 21:12 37:17,20
  38:14,21 39:4 55:13,14
  55:14,22 56:1,16 57:9
  57:9 59:17 60:12
  101:23 130:15 204:25
  216:1 217:6 224:8
  228:7 248:3,12 249:23
  264:22 266:2,5 312:19
```

trust 320:12

379:7

truth 181:11 240:4,4

try 91:14 118:23 146:3

196:2 219:25 220:20

```
typed 374:5
                           unduly 352:20
types 42:10,11 54:13
                           unemployment 154:14
  60:19 66:7 94:14 122:5
  129:1 130:17 150:9
  277:2 310:19 374:25
typical 14:3 111:2 130:2
  261:12,19
typically 74:11,14 118:12
  230:5 245:12 256:5,11
  331:10 369:16
           U
ultimate 111:7 167:14
  296:6 362:23
ultimately 59:2,8,12
  113:2 134:2 135:18
  140:15 160:19 165:4
  172:12 177:3 301:9
  362:14 370:16
umbrella 227:24
un 312:4
unable 65:24 161:16
                             350:2,3
unacceptable 63:10,10
unavoidably 161:2
unbiased 261:1
uncertainties 160:13,14
                             361:19
uncertainty 206:8 275:21
uncomposted 312:5
under 37:12 55:1 89:19
  117:12 119:3,13 120:6
  129:22 148:14 155:10
                             172:22
  163:13 164:18 197:18
  198:13 213:18 234:14
  243:14 252:12 278:19
  306:8.8.12 364:15
  370:14 372:22 381:6
  382:2,4,7 385:14,14
underestimated 145:14
underestimates 25:13
  26:5
undergoing 49:3
underground 14:6 184:5
underlie 159:21
                             382.16
underline 275:11
underlines 208:11
underline/strikeout
  275:11
                             107:24
underlining 219:9
understand 11:19 16:17
  48:19 66:13 90:23
  100:5 120:2,16 121:8
  122:1 140:18 145:2,18
  146:15 149:17 154:16
  170:19 171:7 209:10
  218:11 221:6 226:5,24
  228:25 231:24 232:6
  246:24 280:20 303:21
                             311:6
  330:16 332:11 353:2
  354:11 359:5 369:14
  373:3
                             244:3,4
understanding 79:7
  94:17 145:5 164:17
  182:4 218:17 246:5
  259:7 321:12
understood 160:22
```

170:18 229:18 239:20

undertake 145:8

undertaken 297:8

undertaking 66:18

undesirable 352:6

undue 123:15 295:7,8

```
unending 198:20
unfairly 363:2
unfortunately 87:4
  214:17 289:10 301:8
  371:4 382:7,12
UNIDENTIFIED 129:18
   129:21 130:1,5 143:7
  153:15,19 251:8
  298:24 299:5,12,14,17
  299:20 324:4
unique 14:2,3,8,14 19:4
  19:5 42:14,20 107:5
uniqueness 105:18
unit 15:13 16:9 40:7
Unitarian 347:22 349:24
  359:14 361:10.11.19
United 3:9 23:14 30:13
  30:15 189:9 278:14
  299:6,25 333:13,14
Universalist 347:22
  359:15 361:10,11
Universalists 349:24
universally 347:3
universe 183:16
universities 305:5
University 157:5 168:23
unless 5:17 11:15
  102:12 135:20
unlikely 159:12 184:11
unpardonable 295:1
unpredictability 266:3,5
unsafe 146:14
unsustainable 291:2
  348:22 363:1
until 9:25 65:4 138:21
  159:17 178:1 229:1
  247:25 355:8 382:16
unusable 358:7,8
unwork 107:13
unworkable 107:11,13
upcoming 334:5
update 144:23 268:24
updated 7:25 152:15
updates 204:11
updating 12:20 211:24
uploaded 72:9
upper 23:5 182:20 184:4
ups 160:10 254:12
upstream 30:6 184:20
uptake 56:8 180:4
  241:14,20 242:10
uptaken 241:11,24
up-gradient 126:8
up-slope 202:16
urban 20:16 21:25 22:2
  364:15,16,19 365:5
urge 149:24 151:12
   152:1,23 298:2,14
  353:15 362:21
Urgency 137:21
urgent 137:21,22 138:9
```

**USC's** 301:24 use 24:2 43:19 45:1 47:10,18 48:12 49:18 51:5,18 54:16 55:17 82:9,11 83:8,10,12,23 86:20 87:1,9 92:15,21 92:23,24 107:8 110:1 114:17,19 129:4,11 131:10 137:3 144:6 163:9,17 172:13,16,17 172:18 173:8 176:22 179:4,10 182:24 186:10,11,13 188:22 189:9 196:16,22 197:10 198:15,25 200:1,14,18,24 206:10 207:4 240:8 242:5 243:3,8,21 244:13 247:2,2,8,11 262:20 263:10 264:2 275:7 286:8 287:9 294:14 310:17 316:3 322:23 330:3 341:9 342:25 351:9.12 352:5 357:20 365:22 366:14 370:17 374.9 used 10:23 13:3 30:21 31:9 38:16 60:17 95:2 95:4 102:20 106:1 118:12 126:15 128:13 129:8,22 130:2,8 183:18 185:4 187:10 192:14 193:7 194:25 242:8 243:7,23 252:21 257:6 270:4,5,9,17,18 336:4,19 342:3 378:20 useful 310:3 users 28:1 343:21,23 uses 42:10 44:15 70:4 108:9 163:16 185:5 270:14 290:15 366:16 374:24 375:2,6 **USGS** 254:23 371:19,20 using 8:20 11:25 27:5 55:18,20 60:12,14 82:16,17 86:23,23 87:2 87:7,12 88:25 100:16 169:22 171:25 179:7 188:21 196:17 202:13 228:7 235:5 246:23 247:6 263:22,23,25 264:25,25 311:17 312:24 366:5 **usually** 248:3 Utilities 27:23 utilize 151:7 206:24 330:6 utilized 172:25 204:23 U.C 167:24 168:13 239:21 240:25 241:6 305:18 U.S 129:19 189:4,8 284:5 306:6 350:9

#### ٧ validity 205:17 valley 2:18 25:2,7 51:15 59:25 95:8,10 101:16 143:21 144:13 183:5 184:17 185:7 186:1 190:13,20,21 229:23

271:16 283:23 294:7
297:1 303:2 304:7
307:5 342:3 348:7
350:7 351:1,12 354:5 372:11
valleys 186:3,11
vallies 309:25
valuable 163:14 value 149:20 152:17
159:13,25 163:17
164:3 283:12 301:24
302:1,12 362:14,15,22 values 362:9,11,11,11,13
362:13
variables 14:13
variation 14:10 242:6 varies 254:1
varieties 241:4,11
variety 41:12 83:5 150:9
various 14:21 56:3 57:4
67:18 84:17 85:14 135:25 321:16
vary 248:10
vast 36:25 38:15 64:13
253:6 254:22,24 vastly 172:1
vegetable 51:14 245:21
vegetables 55:8 245:2
245:22 248:16 249:1,3 302:9
vegetate 337:6
vegetated 280:13 281:6
281:18,23
vegetation 79:9,16,16,23 199:3 205:6 281:3
vegetative 78:10,12
174:10,11 241:16
vehicle 242:21 267:3 vehicles 159:11
vendors 160:6
Ventura 300:1,3,11,12
309:17 315:16 verifiable 116:4
verification 50:9
verified 16:17 180:20
181:22 191:4 verifies 44:8
verify 52:13 56:23
239:14
version 261:8,8 305:14 versions 308:22
versus 103:9 112:15
142:14 262:16 273:13
293:10 298:23 very 6:13 12:13 13:6
14:21 19:16,18 21:8,12
25:5 29:5 30:3,7,9,9
32:15 36:23 38:14 42:4 43:7 50:3 54:9,20 64:2
66:6,9 78:9 80:4 83:10
84:21 87:4 96:9,25
113:16 122:2 123:9 135:14 143:23 145:24
146:2 149:23 151:18
157:1,11,13 159:1
160:1 161:1,5,9 162:1
165:10 166:10 167:10 168:10 170:19,25
174:25 175:14,15
179:14,21 190:25 196:1,3,8 198:4 202:10

214:24 215:2 218:2 219:5 221:3,3 222:25 224:24 235:16 243:24 245:4 247:6 252:16 257:8 259:11 263:10 266:13,13,24 270:3,23 274:24 276:15,19 287:21 288:16 290:16 290:19 291:2,13,22 293:2,14,18,25 294:18 297:8,13,15,18,18,19 297:19 298:20 301:6 302:6,9,14,16 304:21 305:22 307:16 309:7 314:1,10 317:23 318:6 319:4,13,22 329:7 332:6 333:9 335:21 345:24 346:2 348:15 348:15 349:10 355:6,6 356:4,4 357:1,9,13,17 357:24 359:9 360:7,18 367:3,25 368:18,18,18 368:19 369:17 375:17 379:9 382:20 384:6 vested 137:7 via 34:16 50:6 268:24 365:17 viability 160:15 viable 144:22 225:16 vice 180:24 238:11 VICE-CHAIR 2:17 vicinity 79:12 111:22 332:21 video 8:20 view 45:22 46:7 73:11 175:23 221:18 views 19:18 vineyard 7:15 44:4 92:23 95:1 97:3,22 116:6 vineyards 44:7 46:25 96:25 violate 90:8 178:3 violating 89:23 90:13 91:4 223:18 violation 141:13 216:25

### W

voluntary 215:16 224:10

volunteer 215:19 353:24

vote 13:25 322:3 323:12

vulnerable 235:8 291:11

323:13 383:24

292:6 303:6

349:18 371:23 373:10

230:14,20 234:14

virtually 188:19

virus 337:5

visited 350:6

visual 301:6

278:11 voiced 309:9

volume 51:3 volumes 244:12

virtue 98:11 99:24 100:9

vision 366:25 367:1

visit 359:24 360:1,4

vital 143:24 169:2

vocabulary 277:15

W 2:22 wait 162:13,15 325:15 345:6 379:14,14

waiting 103:21 142:14 284:9 waive 381:12,16,17 waived 12:2 waiver 1:4 2:5 7:25 8:5 19:21 21:1,3 22:20,21 32:14,16,25 33:24 34:19,24 90:11,18 106:3,17 124:21 125:1 145:2 150:22 155:10 155:12 157:6 185:21 187:11 225:10 273:15 273:16,18,20 369:21 372:11 375:8,8 380:9 380:25 381:5,14,15,21 381:24,25 382:7,16 waivers 131:19 380:11 walnuts 368:13 369:5 want 5:20 7:4,5,12 11:11 11:15,18 13:5 23:10 55:19 57:10,14 58:7,8 59:19 65:2 66:11,17 72:12,13 76:1 89:5,16 89:18.19 91:6 92:20 93:16 94:15 107:6 108:3 109:3 110:11 112:19 118:17.22 125:8 127:1 134:7 135:16 139:8 142:7 143:24 149:15 151:23 160:16 171:1 175:10 178:7 195:10 207:10 207:16,20,23 212:16 220:22 224:19 229:7 230:21 237:25 238:17 255:12 257:25 267:17 267:25 268:4 272:12 272:25 276:22 277:11 277:12,24 278:3,5 282:16 289:1 290:22 290:23 292:23 293:3 296:7,7 297:15,22 300:9 302:20 307:20 308:12,21 310:10 311:1 313:11 314:11 314:20 316:18 319:24 322:6,12,24 324:5 325:15,16,18 326:7 328:20,21 333:17,24 334:2,3 335:18 337:2 340:10 341:19 342:10 345:23 348:20 359:11 360:25 361:15,16 362:6 363:9,14 367:21 369:8 370:25 373:4,4 376:6 379:5 380:3 383:11 wanted 20:2,6 40:24 62:10 65:22 68:17 84:3 107:21 141:24 148:20 177:10 224:13 235:13

235:25 238:15 242:23

249:7 261:11 289:17

290:25 291:4,9,16,22

295:12 296:17 329:21

345:3 351:17 359:20

359:21 360:20 364:3

371:13 379:19 382:5

wanting 227:18 333:17

wants 207:5 220:17

292:21 293:7 294:3

318:19 War 185:4 Ward 342:21,21 344:24 warnings 30:16 warranted 63:25 washed 271:3 washes 271:6 wasn't 196:1 waste 1:4 2:5 7:25 8:6,6 20:20 21:19,22 42:5,25 43:2 51:1 62:15,17 63:19 70:3 71:15 78:7 78:11 80:10 90:6 7 10 90:11,11,17 93:8 94:13 105:14 107:16 108:10 109:25 110:3 123:3 131:16,24 132:1 159:3 203:9,13,14 278:13 349:11,12 381:9,12,15 381:25 382:3,4,18,19 watch 34:20 water 1:1 2:1,16 3:8,9 4:4,21 5:5 8:9 10:12 14:6,8,10 15:2,10,12 15:20 16:1,7 17:11,23 19:15,15 20:16,20,22 21:7,14,19,20,23,25 22:1,2,5,9 23:1,11,18 24:1,2,5 25:3,12,13,15 25:17,19,22,22,24 26:6 26:11,20,22,23,25 27:2 27:5.8.10.18.19.22 28:2,3,9 29:5,10,12,20 29:21 31:22,24 32:10 32:20,23 33:4,14 34:4 34:7 35:11 36:8 38:6 41:14,14 42:6,15,16,25 43:3,7,8,14,18 44:9,14 44:17,23 45:9,17,21 46:5,17,22 47:6,7,9,14 47:16 48:7,20,22,25 49:22,25 50:5,10,16 51:1 53:17,19 58:4 59:3 60:15 63:12 64:1 66:8 69:12,21 70:2,3 71:8,9,13,17,23 72:4 72:21 80:2 81:12,15,15 81:18,25 82:1,13,20 83:9 85:25 86:5,7 89:25 90:3,3,6,8,13,15 90:21 91:3 92:13 98:2 103:19 105:6,7,8,11,14 107:2 108:8,23 109:19 110:17,18 111:2 112:12,17 113:2 114:2 114:9,10,15,20,25 115:2 18 116:7 13 117:10,18,19 118:11 120:20 122:13 124:16 125:15 129:23 131:17 131:23 132:7,8 134:4,8 134:14,19,20,23,24 135:4,5,7,16 136:1,7 136:22,25 137:4,25 138:1,4,6,14 140:9 143:24 144:3,5,7,17,21 146:6,13,16,17,19,20 147:4,13,13,17,20 151:3,10,14,17 154:2 155:2,7,13,16,19,22

156:12,15 158:2

164:12 166:6,9 167:9 167:24 169:10,16,18 169:20 170:22,24 173:18 175:5,19 176:16,21 183:5,8,13 184:1 185:9,13,14 190:5 193:4,15,17 194:21,22 195:16,25 197:15 198:6,15 199:3 200:6,20 201:11,17 202:5,12 206:3 207:14 211:15 212:15 213:5 214:15,23 216:1,9,16 221:18,19 225:12,15 231:4 236:23,24 237:12,12 240:23 241:4 242:22,24 243:3 243:8,9,17,21,23 244:12,13 246:21 247:2,8,11,19,22 250:20 252:14,17,18 252:20 254:20 255:5 257:19 264:17 268:6 269:25 270:5 271:14 271:19,20 272:1,20 276:3 279:6,22,24 281:3,4,25 282:2 283:10,15 284:1,2,4,9 284:15 288:17 289:5 289:17,23 290:3,6,7,12 290:16,25 291:10 292:18.24 293:21.21 293:23,24,25 294:9,11 294:14,16,25 295:4,5 295:17 296:2,3,7,8,8 296:11,22,24 297:1,9 297:25 298:11,16 300:25 301:3,4 303:5,9 303:12 304:9 308:2,4 311:15,21 316:24 319:3,4 329:24 330:3 331:1,15,16,19 332:10 332:11.12.15 333:15 336:18,20 341:9,9,11 341:14 342:25 343:7 343:22 345:16,16,18 345:19 347:7,18 348:10,13,22 349:17 349:25 350:3,12,14 353:3,13,19,19,25,25 354:5,12,16,18 355:22 355:22,24 356:1,10 357:20 358:4,9,10 360:5,6,8,13,17,21 361:3,6 362:5,16,17,19 365:1,2 366:24 368:5 370:5,23,23 371:1,9,10 371:17,17 372:5,25 374:25 377:11,20,22 378:13 379:4,6 380:10 380:18 waterbodies 83:16 111:25 122:19 125:13 125:14 126:15,22 131:16 150:19 314:22

316:23 317:4,6 374:14

374:22,23 375:23

waterbody 37:22 43:14

43:15,22 44:17 45:2

47:23 48:2,5 69:24

376.9 12

78:6 111:14,20 115:11 115:14,20 264:18 279:21 310:14 313:17 313:25 314:18 watered 318:16 waters 29:15 31:2,23 32:13 43:20 80:10 82:23 83:21 84:18,25 87:19 88:12 90:8,9,20 108:24 109:7,9 111:3 112:7,9 122:15 133:22 134:1 137:8 188:4 278:14 281:10 283:18 302:20 365:3 374:9 watershed 17:5,9,14 22:1 96:17 125:19 221:4 307:25 308:3 366:25 367:2,7,8 377:15 watersheds 96:18 111:4 126:2,4 212:9 270:6,7 270:14 309:14 366:18 waterway 119:22 270:24 waterways 118:4 270:21 Watsonville 1:14 2:10 4:6 11:24 12:1,7 92:9 144:14 241:12,19 351:20 361:13 Watsonville/Salinas
250:5 way 7:5 12:10 21:8 25:19
46:23 55:19 58:22,23 61:10 66:12 73:19 75:25 78:9 80:14 85:1 89:10 91:5 99:23 102:8 125:7 128:20 133:23 142:8 197:3,3 207:5 225:23 254:7 257:25 270:4,8,17,18 271:18 279:10 280:8,14,14 285:21 288:9 293:4 311:6 318:15,19 322:13 327:25 328:20 347:8 348:8,22 363:8 369:13,23 370:15 372:5 373:6 377:11 381:20 ways 167:12 270:10
287:5 346:20 351:8 357:10
way-back 270:12 WDR 381:18 382:7 weaken 343:9 wealth 302:12 wealthiest 303:19 wearing 357:6 weather 160:10 web 40:15 113:20 239:19 292:17 384:2,3
Webb 1:24 2:10 385:3,21 Weber 4:23 Wednesday 324:17 week 152:9 290:13
weekend 360:3 weekend 360:3 weeks 144:25 229:1 265:23 287:9 326:25
327:1 welcome 4:5 7:17,18
382:22 well 14:9 9 25:5 26:24

well 14:9,9 25:5 26:24

```
27:13 34:11,12 43:14
  44:3,20 50:5 51:5
  54:23,25 59:15 61:8
  64:4 65:11,23 66:6,13
  66:18 69:4 70:14 71:17
  72:9 75:1 77:24 80:5
  83:15 84:7,16 87:13
  91:5,18,23 92:1 93:4
  93:12 101:5,6 102:7
  103:20 105:3,25
  112:21 113:18 115:3
  116:22,24,25 118:24
  119:3,6,25 120:9,16
  123:8 124:3 126:14,18
  135:3 137:2,19 143:1,9
  146:7,21,25 147:3,11
  148:8 151:3 169:19
  173:15 175:3,16,21
  176:16,17,22 177:5,15
  178:13,14,23 179:5
  180:8 181:2 184:7,19
  184:22 191:11 192:19
  192:25 193:4,5,21
  194:14.14 195:17
  200:23 201:17 202:3
  202:21 203:17 208:11
  212:21 215:6 216:6.12
  221:10 222:11 226:9
  229:18,21 230:1,23
  231:3.20.22 232:2.13
  233:19,20 234:25
  237:10 239:20 241:16
  246:24 248:18 251:6
  254:2,2,6,7,8 255:4,11
  256:1,7,10,16 257:6
  258:15 260:13 261:4
  268:6 269:16 271:20
  272:12.13 275:22.22
  277:8 279:16 282:5
  283:15,16 285:11
  286:7 288:12 289:14
  290:1,17 291:17 293:9
  295:10.23 300:9
  301:21 305:11 306:3
  307:2 310:22 314:7
  321:10,20 323:4 324:2
  324:17,23 325:21
  326:13,19 335:18
  337:15,22,23 338:18
  339:9,12 341:14 342:4
  345:11,22 346:8,17
  347:11 348:18 350:17
  355:17,18 356:12
  360:5 373:15,16,17
  374:17 379:12.13
  381:23 383:7
wells 24:9 25:3.7.14.14
  25:15,18,21,23 26:1,4
  26:6,7,8,11 27:25
  57:24 63:8,11,12 114:9
  114:25 117:1,2,5
  132:21,23,24,25,25
  134:11,12,13,13,14,24
  135:1 137:23,23,25
  183:5,8,10,11,16 184:1
  184:3,18,18 185:9,10
  185:13,14 190:7 191:8
  191:9,9,20 192:7,17,19
  194:20,22,23,24 195:9
```

195:16 215:25 232:25

252:23 254:5,11,19,25

```
256:2,11,13,16,18,22
  257:2,5,14,17,18 258:3
  258:4,11,14 271:13,25
  272:2,6,6 276:3,6
  291:25 292:14 293:12
  330:14 345:12 347:15
  355:4 371:17,18
  372:15,24
well-being 356:9
well-run 161:17
went 37:1 40:11 239:14
  281:9 312:16,16
  359:24 360:1
were 16:24 34:5 40:24
  51:12 53:8 74:7,7 82:9
  82:10 83:9,10,14 92:10
  92:11 99:10 104:8,9
  107:10,21 112:1
  113:12,16,18,23 114:1
  114:14 116:20,20
  117:4,21 118:10 122:7
  127:7 128:10,17
  131:20 138:3 139:15
  139:21 143:2 146:21
  151:1 152:10,21
  178:17 183:12 189:12
  191.6 192.17 19
  195:13,13 199:25
  200:8 212:10 226:5,17
  230:25 234:23 239:12
  241:15 243:10 244:7,9
  252:16.17.20.23
  253:23 254:12,23
  258:11 259:12 260:17
  262:5,6 263:13 272:22
  272:23 273:6 278:8
  283:25 286:8 289:9
  292:19 293:5.9 294:10
  313:13,17,25 316:13
  316:20 320:14 332:3,3
  333:21 338:24 345:5
  345:23 350:1 355:6,12
  358:7 359:18.18
  360:11 361:2 372:17
  381:6 384:7 385:5,7,8
weren't 116:24 128:18
  232:24 359:22
west 59:25 337:5 377:17
  377:25
Western 231:6
wetland 212:3
wetlands 17:11 281:6.24
we'll 5:8 10:15,15 12:15
  13:12 27:6,7 35:17
  36:18 37:8 38:9 58:1,5
  63:4 68:12 80:5 103:18
  139.1 145.17 153.3
  156:17 167:1 208:16
  233:21 307:21 320:21
  320:24 321:20 325:25
  327:12 328:11,14,14
  328:22,22,23 329:1
  379:18 383:7,24 384:2
  384:4
we're 11:12,25 13:17
  18:13 22:1,21 26:15,24
  27:2,3,5 59:24 63:7
  64:7,8,23 65:17,19
  66:18,19 67:22 74:23
  78:19 88:9 92:9 104:13
  108:23 112:14 124:16
```

```
125:5 136:25 138:5,10
  138:11,12,20 142:3,4
  144:3 146:10 161:18
  162:10 170:8,8,12,16
  176:5,6 188:3 197:14
  203:14 208:12 212:21
  214:14 215:2 218:9
  220:24,25 225:4,22
  232:3,15,15 237:18,21
  237:22 240:6,8 246:8,9
  246:14,14 249:2,14
  250:15,15,18 251:5
  253:3 255:14.17
  270:11 271:9,10 273:7
  276:23 279:19 282:11
  283:7 287:11 291:24
  296:6,18 305:8 310:1
  312:23 313:2 314:13
  318:3,13 320:5,17,21
  320:22 323:1 327:20
  329:11,22 330:7
  337:18 341:2 342:8
  346:2 347:4 348:9,9,10
  356:12.12 357:11
  359:5 361:24 372:8
  374:20,21 375:13,19
  375:20 376:2,17,18
  377:7,21 382:25 383:3
  384:5
we've 13:3,10 14:20 15:8
  15:8 18:25 20:5,6
  27:18 34:24 36:12
  38:15 65:5 68:1 74:17
  76:19 85:1 86:4 104:15
  104:21 114:6 126:12
  133:12,14,17 134:18
  134:20,22 135:14
  137:9.10.11 146:24
  151:4 160:1 185:1
  207:15 208:5 224:8
  225:9,13 229:2,3
  230:20 231:3 244:1
  267:6.24 290:9 297:16
  302:19 308:3 320:4
  321:13 323:21 326:2
  329:22 349:4 359:6
  371:22 382:8,12
  383:14
whatever's 307:22
while 32:14 39:11 41:14
  47:15 50:13 80:1 86:2
  107:1 161:23 181:11
  207:7 280:2 293:5
  294:22 303:19,21
  358:11
whole 13:1 22:1 60:18
  66:24 68:25 95:8 98:23
  101:20 156:1 165:9
  169:8 190:23 200:18
  200:25 209:14 219:15
  239:8 242:9 244:14
  246:18,20 258:3,13
  279:3 289:9 291:1
  293:24 311:6 344:7
  349:21 357:20
whole-plant 241:15
```

whole-systems 253:17

wide 54:9,19,20 63:23

83:4 105:20 196:15,21

who've 378:3

widen 187:3

```
width 71:15
wildlife 79:12
willing 343:4
windows 250:10
wine 266:14 267:3
winery 360:5
winners 162:17,19
winning 341:19
win-win 155:25
wire 180:21
wise 313:6
wish 9:23 231:16 348:18
  350:17 356:8
wishes 9:12
wishful 91:24
wishing 224:10
woke 138:3
Wolff 2:19 4:9,10 7:9,10
 7.13 19 8.15
woman 142:20
women 302:18 360:2
won 318:22
Worcester 15:5
word 7:12 41:10 150:13
  181:18 272:25
words 46:18 243:14
  271:9 276:13 277:1
  279:24
work 64:2 80:12,20,20
  91:11 151:13 180:22
  181:14,17,20 182:1
  187:20 198:6 200:6
  208:7 210:4 211:19
  220:4,23 221:20 227:2
  231:10,19 235:9
  240:20,25 249:15
  255:2 260:20 271:17
  289:16 297:24 309:14
  309:17 327:8 337:2
  344:7 345:1,7 347:4
  348:17 351:19 356:25
  357:1,23 359:9 365:17
  373:11
workable 238:25
worked 15:16,22 16:9
  17:2,2,14,16 18:8,11
  87:24 207:19 241:6
  242:25 297:9 360:2
  372.12
workers 303:17
working 15:13 17:13,22
  19:1 58:24 78:23 122:9
  123:9 124:22 136:2,2,6
  136:8,12 138:10
  157:19 190:6,8 220:8
  223:2 234:4 266:20
  296:20 302:8.22 343:9
  343:15 345:4 351:1
works 15:20,21,25 53:21
  58:23 90:22 250:14
  296:24
workshop 13:8 150:17
  215:15,19 254:4
workshops 13:7 212:3
  212:12
world 31:11 156:13
  185:4 196:12 298:6
  333:14 350:16
world-class 166:3
worried 278:22
```

**1** 22:18,19 29:14,16

35:20,20,21,25 43:17

43:18 44:5 49:7 50:8

worry 178:2 298:10 318:11 372:6 worse 134:17 183:3 249:14 250:25 257:13 257:14 309:4 worst 218:18 303:12 346.1 Worster 39:24 worth 159:19 161:4 344:7,8,11 worthwhile 230:2 wouldn't 67:20 97:25 107:22 127:18.18 140:9 191:11 195:5,7,9 226:25 230:2,3,24 231:1 233:6 247:3 262:2 265:9 286:9 312:15 337:7 347:13 373:16 would've 144:18 254:13 wrap 144:10,11 147:7 318:1 332:24 352:7 wrest 344:6 write 177:19,19 328:22 328:23 329:1,10 368:21 writing 325:13 364:11 written 10:5 71:9 85:2 125:7 151:9 203:6 299:8 321:17 330:22 367:20 370:19 wrong 86:1 94:18 136:25 163:5 191:16 320:15 wrote 168:6 www.depo.com 1:22 Wyatt 318:1,5 319:14 X 133:13 223:21 227:11 Y 223:21 yard 184:10

yeah 8:3 57:6 68:3 72:24 76:1 77:5 89:12,18,25 92.4 115.7 119.6 12 124:7,19 130:5 142:12 143:14 176:25 177:23 188:8 192:2 193:24 207:9 228:4 231:16 243:19 245:11 251:8 265:16 267:21 289:3 299:16 323:11 326:14 327:5 329:17 338:5,20 339:23 377:1 year 13:14 116:17 117:8 133:2,3 140:22 164:4,7 174:12,13 191:6,19 224:24,25 225:2 231:17 247:12,24 248:19,22 249:15 250:7 251:13 253:9,24 253:24 271:2 275:15 292:15 312:8 332:14 335:4 366:4 years 12:22,25 14:20 18:8,25 20:15,18 24:25 25:1 53:25 76:18 93:13 104:17 111:7,8,11,16 112:4,13,18 117:7 146:25 172:21,21

177:17 183:11 184:24 186:9,20,24 190:9,10 196:24 221:14,15,15 224:2,3 225:3,9 248:3 248:17 253:11 254:16 254:24 256:20 258:16 262:13 263:7 266:1 279:25 286:17,19,25 287:1,2,11 306:11,12 315:25 329:23 330:13 331:4,23 332:14 333:17 334:14 335:23 344:16 345:5 346:10 347:11 351:1 354:4 364:24 371:12,21 372:16 373:1 377:23 378:8,20 382:8 383:14 year's 295:18 yellow 25:10 34:9,9 183:18 311:4 Yep 39:7 75:24 yesterday 4:18 12:11 26:15 vield 31:12 174:19 yields 54:19 247:4 346:17 Ynez 189:14 309:21 young 2:17 3:3 4:3,4,19 5:3,20 6:25 7:17,20,22 7:24 8:4,11 11:4 12:9 38:17,23,25 39:3,6 55:11 56:15.18 57:6 58:6,13,16,21 59:13 62:19 63:14 64:4,11,15 64:19,21 65:7,21 66:13 67:2,4,9 68:3,13 70:12 70:18 75:7,20 76:1,13 76:24 77:2,6,11,19 80:22 81:6 82:5,14,19 82:21,25 83:20 84:14 85:5,8,11,16,19 86:21 87:13,16,21,23 88:5,24 89:5.12.14.18.22 90:23 91:12,23 92:2,7,19 93:23 98:9 99:4,15,18 99:22 100:5,19,22 101:5,7,12,17 102:7 103:17,22 104:3 117:12 127:24 138:24 139:6 141:20,22 142:2 142:12 143:13 144:9 144:12 145:20,24 146:1,4 147:7,22 148:2 148:5,7,9,11,13,15 150:1,4,16 151:19,21 153:1,6,8,14,18 156:2 156:8 157:2 166:11.14 172:4,12,16,18 173:12 175:3,7 176:4,9,17,23 176:25 177:4,7 178:11 178:14,16,19,21 179:6 179:9,12,14,16,17,18 180:7,10 188:8,15,17 188:25 189:19,24 190:20,25 191:3 195:21 199:19,22 200:17,23 201:3,13,16 201:19.22 202:1.23.25 204:8 207:9 215:4,12 216:7 217:13,24 218:2 228:4 231:20,23,25

232:13,15,18,20 235:12,23 236:1 237:14 238:6,9,10 246:4 251:25 253:21 254:7 255:4.12 257:20 258:15 260:6,10,12 264:24 265:11,16 266:17 267:8,21 268:3 268:17,19,21 269:5,14 269:17 272:2 282:11 282:14,16,19 284:20 284:22 285:1 288:14 288:16.23 289:3.7.21 298:18 299:1,4,16,18 305:23 307:14,16 319:11 321:20,22,24 322:8,10,19,22 323:3,9 323:12,14,16,19 324:5 324:8,10,14,17,23 325:1,24 326:4,11,13 326:17,19,22 327:5,7 327:11 328:8,10,13,25 329:3,6,9,16,18 332:10 332:11,11,15,24 333:7 335:11,14,16 337:15 337:22,24 338:1,5,8,10 339:5,8,13,16,18,23 340:5,21,23 342:19 344:23 347:19 350:19 352:9.11.13 353:21 354:22 356:12,15 359:10.13 361:8 363:25 364:1,10 367:14 370:20 373:19 373:24 374:2 376:21 376:24 377:2 379:10 379:14,17,19,22 382:21,23 383:10 384:5

Z 223:21 zero 158:24 159:8,10 zone 140:9 170:7 173:19 176:14 177:2,13 178:9 243:24 246:7 251:11 259:17 288:1 351:7 zones 152:10 zoom 311:8 zucchinis 150:8

\$10 166:19 \$150 284:10 \$150,000 145:18 \$167 164:3 \$2,370 133:6 \$200 357:1 \$2370 139:10 \$36 334:9,23 \$36,000 334:24 \$5,200 145:11 \$790 133:5 \$800 344:8

0

**0** 91:6 **0.5** 54:25 **08** 12:24

53:5,12 54:12,21,23 55:1,8 81:16 89:10,10 89:13 91:6 100:13,20 101:21 116:12 119:7,9 119:10 126:16,18 133:4,21 182:16 216:19 240:8 261:19 262:21 263:3 264:5,6,9 264:10 266:15,15 267:4 276:6 277:10 310:5,9,15,16,23 311:19 312:20 313:7 338:15 366:21 367:5 368:14.22 1A 263:22 1B 263:22 1st 106:4 108:16 113:1 279:20 382:15 1 000 264.8 1,000-dollar 334:23 1,700 268:23 1.0 57:2 196:14,25 **1.2** 53:6 196:14 246:12 259:9,12 300:24 364:22 **1.5** 55:6 378:9,11 1:00 153:5.6 **10** 29:11,21 48:15 49:1,8 53:24 71:24 80:18 103:2 110:18,23 111:7 111:8,15,21 112:5,12 112:17,17 134:3 184:24 218:20.22 226:20 244:7 252:18 265:19 266:3 275:16 287:1 303:23 342:10 345:5 346:10 366:11 372:16 373:1 10,000 138:13 163:23 10-percent 110:15,22 10-year-old 292:10 100 53:14,24 112:4 210:22 225:2 241:20 250:16 281:9 284:7 304:9 341:14 344:14 100.000 304:13 100-acre 139:17 1000-acre 61:6 **101** 1:2 2:3 120:3 184:11 11 3:4 11:00 141:24 **112** 154:21 183:25 **113** 31:18 116 113:10,15 **12** 10:12,13 103:2 185:12 185:13 194:22 259:14 265:22 378:8 12-month 212:8 226:18 237:7 12:00 5:21 6:6 142:1.2.5 **120** 54:14 56:2 243:16 1200 36:2 **125** 147:3

13 265:18,22 275:2,25

13.269 213:6

13223 380:19

1300 96:16

**13260** 382:2 13263,prescribe 382:4 **13269** 380:10 14 7:22 249:21 14th 364:13 14-month 248:23 **140** 54:14 56:2 147:4 **15** 10:10 202:13 218:20 265:12 329:23 330:9 330:13 331:4 15-foot 81:2 **150** 286:19 **150.000** 304:12 **1500** 358:5 **151** 49:7 **154** 164:2 **155** 183:10 **156** 3:5 **16** 32:25 299:5 **17** 1:13 2:10 4:1 69:16 94:8 243:1,11 17th 4:7 **170** 47:20 **1700** 41:21,25 52:21 69:16 71:24 80:18 102:25 18th 326:23 327:1 **180-foot** 195:8,13,14 19 143:22 154:19 1900 370:18 **192** 242:9 **1955** 370:4 **1978** 182:19 186:7 188:22 1978's 187:2 1980 188:22 **1985** 17:2 1988 23:17 24:18 199 49:8 1990 185:25 355:4 1994 167:7 179:11 1995 17:13 1996 28:17.20 1999 185:25 239:17 2

2 22:18,20 34:22,23 35:9 35:10,15,20,24 36:2 37:18.25 44:13 49:8.20 49:20 50:2 81:19 93:24 98:18 133:4 190:18 209:5,11 216:19 217:17 262:2,21 263:12 264:6.10.11.14 266:15 267:4 276:6,8 276:14,25 277:10 280:5 281:21 310:5 346:23 347:3 366:17 366:21 367:5 376:14 2nd 157:17 2s 217:25 2.000 262:7 **2,000-acre** 197:17 2,500 154:21 2.8 54:23 **20** 25:1 111:10 190:16 253:11 335:22 347:10 372:16 20,000 304:19 306:8,11 306:12 20-year-old 292:11

**41.000** 304:19

_
000 04:0 0 0 00 00 100 =
<b>200</b> 61:2,3,3 96:20 100:7 100:14 190:18,18
242:1
<b>200-acre</b> 97:13 197:16
<b>2000</b> 306:13
<b>2001</b> 304:8 308:4
<b>2004</b> 19:21 21:1,3 22:20
22:20 29:4 32:9,14,22 32:25 33:6,10,11,13,16
33:24 34:19,24 50:3
81:19 106:2,17 155:10
225:10 273:14 276:10
310:4,24
<b>2005</b> 188:23 <b>2006</b> 18:6 188:24 189:14
<b>2008</b> 104:17 188:24
273:6 306:16 308:7
<b>2009</b> 188:24 189:14
292:12 308:7
<b>2010</b> 31:1 104:7,9 106:5 113:1,13 152:13
182:18 239:16 240:12
273:16,18 274:15
292:12 295:16 301:3
303:25 305:13 306:14 307:10,12 346:3 359:3
376:15
<b>2010-0040</b> 380:9
<b>2011</b> 1:13 2:10 4:1,7
22:13 23:2 29:4 32:24 33:5 34:22 45:14 48:12
53:22 63:21 104:13
106:21 113:12 205:8
214:24 239:10 273:19
273:25 295:20,24 298:15 364:13
<b>2015</b> 108:17
<b>2020</b> 367:1
<b>21</b> 36:1,1 186:20 243:7
247:9,11 250:5 <b>22</b> 31:4 48:3 247:11
<b>23</b> 25:6 76:18 274:25
292:25
<b>231</b> 154:18
<b>233,000</b> 36:5 <b>238</b> 3:6
<b>24</b> 10:11 267:24 269:18
<b>24,000</b> 250:6
<b>25</b> 36:3 147:6 154:19
183:11 225:1 254:16 333:16
<b>25th</b> 326:24 327:1
<b>25,000</b> 304:19
25-foot 44:12 261:25
<b>26</b> 271:2 301:23,25
<b>266</b> 183:10 <b>269</b> 3:7
<b>27</b> 111:8 301:16
<b>275</b> 2:9
<b>28</b> 242:4 271:24 272:1
377:16 <b>28th</b> 153:20
<b>288-3376</b> 1:23
<b>289</b> 3:8
<b>298</b> 154:18
<b>299</b> 3:10
3
<b>3</b> 22:19,24 35:9,9,11 36:3
37·10 25 38·4 44·22

37:19,25 38:4 44:22

49:8,23 50:9,12,15,19

50:23 51:6,9,22 52:15 52:19 53:1 60:25 61:16 69:21,23 71:19,22 78:4 81:24 93:24 94:17 95:1 95:20 96:11 98:6.11 101:19,20 103:13 108:12 109:7 111:6 114:11 116:15 131:25 133:6 139:7,9 140:5,24 150:13 163:6 197:22 209:6,11 216:19 217:15,18,25 233:18 262:6.21 263:17 264:12,13 266:15 267:4 275:1,9,17 276:12,25 277:2,6,8 278:12 279:3,4,7,23 280:7 281:21 288:9 300:22 310:6 313:15 313:19 314:7,10,12 315:13,15 316:11,15 317:2 330:23 346:22 347:3 368:12 369:5 375:16,21,24 376:8 3C 110:10 279:17 3rd 51:16 113:11 235:15 236:3 3,000 42:2 103:1 263:11 3,300 154:22 3.2 164:10 **30** 52:21 69:16 80:13 111:1.14 152:20 190:9 253:11 261:25 280:19 281:10,19 331:22 335:22 351:1 30,000 250:6 30-foot 71:14 72:18 78:1 80.22 300 96:21 301:15 355:1 300-plus 293:4 303(d) 314:18 337:25 303(d)-listed 375:23 376:9 303-D 200:1 307 3:11 31st 380:9,14 381:24 **320** 239:7 240:3 **329** 3:12 33 186.9 24 33-year-old 186:20 188:22 34 243:1,6 259:12 348 185:8 **35** 192:3 35-year 180:17 350 355:1 360 45:25 46:14 47:3.12 47:20 48:3,15,25 82:8 365 47:12 **37** 25:8,10 38 190:16,17 **392** 54:8 66:23 4 3:2 168:21 342:10 4th 40:13,19 324:16,17

325:8

**4.6** 284:2

4.425 182:16

40 192:3 253:11 275:16

293:1 368:13

435,000 41:20 44,000 26:7 45 190:17 292:19 293:1 369:5 45hich 293:1 **450** 352:18 **4588** 1:24 2:11 385:3,21 **47.8** 304:1 470 154:23 48 265:18 5 **5** 10:19 239:9 240:6 244:9 259:12 274:25 346.9 5th 320:2 5-vear 332:17 **5:30** 7:4 50 29:13,25 95:18 281:23 287:1 313:23 331:22 334:8 347:10 378:18 50.000 306:8 50.449 182:10 50-foot 152:20 261:25 281:9 316:21 500 35:25 261:23 263:25 501/590 334:8 **51** 265:18 **54** 36:4 275:1,25 549-3174 1:3 2:4 55 10:9 142:7 156:17 **56** 164:2 **5600** 152:19 163:23 58,000 304:17

6
6 263:3,6
6th 324:16 325:8
6,000 329:25
6:00 380:3 384:8
60 29:12,16 146:9 156:17
61.4 294:12 295:5
64 355:2
66,000 304:17
67-percent 111:11
69 304:6

7 **7** 91:19,21 109:2 7th 327:11 7:00 367:19 **70** 54:9 66:23 253:6 281:8 323:21,21 70s 28:21 73 82:22,22 83:21 85:17 86:12 149:7 157:15 266:4 **75** 47:8 82:10,12,16 83:13 86:17 148:23 239:8 281:9 313:22 **75.000** 182:11 76 304:10 77,000 191:19 78 192:15 8

8 3:3 10:12,14 301:22

**8:15** 2:10 4:1 289:10 320:16

80 253:6 289:24 290:15 800 1:23 92:23 96:19 98:14 805 1:3 2:4 82 303:12 83 292:18,24 304:11 342:2 84 378:20 85 188:22 86 302:23 87 154:20 89 184:18 895 1:2 2:3

9
9th 40:21
90 208:23 224:15,19,23
226:22 247:24
91 304:10
92 241:25
92,000 36:1
93 91:20 243:13
93401-7906 1:2 2:3
9500 152:19
953 185:9
99 68:18
999 95:13