1	CENTRAL COAST REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
2	PANEL HEARING
3	SAN LUIS OBISPO, CALIFORNIA
4	MAY 4, 2011
5	
6	
7	
8	VOLUME II
9	
10	CONTINUATION
11	OF THE
12	HEARING ON THE WAIVER OF WASTE DISCHARGE
13	REQUIREMENTS DISCHARGED FROM
14	IRRIGATED LANDS
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	ATKINSON-BAKER, INC.
20	COURT REPORTERS
21	www.depo.com
22	800-288-3376
23	
24	REPORTED BY: CAROL C. COON, RPR, CSR NO. 11701
25	FILE NO.: A504530

1	APPEARANCES		1	SAN LUIS OBISPO, CALIFORNIA
2			2	WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 2011, 10:00 A.M.
4	FOR THE CENTRAL COAST REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD:		3	
5			4	
6	JEFFREY S. YOUNG, CHAIRMAN DAVID T. HODGIN		5	MR. YOUNG: Good morning. I'm Jeff Young, Chair
7	MONICA S. HUNTER RUSSELL M. JEFFRIES		6	of the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control
8	FRANCES McCHESNEY, SENIOR COUNSEL JESSICA NEWMAN, COUNSEL		7	Board.
9			8	Welcome to San Luis Obispo. This is May 4th.
10	LEAD STAFF PERSONS:		9	And this is today only a continuation of this item that we
11	ROGER W. BRIGGS, EXECUTIVE OFFICER MICHAEL THOMAS, ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER		10	started in Watsonville in March.
12	LISA HOROWITZ McCANN, SECTION MANAGER ANGELA SCHROETER, AGRICULTURAL REGULATORY		11	MR. BRIGGS: March 17th.
13	PROGRAM/BASIN PLANNING MATTHEW KEELING		12	MR. YOUNG: March 17th.
	MONICA BARRICARTE		13	Why don't we take roll call.
14 15			14	MR. BRIGGS: Dave Hodgin.
16	SPEAKERS: PAGE:		15	MR. HODGIN: Present.
17	CAROL PREASLEY 401 STEVE SHIMEK 402, 502		16	MR. BRIGGS: Miss Hunter.
	ANDY CALDWELL 404		17	MISS HUNTER: Present.
18	NANCY ISAKSON 405, 431 MIKE BROADHURST 408		18	MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Hayashi.
19	STEVE CARTER 410 TIM BOREL 413		19	MR. HAYASHI: Present.
20	CHRIS BUNN 415 BOB CAMPBELL 420		20	MR. BRIGGS: Dr. Wolff.
21	FRED CHAMBERLIN 422		21	DR. WOLFF: Present.
22	DAVID COSTA 424, 525 SONYA SALAS 426		22	MR. JEFFRIES: Did I get left out, or I'm not on
23	DEIRDRE DES JARDINS 427 DARLENE DIN 430		23	the Board anymore?
24	JOE DILLON 432 WILLIAM ELLIOTT 435		24	MR. BRIGGS: Vice Chair and former Chair,
25	JOY FITZHUGH 437 SUSAN McDONALD 440,441		25	Mr. Jeffries.
	110,111	Page 387		Page 389
1 2	APPEARANCES (CONT'D) SPEAKERS: PAGE:		1	MR. YOUNG: Mr. Briggs, introductions.
3	NORM GROOT 446		2	MR. BRIGGS: Well, I haven't done very well so
4	EDWARD 449 PRICILLA AKIN 467,468		3	far.
	LOWELL ZELINSKI 469		4	To my left is Francis McChesney, our Counsel
5	CHRISTINE KEMP 475 CHRISTINE BHATNAGAR 477		5	from the State Water Research Control Board, and to her
6	MARC LOS HUERTOS 479		6	left, also from the Office of Chief Counsel, is Counsel,
7	KAY MERCER 496 CHRIS O'CONNOR 499		7	who will be assisting us as Francis has been assigned to
	RICHARD QUANDT 505		8	other duties. Although Francis will continue to assist
8	BILL RITZ 509 KEITH ROBERTS 512		9	us as well, but this is Jessica Newman.
9	KIRK SCHMIDT 517		10	Welcome, Jessica.
10	C.Z. WHITNEY 520 HOWARD WHITNEY 521		11	We do not have our State Board Member
	DANNY MERKLEY 531		12	liaison. That's Fran Weber. She was not able to be here
11	TESS DUNHAM 532 RICK TOMLINSON 535		13	today due to other meeting conflicts.
12	ANGELA SCHROETER 555,573		14	And I'll point out that over here on the left
13	JILL NORTH 559 LISA McCANN 563		15	we have Carol Coon, court reporter. And if any of you
	MATTHEW KEELING 564		16	are interested in making arrangements with her, you can
14	MONICA BARRICARTE 576 KAREN WORCESTER 597		17	contact her.
15	MICHAEL THOMAS 604		18	And, let's see, the restrooms are over here.
16 17			19	And we do have some people standing in the back of the
18			20	room. There are still, I see, a few empty seats, so it's
19 20			21	up to you if you want to search those out. We also have
21			22	overflow seating you probably saw when you came in, out
22 23			23	in the foray area.
24			24	Do we have seating in the file review? No.
25		Dog 200	25	Okay. There's a speaker out there so you can at least
1		Page 388		Page 390

listen if that's necessary. 1 conclusion and recommendation, and then will be time for 2 2 the Board Panel to deliberate. There's four seats right here. Some seats 3 3 right down through here. One right there. And that's So that's the order of events today. 4 it, Mr. Chair. 4 I just have two slides now that give a little 5 5 MR. YOUNG: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Briggs. bit of an overview, kind of get our brain engaged again 6 6 MR. THOMAS: We had a possible glitch with the on what we were talking about last time. 7 7 So, the staff will have pointed out at the recorder during the roll call. 8 8 last hearing about the severity of the water quality I'd just like for the record to say that the 9 9 problems. We went over that in some detail with summary Board members Hayashi, Hunter, JEFFRIES, Wolff are 10 10 of the extensive information documented in our staff present. 11 11 report and attachments. The Order addresses those water MR. YOUNG: Thank you. All right. 12 I take it, Mr. Hayashi, you have something to 12 quality problems. It included three tiers, and I'll talk 13 13 about that a little bit more in the next slide with the say. 14 highest tier, Tier 3, having more control requirements. 14 MR. HAYASHI: Yes. For the next time, I guess. 15 15 I'm recused again. So I will see you next time. We've had many changes to the Order as it has 16 16 morphed through the last two-and-a-half years that we've MR. YOUNG: That is because you're an irrigated 17 17 farmer. You're a farmer that irrigates, that's why been working on this. And those changes have been in 18 18 response to many comments that we received. Comments in you're recused from this hearing? 19 19 MR. HAYASHI: Yes. workshops, in meetings and in writing. 20 20 MR. YOUNG: Dr. Wolff. Next. So, to begin the tiers, this slide is 21 MR. WOLFF: We'll keep company to my colleague 21 very similar, not exactly the same as we saw last time. 22 22 here. I will recuse myself. Since a portion of my And so you might recall that we started looking at the 23 23 property is dedicated, although one half is dry farming. center column in Tier 2. And the reason for doing that 24 24 MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Dr. Wolff. All right. is because it kind of forms the foundation for the Tiers. 25 25 So everything that's in white here, the white font, is Mr. Briggs. Page 391 Page 393 1 MR. BRIGGS: Item 4 is, as the Chair just 1 basically a holdover from the existing 2004 Order the 2 2 mentioned a minute ago, is actually a continuation of the Board adopted seven years ago. 3 3 March 17th item that we had in Watsonville, the northern So, that Order requires -- is currently in part of the region. And so we're down here in the south place and effective -- requires water quality standards 5 5 to be met, signing up. It has the various practices, central part of our region today for the continuation of 6 that hearing. Concerning the Conditional Waiver of Waste 6 management measures that are required in the Farm Plan. 7 7 Discharge Requirements Discharged from Irrigated Lands. Surface water monitoring. Just to be clear, 8 So just a little overview of what we're going 8 because there's a potential for confusion here, so the 9 9 to be doing today. This is a panel hearing, as you just watering monitoring refers to the watershed scale heard, two of our members are forced to being recused on 10 10 monitoring, which is ongoing now. That's what's being 11 11 this item, and since we don't have a guorum of the Board conducted on behalf of the industry by the Cooperative 12 12 sitting up here, we're handling it as a panel hearing, Monitoring Program. So that's what we refer to there. 13 which is what we were doing last time as well, the 13 There was the education component time 14 continuation of that. 14 schedule that applies to all of these things. 15 What that means is then the panel will then 15 And then Annual Compliance Report. So that's 16 come to a conclusion of the panel that will go forward as 16 all part of the existing 2004 Order. 17 a recommendation for action to the next quorum of the 17 So now for our proposed new Tier 2, it takes 18 18 Board, which is, hopefully, sooner rather than later. all the existing and it adds very few items. It still 19 So, after I get done with my little overview 19 has the compliance report, but it's basically simplified, 20 20 here we will continue with the public comments. streamlined to be an online entry. We talked about that So, we had folks who showed up for the 21 21 fairly extensively at the last meeting. 22 22 hearing last time in Watsonville, and what our Chair did The Order requires groundwater sampling and 23 23 is -- actually, I'll wait on that explanation. Just an reporting. While the existing Order included what --24 24

25

Page 392

3 (Pages 391 to 394)

meeting water quality standards, all standards including

groundwater, the focus was really on surface water. And

So, after public comments we'll have a staff

overview of what we're doing today.

25

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

19

20

25

we've talked about the water quality issues that are well documented now with groundwater problems. So this is a necessary component from the staff's point of view to add to this middle Tier.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

18

19

20

21

22

23

And then backflow prevention is also a groundwater prevention or a groundwater protection measure and seems to be kind of a no-brainer. I think it's fair to say we haven't received any comments about that whatsoever. So, very similar to the existing Order.

The Tier 1 criteria then is the same as Tier 2, minus this annual compliance form. So it's a little bit simpler.

And then Tier 3, we have the Tier 2 requirements, plus individual run-off monitoring. So in addition to the surface water monitoring, the watershed monitoring, this would be individual run-off monitoring just for those who would end up in Tier 3.

The Water Quality Buffer Plan is also actually a subset for those that have riparian areas in their lands or adjacent to their lands.

And then Irrigation Nutrient Management Plan. And one of the things I added to the slide was, just parenthetically, it's a more detailed irrigation nutrient management plan. You see over here we have

25 nutrient management and irrigation management. So just

Page 395

to distinguish it it has some more detail, for example, the nitrogen balance that was reported.

So those are the -- those are three tiers just as a reminder to you that are proposed.

So next, public comments. We received after all the written supplementals that were due by the January 3rd, was our cutoff for written supplementals, we received oral comments at the hearing in Watsonville. Now, the Board could have closed the hearing, could have

10 completed the hearing, could have deliberated, could have 11 taken action at that meeting, it was noticed to do that.

12 But, basically, we got kicked out of room by the City.

13 So in light of that timeline our Chair asked those who

14

could not make it to the next meeting, show of hands, 15 basically, and those who wanted to go ahead and testify

16 in Watsonville, we had them come up to the podium and 17

then our Chair said, okay, so the rest of you who have turned in cards at that meeting will have an opportunity

at today's meeting.

So we have a fixed number of cards, and we have them on a list here, and so that will just be a continuation of those comments from those who submitted cards at that time.

2.4 And I'll let you know, it might be helpful for -- in terms of anticipating when to come up for the

Page 396

three-minute comments, that they're in alphabetical order, so -- by your last name.

So, we will continue with public comments. And one of the things that I wanted to point out to you is that -- I won't point because I'll probably blind you -- but we have the lights up here, the timer at the podium, and we would really appreciate it if you would use that. And the reason for that is to help you. So the yellow light comes on, I think it might be -- we can check on the first person, maybe 30 seconds. That's basically a warning that you should be getting to your conclusion.

And so, please, when the beeper goes off, and the red light comes on on your own volition finish the sentence and then that's it. It doesn't mean to be creative with the world's longest run-on sentence. If you do that rather than just ignoring it and going on until the Chair has to interrupt, just, if you could please cooperate and do that. That would be a big help.

Just one other logistics point; we do have 50 some cards, so that's probably going to take about two-and-a-half-hours or so, see how we do vis-a-vis the lunch break. And also after we do finish all the cards, whenever that is, all the speakers today, then we are going to be asking for a break, so that we -- the staff

Page 397

1 can get together and figure out what our final response 2 and comments will be.

And I think that's it for preliminary remarks.

Did I miss anything.

Okay.

MS. McCHESNEY: Just to recognize the remaining opposing --

MR. BRIGGS: Oh, right, I meant to mention that.

10 Thank you. That the Farm Bureau folks through 11 prearranged, prior to the March 17th meeting asked that

12 they have a total of 60 minutes -- well, maybe actually

13 more than that, it was granted by the Chair, 60 minutes. 14 And they specifically asked prior to that to reserve five

15 minutes at the conclusion of all the public comments for

16 them to have whatever they want to do, whether it's a

17 summary or some responsive comments or a combination. 18

So, the Farm Bureau folks will have an opportunity for that after all the cards.

Thank you for that reminder.

21 If there are any Spanish speaking folks need 22 some assistance, Hector Hernandez is in the back room 23 over here and can help with that. Monica is right here, 24 Monica Barricarte, our staff.

Thank you both for assisting.

б

MR. YOUNG: I just wanted to go over kind of -- where we're at today in terms of speakers and the decision I made in terms of splitting up the speaker cards and what they represent in my mind and why I did what I did.

We had about 75 or so speaker cards. There was going to be no way for us to get through everybody and get out when we needed to get out unless I did something like give everyone a minute or 30 seconds. I didn't want to do that. I just felt it was more fair to give everyone the full three minutes and that's why I asked who could show up today and who really could not show up and who opted to give their comments in Watsonville.

So, we had about 20 speakers in Watsonville, and that left the balance of about 55 or so speaker cards. Those people are going to get three minutes. That's still going take us the better part of two-and-a-half-hours to get through. I made that decision to try to manage all of the information, all the speakers.

I wanted to allow the Board time to deliberate, but we can't deliberate on this in private, it has to be done publicly. So it's important that I allow enough time for that to happen.

Page 399

forward.

We've also had a request for someone to give their objection to the way we're going to handle the proceeding today, the hearing. And although I'll go ahead and allow anyone who wants to give us their objection on what we're going to do today, why don't we go through those right now.

MR. BRIGGS: One other clarification.

MR. YOUNG: Go ahead.

MR. BRIGGS: Chair Young mentioned that something about written comments, the written comment period was closed with the exception of that was that people at the hearing in March some of them knew they couldn't stay through the end of the meeting, it was an all day session, so they handed in their cards with their notes of what they intended to say. We typed those up and distributed those to the Board members. Then we've had a couple, maybe one other person who has done that in the meantime said I can't make it, and they submitted those. I've also distributed those to the Board members as well.

MR. YOUNG: If anyone wants to put their objections on the record, I'll give those individuals a minute-and-a-half to do so.

MS. PREASLEY: My name is Carol Presley. I'm a registered civil engineer. I reside in Oxnard.

Page 401

I've had a couple of requests for people who speak today that they could not make it. They submitted cards, but they couldn't make it today and there was a request that we make some allocation or exception to that. What I have done is decided. I'm just going to use these speaker cards, if there's an individual speaker speaking on behalf of him or herself, and that person doesn't show up, then I'm not allowing anyone to cede time to someone else from an individual. That person could have submitted written comments to us that would be fine. I think some people have done that. And we do have comments on the back of some of these cards. So that information is getting into the record. We had a request for an organization, is it the MR. BRIGGS: Well, there were two of them. Paso Robles Wine Alliance and Unitarian Church.

MR. BRIGGS: Well, there were two of them. Paso Robles Wine Alliance and Unitarian Church.

MR. YOUNG: So with those, because those were organizations what I've decided to do is to allow someone else to speak on behalf of that organization or entity.

Just a call I made. And some people may feel that that's not fair, some people may feel that it is fair. I'm just trying to allow as many people to speak as possible and also manage and control the meeting so we can get through it today. I just wanted you to know that as we go

I'm just commenting about the Conditional Waiver. It's about a public process issue.

Due to work commitments I was unable to attend the March 17 meeting and was therefore unable to fill out the card. However, my statement also responds to new material presented at that meeting and, therefore, is subject to the full implication of the Baglakeen Act.

The intent of Baglakeen Act is clear. The Board is expected to list the public comments before acting. The Act specifically points to the fact that when new information has been presented as it was by virtue of testimony brought forward and heard on March 17th, that the public has the right to respond to the new information.

As a public agency employee myself I would think it prudent for this Board to limit risk to litigation particularly over the triviality of not allowing public input.

Thank you.

MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.

21 Mr. Shimek.

MR. SHIMEK: My name is Steve Shimek from the

23 Monterey Coastal --

(Interruption by the reporter.)

MR. SHIMEK: Sure. My name is Steve Shimek,

A504530 PANEL HEARING M

MAY 4, 2011

1	Shimek, S-H-I-M-E-K. The organization is Monterey	1	one particular person your Board originally intended to
2	Coastal.	2	have it in April thought, well, I'm going to be here in
3	It came to our attention that the groups were	3	April, I'll go, it turns out you pushed it to May now she
4	organizing people to read other people's statements. And	4	can't be here. And so it's kind of like it's a moving
	so, we actually went out and we told some people that we	5	target. And I know this is not your intention, it's just
II .	would like to organize the same thing. So we have	6	the way it worked out.
	statements from people like that cannot make it from	7	I'm very appreciative we're going to get
	organizations on organizational letterhead such as	8	three minutes versus one, but one of the very low cost
II .	Pesticide Watch that they would like read into the record	9	ways to address this is to have video teleconferencing
	when their name is called.	10	for public access. Santa Barbara County Board does it.
11	So, we would like to know as soon as possible	11	It costs virtually nothing. And that way people aren't
	if we will be able to read those letters into the record.	12	expected to give up their whole day and travel 100 miles
13	There are also in addition to the	13	for three minutes.
	organizational letters, there are letters from	14	Thank you.
	individuals. So I'm just letting you know it's kind of	15	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.
	two classes of letters.	16	
17		17	MS. ISAKSON: I'm Nancy Isakson with the Salinas
18	Thank you.	18	Valley Water Coalition. I-S-A-K-S-O-N.
	MR. YOUNG: As to the Pesticide Watch did they		MR. YOUNG: Hold on for a second.
	submit written comments?	19	So, folks, we have a reporter here, just like
20	MR. SHIMEK: I am not aware, so I don't know.	20	we did in Watsonville sitting over here to my left. So,
21	MS. HUNTER: Yes, they did.	21	everyone really needs to speak up, and she's asking
22	MR. SHIMEK: They did? This is from the Education	22	everybody to spell their names when they come to the
	Watch Education Fund. I don't know if that's	23	podium. So try to remember that.
	significantly different, but that's what's on the	24	Thank you.
25	letterhead. I would imagine that it is a program of	25	MR. BRIGGS: One other thing for staff, instead of
	Page 403		Page 405
1	nosticidos	1	challing it just say who you are. We do have name tags
2	pesticides. MS_MaCHESNEY: Does envised uknow if they	2	spelling it, just say who you are. We do have name tags
	MS. McCHESNEY: Does anybody know if they	3	up here when the staff is speaking as well.
4	submitted a card in March?	4	MS. ISAKSON: Thank you.
5	Yes, we did.	5	We did submit speaker cards at the March 17th
	MR. YOUNG: Yes.		meeting and weren't able to stay, and so we had asked to
6	MS. McCHESNEY: So there's a person representing	6	have our letters submitted. And, subsequently, I wanted
	the organization that could speak on behalf of the	7	to confirm that they have been distributed to the Board.
	organization?	8	And my understanding is that they were not because they
9	MR. SHIMEK: That would be me.	9	were not seems like in the form of note cards and that
10	Thank you.	10	they were letters, something that I was told there would
11	MR. CALDWELL: Chairman Young, I'm Andy Caldwell,	11	be no way you could read them, the entirety into the
	C-A-L-D-W-E-L-L, with COLAB in San Luis Obispo in Santa	12	record. If I could object to you not allowing people to
	Barbara County.	13	submit written comments after your January cutoff date.
14	Our concern with you know, the Regional	14	Staff changes have been made, and I think
	Board is organized because you have such a big region you	15	that it is really you're doing a disservice to this
	rotate your meetings throughout the community to	16	Board and a disservice to the public by not allowing us
	facilitate public access which we very much appreciate.	17	to comment on the changes and the subsequent discussions
18	But it's almost a moving target this time	18	that have occurred at the Board level.
	around where people from this region had to go up to	19	So, we were not allowed to give you our
20	Watsonville, but you ran out of time in Watsonville, so	20	letters, and but we are making a presentation today, a
1		21	slide presentation, but we I do want to voice my
21	then some people that couldn't make it there couldn't		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	then some people that couldn't make it there couldn't make it here aren't speaking. Some of the people that	22	objection I think that's very unfair and against the open
22			
22 23	make it here aren't speaking. Some of the people that	22	objection I think that's very unfair and against the open
22 23 24	make it here aren't speaking. Some of the people that were there that, you know, couldn't speak there because	22 23	objection I think that's very unfair and against the open public law.

1	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.	1	because they'll just pass on the cost. Really.
2	You know, we have input from staff and	2	Let me dispel some faulty thinking. First of
3	members of the public continually through an agenda item,	3	all, all food companies don't care where your food comes
4	so new information is always coming up that we're	4	from, nor do they consider quality; they only consider
5	considering and listening to. That doesn't just open up,	5	costs.
6	you know, more time for public comment just because	6	Food companies buy produce from the lowest
7	people are submitting information to us.	7	cost producer based upon what they can charge you,
8	Staff may go ahead and respond to something	8	American consumers, whose number one priority is price,
9	an hour or two from now after hearing something from	9	not quality.
10	speakers that doesn't trip another round of everyone	10	And second, farmers are, in fact, generally
11	having more time to comment on what staff might come up	11	pretty good people, although crazy enough to do what we
12	with. It's not going to work that way. We'll never get	12	do because we love the land. So, who should share the
13	through it, with the meeting, if it goes on that way.	13	responsibility here? Could it be the people who made the
14	Okay. Does anyone else wish to address us	14	fertilizer? Those who ship it? The companies who sell
15	and give us their objection to the way we're going to	15	to the farmers? You're probably thinking that's a
16	handle this meeting?	16	stretch.
17		17	The truth is the Board staff has completely
18	(No response.)	18	missed the guilty party. Just look next to you; your
19		19	neighbor in the next seat who shops at supermarkets and
20	MR. YOUNG: Okay. As to Mr. Shimek's request, Mr.	20	demands rock bottom prices.
21	Shimek, as long as you were representing an entity, an	21	To illustrate my seemingly preposterous
22	organization, you can speak on behalf of that entity.	22	allegation imagine yourself standing in a produce aisle
23	That's fine. Okay.	23	at your local supermarket looking at lettuce. Odds are
24	These have all been put down by Mr. Briggs in	24	those pristine heads of lettuce come from a grower in the
25	alphabetical order. So we'll do it that way because it	25	Salinas Valley.
	Page 407		Page 409
_		_	
1	will make it easy for me. I've got a list in front of	1	The fact is no matter where you are in the
2	me.	2	U.S. the majority of your lettuce and spinach, cold
2	me. The first speaker is Karen Araujo. Is she	2	U.S. the majority of your lettuce and spinach, cold crops, et cetera, come from the Salinas Valley year
2 3 4	me.	2 3 4	U.S. the majority of your lettuce and spinach, cold crops, et cetera, come from the Salinas Valley year round. The general climate allows them to do it on a
2 3 4 5	me. The first speaker is Karen Araujo. Is she here?	2 3 4 5	U.S. the majority of your lettuce and spinach, cold crops, et cetera, come from the Salinas Valley year round. The general climate allows them to do it on a massive scale and they do a great job. But agriculture
2 3 4 5 6	me. The first speaker is Karen Araujo. Is she	2 3 4 5 6	U.S. the majority of your lettuce and spinach, cold crops, et cetera, come from the Salinas Valley year round. The general climate allows them to do it on a massive scale and they do a great job. But agriculture over the decades has pushed the limit of the land to
2 3 4 5 6 7	me. The first speaker is Karen Araujo. Is she here? (No response.)	2 3 4 5 6 7	U.S. the majority of your lettuce and spinach, cold crops, et cetera, come from the Salinas Valley year round. The general climate allows them to do it on a massive scale and they do a great job. But agriculture over the decades has pushed the limit of the land to produce. It now requires hundreds of pounds of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	me. The first speaker is Karen Araujo. Is she here?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	U.S. the majority of your lettuce and spinach, cold crops, et cetera, come from the Salinas Valley year round. The general climate allows them to do it on a massive scale and they do a great job. But agriculture over the decades has pushed the limit of the land to produce. It now requires hundreds of pounds of fertilizer and pesticides to be applied every year for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	me. The first speaker is Karen Araujo. Is she here? (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The second one is Harold Biaggini.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	U.S. the majority of your lettuce and spinach, cold crops, et cetera, come from the Salinas Valley year round. The general climate allows them to do it on a massive scale and they do a great job. But agriculture over the decades has pushed the limit of the land to produce. It now requires hundreds of pounds of fertilizer and pesticides to be applied every year for each acre. Otherwise long ago exhausted soil would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	me. The first speaker is Karen Araujo. Is she here? (No response.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	U.S. the majority of your lettuce and spinach, cold crops, et cetera, come from the Salinas Valley year round. The general climate allows them to do it on a massive scale and they do a great job. But agriculture over the decades has pushed the limit of the land to produce. It now requires hundreds of pounds of fertilizer and pesticides to be applied every year for each acre. Otherwise long ago exhausted soil would produce little. And a bit of that fertilizer and some of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	me. The first speaker is Karen Araujo. Is she here? (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The second one is Harold Biaggini. (No response.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	U.S. the majority of your lettuce and spinach, cold crops, et cetera, come from the Salinas Valley year round. The general climate allows them to do it on a massive scale and they do a great job. But agriculture over the decades has pushed the limit of the land to produce. It now requires hundreds of pounds of fertilizer and pesticides to be applied every year for each acre. Otherwise long ago exhausted soil would produce little. And a bit of that fertilizer and some of those pesticides end up in your water.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	me. The first speaker is Karen Araujo. Is she here? (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The second one is Harold Biaggini. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The third one is a speaker on behalf	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	U.S. the majority of your lettuce and spinach, cold crops, et cetera, come from the Salinas Valley year round. The general climate allows them to do it on a massive scale and they do a great job. But agriculture over the decades has pushed the limit of the land to produce. It now requires hundreds of pounds of fertilizer and pesticides to be applied every year for each acre. Otherwise long ago exhausted soil would produce little. And a bit of that fertilizer and some of those pesticides end up in your water. So who's really responsible for this mess we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	me. The first speaker is Karen Araujo. Is she here? (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The second one is Harold Biaggini. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The third one is a speaker on behalf of the Paso Robes Wine Company Alliance.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	U.S. the majority of your lettuce and spinach, cold crops, et cetera, come from the Salinas Valley year round. The general climate allows them to do it on a massive scale and they do a great job. But agriculture over the decades has pushed the limit of the land to produce. It now requires hundreds of pounds of fertilizer and pesticides to be applied every year for each acre. Otherwise long ago exhausted soil would produce little. And a bit of that fertilizer and some of those pesticides end up in your water. So who's really responsible for this mess we find ourselves in? I would argue that you, consumers,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	me. The first speaker is Karen Araujo. Is she here? (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The second one is Harold Biaggini. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The third one is a speaker on behalf of the Paso Robes Wine Company Alliance. The next one is Tim Borel, Nunes Vegetables	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	U.S. the majority of your lettuce and spinach, cold crops, et cetera, come from the Salinas Valley year round. The general climate allows them to do it on a massive scale and they do a great job. But agriculture over the decades has pushed the limit of the land to produce. It now requires hundreds of pounds of fertilizer and pesticides to be applied every year for each acre. Otherwise long ago exhausted soil would produce little. And a bit of that fertilizer and some of those pesticides end up in your water. So who's really responsible for this mess we find ourselves in? I would argue that you, consumers, who don't care how long and how it happens as long as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	me. The first speaker is Karen Araujo. Is she here? (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The second one is Harold Biaggini. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The third one is a speaker on behalf of the Paso Robes Wine Company Alliance. The next one is Tim Borel, Nunes Vegetables and than Mike Broadhurst, Cambria Farms.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	U.S. the majority of your lettuce and spinach, cold crops, et cetera, come from the Salinas Valley year round. The general climate allows them to do it on a massive scale and they do a great job. But agriculture over the decades has pushed the limit of the land to produce. It now requires hundreds of pounds of fertilizer and pesticides to be applied every year for each acre. Otherwise long ago exhausted soil would produce little. And a bit of that fertilizer and some of those pesticides end up in your water. So who's really responsible for this mess we find ourselves in? I would argue that you, consumers, who don't care how long and how it happens as long as it's cheap.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	me. The first speaker is Karen Araujo. Is she here? (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The second one is Harold Biaggini. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The third one is a speaker on behalf of the Paso Robes Wine Company Alliance. The next one is Tim Borel, Nunes Vegetables and than Mike Broadhurst, Cambria Farms. MR. BROADHURST: Good morning. Mike Broadhurst,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	U.S. the majority of your lettuce and spinach, cold crops, et cetera, come from the Salinas Valley year round. The general climate allows them to do it on a massive scale and they do a great job. But agriculture over the decades has pushed the limit of the land to produce. It now requires hundreds of pounds of fertilizer and pesticides to be applied every year for each acre. Otherwise long ago exhausted soil would produce little. And a bit of that fertilizer and some of those pesticides end up in your water. So who's really responsible for this mess we find ourselves in? I would argue that you, consumers, who don't care how long and how it happens as long as it's cheap. So let me conclude by asking. What is the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	me. The first speaker is Karen Araujo. Is she here? (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The second one is Harold Biaggini. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The third one is a speaker on behalf of the Paso Robes Wine Company Alliance. The next one is Tim Borel, Nunes Vegetables and than Mike Broadhurst, Cambria Farms. MR. BROADHURST: Good morning. Mike Broadhurst, B-R-O-A-D-H-U-R-S-T. I own and farm about 20 acres near	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	U.S. the majority of your lettuce and spinach, cold crops, et cetera, come from the Salinas Valley year round. The general climate allows them to do it on a massive scale and they do a great job. But agriculture over the decades has pushed the limit of the land to produce. It now requires hundreds of pounds of fertilizer and pesticides to be applied every year for each acre. Otherwise long ago exhausted soil would produce little. And a bit of that fertilizer and some of those pesticides end up in your water. So who's really responsible for this mess we find ourselves in? I would argue that you, consumers, who don't care how long and how it happens as long as it's cheap. So let me conclude by asking. What is the real cost of your cheap food and who should pay for water
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	me. The first speaker is Karen Araujo. Is she here? (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The second one is Harold Biaggini. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The third one is a speaker on behalf of the Paso Robes Wine Company Alliance. The next one is Tim Borel, Nunes Vegetables and than Mike Broadhurst, Cambria Farms. MR. BROADHURST: Good morning. Mike Broadhurst, B-R-O-A-D-H-U-R-S-T. I own and farm about 20 acres near Cambria. Thank you for listening to me.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	U.S. the majority of your lettuce and spinach, cold crops, et cetera, come from the Salinas Valley year round. The general climate allows them to do it on a massive scale and they do a great job. But agriculture over the decades has pushed the limit of the land to produce. It now requires hundreds of pounds of fertilizer and pesticides to be applied every year for each acre. Otherwise long ago exhausted soil would produce little. And a bit of that fertilizer and some of those pesticides end up in your water. So who's really responsible for this mess we find ourselves in? I would argue that you, consumers, who don't care how long and how it happens as long as it's cheap. So let me conclude by asking. What is the real cost of your cheap food and who should pay for water quality?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	me. The first speaker is Karen Araujo. Is she here? (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The second one is Harold Biaggini. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The third one is a speaker on behalf of the Paso Robes Wine Company Alliance. The next one is Tim Borel, Nunes Vegetables and than Mike Broadhurst, Cambria Farms. MR. BROADHURST: Good morning. Mike Broadhurst, B-R-O-A-D-H-U-R-S-T. I own and farm about 20 acres near Cambria. Thank you for listening to me. Staff portrays all farmers as dischargers,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	U.S. the majority of your lettuce and spinach, cold crops, et cetera, come from the Salinas Valley year round. The general climate allows them to do it on a massive scale and they do a great job. But agriculture over the decades has pushed the limit of the land to produce. It now requires hundreds of pounds of fertilizer and pesticides to be applied every year for each acre. Otherwise long ago exhausted soil would produce little. And a bit of that fertilizer and some of those pesticides end up in your water. So who's really responsible for this mess we find ourselves in? I would argue that you, consumers, who don't care how long and how it happens as long as it's cheap. So let me conclude by asking. What is the real cost of your cheap food and who should pay for water quality? Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	me. The first speaker is Karen Araujo. Is she here? (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The second one is Harold Biaggini. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The third one is a speaker on behalf of the Paso Robes Wine Company Alliance. The next one is Tim Borel, Nunes Vegetables and than Mike Broadhurst, Cambria Farms. MR. BROADHURST: Good morning. Mike Broadhurst, B-R-O-A-D-H-U-R-S-T. I own and farm about 20 acres near Cambria. Thank you for listening to me. Staff portrays all farmers as dischargers, perpetrators, offenders, culprits; you chose the word,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	U.S. the majority of your lettuce and spinach, cold crops, et cetera, come from the Salinas Valley year round. The general climate allows them to do it on a massive scale and they do a great job. But agriculture over the decades has pushed the limit of the land to produce. It now requires hundreds of pounds of fertilizer and pesticides to be applied every year for each acre. Otherwise long ago exhausted soil would produce little. And a bit of that fertilizer and some of those pesticides end up in your water. So who's really responsible for this mess we find ourselves in? I would argue that you, consumers, who don't care how long and how it happens as long as it's cheap. So let me conclude by asking. What is the real cost of your cheap food and who should pay for water quality? Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Thank for your comments.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	me. The first speaker is Karen Araujo. Is she here? (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The second one is Harold Biaggini. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The third one is a speaker on behalf of the Paso Robes Wine Company Alliance. The next one is Tim Borel, Nunes Vegetables and than Mike Broadhurst, Cambria Farms. MR. BROADHURST: Good morning. Mike Broadhurst, B-R-O-A-D-H-U-R-S-T. I own and farm about 20 acres near Cambria. Thank you for listening to me. Staff portrays all farmers as dischargers, perpetrators, offenders, culprits; you chose the word, it's implicit that we are people who lack morals and have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	U.S. the majority of your lettuce and spinach, cold crops, et cetera, come from the Salinas Valley year round. The general climate allows them to do it on a massive scale and they do a great job. But agriculture over the decades has pushed the limit of the land to produce. It now requires hundreds of pounds of fertilizer and pesticides to be applied every year for each acre. Otherwise long ago exhausted soil would produce little. And a bit of that fertilizer and some of those pesticides end up in your water. So who's really responsible for this mess we find ourselves in? I would argue that you, consumers, who don't care how long and how it happens as long as it's cheap. So let me conclude by asking. What is the real cost of your cheap food and who should pay for water quality? Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Thank for your comments. MR. BRIGGS: I noticed that clarification, when
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	me. The first speaker is Karen Araujo. Is she here? (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The second one is Harold Biaggini. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The third one is a speaker on behalf of the Paso Robes Wine Company Alliance. The next one is Tim Borel, Nunes Vegetables and than Mike Broadhurst, Cambria Farms. MR. BROADHURST: Good morning. Mike Broadhurst, B-R-O-A-D-H-U-R-S-T. I own and farm about 20 acres near Cambria. Thank you for listening to me. Staff portrays all farmers as dischargers, perpetrators, offenders, culprits; you chose the word, it's implicit that we are people who lack morals and have polluted your drinking water for our own benefit.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	U.S. the majority of your lettuce and spinach, cold crops, et cetera, come from the Salinas Valley year round. The general climate allows them to do it on a massive scale and they do a great job. But agriculture over the decades has pushed the limit of the land to produce. It now requires hundreds of pounds of fertilizer and pesticides to be applied every year for each acre. Otherwise long ago exhausted soil would produce little. And a bit of that fertilizer and some of those pesticides end up in your water. So who's really responsible for this mess we find ourselves in? I would argue that you, consumers, who don't care how long and how it happens as long as it's cheap. So let me conclude by asking. What is the real cost of your cheap food and who should pay for water quality? Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Thank for your comments. MR. BRIGGS: I noticed that clarification, when the yellow light comes on is when you have one minute to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	me. The first speaker is Karen Araujo. Is she here? (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The second one is Harold Biaggini. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The third one is a speaker on behalf of the Paso Robes Wine Company Alliance. The next one is Tim Borel, Nunes Vegetables and than Mike Broadhurst, Cambria Farms. MR. BROADHURST: Good morning. Mike Broadhurst, B-R-O-A-D-H-U-R-S-T. I own and farm about 20 acres near Cambria. Thank you for listening to me. Staff portrays all farmers as dischargers, perpetrators, offenders, culprits; you chose the word, it's implicit that we are people who lack morals and have polluted your drinking water for our own benefit. Many in the public have apparently bought	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	U.S. the majority of your lettuce and spinach, cold crops, et cetera, come from the Salinas Valley year round. The general climate allows them to do it on a massive scale and they do a great job. But agriculture over the decades has pushed the limit of the land to produce. It now requires hundreds of pounds of fertilizer and pesticides to be applied every year for each acre. Otherwise long ago exhausted soil would produce little. And a bit of that fertilizer and some of those pesticides end up in your water. So who's really responsible for this mess we find ourselves in? I would argue that you, consumers, who don't care how long and how it happens as long as it's cheap. So let me conclude by asking. What is the real cost of your cheap food and who should pay for water quality? Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Thank for your comments. MR. BRIGGS: I noticed that clarification, when the yellow light comes on is when you have one minute to go.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	me. The first speaker is Karen Araujo. Is she here? (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The second one is Harold Biaggini. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The third one is a speaker on behalf of the Paso Robes Wine Company Alliance. The next one is Tim Borel, Nunes Vegetables and than Mike Broadhurst, Cambria Farms. MR. BROADHURST: Good morning. Mike Broadhurst, B-R-O-A-D-H-U-R-S-T. I own and farm about 20 acres near Cambria. Thank you for listening to me. Staff portrays all farmers as dischargers, perpetrators, offenders, culprits; you chose the word, it's implicit that we are people who lack morals and have polluted your drinking water for our own benefit. Many in the public have apparently bought into this notion and can't understand why farmers don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	U.S. the majority of your lettuce and spinach, cold crops, et cetera, come from the Salinas Valley year round. The general climate allows them to do it on a massive scale and they do a great job. But agriculture over the decades has pushed the limit of the land to produce. It now requires hundreds of pounds of fertilizer and pesticides to be applied every year for each acre. Otherwise long ago exhausted soil would produce little. And a bit of that fertilizer and some of those pesticides end up in your water. So who's really responsible for this mess we find ourselves in? I would argue that you, consumers, who don't care how long and how it happens as long as it's cheap. So let me conclude by asking. What is the real cost of your cheap food and who should pay for water quality? Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Thank for your comments. MR. BRIGGS: I noticed that clarification, when the yellow light comes on is when you have one minute to go. MR. CARTER: Steve Carter. C-A-R-T-E-R.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	me. The first speaker is Karen Araujo. Is she here? (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The second one is Harold Biaggini. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: The third one is a speaker on behalf of the Paso Robes Wine Company Alliance. The next one is Tim Borel, Nunes Vegetables and than Mike Broadhurst, Cambria Farms. MR. BROADHURST: Good morning. Mike Broadhurst, B-R-O-A-D-H-U-R-S-T. I own and farm about 20 acres near Cambria. Thank you for listening to me. Staff portrays all farmers as dischargers, perpetrators, offenders, culprits; you chose the word, it's implicit that we are people who lack morals and have polluted your drinking water for our own benefit. Many in the public have apparently bought	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	U.S. the majority of your lettuce and spinach, cold crops, et cetera, come from the Salinas Valley year round. The general climate allows them to do it on a massive scale and they do a great job. But agriculture over the decades has pushed the limit of the land to produce. It now requires hundreds of pounds of fertilizer and pesticides to be applied every year for each acre. Otherwise long ago exhausted soil would produce little. And a bit of that fertilizer and some of those pesticides end up in your water. So who's really responsible for this mess we find ourselves in? I would argue that you, consumers, who don't care how long and how it happens as long as it's cheap. So let me conclude by asking. What is the real cost of your cheap food and who should pay for water quality? Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Thank for your comments. MR. BRIGGS: I noticed that clarification, when the yellow light comes on is when you have one minute to go.

2

3

4

5

6

7

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

industries in general strive to work cooperatively with 2 our governmental and community partners. But these 3 efforts can be thwarted by excessive regulation that 4 requires monitoring for reasons that have not been 5 identified, are not stable overdriven, they can 6 jeopardize proprietary information, create redundancy 7 amongst jurisdictions or result in negative economic 8 consequences.

Your Board quantifies the objectives for the next five years during the May, July workshops of 2010 to focus on surface water nitrates and organophosphates. Secondary sediment and riparian issues should be addressed later. Staff's proposal continues to take on too much without the necessary tools or ability to make a difference in improving water quality.

Only the constituents identified should be addressed in this order: Nitrates, Chlorphyrifos and Diazinon. The entire list of 303D impaired water body should not be the reference point. Some of the impairments are due to other pollutants where Ag is neither the identified nor sole contributor.

We object to measurements in monitoring a criteria that are not a subject of this Order. Monetary and reporting needs to remain proprietary and on farm. We continue to encourage voluntary-based incentive group

Page 411

1 crisis for the state.

Thank you.

MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.

Next speaker.

MR. BOREL: Good morning. Tim Borel, B-O-R-E-L, Nunes Vegetables in Salinas. And I'd like to talk about nitrogen balance ratios.

8 When the topic came up in March at the 9 Watsonville meeting, Chairman Young, I'd like to quote 10 you. You said you don't have a problem with the target 11 in the Order. And I'm here today to say for me the 12 target is the problem.

As, you know, after three years into this Order it automatically kicks to a 1.0 balance ratio based on harvest removal rates. What this sets up is an unsustainable deficit situation. We grow our food on the plants that require more nitrogen than we harvest to eat. We have to be able to grow the whole plant to grow a crop.

So, I've looked into this. I work with Dr. Tim Hartz from UC Davis, the leading authority on nitrogen in cool season vegetables on the coast, and I asked him if he's aware of any research into harvest ratio for nitrogen usage. And he said it would be agronomically impractical to research. That's exactly

Page 413

programs.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

We appreciate staff, including the certification program as a Tier 1 criteria and ability of other programs to be recognized. We recommend that the California Sustainable Wine Alliance Code and sustainable practices be included as another qualifying program.

We acknowledge staff added language that allows reporting of depth to groundwater, the construction of the wells be equipped to provide such information, however, we continue to object to groundwater level monitoring as part of this Order.

Dischargers who do not cause tail water as in the case of vineyards should not be subject to receiving water monitoring.

We also ask that items 35 through 60 be struck from the Order which requires new measures for eroding control on storm water run-off that are infeasible were not previously disclosed or may -- and conflict or overlap with efforts of the local governments RCDs and NRCS Programs.

Staff changes create redundancy in regulation 22 and overlap of local jurisdiction control authority. This redundancy and duplication in regulatory authority 24 is counter to the efforts of Governor Brown to reduce government spending and waste in a time of financial-wide Page 412

what he stated.

I've concluded there's not much sound science with respect to this part of the Order. And I think we'd be better off meeting in the middle and accepting what the crop uptake is and try to achieve a 1.0 ratio on crop uptake as a start and leave the Order there. And then we can wait for the science to back it up and arrive at solutions. I don't think we have the solutions from the science side yet to deal with this, and the Order 10 needs to allow for workable solutions.

I'll pose it another way in a guestion. How in the Draft Order is a grower allowed to seek a conclusion where he demonstrates that he can achieve water quality goals for water leaving his operation and thus be able to fertilize at any rate other than the 1.0 harvest removal rate?

What I urge you to do is set the nitrogen balance ratio on crop uptake at a 1.0 level. And also include a pathway which solutions to the problem can be found so that growers can seek solutions and demonstrate the ability to continue farming while showing that they're doing beneficial -- beneficial practices in their operation to water quality.

Just like you can take a flea and say it's an indicator of an ecosystem, why couldn't a grower take a Page 414

MAY 4, 2011

1		_	
	simple soil sample as an example of the system on his	1	seen how agriculture is such a very complex science and
2	farm and how it relates to the nitrogen legally on his	2	art. I'd like to quote a pastor who said, "Farmers do
3	operation.	3	five percent of the work, God does the rest."
4	Some simple solutions that we can include in	4	We have so little control of our environment
5	there to allow growers the chance to do the extra work in	5	and must learn more on how to work with it and take
6	the first three years and let the science come along with	6	charge of it.
7	us and then we can find a workable solution where water	7	Government has the power to enforce as a
8	quality is protected and farmers can go on operating	8	servant, you all to us, the people, the Ag community, you
9	profitably.	9	have a responsibility. But I think if you allow us to
10	Thank you.	10	take the responsibility as an Ag community to prove
11	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.	11	through reasonable science, as this young man just spoke
12	Would you make just a note what that speaker	12	about, and methodology that our precious water resources
13	said at the end he can back to us with a comment.	13	can be protected for future generations if you give us a
14	All right. Next speaker. I need to call him or	14	chance to do that.
15	her.	15	I think your Board has already heard much
16	Chris Bunn, Crown Packing Company.	16	testimony to Ag's expertise and hands-on experience,
17	Andy Caldwell. Bob Campbell, Lompoc Growers. Bill	17	that's really an important point, hands-on experience,
18	Carrothers from Salinas.	18	people who have farmed for generations here.
19	MR. BUNN: Good morning, Chairman Young, Board	19	Please enforce the Ag Alternative Proposal
20	Members and Staff.	20	and let the people truly govern.
21	My name is Chris Bunn, B-U-N-N. I'm from	21	Thank you.
22	Salinas, California. Part of a fifth generation farming	22	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.
23	family located in the lower regions of the Salinas	23	Mr. Caldwell.
24	Valley. We have homes there with the Japanese families.	24	MR. CALDWELL: Caldwell, C-A-L-D-W-E-L-L.
25	The Japanese families partnership of over 80 years.	25	I'm Andy Caldwell representing the Coalition
	Page 415		Page 417
	1 450 113		1 age 117
1	I want to speak to the Ag	1	of Agriculture and Businesses, Santa Barbara, San Luis
2	Alternative Proposal for the 2011 Waiver.	2	Obispo Counties.
3	First; farmers have collaborated over the	3	We do believe on the rule before you will
4	past five years on only mandatory farming plants, but	4	represent a Class 1 impact both to wildlife habitant
5	have used BMPs and made some of the most extensive	5	because in essence you're going to be cutting off the
6	testing monitoring for water quality in history of any		, , ,
	testing mornioning for water quality in mistory or any	6	only water supply it has throughout much of the area and
7		6	only water supply it has throughout much of the area and agriculture by the loss of land, but secondly, the
	agricultural entity.	7	agriculture by the loss of land, but secondly, the
8	agricultural entity. Your observation will show you what's	7 8	agriculture by the loss of land, but secondly, the impacts of creating habitant by their produce, which
8 9	agricultural entity. Your observation will show you what's occurred beyond mandates and laws. In the past 10-plus	7 8 9	agriculture by the loss of land, but secondly, the impacts of creating habitant by their produce, which means they won't be able to sell that produce.
8 9 10	agricultural entity. Your observation will show you what's occurred beyond mandates and laws. In the past 10-plus years the innovations of drip irrigation, measured	7 8 9 10	agriculture by the loss of land, but secondly, the impacts of creating habitant by their produce, which means they won't be able to sell that produce. But it's a Class 1 impact with a twist
8 9 10 11	agricultural entity. Your observation will show you what's occurred beyond mandates and laws. In the past 10-plus years the innovations of drip irrigation, measured levels, minimum tillage, all kinds of soil testing have	7 8 9 10 11	agriculture by the loss of land, but secondly, the impacts of creating habitant by their produce, which means they won't be able to sell that produce. But it's a Class 1 impact with a twist because by definition Class 1 impact is significant and
8 9 10 11 12	agricultural entity. Your observation will show you what's occurred beyond mandates and laws. In the past 10-plus years the innovations of drip irrigation, measured levels, minimum tillage, all kinds of soil testing have contributed to major quality, water quality improvements.	7 8 9 10 11 12	agriculture by the loss of land, but secondly, the impacts of creating habitant by their produce, which means they won't be able to sell that produce. But it's a Class 1 impact with a twist because by definition Class 1 impact is significant and unavoidable. But what we are trying to beg your
8 9 10 11 12 13	agricultural entity. Your observation will show you what's occurred beyond mandates and laws. In the past 10-plus years the innovations of drip irrigation, measured levels, minimum tillage, all kinds of soil testing have contributed to major quality, water quality improvements. Secondly, the Farm Bureaus, shippers	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	agriculture by the loss of land, but secondly, the impacts of creating habitant by their produce, which means they won't be able to sell that produce. But it's a Class 1 impact with a twist because by definition Class 1 impact is significant and unavoidable. But what we are trying to beg your attention today is that the impacts are avoidable because
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	agricultural entity. Your observation will show you what's occurred beyond mandates and laws. In the past 10-plus years the innovations of drip irrigation, measured levels, minimum tillage, all kinds of soil testing have contributed to major quality, water quality improvements. Secondly, the Farm Bureaus, shippers associations and other Ag organizations here, which you	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	agriculture by the loss of land, but secondly, the impacts of creating habitant by their produce, which means they won't be able to sell that produce. But it's a Class 1 impact with a twist because by definition Class 1 impact is significant and unavoidable. But what we are trying to beg your attention today is that the impacts are avoidable because the agricultural community is willing to achieve and
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	agricultural entity. Your observation will show you what's occurred beyond mandates and laws. In the past 10-plus years the innovations of drip irrigation, measured levels, minimum tillage, all kinds of soil testing have contributed to major quality, water quality improvements. Secondly, the Farm Bureaus, shippers associations and other Ag organizations here, which you have seen, know their members and have the best resource	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	agriculture by the loss of land, but secondly, the impacts of creating habitant by their produce, which means they won't be able to sell that produce. But it's a Class 1 impact with a twist because by definition Class 1 impact is significant and unavoidable. But what we are trying to beg your attention today is that the impacts are avoidable because the agricultural community is willing to achieve and pursue the same goals before you and that is, obviously,
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	agricultural entity. Your observation will show you what's occurred beyond mandates and laws. In the past 10-plus years the innovations of drip irrigation, measured levels, minimum tillage, all kinds of soil testing have contributed to major quality, water quality improvements. Secondly, the Farm Bureaus, shippers associations and other Ag organizations here, which you have seen, know their members and have the best resource to mobilize and implement the best water quality plan for	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	agriculture by the loss of land, but secondly, the impacts of creating habitant by their produce, which means they won't be able to sell that produce. But it's a Class 1 impact with a twist because by definition Class 1 impact is significant and unavoidable. But what we are trying to beg your attention today is that the impacts are avoidable because the agricultural community is willing to achieve and pursue the same goals before you and that is, obviously, clean water, viable habitants and a healthy environment.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	agricultural entity. Your observation will show you what's occurred beyond mandates and laws. In the past 10-plus years the innovations of drip irrigation, measured levels, minimum tillage, all kinds of soil testing have contributed to major quality, water quality improvements. Secondly, the Farm Bureaus, shippers associations and other Ag organizations here, which you have seen, know their members and have the best resource to mobilize and implement the best water quality plan for this nation.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	agriculture by the loss of land, but secondly, the impacts of creating habitant by their produce, which means they won't be able to sell that produce. But it's a Class 1 impact with a twist because by definition Class 1 impact is significant and unavoidable. But what we are trying to beg your attention today is that the impacts are avoidable because the agricultural community is willing to achieve and pursue the same goals before you and that is, obviously, clean water, viable habitants and a healthy environment. The best way to get to those goals is through
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	agricultural entity. Your observation will show you what's occurred beyond mandates and laws. In the past 10-plus years the innovations of drip irrigation, measured levels, minimum tillage, all kinds of soil testing have contributed to major quality, water quality improvements. Secondly, the Farm Bureaus, shippers associations and other Ag organizations here, which you have seen, know their members and have the best resource to mobilize and implement the best water quality plan for this nation. I was fortunate enough to work with the first	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	agriculture by the loss of land, but secondly, the impacts of creating habitant by their produce, which means they won't be able to sell that produce. But it's a Class 1 impact with a twist because by definition Class 1 impact is significant and unavoidable. But what we are trying to beg your attention today is that the impacts are avoidable because the agricultural community is willing to achieve and pursue the same goals before you and that is, obviously, clean water, viable habitants and a healthy environment. The best way to get to those goals is through cooperation. You've got major organizations representing
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	agricultural entity. Your observation will show you what's occurred beyond mandates and laws. In the past 10-plus years the innovations of drip irrigation, measured levels, minimum tillage, all kinds of soil testing have contributed to major quality, water quality improvements. Secondly, the Farm Bureaus, shippers associations and other Ag organizations here, which you have seen, know their members and have the best resource to mobilize and implement the best water quality plan for this nation. I was fortunate enough to work with the first water quality groups before the Ag Waiver. I saw the	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	agriculture by the loss of land, but secondly, the impacts of creating habitant by their produce, which means they won't be able to sell that produce. But it's a Class 1 impact with a twist because by definition Class 1 impact is significant and unavoidable. But what we are trying to beg your attention today is that the impacts are avoidable because the agricultural community is willing to achieve and pursue the same goals before you and that is, obviously, clean water, viable habitants and a healthy environment. The best way to get to those goals is through cooperation. You've got major organizations representing most all of the major growers on the Central Coast saying
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	agricultural entity. Your observation will show you what's occurred beyond mandates and laws. In the past 10-plus years the innovations of drip irrigation, measured levels, minimum tillage, all kinds of soil testing have contributed to major quality, water quality improvements. Secondly, the Farm Bureaus, shippers associations and other Ag organizations here, which you have seen, know their members and have the best resource to mobilize and implement the best water quality plan for this nation. I was fortunate enough to work with the first water quality groups before the Ag Waiver. I saw the kind of commitment and organizational skills these	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	agriculture by the loss of land, but secondly, the impacts of creating habitant by their produce, which means they won't be able to sell that produce. But it's a Class 1 impact with a twist because by definition Class 1 impact is significant and unavoidable. But what we are trying to beg your attention today is that the impacts are avoidable because the agricultural community is willing to achieve and pursue the same goals before you and that is, obviously, clean water, viable habitants and a healthy environment. The best way to get to those goals is through cooperation. You've got major organizations representing most all of the major growers on the Central Coast saying they're willing to cooperate to achieve the goals that
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	agricultural entity. Your observation will show you what's occurred beyond mandates and laws. In the past 10-plus years the innovations of drip irrigation, measured levels, minimum tillage, all kinds of soil testing have contributed to major quality, water quality improvements. Secondly, the Farm Bureaus, shippers associations and other Ag organizations here, which you have seen, know their members and have the best resource to mobilize and implement the best water quality plan for this nation. I was fortunate enough to work with the first water quality groups before the Ag Waiver. I saw the kind of commitment and organizational skills these farmers and ranchers have. You've observed their passion	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	agriculture by the loss of land, but secondly, the impacts of creating habitant by their produce, which means they won't be able to sell that produce. But it's a Class 1 impact with a twist because by definition Class 1 impact is significant and unavoidable. But what we are trying to beg your attention today is that the impacts are avoidable because the agricultural community is willing to achieve and pursue the same goals before you and that is, obviously, clean water, viable habitants and a healthy environment. The best way to get to those goals is through cooperation. You've got major organizations representing most all of the major growers on the Central Coast saying they're willing to cooperate to achieve the goals that outline the law and the Order, but these rules have to be
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	agricultural entity. Your observation will show you what's occurred beyond mandates and laws. In the past 10-plus years the innovations of drip irrigation, measured levels, minimum tillage, all kinds of soil testing have contributed to major quality, water quality improvements. Secondly, the Farm Bureaus, shippers associations and other Ag organizations here, which you have seen, know their members and have the best resource to mobilize and implement the best water quality plan for this nation. I was fortunate enough to work with the first water quality groups before the Ag Waiver. I saw the kind of commitment and organizational skills these farmers and ranchers have. You've observed their passion in a lot of your meetings.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	agriculture by the loss of land, but secondly, the impacts of creating habitant by their produce, which means they won't be able to sell that produce. But it's a Class 1 impact with a twist because by definition Class 1 impact is significant and unavoidable. But what we are trying to beg your attention today is that the impacts are avoidable because the agricultural community is willing to achieve and pursue the same goals before you and that is, obviously, clean water, viable habitants and a healthy environment. The best way to get to those goals is through cooperation. You've got major organizations representing most all of the major growers on the Central Coast saying they're willing to cooperate to achieve the goals that outline the law and the Order, but these rules have to be based on reason, science and best available control
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	agricultural entity. Your observation will show you what's occurred beyond mandates and laws. In the past 10-plus years the innovations of drip irrigation, measured levels, minimum tillage, all kinds of soil testing have contributed to major quality, water quality improvements. Secondly, the Farm Bureaus, shippers associations and other Ag organizations here, which you have seen, know their members and have the best resource to mobilize and implement the best water quality plan for this nation. I was fortunate enough to work with the first water quality groups before the Ag Waiver. I saw the kind of commitment and organizational skills these farmers and ranchers have. You've observed their passion in a lot of your meetings. Lastly, government has a tendency, as you've	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	agriculture by the loss of land, but secondly, the impacts of creating habitant by their produce, which means they won't be able to sell that produce. But it's a Class 1 impact with a twist because by definition Class 1 impact is significant and unavoidable. But what we are trying to beg your attention today is that the impacts are avoidable because the agricultural community is willing to achieve and pursue the same goals before you and that is, obviously, clean water, viable habitants and a healthy environment. The best way to get to those goals is through cooperation. You've got major organizations representing most all of the major growers on the Central Coast saying they're willing to cooperate to achieve the goals that outline the law and the Order, but these rules have to be based on reason, science and best available control technologies. And you do have to take into consideration
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	agricultural entity. Your observation will show you what's occurred beyond mandates and laws. In the past 10-plus years the innovations of drip irrigation, measured levels, minimum tillage, all kinds of soil testing have contributed to major quality, water quality improvements. Secondly, the Farm Bureaus, shippers associations and other Ag organizations here, which you have seen, know their members and have the best resource to mobilize and implement the best water quality plan for this nation. I was fortunate enough to work with the first water quality groups before the Ag Waiver. I saw the kind of commitment and organizational skills these farmers and ranchers have. You've observed their passion in a lot of your meetings. Lastly, government has a tendency, as you've heard many times, to solve problems with one solution	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	agriculture by the loss of land, but secondly, the impacts of creating habitant by their produce, which means they won't be able to sell that produce. But it's a Class 1 impact with a twist because by definition Class 1 impact is significant and unavoidable. But what we are trying to beg your attention today is that the impacts are avoidable because the agricultural community is willing to achieve and pursue the same goals before you and that is, obviously, clean water, viable habitants and a healthy environment. The best way to get to those goals is through cooperation. You've got major organizations representing most all of the major growers on the Central Coast saying they're willing to cooperate to achieve the goals that outline the law and the Order, but these rules have to be based on reason, science and best available control technologies. And you do have to take into consideration the economy.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	agricultural entity. Your observation will show you what's occurred beyond mandates and laws. In the past 10-plus years the innovations of drip irrigation, measured levels, minimum tillage, all kinds of soil testing have contributed to major quality, water quality improvements. Secondly, the Farm Bureaus, shippers associations and other Ag organizations here, which you have seen, know their members and have the best resource to mobilize and implement the best water quality plan for this nation. I was fortunate enough to work with the first water quality groups before the Ag Waiver. I saw the kind of commitment and organizational skills these farmers and ranchers have. You've observed their passion in a lot of your meetings. Lastly, government has a tendency, as you've	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	agriculture by the loss of land, but secondly, the impacts of creating habitant by their produce, which means they won't be able to sell that produce. But it's a Class 1 impact with a twist because by definition Class 1 impact is significant and unavoidable. But what we are trying to beg your attention today is that the impacts are avoidable because the agricultural community is willing to achieve and pursue the same goals before you and that is, obviously, clean water, viable habitants and a healthy environment. The best way to get to those goals is through cooperation. You've got major organizations representing most all of the major growers on the Central Coast saying they're willing to cooperate to achieve the goals that outline the law and the Order, but these rules have to be based on reason, science and best available control technologies. And you do have to take into consideration

Page 420

time is, Chairman Young, you asked this question about, well, is there going to be some places where they just won't be able to grow strawberries or vegetables and use nitrates? And staff said, "yes, they can grow something else."

Well, that speaks of an ignorance that land values determine what can be grown. Why is there very little agriculture left in Coastal California? Because of the cost of land. You can only do high valued crops in that region if the land gets converted to other uses which in and of itself is a Class 1 impact Ag.

We're asking you to garner cooperation, which has been demonstrated over the last five years and to check what the background levels are. Do some pilot projects with cooperating landowners. Focus on the most -- the areas that have severe contamination, focus on that first -- create a pilot project. Get landowners involved. Get grant money. Have demonstrations that you can clean this up.

You know, this problem didn't happen overnight. And it's not going to be solved overnight. We're asking you as folks that represent the public and represent the regulated community and represent municipalities and everything else to say we'll work with

Page 419

those questions.

It was very clear to me that in many cases you're staff presented less accurate information, and was either unable or unwilling to answer simple questions.

For one example, when a Board member asked your staff about their proposal with vegetative buffer zones being in conflict with food safety regulatory agencies, their answer was that the only conflict would be between the Water Quality Control Board and the industry's end users. We all know that's simply not true, and that there would be a conflict between government agencies because of food safety regulations.

While I don't know whether staff was ill-prepared or unwilling to answer that and many other questions correctly, in any event, it was inexcusable.

As I see it, you have two proposals before you. The first proposal presented by your staff does little more than set up the agricultural industry for failure as it is based on inaccurate information and unattainable goals within the time frame set.

On the other hand, you have a proposal from the Ag industry that allows the growers to involve their process that does address the water quality issues that we are all facing, but with obtaining goals and practical solutions in a reasonable time frame with oversight by

Page 421

you, you meet us, we're going to agree on what the goals are, we're going to have a reasonable time frame, we're going to see what the technology, the science, and the economy allow and we're going to go for it.

This doesn't have to be a command and control approach. And it certainly doesn't have to be task masters versus public servants helping the public all the way around and across the board.

And so we would just beg you to work with them versus against them.

Thank you.

MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. Bob Campbell.

MR. CAMPBELL: Good morning. My name is Bob Campbell, C-A-M-P-B-E-L-L. I am a third generation farmer, rancher, Santa Barbara County. I have a grandson who is currently enrolled in the Cal Poly Ag Crop Science Program and we are hoping that we will still be a profitable family business when he graduates so he can get involved.

I attended my first Regional Water Control
Board Meeting in 2011 in Watsonville, California. While
I appreciate the numerous questions that were asked by
the Board members at that meeting, I was disappointed in
your staff's presentation and their ability to answer

your Board.

Several years ago with the outbreak of Ecoli the Ag industry had food safety concerns like never before. And as you probably know the Ag industry proved itself willing and able by taking the lead and making the necessary changes in food safety standards, and we can continue to do that today. And we can do it with this issue and these challenges if we're given the chance.

As stated by one of the Board members at the last meeting regional water quality standards set by your Board will not be reached overnight, but will require some time and effort from all of us.

Setting agriculture up for failure with unobtainable goals is not the answer. I urge you, please, consider seriously the proposal that the Ag industry presented to you so we can all work together to reach what we all want to do and that's have good quality water.

Thank you.

MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.
Is Bill Carrothers here? Mr. Carrothers. Okay.
I don't see him.

23 Mr. Fred Chamberlin, and Coates and then Jim 24 Cochran.

MR. CHAMBERLIN: Good morning. My name is Fred Page 422

1	Chamberlin, C-H-A-M-B-E-R-L-I-N. I live on a ranch in	1	application soil based testing program conducted by a
2	Los Olivos, California.	2	certified crop adviser. But the Draft Order states that
3	I think you have before you a decision to	3	leaf samples must be analyzed before applying more
4	make as to whether you follow a science-based regime to	4	nitrogen.
5	solve the problem you set up to solve or follow an	5	My CCA doesn't support this as an application
6	arbitrary rule-based regime put forward by staff. And	6	trigger because it's not telling you what's in the soil
7	that's really the choice that you Board members have to	7	available for plant uptake. So on the one hand you're
8	make.	8	mandating the use of CCAs, yet on the other you're
9	If you will follow science and work with the	9	mandating a practice contrary to the advice and direction
10	farmers you will be able to solve the problem. If you	10	that they've given me in which I've supported with
11	don't, it won't be solved. If you follow your Board's	11	substantial investment.
12	recommendation, which is not based on science, your staff	12	
13	•	13	When Dr. Tim Hartz says commercial vegetable
14	recommendation, this will end up through years of	14	production would be severely disrupted by restricting
	litigation and eventually if it's not based on science,	15	nitrogen fertilization to the amount of nitrogen removed
15	it won't happen.		in the harvested product, someone better be listening.
16	I would suggest then that you follow the	16	With regards to tiers, for some reason size
17	science-based approach and that you work on the areas	17	is still entering into the equation. And there's a
18	where the problems are.	18	scenario where two vegetable growers with similar crops
19	Thank you.	19	and practices are not only not in the same tier they're
20	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.	20	not even in the adjacent tiers. With the only difference
21	Anne Coates.	21	being the size of the operation, one grower ends up in
22		22	Tier 3 and the other grower ends in Tier 1, yet the staff
23	(No response.)	23	report says that "staff acknowledges that operations less
24		24	than 1,000 acres may discharge similar or greater amounts
25	MR. YOUNG: Jim Cochran. Jim Cochran.	25	of waste and thus cause similar or greater risk to water
	Page 423		Page 425
_		_	
1	(No response.)	1	quality."
2	·	2	The reason I raise that point is to say that
2	(No response.) MR. YOUNG: Kevin Collins. Kevin Collins.	2	The reason I raise that point is to say that there's an additional burden placed on Tier 3 growers is
2 3 4	MR. YOUNG: Kevin Collins. Kevin Collins.	2 3 4	The reason I raise that point is to say that there's an additional burden placed on Tier 3 growers is a huge understatement because the expectations and
2 3 4 5	·	2 3 4 5	The reason I raise that point is to say that there's an additional burden placed on Tier 3 growers is a huge understatement because the expectations and requirements of Tier 3 are exponential as compared to the
2 3 4 5 6	MR. YOUNG: Kevin Collins. Kevin Collins. (No response.)	2 3 4 5 6	The reason I raise that point is to say that there's an additional burden placed on Tier 3 growers is a huge understatement because the expectations and requirements of Tier 3 are exponential as compared to the other tiers, even Tier 2. The devil is in the details of
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. YOUNG: Kevin Collins. Kevin Collins. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: All right. David Costa. And then	2 3 4 5 6 7	The reason I raise that point is to say that there's an additional burden placed on Tier 3 growers is a huge understatement because the expectations and requirements of Tier 3 are exponential as compared to the other tiers, even Tier 2. The devil is in the details of Tier 3 and was not up on the slides to start this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. YOUNG: Kevin Collins. Kevin Collins. (No response.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	The reason I raise that point is to say that there's an additional burden placed on Tier 3 growers is a huge understatement because the expectations and requirements of Tier 3 are exponential as compared to the other tiers, even Tier 2. The devil is in the details of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. YOUNG: Kevin Collins. Kevin Collins. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: All right. David Costa. And then Gail Delihant. Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	The reason I raise that point is to say that there's an additional burden placed on Tier 3 growers is a huge understatement because the expectations and requirements of Tier 3 are exponential as compared to the other tiers, even Tier 2. The devil is in the details of Tier 3 and was not up on the slides to start this meeting. And believe me, having some of those burdens to require only a subset of Tier 3 growers as I read so
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. YOUNG: Kevin Collins. Kevin Collins. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: All right. David Costa. And then Gail Delihant.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	The reason I raise that point is to say that there's an additional burden placed on Tier 3 growers is a huge understatement because the expectations and requirements of Tier 3 are exponential as compared to the other tiers, even Tier 2. The devil is in the details of Tier 3 and was not up on the slides to start this meeting. And believe me, having some of those burdens to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. YOUNG: Kevin Collins. Kevin Collins. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: All right. David Costa. And then Gail Delihant. Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	The reason I raise that point is to say that there's an additional burden placed on Tier 3 growers is a huge understatement because the expectations and requirements of Tier 3 are exponential as compared to the other tiers, even Tier 2. The devil is in the details of Tier 3 and was not up on the slides to start this meeting. And believe me, having some of those burdens to require only a subset of Tier 3 growers as I read so
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. YOUNG: Kevin Collins. Kevin Collins. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: All right. David Costa. And then Gail Delihant. Okay. MR. COSTA: Thank you, Chairman Young. My name is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	The reason I raise that point is to say that there's an additional burden placed on Tier 3 growers is a huge understatement because the expectations and requirements of Tier 3 are exponential as compared to the other tiers, even Tier 2. The devil is in the details of Tier 3 and was not up on the slides to start this meeting. And believe me, having some of those burdens to require only a subset of Tier 3 growers as I read so often in the Draft is of no consolation.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. YOUNG: Kevin Collins. Kevin Collins. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: All right. David Costa. And then Gail Delihant. Okay. MR. COSTA: Thank you, Chairman Young. My name is David Costa, C-O-S-T-A. There's so many areas of this draft that is problematic for me. In no particular order, the proposed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	The reason I raise that point is to say that there's an additional burden placed on Tier 3 growers is a huge understatement because the expectations and requirements of Tier 3 are exponential as compared to the other tiers, even Tier 2. The devil is in the details of Tier 3 and was not up on the slides to start this meeting. And believe me, having some of those burdens to require only a subset of Tier 3 growers as I read so often in the Draft is of no consolation. The volume of documentation, reporting,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. YOUNG: Kevin Collins. Kevin Collins. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: All right. David Costa. And then Gail Delihant. Okay. MR. COSTA: Thank you, Chairman Young. My name is David Costa, C-O-S-T-A. There's so many areas of this draft that is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	The reason I raise that point is to say that there's an additional burden placed on Tier 3 growers is a huge understatement because the expectations and requirements of Tier 3 are exponential as compared to the other tiers, even Tier 2. The devil is in the details of Tier 3 and was not up on the slides to start this meeting. And believe me, having some of those burdens to require only a subset of Tier 3 growers as I read so often in the Draft is of no consolation. The volume of documentation, reporting, monitoring, compliance, milestones, timelines,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. YOUNG: Kevin Collins. Kevin Collins. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: All right. David Costa. And then Gail Delihant. Okay. MR. COSTA: Thank you, Chairman Young. My name is David Costa, C-O-S-T-A. There's so many areas of this draft that is problematic for me. In no particular order, the proposed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	The reason I raise that point is to say that there's an additional burden placed on Tier 3 growers is a huge understatement because the expectations and requirements of Tier 3 are exponential as compared to the other tiers, even Tier 2. The devil is in the details of Tier 3 and was not up on the slides to start this meeting. And believe me, having some of those burdens to require only a subset of Tier 3 growers as I read so often in the Draft is of no consolation. The volume of documentation, reporting, monitoring, compliance, milestones, timelines, evaluations and analysis that are required of Tier 3, I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. YOUNG: Kevin Collins. Kevin Collins. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: All right. David Costa. And then Gail Delihant. Okay. MR. COSTA: Thank you, Chairman Young. My name is David Costa, C-O-S-T-A. There's so many areas of this draft that is problematic for me. In no particular order, the proposed future nitrogen reporting data comes out on October 1st	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	The reason I raise that point is to say that there's an additional burden placed on Tier 3 growers is a huge understatement because the expectations and requirements of Tier 3 are exponential as compared to the other tiers, even Tier 2. The devil is in the details of Tier 3 and was not up on the slides to start this meeting. And believe me, having some of those burdens to require only a subset of Tier 3 growers as I read so often in the Draft is of no consolation. The volume of documentation, reporting, monitoring, compliance, milestones, timelines, evaluations and analysis that are required of Tier 3, I mean, leads me to believe in my opinion Tier 3 growers
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. YOUNG: Kevin Collins. Kevin Collins. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: All right. David Costa. And then Gail Delihant. Okay. MR. COSTA: Thank you, Chairman Young. My name is David Costa, C-O-S-T-A. There's so many areas of this draft that is problematic for me. In no particular order, the proposed future nitrogen reporting data comes out on October 1st of 2014, which is during the ongoing fertilizer season	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	The reason I raise that point is to say that there's an additional burden placed on Tier 3 growers is a huge understatement because the expectations and requirements of Tier 3 are exponential as compared to the other tiers, even Tier 2. The devil is in the details of Tier 3 and was not up on the slides to start this meeting. And believe me, having some of those burdens to require only a subset of Tier 3 growers as I read so often in the Draft is of no consolation. The volume of documentation, reporting, monitoring, compliance, milestones, timelines, evaluations and analysis that are required of Tier 3, I mean, leads me to believe in my opinion Tier 3 growers are so being set up to fail and in doing so you fail.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. YOUNG: Kevin Collins. Kevin Collins. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: All right. David Costa. And then Gail Delihant. Okay. MR. COSTA: Thank you, Chairman Young. My name is David Costa, C-O-S-T-A. There's so many areas of this draft that is problematic for me. In no particular order, the proposed future nitrogen reporting data comes out on October 1st of 2014, which is during the ongoing fertilizer season for crops we just finished planting, three or four weeks	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	The reason I raise that point is to say that there's an additional burden placed on Tier 3 growers is a huge understatement because the expectations and requirements of Tier 3 are exponential as compared to the other tiers, even Tier 2. The devil is in the details of Tier 3 and was not up on the slides to start this meeting. And believe me, having some of those burdens to require only a subset of Tier 3 growers as I read so often in the Draft is of no consolation. The volume of documentation, reporting, monitoring, compliance, milestones, timelines, evaluations and analysis that are required of Tier 3, I mean, leads me to believe in my opinion Tier 3 growers are so being set up to fail and in doing so you fail. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. YOUNG: Kevin Collins. Kevin Collins. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: All right. David Costa. And then Gail Delihant. Okay. MR. COSTA: Thank you, Chairman Young. My name is David Costa, C-O-S-T-A. There's so many areas of this draft that is problematic for me. In no particular order, the proposed future nitrogen reporting data comes out on October 1st of 2014, which is during the ongoing fertilizer season for crops we just finished planting, three or four weeks earlier, so it's not even a natural break in the cropping	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	The reason I raise that point is to say that there's an additional burden placed on Tier 3 growers is a huge understatement because the expectations and requirements of Tier 3 are exponential as compared to the other tiers, even Tier 2. The devil is in the details of Tier 3 and was not up on the slides to start this meeting. And believe me, having some of those burdens to require only a subset of Tier 3 growers as I read so often in the Draft is of no consolation. The volume of documentation, reporting, monitoring, compliance, milestones, timelines, evaluations and analysis that are required of Tier 3, I mean, leads me to believe in my opinion Tier 3 growers are so being set up to fail and in doing so you fail. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. YOUNG: Kevin Collins. Kevin Collins. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: All right. David Costa. And then Gail Delihant. Okay. MR. COSTA: Thank you, Chairman Young. My name is David Costa, C-O-S-T-A. There's so many areas of this draft that is problematic for me. In no particular order, the proposed future nitrogen reporting data comes out on October 1st of 2014, which is during the ongoing fertilizer season for crops we just finished planting, three or four weeks earlier, so it's not even a natural break in the cropping cycle.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	The reason I raise that point is to say that there's an additional burden placed on Tier 3 growers is a huge understatement because the expectations and requirements of Tier 3 are exponential as compared to the other tiers, even Tier 2. The devil is in the details of Tier 3 and was not up on the slides to start this meeting. And believe me, having some of those burdens to require only a subset of Tier 3 growers as I read so often in the Draft is of no consolation. The volume of documentation, reporting, monitoring, compliance, milestones, timelines, evaluations and analysis that are required of Tier 3, I mean, leads me to believe in my opinion Tier 3 growers are so being set up to fail and in doing so you fail. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. Gail Delihant, followed by Deirdre Des Jardins,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. YOUNG: Kevin Collins. Kevin Collins. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: All right. David Costa. And then Gail Delihant. Okay. MR. COSTA: Thank you, Chairman Young. My name is David Costa, C-O-S-T-A. There's so many areas of this draft that is problematic for me. In no particular order, the proposed future nitrogen reporting data comes out on October 1st of 2014, which is during the ongoing fertilizer season for crops we just finished planting, three or four weeks earlier, so it's not even a natural break in the cropping cycle. I'm really confused on how you can require	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	The reason I raise that point is to say that there's an additional burden placed on Tier 3 growers is a huge understatement because the expectations and requirements of Tier 3 are exponential as compared to the other tiers, even Tier 2. The devil is in the details of Tier 3 and was not up on the slides to start this meeting. And believe me, having some of those burdens to require only a subset of Tier 3 growers as I read so often in the Draft is of no consolation. The volume of documentation, reporting, monitoring, compliance, milestones, timelines, evaluations and analysis that are required of Tier 3, I mean, leads me to believe in my opinion Tier 3 growers are so being set up to fail and in doing so you fail. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. Gail Delihant, followed by Deirdre Des Jardins, and then Darlene Din.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. YOUNG: Kevin Collins. Kevin Collins. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: All right. David Costa. And then Gail Delihant. Okay. MR. COSTA: Thank you, Chairman Young. My name is David Costa, C-O-S-T-A. There's so many areas of this draft that is problematic for me. In no particular order, the proposed future nitrogen reporting data comes out on October 1st of 2014, which is during the ongoing fertilizer season for crops we just finished planting, three or four weeks earlier, so it's not even a natural break in the cropping cycle. I'm really confused on how you can require ponds to be lined to avoid percolation in one paragraph then promote percolation basins and recharge projects in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	The reason I raise that point is to say that there's an additional burden placed on Tier 3 growers is a huge understatement because the expectations and requirements of Tier 3 are exponential as compared to the other tiers, even Tier 2. The devil is in the details of Tier 3 and was not up on the slides to start this meeting. And believe me, having some of those burdens to require only a subset of Tier 3 growers as I read so often in the Draft is of no consolation. The volume of documentation, reporting, monitoring, compliance, milestones, timelines, evaluations and analysis that are required of Tier 3, I mean, leads me to believe in my opinion Tier 3 growers are so being set up to fail and in doing so you fail. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. Gail Delihant, followed by Deirdre Des Jardins, and then Darlene Din. MS. SALAS: Good morning. My name is Sonya Salas. And I am for Western Growers. I'm here standing in for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. YOUNG: Kevin Collins. Kevin Collins. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: All right. David Costa. And then Gail Delihant. Okay. MR. COSTA: Thank you, Chairman Young. My name is David Costa, C-O-S-T-A. There's so many areas of this draft that is problematic for me. In no particular order, the proposed future nitrogen reporting data comes out on October 1st of 2014, which is during the ongoing fertilizer season for crops we just finished planting, three or four weeks earlier, so it's not even a natural break in the cropping cycle. I'm really confused on how you can require ponds to be lined to avoid percolation in one paragraph then promote percolation basins and recharge projects in another paragraph, while yet in another paragraph	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	The reason I raise that point is to say that there's an additional burden placed on Tier 3 growers is a huge understatement because the expectations and requirements of Tier 3 are exponential as compared to the other tiers, even Tier 2. The devil is in the details of Tier 3 and was not up on the slides to start this meeting. And believe me, having some of those burdens to require only a subset of Tier 3 growers as I read so often in the Draft is of no consolation. The volume of documentation, reporting, monitoring, compliance, milestones, timelines, evaluations and analysis that are required of Tier 3, I mean, leads me to believe in my opinion Tier 3 growers are so being set up to fail and in doing so you fail. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. Gail Delihant, followed by Deirdre Des Jardins, and then Darlene Din. MS. SALAS: Good morning. My name is Sonya Salas. And I am for Western Growers. I'm here standing in for Gail Delihant, who is unable to represent Western Growers
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. YOUNG: Kevin Collins. Kevin Collins. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: All right. David Costa. And then Gail Delihant. Okay. MR. COSTA: Thank you, Chairman Young. My name is David Costa, C-O-S-T-A. There's so many areas of this draft that is problematic for me. In no particular order, the proposed future nitrogen reporting data comes out on October 1st of 2014, which is during the ongoing fertilizer season for crops we just finished planting, three or four weeks earlier, so it's not even a natural break in the cropping cycle. I'm really confused on how you can require ponds to be lined to avoid percolation in one paragraph then promote percolation basins and recharge projects in another paragraph, while yet in another paragraph promoting the benefits of percolating surface water	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	The reason I raise that point is to say that there's an additional burden placed on Tier 3 growers is a huge understatement because the expectations and requirements of Tier 3 are exponential as compared to the other tiers, even Tier 2. The devil is in the details of Tier 3 and was not up on the slides to start this meeting. And believe me, having some of those burdens to require only a subset of Tier 3 growers as I read so often in the Draft is of no consolation. The volume of documentation, reporting, monitoring, compliance, milestones, timelines, evaluations and analysis that are required of Tier 3, I mean, leads me to believe in my opinion Tier 3 growers are so being set up to fail and in doing so you fail. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. Gail Delihant, followed by Deirdre Des Jardins, and then Darlene Din. MS. SALAS: Good morning. My name is Sonya Salas. And I am for Western Growers. I'm here standing in for Gail Delihant, who is unable to represent Western Growers because of conflicts in the legislation in Sacramento.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. YOUNG: Kevin Collins. Kevin Collins. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: All right. David Costa. And then Gail Delihant. Okay. MR. COSTA: Thank you, Chairman Young. My name is David Costa, C-O-S-T-A. There's so many areas of this draft that is problematic for me. In no particular order, the proposed future nitrogen reporting data comes out on October 1st of 2014, which is during the ongoing fertilizer season for crops we just finished planting, three or four weeks earlier, so it's not even a natural break in the cropping cycle. I'm really confused on how you can require ponds to be lined to avoid percolation in one paragraph then promote percolation basins and recharge projects in another paragraph, while yet in another paragraph promoting the benefits of percolating surface water despite exceedences of water quality standards.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	The reason I raise that point is to say that there's an additional burden placed on Tier 3 growers is a huge understatement because the expectations and requirements of Tier 3 are exponential as compared to the other tiers, even Tier 2. The devil is in the details of Tier 3 and was not up on the slides to start this meeting. And believe me, having some of those burdens to require only a subset of Tier 3 growers as I read so often in the Draft is of no consolation. The volume of documentation, reporting, monitoring, compliance, milestones, timelines, evaluations and analysis that are required of Tier 3, I mean, leads me to believe in my opinion Tier 3 growers are so being set up to fail and in doing so you fail. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. Gail Delihant, followed by Deirdre Des Jardins, and then Darlene Din. MS. SALAS: Good morning. My name is Sonya Salas. And I am for Western Growers. I'm here standing in for Gail Delihant, who is unable to represent Western Growers because of conflicts in the legislation in Sacramento. MR. YOUNG: Excuse me, could you spell your name?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. YOUNG: Kevin Collins. Kevin Collins. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: All right. David Costa. And then Gail Delihant. Okay. MR. COSTA: Thank you, Chairman Young. My name is David Costa, C-O-S-T-A. There's so many areas of this draft that is problematic for me. In no particular order, the proposed future nitrogen reporting data comes out on October 1st of 2014, which is during the ongoing fertilizer season for crops we just finished planting, three or four weeks earlier, so it's not even a natural break in the cropping cycle. I'm really confused on how you can require ponds to be lined to avoid percolation in one paragraph then promote percolation basins and recharge projects in another paragraph, while yet in another paragraph promoting the benefits of percolating surface water	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	The reason I raise that point is to say that there's an additional burden placed on Tier 3 growers is a huge understatement because the expectations and requirements of Tier 3 are exponential as compared to the other tiers, even Tier 2. The devil is in the details of Tier 3 and was not up on the slides to start this meeting. And believe me, having some of those burdens to require only a subset of Tier 3 growers as I read so often in the Draft is of no consolation. The volume of documentation, reporting, monitoring, compliance, milestones, timelines, evaluations and analysis that are required of Tier 3, I mean, leads me to believe in my opinion Tier 3 growers are so being set up to fail and in doing so you fail. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. Gail Delihant, followed by Deirdre Des Jardins, and then Darlene Din. MS. SALAS: Good morning. My name is Sonya Salas. And I am for Western Growers. I'm here standing in for Gail Delihant, who is unable to represent Western Growers because of conflicts in the legislation in Sacramento.

1 MR. YOUNG: That was your last name? 1 getting into the shell fish and killing sea otters. This 2 MS. SALAS: Salas. 2 is a sentinal species, and we believe that we should 3 3 MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you. adopt the -- the Central Coast Water Board should not 4 MS. SALAS: So I'm here simply to put questions on wait until there's a massive dead zone in Monterey Bay 5 the record in support of the agricultural proposal and 5 and we have irreversibly contaminated the aquifers to 6 6 encourage the Board to also support a viable and prudent take these actions. 7 7 alternative to meet requirements for water improvement. I have here a box of 500 letters that was 8 8 I'm also here to say that Western Growers are gathered by community members in support of the original 9 willing to work with the growers to ensure the proposal 9 regulations and in support of clean water. The Board --10 and to help the members achieve the requirements in these 10 there would have been many more letters but for the 11 11 January 3rd cutoff date. proposals. 12 12 With that I want to thank you for allowing me Thank you. 13 the opportunity to express the support of the agriculture 13 MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. 14 14 proposal. MS. DES JARDINS: I also wanted to submit these 15 MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. 15 photos. I've got copies and copies of the designated 16 16 Deirdre Des Jardins, and Darlene Din, and then critical habitat. 17 17 Joe Dillon. MS. McCHESNEY: Excuse me. Can you give those to 18 MS. DE JARDINS: My name is Darlene Des Jardins, 18 me? Do you have -- are those letters you have are those 19 19 letters that were submitted in January? That box? D-E-S, J-A-R-D-I-N-S. 20 20 I'm speaking for the Santa Cruz Groups of the MS. DE JARDINS: Yes. They were submitted by the 21 21 Sierra Club. **Environmental Coalition for Water.** 22 22 We applaud the Regional Board for maintaining MS. McCHESNEY: They're not new letters? 23 requirements to preserve riparian habitats. 23 MS. DES JARDINS: Yes. 24 24 Pinto Lake in Santa Cruz County has the MR. YOUNG: Wait. Are they new letters? 25 highest level of DTD of any lake in the state. Legacy MS. DE JARDINS: No, they're not new letters. Page 427 Page 429 pesticides are carried by sediment run-off. As you heard 1 There would have been a lot more but for the cutoff date. 2 2 in previous testimony, riparian corridors are critical MR. YOUNG: Okay. 3 3 for eruption control of filtration so these regulations MS. DIN: Darlene Din, D-I-N. 4 4 are essential to restoring the health of this lake. Thank you, Board, for the opportunity to 5 However, we feel that it is critical to have 5 speak before you. 6 6 In reading the Draft Orders for -- during the a prescribed width for riparian corridors as there was in 7 the original draft regulations because these corridors 7 many processes there were too many points that I felt to 8 are being in a critical and very sensitive and protected 8 even cover, that I chose to use my three minutes to talk 9 9 areas. about process and lag time and public involvement. 10 10 As an example, I brought these pictures of And why this is so important is that there's 11 11 Bennet Slew, which is part of the designated critical been a breakdown in the communication between the 12 12 habitant for salamanders. These before and after regulated community, the staff, other technical advisors, 13 satellite photos show that the riparian vegetation around 13 conservationists, labor, agricultural, advocates, 14 the Slew was clear cut sometime in late 2004, early 2005 14 environmental justice, the different groups have, 15 in spite of an 800-acre conservation easement, the 15 unfortunately, become paralyzed within this process. And 16 16 federal endangered Species Act and the State Coastal Act. when I looked at that I think that the best way to solve 17 This just shows you the kind of damage that is being done 17 a problem is to find the areas that we intersect or how 18 18 and this is why we need these regulations in the Ag Order we can find a way to work towards water quality 19 so it's applied uniformly. 19 solutions 20 20 Pinto Lake also has one of the highest levels So, I have worked with other agriculturalists 21 of micro toxins ever measured in a lake. We believe that 21 and members of the environmental community conservation 22 2.2 research will show that nutrient loads in the watershed community, NRCS, RCD, public official's staff, public

23

24

25

Page 428

water agencies, labor farm worker advocates to try to sit

be. Because from the point of view that we've looked at

down and determine what would a solution to water quality

groundwater, but with massive toxic algae lutes in the

lake, which are washing down into Monterey Bay and

are associated not only with the tier grading

23

24

Chlorphyrifos.

it in working towards this end solution, the process that has come forward, unfortunately, is broken and does not work. There's a lag time within science and it's a complex issue.

So when you -- one of the most important things that I hope that you think about today is you can write whatever regulatory scheme that needs to be done for you to meet certain standards, but if the science isn't there, if the technical capacity isn't there, if the groups aren't working towards a solution to a regulated community, it will be chaotic.

And I have found at these meetings that we have started to move together, that everyone is looking to have a voice. They're trying to find out how do we make it work. The approach that appears at this time that would work the best for agriculture and the public is the Ag Alternative which is the coalition approach to be able to sit down and look at watershed, sub-watershed, to be able to work on, through commodities, through science, to actually start to look at water quality solutions is very hard to prescribe an end game. And as David Costa talked about Tier 3 growers, you're not going to solve it when one grower is heavily regulated just by the fact he's a successful grower of over 1,000 acres, when maybe a grower of a smaller acreage in the same

has been detected doesn't mean that they're there often enough that they're problematic. But one class of pesticide, pyrethroids has been shown to be there often enough that it is problematic and it should be added into the regulation explicitly. In defining your tiers an application of pyrophosphate, diazoma were the subset of pyrethroids that were on the list should be added in in making your tiering decisions and that should trickle down to all the other subsequent places when the

department looks at to add to the Diazinon and

the water bodies. Well, just because the one pesticide

The addition of the monitoring sediments using -- will help get some of the information. Will help get some detections when we go down that path, but I still advise you to explicitly call up pyrethroids.

We think that you've been more than reasonable in accommodating agricultural interests. Some of the slides struck me very prominently up in Watsonville when the last few speakers put up comparisons between the February 2010 requirements and the March 2011 requirements. So, when we hear that things are still too much and that you're not -- people aren't being listened to, just take a look at the record and remember that the staff's recommended proposal had a lot more items in it,

Page 431

Page 433

watershed is not able to work in conjunction with him and her to make it work.

I just ask you to really look at the coalition approach and find a way for us to work towards water quality solutions.

Thank you.

MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.

Joe Dillon, followed by William Everett -- Elliott

and then Jody Frediani.

MR. DILLON: Good morning. My name is Joe Dillon, D-I-L-L-O-N. I'm a Regional Water Quality Coordinator for the National Marine Fisheries Service.

We have jurisdiction over ESA listed green sturgeon and some other critters running around the ocean.

We submitted many comments, letters on this. I'm sure you got them. There is -- I appreciate staff's response to them. There were some very good responses to some of our comments.

One topic that was brought up in Watsonville that I would like to revisit just briefly.

Chairman Young, Mr. Jeffries, you've asked why only organic phosphate pesticides were being explicitly called out in this regulation when there was a

long list of various pesticides that had been detected in Page 432

would have been a lot more strict right outside of the
 gate, and that you have the interest, you have heard
 that, and you tried to define what is a reasonable
 starting point and a reasonable first bite at the apple.

We will be back here in five years. There will be more monitoring data available. And, unfortunately, this job has turned me into a pessimist and I think the long term data is going to show that there are problems and we'll be having some of these discussions all over again.

I empathize with your position. My agency has to make these tough decisions. You're in between a rock and a hard place, but sooner or later you're going to have to take that vote. And I encourage you to get on with it.

MR. YOUNG: Thank you.

Mr. Jeffries:

MR. JEFFRIES: In your opinion or your analysis is there a difference between liquid or granule Diazinon? Does it make any difference as it travels through the root zone into the --

MR. DIL LON: It does --

MR. JEFFRIES: Do you understand my question?
MR. DIL LON: And it does make a difference, but
it has much to do with the application rate and the

1 subsequent irrigation and how the parcel is drained as it 1 economic analysis that was done. The Board required an 2 does with the actual formulation up front. 2 economic analysis which was simply not done by the staff. 3 3 If someone applies the granule form of Now, that's definitely part of SEQUA. 4 Diazinon and plows it in and then gives it a heavy 4 So I think that when all these things are 5 5 irrigation and increases the till water they might run a considered, along with the comments being made today and 6 6 lot of that off -- up ahead and into the ditch. previously by all of the speakers, the best and the only 7 7 If they go through and they're spraying with action that should be taken by this Board today is to 8 8 an air blast sprayer or something and they get a full decline to adopt the modifications, to reject the current 9 application of the product they might not get very much 9 proposal and to instruct the staff to start all over 10 run-off at all. So --10 again, and, hopefully, this time do it right. 11 11 MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. MR. JEFFRIES: So there is quite a bit of 12 12 difference between the liquid and the granule? Joy Fitzhugh. 13 MR. DILLON: Potentially, yes. 13 MS. FITZHUGH: Good morning. Joy Fitzhugh, 14 14 F-I-T-Z-H-U-G-H. MR. JEFFRIES: Thank you. 15 MR. YOUNG: Okay. William Elliott, followed by 15 And I'm speaking on behalf of the San Luis 16 Joy Fitzhugh, and then Jody Frediani. 16 Obispo County Farm Bureau today, and also as a prior 17 17 MR. ELLIOTT: Good morning, Chairman Young. My watershed coordinator. And I've had feedback from a 18 name is William Elliott. That's E-L-L-I-O-T-T. 18 number of the small growers that were in the watersheds 19 19 I'm here today to make essentially three that I was working with. And they're very concerned 20 20 comments on process because I think there are people here about the Tier 3 because some of them are small by virtue 21 who are far more knowledgeable in science than I, 21 of not being able to -- well, they're in a 303D listed 22 22 comments concerning weaknesses in this overall proposal. stream area and so forth, and they're having to look at 23 23 The first comment I wanted to make deals with meeting the Tier 3 requirements. 24 24 what I view as being illegal renewal by the Executive They say we're not going to be able to 25 Director Order of the 2004 Agricultural Order. The Board continue. We can't afford -- our margin is small enough Page 437 Page 435 1 may be aware a petition was filed by me with the State 1 that the additional reporting monitoring and 2 2 Board this past week in that regard. Certainly, if the implementation will take away all costs -- all 3 renewal of an executive order is not a modification of an 3 insensitive with the costs. So that I'm looking at 4 executive order I can't imagine what is. trying to reassure them that this isn't so, but I haven't 5 5 Secondly, I think there is a concern, at found that in the report. And I think as well as looking 6 least on my part, with the impacts not looked at and the 6 at this arbitrary 1,000 acre trigger you need to look at 7 totality of the environment. One of those I think in my 7 the small grower who might through no consequence of his 8 view at least, the staff is in effect placing concerns 8 own, be thrown into Tier 3 and have to follow those regs. 9 9 over water quality above concerns over air quality. For And I have to follow the prior speaker when 10 10 instance, as we pointed out in our submissions, the Air he talked about the economic analysis. When I looked 11 11 Quality Board has taken great efforts to control the use through the economic issues that were in this report, and 12 12 of diesel powered engines in the Monterey Bay area and I saw things that were cited from 1990, things that were 13 Salinas Valley. 13 cited from '99 as part of the costs, and they said, oh, 14 14 this is just to show the expense. No. Ten years ago, 20 Certainly having to place water purification 15 machines on farms throughout the Salinas Valley is going 15 years ago does not show the cost. As we all know costs 16 to greatly increase the amount of air pollution as will, 16 have gone up tremendously. 17 of course, the necessity to operate the machines to empty 17 And I think the implementation of this 18 18 them, to service them and everything else. The only program is going to be a lot more costly than most people 19 response really to this entire concern that the staff 19 think. 20 20 made was, well, we can't really tell what the farmers Lastly, I want to say something about the 21 21 what to do, so it's just speculation if you're going to fact that we have an Order that appears to be looking at 22 use the machine. Of course, these machines are the only 22 the program as point source. As we know point source

23

24

25

Page 436

14 (Pages 435 to 438)

coming out of a pipe that -- from a factory or something

uniquely individual non-point sources. And we're trying

is very different from the very complicated, complex,

way in which these standards can be met. So, it sort of

The third and final comment, really, is the

23

24

25

follows.

A504530

PANEL HEARING MAY 4, 2011

1	to pack them into three tiers, which is better than one,	1	MR. YOUNG: Well, I don't have a problem with
2	I'll agree, but we're trying to pack this into three	2	that. You have comments on behalf of the Cattlemen
3	tiers when everybody is very, very different. And I	3	Association?
4	think we have to go back and start looking at the fact	4	MS. McDONALD: Yes.
5	that we aren't all a factory, we're all somebody said	5	MR. YOUNG: If you have comments on behalf of the
6	mother earth kind of regulates how things go, and mother	6	Cattlemen Association, go ahead and give us those
7	earth is not one thing.	7	comments. And then I'll call you up and you can give us
8	I do urge you to take a good serious look at	8	some additional comments.
9	the Ag Coalition Alternative, it is looking at what is	9	MS. McDONALD: Thank you.
10	practical and what can be done by our agricultural	10	My name is Susan McDonald, M-C-D-O-N-A-L-D.
11	community.	11	I live in Cambria.
12	Thank you.	12	Cliff Garrison is the operations manager for
13	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.	13	the Hearst Ranches in San Simeon and in Chalame. We
14	Dr. Hunter.	14	operate in both San Luis Obispo County and Monterey
15	DR. HUNTER: Yeah. Thank you, Joy, good to see	15	County. We are primarily a cattle operation with range
16	you here today.	16	land grazing since 1865. Our farming operation consists
17	Just so I'm clear on the small farmer	17	of six acres of avocados at the Hearst Ranch and 150
18	comments that you bring into us today and your concern	18	acres of alfalfa and our Jack Ranch, as well as dry
19	about the 1,000 acre trigger. Are you	19	farming hay in irrigated pastures.
20	MS. FITZHUGH: Not the 1,000 acre trigger, I'm	20	I'm here, also, in support of our farmers and
21	more concerned about the fact that through no nothing	21	Regional Board to cooperate in achieving water quality
22	that they have done, because they might be on a 303D	22	goals.
23	listed stream within that area, and small acreage, when	23	Some of our thoughts on the Draft Order are
24	you talk about buffers and so forth, you may end up	24	as follows. If you irrigate, there's no way to opted
25	taking their whole production land with a buffer. So	25	out. You are assumed to be discharging agricultural
	Page 439		Page 441
1		1	
1	that's what we're what these people are worried about.	1	waste into waters of the state even if you do not do so.
2	DR. HUNTER: Okay. I just wanted to be sure I	2	The regulations are based on the chance that
3	understood it.	3	we could discharge, and we can not support that
4	MS. FITZHUGH: But the 1,000 acre people do have	4	assumption.
5	an automatic trigger which also. So you're looking at	5	At the Hearst Ranch in San Simeon we operate
6	both ends of the spectrum possibly being caught in this	6	80,000 acres under a conservation easement and use best
7	Tier 3.		management practices to eliminate risk of waste discharge
8	Thank you.	8	from our six acre avocado orchard.
	DR. HUNTER: Thank you.		We support tier zero, as mentioned at the
10	MR. YOUNG: Jody Frediani.	10	last hearing and an exception from the Order. Tiers
11	(Alamanana)	11	should be tied to actual risk, each property must be
12	(No response.)	12	individually analyzed.
13 14	MD VOLING, Okov	13 14	In general, we do not support how the tiers
15	MR. YOUNG: Okay.	15	are set up, especially how proximity to an impaired water
16	Cliff Garrison. Cliff Garrison.	16	body put us into a higher tier. Recently Chalame Creek
17	MS. McDONALD: He had to leave.	17	was put on the 303D list for Ecoli and that places our
18	MR. YOUNG: He had to leave. Was he here this	18	ranch in a higher risk tier.
19	morning?	19	The listing was based on samples taken from
20	MS. McDONALD: I have written comments if you would like for me to read it.	20	the one and only monitoring site under the Degenara
21	would like for me to read it.	21	Water Bridge on Chalame Creek, a place inhabited by 100s of swallows, place and other uncentrallable sources. Cows
22	MR. YOUNG: Okay. Are these for the Cattlemen	21	of swallows, pigs and other uncontrollable sources. Cows
23	Association?	23	are assumed to be a problem because they are
24	MS. McDONALD: Yes.	24	controllable.
	MD VOLING: Okay Wall why don't you		
25	MR. YOUNG: Okay. Well, why don't you MS. McDONALD: I still have my own comments.	25	These samples do not represent the overall health of our stream or the management practices of our

1	ranch.	1	and the Porter Cologne Act due to the groundwater
2	Sampling and monitoring must be supported by	2	recharge benefits. This new Draft Order reverses this
3	science and sound practices the farmer and water board	3	practice and the negative environmental consequences of
4	can agree on. There has to be accuracy of measurements	4	impermeable containment structures on groundwater
5	on the farmers, either nitrate contributors or discharges	5 6	recharge would be substantial, particularly in the
6	for uncontrollable sources; in our case wildlife.	7	Salinas Valley area.
7	Sampling should be a cooperative effort done	8	The Draft Order from staff is requiring an
8 9	at intervals to demonstrate transit water quality. A good example of this is at San Simeon at	9	agricultural community to clean tail water. Water that
10	the Arroyo Villa Cruz, it's on the impaired list for	10	leaves the ranch to a level that is better than drinking water standards.
11	excedent of Ecoli from a sample taken in 2006. I found a	11	Municipalities do not drink treated water to
12	lot of inaccurate data in the document. The monitoring	12	these standards until the water is actually being served
13	cite was unrepresentative of 11.2 miles of water body	13	up for consumption. This Draft Order asks farmers to
14	that we manage solely. We collect our own water quality	14	become hydrologists and essentially install waste water
15	data during conservation easement monitoring.	15	treatment systems if they are to discharge any water from
16	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.	16	their fields, which is a far different requirement than
17	Dirk Giannini, Alice Grip, Norm Groot, Edward	17	drinking water consumption.
18	Hard.	18	This standard is based on a presumption that
19	MR. GIANNINI: Good morning, Chairman Young and	19	a flea placed in a lab water sample setting fails to
20	Board Members.	20	survive regardless of any other contributing factors to
21	My name is Dirk Giannini, G-I-A-N-N-I-N-I.	21	the flea's mortality. The farmers can not recharge
22	I'm a fourth generation farmer in the Salinas Valley. My	22	groundwater and are required to contain their own water
23	wife and two beautiful daughters as well as my parents	23	and storm water in impermeable ponds based on a mortality
24	live in homes on a farm in Salinas.	24	of a flea that does not even survive in the wild along
25	We have grown crops on this farm for over	25	the Central Coast, then the reasonableness of this Draft
	Page 443		Page 445
_		_	
1	80 years. I was born and raised on this ranch and we	1	Order by staff must be called into question.
2	currently use the same domestic well for our drinking	2	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.
2	currently use the same domestic well for our drinking water needs today that my parents raised me on. This	2	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. MR. GIANNINI: In closing I'd like to
2 3 4	currently use the same domestic well for our drinking water needs today that my parents raised me on. This well, which is on the lower draining end of the ranch, is	2 3 4	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. MR. GIANNINI: In closing I'd like to just support the Ag Proposal before you later today.
2 3 4 5	currently use the same domestic well for our drinking water needs today that my parents raised me on. This well, which is on the lower draining end of the ranch, is surrounded by lettuce, broccoli, and strawberry	2 3 4 5	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. MR. GIANNINI: In closing I'd like to
2 3 4 5 6	currently use the same domestic well for our drinking water needs today that my parents raised me on. This well, which is on the lower draining end of the ranch, is surrounded by lettuce, broccoli, and strawberry production which has been in place since the 1970s.	2 3 4 5 6	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. MR. GIANNINI: In closing I'd like to just support the Ag Proposal before you later today. MR. YOUNG: Alice Grip.
2 3 4 5 6 7	currently use the same domestic well for our drinking water needs today that my parents raised me on. This well, which is on the lower draining end of the ranch, is surrounded by lettuce, broccoli, and strawberry production which has been in place since the 1970s. Obviously, this well, which is tested	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. MR. GIANNINI: In closing I'd like to just support the Ag Proposal before you later today.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	currently use the same domestic well for our drinking water needs today that my parents raised me on. This well, which is on the lower draining end of the ranch, is surrounded by lettuce, broccoli, and strawberry production which has been in place since the 1970s. Obviously, this well, which is tested regularly, meets drinking water standards. I can state	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. MR. GIANNINI: In closing I'd like to just support the Ag Proposal before you later today. MR. YOUNG: Alice Grip. (No response.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	currently use the same domestic well for our drinking water needs today that my parents raised me on. This well, which is on the lower draining end of the ranch, is surrounded by lettuce, broccoli, and strawberry production which has been in place since the 1970s. Obviously, this well, which is tested regularly, meets drinking water standards. I can state with a sense of pride that our production of crops over	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. MR. GIANNINI: In closing I'd like to just support the Ag Proposal before you later today. MR. YOUNG: Alice Grip. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: Norm Groot.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	currently use the same domestic well for our drinking water needs today that my parents raised me on. This well, which is on the lower draining end of the ranch, is surrounded by lettuce, broccoli, and strawberry production which has been in place since the 1970s. Obviously, this well, which is tested regularly, meets drinking water standards. I can state with a sense of pride that our production of crops over these decades has not degraded our domestic well water	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. MR. GIANNINI: In closing I'd like to just support the Ag Proposal before you later today. MR. YOUNG: Alice Grip. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: Norm Groot. MR. GROOT: My name is Norm Groot, G-R-O-O-T. I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	currently use the same domestic well for our drinking water needs today that my parents raised me on. This well, which is on the lower draining end of the ranch, is surrounded by lettuce, broccoli, and strawberry production which has been in place since the 1970s. Obviously, this well, which is tested regularly, meets drinking water standards. I can state with a sense of pride that our production of crops over these decades has not degraded our domestic well water quality.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. MR. GIANNINI: In closing I'd like to just support the Ag Proposal before you later today. MR. YOUNG: Alice Grip. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: Norm Groot. MR. GROOT: My name is Norm Groot, G-R-O-O-T. I'm the Executive Director of The Monterey County Farm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	currently use the same domestic well for our drinking water needs today that my parents raised me on. This well, which is on the lower draining end of the ranch, is surrounded by lettuce, broccoli, and strawberry production which has been in place since the 1970s. Obviously, this well, which is tested regularly, meets drinking water standards. I can state with a sense of pride that our production of crops over these decades has not degraded our domestic well water quality. The Ag Order proposed by your staff has a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. MR. GIANNINI: In closing I'd like to just support the Ag Proposal before you later today. MR. YOUNG: Alice Grip. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: Norm Groot. MR. GROOT: My name is Norm Groot, G-R-O-O-T. I'm the Executive Director of The Monterey County Farm Bureau.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	currently use the same domestic well for our drinking water needs today that my parents raised me on. This well, which is on the lower draining end of the ranch, is surrounded by lettuce, broccoli, and strawberry production which has been in place since the 1970s. Obviously, this well, which is tested regularly, meets drinking water standards. I can state with a sense of pride that our production of crops over these decades has not degraded our domestic well water quality. The Ag Order proposed by your staff has a number of unintended consequences including the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. MR. GIANNINI: In closing I'd like to just support the Ag Proposal before you later today. MR. YOUNG: Alice Grip. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: Norm Groot. MR. GROOT: My name is Norm Groot, G-R-O-O-T. I'm the Executive Director of The Monterey County Farm Bureau. As a former agricultural producer now
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	currently use the same domestic well for our drinking water needs today that my parents raised me on. This well, which is on the lower draining end of the ranch, is surrounded by lettuce, broccoli, and strawberry production which has been in place since the 1970s. Obviously, this well, which is tested regularly, meets drinking water standards. I can state with a sense of pride that our production of crops over these decades has not degraded our domestic well water quality. The Ag Order proposed by your staff has a number of unintended consequences including the curtailling of groundwater recharge if all retention ponds	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. MR. GIANNINI: In closing I'd like to just support the Ag Proposal before you later today. MR. YOUNG: Alice Grip. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: Norm Groot. MR. GROOT: My name is Norm Groot, G-R-O-O-T. I'm the Executive Director of The Monterey County Farm Bureau. As a former agricultural producer now representing my local agricultural community my main
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	currently use the same domestic well for our drinking water needs today that my parents raised me on. This well, which is on the lower draining end of the ranch, is surrounded by lettuce, broccoli, and strawberry production which has been in place since the 1970s. Obviously, this well, which is tested regularly, meets drinking water standards. I can state with a sense of pride that our production of crops over these decades has not degraded our domestic well water quality. The Ag Order proposed by your staff has a number of unintended consequences including the curtailing of groundwater recharge if all retention ponds to be required to be impermeable. Under in the Draft	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. MR. GIANNINI: In closing I'd like to just support the Ag Proposal before you later today. MR. YOUNG: Alice Grip. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: Norm Groot. MR. GROOT: My name is Norm Groot, G-R-O-O-T. I'm the Executive Director of The Monterey County Farm Bureau. As a former agricultural producer now representing my local agricultural community my main function is to advocate for the ability of farmers and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	currently use the same domestic well for our drinking water needs today that my parents raised me on. This well, which is on the lower draining end of the ranch, is surrounded by lettuce, broccoli, and strawberry production which has been in place since the 1970s. Obviously, this well, which is tested regularly, meets drinking water standards. I can state with a sense of pride that our production of crops over these decades has not degraded our domestic well water quality. The Ag Order proposed by your staff has a number of unintended consequences including the curtailing of groundwater recharge if all retention ponds to be required to be impermeable. Under in the Draft Order by staff farmers and ranchers that use these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. MR. GIANNINI: In closing I'd like to just support the Ag Proposal before you later today. MR. YOUNG: Alice Grip. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: Norm Groot. MR. GROOT: My name is Norm Groot, G-R-O-O-T. I'm the Executive Director of The Monterey County Farm Bureau. As a former agricultural producer now representing my local agricultural community my main function is to advocate for the ability of farmers and ranchers to do what they do best, which is farming and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	currently use the same domestic well for our drinking water needs today that my parents raised me on. This well, which is on the lower draining end of the ranch, is surrounded by lettuce, broccoli, and strawberry production which has been in place since the 1970s. Obviously, this well, which is tested regularly, meets drinking water standards. I can state with a sense of pride that our production of crops over these decades has not degraded our domestic well water quality. The Ag Order proposed by your staff has a number of unintended consequences including the curtailing of groundwater recharge if all retention ponds to be required to be impermeable. Under in the Draft Order by staff farmers and ranchers that use these retention ponds for reservoirs would be required to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. MR. GIANNINI: In closing I'd like to just support the Ag Proposal before you later today. MR. YOUNG: Alice Grip. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: Norm Groot. MR. GROOT: My name is Norm Groot, G-R-O-O-T. I'm the Executive Director of The Monterey County Farm Bureau. As a former agricultural producer now representing my local agricultural community my main function is to advocate for the ability of farmers and ranchers to do what they do best, which is farming and ranching.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	currently use the same domestic well for our drinking water needs today that my parents raised me on. This well, which is on the lower draining end of the ranch, is surrounded by lettuce, broccoli, and strawberry production which has been in place since the 1970s. Obviously, this well, which is tested regularly, meets drinking water standards. I can state with a sense of pride that our production of crops over these decades has not degraded our domestic well water quality. The Ag Order proposed by your staff has a number of unintended consequences including the curtailing of groundwater recharge if all retention ponds to be required to be impermeable. Under in the Draft Order by staff farmers and ranchers that use these retention ponds for reservoirs would be required to reconstruct them in a manner which prohibits any	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. MR. GIANNINI: In closing I'd like to just support the Ag Proposal before you later today. MR. YOUNG: Alice Grip. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: Norm Groot. MR. GROOT: My name is Norm Groot, G-R-O-O-T. I'm the Executive Director of The Monterey County Farm Bureau. As a former agricultural producer now representing my local agricultural community my main function is to advocate for the ability of farmers and ranchers to do what they do best, which is farming and ranching. The very waters that we're discussing here is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	currently use the same domestic well for our drinking water needs today that my parents raised me on. This well, which is on the lower draining end of the ranch, is surrounded by lettuce, broccoli, and strawberry production which has been in place since the 1970s. Obviously, this well, which is tested regularly, meets drinking water standards. I can state with a sense of pride that our production of crops over these decades has not degraded our domestic well water quality. The Ag Order proposed by your staff has a number of unintended consequences including the curtailling of groundwater recharge if all retention ponds to be required to be impermeable. Under in the Draft Order by staff farmers and ranchers that use these retention ponds for reservoirs would be required to reconstruct them in a manner which prohibits any groundwater recharge that may contribute to existing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. MR. GIANNINI: In closing I'd like to just support the Ag Proposal before you later today. MR. YOUNG: Alice Grip. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: Norm Groot. MR. GROOT: My name is Norm Groot, G-R-O-O-T. I'm the Executive Director of The Monterey County Farm Bureau. As a former agricultural producer now representing my local agricultural community my main function is to advocate for the ability of farmers and ranchers to do what they do best, which is farming and ranching. The very waters that we're discussing here is the very livelihood of all farmers and ranchers. Without
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	currently use the same domestic well for our drinking water needs today that my parents raised me on. This well, which is on the lower draining end of the ranch, is surrounded by lettuce, broccoli, and strawberry production which has been in place since the 1970s. Obviously, this well, which is tested regularly, meets drinking water standards. I can state with a sense of pride that our production of crops over these decades has not degraded our domestic well water quality. The Ag Order proposed by your staff has a number of unintended consequences including the curtailing of groundwater recharge if all retention ponds to be required to be impermeable. Under in the Draft Order by staff farmers and ranchers that use these retention ponds for reservoirs would be required to reconstruct them in a manner which prohibits any groundwater recharge that may contribute to existing water quality standards. This means that all ponds and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. MR. GIANNINI: In closing I'd like to just support the Ag Proposal before you later today. MR. YOUNG: Alice Grip. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: Norm Groot. MR. GROOT: My name is Norm Groot, G-R-O-O-T. I'm the Executive Director of The Monterey County Farm Bureau. As a former agricultural producer now representing my local agricultural community my main function is to advocate for the ability of farmers and ranchers to do what they do best, which is farming and ranching. The very waters that we're discussing here is the very livelihood of all farmers and ranchers. Without this resource there would be no food on your table
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	currently use the same domestic well for our drinking water needs today that my parents raised me on. This well, which is on the lower draining end of the ranch, is surrounded by lettuce, broccoli, and strawberry production which has been in place since the 1970s. Obviously, this well, which is tested regularly, meets drinking water standards. I can state with a sense of pride that our production of crops over these decades has not degraded our domestic well water quality. The Ag Order proposed by your staff has a number of unintended consequences including the curtailing of groundwater recharge if all retention ponds to be required to be impermeable. Under in the Draft Order by staff farmers and ranchers that use these retention ponds for reservoirs would be required to reconstruct them in a manner which prohibits any groundwater recharge that may contribute to existing water quality standards. This means that all ponds and reservation water on farm operations must be lined, which	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. MR. GIANNINI: In closing I'd like to just support the Ag Proposal before you later today. MR. YOUNG: Alice Grip. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: Norm Groot. MR. GROOT: My name is Norm Groot, G-R-O-O-T. I'm the Executive Director of The Monterey County Farm Bureau. As a former agricultural producer now representing my local agricultural community my main function is to advocate for the ability of farmers and ranchers to do what they do best, which is farming and ranching. The very waters that we're discussing here is the very livelihood of all farmers and ranchers. Without this resource there would be no food on your table tonight. Agriculture knows the value of these resources
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	currently use the same domestic well for our drinking water needs today that my parents raised me on. This well, which is on the lower draining end of the ranch, is surrounded by lettuce, broccoli, and strawberry production which has been in place since the 1970s. Obviously, this well, which is tested regularly, meets drinking water standards. I can state with a sense of pride that our production of crops over these decades has not degraded our domestic well water quality. The Ag Order proposed by your staff has a number of unintended consequences including the curtailing of groundwater recharge if all retention ponds to be required to be impermeable. Under in the Draft Order by staff farmers and ranchers that use these retention ponds for reservoirs would be required to reconstruct them in a manner which prohibits any groundwater recharge that may contribute to existing water quality standards. This means that all ponds and reservation water on farm operations must be lined, which is a very expensive proposition for any farmer or rancher	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. MR. GIANNINI: In closing I'd like to just support the Ag Proposal before you later today. MR. YOUNG: Alice Grip. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: Norm Groot. MR. GROOT: My name is Norm Groot, G-R-O-O-T. I'm the Executive Director of The Monterey County Farm Bureau. As a former agricultural producer now representing my local agricultural community my main function is to advocate for the ability of farmers and ranchers to do what they do best, which is farming and ranching. The very waters that we're discussing here is the very livelihood of all farmers and ranchers. Without this resource there would be no food on your table tonight. Agriculture knows the value of these resources appreciates that water quality is important to our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	currently use the same domestic well for our drinking water needs today that my parents raised me on. This well, which is on the lower draining end of the ranch, is surrounded by lettuce, broccoli, and strawberry production which has been in place since the 1970s. Obviously, this well, which is tested regularly, meets drinking water standards. I can state with a sense of pride that our production of crops over these decades has not degraded our domestic well water quality. The Ag Order proposed by your staff has a number of unintended consequences including the curtailing of groundwater recharge if all retention ponds to be required to be impermeable. Under in the Draft Order by staff farmers and ranchers that use these retention ponds for reservoirs would be required to reconstruct them in a manner which prohibits any groundwater recharge that may contribute to existing water quality standards. This means that all ponds and reservation water on farm operations must be lined, which is a very expensive proposition for any farmer or rancher of any size or volume.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. MR. GIANNINI: In closing I'd like to just support the Ag Proposal before you later today. MR. YOUNG: Alice Grip. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: Norm Groot. MR. GROOT: My name is Norm Groot, G-R-O-O-T. I'm the Executive Director of The Monterey County Farm Bureau. As a former agricultural producer now representing my local agricultural community my main function is to advocate for the ability of farmers and ranchers to do what they do best, which is farming and ranching. The very waters that we're discussing here is the very livelihood of all farmers and ranchers. Without this resource there would be no food on your table tonight. Agriculture knows the value of these resources appreciates that water quality is important to our environment. And I come here today in dismay that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	currently use the same domestic well for our drinking water needs today that my parents raised me on. This well, which is on the lower draining end of the ranch, is surrounded by lettuce, broccoli, and strawberry production which has been in place since the 1970s. Obviously, this well, which is tested regularly, meets drinking water standards. I can state with a sense of pride that our production of crops over these decades has not degraded our domestic well water quality. The Ag Order proposed by your staff has a number of unintended consequences including the curtailing of groundwater recharge if all retention ponds to be required to be impermeable. Under in the Draft Order by staff farmers and ranchers that use these retention ponds for reservoirs would be required to reconstruct them in a manner which prohibits any groundwater recharge that may contribute to existing water quality standards. This means that all ponds and reservation water on farm operations must be lined, which is a very expensive proposition for any farmer or rancher	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. MR. GIANNINI: In closing I'd like to just support the Ag Proposal before you later today. MR. YOUNG: Alice Grip. (No response.) MR. YOUNG: Norm Groot. MR. GROOT: My name is Norm Groot, G-R-O-O-T. I'm the Executive Director of The Monterey County Farm Bureau. As a former agricultural producer now representing my local agricultural community my main function is to advocate for the ability of farmers and ranchers to do what they do best, which is farming and ranching. The very waters that we're discussing here is the very livelihood of all farmers and ranchers. Without this resource there would be no food on your table tonight. Agriculture knows the value of these resources appreciates that water quality is important to our

1	sense.	1	MR. YOUNG: Thank for your comments.
2	Agriculture is fully aware of the impairments	2	MR. GROOT: You're welcome.
3	within our regional watershed and is committed to improve	3	MR. YOUNG: Edward Hard.
4	water quality along the Central Coast. No credit has	4	MR. HARD: Good morning. Edward Hard, California
5	been given to agriculture for the improvements made to	5	Department of Food and Agriculture.
6	production practices that resulted in improved water	6	My comments today are coming directly from
7	quality. We know this from the data collected throughout	7	the Secretary, Karen Ross.
8	the current Ag Order when that was successfully deployed	8	We are here in spirit in collaboration in an
9	using cooperation among the stakeholders.	9	effort to find ways to solve these problems that we've
10	The multiple proposals from your staff lack	10	been addressing to you for the last several years.
11	any cooperation from any stakeholders within region three	11	I think one of the key pieces that this Board
12	and any input from agricultural stakeholders in this	12	should know is what is the CFA's interest in this
13	process has been met by resistance from your staff.	13	process? Our interests stems fertilizer. We have
14	This exclusion of common sense approach to	14	jurisdictional authority for fertilizers for
15	developing an Ag Order that all stakeholders can agree to	15	fertilizers that are sold and distributed across the
16	is what's missing here. If our legislators, such as Sam	16	state. We ensure that they are safe, effective and the
17	Farr, Anthony Canella and Louie Salejo find that this	17	claims that are on the labels meet the guarantees for
18	process has gone off track, then there's cause for	18	what the labels are asking or demonstrating on the label,
19	concern that your staff has exceeded its boundaries.	19	not the product.
20	The assumptions made by staff are based on	20	We have authority to license and have product
21	data anomalies and use subset science as a backup. As	21	labor review and registration. We also have an
22	you've heard in Watsonville the very water quality	22	enforcement division that evaluates whether or not the
23	reports that the staff proposals are based on has	23	fertilizers that are being sold in bulk or in packages
24	suggested data sampling techniques.	24	are making sure that their claims are meeting what
25	Agriculture within your region has stepped up	25	they're asking for in terms of their efficacy,
	Page 447		Page 449
			-
1	with a workable viable solution for the next five years.	1	scientifically and what is being put forth in the claim.
2	One that achieves water quality improvements that are	2	We do not have jurisdictional authority over
3	measurable, accountable and verifiable. The object of	3	application, but herein lies our concerns with this
4	any Ag Order should be to help this industry achieve	4	Order. We have concerns and recommendations. Regulatory
5	this standard with a common sense approach that allows	5	process thus far is extremely heavy on regulatory
6	farming and ranching to continue while improving our	6	requirements, but short on process that creates a
7	environment within the region.	7	scientifically credible outcome. This stands to create a
8	I ask that you allow common sense to enter	8	lack of credibility and success of this regulatory
9	into this decision and support the agricultural proposal	9	process. This regulatory path forward is unsustainable
10	that provides a solution that we all collectively own a	10	as it is currently drafted.
11	share of responsibility. We all drink the same water and	11	There's a disproportionate effect within the
12	we all like to eat safe, healthy food.	12	economic and environmental conditions in this region
13	Thank you.	13	within this Order. It will be undermining successful
14	MR. YOUNG: I have a question for you, Mr. Groot.	14	efforts that this agricultural community has demonstrated
15	Are you supportive of groundwater monitoring for nitrate	15	through this region.
16	as far as this overall effort?	16	There'll be excessive competition among
17	MR. GROOT: I believe that you will hear later	17	growers to find scientific answers that are not
18	from the Ag Panel that will make a conclusion that, yes,	18	scientific. What do I mean by that? This regulation as
19	we are willing to put a proposal on the table concerning	19	it currently stands, that's in all tiers, would have
20	groundwater monitoring.	20	growers trying to figure out what the nutrient uptake
21	MR. YOUNG: Okay. That effort represents the	21	values are. There are 52, by our count, crops grown in
22	Monterey County Farm Bureau position?	22	this region, give or take one of two. Of those 52 crops
23	MR. GROOT: Our position is included in that	23	only two have ever had scientifically evaluated uptake
24	because we are part of the Ag working group coalition and	24	values. And those two that have been done are not
25	it's formulated that was	25	scientifically valid

Page 448

1	So, this puts us in a quandary. We have a	1	have a baseline by which this body can then probably
2	panel going forward without a lot of effort that's been	2	regulate and dictate to meet our quorum. How are we
3	put into bringing in the regulatory pardon me, the	3	going to meet that water quality standards. You can't do
4	scientific farm of state government, UC SCFU, they're	4	it without standing what those values are.
5	completely absent from this process.	5	MR. YOUNG: So you're saying at this point you
6	Our recommendations are this. Perform a	6	don't know because the science hasn't been done whether
7	scientific evaluation of the proposed regulation.	7	or not in making any modification to application rates is
8	Facilitate the identification and scientific data and	8	going to result in improvements to water quality.
9	needs specifically related to the nitrogen uptake values	9	MR. HARD: We do not know currently, based upon
10	for all the crops, all tiers.	10	what this regulation regulation is asking in all the
11	Facilitate the establishment of common set of	11	tiers, based on all the crops within those tiers how we
12	nitrogen uptake curves for each crop that growers and	12	would use a management practice that would efficaciously
13	rely upon. You can't have all these crop advisors going	13	cost effectively meet the water quality standards. We
14	out that are hired by growers to have their own	14	don't have that.
15	evaluation of what the curves are. We need a common set	15	MR. YOUNG: Okay.
16	established by the state which is the University of	16	MR. HARD: Given that timeline that you've asked
17	CSU and the University of California.	17	growers to meet this, 2014, it takes two to three years
18	How are we going to do this?	18	just to evaluate two crops to determine nitrogen uptake
19	Thank you for allowing me time. We are a	19	values. So extrapolating that out is not 2014.
20	state agency in this process and we have been, to this	20	MR. YOUNG: Does the Secretary have a position
21	date, not given enough time to discuss this issue, so,	21	with respect to sampling the groundwater for nitrate?
22	please, bare with me for one more minute.	22	MR. HARD: The Secretary believes that monitoring
23	MR. YOUNG: I'll give you one more minute.	23	of any sort is necessary in any sweep of options. A
24	MR. HARD: Thank you.	24	portfolio approach is needed.
25	Identify and leverage resources to accomplish	25	She has been working with the Governor's
	Page 451		Page 453
1	funding in all tiers that you have identified. All	1	office as was the Secretary to address these issues. And
1 2	funding in all tiers that you have identified. All	1 2	office as was the Secretary to address these issues. And
2	tiers, specifically, high risk crops. Nitrogen uptake	2	you will be hearing shortly some of our other
2	tiers, specifically, high risk crops. Nitrogen uptake values of all crops, again, should be identified. And	2	you will be hearing shortly some of our other suggestions.
2 3 4	tiers, specifically, high risk crops. Nitrogen uptake values of all crops, again, should be identified. And we, through fertilizer research and education program at	2 3 4	you will be hearing shortly some of our other suggestions. MR. YOUNG: Okay. But I just want to narrow it
2	tiers, specifically, high risk crops. Nitrogen uptake values of all crops, again, should be identified. And we, through fertilizer research and education program at the Department of Food and Ag office have over the years,	2 3 4 5	you will be hearing shortly some of our other suggestions. MR. YOUNG: Okay. But I just want to narrow it down to that one particular item. Does the Secretary
2 3 4 5 6	tiers, specifically, high risk crops. Nitrogen uptake values of all crops, again, should be identified. And we, through fertilizer research and education program at the Department of Food and Ag office have over the years, 21 years now, been evaluating nitrate found in the	2 3 4 5 6	you will be hearing shortly some of our other suggestions. MR. YOUNG: Okay. But I just want to narrow it down to that one particular item. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to requiring farmers to test
2 3 4 5 6 7	tiers, specifically, high risk crops. Nitrogen uptake values of all crops, again, should be identified. And we, through fertilizer research and education program at the Department of Food and Ag office have over the years, 21 years now, been evaluating nitrate found in the groundwater.	2 3 4 5 6 7	you will be hearing shortly some of our other suggestions. MR. YOUNG: Okay. But I just want to narrow it down to that one particular item. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to requiring farmers to test groundwater for nitrate?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	tiers, specifically, high risk crops. Nitrogen uptake values of all crops, again, should be identified. And we, through fertilizer research and education program at the Department of Food and Ag office have over the years, 21 years now, been evaluating nitrate found in the groundwater. And we have conducted research by two	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	you will be hearing shortly some of our other suggestions. MR. YOUNG: Okay. But I just want to narrow it down to that one particular item. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to requiring farmers to test groundwater for nitrate? MR. HARD: No.
2 3 4 5 6 7	tiers, specifically, high risk crops. Nitrogen uptake values of all crops, again, should be identified. And we, through fertilizer research and education program at the Department of Food and Ag office have over the years, 21 years now, been evaluating nitrate found in the groundwater. And we have conducted research by two individuals that have been mentioned here today. At	2 3 4 5 6 7	you will be hearing shortly some of our other suggestions. MR. YOUNG: Okay. But I just want to narrow it down to that one particular item. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to requiring farmers to test groundwater for nitrate? MR. HARD: No. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Does the Secretary have a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	tiers, specifically, high risk crops. Nitrogen uptake values of all crops, again, should be identified. And we, through fertilizer research and education program at the Department of Food and Ag office have over the years, 21 years now, been evaluating nitrate found in the groundwater. And we have conducted research by two individuals that have been mentioned here today. At least one, Dr. Hartz and Dr. Cann. Those two are one	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you will be hearing shortly some of our other suggestions. MR. YOUNG: Okay. But I just want to narrow it down to that one particular item. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to requiring farmers to test groundwater for nitrate? MR. HARD: No. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to the toxicity sampling that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	tiers, specifically, high risk crops. Nitrogen uptake values of all crops, again, should be identified. And we, through fertilizer research and education program at the Department of Food and Ag office have over the years, 21 years now, been evaluating nitrate found in the groundwater. And we have conducted research by two individuals that have been mentioned here today. At least one, Dr. Hartz and Dr. Cann. Those two are one is a specialist with UC and the other one is a farm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	you will be hearing shortly some of our other suggestions. MR. YOUNG: Okay. But I just want to narrow it down to that one particular item. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to requiring farmers to test groundwater for nitrate? MR. HARD: No. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to the toxicity sampling that's being proposed by the staff?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	tiers, specifically, high risk crops. Nitrogen uptake values of all crops, again, should be identified. And we, through fertilizer research and education program at the Department of Food and Ag office have over the years, 21 years now, been evaluating nitrate found in the groundwater. And we have conducted research by two individuals that have been mentioned here today. At least one, Dr. Hartz and Dr. Cann. Those two are one is a specialist with UC and the other one is a farm advisor from Monterey County. So do we have information	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you will be hearing shortly some of our other suggestions. MR. YOUNG: Okay. But I just want to narrow it down to that one particular item. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to requiring farmers to test groundwater for nitrate? MR. HARD: No. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to the toxicity sampling that's being proposed by the staff? MR. HARD: No.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	tiers, specifically, high risk crops. Nitrogen uptake values of all crops, again, should be identified. And we, through fertilizer research and education program at the Department of Food and Ag office have over the years, 21 years now, been evaluating nitrate found in the groundwater. And we have conducted research by two individuals that have been mentioned here today. At least one, Dr. Hartz and Dr. Cann. Those two are one is a specialist with UC and the other one is a farm advisor from Monterey County. So do we have information that will help springboard that into action. But what we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	you will be hearing shortly some of our other suggestions. MR. YOUNG: Okay. But I just want to narrow it down to that one particular item. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to requiring farmers to test groundwater for nitrate? MR. HARD: No. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to the toxicity sampling that's being proposed by the staff? MR. HARD: No. MR. YOUNG: Does the Secretary have a position
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	tiers, specifically, high risk crops. Nitrogen uptake values of all crops, again, should be identified. And we, through fertilizer research and education program at the Department of Food and Ag office have over the years, 21 years now, been evaluating nitrate found in the groundwater. And we have conducted research by two individuals that have been mentioned here today. At least one, Dr. Hartz and Dr. Cann. Those two are one is a specialist with UC and the other one is a farm advisor from Monterey County. So do we have information that will help springboard that into action. But what we don't have is a process that says how are you going	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	you will be hearing shortly some of our other suggestions. MR. YOUNG: Okay. But I just want to narrow it down to that one particular item. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to requiring farmers to test groundwater for nitrate? MR. HARD: No. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to the toxicity sampling that's being proposed by the staff? MR. HARD: No. MR. YOUNG: Does the Secretary have a position with respect to whether certain aspects of what staff is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	tiers, specifically, high risk crops. Nitrogen uptake values of all crops, again, should be identified. And we, through fertilizer research and education program at the Department of Food and Ag office have over the years, 21 years now, been evaluating nitrate found in the groundwater. And we have conducted research by two individuals that have been mentioned here today. At least one, Dr. Hartz and Dr. Cann. Those two are one is a specialist with UC and the other one is a farm advisor from Monterey County. So do we have information that will help springboard that into action. But what we don't have is a process that says how are you going establish a management practice without any science	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	you will be hearing shortly some of our other suggestions. MR. YOUNG: Okay. But I just want to narrow it down to that one particular item. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to requiring farmers to test groundwater for nitrate? MR. HARD: No. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to the toxicity sampling that's being proposed by the staff? MR. HARD: No. MR. YOUNG: Does the Secretary have a position with respect to whether certain aspects of what staff is proposing should be done on a voluntary basis versus a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	tiers, specifically, high risk crops. Nitrogen uptake values of all crops, again, should be identified. And we, through fertilizer research and education program at the Department of Food and Ag office have over the years, 21 years now, been evaluating nitrate found in the groundwater. And we have conducted research by two individuals that have been mentioned here today. At least one, Dr. Hartz and Dr. Cann. Those two are one is a specialist with UC and the other one is a farm advisor from Monterey County. So do we have information that will help springboard that into action. But what we don't have is a process that says how are you going establish a management practice without any science regarding the uptake values? It's preposterous.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	you will be hearing shortly some of our other suggestions. MR. YOUNG: Okay. But I just want to narrow it down to that one particular item. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to requiring farmers to test groundwater for nitrate? MR. HARD: No. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to the toxicity sampling that's being proposed by the staff? MR. HARD: No. MR. YOUNG: Does the Secretary have a position with respect to whether certain aspects of what staff is proposing should be done on a voluntary basis versus a mandatory regulatory basis?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	tiers, specifically, high risk crops. Nitrogen uptake values of all crops, again, should be identified. And we, through fertilizer research and education program at the Department of Food and Ag office have over the years, 21 years now, been evaluating nitrate found in the groundwater. And we have conducted research by two individuals that have been mentioned here today. At least one, Dr. Hartz and Dr. Cann. Those two are one is a specialist with UC and the other one is a farm advisor from Monterey County. So do we have information that will help springboard that into action. But what we don't have is a process that says how are you going establish a management practice without any science regarding the uptake values? It's preposterous. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	you will be hearing shortly some of our other suggestions. MR. YOUNG: Okay. But I just want to narrow it down to that one particular item. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to requiring farmers to test groundwater for nitrate? MR. HARD: No. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to the toxicity sampling that's being proposed by the staff? MR. HARD: No. MR. YOUNG: Does the Secretary have a position with respect to whether certain aspects of what staff is proposing should be done on a voluntary basis versus a mandatory regulatory basis? MR. HARD: That distinction has not come up. Our
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	tiers, specifically, high risk crops. Nitrogen uptake values of all crops, again, should be identified. And we, through fertilizer research and education program at the Department of Food and Ag office have over the years, 21 years now, been evaluating nitrate found in the groundwater. And we have conducted research by two individuals that have been mentioned here today. At least one, Dr. Hartz and Dr. Cann. Those two are one is a specialist with UC and the other one is a farm advisor from Monterey County. So do we have information that will help springboard that into action. But what we don't have is a process that says how are you going establish a management practice without any science regarding the uptake values? It's preposterous.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	you will be hearing shortly some of our other suggestions. MR. YOUNG: Okay. But I just want to narrow it down to that one particular item. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to requiring farmers to test groundwater for nitrate? MR. HARD: No. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to the toxicity sampling that's being proposed by the staff? MR. HARD: No. MR. YOUNG: Does the Secretary have a position with respect to whether certain aspects of what staff is proposing should be done on a voluntary basis versus a mandatory regulatory basis?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	tiers, specifically, high risk crops. Nitrogen uptake values of all crops, again, should be identified. And we, through fertilizer research and education program at the Department of Food and Ag office have over the years, 21 years now, been evaluating nitrate found in the groundwater. And we have conducted research by two individuals that have been mentioned here today. At least one, Dr. Hartz and Dr. Cann. Those two are one is a specialist with UC and the other one is a farm advisor from Monterey County. So do we have information that will help springboard that into action. But what we don't have is a process that says how are you going establish a management practice without any science regarding the uptake values? It's preposterous. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Couple questions for you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	you will be hearing shortly some of our other suggestions. MR. YOUNG: Okay. But I just want to narrow it down to that one particular item. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to requiring farmers to test groundwater for nitrate? MR. HARD: No. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to the toxicity sampling that's being proposed by the staff? MR. HARD: No. MR. YOUNG: Does the Secretary have a position with respect to whether certain aspects of what staff is proposing should be done on a voluntary basis versus a mandatory regulatory basis? MR. HARD: That distinction has not come up. Our sole interest here is the fact that the regulation as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	tiers, specifically, high risk crops. Nitrogen uptake values of all crops, again, should be identified. And we, through fertilizer research and education program at the Department of Food and Ag office have over the years, 21 years now, been evaluating nitrate found in the groundwater. And we have conducted research by two individuals that have been mentioned here today. At least one, Dr. Hartz and Dr. Cann. Those two are one is a specialist with UC and the other one is a farm advisor from Monterey County. So do we have information that will help springboard that into action. But what we don't have is a process that says how are you going establish a management practice without any science regarding the uptake values? It's preposterous. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Couple questions for you. MR. HARD: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	you will be hearing shortly some of our other suggestions. MR. YOUNG: Okay. But I just want to narrow it down to that one particular item. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to requiring farmers to test groundwater for nitrate? MR. HARD: No. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to the toxicity sampling that's being proposed by the staff? MR. HARD: No. MR. YOUNG: Does the Secretary have a position with respect to whether certain aspects of what staff is proposing should be done on a voluntary basis versus a mandatory regulatory basis? MR. HARD: That distinction has not come up. Our sole interest here is the fact that the regulation as currently drafted is lacking scientific analysis for a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	tiers, specifically, high risk crops. Nitrogen uptake values of all crops, again, should be identified. And we, through fertilizer research and education program at the Department of Food and Ag office have over the years, 21 years now, been evaluating nitrate found in the groundwater. And we have conducted research by two individuals that have been mentioned here today. At least one, Dr. Hartz and Dr. Cann. Those two are one is a specialist with UC and the other one is a farm advisor from Monterey County. So do we have information that will help springboard that into action. But what we don't have is a process that says how are you going establish a management practice without any science regarding the uptake values? It's preposterous. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Couple questions for you. MR. HARD: Yes. MR. YOUNG: Do you think that nitrogen application	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	you will be hearing shortly some of our other suggestions. MR. YOUNG: Okay. But I just want to narrow it down to that one particular item. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to requiring farmers to test groundwater for nitrate? MR. HARD: No. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to the toxicity sampling that's being proposed by the staff? MR. HARD: No. MR. YOUNG: Does the Secretary have a position with respect to whether certain aspects of what staff is proposing should be done on a voluntary basis versus a mandatory regulatory basis? MR. HARD: That distinction has not come up. Our sole interest here is the fact that the regulation as currently drafted is lacking scientific analysis for a foundation that makes the regulation effective. All of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	tiers, specifically, high risk crops. Nitrogen uptake values of all crops, again, should be identified. And we, through fertilizer research and education program at the Department of Food and Ag office have over the years, 21 years now, been evaluating nitrate found in the groundwater. And we have conducted research by two individuals that have been mentioned here today. At least one, Dr. Hartz and Dr. Cann. Those two are one is a specialist with UC and the other one is a farm advisor from Monterey County. So do we have information that will help springboard that into action. But what we don't have is a process that says how are you going establish a management practice without any science regarding the uptake values? It's preposterous. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Couple questions for you. MR. HARD: Yes. MR. YOUNG: Do you think that nitrogen application can be adjusted so that there's no impact to receiving	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	you will be hearing shortly some of our other suggestions. MR. YOUNG: Okay. But I just want to narrow it down to that one particular item. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to requiring farmers to test groundwater for nitrate? MR. HARD: No. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to the toxicity sampling that's being proposed by the staff? MR. HARD: No. MR. YOUNG: Does the Secretary have a position with respect to whether certain aspects of what staff is proposing should be done on a voluntary basis versus a mandatory regulatory basis? MR. HARD: That distinction has not come up. Our sole interest here is the fact that the regulation as currently drafted is lacking scientific analysis for a foundation that makes the regulation effective. All of those questions you aforementioned won't come into play
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	tiers, specifically, high risk crops. Nitrogen uptake values of all crops, again, should be identified. And we, through fertilizer research and education program at the Department of Food and Ag office have over the years, 21 years now, been evaluating nitrate found in the groundwater. And we have conducted research by two individuals that have been mentioned here today. At least one, Dr. Hartz and Dr. Cann. Those two are one is a specialist with UC and the other one is a farm advisor from Monterey County. So do we have information that will help springboard that into action. But what we don't have is a process that says how are you going establish a management practice without any science regarding the uptake values? It's preposterous. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Couple questions for you. MR. HARD: Yes. MR. YOUNG: Do you think that nitrogen application can be adjusted so that there's no impact to receiving water within our region?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	you will be hearing shortly some of our other suggestions. MR. YOUNG: Okay. But I just want to narrow it down to that one particular item. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to requiring farmers to test groundwater for nitrate? MR. HARD: No. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to the toxicity sampling that's being proposed by the staff? MR. HARD: No. MR. YOUNG: Does the Secretary have a position with respect to whether certain aspects of what staff is proposing should be done on a voluntary basis versus a mandatory regulatory basis? MR. HARD: That distinction has not come up. Our sole interest here is the fact that the regulation as currently drafted is lacking scientific analysis for a foundation that makes the regulation effective. All of those questions you aforementioned won't come into play until we demonstrated the science is valid.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	tiers, specifically, high risk crops. Nitrogen uptake values of all crops, again, should be identified. And we, through fertilizer research and education program at the Department of Food and Ag office have over the years, 21 years now, been evaluating nitrate found in the groundwater. And we have conducted research by two individuals that have been mentioned here today. At least one, Dr. Hartz and Dr. Cann. Those two are one is a specialist with UC and the other one is a farm advisor from Monterey County. So do we have information that will help springboard that into action. But what we don't have is a process that says how are you going establish a management practice without any science regarding the uptake values? It's preposterous. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Couple questions for you. MR. YOUNG: Do you think that nitrogen application can be adjusted so that there's no impact to receiving water within our region? MR. HARD: I'm going to answer this based on what	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	you will be hearing shortly some of our other suggestions. MR. YOUNG: Okay. But I just want to narrow it down to that one particular item. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to requiring farmers to test groundwater for nitrate? MR. HARD: No. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Does the Secretary have a position with respect to the toxicity sampling that's being proposed by the staff? MR. HARD: No. MR. YOUNG: Does the Secretary have a position with respect to whether certain aspects of what staff is proposing should be done on a voluntary basis versus a mandatory regulatory basis? MR. HARD: That distinction has not come up. Our sole interest here is the fact that the regulation as currently drafted is lacking scientific analysis for a foundation that makes the regulation effective. All of those questions you aforementioned won't come into play until we demonstrated the science is valid. MR. YOUNG: And are you referring to the science

		l	
1	establish a nitrate balance.	1	balancing what the public needs and what the environment
2	MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you for your comments.	2	needs.
3	MR. HARD: Sure.	3	On its face, without evaluating the science
4	MR. JEFFRIES: You talked about the 52 crops that	4	depending on what those crops are, buffers seem to be a
5	are grown and the uptake for the nitrogen value and so	5 6	stretch in the context of there's a potential there. If
6 7	forth, isn't the other part of equation the soil types as	7	you read the legal fine print that we are taking of that
8	Well?	8	property.
9	MR. HARD: Exactly. The soil variation, the climate variability throughout this region, and the	9	MR. JEFFRIES: Your analysis of sentiment control
و 10	various types of crops and their approximation to whether	10	by the use of buffer zones, have you analyzed that? MR. HARD: We, through the Speciality Crop Block
11	it's a stream of impairment, all of that factors in. And	11	Grant Program, California Food and Agriculture, which is
12	these all came out lumped in together. The integrated	12	the USDA money in collaboration with the State Water
13	approach which heretofore has not occurred. And we are	13	Board funding projects, vegetation, but we have a direct
14	only coming at it from the angle that we do have	14	conflict with the food safety. Those measures have been
15	jurisdictional purview over evaluation of regulations	15	asked to remove those buffers in various areas.
16	that are promulgated by regulatory bodies and state	16	So, here you have a fiduciary responsible and
17	government. And part of the issue here is the science.	17	at the same time you have a food safety conflict. That
18	Pardon me, the science hasn't been done.	18	says, well wait a minute, okay, these buffers are posing
19	So what we're asking here is together, our	19	a threat to public health. It's a double edge sword.
20	department as well as the Regional Board and the State	20	The buffers are providing a food safety because we're
21	Water Board, essentially federal agencies, such as NRCS,	21	trying to reduce the sediment going into water quality.
22	specifically the RCDs, the UC, SCU get together to figure	22	MR. JEFFRIES: At the March meeting I asked the
23	out how we're going to solve this Because it's not going	23	question about the buffer zone and the conflict between
24	to be done by this Board.	24	the food safety agencies and this agency. And if I
25	You have having worked with the Central	25	remember correctly, the comment came back from our staff
	Page 455		Page 457
1	Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board on their	1	that there is no food safety regulations on buffer zones.
2	program before, working with Francis. We have engineers.	2	Is that correct or not correct?
3	We have scientists, and we have geologists. These are	3	MR. HARD: We have a leafy green marketing
4	not agronomists.	4	agreement. I'm not an expert, I admit, on that
	not agronomists.		agreement. The not an expert, I durint, on that
5	I'm not going after staff. I appreciate what	5	agreement I do not believe if there's anybody in the
5 6	I'm not going after staff. I appreciate what we've been able to do in crops and regions, but	5 6	agreement. I do not believe if there's anybody in the
6	we've been able to do in crops and regions, but	6	audience that knows that document better than I. There
	we've been able to do in crops and regions, but agronomics is not coming into this process anywhere.	6 7	audience that knows that document better than I. There is no stipulation that I'm aware of relative to buffers,
6 7	we've been able to do in crops and regions, but agronomics is not coming into this process anywhere. MR. JEFFRIES: One more question. Has your agency	6	audience that knows that document better than I. There is no stipulation that I'm aware of relative to buffers, specifically.
6 7 8	we've been able to do in crops and regions, but agronomics is not coming into this process anywhere. MR. JEFFRIES: One more question. Has your agency taken a position on buffer corridors?	6 7 8	audience that knows that document better than I. There is no stipulation that I'm aware of relative to buffers, specifically. Anyone else want to
6 7 8 9	we've been able to do in crops and regions, but agronomics is not coming into this process anywhere. MR. JEFFRIES: One more question. Has your agency taken a position on buffer corridors? MR. HARD: Yes, we have. We believe they are	6 7 8 9	audience that knows that document better than I. There is no stipulation that I'm aware of relative to buffers, specifically.
6 7 8 9	we've been able to do in crops and regions, but agronomics is not coming into this process anywhere. MR. JEFFRIES: One more question. Has your agency taken a position on buffer corridors? MR. HARD: Yes, we have. We believe they are excessive. We made those comments on May 12, 2010.	6 7 8 9	audience that knows that document better than I. There is no stipulation that I'm aware of relative to buffers, specifically. Anyone else want to MR. JEFFRIES: I'm sure somebody else will address that.
6 7 8 9 10	we've been able to do in crops and regions, but agronomics is not coming into this process anywhere. MR. JEFFRIES: One more question. Has your agency taken a position on buffer corridors? MR. HARD: Yes, we have. We believe they are	6 7 8 9 10 11	audience that knows that document better than I. There is no stipulation that I'm aware of relative to buffers, specifically. Anyone else want to MR. JEFFRIES: I'm sure somebody else will address that. MR. HARD: This is a public process.
6 7 8 9 10 11	we've been able to do in crops and regions, but agronomics is not coming into this process anywhere. MR. JEFFRIES: One more question. Has your agency taken a position on buffer corridors? MR. HARD: Yes, we have. We believe they are excessive. We made those comments on May 12, 2010. MR. JEFFRIES: Can you elaborate on the excessive?	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	audience that knows that document better than I. There is no stipulation that I'm aware of relative to buffers, specifically. Anyone else want to MR. JEFFRIES: I'm sure somebody else will address that.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	we've been able to do in crops and regions, but agronomics is not coming into this process anywhere. MR. JEFFRIES: One more question. Has your agency taken a position on buffer corridors? MR. HARD: Yes, we have. We believe they are excessive. We made those comments on May 12, 2010. MR. JEFFRIES: Can you elaborate on the excessive? MR. HARD: Well, I think the issue here is that	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	audience that knows that document better than I. There is no stipulation that I'm aware of relative to buffers, specifically. Anyone else want to MR. JEFFRIES: I'm sure somebody else will address that. MR. HARD: This is a public process. MR. JEFFRIES: Hopefully.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	we've been able to do in crops and regions, but agronomics is not coming into this process anywhere. MR. JEFFRIES: One more question. Has your agency taken a position on buffer corridors? MR. HARD: Yes, we have. We believe they are excessive. We made those comments on May 12, 2010. MR. JEFFRIES: Can you elaborate on the excessive? MR. HARD: Well, I think the issue here is that when we ask this all gets down to, again, buffer	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	audience that knows that document better than I. There is no stipulation that I'm aware of relative to buffers, specifically. Anyone else want to MR. JEFFRIES: I'm sure somebody else will address that. MR. HARD: This is a public process. MR. JEFFRIES: Hopefully. MR. YOUNG: Thank you.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	we've been able to do in crops and regions, but agronomics is not coming into this process anywhere. MR. JEFFRIES: One more question. Has your agency taken a position on buffer corridors? MR. HARD: Yes, we have. We believe they are excessive. We made those comments on May 12, 2010. MR. JEFFRIES: Can you elaborate on the excessive? MR. HARD: Well, I think the issue here is that when we ask this all gets down to, again, buffer corridors related to science. If we understand what the	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	audience that knows that document better than I. There is no stipulation that I'm aware of relative to buffers, specifically. Anyone else want to MR. JEFFRIES: I'm sure somebody else will address that. MR. HARD: This is a public process. MR. JEFFRIES: Hopefully. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Mr. Hodgin.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	we've been able to do in crops and regions, but agronomics is not coming into this process anywhere. MR. JEFFRIES: One more question. Has your agency taken a position on buffer corridors? MR. HARD: Yes, we have. We believe they are excessive. We made those comments on May 12, 2010. MR. JEFFRIES: Can you elaborate on the excessive? MR. HARD: Well, I think the issue here is that when we ask this all gets down to, again, buffer corridors related to science. If we understand what the crop is doing, those buffer corridors may or may not be	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	audience that knows that document better than I. There is no stipulation that I'm aware of relative to buffers, specifically. Anyone else want to MR. JEFFRIES: I'm sure somebody else will address that. MR. HARD: This is a public process. MR. JEFFRIES: Hopefully. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Mr. Hodgin. MR. HODGIN: The scientific evaluation of the 52
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	we've been able to do in crops and regions, but agronomics is not coming into this process anywhere. MR. JEFFRIES: One more question. Has your agency taken a position on buffer corridors? MR. HARD: Yes, we have. We believe they are excessive. We made those comments on May 12, 2010. MR. JEFFRIES: Can you elaborate on the excessive? MR. HARD: Well, I think the issue here is that when we ask this all gets down to, again, buffer corridors related to science. If we understand what the crop is doing, those buffer corridors may or may not be necessary. Okay. You need to back it out in various	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	audience that knows that document better than I. There is no stipulation that I'm aware of relative to buffers, specifically. Anyone else want to MR. JEFFRIES: I'm sure somebody else will address that. MR. HARD: This is a public process. MR. JEFFRIES: Hopefully. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Mr. Hodgin. MR. HODGIN: The scientific evaluation of the 52 crops
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	we've been able to do in crops and regions, but agronomics is not coming into this process anywhere. MR. JEFFRIES: One more question. Has your agency taken a position on buffer corridors? MR. HARD: Yes, we have. We believe they are excessive. We made those comments on May 12, 2010. MR. JEFFRIES: Can you elaborate on the excessive? MR. HARD: Well, I think the issue here is that when we ask this all gets down to, again, buffer corridors related to science. If we understand what the crop is doing, those buffer corridors may or may not be necessary. Okay. You need to back it out in various scales.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	audience that knows that document better than I. There is no stipulation that I'm aware of relative to buffers, specifically. Anyone else want to MR. JEFFRIES: I'm sure somebody else will address that. MR. HARD: This is a public process. MR. JEFFRIES: Hopefully. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Mr. Hodgin. MR. HODGIN: The scientific evaluation of the 52 crops MR. HARD: Yes.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	we've been able to do in crops and regions, but agronomics is not coming into this process anywhere. MR. JEFFRIES: One more question. Has your agency taken a position on buffer corridors? MR. HARD: Yes, we have. We believe they are excessive. We made those comments on May 12, 2010. MR. JEFFRIES: Can you elaborate on the excessive? MR. HARD: Well, I think the issue here is that when we ask this all gets down to, again, buffer corridors related to science. If we understand what the crop is doing, those buffer corridors may or may not be necessary. Okay. You need to back it out in various scales. As on the face of it, without looking at the	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	audience that knows that document better than I. There is no stipulation that I'm aware of relative to buffers, specifically. Anyone else want to MR. JEFFRIES: I'm sure somebody else will address that. MR. HARD: This is a public process. MR. JEFFRIES: Hopefully. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Mr. Hodgin. MR. HODGIN: The scientific evaluation of the 52 crops MR. HARD: Yes. MR. JEFFRIES: Is your department prepared to have
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	we've been able to do in crops and regions, but agronomics is not coming into this process anywhere. MR. JEFFRIES: One more question. Has your agency taken a position on buffer corridors? MR. HARD: Yes, we have. We believe they are excessive. We made those comments on May 12, 2010. MR. JEFFRIES: Can you elaborate on the excessive? MR. HARD: Well, I think the issue here is that when we ask this all gets down to, again, buffer corridors related to science. If we understand what the crop is doing, those buffer corridors may or may not be necessary. Okay. You need to back it out in various scales. As on the face of it, without looking at the science, buffer corridors have the potential to take land	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	audience that knows that document better than I. There is no stipulation that I'm aware of relative to buffers, specifically. Anyone else want to MR. JEFFRIES: I'm sure somebody else will address that. MR. HARD: This is a public process. MR. JEFFRIES: Hopefully. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Mr. Hodgin. MR. HODGIN: The scientific evaluation of the 52 crops MR. HARD: Yes. MR. JEFFRIES: Is your department prepared to have that evaluation done? MR. HARD: We have been prepared for 21 years to select six to eight projects on an annual bases, either
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	we've been able to do in crops and regions, but agronomics is not coming into this process anywhere. MR. JEFFRIES: One more question. Has your agency taken a position on buffer corridors? MR. HARD: Yes, we have. We believe they are excessive. We made those comments on May 12, 2010. MR. JEFFRIES: Can you elaborate on the excessive? MR. HARD: Well, I think the issue here is that when we ask this all gets down to, again, buffer corridors related to science. If we understand what the crop is doing, those buffer corridors may or may not be necessary. Okay. You need to back it out in various scales. As on the face of it, without looking at the science, buffer corridors have the potential to take land out of production, which in all intents and purposes, is dictating what a grower can or cannot do. Our whole objective here is to ensure a	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	audience that knows that document better than I. There is no stipulation that I'm aware of relative to buffers, specifically. Anyone else want to MR. JEFFRIES: I'm sure somebody else will address that. MR. HARD: This is a public process. MR. JEFFRIES: Hopefully. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Mr. Hodgin. MR. HODGIN: The scientific evaluation of the 52 crops MR. HARD: Yes. MR. JEFFRIES: Is your department prepared to have that evaluation done? MR. HARD: We have been prepared for 21 years to select six to eight projects on an annual bases, either individually or all in one sum. We have a half million
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	we've been able to do in crops and regions, but agronomics is not coming into this process anywhere. MR. JEFFRIES: One more question. Has your agency taken a position on buffer corridors? MR. HARD: Yes, we have. We believe they are excessive. We made those comments on May 12, 2010. MR. JEFFRIES: Can you elaborate on the excessive? MR. HARD: Well, I think the issue here is that when we ask this all gets down to, again, buffer corridors related to science. If we understand what the crop is doing, those buffer corridors may or may not be necessary. Okay. You need to back it out in various scales. As on the face of it, without looking at the science, buffer corridors have the potential to take land out of production, which in all intents and purposes, is dictating what a grower can or cannot do. Our whole objective here is to ensure a balance between the environment, what growers are being	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	audience that knows that document better than I. There is no stipulation that I'm aware of relative to buffers, specifically. Anyone else want to MR. JEFFRIES: I'm sure somebody else will address that. MR. HARD: This is a public process. MR. JEFFRIES: Hopefully. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Mr. Hodgin. MR. HODGIN: The scientific evaluation of the 52 crops MR. HARD: Yes. MR. JEFFRIES: Is your department prepared to have that evaluation done? MR. HARD: We have been prepared for 21 years to select six to eight projects on an annual bases, either individually or all in one sum. We have a half million dollars each year that we use. Our priorities are based
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	we've been able to do in crops and regions, but agronomics is not coming into this process anywhere. MR. JEFFRIES: One more question. Has your agency taken a position on buffer corridors? MR. HARD: Yes, we have. We believe they are excessive. We made those comments on May 12, 2010. MR. JEFFRIES: Can you elaborate on the excessive? MR. HARD: Well, I think the issue here is that when we ask this all gets down to, again, buffer corridors related to science. If we understand what the crop is doing, those buffer corridors may or may not be necessary. Okay. You need to back it out in various scales. As on the face of it, without looking at the science, buffer corridors have the potential to take land out of production, which in all intents and purposes, is dictating what a grower can or cannot do. Our whole objective here is to ensure a	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	audience that knows that document better than I. There is no stipulation that I'm aware of relative to buffers, specifically. Anyone else want to MR. JEFFRIES: I'm sure somebody else will address that. MR. HARD: This is a public process. MR. JEFFRIES: Hopefully. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Mr. Hodgin. MR. HODGIN: The scientific evaluation of the 52 crops MR. HARD: Yes. MR. JEFFRIES: Is your department prepared to have that evaluation done? MR. HARD: We have been prepared for 21 years to select six to eight projects on an annual bases, either individually or all in one sum. We have a half million

of the Groundwater, that's been our mandate. Food Ag
Code 1411 Subsection B allows us to do this sort of
research on the basic facts. We do not do this alone. I
would be foolish to stand here and say we're here with
all the capability to do it. This is not a sustainable
way for one agency to run it alone, nor a sustainable way
for a regulatory body, such as yourselves, to run it
alone. We have to do this in collaborative ways.

So, getting back and saying, well, how have we engaged UC to date? We have been doing this for 21 years. Part of the question now is how does the Regional Board want to participate and help this process move forward.

baseline.

MR. HODGIN: Just like this has been a long term process. We only have evaluations for two, and I think you're questioning the scientific value of those evaluations.

MR. HARD: Yes. Prior to me coming here, and I'm not going to mention names, but I did speak with University of California Anne Oren, (phonetic), and that is a problem that they have identified. And we don't even have a nitrogen balance in this region. That would be the goal of the ad hoc committee that was established in 1990.

Things, you know, we need sort of a way to go
Page 459

MR. HARD: No practice is being mandated. What I'm saying is there's the option to use practices through that plan in irrigation water. And those practices may or may not be beneficial because we don't have the

being mandated as part of nutrient management program.

or may not be beneficial because we don't have the
 nutrient uptake values for those crops that those
 particular growers, wherever they may fit in this region,

8 would be utilized.

So, we're kind of like, well, if we do this practice or find a practice through consultants growers may or may not hire, that practice, what's the science behind it? We don't even know the 52 crops in the region, how they -- how those individual crops are going to react to nitrogen uptake. It's putting the cart before the horse.

And what we're saying is, to step back for a

second, if you have the propensity to regulate you're going to have to do it in such a way that -- this is the devil's advocate problem here -- if you say the worse crops are in Tier 3 or in Tier 2, you mean to tell me that you're not going to regulate Tier 2 and Tier 3 to a science? The same problem that this department is trying to figure out. This is a science and policy problem. Okay? And nobody is good at that. You can't merge the two. This is exactly the problem we're facing here.

Page 461

from point A to point B. But life is a curve, and we have to stay on topic. And we kind of deviated from that, collectively, we can't do it alone, and nor can you. So we need to collectively put our heads together and figure out how we're going to solve this.

MR. YOUNG: All right. I have for you, it has to do with the Nutrient Management Plan. Staff is proposing --

MR. HARD: Irrigation Nutrient Management Plan? MR. YOUNG: Yeah, the nutrient one. Any reaction to that, automatically using that?

MR. HARD: Right. I mean, having, you know, we worked with the Central Valley Board on the dairy program, they have a very similar sort of program in place, that is a perfect vehicle, but you're asking to put practices in place, but we don't know whether they work. And you, as a body, cannot prescribe practices. That's against -- the Board, the Water Board, but to have an option to figure out what practices are going to be beneficial for growers using that plan, how would they get there? They can't get there without understanding what that particular crop they're growing is and how to respond to the nitrogen they're using. That's the

MR. YOUNG: What practices are you thinking are Page 460

We have a policy department, we have regulation, but yet we don't have the science. What do we do?

Let me just tell you that one of the points that our goal here is to integrate science with policy in the department. Of course, all these issues whether in the Central Valley or Central Coast try to communicate constructively, encourage collaboration, identify process improvement. These comments are about process improvements.

MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.

Dr. Hunter.

MS. HUNTER: Thank you.

One of the things that I'm most interested in is in working with the several agencies. You've probably heard me speak before on the importance of coordination with agencies. But at the same time I'm really struck by the fact that since the late Eighties and into the early Nineties, the agencies that have had jurisdiction over nitrate in particular, in use of fertilizers, have in some areas no impact on reducing the problem.

And today I hear you saying that there is no science. And why is there is no science formally outlining what the issues are and how the problems can be resolved? But you're also suggesting that farmers don't $Page\ 462$

1	understand their own crops and they don't understand the	1	perform.
2	application of fertilizers. I mean that's what I'm	2	We're working in the best interests of
3	hearing you say.	3	agriculture. We can't have a bunch of individual
4	MR. HARD: Please don't distort my comments.	4	analysis coming out for various crops. It has to be
5	DR. HUNTER: Well, this is what it boils down to.	5	consistent. It will only help your process, and it will
6	When you come to the Board and you say within 21 years we	6	only help agriculture. If you have a bunch of
7	have no idea what best practices are for nitrogen.	7	individuals analyses for various crops is not going to be
8	MR. HARD: When it comes to these 52 crops, we do	8	beneficial to agriculture or the environment.
9	not.	9	MR. YOUNG: Well, the troubling part about what
10	DR. HUNTER: That doesn't compute. That doesn't	10	you're telling us is that we're not going to have the
11	compute.	11	science for years and years and years. This is the one
12	MR. HARD: Statewide is our jurisdiction for	12	agency in the State of California mandated for protection
13	evaluating research on nitrogen going to groundwater.	13	of water quality and all beneficial uses.
14	DR. HUNTER: Well, what we know is the data is	14	We didn't create this job for ourselves, the
15	showing that in certain places in Salinas or Salinas	15	legislature did. The buck stops here in terms of making
16	is one of those areas, nitrogen is increasing, and it's	16	the decision as to whether we follow the law and apply
17	showing in water. So, what we have to do is consider	17	the water quality standards.
18	what tools we have, what options we have.	18	So, I mean, this is a very contentious issue.
19	But I'm very disappointed to hear you say	19	There's a lot of competing factors. It may be that
20	that we have no science to support that. After all the	20	whatever form this Order gets passed, it may be the
21	effort that farmers did, and that farmers also don't	21	impetus for your agency and other agencies to come
22	understand how to do this application. They have been	22	together and try to get this figured out. But, you know,
23	part of that process as have Monterey County. So	23	we've heard about the Fish and Game having some, you
24	MR. HARD: Farmers do know how to do their job.	24	know, having regulatory power with the riparian
25	The issue is in regulation that is prescriptive in nature	25	corridors, DPR has regulatory power. We're looking at
	Page 463		Page 465
1	hasically tells them that they have to do plantings, but	1	the data that shows impasse. So we're trying our hest to
1 2	basically tells them that they have to do plantings, but	1 2	the data that shows impasse. So we're trying our best to
2	if you carefully look at the plant, how could one	2	try to find a way to get to getting them resolved. So
2	if you carefully look at the plant, how could one scientifically objectively look at this and say, wait a	2	try to find a way to get to getting them resolved. So MR. HARD: We just want to make sure that this
2 3 4	if you carefully look at the plant, how could one scientifically objectively look at this and say, wait a minute, Tier 2 and Tier 3, these are the most sensitive	2 3 4	try to find a way to get to getting them resolved. So MR. HARD: We just want to make sure that this agency knows this is more than just the regulatory and
2 3 4 5	if you carefully look at the plant, how could one scientifically objectively look at this and say, wait a minute, Tier 2 and Tier 3, these are the most sensitive areas we're going to target. That's fine, but when you	2 3 4 5	try to find a way to get to getting them resolved. So MR. HARD: We just want to make sure that this agency knows this is more than just the regulatory and executive branch problem. This is water management and
2 3 4 5 6	if you carefully look at the plant, how could one scientifically objectively look at this and say, wait a minute, Tier 2 and Tier 3, these are the most sensitive areas we're going to target. That's fine, but when you look at how those crops respond to granulated or liquid	2 3 4 5 6	try to find a way to get to getting them resolved. So MR. HARD: We just want to make sure that this agency knows this is more than just the regulatory and executive branch problem. This is water management and water quality issue. And you have water quality
2 3 4 5 6 7	if you carefully look at the plant, how could one scientifically objectively look at this and say, wait a minute, Tier 2 and Tier 3, these are the most sensitive areas we're going to target. That's fine, but when you look at how those crops respond to granulated or liquid fertilize application, we don't know, on a baseline, we	2 3 4 5 6 7	try to find a way to get to getting them resolved. So MR. HARD: We just want to make sure that this agency knows this is more than just the regulatory and executive branch problem. This is water management and water quality issue. And you have water quality jurisdiction. There is no other alternative. Not on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	if you carefully look at the plant, how could one scientifically objectively look at this and say, wait a minute, Tier 2 and Tier 3, these are the most sensitive areas we're going to target. That's fine, but when you look at how those crops respond to granulated or liquid fertilize application, we don't know, on a baseline, we don't know. So why would you, as a regulatory body, from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	try to find a way to get to getting them resolved. So MR. HARD: We just want to make sure that this agency knows this is more than just the regulatory and executive branch problem. This is water management and water quality issue. And you have water quality jurisdiction. There is no other alternative. Not on surface water.
2 3 4 5 6 7	if you carefully look at the plant, how could one scientifically objectively look at this and say, wait a minute, Tier 2 and Tier 3, these are the most sensitive areas we're going to target. That's fine, but when you look at how those crops respond to granulated or liquid fertilize application, we don't know, on a baseline, we don't know. So why would you, as a regulatory body, from our perspective, we're saying wait a minute	2 3 4 5 6 7	try to find a way to get to getting them resolved. So MR. HARD: We just want to make sure that this agency knows this is more than just the regulatory and executive branch problem. This is water management and water quality issue. And you have water quality jurisdiction. There is no other alternative. Not on surface water. MR. YOUNG: I understand. Okay.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	if you carefully look at the plant, how could one scientifically objectively look at this and say, wait a minute, Tier 2 and Tier 3, these are the most sensitive areas we're going to target. That's fine, but when you look at how those crops respond to granulated or liquid fertilize application, we don't know, on a baseline, we don't know. So why would you, as a regulatory body, from our perspective, we're saying wait a minute DR. HUNTER: But you're not well, I've made my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	try to find a way to get to getting them resolved. So MR. HARD: We just want to make sure that this agency knows this is more than just the regulatory and executive branch problem. This is water management and water quality issue. And you have water quality jurisdiction. There is no other alternative. Not on surface water. MR. YOUNG: I understand. Okay. Thank you for your comments.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	if you carefully look at the plant, how could one scientifically objectively look at this and say, wait a minute, Tier 2 and Tier 3, these are the most sensitive areas we're going to target. That's fine, but when you look at how those crops respond to granulated or liquid fertilize application, we don't know, on a baseline, we don't know. So why would you, as a regulatory body, from our perspective, we're saying wait a minute DR. HUNTER: But you're not well, I've made my comments. We're not prescribing practices, we're asking	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	try to find a way to get to getting them resolved. So MR. HARD: We just want to make sure that this agency knows this is more than just the regulatory and executive branch problem. This is water management and water quality issue. And you have water quality jurisdiction. There is no other alternative. Not on surface water. MR. YOUNG: I understand. Okay. Thank you for your comments. We're going to take a break and return at 1:00.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	if you carefully look at the plant, how could one scientifically objectively look at this and say, wait a minute, Tier 2 and Tier 3, these are the most sensitive areas we're going to target. That's fine, but when you look at how those crops respond to granulated or liquid fertilize application, we don't know, on a baseline, we don't know. So why would you, as a regulatory body, from our perspective, we're saying wait a minute DR. HUNTER: But you're not well, I've made my comments. We're not prescribing practices, we're asking the farmers and they've come up with a number of quite	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	try to find a way to get to getting them resolved. So MR. HARD: We just want to make sure that this agency knows this is more than just the regulatory and executive branch problem. This is water management and water quality issue. And you have water quality jurisdiction. There is no other alternative. Not on surface water. MR. YOUNG: I understand. Okay. Thank you for your comments.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	if you carefully look at the plant, how could one scientifically objectively look at this and say, wait a minute, Tier 2 and Tier 3, these are the most sensitive areas we're going to target. That's fine, but when you look at how those crops respond to granulated or liquid fertilize application, we don't know, on a baseline, we don't know. So why would you, as a regulatory body, from our perspective, we're saying wait a minute DR. HUNTER: But you're not well, I've made my comments. We're not prescribing practices, we're asking the farmers and they've come up with a number of quite a number. We have seen improvements in some places. So	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	try to find a way to get to getting them resolved. So MR. HARD: We just want to make sure that this agency knows this is more than just the regulatory and executive branch problem. This is water management and water quality issue. And you have water quality jurisdiction. There is no other alternative. Not on surface water. MR. YOUNG: I understand. Okay. Thank you for your comments. We're going to take a break and return at 1:00. Okay. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	if you carefully look at the plant, how could one scientifically objectively look at this and say, wait a minute, Tier 2 and Tier 3, these are the most sensitive areas we're going to target. That's fine, but when you look at how those crops respond to granulated or liquid fertilize application, we don't know, on a baseline, we don't know. So why would you, as a regulatory body, from our perspective, we're saying wait a minute DR. HUNTER: But you're not well, I've made my comments. We're not prescribing practices, we're asking the farmers and they've come up with a number of quite a number. We have seen improvements in some places. So I think we have learned. So, I just wanted to be sure I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	try to find a way to get to getting them resolved. So MR. HARD: We just want to make sure that this agency knows this is more than just the regulatory and executive branch problem. This is water management and water quality issue. And you have water quality jurisdiction. There is no other alternative. Not on surface water. MR. YOUNG: I understand. Okay. Thank you for your comments. We're going to take a break and return at 1:00.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	if you carefully look at the plant, how could one scientifically objectively look at this and say, wait a minute, Tier 2 and Tier 3, these are the most sensitive areas we're going to target. That's fine, but when you look at how those crops respond to granulated or liquid fertilize application, we don't know, on a baseline, we don't know. So why would you, as a regulatory body, from our perspective, we're saying wait a minute DR. HUNTER: But you're not well, I've made my comments. We're not prescribing practices, we're asking the farmers and they've come up with a number of quite a number. We have seen improvements in some places. So I think we have learned. So, I just wanted to be sure I understood your remarks today.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	try to find a way to get to getting them resolved. So MR. HARD: We just want to make sure that this agency knows this is more than just the regulatory and executive branch problem. This is water management and water quality issue. And you have water quality jurisdiction. There is no other alternative. Not on surface water. MR. YOUNG: I understand. Okay. Thank you for your comments. We're going to take a break and return at 1:00. Okay. Thank you. (Lunch break taken.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	if you carefully look at the plant, how could one scientifically objectively look at this and say, wait a minute, Tier 2 and Tier 3, these are the most sensitive areas we're going to target. That's fine, but when you look at how those crops respond to granulated or liquid fertilize application, we don't know, on a baseline, we don't know. So why would you, as a regulatory body, from our perspective, we're saying wait a minute DR. HUNTER: But you're not well, I've made my comments. We're not prescribing practices, we're asking the farmers and they've come up with a number of quite a number. We have seen improvements in some places. So I think we have learned. So, I just wanted to be sure I understood your remarks today. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	try to find a way to get to getting them resolved. So MR. HARD: We just want to make sure that this agency knows this is more than just the regulatory and executive branch problem. This is water management and water quality issue. And you have water quality jurisdiction. There is no other alternative. Not on surface water. MR. YOUNG: I understand. Okay. Thank you for your comments. We're going to take a break and return at 1:00. Okay. Thank you. (Lunch break taken.) MR. YOUNG: Okay. Next speaker is Don
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	if you carefully look at the plant, how could one scientifically objectively look at this and say, wait a minute, Tier 2 and Tier 3, these are the most sensitive areas we're going to target. That's fine, but when you look at how those crops respond to granulated or liquid fertilize application, we don't know, on a baseline, we don't know. So why would you, as a regulatory body, from our perspective, we're saying wait a minute DR. HUNTER: But you're not well, I've made my comments. We're not prescribing practices, we're asking the farmers and they've come up with a number of quite a number. We have seen improvements in some places. So I think we have learned. So, I just wanted to be sure I understood your remarks today. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Hard.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	try to find a way to get to getting them resolved. So MR. HARD: We just want to make sure that this agency knows this is more than just the regulatory and executive branch problem. This is water management and water quality issue. And you have water quality jurisdiction. There is no other alternative. Not on surface water. MR. YOUNG: I understand. Okay. Thank you for your comments. We're going to take a break and return at 1:00. Okay. Thank you. (Lunch break taken.) MR. YOUNG: Okay. Next speaker is Don Hoernschemeyer, then Bridget Hoover, then Nancy Isakson.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	if you carefully look at the plant, how could one scientifically objectively look at this and say, wait a minute, Tier 2 and Tier 3, these are the most sensitive areas we're going to target. That's fine, but when you look at how those crops respond to granulated or liquid fertilize application, we don't know, on a baseline, we don't know. So why would you, as a regulatory body, from our perspective, we're saying wait a minute DR. HUNTER: But you're not well, I've made my comments. We're not prescribing practices, we're asking the farmers and they've come up with a number of quite a number. We have seen improvements in some places. So I think we have learned. So, I just wanted to be sure I understood your remarks today. Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	try to find a way to get to getting them resolved. So MR. HARD: We just want to make sure that this agency knows this is more than just the regulatory and executive branch problem. This is water management and water quality issue. And you have water quality jurisdiction. There is no other alternative. Not on surface water. MR. YOUNG: I understand. Okay. Thank you for your comments. We're going to take a break and return at 1:00. Okay. Thank you. (Lunch break taken.) MR. YOUNG: Okay. Next speaker is Don
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	if you carefully look at the plant, how could one scientifically objectively look at this and say, wait a minute, Tier 2 and Tier 3, these are the most sensitive areas we're going to target. That's fine, but when you look at how those crops respond to granulated or liquid fertilize application, we don't know, on a baseline, we don't know. So why would you, as a regulatory body, from our perspective, we're saying wait a minute DR. HUNTER: But you're not well, I've made my comments. We're not prescribing practices, we're asking the farmers and they've come up with a number of quite a number. We have seen improvements in some places. So I think we have learned. So, I just wanted to be sure I understood your remarks today. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Hard. MR. HARD: The Department will be in touch with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	try to find a way to get to getting them resolved. So MR. HARD: We just want to make sure that this agency knows this is more than just the regulatory and executive branch problem. This is water management and water quality issue. And you have water quality jurisdiction. There is no other alternative. Not on surface water. MR. YOUNG: I understand. Okay. Thank you for your comments. We're going to take a break and return at 1:00. Okay. Thank you. (Lunch break taken.) MR. YOUNG: Okay. Next speaker is Don Hoernschemeyer, then Bridget Hoover, then Nancy Isakson. Oh, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	if you carefully look at the plant, how could one scientifically objectively look at this and say, wait a minute, Tier 2 and Tier 3, these are the most sensitive areas we're going to target. That's fine, but when you look at how those crops respond to granulated or liquid fertilize application, we don't know, on a baseline, we don't know. So why would you, as a regulatory body, from our perspective, we're saying wait a minute DR. HUNTER: But you're not well, I've made my comments. We're not prescribing practices, we're asking the farmers and they've come up with a number of quite a number. We have seen improvements in some places. So I think we have learned. So, I just wanted to be sure I understood your remarks today. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Hard. MR. HARD: The Department will be in touch with the Chair and the State Water Board for consultation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	try to find a way to get to getting them resolved. So MR. HARD: We just want to make sure that this agency knows this is more than just the regulatory and executive branch problem. This is water management and water quality issue. And you have water quality jurisdiction. There is no other alternative. Not on surface water. MR. YOUNG: I understand. Okay. Thank you for your comments. We're going to take a break and return at 1:00. Okay. Thank you. (Lunch break taken.) MR. YOUNG: Okay. Next speaker is Don Hoernschemeyer, then Bridget Hoover, then Nancy Isakson. Oh, yes. Is there anybody in the audience that and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	if you carefully look at the plant, how could one scientifically objectively look at this and say, wait a minute, Tier 2 and Tier 3, these are the most sensitive areas we're going to target. That's fine, but when you look at how those crops respond to granulated or liquid fertilize application, we don't know, on a baseline, we don't know. So why would you, as a regulatory body, from our perspective, we're saying wait a minute DR. HUNTER: But you're not well, I've made my comments. We're not prescribing practices, we're asking the farmers and they've come up with a number of quite a number. We have seen improvements in some places. So I think we have learned. So, I just wanted to be sure I understood your remarks today. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Hard. MR. HARD: The Department will be in touch with the Chair and the State Water Board for consultation. And part of my presence here today is to inform you that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	try to find a way to get to getting them resolved. So MR. HARD: We just want to make sure that this agency knows this is more than just the regulatory and executive branch problem. This is water management and water quality issue. And you have water quality jurisdiction. There is no other alternative. Not on surface water. MR. YOUNG: I understand. Okay. Thank you for your comments. We're going to take a break and return at 1:00. Okay. Thank you. (Lunch break taken.) MR. YOUNG: Okay. Next speaker is Don Hoernschemeyer, then Bridget Hoover, then Nancy Isakson. Oh, yes. Is there anybody in the audience that and I don't know if you've seen the list but it's all
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	if you carefully look at the plant, how could one scientifically objectively look at this and say, wait a minute, Tier 2 and Tier 3, these are the most sensitive areas we're going to target. That's fine, but when you look at how those crops respond to granulated or liquid fertilize application, we don't know, on a baseline, we don't know. So why would you, as a regulatory body, from our perspective, we're saying wait a minute DR. HUNTER: But you're not well, I've made my comments. We're not prescribing practices, we're asking the farmers and they've come up with a number of quite a number. We have seen improvements in some places. So I think we have learned. So, I just wanted to be sure I understood your remarks today. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Hard. MR. HARD: The Department will be in touch with the Chair and the State Water Board for consultation. And part of my presence here today is to inform you that we are taking this extremely seriously. And the horse we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	try to find a way to get to getting them resolved. So MR. HARD: We just want to make sure that this agency knows this is more than just the regulatory and executive branch problem. This is water management and water quality issue. And you have water quality jurisdiction. There is no other alternative. Not on surface water. MR. YOUNG: I understand. Okay. Thank you for your comments. We're going to take a break and return at 1:00. Okay. Thank you. (Lunch break taken.) MR. YOUNG: Okay. Next speaker is Don Hoernschemeyer, then Bridget Hoover, then Nancy Isakson. Oh, yes. Is there anybody in the audience that and I don't know if you've seen the list but it's all alphabetized. I have a request who's name begins with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	if you carefully look at the plant, how could one scientifically objectively look at this and say, wait a minute, Tier 2 and Tier 3, these are the most sensitive areas we're going to target. That's fine, but when you look at how those crops respond to granulated or liquid fertilize application, we don't know, on a baseline, we don't know. So why would you, as a regulatory body, from our perspective, we're saying wait a minute DR. HUNTER: But you're not well, I've made my comments. We're not prescribing practices, we're asking the farmers and they've come up with a number of quite a number. We have seen improvements in some places. So I think we have learned. So, I just wanted to be sure I understood your remarks today. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Hard. MR. HARD: The Department will be in touch with the Chair and the State Water Board for consultation. And part of my presence here today is to inform you that we are taking this extremely seriously. And the horse we have in this race is about the way in which the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	try to find a way to get to getting them resolved. So MR. HARD: We just want to make sure that this agency knows this is more than just the regulatory and executive branch problem. This is water management and water quality issue. And you have water quality jurisdiction. There is no other alternative. Not on surface water. MR. YOUNG: I understand. Okay. Thank you for your comments. We're going to take a break and return at 1:00. Okay. Thank you. (Lunch break taken.) MR. YOUNG: Okay. Next speaker is Don Hoernschemeyer, then Bridget Hoover, then Nancy Isakson. Oh, yes. Is there anybody in the audience that and I don't know if you've seen the list but it's all alphabetized. I have a request who's name begins with "Z" to speak out of order because he needs to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	if you carefully look at the plant, how could one scientifically objectively look at this and say, wait a minute, Tier 2 and Tier 3, these are the most sensitive areas we're going to target. That's fine, but when you look at how those crops respond to granulated or liquid fertilize application, we don't know, on a baseline, we don't know. So why would you, as a regulatory body, from our perspective, we're saying wait a minute DR. HUNTER: But you're not well, I've made my comments. We're not prescribing practices, we're asking the farmers and they've come up with a number of quite a number. We have seen improvements in some places. So I think we have learned. So, I just wanted to be sure I understood your remarks today. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Mr. Hard. MR. HARD: The Department will be in touch with the Chair and the State Water Board for consultation. And part of my presence here today is to inform you that we are taking this extremely seriously. And the horse we have in this race is about the way in which the unsustainable nature of this regulatory approach is to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	try to find a way to get to getting them resolved. So MR. HARD: We just want to make sure that this agency knows this is more than just the regulatory and executive branch problem. This is water management and water quality issue. And you have water quality jurisdiction. There is no other alternative. Not on surface water. MR. YOUNG: I understand. Okay. Thank you for your comments. We're going to take a break and return at 1:00. Okay. Thank you. (Lunch break taken.) MR. YOUNG: Okay. Next speaker is Don Hoernschemeyer, then Bridget Hoover, then Nancy Isakson. Oh, yes. Is there anybody in the audience that and I don't know if you've seen the list but it's all alphabetized. I have a request who's name begins with "Z" to speak out of order because he needs to be somewhere by 1:30 or 2.

1	comments in, I'll consider taking you out of order at	1	MR. ZELINSKI: Dr. Lowell Zelinski,
2	this time.	2	Z-E-L-I-N-S-K-I. And I have a Ph.D in soil plant and
3	Okay. Why don't you come forward.	3	water relation from the University of California Davis.
4	MS. AKIN: I am reading the letter from Dr. Don	4	And I am a member of the San Luis Obispo County Water
5	Hoernschemeyer. I believe you have the spelling over	5	Resources Advisory Committee as well as owning a small
6	there. My name is Pricilla Akin of the anyway, I'm	6	company that does irrigation and fertility consulting in
7	from the Local Unitarian Universalist Congregation.	7	both Monterey County and in Paso Robles.
8	Dr. Hoernschemeyer is from the Aktos	8	I want to commend the staff for responding a
9	Congregation and was not able to get down here.	9	to a lot of questions I had submitted in the past and
10 11	MR. YOUNG: Can you spell the name or do you have the letter?	10 11	they did clarify a number of issues that I had. There
12		12	are still some other ones. But what I am most concerned
13	Okay. MS_AKIN: Members of the Central Coast Regional	13	about is the nitrogen use sufficiency requirements, you can only put on, though, the ratio of one pound of N for
14	MS. AKIN: Members of the Central Coast Regional Board, as a concerned citizen writer on the health	14	part of N removed.
15	hazards from water pollution and as a citizen concerned	15	Part of my Ph.D dissertation was looking at
16	with the health of every person, and especially children,	16	nitrate uptake sufficiency of cotton, and we use labelled
17	and the health of sea otters and marine mammals in our	17	nitrogen so we could track how much was taken up. The
18	area, I want to urge you to institute effective	18	best we could ever do was recover 50 percent of the
19	regulation of hazardous run-off from agricultural fields.	19	nitrogen we applied in the whole plant that we analyzed.
20	Many farmers want to take action to minimize	20	So there's a number of speakers have spoken about this
21	run-off of fertilizers and pesticides from their fields,	21	about how it would be difficult to obtain that one-to-one
22	and that is commendable, however, history has shown	22	relationship, and I think it's impossible without
23	self-regulation is very slow and usually not effective.	23	suffering yield losses. The plants are not just that
24	Pollution regulations with clear enforcement	24	sufficient in taking up nitrogen.
25	actions are required to protect the health of our rivers,	25	Additionally, I wonder I'm sure the
	Page 467		Page 469
1	accome and aquifore and ultimately the health of the	1	Doord's owers but I'd like to reiterate that the
1	oceans and aquifers and, ultimately, the health of the	1	Board's aware, but I'd like to reiterate, that the
2	people.	2	vegetable growers in Salinas Valley plant a number of
2	people. Of course, the regulations must be feasible	2	vegetable growers in Salinas Valley plant a number of crops a number of times a year and in small blocks within
2 3 4	people. Of course, the regulations must be feasible and reasonable. The proper role of the farmers of the	2 3 4	vegetable growers in Salinas Valley plant a number of crops a number of times a year and in small blocks within larger fields, and if they're required to prepare a
2 3 4 5	people. Of course, the regulations must be feasible and reasonable. The proper role of the farmers of the area is to speak to these issues. I urge you to enact	2 3 4 5	vegetable growers in Salinas Valley plant a number of crops a number of times a year and in small blocks within larger fields, and if they're required to prepare a nutrient budget for each one of those plantings, there
2 3 4	people. Of course, the regulations must be feasible and reasonable. The proper role of the farmers of the area is to speak to these issues. I urge you to enact regulations that address every water pollutant known to	2 3 4	vegetable growers in Salinas Valley plant a number of crops a number of times a year and in small blocks within larger fields, and if they're required to prepare a nutrient budget for each one of those plantings, there would be potentially tens of thousands of nutrient
2 3 4 5 6	people. Of course, the regulations must be feasible and reasonable. The proper role of the farmers of the area is to speak to these issues. I urge you to enact regulations that address every water pollutant known to occur in the Salinas Valley. This should certainly	2 3 4 5 6	vegetable growers in Salinas Valley plant a number of crops a number of times a year and in small blocks within larger fields, and if they're required to prepare a nutrient budget for each one of those plantings, there would be potentially tens of thousands of nutrient budgets that need to be submitted. They'll go by a
2 3 4 5 6 7	people. Of course, the regulations must be feasible and reasonable. The proper role of the farmers of the area is to speak to these issues. I urge you to enact regulations that address every water pollutant known to occur in the Salinas Valley. This should certainly include toxic pesticides such as Chloropherpheral and	2 3 4 5 6 7	vegetable growers in Salinas Valley plant a number of crops a number of times a year and in small blocks within larger fields, and if they're required to prepare a nutrient budget for each one of those plantings, there would be potentially tens of thousands of nutrient budgets that need to be submitted. They'll go by a 3-acre block of lettuce and then two weeks later they'll
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	people. Of course, the regulations must be feasible and reasonable. The proper role of the farmers of the area is to speak to these issues. I urge you to enact regulations that address every water pollutant known to occur in the Salinas Valley. This should certainly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	vegetable growers in Salinas Valley plant a number of crops a number of times a year and in small blocks within larger fields, and if they're required to prepare a nutrient budget for each one of those plantings, there would be potentially tens of thousands of nutrient budgets that need to be submitted. They'll go by a 3-acre block of lettuce and then two weeks later they'll find another 3 acre block, and two weeks later they'll
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	people. Of course, the regulations must be feasible and reasonable. The proper role of the farmers of the area is to speak to these issues. I urge you to enact regulations that address every water pollutant known to occur in the Salinas Valley. This should certainly include toxic pesticides such as Chloropherpheral and Indoprofen, which are being band in Europe. And the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	vegetable growers in Salinas Valley plant a number of crops a number of times a year and in small blocks within larger fields, and if they're required to prepare a nutrient budget for each one of those plantings, there would be potentially tens of thousands of nutrient budgets that need to be submitted. They'll go by a 3-acre block of lettuce and then two weeks later they'll
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	people. Of course, the regulations must be feasible and reasonable. The proper role of the farmers of the area is to speak to these issues. I urge you to enact regulations that address every water pollutant known to occur in the Salinas Valley. This should certainly include toxic pesticides such as Chloropherpheral and Indoprofen, which are being band in Europe. And the fungicide and carcinogen Capsin of which 300,000 pounds	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	vegetable growers in Salinas Valley plant a number of crops a number of times a year and in small blocks within larger fields, and if they're required to prepare a nutrient budget for each one of those plantings, there would be potentially tens of thousands of nutrient budgets that need to be submitted. They'll go by a 3-acre block of lettuce and then two weeks later they'll find another 3 acre block, and two weeks later they'll find another 3 acre block. So I just wanted to make sure
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	people. Of course, the regulations must be feasible and reasonable. The proper role of the farmers of the area is to speak to these issues. I urge you to enact regulations that address every water pollutant known to occur in the Salinas Valley. This should certainly include toxic pesticides such as Chloropherpheral and Indoprofen, which are being band in Europe. And the fungicide and carcinogen Capsin of which 300,000 pounds were applied to crops in this region in 2009.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	vegetable growers in Salinas Valley plant a number of crops a number of times a year and in small blocks within larger fields, and if they're required to prepare a nutrient budget for each one of those plantings, there would be potentially tens of thousands of nutrient budgets that need to be submitted. They'll go by a 3-acre block of lettuce and then two weeks later they'll find another 3 acre block, and two weeks later they'll find another 3 acre block. So I just wanted to make sure that that was clear.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	people. Of course, the regulations must be feasible and reasonable. The proper role of the farmers of the area is to speak to these issues. I urge you to enact regulations that address every water pollutant known to occur in the Salinas Valley. This should certainly include toxic pesticides such as Chloropherpheral and Indoprofen, which are being band in Europe. And the fungicide and carcinogen Capsin of which 300,000 pounds were applied to crops in this region in 2009. Thank you for your consideration. Don	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	vegetable growers in Salinas Valley plant a number of crops a number of times a year and in small blocks within larger fields, and if they're required to prepare a nutrient budget for each one of those plantings, there would be potentially tens of thousands of nutrient budgets that need to be submitted. They'll go by a 3-acre block of lettuce and then two weeks later they'll find another 3 acre block, and two weeks later they'll find another 3 acre block. So I just wanted to make sure that that was clear. One other thing I want to mention is that one
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	people. Of course, the regulations must be feasible and reasonable. The proper role of the farmers of the area is to speak to these issues. I urge you to enact regulations that address every water pollutant known to occur in the Salinas Valley. This should certainly include toxic pesticides such as Chloropherpheral and Indoprofen, which are being band in Europe. And the fungicide and carcinogen Capsin of which 300,000 pounds were applied to crops in this region in 2009. Thank you for your consideration. Don Hoernschemeyer.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	vegetable growers in Salinas Valley plant a number of crops a number of times a year and in small blocks within larger fields, and if they're required to prepare a nutrient budget for each one of those plantings, there would be potentially tens of thousands of nutrient budgets that need to be submitted. They'll go by a 3-acre block of lettuce and then two weeks later they'll find another 3 acre block, and two weeks later they'll find another 3 acre block. So I just wanted to make sure that that was clear. One other thing I want to mention is that one of the questions I did submit to staff was does the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	people. Of course, the regulations must be feasible and reasonable. The proper role of the farmers of the area is to speak to these issues. I urge you to enact regulations that address every water pollutant known to occur in the Salinas Valley. This should certainly include toxic pesticides such as Chloropherpheral and Indoprofen, which are being band in Europe. And the fungicide and carcinogen Capsin of which 300,000 pounds were applied to crops in this region in 2009. Thank you for your consideration. Don Hoernschemeyer. MR. BRIGGS: Ma'am, I realize she's got Don's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	vegetable growers in Salinas Valley plant a number of crops a number of times a year and in small blocks within larger fields, and if they're required to prepare a nutrient budget for each one of those plantings, there would be potentially tens of thousands of nutrient budgets that need to be submitted. They'll go by a 3-acre block of lettuce and then two weeks later they'll find another 3 acre block, and two weeks later they'll find another 3 acre block. So I just wanted to make sure that that was clear. One other thing I want to mention is that one of the questions I did submit to staff was does the incidence of methemoglobin anemia in Monterey County
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	people. Of course, the regulations must be feasible and reasonable. The proper role of the farmers of the area is to speak to these issues. I urge you to enact regulations that address every water pollutant known to occur in the Salinas Valley. This should certainly include toxic pesticides such as Chloropherpheral and Indoprofen, which are being band in Europe. And the fungicide and carcinogen Capsin of which 300,000 pounds were applied to crops in this region in 2009. Thank you for your consideration. Don Hoernschemeyer. MR. BRIGGS: Ma'am, I realize she's got Don's name, but I don't know if she's got your name.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	vegetable growers in Salinas Valley plant a number of crops a number of times a year and in small blocks within larger fields, and if they're required to prepare a nutrient budget for each one of those plantings, there would be potentially tens of thousands of nutrient budgets that need to be submitted. They'll go by a 3-acre block of lettuce and then two weeks later they'll find another 3 acre block, and two weeks later they'll find another 3 acre block. So I just wanted to make sure that that was clear. One other thing I want to mention is that one of the questions I did submit to staff was does the incidence of methemoglobin anemia in Monterey County support the contention that a lot of people are drinking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	people. Of course, the regulations must be feasible and reasonable. The proper role of the farmers of the area is to speak to these issues. I urge you to enact regulations that address every water pollutant known to occur in the Salinas Valley. This should certainly include toxic pesticides such as Chloropherpheral and Indoprofen, which are being band in Europe. And the fungicide and carcinogen Capsin of which 300,000 pounds were applied to crops in this region in 2009. Thank you for your consideration. Don Hoernschemeyer. MR. BRIGGS: Ma'am, I realize she's got Don's name, but I don't know if she's got your name. MS. AKIN: Pricilla Akin. Last name spelled A-K-I-N. MR. BRIGGS: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	vegetable growers in Salinas Valley plant a number of crops a number of times a year and in small blocks within larger fields, and if they're required to prepare a nutrient budget for each one of those plantings, there would be potentially tens of thousands of nutrient budgets that need to be submitted. They'll go by a 3-acre block of lettuce and then two weeks later they'll find another 3 acre block, and two weeks later they'll find another 3 acre block. So I just wanted to make sure that that was clear. One other thing I want to mention is that one of the questions I did submit to staff was does the incidence of methemoglobin anemia in Monterey County support the contention that a lot of people are drinking high nitrate water. And the response is, no, it does not. That's all my comments. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	people. Of course, the regulations must be feasible and reasonable. The proper role of the farmers of the area is to speak to these issues. I urge you to enact regulations that address every water pollutant known to occur in the Salinas Valley. This should certainly include toxic pesticides such as Chloropherpheral and Indoprofen, which are being band in Europe. And the fungicide and carcinogen Capsin of which 300,000 pounds were applied to crops in this region in 2009. Thank you for your consideration. Don Hoernschemeyer. MR. BRIGGS: Ma'am, I realize she's got Don's name, but I don't know if she's got your name. MS. AKIN: Pricilla Akin. Last name spelled A-K-I-N. MR. BRIGGS: Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	vegetable growers in Salinas Valley plant a number of crops a number of times a year and in small blocks within larger fields, and if they're required to prepare a nutrient budget for each one of those plantings, there would be potentially tens of thousands of nutrient budgets that need to be submitted. They'll go by a 3-acre block of lettuce and then two weeks later they'll find another 3 acre block, and two weeks later they'll find another 3 acre block. So I just wanted to make sure that that was clear. One other thing I want to mention is that one of the questions I did submit to staff was does the incidence of methemoglobin anemia in Monterey County support the contention that a lot of people are drinking high nitrate water. And the response is, no, it does not. That's all my comments. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: So, just a followup question for you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	people. Of course, the regulations must be feasible and reasonable. The proper role of the farmers of the area is to speak to these issues. I urge you to enact regulations that address every water pollutant known to occur in the Salinas Valley. This should certainly include toxic pesticides such as Chloropherpheral and Indoprofen, which are being band in Europe. And the fungicide and carcinogen Capsin of which 300,000 pounds were applied to crops in this region in 2009. Thank you for your consideration. Don Hoernschemeyer. MR. BRIGGS: Ma'am, I realize she's got Don's name, but I don't know if she's got your name. MS. AKIN: Pricilla Akin. Last name spelled A-K-I-N. MR. BRIGGS: Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Sir, come forward, and you must be at the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	vegetable growers in Salinas Valley plant a number of crops a number of times a year and in small blocks within larger fields, and if they're required to prepare a nutrient budget for each one of those plantings, there would be potentially tens of thousands of nutrient budgets that need to be submitted. They'll go by a 3-acre block of lettuce and then two weeks later they'll find another 3 acre block, and two weeks later they'll find another 3 acre block. So I just wanted to make sure that that was clear. One other thing I want to mention is that one of the questions I did submit to staff was does the incidence of methemoglobin anemia in Monterey County support the contention that a lot of people are drinking high nitrate water. And the response is, no, it does not. That's all my comments. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: So, just a followup question for you. So, what you're saying is that you have to over-fertilize
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	people. Of course, the regulations must be feasible and reasonable. The proper role of the farmers of the area is to speak to these issues. I urge you to enact regulations that address every water pollutant known to occur in the Salinas Valley. This should certainly include toxic pesticides such as Chloropherpheral and Indoprofen, which are being band in Europe. And the fungicide and carcinogen Capsin of which 300,000 pounds were applied to crops in this region in 2009. Thank you for your consideration. Don Hoernschemeyer. MR. BRIGGS: Ma'am, I realize she's got Don's name, but I don't know if she's got your name. MS. AKIN: Pricilla Akin. Last name spelled A-K-I-N. MR. BRIGGS: Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Sir, come forward, and you must be at the bottom of my card list.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	vegetable growers in Salinas Valley plant a number of crops a number of times a year and in small blocks within larger fields, and if they're required to prepare a nutrient budget for each one of those plantings, there would be potentially tens of thousands of nutrient budgets that need to be submitted. They'll go by a 3-acre block of lettuce and then two weeks later they'll find another 3 acre block, and two weeks later they'll find another 3 acre block. So I just wanted to make sure that that was clear. One other thing I want to mention is that one of the questions I did submit to staff was does the incidence of methemoglobin anemia in Monterey County support the contention that a lot of people are drinking high nitrate water. And the response is, no, it does not. That's all my comments. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: So, just a followup question for you. So, what you're saying is that you have to over-fertilize because at least with your experience with cotton it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Of course, the regulations must be feasible and reasonable. The proper role of the farmers of the area is to speak to these issues. I urge you to enact regulations that address every water pollutant known to occur in the Salinas Valley. This should certainly include toxic pesticides such as Chloropherpheral and Indoprofen, which are being band in Europe. And the fungicide and carcinogen Capsin of which 300,000 pounds were applied to crops in this region in 2009. Thank you for your consideration. Don Hoernschemeyer. MR. BRIGGS: Ma'am, I realize she's got Don's name, but I don't know if she's got your name. MS. AKIN: Pricilla Akin. Last name spelled A-K-I-N. MR. BRIGGS: Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Sir, come forward, and you must be at the bottom of my card list. MR. ZELINSKI: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	vegetable growers in Salinas Valley plant a number of crops a number of times a year and in small blocks within larger fields, and if they're required to prepare a nutrient budget for each one of those plantings, there would be potentially tens of thousands of nutrient budgets that need to be submitted. They'll go by a 3-acre block of lettuce and then two weeks later they'll find another 3 acre block, and two weeks later they'll find another 3 acre block. So I just wanted to make sure that that was clear. One other thing I want to mention is that one of the questions I did submit to staff was does the incidence of methemoglobin anemia in Monterey County support the contention that a lot of people are drinking high nitrate water. And the response is, no, it does not. That's all my comments. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: So, just a followup question for you. So, what you're saying is that you have to over-fertilize because at least with your experience with cotton it's not very efficient in taking up nitrogen.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Of course, the regulations must be feasible and reasonable. The proper role of the farmers of the area is to speak to these issues. I urge you to enact regulations that address every water pollutant known to occur in the Salinas Valley. This should certainly include toxic pesticides such as Chloropherpheral and Indoprofen, which are being band in Europe. And the fungicide and carcinogen Capsin of which 300,000 pounds were applied to crops in this region in 2009. Thank you for your consideration. Don Hoernschemeyer. MR. BRIGGS: Ma'am, I realize she's got Don's name, but I don't know if she's got your name. MS. AKIN: Pricilla Akin. Last name spelled A-K-I-N. MR. BRIGGS: Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Sir, come forward, and you must be at the bottom of my card list. MR. ZELINSKI: Yes. MR. YOUNG: You're Dr. Lowell Zelinski?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	vegetable growers in Salinas Valley plant a number of crops a number of times a year and in small blocks within larger fields, and if they're required to prepare a nutrient budget for each one of those plantings, there would be potentially tens of thousands of nutrient budgets that need to be submitted. They'll go by a 3-acre block of lettuce and then two weeks later they'll find another 3 acre block, and two weeks later they'll find another 3 acre block. So I just wanted to make sure that that was clear. One other thing I want to mention is that one of the questions I did submit to staff was does the incidence of methemoglobin anemia in Monterey County support the contention that a lot of people are drinking high nitrate water. And the response is, no, it does not. That's all my comments. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: So, just a followup question for you. So, what you're saying is that you have to over-fertilize because at least with your experience with cotton it's not very efficient in taking up nitrogen. MR. ZELINSKI: Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Of course, the regulations must be feasible and reasonable. The proper role of the farmers of the area is to speak to these issues. I urge you to enact regulations that address every water pollutant known to occur in the Salinas Valley. This should certainly include toxic pesticides such as Chloropherpheral and Indoprofen, which are being band in Europe. And the fungicide and carcinogen Capsin of which 300,000 pounds were applied to crops in this region in 2009. Thank you for your consideration. Don Hoernschemeyer. MR. BRIGGS: Ma'am, I realize she's got Don's name, but I don't know if she's got your name. MS. AKIN: Pricilla Akin. Last name spelled A-K-I-N. MR. BRIGGS: Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Sir, come forward, and you must be at the bottom of my card list. MR. ZELINSKI: Yes. MR. YOUNG: You're Dr. Lowell Zelinski? MR. ZELINSKI: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	vegetable growers in Salinas Valley plant a number of crops a number of times a year and in small blocks within larger fields, and if they're required to prepare a nutrient budget for each one of those plantings, there would be potentially tens of thousands of nutrient budgets that need to be submitted. They'll go by a 3-acre block of lettuce and then two weeks later they'll find another 3 acre block, and two weeks later they'll find another 3 acre block. So I just wanted to make sure that that was clear. One other thing I want to mention is that one of the questions I did submit to staff was does the incidence of methemoglobin anemia in Monterey County support the contention that a lot of people are drinking high nitrate water. And the response is, no, it does not. That's all my comments. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: So, just a followup question for you. So, what you're saying is that you have to over-fertilize because at least with your experience with cotton it's not very efficient in taking up nitrogen. MR. ZELINSKI: Right. MR. YOUNG: And the only way you can get that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Of course, the regulations must be feasible and reasonable. The proper role of the farmers of the area is to speak to these issues. I urge you to enact regulations that address every water pollutant known to occur in the Salinas Valley. This should certainly include toxic pesticides such as Chloropherpheral and Indoprofen, which are being band in Europe. And the fungicide and carcinogen Capsin of which 300,000 pounds were applied to crops in this region in 2009. Thank you for your consideration. Don Hoernschemeyer. MR. BRIGGS: Ma'am, I realize she's got Don's name, but I don't know if she's got your name. MS. AKIN: Pricilla Akin. Last name spelled A-K-I-N. MR. BRIGGS: Thank you. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Sir, come forward, and you must be at the bottom of my card list. MR. ZELINSKI: Yes. MR. YOUNG: You're Dr. Lowell Zelinski?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	vegetable growers in Salinas Valley plant a number of crops a number of times a year and in small blocks within larger fields, and if they're required to prepare a nutrient budget for each one of those plantings, there would be potentially tens of thousands of nutrient budgets that need to be submitted. They'll go by a 3-acre block of lettuce and then two weeks later they'll find another 3 acre block, and two weeks later they'll find another 3 acre block. So I just wanted to make sure that that was clear. One other thing I want to mention is that one of the questions I did submit to staff was does the incidence of methemoglobin anemia in Monterey County support the contention that a lot of people are drinking high nitrate water. And the response is, no, it does not. That's all my comments. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: So, just a followup question for you. So, what you're saying is that you have to over-fertilize because at least with your experience with cotton it's not very efficient in taking up nitrogen. MR. ZELINSKI: Right.

1	MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, because the fate of nitrogen,	1	we believe the Order oversteps the limited authority
2	where it goes, it isn't always taken up by the plant. So	2	granted to you through the California Water Code and that
3	it volatilizes into the atmosphere of amonia gas, or	3	jurisdiction to implement and enforce some of these
4	other things, or uria. So there's a lot of other syncs,	4	regulations have actually been granted to the Monterey
5	or ways the nitrogen can leave the system.	5	County Water Resource Agency.
6	And I say that it's complex. If you make the	6	I'm sorry, I see this is going through time.
7	nitrogen fertilizer requirement equal to the amount of	7	I'm going to summarize this. That specific
8	nitrogen removed, have you considered the amount of	8	to nitrate concerns the Monterey County Health Department
9	nitrogen in the water that was being applied with the	9	and Monterey County Resource Agency have programs in
10	irrigation.	10	place to address the nitrate in the groundwater. They've
11	Additionally, you can if you put on	11	done this for years. And we ask that you let the local
12	50 pounds of nitrogen, you can pollute more with that 50	12	agencies work with the local solutions.
13	pound addition, than with a 200-pound addition depending	13	Again, we believe that the Order provides a
14	on the timing and the method of application.	14	duplicative layer and oversteps your authority, and we
15	So I think it's not as simple as you would	15	think we do need to step back, and I hate to say start
16	think of just putting on what the crop needs. There's	16	over, but we need to look at, as Mr. Hard said, what is
17	much more to nitrogen management than that.	17	the problem and how do we best address the solutions.
18	MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you for your comments.	18	Again, our Chair, Mr. Roberts, who will
19	Nancy Isakson, and then Christine Khan.	19	address from a hydrologic point because we believe that
20	MS. ISAKSON: I prepared a power point.	20	that's what you need to do.
21	Nancy Isakson, I-S-A-K-S-O-N, and I'm here as	21	Thank you.
22	President of Salinas Valley Water Coalition.	22	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.
23	And I had compared a power point for you. I	23	Miss Isakson, I have a few questions for you.
24	just want to summarize some things for you.	24	Does the Monterey County Water Agency have any program to
25	Salinas Valley Water Coalition is a not for	25	address nitrate in the groundwater?
	Page 471		Page 473
1	profit organization comprised of agricultural landowners,	1	MS. ISAKSON: I believe they do. I thought I
1 2	profit organization comprised of agricultural landowners, farmers, businesses within the Salinas Valley. Our	1 2	MS. ISAKSON: I believe they do. I thought I heard Curtis Weekes address this Board, not in March, but
2	farmers, businesses within the Salinas Valley. Our	2	heard Curtis Weekes address this Board, not in March, but
2	farmers, businesses within the Salinas Valley. Our mission statement includes the statement, the management	2	heard Curtis Weekes address this Board, not in March, but the time before in Watsonville, and I thought he had
2 3 4	farmers, businesses within the Salinas Valley. Our mission statement includes the statement, the management of the Salinas River Basin should be based on a scientific basis, comply with all laws and regulations	2 3 4	heard Curtis Weekes address this Board, not in March, but the time before in Watsonville, and I thought he had discussed that specifically. I know they do they have
2 3 4 5	farmers, businesses within the Salinas Valley. Our mission statement includes the statement, the management of the Salinas River Basin should be based on a	2 3 4 5	heard Curtis Weekes address this Board, not in March, but the time before in Watsonville, and I thought he had discussed that specifically. I know they do they have a committee, I'm not part of that water committee, but
2 3 4 5 6	farmers, businesses within the Salinas Valley. Our mission statement includes the statement, the management of the Salinas River Basin should be based on a scientific basis, comply with all laws and regulations and promote the accountability of governing agencies.	2 3 4 5 6	heard Curtis Weekes address this Board, not in March, but the time before in Watsonville, and I thought he had discussed that specifically. I know they do they have a committee, I'm not part of that water committee, but there may be some people here in the room that are, but
2 3 4 5 6 7	farmers, businesses within the Salinas Valley. Our mission statement includes the statement, the management of the Salinas River Basin should be based on a scientific basis, comply with all laws and regulations and promote the accountability of governing agencies. And that's how we operated for 20 years and we continue	2 3 4 5 6 7	heard Curtis Weekes address this Board, not in March, but the time before in Watsonville, and I thought he had discussed that specifically. I know they do they have a committee, I'm not part of that water committee, but there may be some people here in the room that are, but Kathy Thomasberg was the water agency that oversees that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	farmers, businesses within the Salinas Valley. Our mission statement includes the statement, the management of the Salinas River Basin should be based on a scientific basis, comply with all laws and regulations and promote the accountability of governing agencies. And that's how we operated for 20 years and we continue to operate.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	heard Curtis Weekes address this Board, not in March, but the time before in Watsonville, and I thought he had discussed that specifically. I know they do they have a committee, I'm not part of that water committee, but there may be some people here in the room that are, but Kathy Thomasberg was the water agency that oversees that as a staff person. MR. YOUNG: But other than what you heard
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	farmers, businesses within the Salinas Valley. Our mission statement includes the statement, the management of the Salinas River Basin should be based on a scientific basis, comply with all laws and regulations and promote the accountability of governing agencies. And that's how we operated for 20 years and we continue to operate. Based on that we retain the services of a law firm, Haram, Lloyd, Carpauli and we also retained the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	heard Curtis Weekes address this Board, not in March, but the time before in Watsonville, and I thought he had discussed that specifically. I know they do they have a committee, I'm not part of that water committee, but there may be some people here in the room that are, but Kathy Thomasberg was the water agency that oversees that as a staff person.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	farmers, businesses within the Salinas Valley. Our mission statement includes the statement, the management of the Salinas River Basin should be based on a scientific basis, comply with all laws and regulations and promote the accountability of governing agencies. And that's how we operated for 20 years and we continue to operate. Based on that we retain the services of a law	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	heard Curtis Weekes address this Board, not in March, but the time before in Watsonville, and I thought he had discussed that specifically. I know they do they have a committee, I'm not part of that water committee, but there may be some people here in the room that are, but Kathy Thomasberg was the water agency that oversees that as a staff person. MR. YOUNG: But other than what you heard Mr. Weekes say I think it was up in Watsonville, and I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	farmers, businesses within the Salinas Valley. Our mission statement includes the statement, the management of the Salinas River Basin should be based on a scientific basis, comply with all laws and regulations and promote the accountability of governing agencies. And that's how we operated for 20 years and we continue to operate. Based on that we retain the services of a law firm, Haram, Lloyd, Carpauli and we also retained the services of a hydrologist who our Chair will speak to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	heard Curtis Weekes address this Board, not in March, but the time before in Watsonville, and I thought he had discussed that specifically. I know they do they have a committee, I'm not part of that water committee, but there may be some people here in the room that are, but Kathy Thomasberg was the water agency that oversees that as a staff person. MR. YOUNG: But other than what you heard Mr. Weekes say I think it was up in Watsonville, and I don't think it was this last March. MS. ISAKSON: No. He was the time before.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	farmers, businesses within the Salinas Valley. Our mission statement includes the statement, the management of the Salinas River Basin should be based on a scientific basis, comply with all laws and regulations and promote the accountability of governing agencies. And that's how we operated for 20 years and we continue to operate. Based on that we retain the services of a law firm, Haram, Lloyd, Carpauli and we also retained the services of a hydrologist who our Chair will speak to later. We I want to address the legal issues, and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	heard Curtis Weekes address this Board, not in March, but the time before in Watsonville, and I thought he had discussed that specifically. I know they do they have a committee, I'm not part of that water committee, but there may be some people here in the room that are, but Kathy Thomasberg was the water agency that oversees that as a staff person. MR. YOUNG: But other than what you heard Mr. Weekes say I think it was up in Watsonville, and I don't think it was this last March. MS. ISAKSON: No. He was the time before. MR. YOUNG: In July, probably, 2010. Are you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	farmers, businesses within the Salinas Valley. Our mission statement includes the statement, the management of the Salinas River Basin should be based on a scientific basis, comply with all laws and regulations and promote the accountability of governing agencies. And that's how we operated for 20 years and we continue to operate. Based on that we retain the services of a law firm, Haram, Lloyd, Carpauli and we also retained the services of a hydrologist who our Chair will speak to later. We I want to address the legal issues, and again, I'm just going to summarize, but we believe that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	heard Curtis Weekes address this Board, not in March, but the time before in Watsonville, and I thought he had discussed that specifically. I know they do they have a committee, I'm not part of that water committee, but there may be some people here in the room that are, but Kathy Thomasberg was the water agency that oversees that as a staff person. MR. YOUNG: But other than what you heard Mr. Weekes say I think it was up in Watsonville, and I don't think it was this last March. MS. ISAKSON: No. He was the time before. MR. YOUNG: In July, probably, 2010. Are you aware of anything other than his comments that he made?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	farmers, businesses within the Salinas Valley. Our mission statement includes the statement, the management of the Salinas River Basin should be based on a scientific basis, comply with all laws and regulations and promote the accountability of governing agencies. And that's how we operated for 20 years and we continue to operate. Based on that we retain the services of a law firm, Haram, Lloyd, Carpauli and we also retained the services of a hydrologist who our Chair will speak to later. We I want to address the legal issues, and again, I'm just going to summarize, but we believe that the proposed order oversteps the boundaries of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	heard Curtis Weekes address this Board, not in March, but the time before in Watsonville, and I thought he had discussed that specifically. I know they do they have a committee, I'm not part of that water committee, but there may be some people here in the room that are, but Kathy Thomasberg was the water agency that oversees that as a staff person. MR. YOUNG: But other than what you heard Mr. Weekes say I think it was up in Watsonville, and I don't think it was this last March. MS. ISAKSON: No. He was the time before. MR. YOUNG: In July, probably, 2010. Are you aware of anything other than his comments that he made? MS. ISAKSON: Oh, I know that there have been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	farmers, businesses within the Salinas Valley. Our mission statement includes the statement, the management of the Salinas River Basin should be based on a scientific basis, comply with all laws and regulations and promote the accountability of governing agencies. And that's how we operated for 20 years and we continue to operate. Based on that we retain the services of a law firm, Haram, Lloyd, Carpauli and we also retained the services of a hydrologist who our Chair will speak to later. We I want to address the legal issues, and again, I'm just going to summarize, but we believe that the proposed order oversteps the boundaries of the legislative authority granted to you and imposes a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	heard Curtis Weekes address this Board, not in March, but the time before in Watsonville, and I thought he had discussed that specifically. I know they do they have a committee, I'm not part of that water committee, but there may be some people here in the room that are, but Kathy Thomasberg was the water agency that oversees that as a staff person. MR. YOUNG: But other than what you heard Mr. Weekes say I think it was up in Watsonville, and I don't think it was this last March. MS. ISAKSON: No. He was the time before. MR. YOUNG: In July, probably, 2010. Are you aware of anything other than his comments that he made? MS. ISAKSON: Oh, I know that there have been programs. I mean
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	farmers, businesses within the Salinas Valley. Our mission statement includes the statement, the management of the Salinas River Basin should be based on a scientific basis, comply with all laws and regulations and promote the accountability of governing agencies. And that's how we operated for 20 years and we continue to operate. Based on that we retain the services of a law firm, Haram, Lloyd, Carpauli and we also retained the services of a hydrologist who our Chair will speak to later. We I want to address the legal issues, and again, I'm just going to summarize, but we believe that the proposed order oversteps the boundaries of the legislative authority granted to you and imposes a duplicate set of regulations, violates the equal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	heard Curtis Weekes address this Board, not in March, but the time before in Watsonville, and I thought he had discussed that specifically. I know they do they have a committee, I'm not part of that water committee, but there may be some people here in the room that are, but Kathy Thomasberg was the water agency that oversees that as a staff person. MR. YOUNG: But other than what you heard Mr. Weekes say I think it was up in Watsonville, and I don't think it was this last March. MS. ISAKSON: No. He was the time before. MR. YOUNG: In July, probably, 2010. Are you aware of anything other than his comments that he made? MS. ISAKSON: Oh, I know that there have been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	farmers, businesses within the Salinas Valley. Our mission statement includes the statement, the management of the Salinas River Basin should be based on a scientific basis, comply with all laws and regulations and promote the accountability of governing agencies. And that's how we operated for 20 years and we continue to operate. Based on that we retain the services of a law firm, Haram, Lloyd, Carpauli and we also retained the services of a hydrologist who our Chair will speak to later. We I want to address the legal issues, and again, I'm just going to summarize, but we believe that the proposed order oversteps the boundaries of the legislative authority granted to you and imposes a duplicate set of regulations, violates the equal protection clauses of the United States and California	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	heard Curtis Weekes address this Board, not in March, but the time before in Watsonville, and I thought he had discussed that specifically. I know they do they have a committee, I'm not part of that water committee, but there may be some people here in the room that are, but Kathy Thomasberg was the water agency that oversees that as a staff person. MR. YOUNG: But other than what you heard Mr. Weekes say I think it was up in Watsonville, and I don't think it was this last March. MS. ISAKSON: No. He was the time before. MR. YOUNG: In July, probably, 2010. Are you aware of anything other than his comments that he made? MS. ISAKSON: Oh, I know that there have been programs. I mean MR. YOUNG: The Monterey MS. ISAKSON: I couldn't tell you what the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	farmers, businesses within the Salinas Valley. Our mission statement includes the statement, the management of the Salinas River Basin should be based on a scientific basis, comply with all laws and regulations and promote the accountability of governing agencies. And that's how we operated for 20 years and we continue to operate. Based on that we retain the services of a law firm, Haram, Lloyd, Carpauli and we also retained the services of a hydrologist who our Chair will speak to later. We I want to address the legal issues, and again, I'm just going to summarize, but we believe that the proposed order oversteps the boundaries of the legislative authority granted to you and imposes a duplicate set of regulations, violates the equal protection clauses of the United States and California Constitution and fails to protect farmers' proprietary	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	heard Curtis Weekes address this Board, not in March, but the time before in Watsonville, and I thought he had discussed that specifically. I know they do they have a committee, I'm not part of that water committee, but there may be some people here in the room that are, but Kathy Thomasberg was the water agency that oversees that as a staff person. MR. YOUNG: But other than what you heard Mr. Weekes say I think it was up in Watsonville, and I don't think it was this last March. MS. ISAKSON: No. He was the time before. MR. YOUNG: In July, probably, 2010. Are you aware of anything other than his comments that he made? MS. ISAKSON: Oh, I know that there have been programs. I mean MR. YOUNG: The Monterey MS. ISAKSON: I couldn't tell you what the specifics are, but I personally have monitored the water
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	farmers, businesses within the Salinas Valley. Our mission statement includes the statement, the management of the Salinas River Basin should be based on a scientific basis, comply with all laws and regulations and promote the accountability of governing agencies. And that's how we operated for 20 years and we continue to operate. Based on that we retain the services of a law firm, Haram, Lloyd, Carpauli and we also retained the services of a hydrologist who our Chair will speak to later. We I want to address the legal issues, and again, I'm just going to summarize, but we believe that the proposed order oversteps the boundaries of the legislative authority granted to you and imposes a duplicate set of regulations, violates the equal protection clauses of the United States and California Constitution and fails to protect farmers' proprietary rights.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	heard Curtis Weekes address this Board, not in March, but the time before in Watsonville, and I thought he had discussed that specifically. I know they do they have a committee, I'm not part of that water committee, but there may be some people here in the room that are, but Kathy Thomasberg was the water agency that oversees that as a staff person. MR. YOUNG: But other than what you heard Mr. Weekes say I think it was up in Watsonville, and I don't think it was this last March. MS. ISAKSON: No. He was the time before. MR. YOUNG: In July, probably, 2010. Are you aware of anything other than his comments that he made? MS. ISAKSON: Oh, I know that there have been programs. I mean MR. YOUNG: The Monterey MS. ISAKSON: I couldn't tell you what the specifics are, but I personally have monitored the water agency, the Water Resource Agency activity. I know that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	farmers, businesses within the Salinas Valley. Our mission statement includes the statement, the management of the Salinas River Basin should be based on a scientific basis, comply with all laws and regulations and promote the accountability of governing agencies. And that's how we operated for 20 years and we continue to operate. Based on that we retain the services of a law firm, Haram, Lloyd, Carpauli and we also retained the services of a hydrologist who our Chair will speak to later. We I want to address the legal issues, and again, I'm just going to summarize, but we believe that the proposed order oversteps the boundaries of the legislative authority granted to you and imposes a duplicate set of regulations, violates the equal protection clauses of the United States and California Constitution and fails to protect farmers' proprietary rights. For these reasons and, really, it tracks with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	heard Curtis Weekes address this Board, not in March, but the time before in Watsonville, and I thought he had discussed that specifically. I know they do they have a committee, I'm not part of that water committee, but there may be some people here in the room that are, but Kathy Thomasberg was the water agency that oversees that as a staff person. MR. YOUNG: But other than what you heard Mr. Weekes say I think it was up in Watsonville, and I don't think it was this last March. MS. ISAKSON: No. He was the time before. MR. YOUNG: In July, probably, 2010. Are you aware of anything other than his comments that he made? MS. ISAKSON: Oh, I know that there have been programs. I mean MR. YOUNG: The Monterey MS. ISAKSON: I couldn't tell you what the specifics are, but I personally have monitored the water agency, the Water Resource Agency activity. I know that they do have programs. I couldn't tell you,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	farmers, businesses within the Salinas Valley. Our mission statement includes the statement, the management of the Salinas River Basin should be based on a scientific basis, comply with all laws and regulations and promote the accountability of governing agencies. And that's how we operated for 20 years and we continue to operate. Based on that we retain the services of a law firm, Haram, Lloyd, Carpauli and we also retained the services of a hydrologist who our Chair will speak to later. We I want to address the legal issues, and again, I'm just going to summarize, but we believe that the proposed order oversteps the boundaries of the legislative authority granted to you and imposes a duplicate set of regulations, violates the equal protection clauses of the United States and California Constitution and fails to protect farmers' proprietary rights. For these reasons and, really, it tracks with what Mr. Hard said earlier, The Water Coalition requests	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	heard Curtis Weekes address this Board, not in March, but the time before in Watsonville, and I thought he had discussed that specifically. I know they do they have a committee, I'm not part of that water committee, but there may be some people here in the room that are, but Kathy Thomasberg was the water agency that oversees that as a staff person. MR. YOUNG: But other than what you heard Mr. Weekes say I think it was up in Watsonville, and I don't think it was this last March. MS. ISAKSON: No. He was the time before. MR. YOUNG: In July, probably, 2010. Are you aware of anything other than his comments that he made? MS. ISAKSON: Oh, I know that there have been programs. I mean MR. YOUNG: The Monterey MS. ISAKSON: I couldn't tell you what the specifics are, but I personally have monitored the water agency, the Water Resource Agency activity. I know that they do have programs. I couldn't tell you, specifically, what they are.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	farmers, businesses within the Salinas Valley. Our mission statement includes the statement, the management of the Salinas River Basin should be based on a scientific basis, comply with all laws and regulations and promote the accountability of governing agencies. And that's how we operated for 20 years and we continue to operate. Based on that we retain the services of a law firm, Haram, Lloyd, Carpauli and we also retained the services of a hydrologist who our Chair will speak to later. We I want to address the legal issues, and again, I'm just going to summarize, but we believe that the proposed order oversteps the boundaries of the legislative authority granted to you and imposes a duplicate set of regulations, violates the equal protection clauses of the United States and California Constitution and fails to protect farmers' proprietary rights. For these reasons and, really, it tracks with what Mr. Hard said earlier, The Water Coalition requests that the Board rejected the proposed order. We think you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	heard Curtis Weekes address this Board, not in March, but the time before in Watsonville, and I thought he had discussed that specifically. I know they do they have a committee, I'm not part of that water committee, but there may be some people here in the room that are, but Kathy Thomasberg was the water agency that oversees that as a staff person. MR. YOUNG: But other than what you heard Mr. Weekes say I think it was up in Watsonville, and I don't think it was this last March. MS. ISAKSON: No. He was the time before. MR. YOUNG: In July, probably, 2010. Are you aware of anything other than his comments that he made? MS. ISAKSON: Oh, I know that there have been programs. I mean MR. YOUNG: The Monterey MS. ISAKSON: I couldn't tell you what the specifics are, but I personally have monitored the water agency, the Water Resource Agency activity. I know that they do have programs. I couldn't tell you, specifically, what they are. MR. YOUNG: Okay. But these are programs for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	farmers, businesses within the Salinas Valley. Our mission statement includes the statement, the management of the Salinas River Basin should be based on a scientific basis, comply with all laws and regulations and promote the accountability of governing agencies. And that's how we operated for 20 years and we continue to operate. Based on that we retain the services of a law firm, Haram, Lloyd, Carpauli and we also retained the services of a hydrologist who our Chair will speak to later. We I want to address the legal issues, and again, I'm just going to summarize, but we believe that the proposed order oversteps the boundaries of the legislative authority granted to you and imposes a duplicate set of regulations, violates the equal protection clauses of the United States and California Constitution and fails to protect farmers' proprietary rights. For these reasons and, really, it tracks with what Mr. Hard said earlier, The Water Coalition requests	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	heard Curtis Weekes address this Board, not in March, but the time before in Watsonville, and I thought he had discussed that specifically. I know they do they have a committee, I'm not part of that water committee, but there may be some people here in the room that are, but Kathy Thomasberg was the water agency that oversees that as a staff person. MR. YOUNG: But other than what you heard Mr. Weekes say I think it was up in Watsonville, and I don't think it was this last March. MS. ISAKSON: No. He was the time before. MR. YOUNG: In July, probably, 2010. Are you aware of anything other than his comments that he made? MS. ISAKSON: Oh, I know that there have been programs. I mean MR. YOUNG: The Monterey MS. ISAKSON: I couldn't tell you what the specifics are, but I personally have monitored the water agency, the Water Resource Agency activity. I know that they do have programs. I couldn't tell you, specifically, what they are.

1	monitoring system in place to monitor that nitrate.	1	are self-imposed regulations that the farmers are
2	MR. YOUNG: I'm aware of all the data they	2	attempting to deal with a problem which arose and are
3	produce, but I wasn't aware that they had a program to	3	regulating it. So if you require buffers and then they
4	address the nitrate.	4	can't have buffers because other folks don't want it, you
5	MS. ISAKSON: It's my understanding that they do	5	have a conflict.
6	have a program. They work with the growers, there's a	6	And there are other ways, proven ways, to
7	Adrain (phonetic) Committee.	7	reduce the run-off sediment and pesticide levels using
8	MR. YOUNG: Do you know if the program has been	8	the folocating agents and the degraded enzymes, and those
9	successful?	9	alternatives ought to be put in place as well just
10	MS. ISAKSON: I believe that it has shown certain	10	requiring standard buffers.
11	trends to reducing nitrates, yes.	11	So we're asking that alternative methods that
12	MR. YOUNG: Okay.	12	are an important component with the irrigation methods,
13	MS. ISAKSON: In the groundwater.	13	and those alternative methods need to be permitted under
14	MR. YOUNG: All right. Thank you for your	14	the waiver.
15	comments.	15	Thank you.
16	MS. ISAKSON: Sorry. Thank you.	16	MR. YOUNG: Thank for your comments.
17	MR. YOUNG: Christine Kemp, followed by Kerry	17	Kerry Lobel.
18	Lobel, and then Marc Los Huertos.	18	MS. BHATNAGAR: I'm here to read a statement on
19	MS. KEMP: Good afternoon members of the Board.	19	her behalf.
20	My name is Christine Kemp, K-E-M-P. I'm an attorney with	20	MR. YOUNG: Your name.
21	the law firm of Mullen, Hamily, Khan and Hoff in Salinas.	21	MS. BHATNAGAR: My name is Christie Bhatnagar.
22	We represent several agricultural, many agricultural	22	Last name is, B-H-A-T-N-A-G-A-R.
23	clients and I'm here to speak on their behalf.	23	MR. YOUNG: And your reading this for which
24	I wanted to address two specific issues, in	24	organization?
25	particular related to the one size fits all nature of the	25	MS. BHATNAGAR: For Puente De La Costa Sul. And
	Page 475		Page 477
1	waiver. And with respect to the hundred within a	1	the person is Kerry Lobel. She's the Executive Director.
2	hundred feet of surface water and/or adjacent to surface	2	She submitted a letter for the members.
3	water that definition needs to be clarified because you	3	"Dear Members of the Central Coast Regional Water
4	have agricultural fields that may be adjacent to	4	Quality Control Board.
5	surface water within a hundred feet, a thousand feet, but	5	Thank you for the opportunity to present
6	it doesn't account for levies, which we saw driving down	6	written remarks. I regret that I'm unable to join you in
7	today, you have a levy, you have an agricultural field,	7	San Luis Obispo today.
8	the water is not running into the water body, but they're	8	I write today on behalf of Puente De La Costa
9	still subject to the tiering criteria.	9	Sul. Puente is a ten-year old 501C3 non-profit
10	You also have leveling of agricultural	10	organization. It's mission is to provide vital services
11	fields, laser leveling where the drainage may be away	11	for men and women and children and families living in
12	from the water body, but again, those requirements are	12	rural San Mateo South Coast communities of Pescadero, La
13	not being taken into consideration.	13	Honda, Lomamal and San Gregorio.
14	An adjunct to that is the requirement of	14	Puente region residents on the South Coast of
15	buffers. This is problematic for many reasons, and you	15	San Mateo County, the most rural areas in the greater Bay
16	heard some of that today. It removes agricultural land	16	Area or Puente service area, it covers about 160 mostly
17	from production, and for some small farms that could be a	17	undeveloped square miles, including the unincorporated
18	significant loss of their productivity in the ability to	18	areas of Pescadero, San Gregorio, La Honda and Lomamal.
19	farm their land. It does conflict with the safety	19	The four communities have no dental or medical providers
20	regulations not necessarily regulations, but the	20	pharmacies, laundromats, department or hardware stores,
21	agreement, the Leafy Green Ag Agreement that if it's been	21	libraries or supermarkets.
		l	
22	put in place, and those are self-regulated agreements	22	Members of this Board are no strangers to the
22 23	put in place, and those are self-regulated agreements amongst the farmers to address the problem that arose out	23	challenges that nitrate in water have brought to our

Page 476

1	presence of nitrates at six times the federal limit.	1	terms. I don't want to belabor this, but the correlation
2	Residents at the farm had been drinking	2	of .6, which is really good in sort of environmental
3	bottled water at their own cost for more than a decade.	3	sciences, turns into a R square of .36, which translates
4	And health inspection reports had cited problems dating	4	to 36 percent of the variant covered by that correlative
5	from at least 2004.	5	relationship, but that means 64 percent is not related.
6	A likely source of the nitrate contamination	6	And so, in theory with a very good R statistic of .6 you
7	was fertilizer application adjacent to the well.	7	could be misapplying the mechanisms of water quality
8	Many residents of our region live in shared	8	impairment up to 74 percent of the population.
9	housing adjacent to fields that are in production for	9	I hope that makes sense.
10	food or flowers. Because our community has no health	10	So, I also did a lot of research on
11	care it is impossible for us to measure the health	11	vegetative buffer strips for my dissertation, and I found
12	burdens that may be placed on babies, infants and the	12	that vegetative buffer strips actually are very
13	elderly from nitric contamination. However, we find the	13	problematic in California because of the Mediterranean
14	health data troubling.	14	climate. In particular, we don't have a good
15	Nearly all of us in our community rely on	15	biogeochemical contents to remove the nitrogen using
16	wells for water for our drinking, cooking and bathing.	16	genetic rotation in the Mediterranean climate because of
17	We also rely on agriculture and flower culture to sustain	17	the dry season from Marchish until November. So applying
18	our rural community. Certainly clean water and	18	the vegetative buffer strips, wholesale, as a potential
19	agriculture can live side by side.	19	best management practice to remove nitrate, and I'm just
20	Kerry Lobel, Executive Director."	20	speaking for nitrate, is I would say a misapplication of
21	MR. YOUNG: Thank very much for your comments.	21	that best management practice.
22	Okay.	22	And the last thing I just want to say is that
23	MR. LOS HUERTOS: Marc Los Huertos.	23	I, on some level, feel like the mechanism of pollution
24	MR. YOUNG: Okay. Arrianne Martin and then Mibs	24	generally takes place through a watershed or water
25	McCarthy.	25	source. And I didn't see an explicit linkage to the
	Page 479		Page 481
1	MR_LOS HUFRTOS: 1-O-S_H-II-F-R-T-O-S	1	mechanisms or water impairment through the Ag Waiver
1 2	MR. LOS HUERTOS: L-O-S H-U-E-R-T-O-S. MR. YOUNG: Go ahead	1 2	mechanisms or water impairment through the Ag Waiver
2	MR. YOUNG: Go ahead.	2	through watershed processes. And that's the one thing ${\bf I}$
2	MR. YOUNG: Go ahead. MR. LOS HUERTOS: I'm a faculty member at Cal	2	through watershed processes. And that's the one thing I have to admit I like about the Ag Proposal is that it
2	MR. YOUNG: Go ahead. MR. LOS HUERTOS: I'm a faculty member at Cal State Monterey Bay. I've been working on water quality	2	through watershed processes. And that's the one thing I have to admit I like about the Ag Proposal is that it does address at least potential address of
2 3 4	MR. YOUNG: Go ahead. MR. LOS HUERTOS: I'm a faculty member at Cal State Monterey Bay. I've been working on water quality issues and farming for over 15 years, mostly on nitrogen	2 3 4 5	through watershed processes. And that's the one thing I have to admit I like about the Ag Proposal is that it does address at least potential address of MR. YOUNG: Finish your sentence.
2 3 4 5	MR. YOUNG: Go ahead. MR. LOS HUERTOS: I'm a faculty member at Cal State Monterey Bay. I've been working on water quality issues and farming for over 15 years, mostly on nitrogen biochemistry issues, groundwater service, water	2 3 4	through watershed processes. And that's the one thing I have to admit I like about the Ag Proposal is that it does address at least potential address of MR. YOUNG: Finish your sentence. MR. LOS HUERTOS: So that the linkage in the Ag
2 3 4 5 6	MR. YOUNG: Go ahead. MR. LOS HUERTOS: I'm a faculty member at Cal State Monterey Bay. I've been working on water quality issues and farming for over 15 years, mostly on nitrogen biochemistry issues, groundwater service, water contamination as well as pest management practices.	2 3 4 5 6	through watershed processes. And that's the one thing I have to admit I like about the Ag Proposal is that it does address at least potential address of MR. YOUNG: Finish your sentence. MR. LOS HUERTOS: So that the linkage in the Ag Proposal to watersheds in allowing watersheds working
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. YOUNG: Go ahead. MR. LOS HUERTOS: I'm a faculty member at Cal State Monterey Bay. I've been working on water quality issues and farming for over 15 years, mostly on nitrogen biochemistry issues, groundwater service, water contamination as well as pest management practices. And so there's a couple of comments I want to	2 3 4 5 6 7	through watershed processes. And that's the one thing I have to admit I like about the Ag Proposal is that it does address at least potential address of MR. YOUNG: Finish your sentence. MR. LOS HUERTOS: So that the linkage in the Ag Proposal to watersheds in allowing watersheds working groups to be able to develop monitoring plans within the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. YOUNG: Go ahead. MR. LOS HUERTOS: I'm a faculty member at Cal State Monterey Bay. I've been working on water quality issues and farming for over 15 years, mostly on nitrogen biochemistry issues, groundwater service, water contamination as well as pest management practices. And so there's a couple of comments I want to make. Unfortunately, doesn't have time to boil all my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	through watershed processes. And that's the one thing I have to admit I like about the Ag Proposal is that it does address at least potential address of MR. YOUNG: Finish your sentence. MR. LOS HUERTOS: So that the linkage in the Ag Proposal to watersheds in allowing watersheds working groups to be able to develop monitoring plans within the watershed is very attractive because it allows watershed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. YOUNG: Go ahead. MR. LOS HUERTOS: I'm a faculty member at Cal State Monterey Bay. I've been working on water quality issues and farming for over 15 years, mostly on nitrogen biochemistry issues, groundwater service, water contamination as well as pest management practices. And so there's a couple of comments I want to make. Unfortunately, doesn't have time to boil all my ideas down into something that lasts only three minutes,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	through watershed processes. And that's the one thing I have to admit I like about the Ag Proposal is that it does address at least potential address of MR. YOUNG: Finish your sentence. MR. LOS HUERTOS: So that the linkage in the Ag Proposal to watersheds in allowing watersheds working groups to be able to develop monitoring plans within the watershed is very attractive because it allows watershed groups to set standards and set targets and potentially
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. YOUNG: Go ahead. MR. LOS HUERTOS: I'm a faculty member at Cal State Monterey Bay. I've been working on water quality issues and farming for over 15 years, mostly on nitrogen biochemistry issues, groundwater service, water contamination as well as pest management practices. And so there's a couple of comments I want to make. Unfortunately, doesn't have time to boil all my ideas down into something that lasts only three minutes, but I'll do my best here.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	through watershed processes. And that's the one thing I have to admit I like about the Ag Proposal is that it does address at least potential address of MR. YOUNG: Finish your sentence. MR. LOS HUERTOS: So that the linkage in the Ag Proposal to watersheds in allowing watersheds working groups to be able to develop monitoring plans within the watershed is very attractive because it allows watershed groups to set standards and set targets and potentially set targets in with response and with approval to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. YOUNG: Go ahead. MR. LOS HUERTOS: I'm a faculty member at Cal State Monterey Bay. I've been working on water quality issues and farming for over 15 years, mostly on nitrogen biochemistry issues, groundwater service, water contamination as well as pest management practices. And so there's a couple of comments I want to make. Unfortunately, doesn't have time to boil all my ideas down into something that lasts only three minutes,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	through watershed processes. And that's the one thing I have to admit I like about the Ag Proposal is that it does address at least potential address of MR. YOUNG: Finish your sentence. MR. LOS HUERTOS: So that the linkage in the Ag Proposal to watersheds in allowing watersheds working groups to be able to develop monitoring plans within the watershed is very attractive because it allows watershed groups to set standards and set targets and potentially set targets in with response and with approval to the Board so that the people on the ground can make
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. YOUNG: Go ahead. MR. LOS HUERTOS: I'm a faculty member at Cal State Monterey Bay. I've been working on water quality issues and farming for over 15 years, mostly on nitrogen biochemistry issues, groundwater service, water contamination as well as pest management practices. And so there's a couple of comments I want to make. Unfortunately, doesn't have time to boil all my ideas down into something that lasts only three minutes, but I'll do my best here. One of the issues that I want to raise is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	through watershed processes. And that's the one thing I have to admit I like about the Ag Proposal is that it does address at least potential address of MR. YOUNG: Finish your sentence. MR. LOS HUERTOS: So that the linkage in the Ag Proposal to watersheds in allowing watersheds working groups to be able to develop monitoring plans within the watershed is very attractive because it allows watershed groups to set standards and set targets and potentially set targets in with response and with approval to the Board so that the people on the ground can make appropriate timelines and targets.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. YOUNG: Go ahead. MR. LOS HUERTOS: I'm a faculty member at Cal State Monterey Bay. I've been working on water quality issues and farming for over 15 years, mostly on nitrogen biochemistry issues, groundwater service, water contamination as well as pest management practices. And so there's a couple of comments I want to make. Unfortunately, doesn't have time to boil all my ideas down into something that lasts only three minutes, but I'll do my best here. One of the issues that I want to raise is that, in general, I found that the tiering system does not relate to water quality risks. And I thought this is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	through watershed processes. And that's the one thing I have to admit I like about the Ag Proposal is that it does address at least potential address of MR. YOUNG: Finish your sentence. MR. LOS HUERTOS: So that the linkage in the Ag Proposal to watersheds in allowing watersheds working groups to be able to develop monitoring plans within the watershed is very attractive because it allows watershed groups to set standards and set targets and potentially set targets in with response and with approval to the Board so that the people on the ground can make appropriate timelines and targets. So I know in San Juan Valley Maryellen Dick
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. YOUNG: Go ahead. MR. LOS HUERTOS: I'm a faculty member at Cal State Monterey Bay. I've been working on water quality issues and farming for over 15 years, mostly on nitrogen biochemistry issues, groundwater service, water contamination as well as pest management practices. And so there's a couple of comments I want to make. Unfortunately, doesn't have time to boil all my ideas down into something that lasts only three minutes, but I'll do my best here. One of the issues that I want to raise is that, in general, I found that the tiering system does not relate to water quality risks. And I thought this is ironic because in Watsonville, both environmental and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	through watershed processes. And that's the one thing I have to admit I like about the Ag Proposal is that it does address at least potential address of MR. YOUNG: Finish your sentence. MR. LOS HUERTOS: So that the linkage in the Ag Proposal to watersheds in allowing watersheds working groups to be able to develop monitoring plans within the watershed is very attractive because it allows watershed groups to set standards and set targets and potentially set targets in with response and with approval to the Board so that the people on the ground can make appropriate timelines and targets. So I know in San Juan Valley Maryellen Dick has worked very hard with those harvest growers; they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. YOUNG: Go ahead. MR. LOS HUERTOS: I'm a faculty member at Cal State Monterey Bay. I've been working on water quality issues and farming for over 15 years, mostly on nitrogen biochemistry issues, groundwater service, water contamination as well as pest management practices. And so there's a couple of comments I want to make. Unfortunately, doesn't have time to boil all my ideas down into something that lasts only three minutes, but I'll do my best here. One of the issues that I want to raise is that, in general, I found that the tiering system does not relate to water quality risks. And I thought this is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	through watershed processes. And that's the one thing I have to admit I like about the Ag Proposal is that it does address at least potential address of MR. YOUNG: Finish your sentence. MR. LOS HUERTOS: So that the linkage in the Ag Proposal to watersheds in allowing watersheds working groups to be able to develop monitoring plans within the watershed is very attractive because it allows watershed groups to set standards and set targets and potentially set targets in with response and with approval to the Board so that the people on the ground can make appropriate timelines and targets. So I know in San Juan Valley Maryellen Dick
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. YOUNG: Go ahead. MR. LOS HUERTOS: I'm a faculty member at Cal State Monterey Bay. I've been working on water quality issues and farming for over 15 years, mostly on nitrogen biochemistry issues, groundwater service, water contamination as well as pest management practices. And so there's a couple of comments I want to make. Unfortunately, doesn't have time to boil all my ideas down into something that lasts only three minutes, but I'll do my best here. One of the issues that I want to raise is that, in general, I found that the tiering system does not relate to water quality risks. And I thought this is ironic because in Watsonville, both environmental and farming communities felt that the tiering system wasn't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	through watershed processes. And that's the one thing I have to admit I like about the Ag Proposal is that it does address at least potential address of MR. YOUNG: Finish your sentence. MR. LOS HUERTOS: So that the linkage in the Ag Proposal to watersheds in allowing watersheds working groups to be able to develop monitoring plans within the watershed is very attractive because it allows watershed groups to set standards and set targets and potentially set targets in with response and with approval to the Board so that the people on the ground can make appropriate timelines and targets. So I know in San Juan Valley Maryellen Dick has worked very hard with those harvest growers; they have a very good idea with oh, I'm sorry.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. YOUNG: Go ahead. MR. LOS HUERTOS: I'm a faculty member at Cal State Monterey Bay. I've been working on water quality issues and farming for over 15 years, mostly on nitrogen biochemistry issues, groundwater service, water contamination as well as pest management practices. And so there's a couple of comments I want to make. Unfortunately, doesn't have time to boil all my ideas down into something that lasts only three minutes, but I'll do my best here. One of the issues that I want to raise is that, in general, I found that the tiering system does not relate to water quality risks. And I thought this is ironic because in Watsonville, both environmental and farming communities felt that the tiering system wasn't related to risk.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	through watershed processes. And that's the one thing I have to admit I like about the Ag Proposal is that it does address at least potential address of MR. YOUNG: Finish your sentence. MR. LOS HUERTOS: So that the linkage in the Ag Proposal to watersheds in allowing watersheds working groups to be able to develop monitoring plans within the watershed is very attractive because it allows watershed groups to set standards and set targets and potentially set targets in with response and with approval to the Board so that the people on the ground can make appropriate timelines and targets. So I know in San Juan Valley Maryellen Dick has worked very hard with those harvest growers; they have a very good idea with oh, I'm sorry. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. YOUNG: Go ahead. MR. LOS HUERTOS: I'm a faculty member at Cal State Monterey Bay. I've been working on water quality issues and farming for over 15 years, mostly on nitrogen biochemistry issues, groundwater service, water contamination as well as pest management practices. And so there's a couple of comments I want to make. Unfortunately, doesn't have time to boil all my ideas down into something that lasts only three minutes, but I'll do my best here. One of the issues that I want to raise is that, in general, I found that the tiering system does not relate to water quality risks. And I thought this is ironic because in Watsonville, both environmental and farming communities felt that the tiering system wasn't related to risk. And let me just put it back up a little	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	through watershed processes. And that's the one thing I have to admit I like about the Ag Proposal is that it does address at least potential address of MR. YOUNG: Finish your sentence. MR. LOS HUERTOS: So that the linkage in the Ag Proposal to watersheds in allowing watersheds working groups to be able to develop monitoring plans within the watershed is very attractive because it allows watershed groups to set standards and set targets and potentially set targets in with response and with approval to the Board so that the people on the ground can make appropriate timelines and targets. So I know in San Juan Valley Maryellen Dick has worked very hard with those harvest growers; they have a very good idea with oh, I'm sorry. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: That was a creative run-on sentence.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. YOUNG: Go ahead. MR. LOS HUERTOS: I'm a faculty member at Cal State Monterey Bay. I've been working on water quality issues and farming for over 15 years, mostly on nitrogen biochemistry issues, groundwater service, water contamination as well as pest management practices. And so there's a couple of comments I want to make. Unfortunately, doesn't have time to boil all my ideas down into something that lasts only three minutes, but I'll do my best here. One of the issues that I want to raise is that, in general, I found that the tiering system does not relate to water quality risks. And I thought this is ironic because in Watsonville, both environmental and farming communities felt that the tiering system wasn't related to risk. And let me just put it back up a little bit. On a lot of what I've read in mostly national and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	through watershed processes. And that's the one thing I have to admit I like about the Ag Proposal is that it does address at least potential address of MR. YOUNG: Finish your sentence. MR. LOS HUERTOS: So that the linkage in the Ag Proposal to watersheds in allowing watersheds working groups to be able to develop monitoring plans within the watershed is very attractive because it allows watershed groups to set standards and set targets and potentially set targets in with response and with approval to the Board so that the people on the ground can make appropriate timelines and targets. So I know in San Juan Valley Maryellen Dick has worked very hard with those harvest growers; they have a very good idea with oh, I'm sorry. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: That was a creative run-on sentence. MR. JEFFRIES: I'd like you started addressing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. YOUNG: Go ahead. MR. LOS HUERTOS: I'm a faculty member at Cal State Monterey Bay. I've been working on water quality issues and farming for over 15 years, mostly on nitrogen biochemistry issues, groundwater service, water contamination as well as pest management practices. And so there's a couple of comments I want to make. Unfortunately, doesn't have time to boil all my ideas down into something that lasts only three minutes, but I'll do my best here. One of the issues that I want to raise is that, in general, I found that the tiering system does not relate to water quality risks. And I thought this is ironic because in Watsonville, both environmental and farming communities felt that the tiering system wasn't related to risk. And let me just put it back up a little bit. On a lot of what I've read in mostly national and international papers on water quality resolution there's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	through watershed processes. And that's the one thing I have to admit I like about the Ag Proposal is that it does address at least potential address of MR. YOUNG: Finish your sentence. MR. LOS HUERTOS: So that the linkage in the Ag Proposal to watersheds in allowing watersheds working groups to be able to develop monitoring plans within the watershed is very attractive because it allows watershed groups to set standards and set targets and potentially set targets in with response and with approval to the Board so that the people on the ground can make appropriate timelines and targets. So I know in San Juan Valley Maryellen Dick has worked very hard with those harvest growers; they have a very good idea with oh, I'm sorry. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: That was a creative run-on sentence. MR. JEFFRIES: I'd like you started addressing San Juan Valley, I'd like to hear the rest of that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. YOUNG: Go ahead. MR. LOS HUERTOS: I'm a faculty member at Cal State Monterey Bay. I've been working on water quality issues and farming for over 15 years, mostly on nitrogen biochemistry issues, groundwater service, water contamination as well as pest management practices. And so there's a couple of comments I want to make. Unfortunately, doesn't have time to boil all my ideas down into something that lasts only three minutes, but I'll do my best here. One of the issues that I want to raise is that, in general, I found that the tiering system does not relate to water quality risks. And I thought this is ironic because in Watsonville, both environmental and farming communities felt that the tiering system wasn't related to risk. And let me just put it back up a little bit. On a lot of what I've read in mostly national and international papers on water quality resolution there's generally a correlation between land use and management	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	through watershed processes. And that's the one thing I have to admit I like about the Ag Proposal is that it does address at least potential address of MR. YOUNG: Finish your sentence. MR. LOS HUERTOS: So that the linkage in the Ag Proposal to watersheds in allowing watersheds working groups to be able to develop monitoring plans within the watershed is very attractive because it allows watershed groups to set standards and set targets and potentially set targets in with response and with approval to the Board so that the people on the ground can make appropriate timelines and targets. So I know in San Juan Valley Maryellen Dick has worked very hard with those harvest growers; they have a very good idea with oh, I'm sorry. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: That was a creative run-on sentence. MR. JEFFRIES: I'd like you started addressing San Juan Valley, I'd like to hear the rest of that. There's some real critical issues in the San Juan Valley.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. YOUNG: Go ahead. MR. LOS HUERTOS: I'm a faculty member at Cal State Monterey Bay. I've been working on water quality issues and farming for over 15 years, mostly on nitrogen biochemistry issues, groundwater service, water contamination as well as pest management practices. And so there's a couple of comments I want to make. Unfortunately, doesn't have time to boil all my ideas down into something that lasts only three minutes, but I'll do my best here. One of the issues that I want to raise is that, in general, I found that the tiering system does not relate to water quality risks. And I thought this is ironic because in Watsonville, both environmental and farming communities felt that the tiering system wasn't related to risk. And let me just put it back up a little bit. On a lot of what I've read in mostly national and international papers on water quality resolution there's generally a correlation between land use and management practices and water quality. The problem is when you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	through watershed processes. And that's the one thing I have to admit I like about the Ag Proposal is that it does address at least potential address of MR. YOUNG: Finish your sentence. MR. LOS HUERTOS: So that the linkage in the Ag Proposal to watersheds in allowing watersheds working groups to be able to develop monitoring plans within the watershed is very attractive because it allows watershed groups to set standards and set targets and potentially set targets in with response and with approval to the Board so that the people on the ground can make appropriate timelines and targets. So I know in San Juan Valley Maryellen Dick has worked very hard with those harvest growers; they have a very good idea with oh, I'm sorry. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: That was a creative run-on sentence. MR. JEFFRIES: I'd like you started addressing San Juan Valley, I'd like to hear the rest of that. There's some real critical issues in the San Juan Valley. MR. LOS HUERTOS: It's hard to ignore the red
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. YOUNG: Go ahead. MR. LOS HUERTOS: I'm a faculty member at Cal State Monterey Bay. I've been working on water quality issues and farming for over 15 years, mostly on nitrogen biochemistry issues, groundwater service, water contamination as well as pest management practices. And so there's a couple of comments I want to make. Unfortunately, doesn't have time to boil all my ideas down into something that lasts only three minutes, but I'll do my best here. One of the issues that I want to raise is that, in general, I found that the tiering system does not relate to water quality risks. And I thought this is ironic because in Watsonville, both environmental and farming communities felt that the tiering system wasn't related to risk. And let me just put it back up a little bit. On a lot of what I've read in mostly national and international papers on water quality resolution there's generally a correlation between land use and management practices and water quality. The problem is when you apply it to a farming community the correlation then	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	through watershed processes. And that's the one thing I have to admit I like about the Ag Proposal is that it does address at least potential address of MR. YOUNG: Finish your sentence. MR. LOS HUERTOS: So that the linkage in the Ag Proposal to watersheds in allowing watersheds working groups to be able to develop monitoring plans within the watershed is very attractive because it allows watershed groups to set standards and set targets and potentially set targets in with response and with approval to the Board so that the people on the ground can make appropriate timelines and targets. So I know in San Juan Valley Maryellen Dick has worked very hard with those harvest growers; they have a very good idea with oh, I'm sorry. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: That was a creative run-on sentence. MR. JEFFRIES: I'd like you started addressing San Juan Valley, I'd like to hear the rest of that. There's some real critical issues in the San Juan Valley. MR. LOS HUERTOS: It's hard to ignore the red light on me.

1

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

drained soils, on the west side, very poorly drained soil. The poorly drained soils have a high percentage of tile drains. Those tile drains and the relatively high water table, an increasing water table, has very high nitric concentrations, not just in the tiles, but in the surface water.

So I've been monitoring San Juan Creek for almost ten years and the concentrations are generally in the 40 to 50s, sometimes 60s, part per million. And to address that and the nitrate issues on the San Juan Valley are a little bit odd because you don't think of that part of the county as a high Ag area. As it turns out San Juan has the highest yields of the Central Coast of Monterey for decades. So it's very interesting here, it's a perfect microclimate. Unfortunately, they have imported water. The imported water has raised the water table. Raising the water table has forced growers to increase the tile drainage. Their aquifer is relatively salty, so they can't even use their aguifer water. So they're creating a system where they've got too much water, a lot of nitrate because of the high production value crops that they're using.

And to turn back to Maryellen Dick. Maryellen Dick has been working with these growers very, very successfully to start installing best management

Page 483

the CMPs, I was not expecting to see changes in the CMP site for at least five to ten years.

3 MR. JEFFRIES: Thank you. 4

MR. YOUNG: Dr. Hunter.

DR. HUNTER: So, the work that you've been involved with and in a lot of the cooperative work going on between farm communities and scientists and some of the technical assistance available, do you think that under the Ag Order we would be able to see the continued kind of collaboration on developing CMP, because the programs are not intended to be prescriptive, so why would we not see that continued level of effort and support from the RCUs, funding from RCS, et cetera. I just want to know where that linkage gets broken.

that that linkage was automatically broken. I have seen some breakdowns in the linkage. Not as part of this Board at all, but the Department of Financial Assistance. Is that what that was? Have come up with some fairly strict rules on reporting requirements when we get state funding from the Water Board which has made it very -what's a word for it? Hesitant for growers to participate in at least state water funded cooperative process. A lot of that money goes through the RCD or Cal State Monterey or even UC, University of California,

MR. LOS HUERTOS: Yeah. I hope that I didn't say

Page 485

practices.

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

So, for example, I work with a grower testing vegetative buffer zones -- not that -- treatment of wetlands to remove the nitrate using basically plants and microbial processes to remove the nitrate in pilot projects right now, and to tell you the truth we haven't gotten it figured out because we got so much water moving through these systems that we can reduce the nitrate 1, or 2 or 3 parts per million, but when you're starting the 40 or 50 parts per million, which aren't even that growers -- nitrate, it's going to take a long time for us to figure how to fix that issue.

But the nice thing is that now we have on the ground experience with those growers we have watershed coordinators as well as depth in dealing with these growers and we can come up with targets and say ends are our monitoring stations and growers can up with a watershed group to monitor a whole bunch of sub-watersheds, substations for growers and then be able to use that data to modify individual monitoring practices that would show up on a CMP site probably in two, three, five to ten years.

I would say that CMP sites were designed to see the long term trends. So I'm not surprised -- I actually helped design this -- the monitoring plans for Page 484 1 So it's been very hard for us to get growers to cooperate 2 knowing that data is going to be reported into a public 3 entity. And then, potentially, in three to five years someone turns around and starts suing them for water 5 quality impairment that they're actually trying to fix. 6 That's part of it.

So that's part of it. The other part of it is that it's not clear and I don't -- I think your staff has done a very, a lot of effort and a very good job trying to come up with approaches on -- on, frankly, something that no state, no national agency, no water protection agency has done.

I actually co-wrote a paper for the Organic Press along with a Board member, Brian Dodd, on the Ag Waiver Program, so I'm fairly familiar with what else has been done around the country.

So, the way the Ag Waiver is written if you're in a Tier 2 or Tier 3 or Tier 1, developing those management practices has -- cooperating with funding that might be linking your data to a state water database has the potential of refining or changing those Tier criteria, and growers I think would get really nervous if they're bumped from one tier to another based on the data that they are collecting based on their cooperation that they're hoping to improve water quality.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So I think it's a -- I think it's a frustration that potential cooperation will then come back and haunt them in three to five or ten years in a way that they didn't really anticipate. So I think you're finding growers, at least in terms my case, I have a Prop 84 Grant and I can't find growers to cooperate at all because they are scared to death that somehow in three to five years a new Ag Order will turn around and that data will get used to -- I don't mean to hunt them down, but to create a more difficult circumstance they're already facing.

Does that make sense?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. YOUNG: I've got some questions for you. With respect to the first part of what you were telling us about, the risk factors in tiering. You're familiar then with all the risk factors that staff has used in creating tiers. Do you feel that any of those risk factors are inappropriate?

MR. LOS HUERTOS: Yes. MR. YOUNG: Which ones?

MR. LOS HUERTOS: Well, so, I'm not a risk analyst, but I taught myself to do risk analysis about

23 three weeks ago after I started reading the reports.

24 Some of the things I found that was proximity to a 303 25

listed body is problematic just in terms landscape

Page 487

it's irrigation management versus fertility management. When you -- you can't do anything about where you are, you can't do anything about the aguifer, you can't do anything about the aquacludes or the confining layers, but you can do a lot with the management of the farm in terms of irrigation and fertility.

And currently -- and I'm not going to be a friend to anybody today -- currently you drive in the Salinas Valley at night and there are people driving up and down the valley turning on and off the sprinklers probably at 10, 12, 14 bucks an hour. And if they can't make it back in time, the obvious thing is to leave it on because you don't want to under-irrrigate because the crop would look really bad and no one will do that in the daytime.

So we did some monitoring for the followup program for the CMP where we put automatic gauges so that it would measure day and night for basically -- I think we did like a week or something, I can't remember how long, but a couple of weeks, and we saw a huge amount of flow in some watersheds in the middle of the night. They didn't want to capture the night, of course, so I sent my staff out to sample it sample at 2 in the afternoon, so I was missing all these big spikes.

So, linking the risk to the practices and

Page 489

processes. So, two speakers ago brought this up, if you're next to a levy, then you might be next to a 303 listed body, but your water doesn't go through the levy into that water.

So, for example, the Poplar River is polluted in above Chittenden in San Mateo -- or Santa Cruz, Santa Clara, and San Mineo County, and meanwhile all the growers in Poplar Valley that are adjacent to the Poplar River contributing to the Poplar River, yet they may be captured within that.

I monitor organic farms that are 500 acres that have tons of nitrate coming off of them, and I monitor huge farms with no nitrate coming off of them. And so, again, the size criteria is a little weird for me because it doesn't link to the impairment issue directly.

Does that make sense? MR. YOUNG: Yes, it does.

MR. LOS HUERTOS: And then -- I don't know a lot about pesticides, but let me finish this little train about that.

The other issue is where when I speak to people about those processes that drive, for example, groundwater contamination, nitrate contamination, its soils, it's the geologic formation is what I mean in how you're connected with the aquifer and things like that, Page 488 behavior would be really appropriate.

And what I didn't see in the tier system was a much more focused educational component. So, for example, a much more restricted or stringent education program on certified irrigation managers where we're not paying someone 12 bucks an hour to drive up and down the valley, but paying someone 25 bucks an hour to look at stations to manage the irrigation effectively so that we really have a well trained cadre of people that really understand irrigation management in a more sophisticated way.

If you can control irrigation management with that kind of expertise, then the location kinds of things become less and less important. And that -- in terms of risk, that's where I would put my dollars into the management of people.

MR. YOUNG: Well, we have the Irrigation Nutrient Management Plan as part of Tier 3, are you suggesting that something like that be put into Tier 2?

MR. LOS HUERTOS: I would say that, in general, growers need to be investing more in having better and more sophisticated irrigation fertility management, and it's been something that has been -- what's a nice way of saying it -- it's not been something high on the list because there are so many other things that are pulling Page 490

1 2	at agriculture in terms of being able to make enough money to survive in the valley.	1 2	for Mibs McCarthy. Mibs McCarthy is a member of the Unitarian
3	So I guess what I would say is instead of	3	Universalist Fellowship in Carmel, Monterey Congregation.
4	thinking about it in terms of a management plan, but	4	"To Central Coast Regional Water Board. My name
5	creating a structure where people would be certified	5	is Mibs McCarthy and I'm a resident of the Central Coast.
6	irrigators through the Water Board and that that would be	6	I'm concerned about the nitrate contamination of our
7	sort of the first step so that you have people that are	7	groundwater for environmental, social and economic
8	well trained and required sort of a certification process	8	justice reasons.
9	because I think that to tell you the truth, all these	9	Small, poor communities such as San Huerado,
10	irrigation management plans, I don't think the Water	10	which our residents are paying for this contamination
11	Board, the staff is going to be able to deal with all of	11	with their health and also paying for replacement water.
12	that stuff. It would be better to have really well	12	Thousands of other Central Coast residents are in the
13	trained people on the ground knowing what they're doing	13	same situation. It isn't fair that the cost of treating
14	and getting paid for what they're doing and having to go	14	or avoiding polluted drinking water should fall on
15	through a fairly rounded certification process.	15	taxpayers or consumers when the use of fertilizers and
16	I'm not making sense?	16	pesticides increases the farmers' profit.
17	MR. YOUNG: Well, you're making sense, I just	17	It seems to me that every farmer should know
18	wonder if you're going with what's in the plan. Because	18	exactly what is in his or her run-off, and should be
19	it says here that these plans need to be certified by	19	responsible to make it safe from contamination. It is
20	professional soil scientists, professional agronomists,	20	the government's responsibility to regulate industry for
21	or crop advisor certified by the American Society of	21	the greater good.
22	Agronomy, or similarly qualified professionals. Wouldn't	22	The Regional Board has a mandate to protect
23	they incorporate what you're suggesting?	23	water quality for all beneficial uses.
24	MR. LOS HUERTOS: Yes, it would. I guess what I'm	24	I thank the Board for taking up this huge
25	hesitant to do is to say, therefore, then all these plans	25	project to help our Central Coast region.
	Page 491		Page 493
1	need to get submitted to the stoff. So	1	The Nevember 2010 Draft Proposal is so weak
1	need to get submitted to the staff. So	1	The November 2010 Draft Proposal is so weak
2	MR. YOUNG: Well, these actually, it says here	2	it does not protect the drinking water. Please adopt the
2	MR. YOUNG: Well, these actually, it says here that this stuff is this plan is not submitted to the	2	it does not protect the drinking water. Please adopt the February 2010 Draft and live up to your mandate.
2 3 4	MR. YOUNG: Well, these actually, it says here that this stuff is this plan is not submitted to the Central Coast Water Board with the exception of some key	2 3 4	it does not protect the drinking water. Please adopt the February 2010 Draft and live up to your mandate. Thank you. Mibs McCarthy."
2 3 4 5	MR. YOUNG: Well, these actually, it says here that this stuff is this plan is not submitted to the Central Coast Water Board with the exception of some key elements.	2 3 4 5	it does not protect the drinking water. Please adopt the February 2010 Draft and live up to your mandate. Thank you. Mibs McCarthy." That was M-C-C-A-R-T-H-Y.
2 3 4 5 6	MR. YOUNG: Well, these actually, it says here that this stuff is this plan is not submitted to the Central Coast Water Board with the exception of some key elements. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Okay. That I	2 3 4 5 6	it does not protect the drinking water. Please adopt the February 2010 Draft and live up to your mandate. Thank you. Mibs McCarthy." That was M-C-C-A-R-T-H-Y. MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. YOUNG: Well, these actually, it says here that this stuff is this plan is not submitted to the Central Coast Water Board with the exception of some key elements. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Okay. That I MR. YOUNG: I'm listening to everything in trying	2 3 4 5 6 7	it does not protect the drinking water. Please adopt the February 2010 Draft and live up to your mandate. Thank you. Mibs McCarthy." That was M-C-C-A-R-T-H-Y. MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. Susan McDonald, Kay Mercer and Larry Meyer.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. YOUNG: Well, these actually, it says here that this stuff is this plan is not submitted to the Central Coast Water Board with the exception of some key elements. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Okay. That I MR. YOUNG: I'm listening to everything in trying to qualify or figure out what I hear versus what's being	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	it does not protect the drinking water. Please adopt the February 2010 Draft and live up to your mandate. Thank you. Mibs McCarthy." That was M-C-C-A-R-T-H-Y. MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. Susan McDonald, Kay Mercer and Larry Meyer. Okay. Susan McDonald.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. YOUNG: Well, these actually, it says here that this stuff is this plan is not submitted to the Central Coast Water Board with the exception of some key elements. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Okay. That I MR. YOUNG: I'm listening to everything in trying to qualify or figure out what I hear versus what's being said.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	it does not protect the drinking water. Please adopt the February 2010 Draft and live up to your mandate. Thank you. Mibs McCarthy." That was M-C-C-A-R-T-H-Y. MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. Susan McDonald, Kay Mercer and Larry Meyer. Okay. Susan McDonald. MS. McDONALD: I'm Susan McDonald,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. YOUNG: Well, these actually, it says here that this stuff is this plan is not submitted to the Central Coast Water Board with the exception of some key elements. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Okay. That I MR. YOUNG: I'm listening to everything in trying to qualify or figure out what I hear versus what's being said. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Maybe this is what I'm the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	it does not protect the drinking water. Please adopt the February 2010 Draft and live up to your mandate. Thank you. Mibs McCarthy." That was M-C-C-A-R-T-H-Y. MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. Susan McDonald, Kay Mercer and Larry Meyer. Okay. Susan McDonald. MS. McDONALD: I'm Susan McDonald, M-C-D-O-N-A-L-D. I live in Cambria on a 303D listed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. YOUNG: Well, these actually, it says here that this stuff is this plan is not submitted to the Central Coast Water Board with the exception of some key elements. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Okay. That I MR. YOUNG: I'm listening to everything in trying to qualify or figure out what I hear versus what's being said. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Maybe this is what I'm the distinction I'm trying to make.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	it does not protect the drinking water. Please adopt the February 2010 Draft and live up to your mandate. Thank you. Mibs McCarthy." That was M-C-C-A-R-T-H-Y. MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. Susan McDonald, Kay Mercer and Larry Meyer. Okay. Susan McDonald. MS. McDONALD: I'm Susan McDonald, M-C-D-O-N-A-L-D. I live in Cambria on a 303D listed creek. My neighbors are farmers, but being near a listed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. YOUNG: Well, these actually, it says here that this stuff is this plan is not submitted to the Central Coast Water Board with the exception of some key elements. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Okay. That I MR. YOUNG: I'm listening to everything in trying to qualify or figure out what I hear versus what's being said. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Maybe this is what I'm the distinction I'm trying to make. It would be cool if we had that kind of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	it does not protect the drinking water. Please adopt the February 2010 Draft and live up to your mandate. Thank you. Mibs McCarthy." That was M-C-C-A-R-T-H-Y. MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. Susan McDonald, Kay Mercer and Larry Meyer. Okay. Susan McDonald. MS. McDONALD: I'm Susan McDonald, M-C-D-O-N-A-L-D. I live in Cambria on a 303D listed creek. My neighbors are farmers, but being near a listed water body does automatically mean that they are causing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. YOUNG: Well, these actually, it says here that this stuff is this plan is not submitted to the Central Coast Water Board with the exception of some key elements. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Okay. That I MR. YOUNG: I'm listening to everything in trying to qualify or figure out what I hear versus what's being said. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Maybe this is what I'm the distinction I'm trying to make. It would be cool if we had that kind of people running around within watersheds to kind of link	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	it does not protect the drinking water. Please adopt the February 2010 Draft and live up to your mandate. Thank you. Mibs McCarthy." That was M-C-C-A-R-T-H-Y. MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. Susan McDonald, Kay Mercer and Larry Meyer. Okay. Susan McDonald. MS. McDONALD: I'm Susan McDonald, M-C-D-O-N-A-L-D. I live in Cambria on a 303D listed creek. My neighbors are farmers, but being near a listed water body does automatically mean that they are causing or adding to that water body impairment. If there's no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. YOUNG: Well, these actually, it says here that this stuff is this plan is not submitted to the Central Coast Water Board with the exception of some key elements. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Okay. That I MR. YOUNG: I'm listening to everything in trying to qualify or figure out what I hear versus what's being said. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Maybe this is what I'm the distinction I'm trying to make. It would be cool if we had that kind of people running around within watersheds to kind of link the grower activities together.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	it does not protect the drinking water. Please adopt the February 2010 Draft and live up to your mandate. Thank you. Mibs McCarthy." That was M-C-C-A-R-T-H-Y. MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. Susan McDonald, Kay Mercer and Larry Meyer. Okay. Susan McDonald. MS. McDONALD: I'm Susan McDonald, M-C-D-O-N-A-L-D. I live in Cambria on a 303D listed creek. My neighbors are farmers, but being near a listed water body does automatically mean that they are causing or adding to that water body impairment. If there's no run-off of fertilizers or pesticides, farming can be done
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. YOUNG: Well, these actually, it says here that this stuff is this plan is not submitted to the Central Coast Water Board with the exception of some key elements. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Okay. That I MR. YOUNG: I'm listening to everything in trying to qualify or figure out what I hear versus what's being said. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Maybe this is what I'm the distinction I'm trying to make. It would be cool if we had that kind of people running around within watersheds to kind of link the grower activities together. Does that make more sense?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	it does not protect the drinking water. Please adopt the February 2010 Draft and live up to your mandate. Thank you. Mibs McCarthy." That was M-C-C-A-R-T-H-Y. MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. Susan McDonald, Kay Mercer and Larry Meyer. Okay. Susan McDonald. MS. McDONALD: I'm Susan McDonald, M-C-D-O-N-A-L-D. I live in Cambria on a 303D listed creek. My neighbors are farmers, but being near a listed water body does automatically mean that they are causing or adding to that water body impairment. If there's no run-off of fertilizers or pesticides, farming can be done safely.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. YOUNG: Well, these actually, it says here that this stuff is this plan is not submitted to the Central Coast Water Board with the exception of some key elements. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Okay. That I MR. YOUNG: I'm listening to everything in trying to qualify or figure out what I hear versus what's being said. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Maybe this is what I'm the distinction I'm trying to make. It would be cool if we had that kind of people running around within watersheds to kind of link the grower activities together. Does that make more sense? MR. YOUNG: Yes. I understand.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	it does not protect the drinking water. Please adopt the February 2010 Draft and live up to your mandate. Thank you. Mibs McCarthy." That was M-C-C-A-R-T-H-Y. MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. Susan McDonald, Kay Mercer and Larry Meyer. Okay. Susan McDonald. MS. McDONALD: I'm Susan McDonald, M-C-D-O-N-A-L-D. I live in Cambria on a 303D listed creek. My neighbors are farmers, but being near a listed water body does automatically mean that they are causing or adding to that water body impairment. If there's no run-off of fertilizers or pesticides, farming can be done safely. Farmers in my area have changed the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. YOUNG: Well, these actually, it says here that this stuff is this plan is not submitted to the Central Coast Water Board with the exception of some key elements. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Okay. That I MR. YOUNG: I'm listening to everything in trying to qualify or figure out what I hear versus what's being said. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Maybe this is what I'm the distinction I'm trying to make. It would be cool if we had that kind of people running around within watersheds to kind of link the grower activities together. Does that make more sense? MR. YOUNG: Yes. I understand. MR. LOS HUERTOS: And then you had a question	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	it does not protect the drinking water. Please adopt the February 2010 Draft and live up to your mandate. Thank you. Mibs McCarthy." That was M-C-C-A-R-T-H-Y. MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. Susan McDonald, Kay Mercer and Larry Meyer. Okay. Susan McDonald. MS. McDONALD: I'm Susan McDonald, M-C-D-O-N-A-L-D. I live in Cambria on a 303D listed creek. My neighbors are farmers, but being near a listed water body does automatically mean that they are causing or adding to that water body impairment. If there's no run-off of fertilizers or pesticides, farming can be done safely. Farmers in my area have changed the irrigation practices to prevent run-off. They use cover
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. YOUNG: Well, these actually, it says here that this stuff is this plan is not submitted to the Central Coast Water Board with the exception of some key elements. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Okay. That I MR. YOUNG: I'm listening to everything in trying to qualify or figure out what I hear versus what's being said. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Maybe this is what I'm the distinction I'm trying to make. It would be cool if we had that kind of people running around within watersheds to kind of link the grower activities together. Does that make more sense? MR. YOUNG: Yes. I understand. MR. LOS HUERTOS: And then you had a question about pesticides.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	it does not protect the drinking water. Please adopt the February 2010 Draft and live up to your mandate. Thank you. Mibs McCarthy." That was M-C-C-A-R-T-H-Y. MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. Susan McDonald, Kay Mercer and Larry Meyer. Okay. Susan McDonald. MS. McDONALD: I'm Susan McDonald, M-C-D-O-N-A-L-D. I live in Cambria on a 303D listed creek. My neighbors are farmers, but being near a listed water body does automatically mean that they are causing or adding to that water body impairment. If there's no run-off of fertilizers or pesticides, farming can be done safely. Farmers in my area have changed the irrigation practices to prevent run-off. They use cover crop as assurance to protect water quality.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. YOUNG: Well, these actually, it says here that this stuff is this plan is not submitted to the Central Coast Water Board with the exception of some key elements. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Okay. That I MR. YOUNG: I'm listening to everything in trying to qualify or figure out what I hear versus what's being said. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Maybe this is what I'm the distinction I'm trying to make. It would be cool if we had that kind of people running around within watersheds to kind of link the grower activities together. Does that make more sense? MR. YOUNG: Yes. I understand. MR. LOS HUERTOS: And then you had a question about pesticides. MR. YOUNG: Well, the use of the two pesticides	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	it does not protect the drinking water. Please adopt the February 2010 Draft and live up to your mandate. Thank you. Mibs McCarthy." That was M-C-C-A-R-T-H-Y. MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. Susan McDonald, Kay Mercer and Larry Meyer. Okay. Susan McDonald. MS. McDONALD: I'm Susan McDonald, M-C-D-O-N-A-L-D. I live in Cambria on a 303D listed creek. My neighbors are farmers, but being near a listed water body does automatically mean that they are causing or adding to that water body impairment. If there's no run-off of fertilizers or pesticides, farming can be done safely. Farmers in my area have changed the irrigation practices to prevent run-off. They use cover crop as assurance to protect water quality. Location, I believe, without consideration of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. YOUNG: Well, these actually, it says here that this stuff is this plan is not submitted to the Central Coast Water Board with the exception of some key elements. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Okay. That I MR. YOUNG: I'm listening to everything in trying to qualify or figure out what I hear versus what's being said. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Maybe this is what I'm the distinction I'm trying to make. It would be cool if we had that kind of people running around within watersheds to kind of link the grower activities together. Does that make more sense? MR. YOUNG: Yes. I understand. MR. LOS HUERTOS: And then you had a question about pesticides. MR. YOUNG: Well, the use of the two pesticides are those reasonable risk factors to use in tiering?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	it does not protect the drinking water. Please adopt the February 2010 Draft and live up to your mandate. Thank you. Mibs McCarthy." That was M-C-C-A-R-T-H-Y. MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. Susan McDonald, Kay Mercer and Larry Meyer. Okay. Susan McDonald. MS. McDONALD: I'm Susan McDonald, M-C-D-O-N-A-L-D. I live in Cambria on a 303D listed creek. My neighbors are farmers, but being near a listed water body does automatically mean that they are causing or adding to that water body impairment. If there's no run-off of fertilizers or pesticides, farming can be done safely. Farmers in my area have changed the irrigation practices to prevent run-off. They use cover crop as assurance to protect water quality. Location, I believe, without consideration of farm management practices should not be used to bump an
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. YOUNG: Well, these actually, it says here that this stuff is this plan is not submitted to the Central Coast Water Board with the exception of some key elements. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Okay. That I MR. YOUNG: I'm listening to everything in trying to qualify or figure out what I hear versus what's being said. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Maybe this is what I'm the distinction I'm trying to make. It would be cool if we had that kind of people running around within watersheds to kind of link the grower activities together. Does that make more sense? MR. YOUNG: Yes. I understand. MR. LOS HUERTOS: And then you had a question about pesticides. MR. YOUNG: Well, the use of the two pesticides are those reasonable risk factors to use in tiering? MR. LOS HUERTOS: Yeah. I'm not qualified to talk	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	it does not protect the drinking water. Please adopt the February 2010 Draft and live up to your mandate. Thank you. Mibs McCarthy." That was M-C-C-A-R-T-H-Y. MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. Susan McDonald, Kay Mercer and Larry Meyer. Okay. Susan McDonald. MS. McDONALD: I'm Susan McDonald, M-C-D-O-N-A-L-D. I live in Cambria on a 303D listed creek. My neighbors are farmers, but being near a listed water body does automatically mean that they are causing or adding to that water body impairment. If there's no run-off of fertilizers or pesticides, farming can be done safely. Farmers in my area have changed the irrigation practices to prevent run-off. They use cover crop as assurance to protect water quality. Location, I believe, without consideration of farm management practices should not be used to bump an Ag operation up to a higher tier.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. YOUNG: Well, these actually, it says here that this stuff is this plan is not submitted to the Central Coast Water Board with the exception of some key elements. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Okay. That I MR. YOUNG: I'm listening to everything in trying to qualify or figure out what I hear versus what's being said. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Maybe this is what I'm the distinction I'm trying to make. It would be cool if we had that kind of people running around within watersheds to kind of link the grower activities together. Does that make more sense? MR. YOUNG: Yes. I understand. MR. LOS HUERTOS: And then you had a question about pesticides. MR. YOUNG: Well, the use of the two pesticides are those reasonable risk factors to use in tiering? MR. LOS HUERTOS: Yeah. I'm not qualified to talk about pesticides.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	it does not protect the drinking water. Please adopt the February 2010 Draft and live up to your mandate. Thank you. Mibs McCarthy." That was M-C-C-A-R-T-H-Y. MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. Susan McDonald, Kay Mercer and Larry Meyer. Okay. Susan McDonald. MS. McDONALD: I'm Susan McDonald, M-C-D-O-N-A-L-D. I live in Cambria on a 303D listed creek. My neighbors are farmers, but being near a listed water body does automatically mean that they are causing or adding to that water body impairment. If there's no run-off of fertilizers or pesticides, farming can be done safely. Farmers in my area have changed the irrigation practices to prevent run-off. They use cover crop as assurance to protect water quality. Location, I believe, without consideration of farm management practices should not be used to bump an Ag operation up to a higher tier. There's also some question about the criteria
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. YOUNG: Well, these actually, it says here that this stuff is this plan is not submitted to the Central Coast Water Board with the exception of some key elements. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Okay. That I MR. YOUNG: I'm listening to everything in trying to qualify or figure out what I hear versus what's being said. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Maybe this is what I'm the distinction I'm trying to make. It would be cool if we had that kind of people running around within watersheds to kind of link the grower activities together. Does that make more sense? MR. YOUNG: Yes. I understand. MR. LOS HUERTOS: And then you had a question about pesticides. MR. YOUNG: Well, the use of the two pesticides are those reasonable risk factors to use in tiering? MR. LOS HUERTOS: Yeah. I'm not qualified to talk about pesticides. MR. YOUNG: Thank you.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	it does not protect the drinking water. Please adopt the February 2010 Draft and live up to your mandate. Thank you. Mibs McCarthy." That was M-C-C-A-R-T-H-Y. MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. Susan McDonald, Kay Mercer and Larry Meyer. Okay. Susan McDonald. MS. McDONALD: I'm Susan McDonald, M-C-D-O-N-A-L-D. I live in Cambria on a 303D listed creek. My neighbors are farmers, but being near a listed water body does automatically mean that they are causing or adding to that water body impairment. If there's no run-off of fertilizers or pesticides, farming can be done safely. Farmers in my area have changed the irrigation practices to prevent run-off. They use cover crop as assurance to protect water quality. Location, I believe, without consideration of farm management practices should not be used to bump an Ag operation up to a higher tier. There's also some question about the criteria being used to define impaired water bodies into this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. YOUNG: Well, these actually, it says here that this stuff is this plan is not submitted to the Central Coast Water Board with the exception of some key elements. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Okay. That I MR. YOUNG: I'm listening to everything in trying to qualify or figure out what I hear versus what's being said. MR. LOS HUERTOS: Maybe this is what I'm the distinction I'm trying to make. It would be cool if we had that kind of people running around within watersheds to kind of link the grower activities together. Does that make more sense? MR. YOUNG: Yes. I understand. MR. LOS HUERTOS: And then you had a question about pesticides. MR. YOUNG: Well, the use of the two pesticides are those reasonable risk factors to use in tiering? MR. LOS HUERTOS: Yeah. I'm not qualified to talk about pesticides.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	it does not protect the drinking water. Please adopt the February 2010 Draft and live up to your mandate. Thank you. Mibs McCarthy." That was M-C-C-A-R-T-H-Y. MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. Susan McDonald, Kay Mercer and Larry Meyer. Okay. Susan McDonald. MS. McDONALD: I'm Susan McDonald, M-C-D-O-N-A-L-D. I live in Cambria on a 303D listed creek. My neighbors are farmers, but being near a listed water body does automatically mean that they are causing or adding to that water body impairment. If there's no run-off of fertilizers or pesticides, farming can be done safely. Farmers in my area have changed the irrigation practices to prevent run-off. They use cover crop as assurance to protect water quality. Location, I believe, without consideration of farm management practices should not be used to bump an Ag operation up to a higher tier. There's also some question about the criteria

1	pesticides, nutrients, temperature, sediment. I'm	1	of Fish and Game. They're not taking into account the
2	wondering, are water bodies in 303D listed for Ecoli and	2	amount of environmental state work and toxicological work
3	other indicator bacteria not associated with irrigated	3	that's done by the state agencies when these pesticides
4	Ag, are they also a trigger for Tier 2 and Tier 3. If	4	are registered.
5	that's the case, it seems like mixing apples and oranges	5	Second of all, in terms of the list itself, I
6	to me.	6	was kind of shocked when I first looked at it because
7	The criteria for irrigated Ag should be based	7	many of the pesticides that are on the list aren't Ag
8	on discharges actually made by irrigated Ag.	8	chemicals. Some of them are termitacides, which means
9	Finally, agriculture is not responsible for	9	they're used to control termites. They're roadside
10	all the constituent pollutants found in local watersheds.	10	herbicides, they're not used by Ag. Some are not
11	If agriculture is being ordered to clean up pollutants	11	registered in California. Some are registered in
12	without any delineation between Ag discharges and those	12	California, but aren't used on the Central Coast.
13	coming from other sources, particularly urban lawns,	13	So, out of the 84 pesticides 13 of the active
14	landscape and gardens. Homeowners use many of the same	14	ingredients are used on, approximately, 80 percent of the
15	fertilizers, pesticides yet agriculture is being	15	crops. Only 13 of the 84 are used on 80 percent of the
16	targeted.	16	crops on the Central Coast. 52 of those are included in
17	The goal is to improve water quality, but	17	EPRs ongoing surface water monitoring program. 37 are
18	fairness must be a part of the equation.	18	included in EPR pesticide management zones, which
19	I support the farmers for water quality terms	19	includes a permit, and covers a specific geographical
20	and conditions for compliance through a third party group	20	area. 13 of those 84 percent are DPR restricted use
21	as a way to accomplish both.	21	pesticides which require permits.
22	Thank you.	22	So what's the solution to this? Instead of
23	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.	23	just saying you use this product, therefore, you're in a
24	And, by the way, Ecoli is not on the radar for	24	certain tier. It really should have some risk assessment
25	this.	25	involved with it.
	Page 495		Page 497
1	MS McDONALD: It's not?	1	Vou know. I heard someone say use agronomy
1 2	MS. McDONALD: It's not?	1 2	You know, I heard someone say use agronomy.
2	MR. YOUNG: It's not.	2	Agronomy applies here. How where is the product being
2	MR. YOUNG: It's not. Kay Mercer.	2	Agronomy applies here. How where is the product being used? What crop is it being used on? When is it being
2 3 4	MR. YOUNG: It's not. Kay Mercer. MS. MERCER: Hello, I'm Kay Mercer. M-E-R-C-E-R.	2 3 4	Agronomy applies here. How where is the product being used? What crop is it being used on? When is it being used? Why is it being used? How is it being used? How
2 3 4 5	MR. YOUNG: It's not. Kay Mercer. MS. MERCER: Hello, I'm Kay Mercer. M-E-R-C-E-R. Thank you for allowing me to come before you. I	2 3 4 5	Agronomy applies here. How where is the product being used? What crop is it being used on? When is it being used? Why is it being used? How is it being used? How much is being used? What's the soil type? What's the
2 3 4 5 6	MR. YOUNG: It's not. Kay Mercer. MS. MERCER: Hello, I'm Kay Mercer. M-E-R-C-E-R. Thank you for allowing me to come before you. I want to talk about the draft Ag Waiver and the top three	2 3 4 5 6	Agronomy applies here. How where is the product being used? What crop is it being used on? When is it being used? Why is it being used? How is it being used? How much is being used? What's the soil type? What's the hydromorthology? All of those things what's happening
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. YOUNG: It's not. Kay Mercer. MS. MERCER: Hello, I'm Kay Mercer. M-E-R-C-E-R. Thank you for allowing me to come before you. I want to talk about the draft Ag Waiver and the top three issues that I see in the current draft that's before you.	2 3 4 5 6 7	Agronomy applies here. How where is the product being used? What crop is it being used on? When is it being used? Why is it being used? How is it being used? How much is being used? What's the soil type? What's the hydromorthology? All of those things what's happening in the watershed? All those things go into that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. YOUNG: It's not. Kay Mercer. MS. MERCER: Hello, I'm Kay Mercer. M-E-R-C-E-R. Thank you for allowing me to come before you. I want to talk about the draft Ag Waiver and the top three issues that I see in the current draft that's before you. The first is that it's really not solution	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Agronomy applies here. How where is the product being used? What crop is it being used on? When is it being used? Why is it being used? How is it being used? How much is being used? What's the soil type? What's the hydromorthology? All of those things what's happening in the watershed? All those things go into that. MR. YOUNG: Can you wrap up?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. YOUNG: It's not. Kay Mercer. MS. MERCER: Hello, I'm Kay Mercer. M-E-R-C-E-R. Thank you for allowing me to come before you. I want to talk about the draft Ag Waiver and the top three issues that I see in the current draft that's before you. The first is that it's really not solution focused, it is a regulation, but there's not a lot of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Agronomy applies here. How where is the product being used? What crop is it being used on? When is it being used? Why is it being used? How is it being used? How much is being used? What's the soil type? What's the hydromorthology? All of those things what's happening in the watershed? All those things go into that. MR. YOUNG: Can you wrap up? MS. McDONALD: I can wrap up.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. YOUNG: It's not. Kay Mercer. MS. MERCER: Hello, I'm Kay Mercer. M-E-R-C-E-R. Thank you for allowing me to come before you. I want to talk about the draft Ag Waiver and the top three issues that I see in the current draft that's before you. The first is that it's really not solution focused, it is a regulation, but there's not a lot of solutions offered in the regulation. I think it is a big	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Agronomy applies here. How where is the product being used? What crop is it being used on? When is it being used? Why is it being used? How is it being used? How much is being used? What's the soil type? What's the hydromorthology? All of those things what's happening in the watershed? All those things go into that. MR. YOUNG: Can you wrap up? MS. McDONALD: I can wrap up. MR. YOUNG: One sentence.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. YOUNG: It's not. Kay Mercer. MS. MERCER: Hello, I'm Kay Mercer. M-E-R-C-E-R. Thank you for allowing me to come before you. I want to talk about the draft Ag Waiver and the top three issues that I see in the current draft that's before you. The first is that it's really not solution focused, it is a regulation, but there's not a lot of solutions offered in the regulation. I think it is a big improvement over what we had in 2010, however, it's over	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Agronomy applies here. How where is the product being used? What crop is it being used on? When is it being used? Why is it being used? How is it being used? How much is being used? What's the soil type? What's the hydromorthology? All of those things what's happening in the watershed? All those things go into that. MR. YOUNG: Can you wrap up? MS. McDONALD: I can wrap up. MR. YOUNG: One sentence. MS. McDONALD: One sentence. Your list of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. YOUNG: It's not. Kay Mercer. MS. MERCER: Hello, I'm Kay Mercer. M-E-R-C-E-R. Thank you for allowing me to come before you. I want to talk about the draft Ag Waiver and the top three issues that I see in the current draft that's before you. The first is that it's really not solution focused, it is a regulation, but there's not a lot of solutions offered in the regulation. I think it is a big improvement over what we had in 2010, however, it's over complicated and it's doubtful whether it could be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Agronomy applies here. How where is the product being used? What crop is it being used on? When is it being used? Why is it being used? How is it being used? How much is being used? What's the soil type? What's the hydromorthology? All of those things what's happening in the watershed? All those things go into that. MR. YOUNG: Can you wrap up? MS. McDONALD: I can wrap up. MR. YOUNG: One sentence. MS. McDONALD: One sentence. Your list of impaired water bodies is impaired itself.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. YOUNG: It's not. Kay Mercer. MS. MERCER: Hello, I'm Kay Mercer. M-E-R-C-E-R. Thank you for allowing me to come before you. I want to talk about the draft Ag Waiver and the top three issues that I see in the current draft that's before you. The first is that it's really not solution focused, it is a regulation, but there's not a lot of solutions offered in the regulation. I think it is a big improvement over what we had in 2010, however, it's over complicated and it's doubtful whether it could be administered or enforced by staff. And, in fact, I'm not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Agronomy applies here. How where is the product being used? What crop is it being used on? When is it being used? Why is it being used? How is it being used? How much is being used? What's the soil type? What's the hydromorthology? All of those things what's happening in the watershed? All those things go into that. MR. YOUNG: Can you wrap up? MS. McDONALD: I can wrap up. MR. YOUNG: One sentence. MS. McDONALD: One sentence. Your list of impaired water bodies is impaired itself. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you very much for your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. YOUNG: It's not. Kay Mercer. MS. MERCER: Hello, I'm Kay Mercer. M-E-R-C-E-R. Thank you for allowing me to come before you. I want to talk about the draft Ag Waiver and the top three issues that I see in the current draft that's before you. The first is that it's really not solution focused, it is a regulation, but there's not a lot of solutions offered in the regulation. I think it is a big improvement over what we had in 2010, however, it's over complicated and it's doubtful whether it could be administered or enforced by staff. And, in fact, I'm not sure if it's implementable at all.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Agronomy applies here. How where is the product being used? What crop is it being used on? When is it being used? Why is it being used? How is it being used? How much is being used? What's the soil type? What's the hydromorthology? All of those things what's happening in the watershed? All those things go into that. MR. YOUNG: Can you wrap up? MS. McDONALD: I can wrap up. MR. YOUNG: One sentence. MS. McDONALD: One sentence. Your list of impaired water bodies is impaired itself. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you very much for your comments.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. YOUNG: It's not. Kay Mercer. MS. MERCER: Hello, I'm Kay Mercer. M-E-R-C-E-R. Thank you for allowing me to come before you. I want to talk about the draft Ag Waiver and the top three issues that I see in the current draft that's before you. The first is that it's really not solution focused, it is a regulation, but there's not a lot of solutions offered in the regulation. I think it is a big improvement over what we had in 2010, however, it's over complicated and it's doubtful whether it could be administered or enforced by staff. And, in fact, I'm not sure if it's implementable at all. I do want to talk about anomalies. Robert	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Agronomy applies here. How where is the product being used? What crop is it being used on? When is it being used? Why is it being used? How is it being used? How much is being used? What's the soil type? What's the hydromorthology? All of those things what's happening in the watershed? All those things go into that. MR. YOUNG: Can you wrap up? MS. McDONALD: I can wrap up. MR. YOUNG: One sentence. MS. McDONALD: One sentence. Your list of impaired water bodies is impaired itself. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you very much for your comments. MS. McDONALD: Do you want to hear about the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. YOUNG: It's not. Kay Mercer. MS. MERCER: Hello, I'm Kay Mercer. M-E-R-C-E-R. Thank you for allowing me to come before you. I want to talk about the draft Ag Waiver and the top three issues that I see in the current draft that's before you. The first is that it's really not solution focused, it is a regulation, but there's not a lot of solutions offered in the regulation. I think it is a big improvement over what we had in 2010, however, it's over complicated and it's doubtful whether it could be administered or enforced by staff. And, in fact, I'm not sure if it's implementable at all. I do want to talk about anomalies. Robert Doladall (phonetic) talked to you about groundwater and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Agronomy applies here. How where is the product being used? What crop is it being used on? When is it being used? Why is it being used? How is it being used? How much is being used? What's the soil type? What's the hydromorthology? All of those things what's happening in the watershed? All those things go into that. MR. YOUNG: Can you wrap up? MS. McDONALD: I can wrap up. MR. YOUNG: One sentence. MS. McDONALD: One sentence. Your list of impaired water bodies is impaired itself. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you very much for your comments. MS. McDONALD: Do you want to hear about the impairment just real quick?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. YOUNG: It's not. Kay Mercer. MS. MERCER: Hello, I'm Kay Mercer. M-E-R-C-E-R. Thank you for allowing me to come before you. I want to talk about the draft Ag Waiver and the top three issues that I see in the current draft that's before you. The first is that it's really not solution focused, it is a regulation, but there's not a lot of solutions offered in the regulation. I think it is a big improvement over what we had in 2010, however, it's over complicated and it's doubtful whether it could be administered or enforced by staff. And, in fact, I'm not sure if it's implementable at all. I do want to talk about anomalies. Robert Doladall (phonetic) talked to you about groundwater and nitrates in March. I'd like to talk about a couple of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Agronomy applies here. How where is the product being used? What crop is it being used on? When is it being used? Why is it being used? How is it being used? How much is being used? What's the soil type? What's the hydromorthology? All of those things what's happening in the watershed? All those things go into that. MR. YOUNG: Can you wrap up? MS. McDONALD: I can wrap up. MR. YOUNG: One sentence. MS. McDONALD: One sentence. Your list of impaired water bodies is impaired itself. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you very much for your comments. MS. McDONALD: Do you want to hear about the impairment just real quick? MR. JEFFRIES: I want to hear it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. YOUNG: It's not. Kay Mercer. MS. MERCER: Hello, I'm Kay Mercer. M-E-R-C-E-R. Thank you for allowing me to come before you. I want to talk about the draft Ag Waiver and the top three issues that I see in the current draft that's before you. The first is that it's really not solution focused, it is a regulation, but there's not a lot of solutions offered in the regulation. I think it is a big improvement over what we had in 2010, however, it's over complicated and it's doubtful whether it could be administered or enforced by staff. And, in fact, I'm not sure if it's implementable at all. I do want to talk about anomalies. Robert Doladall (phonetic) talked to you about groundwater and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Agronomy applies here. How where is the product being used? What crop is it being used on? When is it being used? Why is it being used? How is it being used? How much is being used? What's the soil type? What's the hydromorthology? All of those things what's happening in the watershed? All those things go into that. MR. YOUNG: Can you wrap up? MS. McDONALD: I can wrap up. MR. YOUNG: One sentence. MS. McDONALD: One sentence. Your list of impaired water bodies is impaired itself. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you very much for your comments. MS. McDONALD: Do you want to hear about the impairment just real quick? MR. JEFFRIES: I want to hear it. MS. McDONALD: Particularly as it applies to Santa
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. YOUNG: It's not. Kay Mercer. MS. MERCER: Hello, I'm Kay Mercer. M-E-R-C-E-R. Thank you for allowing me to come before you. I want to talk about the draft Ag Waiver and the top three issues that I see in the current draft that's before you. The first is that it's really not solution focused, it is a regulation, but there's not a lot of solutions offered in the regulation. I think it is a big improvement over what we had in 2010, however, it's over complicated and it's doubtful whether it could be administered or enforced by staff. And, in fact, I'm not sure if it's implementable at all. I do want to talk about anomalies. Robert Doladall (phonetic) talked to you about groundwater and nitrates in March. I'd like to talk about a couple of other situations in the Draft Order where there's anomaly omissions and some errors.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Agronomy applies here. How where is the product being used? What crop is it being used on? When is it being used? Why is it being used? How is it being used? How much is being used? What's the soil type? What's the hydromorthology? All of those things what's happening in the watershed? All those things go into that. MR. YOUNG: Can you wrap up? MS. McDONALD: I can wrap up. MR. YOUNG: One sentence. MS. McDONALD: One sentence. Your list of impaired water bodies is impaired itself. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you very much for your comments. MS. McDONALD: Do you want to hear about the impairment just real quick? MR. JEFFRIES: I want to hear it. MS. McDONALD: Particularly as it applies to Santa Cruz County.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. YOUNG: It's not. Kay Mercer. MS. MERCER: Hello, I'm Kay Mercer. M-E-R-C-E-R. Thank you for allowing me to come before you. I want to talk about the draft Ag Waiver and the top three issues that I see in the current draft that's before you. The first is that it's really not solution focused, it is a regulation, but there's not a lot of solutions offered in the regulation. I think it is a big improvement over what we had in 2010, however, it's over complicated and it's doubtful whether it could be administered or enforced by staff. And, in fact, I'm not sure if it's implementable at all. I do want to talk about anomalies. Robert Doladall (phonetic) talked to you about groundwater and nitrates in March. I'd like to talk about a couple of other situations in the Draft Order where there's anomaly omissions and some errors. First, I'd like to talk about the list of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Agronomy applies here. How where is the product being used? What crop is it being used on? When is it being used? Why is it being used? How is it being used? How much is being used? What's the soil type? What's the hydromorthology? All of those things what's happening in the watershed? All those things go into that. MR. YOUNG: Can you wrap up? MS. McDONALD: I can wrap up. MR. YOUNG: One sentence. MS. McDONALD: One sentence. Your list of impaired water bodies is impaired itself. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you very much for your comments. MS. McDONALD: Do you want to hear about the impairment just real quick? MR. JEFFRIES: I want to hear it. MS. McDONALD: Particularly as it applies to Santa Cruz County. The 29 impaired water bodies that are on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. YOUNG: It's not. Kay Mercer. MS. MERCER: Hello, I'm Kay Mercer. M-E-R-C-E-R. Thank you for allowing me to come before you. I want to talk about the draft Ag Waiver and the top three issues that I see in the current draft that's before you. The first is that it's really not solution focused, it is a regulation, but there's not a lot of solutions offered in the regulation. I think it is a big improvement over what we had in 2010, however, it's over complicated and it's doubtful whether it could be administered or enforced by staff. And, in fact, I'm not sure if it's implementable at all. I do want to talk about anomalies. Robert Doladall (phonetic) talked to you about groundwater and nitrates in March. I'd like to talk about a couple of other situations in the Draft Order where there's anomaly omissions and some errors. First, I'd like to talk about the list of pesticides.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Agronomy applies here. How where is the product being used? What crop is it being used on? When is it being used? Why is it being used? How is it being used? How much is being used? What's the soil type? What's the hydromorthology? All of those things what's happening in the watershed? All those things go into that. MR. YOUNG: Can you wrap up? MS. McDONALD: I can wrap up. MR. YOUNG: One sentence. MS. McDONALD: One sentence. Your list of impaired water bodies is impaired itself. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you very much for your comments. MS. McDONALD: Do you want to hear about the impairment just real quick? MR. JEFFRIES: I want to hear it. MS. McDONALD: Particularly as it applies to Santa Cruz County. The 29 impaired water bodies that are on the list, I read the reports for the sediment and nutrients,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. YOUNG: It's not. Kay Mercer. MS. MERCER: Hello, I'm Kay Mercer. M-E-R-C-E-R. Thank you for allowing me to come before you. I want to talk about the draft Ag Waiver and the top three issues that I see in the current draft that's before you. The first is that it's really not solution focused, it is a regulation, but there's not a lot of solutions offered in the regulation. I think it is a big improvement over what we had in 2010, however, it's over complicated and it's doubtful whether it could be administered or enforced by staff. And, in fact, I'm not sure if it's implementable at all. I do want to talk about anomalies. Robert Doladall (phonetic) talked to you about groundwater and nitrates in March. I'd like to talk about a couple of other situations in the Draft Order where there's anomaly omissions and some errors. First, I'd like to talk about the list of pesticides. There's 84 pesticides that are listed,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Agronomy applies here. How where is the product being used? What crop is it being used on? When is it being used? Why is it being used? How is it being used? How much is being used? What's the soil type? What's the hydromorthology? All of those things what's happening in the watershed? All those things go into that. MR. YOUNG: Can you wrap up? MS. McDONALD: I can wrap up. MR. YOUNG: One sentence. MS. McDONALD: One sentence. Your list of impaired water bodies is impaired itself. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you very much for your comments. MS. McDONALD: Do you want to hear about the impairment just real quick? MR. JEFFRIES: I want to hear it. MS. McDONALD: Particularly as it applies to Santa Cruz County. The 29 impaired water bodies that are on the list, I read the reports for the sediment and nutrients, out of those 12 do not attribute sediment or attributing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. YOUNG: It's not. Kay Mercer. MS. MERCER: Hello, I'm Kay Mercer. M-E-R-C-E-R. Thank you for allowing me to come before you. I want to talk about the draft Ag Waiver and the top three issues that I see in the current draft that's before you. The first is that it's really not solution focused, it is a regulation, but there's not a lot of solutions offered in the regulation. I think it is a big improvement over what we had in 2010, however, it's over complicated and it's doubtful whether it could be administered or enforced by staff. And, in fact, I'm not sure if it's implementable at all. I do want to talk about anomalies. Robert Doladall (phonetic) talked to you about groundwater and nitrates in March. I'd like to talk about a couple of other situations in the Draft Order where there's anomaly omissions and some errors. First, I'd like to talk about the list of pesticides. There's 84 pesticides that are listed, finding 58 in the Draft Order.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Agronomy applies here. How where is the product being used? What crop is it being used on? When is it being used? Why is it being used? How is it being used? How much is being used? What's the soil type? What's the hydromorthology? All of those things what's happening in the watershed? All those things go into that. MR. YOUNG: Can you wrap up? MS. McDONALD: I can wrap up. MR. YOUNG: One sentence. MS. McDONALD: One sentence. Your list of impaired water bodies is impaired itself. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you very much for your comments. MS. McDONALD: Do you want to hear about the impairment just real quick? MR. JEFFRIES: I want to hear it. MS. McDONALD: Particularly as it applies to Santa Cruz County. The 29 impaired water bodies that are on the list, I read the reports for the sediment and nutrients, out of those 12 do not attribute sediment or attributing or nutrients to irrigated Ag.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. YOUNG: It's not. Kay Mercer. MS. MERCER: Hello, I'm Kay Mercer. M-E-R-C-E-R. Thank you for allowing me to come before you. I want to talk about the draft Ag Waiver and the top three issues that I see in the current draft that's before you. The first is that it's really not solution focused, it is a regulation, but there's not a lot of solutions offered in the regulation. I think it is a big improvement over what we had in 2010, however, it's over complicated and it's doubtful whether it could be administered or enforced by staff. And, in fact, I'm not sure if it's implementable at all. I do want to talk about anomalies. Robert Doladall (phonetic) talked to you about groundwater and nitrates in March. I'd like to talk about a couple of other situations in the Draft Order where there's anomaly omissions and some errors. First, I'd like to talk about the list of pesticides. There's 84 pesticides that are listed,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Agronomy applies here. How where is the product being used? What crop is it being used on? When is it being used? Why is it being used? How is it being used? How much is being used? What's the soil type? What's the hydromorthology? All of those things what's happening in the watershed? All those things go into that. MR. YOUNG: Can you wrap up? MS. McDONALD: I can wrap up. MR. YOUNG: One sentence. MS. McDONALD: One sentence. Your list of impaired water bodies is impaired itself. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you very much for your comments. MS. McDONALD: Do you want to hear about the impairment just real quick? MR. JEFFRIES: I want to hear it. MS. McDONALD: Particularly as it applies to Santa Cruz County. The 29 impaired water bodies that are on the list, I read the reports for the sediment and nutrients, out of those 12 do not attribute sediment or attributing

		l	
1	to irrigated Ag.	1	In May the Board also provided direction to
2	I did a used ingrated report from the	2	not require more information that could be managed or
3	State Water Regional Control Board and did a digital	3	analyzed. I would really disagree with some of the
4	inspection of the remaining, all 99 water bodies. The	4	slides that say that the current draft is actually less
5	other 17 in Santa Cruz County that remain on the list	5	burdensome than the current waiver. It's just not true.
6	only 15 of those had any measurable irrigated Ag. 15. I	6	So, there is a lot of work required by this proposal and
7	mean I'm sorry 15 had no measurable irrigated Ag. The	7	people should be paying attention to that.
8	two that remain that actually had any measurable	8	Again, in May one of the directions was to
9	irrigated Ag, one had five percent, one had seven	9	not use the 303D list because I think I had in my
10	percent.	10	notes somebody said because it's too broad. Still this
11	So, you have so what happened is you have	11	hundred nearly hundred water bodies is still in there
12	growers, you might have some great grower up in the Santa	12	as a trigger. You know, I don't really consider 100
13	Cruz hills that is now on impaired water bodies that has	13	water bodies as being sort of priority for the area if
14	no appreciable irrigated Ag that's instantly in Tier 2.	14	we're really going to focus our attention.
15	And so or maybe even in Tier 3, depending on what	15	So, despite the May direction to focus on
16	pesticides you guys decide to make a tiering criteria.	16	surface water and nitrate and organic phosphate, this
17	And so all of a sudden your own reports say	17	latest Draft continues to include riparian areas, storm
18	that irrigated Ag is not a source of impairment and then	18	water and groundwater. It seems that although some
19	you turn around and have list these water bodies as	19	things get taken out in the new draft that more things
20	impaired and make it a criteria in a regulation for	20	get included.
21	irrigated Ag.	21	There was some language around storm water.
22	Thank you.	22	It was mentioned by a previous grower. That was actually
23	MR. YOUNG: Thank you.	23	very contradictory between paragraphs and quite a bit
24	Larry Meyer, Kris O'Connor, Barbara Ann Ogle,	24	confusing.
25	and then Dana Perls.	25	We are also concerned about the tier trigger
	Page 499		Page 501
1	MS O'CONNOD: I'm Vric O'Coppor V D I S	1	about the tonic of even including more posticides as this
2	MS. O'CONNOR: I'm Kris O'Connor, K-R-I-S, apostrophe 0-C-O-N-N-O-R, with the Central Coast Vineyard	2	about the topic of even including more pesticides as this tier trigger. Again, in March some of the language was
3	Team.	3	used interchangeably between towards detection and
4	I want to thank you for the latest Draft	4	toxicity. I would really encourage the Board to look at
5	including certified growers in the Tier 1 category. We	5	Sara Green's memo that she provided from Preservation
6	certainly appreciate this recognition, but in accordance	6	Inc. and make sure that we're talking in the appropriate
7	with our previous letters we still believe that there are	7	language.
8	many operations that are not certified that do not pose	8	So, again, I would also like to remind you
9	threats to water quality.	9	that, you know, the material does not really equate, we
10	In the May Board Workshop here in San Luis	10	really have to be looking at transport, also.
11	Obispo the direction was clear, create an Order that both	11	So, the Vineyard Team has, obviously, done a
12	incentivizes practices and rewards growers. But,	12	lot of work on this issue. We continue to work with the
13	nevertheless, the current framework still presumes that	13	staff and the Board to try to come up with a solution to
14	Ag operators are polluters, that they're guilty until	14	protect water quality.
15	they can prove they're innocent.	15	We're happy to be a resource.
16	This Draft continues to apply a point source	16	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.
17	regulatory model for a non-point source program. So,	17	Barbara Ann Ogle. Dana Perls.
18	really, if we were looking at an incentivizing approach	18	MR. YOUNG: Hi, Dana.
19	that actually protected water quality like some of the	19	MR. SHIMEK: Hi. Steve Shimek, S-H-I-M-E-K. I
20	previous speakers, we would be looking at actual risk.	20	have a letter from Pesticide Watch Environmental Fund.
21	We would have tiers that had triggers that actually	21	Before I begin, though, I would like to mention the fact
22	growers had control over and that related to a risk and	22	that you asked the question about if anybody knows about
23	to help protect water quality. And that way you would	23	the buffers; it came up during the CDFA's presentation.
24	incentivize people to adopt things with clean water and	24	I actually met with LGMA about buffers and there is a
25	move into different tiers.	25	requirement about buffers. They asked the question and

Page 500

1	they asked if anyone had any information.	1	contamination as a factor.
2	MR. BRIGGS: He's here to read a statement.	2	We urge you to take timely action to put in
3	MR. YOUNG: You're here speaking you're giving	3	place strict requirements for irrigated agricultural
4	someone else's comments, so if someone had asked for	4	discharges so the California residents and water is truly
5	specific questions it would be different.	5	protected and restored.
6	MR. SHIMEK: So the only person	6	Dana Perls."
7	MR. YOUNG: You're here to speak to give	7	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.
8	comments for Pesticide Watch, please give us those	8	Susan Petrovich. I understand she's not here. Is
9	comments.	9	there anybody from the Santa Barbara County Cattlemen's
10	MR. YOUNG: Yes, Mr. Jeffries.	10	Association speaking on their behalf?
11	MR. JEFFRIES: Does Mr. Shimek have a card? Or is	11	
12	he speaking on behalf of someone else?	12	(No response.)
13	MR. SHIMEK: No, I do not have one.	13	, ,
14	MR. JEFFRIES: You spoke at one time.	14	MR. YOUNG: Richard Quandt. Then Bill Ritz, Keith
15	MR. SHIMEK: I was just trying to answer the	15	Roberts.
16	question the panel had asked.	16	MR. QUANDT: Thank you on behalf of Farmer's for
17	MR. YOUNG: Right, but it was asked of someone	17	Water Quality. My name is Richard Quandt, Q-U-A-N-D-T.
18	else. So, I'm not it wasn't an open invitation for	18	I'm president of Grower-Shipper Association.
19	everyone else.	19	I have nine slides that I would like to
20	MR. SHIMEK: Actually, it was when you asked it.	20	summarize in terms of estimated cost of meeting the
21	MR. YOUNG: All right. Steve, let's do this. I'm	21	monitoring and the reporting requirements for Tier 3
22	setting this back to three minutes. Start over. Give me	22	farmers and their staff's March proposal.
23	Dana Perls' comments.	23	Next slide, please.
24	MR. SHIMEK: All right. My name is it Steve	24	This slide is we first reviewed DPR and Ag
25	Shimek, and I'm speaking on behalf of Dana Perls,	25	Commission of Pesticide Use Report to determine the
	Page 503		Page 505
1	Pesticide Watch Education Fund.	1	number of farms that fell within Tier 3. The two
2	"The 2011 Draft Order is an improvement on	2	criterias we used was 1,000 acres of vegetables and
3	the 2004 Conditional Waiver which did not prioritize	3	strawberries and we broke it down by county.
4	water quality requirements and did not contain any	4	The second criteria was discharging to an
5	compliance or preservation of monitoring provisions.	5	impaired water body and using the pesticide Chlorpyrifos
6	However, PWEF is very disappointed that in spite of the	6	and Diazinon. You can see the results of the
7	immense evidence in drinking water concerns from	7	calculations. We're calculating about 325 of the,
8	contaminated groundwater the 2011 Draft Order remains	8	approximately, 1600 dischargers would fall within Tier 3
9	significantly weaker than it could be.	9	representing 218 219,000, acres, which is about
10	PWEF is concerned that the only types of	10	53 percent of the total unirrigated acres in the region.
11	pesticides which are being considered are Diazinon and	11	Next slide, please.
12	Chlorphyrifos. While these two commonly used pesticides	12	We did try to estimate the Tier 3 enrollment
13	which may affect groundwater contamination a number of	13	cost. This was based on the summary of interviews with
14	pesticides which severely contaminate is significant.	14	Tier 3 growers. We developed a range, and you can see
15	Rather than only considering two pesticides there needs	15	the range is 25,000 to 30,000 per operation.
16	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
	to be a more comprehensive list of pesticides which apply	16	Next slide, please.
17	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	17	Next slide, please. We also looked at the annual cost of meeting
17 18	to be a more comprehensive list of pesticides which apply to all areas. Bullet point 2: And I'm summarizing, surface	17 18	We also looked at the annual cost of meeting the monitoring and reporting requirements in the Order.
17 18 19	to be a more comprehensive list of pesticides which apply to all areas. Bullet point 2: And I'm summarizing, surface water and Ag run-off should test for numerous pesticide	17 18 19	We also looked at the annual cost of meeting the monitoring and reporting requirements in the Order. You can see the main components of that deal with the
17 18 19 20	to be a more comprehensive list of pesticides which apply to all areas. Bullet point 2: And I'm summarizing, surface water and Ag run-off should test for numerous pesticide indicators what will likely end up in the groundwater.	17 18 19 20	We also looked at the annual cost of meeting the monitoring and reporting requirements in the Order.
17 18 19 20 21	to be a more comprehensive list of pesticides which apply to all areas. Bullet point 2: And I'm summarizing, surface water and Ag run-off should test for numerous pesticide indicators what will likely end up in the groundwater. Bullet point 3: Methylidyne is a registered	17 18 19 20 21	We also looked at the annual cost of meeting the monitoring and reporting requirements in the Order. You can see the main components of that deal with the surface water, discharged monitoring requirements and the reporting requirement under the Annual Compliance Plan.
17 18 19 20 21 22	to be a more comprehensive list of pesticides which apply to all areas. Bullet point 2: And I'm summarizing, surface water and Ag run-off should test for numerous pesticide indicators what will likely end up in the groundwater.	17 18 19 20	We also looked at the annual cost of meeting the monitoring and reporting requirements in the Order. You can see the main components of that deal with the surface water, discharged monitoring requirements and the
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to be a more comprehensive list of pesticides which apply to all areas. Bullet point 2: And I'm summarizing, surface water and Ag run-off should test for numerous pesticide indicators what will likely end up in the groundwater. Bullet point 3: Methylidyne is a registered	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	We also looked at the annual cost of meeting the monitoring and reporting requirements in the Order. You can see the main components of that deal with the surface water, discharged monitoring requirements and the reporting requirement under the Annual Compliance Plan.
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	to be a more comprehensive list of pesticides which apply to all areas. Bullet point 2: And I'm summarizing, surface water and Ag run-off should test for numerous pesticide indicators what will likely end up in the groundwater. Bullet point 3: Methylidyne is a registered pesticide should be included in this list of run-off	17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	We also looked at the annual cost of meeting the monitoring and reporting requirements in the Order. You can see the main components of that deal with the surface water, discharged monitoring requirements and the reporting requirement under the Annual Compliance Plan. Our data indicated there would be a range of between \$6-and \$9,000 per year, per Tier 3 grower. Next slide, please.
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to be a more comprehensive list of pesticides which apply to all areas. Bullet point 2: And I'm summarizing, surface water and Ag run-off should test for numerous pesticide indicators what will likely end up in the groundwater. Bullet point 3: Methylidyne is a registered pesticide should be included in this list of run-off contaminants.	17 18 19 20 21 22 23	We also looked at the annual cost of meeting the monitoring and reporting requirements in the Order. You can see the main components of that deal with the surface water, discharged monitoring requirements and the reporting requirement under the Annual Compliance Plan. Our data indicated there would be a range of between \$6-and \$9,000 per year, per Tier 3 grower.

A504530

PANEL HEARING MAY 4, 2011

1	previous slide is a 30-foot vegetative buffer that Tier 3	1	requirement.
2	growers would have to install for operations located on	2	MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr.
3	or adjacent to an impaired water body.	3	Quandt.
4	Next slide, please.	4	MR. RITZ: Good afternoon, Chairman Young. My
5	We determined there is, approximately,	5	name is Bill Ritz, R-I-T-Z, like a cracker.
6	68 6,870 acres in crop production that would be lost.	6	I'm District Representative for State
7	In many cases the loss would be more than 30 feet because	7	Senator Anthony Canella, previously worked for Senator
8	many fields are narrow and irregular and they follow the	8	Dow.
9	contours of the natural water body. In certain cases	9	State Senator Canella is a Senator of
10	25 percent of the field would be lost. This slide	10	District 12. Part of the region falls within his
11	attempts to show some examples of that.	11	district, which would be part of Monterey County and San
12	Next slide, please.	12	Marino County.
13	There are also perennial crops that may have	13	The Senator is also the Senate Chairman of
14	to be moved from the vegetative buffers. We calculated a	14	Agricultural Committee.
15	lost for avocado growers of between 5,000 and 6,000 per	15	I have a few comments from Senator Canella.
16	tree and for removal and relocation. Vineyards between	16	It would seem that all side of this issue
17	3700 and 1100 per acre.	17	agree that clean water and healthy environment are in
18	Thank you.	18	everyone's best interests. It's essential that
19	Next slide, please.	19	collaborative efforts between the Board, staff, the Ag
20	I'm going pretty fast.	20	community, appropriate agencies, all parties, must concur
21	In terms of the conflicts with food safety in	21	to develop a reasonable long term solution. Long term
22	light of what we have with these vegetative buffers most	22	solutions.
23	of the leafy green growers would have to install buffers,	23	Communities such as Monterey County are
24	they would have to install fencing that we calculated at	24	extremely dependent on the agricultural industry to
25	82 million dollars.	25	maintain a vital economy, create jobs to grow healthy
	Page 507		Page 509
		_	
1	And the last slide, please.	1	produce that feeds not only California, the United
2	MR. YOUNG: Wait. Thank you for your comments,	2	States, but is shipped around the world.
2	MR. YOUNG: Wait. Thank you for your comments, Mr. Quandt.	2	States, but is shipped around the world. Increasing levels of regulation and
2 3 4	MR. YOUNG: Wait. Thank you for your comments, Mr. Quandt. I just have a question, though, it's my	2 3 4	States, but is shipped around the world. Increasing levels of regulation and mitigation will threaten very important industry in our
2 3 4 5	MR. YOUNG: Wait. Thank you for your comments, Mr. Quandt. I just have a question, though, it's my understanding staff was not proposing that any trees get	2 3 4 5	States, but is shipped around the world. Increasing levels of regulation and mitigation will threaten very important industry in our area. Senator Canella has previously submitted written
2 3 4 5 6	MR. YOUNG: Wait. Thank you for your comments, Mr. Quandt. I just have a question, though, it's my understanding staff was not proposing that any trees get removed if they're in the buffer. Is that correct or	2 3 4 5 6	States, but is shipped around the world. Increasing levels of regulation and mitigation will threaten very important industry in our area. Senator Canella has previously submitted written comments to you urging the Board to cooperate in all
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. YOUNG: Wait. Thank you for your comments, Mr. Quandt. I just have a question, though, it's my understanding staff was not proposing that any trees get removed if they're in the buffer. Is that correct or not?	2 3 4 5 6 7	States, but is shipped around the world. Increasing levels of regulation and mitigation will threaten very important industry in our area. Senator Canella has previously submitted written comments to you urging the Board to cooperate in all alternatives, such as the Agricultural Alternative
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. YOUNG: Wait. Thank you for your comments, Mr. Quandt. I just have a question, though, it's my understanding staff was not proposing that any trees get removed if they're in the buffer. Is that correct or not? I'm asking staff.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	States, but is shipped around the world. Increasing levels of regulation and mitigation will threaten very important industry in our area. Senator Canella has previously submitted written comments to you urging the Board to cooperate in all alternatives, such as the Agricultural Alternative Conditional Waiver.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. YOUNG: Wait. Thank you for your comments, Mr. Quandt. I just have a question, though, it's my understanding staff was not proposing that any trees get removed if they're in the buffer. Is that correct or not? I'm asking staff. MS. SCHROETER: Repeat the question.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	States, but is shipped around the world. Increasing levels of regulation and mitigation will threaten very important industry in our area. Senator Canella has previously submitted written comments to you urging the Board to cooperate in all alternatives, such as the Agricultural Alternative Conditional Waiver. And finally, a regulation of this magnitude
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. YOUNG: Wait. Thank you for your comments, Mr. Quandt. I just have a question, though, it's my understanding staff was not proposing that any trees get removed if they're in the buffer. Is that correct or not? I'm asking staff. MS. SCHROETER: Repeat the question. MR. YOUNG: Mr. Quandt is concerned	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	States, but is shipped around the world. Increasing levels of regulation and mitigation will threaten very important industry in our area. Senator Canella has previously submitted written comments to you urging the Board to cooperate in all alternatives, such as the Agricultural Alternative Conditional Waiver. And finally, a regulation of this magnitude deserves that negotiations include all stakeholders to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. YOUNG: Wait. Thank you for your comments, Mr. Quandt. I just have a question, though, it's my understanding staff was not proposing that any trees get removed if they're in the buffer. Is that correct or not? I'm asking staff. MS. SCHROETER: Repeat the question. MR. YOUNG: Mr. Quandt is concerned MR. THOMAS: Yes, that is correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	States, but is shipped around the world. Increasing levels of regulation and mitigation will threaten very important industry in our area. Senator Canella has previously submitted written comments to you urging the Board to cooperate in all alternatives, such as the Agricultural Alternative Conditional Waiver. And finally, a regulation of this magnitude deserves that negotiations include all stakeholders to create a plan of sound science in achievable goals.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. YOUNG: Wait. Thank you for your comments, Mr. Quandt. I just have a question, though, it's my understanding staff was not proposing that any trees get removed if they're in the buffer. Is that correct or not? I'm asking staff. MS. SCHROETER: Repeat the question. MR. YOUNG: Mr. Quandt is concerned MR. THOMAS: Yes, that is correct. MR. YOUNG: That is correct.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	States, but is shipped around the world. Increasing levels of regulation and mitigation will threaten very important industry in our area. Senator Canella has previously submitted written comments to you urging the Board to cooperate in all alternatives, such as the Agricultural Alternative Conditional Waiver. And finally, a regulation of this magnitude deserves that negotiations include all stakeholders to create a plan of sound science in achievable goals. On behalf of Senator Canella, I thank you for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. YOUNG: Wait. Thank you for your comments, Mr. Quandt. I just have a question, though, it's my understanding staff was not proposing that any trees get removed if they're in the buffer. Is that correct or not? I'm asking staff. MS. SCHROETER: Repeat the question. MR. YOUNG: Mr. Quandt is concerned MR. THOMAS: Yes, that is correct. MR. YOUNG: That is correct. Okay. What about with vineyards and, you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	States, but is shipped around the world. Increasing levels of regulation and mitigation will threaten very important industry in our area. Senator Canella has previously submitted written comments to you urging the Board to cooperate in all alternatives, such as the Agricultural Alternative Conditional Waiver. And finally, a regulation of this magnitude deserves that negotiations include all stakeholders to create a plan of sound science in achievable goals. On behalf of Senator Canella, I thank you for your consideration.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. YOUNG: Wait. Thank you for your comments, Mr. Quandt. I just have a question, though, it's my understanding staff was not proposing that any trees get removed if they're in the buffer. Is that correct or not? I'm asking staff. MS. SCHROETER: Repeat the question. MR. YOUNG: Mr. Quandt is concerned MR. THOMAS: Yes, that is correct. MR. YOUNG: That is correct. Okay. What about with vineyards and, you know, vines, would they have to be removed if they're in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	States, but is shipped around the world. Increasing levels of regulation and mitigation will threaten very important industry in our area. Senator Canella has previously submitted written comments to you urging the Board to cooperate in all alternatives, such as the Agricultural Alternative Conditional Waiver. And finally, a regulation of this magnitude deserves that negotiations include all stakeholders to create a plan of sound science in achievable goals. On behalf of Senator Canella, I thank you for your consideration. Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. YOUNG: Wait. Thank you for your comments, Mr. Quandt. I just have a question, though, it's my understanding staff was not proposing that any trees get removed if they're in the buffer. Is that correct or not? I'm asking staff. MS. SCHROETER: Repeat the question. MR. YOUNG: Mr. Quandt is concerned MR. THOMAS: Yes, that is correct. MR. YOUNG: That is correct. Okay. What about with vineyards and, you know, vines, would they have to be removed if they're in a buffer?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	States, but is shipped around the world. Increasing levels of regulation and mitigation will threaten very important industry in our area. Senator Canella has previously submitted written comments to you urging the Board to cooperate in all alternatives, such as the Agricultural Alternative Conditional Waiver. And finally, a regulation of this magnitude deserves that negotiations include all stakeholders to create a plan of sound science in achievable goals. On behalf of Senator Canella, I thank you for your consideration. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: A few questions for you, Mr. Ritz. If
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. YOUNG: Wait. Thank you for your comments, Mr. Quandt. I just have a question, though, it's my understanding staff was not proposing that any trees get removed if they're in the buffer. Is that correct or not? I'm asking staff. MS. SCHROETER: Repeat the question. MR. YOUNG: Mr. Quandt is concerned MR. THOMAS: Yes, that is correct. MR. YOUNG: That is correct. Okay. What about with vineyards and, you know, vines, would they have to be removed if they're in a buffer? MS. SCHROETER: The Water Quality Buffer Plan is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	States, but is shipped around the world. Increasing levels of regulation and mitigation will threaten very important industry in our area. Senator Canella has previously submitted written comments to you urging the Board to cooperate in all alternatives, such as the Agricultural Alternative Conditional Waiver. And finally, a regulation of this magnitude deserves that negotiations include all stakeholders to create a plan of sound science in achievable goals. On behalf of Senator Canella, I thank you for your consideration. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: A few questions for you, Mr. Ritz. If you don't have a position on this, that's fine, I'm just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. YOUNG: Wait. Thank you for your comments, Mr. Quandt. I just have a question, though, it's my understanding staff was not proposing that any trees get removed if they're in the buffer. Is that correct or not? I'm asking staff. MS. SCHROETER: Repeat the question. MR. YOUNG: Mr. Quandt is concerned MR. THOMAS: Yes, that is correct. MR. YOUNG: That is correct. Okay. What about with vineyards and, you know, vines, would they have to be removed if they're in a buffer? MS. SCHROETER: The Water Quality Buffer Plan is about addressing the discharge. There's no requirement	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	States, but is shipped around the world. Increasing levels of regulation and mitigation will threaten very important industry in our area. Senator Canella has previously submitted written comments to you urging the Board to cooperate in all alternatives, such as the Agricultural Alternative Conditional Waiver. And finally, a regulation of this magnitude deserves that negotiations include all stakeholders to create a plan of sound science in achievable goals. On behalf of Senator Canella, I thank you for your consideration. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: A few questions for you, Mr. Ritz. If you don't have a position on this, that's fine, I'm just kind of curious. With respect to the groundwater
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. YOUNG: Wait. Thank you for your comments, Mr. Quandt. I just have a question, though, it's my understanding staff was not proposing that any trees get removed if they're in the buffer. Is that correct or not? I'm asking staff. MS. SCHROETER: Repeat the question. MR. YOUNG: Mr. Quandt is concerned MR. THOMAS: Yes, that is correct. MR. YOUNG: That is correct. Okay. What about with vineyards and, you know, vines, would they have to be removed if they're in a buffer? MS. SCHROETER: The Water Quality Buffer Plan is about addressing the discharge. There's no requirement to remove anything within that area if they can address	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	States, but is shipped around the world. Increasing levels of regulation and mitigation will threaten very important industry in our area. Senator Canella has previously submitted written comments to you urging the Board to cooperate in all alternatives, such as the Agricultural Alternative Conditional Waiver. And finally, a regulation of this magnitude deserves that negotiations include all stakeholders to create a plan of sound science in achievable goals. On behalf of Senator Canella, I thank you for your consideration. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: A few questions for you, Mr. Ritz. If you don't have a position on this, that's fine, I'm just kind of curious. With respect to the groundwater monitoring component, does your office have any?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. YOUNG: Wait. Thank you for your comments, Mr. Quandt. I just have a question, though, it's my understanding staff was not proposing that any trees get removed if they're in the buffer. Is that correct or not? I'm asking staff. MS. SCHROETER: Repeat the question. MR. YOUNG: Mr. Quandt is concerned MR. THOMAS: Yes, that is correct. MR. YOUNG: That is correct. Okay. What about with vineyards and, you know, vines, would they have to be removed if they're in a buffer? MS. SCHROETER: The Water Quality Buffer Plan is about addressing the discharge. There's no requirement to remove anything within that area if they can address the discharge. So, the trees don't need to be removed,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	States, but is shipped around the world. Increasing levels of regulation and mitigation will threaten very important industry in our area. Senator Canella has previously submitted written comments to you urging the Board to cooperate in all alternatives, such as the Agricultural Alternative Conditional Waiver. And finally, a regulation of this magnitude deserves that negotiations include all stakeholders to create a plan of sound science in achievable goals. On behalf of Senator Canella, I thank you for your consideration. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: A few questions for you, Mr. Ritz. If you don't have a position on this, that's fine, I'm just kind of curious. With respect to the groundwater monitoring component, does your office have any? MR. RITZ: I couldn't answer that. I have to get
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. YOUNG: Wait. Thank you for your comments, Mr. Quandt. I just have a question, though, it's my understanding staff was not proposing that any trees get removed if they're in the buffer. Is that correct or not? I'm asking staff. MS. SCHROETER: Repeat the question. MR. YOUNG: Mr. Quandt is concerned MR. THOMAS: Yes, that is correct. MR. YOUNG: That is correct. Okay. What about with vineyards and, you know, vines, would they have to be removed if they're in a buffer? MS. SCHROETER: The Water Quality Buffer Plan is about addressing the discharge. There's no requirement to remove anything within that area if they can address the discharge. So, the trees don't need to be removed, vineyards don't need to be removed, if they control the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	States, but is shipped around the world. Increasing levels of regulation and mitigation will threaten very important industry in our area. Senator Canella has previously submitted written comments to you urging the Board to cooperate in all alternatives, such as the Agricultural Alternative Conditional Waiver. And finally, a regulation of this magnitude deserves that negotiations include all stakeholders to create a plan of sound science in achievable goals. On behalf of Senator Canella, I thank you for your consideration. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: A few questions for you, Mr. Ritz. If you don't have a position on this, that's fine, I'm just kind of curious. With respect to the groundwater monitoring component, does your office have any? MR. RITZ: I couldn't answer that. I have to get information on that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. YOUNG: Wait. Thank you for your comments, Mr. Quandt. I just have a question, though, it's my understanding staff was not proposing that any trees get removed if they're in the buffer. Is that correct or not? I'm asking staff. MS. SCHROETER: Repeat the question. MR. YOUNG: Mr. Quandt is concerned MR. THOMAS: Yes, that is correct. MR. YOUNG: That is correct. Okay. What about with vineyards and, you know, vines, would they have to be removed if they're in a buffer? MS. SCHROETER: The Water Quality Buffer Plan is about addressing the discharge. There's no requirement to remove anything within that area if they can address the discharge. So, the trees don't need to be removed, vineyards don't need to be removed, if they control the discharge, that's the part of the plan.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Increasing levels of regulation and mitigation will threaten very important industry in our area. Senator Canella has previously submitted written comments to you urging the Board to cooperate in all alternatives, such as the Agricultural Alternative Conditional Waiver. And finally, a regulation of this magnitude deserves that negotiations include all stakeholders to create a plan of sound science in achievable goals. On behalf of Senator Canella, I thank you for your consideration. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: A few questions for you, Mr. Ritz. If you don't have a position on this, that's fine, I'm just kind of curious. With respect to the groundwater monitoring component, does your office have any? MR. RITZ: I couldn't answer that. I have to get information on that. MR. YOUNG: Right. How about for any of the other
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. YOUNG: Wait. Thank you for your comments, Mr. Quandt. I just have a question, though, it's my understanding staff was not proposing that any trees get removed if they're in the buffer. Is that correct or not? I'm asking staff. MS. SCHROETER: Repeat the question. MR. YOUNG: Mr. Quandt is concerned MR. THOMAS: Yes, that is correct. MR. YOUNG: That is correct. Okay. What about with vineyards and, you know, vines, would they have to be removed if they're in a buffer? MS. SCHROETER: The Water Quality Buffer Plan is about addressing the discharge. There's no requirement to remove anything within that area if they can address the discharge. So, the trees don't need to be removed, vineyards don't need to be removed, if they control the discharge, that's the part of the plan. MR. THOMAS: There's no requirement to removing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Increasing levels of regulation and mitigation will threaten very important industry in our area. Senator Canella has previously submitted written comments to you urging the Board to cooperate in all alternatives, such as the Agricultural Alternative Conditional Waiver. And finally, a regulation of this magnitude deserves that negotiations include all stakeholders to create a plan of sound science in achievable goals. On behalf of Senator Canella, I thank you for your consideration. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: A few questions for you, Mr. Ritz. If you don't have a position on this, that's fine, I'm just kind of curious. With respect to the groundwater monitoring component, does your office have any? MR. RITZ: I couldn't answer that. I have to get information on that. MR. YOUNG: Right. How about for any of the other specific components, you know, part of the Order, has
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. YOUNG: Wait. Thank you for your comments, Mr. Quandt. I just have a question, though, it's my understanding staff was not proposing that any trees get removed if they're in the buffer. Is that correct or not? I'm asking staff. MS. SCHROETER: Repeat the question. MR. YOUNG: Mr. Quandt is concerned MR. THOMAS: Yes, that is correct. MR. YOUNG: That is correct. Okay. What about with vineyards and, you know, vines, would they have to be removed if they're in a buffer? MS. SCHROETER: The Water Quality Buffer Plan is about addressing the discharge. There's no requirement to remove anything within that area if they can address the discharge. So, the trees don't need to be removed, vineyards don't need to be removed, if they control the discharge, that's the part of the plan. MR. THOMAS: There's no requirement to removing vineyards	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Increasing levels of regulation and mitigation will threaten very important industry in our area. Senator Canella has previously submitted written comments to you urging the Board to cooperate in all alternatives, such as the Agricultural Alternative Conditional Waiver. And finally, a regulation of this magnitude deserves that negotiations include all stakeholders to create a plan of sound science in achievable goals. On behalf of Senator Canella, I thank you for your consideration. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: A few questions for you, Mr. Ritz. If you don't have a position on this, that's fine, I'm just kind of curious. With respect to the groundwater monitoring component, does your office have any? MR. RITZ: I couldn't answer that. I have to get information on that. MR. YOUNG: Right. How about for any of the other specific components, you know, part of the Order, has your office looked at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. YOUNG: Wait. Thank you for your comments, Mr. Quandt. I just have a question, though, it's my understanding staff was not proposing that any trees get removed if they're in the buffer. Is that correct or not? I'm asking staff. MS. SCHROETER: Repeat the question. MR. YOUNG: Mr. Quandt is concerned MR. THOMAS: Yes, that is correct. MR. YOUNG: That is correct. Okay. What about with vineyards and, you know, vines, would they have to be removed if they're in a buffer? MS. SCHROETER: The Water Quality Buffer Plan is about addressing the discharge. There's no requirement to remove anything within that area if they can address the discharge. So, the trees don't need to be removed, vineyards don't need to be removed, if they control the discharge, that's the part of the plan. MR. THOMAS: There's no requirement to removing vineyards MR. YOUNG: Speak into the mic.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Increasing levels of regulation and mitigation will threaten very important industry in our area. Senator Canella has previously submitted written comments to you urging the Board to cooperate in all alternatives, such as the Agricultural Alternative Conditional Waiver. And finally, a regulation of this magnitude deserves that negotiations include all stakeholders to create a plan of sound science in achievable goals. On behalf of Senator Canella, I thank you for your consideration. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: A few questions for you, Mr. Ritz. If you don't have a position on this, that's fine, I'm just kind of curious. With respect to the groundwater monitoring component, does your office have any? MR. RITZ: I couldn't answer that. I have to get information on that. MR. YOUNG: Right. How about for any of the other specific components, you know, part of the Order, has your office looked at MR. RITZ: I can't answer that. I have to go and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. YOUNG: Wait. Thank you for your comments, Mr. Quandt. I just have a question, though, it's my understanding staff was not proposing that any trees get removed if they're in the buffer. Is that correct or not? I'm asking staff. MS. SCHROETER: Repeat the question. MR. YOUNG: Mr. Quandt is concerned MR. THOMAS: Yes, that is correct. MR. YOUNG: That is correct. Okay. What about with vineyards and, you know, vines, would they have to be removed if they're in a buffer? MS. SCHROETER: The Water Quality Buffer Plan is about addressing the discharge. There's no requirement to remove anything within that area if they can address the discharge. So, the trees don't need to be removed, vineyards don't need to be removed, if they control the discharge, that's the part of the plan. MR. THOMAS: There's no requirement to removing vineyards	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Increasing levels of regulation and mitigation will threaten very important industry in our area. Senator Canella has previously submitted written comments to you urging the Board to cooperate in all alternatives, such as the Agricultural Alternative Conditional Waiver. And finally, a regulation of this magnitude deserves that negotiations include all stakeholders to create a plan of sound science in achievable goals. On behalf of Senator Canella, I thank you for your consideration. Thank you. MR. YOUNG: A few questions for you, Mr. Ritz. If you don't have a position on this, that's fine, I'm just kind of curious. With respect to the groundwater monitoring component, does your office have any? MR. RITZ: I couldn't answer that. I have to get information on that. MR. YOUNG: Right. How about for any of the other specific components, you know, part of the Order, has your office looked at

1	The message that I bring today is that we	1	for poultry farms, dairies and agricultural land."
2	continue to look at this in a collaborative manner. All	2	And the models there involved increase of
3	sides, all parties. That's what he wanted to bring	3	nitrate loads from all sources of nitrates from 1945 to
4	forth.	4	1985, and conflict loads after 1985, except that the
5	As far as those issues, I can certainly get	5	poultry farming ceases in 2045.
6	those answers for you.	6	Even though the cessation of the poultry
7	MR. YOUNG: Well, it maybe too late for what we're	7	farmer removes about 50 percent of the nitrate load from
8	doing. I was just curious whether you had them right now	8	the area groundwater basin, the simulation results
9	in your pocket.	9	indicate that very low reduction of groundwater nitrate
10	MR. RITZ: I don't. When would you like them?	10	is achieved in 150 years after cessation of poultry
11	Tomorrow?	11	farms.
12	MR. YOUNG: Now. But that's okay. I didn't make	12	Another interesting result is that nitrate
13	any assumptions that I did have any information. I was	13	continued to increase within parts of the basin even
14	just trying to find out, perhaps, if you do.	14	after the cessation of poultry farming.
15		15	
16	MR. RITZ: Okay. No, I don't.	16	So, this makes it very complicated to align
17	MR. YOUNG: Okay.	17	where nitrates come from, or if the nitrates are an
	MR. BRIGGS: Also, we did respond to the Senator's		issue. It appears that your hypothesis is that farming
18 19	letter.	18	is the sole contributor to the nitrate load. And this
20	MR. RITZ: Yes. We got your response. Basically	19	argues that farming is not the main cause. So, you know,
21	a mini staff report. And we appreciate that.	20	farming you can't grow crops without nitrogen. You all
	MR. BRIGGS: We're trying to collaborate.	21	understand that, right?
22	MR. RITZ: I don't know if it's collaboration or	22	Nitrogen comes in various forms. Some of it
23	more if it was how you felt in a singular purpose.	23	moves I mean the soil types. Earlier on we talked
24	MR. BRIGGS: We were trying to answer it.	24	about the I heard comments about the one second?
25	MR. RITZ: Some of them were answered. I think he	25	MR. YOUNG: One second.
	Page 511		Page 513
1	just feels that more collaboration, more cooperation is	1	Dr. Hunter is going to have a question for you.
2	needed in this issue. If that should be answered	2	Correct, Doctor?
3	today, it should be answered after all these things have	3	Finish your sentence.
4	been answered and brought forth.	4	MR. ROBERTS: I just wanted to clarify the UC
5	I heard a lot of stuff today that certainly	5	-
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		system, berkiey, Davis, Poly Tech, Car Poly, State
6	is new things. So, I appreciate your time.	6	system, Berkley, Davis, Poly Tech, Cal Poly, state universities, they all built their models based on laws
6 7	is new things. So, I appreciate your time. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Ritz.		universities, they all built their models based on laws
	MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ritz.	6	universities, they all built their models based on laws of maximum. Okay. And laws of maximum is where you can
7	MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ritz. Keith Roberts. Followed my Kirk Schmidt, I	6 7	universities, they all built their models based on laws of maximum. Okay. And laws of maximum is where you can put so many units of one thing and then that gives you
7 8 9	MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ritz. Keith Roberts. Followed my Kirk Schmidt, I think.	6 7 8 9	universities, they all built their models based on laws of maximum. Okay. And laws of maximum is where you can put so many units of one thing and then that gives you maximum production. And the reason for that was there
7 8 9 10	MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ritz. Keith Roberts. Followed my Kirk Schmidt, I think. So, Keith Roberts, Kirk Schmidt and Stuart	6 7 8	universities, they all built their models based on laws of maximum. Okay. And laws of maximum is where you can put so many units of one thing and then that gives you maximum production. And the reason for that was there was a world that needed to be fed.
7 8 9 10 11	MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ritz. Keith Roberts. Followed my Kirk Schmidt, I think. So, Keith Roberts, Kirk Schmidt and Stuart Styles.	6 7 8 9 10	universities, they all built their models based on laws of maximum. Okay. And laws of maximum is where you can put so many units of one thing and then that gives you maximum production. And the reason for that was there was a world that needed to be fed. So now you're talking
7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ritz. Keith Roberts. Followed my Kirk Schmidt, I think. So, Keith Roberts, Kirk Schmidt and Stuart Styles. MR. ROBERTS: Keith Roberts. R-O-B-E-R-T-S.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	universities, they all built their models based on laws of maximum. Okay. And laws of maximum is where you can put so many units of one thing and then that gives you maximum production. And the reason for that was there was a world that needed to be fed. So now you're talking MR. YOUNG: Mr. Roberts, thank you for your
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ritz. Keith Roberts. Followed my Kirk Schmidt, I think. So, Keith Roberts, Kirk Schmidt and Stuart Styles. MR. ROBERTS: Keith Roberts. R-O-B-E-R-T-S. Chairman of Salinas Valley Water Coalition.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	universities, they all built their models based on laws of maximum. Okay. And laws of maximum is where you can put so many units of one thing and then that gives you maximum production. And the reason for that was there was a world that needed to be fed. So now you're talking MR. YOUNG: Mr. Roberts, thank you for your comments.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ritz. Keith Roberts. Followed my Kirk Schmidt, I think. So, Keith Roberts, Kirk Schmidt and Stuart Styles. MR. ROBERTS: Keith Roberts. R-O-B-E-R-T-S. Chairman of Salinas Valley Water Coalition. I'm going to skip passed a couple of slides	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	universities, they all built their models based on laws of maximum. Okay. And laws of maximum is where you can put so many units of one thing and then that gives you maximum production. And the reason for that was there was a world that needed to be fed. So now you're talking MR. YOUNG: Mr. Roberts, thank you for your comments. Dr. Hunter.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ritz. Keith Roberts. Followed my Kirk Schmidt, I think. So, Keith Roberts, Kirk Schmidt and Stuart Styles. MR. ROBERTS: Keith Roberts. R-O-B-E-R-T-S. Chairman of Salinas Valley Water Coalition. I'm going to skip passed a couple of slides here.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	universities, they all built their models based on laws of maximum. Okay. And laws of maximum is where you can put so many units of one thing and then that gives you maximum production. And the reason for that was there was a world that needed to be fed. So now you're talking MR. YOUNG: Mr. Roberts, thank you for your comments. Dr. Hunter. DR. HUNTER: Yes, just one question.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ritz. Keith Roberts. Followed my Kirk Schmidt, I think. So, Keith Roberts, Kirk Schmidt and Stuart Styles. MR. ROBERTS: Keith Roberts. R-O-B-E-R-T-S. Chairman of Salinas Valley Water Coalition. I'm going to skip passed a couple of slides here. As Nancy mentioned earlier, we retained a	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	universities, they all built their models based on laws of maximum. Okay. And laws of maximum is where you can put so many units of one thing and then that gives you maximum production. And the reason for that was there was a world that needed to be fed. So now you're talking MR. YOUNG: Mr. Roberts, thank you for your comments. Dr. Hunter. DR. HUNTER: Yes, just one question. The poultry operation ceased, in past tense,
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ritz. Keith Roberts. Followed my Kirk Schmidt, I think. So, Keith Roberts, Kirk Schmidt and Stuart Styles. MR. ROBERTS: Keith Roberts. R-O-B-E-R-T-S. Chairman of Salinas Valley Water Coalition. I'm going to skip passed a couple of slides here. As Nancy mentioned earlier, we retained a hydrologist. And some of his comments are based on this	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	universities, they all built their models based on laws of maximum. Okay. And laws of maximum is where you can put so many units of one thing and then that gives you maximum production. And the reason for that was there was a world that needed to be fed. So now you're talking MR. YOUNG: Mr. Roberts, thank you for your comments. Dr. Hunter. DR. HUNTER: Yes, just one question. The poultry operation ceased, in past tense, in 2045. Is that a typo?
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ritz. Keith Roberts. Followed my Kirk Schmidt, I think. So, Keith Roberts, Kirk Schmidt and Stuart Styles. MR. ROBERTS: Keith Roberts. R-O-B-E-R-T-S. Chairman of Salinas Valley Water Coalition. I'm going to skip passed a couple of slides here. As Nancy mentioned earlier, we retained a hydrologist. And some of his comments are based on this model that was performed by Darnst Livermore National	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	universities, they all built their models based on laws of maximum. Okay. And laws of maximum is where you can put so many units of one thing and then that gives you maximum production. And the reason for that was there was a world that needed to be fed. So now you're talking MR. YOUNG: Mr. Roberts, thank you for your comments. Dr. Hunter. DR. HUNTER: Yes, just one question. The poultry operation ceased, in past tense, in 2045. Is that a typo? MR. ROBERTS: No. That's a model. It's a built
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ritz. Keith Roberts. Followed my Kirk Schmidt, I think. So, Keith Roberts, Kirk Schmidt and Stuart Styles. MR. ROBERTS: Keith Roberts. R-O-B-E-R-T-S. Chairman of Salinas Valley Water Coalition. I'm going to skip passed a couple of slides here. As Nancy mentioned earlier, we retained a hydrologist. And some of his comments are based on this model that was performed by Darnst Livermore National Laboratory in '96 or 2006.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	universities, they all built their models based on laws of maximum. Okay. And laws of maximum is where you can put so many units of one thing and then that gives you maximum production. And the reason for that was there was a world that needed to be fed. So now you're talking MR. YOUNG: Mr. Roberts, thank you for your comments. Dr. Hunter. DR. HUNTER: Yes, just one question. The poultry operation ceased, in past tense, in 2045. Is that a typo? MR. ROBERTS: No. That's a model. It's a built model where we simulated cause and effect. And the point
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ritz. Keith Roberts. Followed my Kirk Schmidt, I think. So, Keith Roberts, Kirk Schmidt and Stuart Styles. MR. ROBERTS: Keith Roberts. R-O-B-E-R-T-S. Chairman of Salinas Valley Water Coalition. I'm going to skip passed a couple of slides here. As Nancy mentioned earlier, we retained a hydrologist. And some of his comments are based on this model that was performed by Darnst Livermore National Laboratory in '96 or 2006. Where they loaded they made a simulation	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	universities, they all built their models based on laws of maximum. Okay. And laws of maximum is where you can put so many units of one thing and then that gives you maximum production. And the reason for that was there was a world that needed to be fed. So now you're talking MR. YOUNG: Mr. Roberts, thank you for your comments. Dr. Hunter. DR. HUNTER: Yes, just one question. The poultry operation ceased, in past tense, in 2045. Is that a typo? MR. ROBERTS: No. That's a model. It's a built model where we simulated cause and effect. And the point is that you don't have a scientific system that has the
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ritz. Keith Roberts. Followed my Kirk Schmidt, I think. So, Keith Roberts, Kirk Schmidt and Stuart Styles. MR. ROBERTS: Keith Roberts. R-O-B-E-R-T-S. Chairman of Salinas Valley Water Coalition. I'm going to skip passed a couple of slides here. As Nancy mentioned earlier, we retained a hydrologist. And some of his comments are based on this model that was performed by Darnst Livermore National Laboratory in '96 or 2006. Where they loaded they made a simulation model and they the basin area was about 15 miles of	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	universities, they all built their models based on laws of maximum. Okay. And laws of maximum is where you can put so many units of one thing and then that gives you maximum production. And the reason for that was there was a world that needed to be fed. So now you're talking MR. YOUNG: Mr. Roberts, thank you for your comments. Dr. Hunter. DR. HUNTER: Yes, just one question. The poultry operation ceased, in past tense, in 2045. Is that a typo? MR. ROBERTS: No. That's a model. It's a built model where we simulated cause and effect. And the point is that you don't have a scientific system that has the metrics built in to allow to determine whether there's
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ritz. Keith Roberts. Followed my Kirk Schmidt, I think. So, Keith Roberts, Kirk Schmidt and Stuart Styles. MR. ROBERTS: Keith Roberts. R-O-B-E-R-T-S. Chairman of Salinas Valley Water Coalition. I'm going to skip passed a couple of slides here. As Nancy mentioned earlier, we retained a hydrologist. And some of his comments are based on this model that was performed by Darnst Livermore National Laboratory in '96 or 2006. Where they loaded they made a simulation model and they the basin area was about 15 miles of the Salinas Valley, a comparison of the Salinas Valley.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	universities, they all built their models based on laws of maximum. Okay. And laws of maximum is where you can put so many units of one thing and then that gives you maximum production. And the reason for that was there was a world that needed to be fed. So now you're talking MR. YOUNG: Mr. Roberts, thank you for your comments. Dr. Hunter. DR. HUNTER: Yes, just one question. The poultry operation ceased, in past tense, in 2045. Is that a typo? MR. ROBERTS: No. That's a model. It's a built model where we simulated cause and effect. And the point is that you don't have a scientific system that has the metrics built in to allow to determine whether there's an issue with contamination, how, where, why. It's cause
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ritz. Keith Roberts. Followed my Kirk Schmidt, I think. So, Keith Roberts, Kirk Schmidt and Stuart Styles. MR. ROBERTS: Keith Roberts. R-O-B-E-R-T-S. Chairman of Salinas Valley Water Coalition. I'm going to skip passed a couple of slides here. As Nancy mentioned earlier, we retained a hydrologist. And some of his comments are based on this model that was performed by Darnst Livermore National Laboratory in '96 or 2006. Where they loaded they made a simulation model and they the basin area was about 15 miles of the Salinas Valley, a comparison of the Salinas Valley. But, they just I'll read it.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	universities, they all built their models based on laws of maximum. Okay. And laws of maximum is where you can put so many units of one thing and then that gives you maximum production. And the reason for that was there was a world that needed to be fed. So now you're talking MR. YOUNG: Mr. Roberts, thank you for your comments. Dr. Hunter. DR. HUNTER: Yes, just one question. The poultry operation ceased, in past tense, in 2045. Is that a typo? MR. ROBERTS: No. That's a model. It's a built model where we simulated cause and effect. And the point is that you don't have a scientific system that has the metrics built in to allow to determine whether there's an issue with contamination, how, where, why. It's cause and effect. You've got to establish cause and effect in
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ritz. Keith Roberts. Followed my Kirk Schmidt, I think. So, Keith Roberts, Kirk Schmidt and Stuart Styles. MR. ROBERTS: Keith Roberts. R-O-B-E-R-T-S. Chairman of Salinas Valley Water Coalition. I'm going to skip passed a couple of slides here. As Nancy mentioned earlier, we retained a hydrologist. And some of his comments are based on this model that was performed by Darnst Livermore National Laboratory in '96 or 2006. Where they loaded they made a simulation model and they the basin area was about 15 miles of the Salinas Valley, a comparison of the Salinas Valley. But, they just I'll read it. "Investigators used a soil act per model to	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	universities, they all built their models based on laws of maximum. Okay. And laws of maximum is where you can put so many units of one thing and then that gives you maximum production. And the reason for that was there was a world that needed to be fed. So now you're talking MR. YOUNG: Mr. Roberts, thank you for your comments. Dr. Hunter. DR. HUNTER: Yes, just one question. The poultry operation ceased, in past tense, in 2045. Is that a typo? MR. ROBERTS: No. That's a model. It's a built model where we simulated cause and effect. And the point is that you don't have a scientific system that has the metrics built in to allow to determine whether there's an issue with contamination, how, where, why. It's cause and effect. You've got to establish cause and effect in your formulations before you can derive to any kind of
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ritz. Keith Roberts. Followed my Kirk Schmidt, I think. So, Keith Roberts, Kirk Schmidt and Stuart Styles. MR. ROBERTS: Keith Roberts. R-O-B-E-R-T-S. Chairman of Salinas Valley Water Coalition. I'm going to skip passed a couple of slides here. As Nancy mentioned earlier, we retained a hydrologist. And some of his comments are based on this model that was performed by Darnst Livermore National Laboratory in '96 or 2006. Where they loaded they made a simulation model and they the basin area was about 15 miles of the Salinas Valley, a comparison of the Salinas Valley. But, they just I'll read it.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	universities, they all built their models based on laws of maximum. Okay. And laws of maximum is where you can put so many units of one thing and then that gives you maximum production. And the reason for that was there was a world that needed to be fed. So now you're talking MR. YOUNG: Mr. Roberts, thank you for your comments. Dr. Hunter. DR. HUNTER: Yes, just one question. The poultry operation ceased, in past tense, in 2045. Is that a typo? MR. ROBERTS: No. That's a model. It's a built model where we simulated cause and effect. And the point is that you don't have a scientific system that has the metrics built in to allow to determine whether there's an issue with contamination, how, where, why. It's cause and effect. You've got to establish cause and effect in

1 MR. HUNTER: Okay. I understand. I just wanted 1 destroy farms, devalue land, put many people out of work. 2 2 And the evidence is there are other items to be clear. 3 3 MR. ROBERTS: Those are correct numbers. that could take care of specific -- algae bloom, there's 4 MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. 4 enzymes, there's dilution. You can add water, you can 5 5 MR. JEFFRIES: Mr. Roberts, you took that slide add enzymes, you can do things to lower the specific 6 6 down, but you talked about poultry. thing. And anybody that has waste charge into ponds has 7 7 MR. ROBERTS: Well, poultry is -- on that specific that ability to do it. So why not think in a bigger box 8 8 area, poultry is manure. The byproduct of poultry is and work on the specific areas of input. 9 manure. If you're asking how that came about it was 9 MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. 10 10 because it was a given area that was suggested that it Kirk Schmidt. 11 11 MR. SCHMIDT: Chairman Young, Members of the was carbon nitrate solution. 12 MR. JEFFRIES: Well, I wasn't really focusing on 12 Board. Kirk Schmidt, Executive Director of Preservation, 13 poultry, but it just triggered that -- and I'm not 13 Inc. S-C-H-M-I-D-T. 14 14 familiar with the whole region -- but in Salinas Valley, I'm, as you're aware, Preservation, Inc., the 15 15 Castorville, Moss Landing, parts of Santa Cruz County had Cooperative Monitoring Program and the existing waiver. 16 16 I'm going to restrict my comments to the Cooperative approximately 400 diaries from the late 1800s until 17 17 probably 19 -- late '60s. And I think I've asked this Monitoring Program as proposed in the current Draft. 18 18 Dealing with surface water quality the proposal in question before. I know in different soil types water 19 19 travels through those at a different rate. And so, the current Draft is very similar to the existing 20 20 consequently, I'm wondering -- and I'm not a scientist, Cooperative Monitoring Program. There appears to be some 21 but I'm wondering with all -- you're talking about 21 changes in sites, and in addition of extensive pesticide 22 22 poultry manure, I'm talking about cows, dairy cows monitoring, four times in the second year, as well as 23 23 manure, which don't exist except for maybe one or two metals, monitoring four times in second year. 24 24 moonglows is the only one -- and shocks, dairy, is the We've done, with exception of metals, we've 25 25 only two active ones that I believe in the Salinas Valley done those type of sampling in the past for the Page 517 Page 515 from different times. How long does that take, those 1 Cooperative Monitoring Program. However, we continue to 2 2 nitrates to travel through the ground to get to have a problem with our inability to conduct method and 3 groundwater? And one of the things I'm grappling with is 3 physical habitat assessment because it requires why do we hold hostage all these farmers today for the trespassing on Ag properties. The current protocol used 5 5 issue of collective nitrate for the last 150 years? requires measuring the habitat for 100 meters to 250 6 MR. ROBERTS: That's a point well taken. I 6 meters upstream from the cooperative monitoring site. We 7 7 totally agree with you. That's -- this is the do not have access to those properties. Our legal 8 fundamental reason why you have to tie hydrology, 8 counsel advised us that trespassing is a strict liability 9 9 agronomy and scientific basis to encounter all the data and we can no longer ask our contractors to conduct that 10 10 before you can make an assumption that one individual type of monitoring. 11 11 person, thing, activity. It could be as simply as However, it seems that because of the 12 12 dinosaurs, it can be as simply as cows, 50 years ago, it protracted length of time the adoption of this waiver 13 could be things that we don't have a clue. 13 will take it may be appropriate to adopt a surface water

And you're exactly right, the capacity of the soil, it's cow, it's exchange capacity, it's electric conductivity, it's organic matter. And there's a lot of areas that if you bring in agronomy into play, that will hold materials into place.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

What I'm saying is you can make improvements but you can't go back and change it unless -- the only way you're going to make improvements is to do cause and effect and determine what specific item you need to work on at a time. It has to be parallel hypothesis to prove or disprove to do cause and effect before you can make any kind of regulatory suggestion that would economically

Page 516

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

protracted length of time the adoption of this waiver will take it may be appropriate to adopt a surface water quality cooperative monitoring program now so that we can have assurances going out into the future what the costs will be so that we can determine what the assessments to farmers will be for next year.

In order to do that we have to meet with farmers this summer. We can not meet with farmers unless we know what the program will be next year. The MRP, unlike the Order itself, is -- it can be changed by your Executive Officer. And we believe that it is time to start the discussions of what the MRP for the Cooperative Monitoring Program for surface water quality will be for next year so that there can be a continuity between this Page 518

1	year and next year given the fact of due to a lack of	1	According to your web site fines issued by
2	quorum you have an inability to adopt a waiver at this	2	your Board at the administrative level are huge. What
3	point.	3	concerns me more is that there is ample credible
4	The second thing is there are some items in	4	testimony that the science on the proposed Order is at
5	the MRP that could be simplified. There's reasons to	5	best incomplete. If the Order is adopted as proposed,
6	support accuracy, but there's no reason to call for	6	farmers, operators, landowners, fractional interest
7	additional costs to achieve that accuracy.	7	owners and anyone else who might be subject to this Order
8	One of the examples, which will come out on	8	will likely be forced to spend inordinate amounts of
9	the presentation, is a change in the groundwater proposal	9	money on mitigation, fines, legal fees, and other
10	that they have from requiring a professional engineer or	10	associated costs.
11	a hydrologist to conduct the sampling at what will be	11	Can the regulation withstand the financial
12	over 3,000 wells to someone who is a trained person.	12	strain imposed on them or will loss of land, equipment
13	Indeed, this is the procedure that's used for food safety	13	income and other assets simply become a path to
14	now where you just have to have someone adequately	14	insolvency. And if that becomes the case, in 2, 3, maybe
15	certified and trained to conduct the sample and not	15	5 years down the road, it becomes evident that the Order
16	require someone at an additional cost to come do the	16	is based on inadequate, incomplete, defective, and/or
17	sampling.	17	otherwise flawed science. What happens to those who have
18	Thank you.	18	faltered under an unjust and unfounded regulatory yoke,
19	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.	19	and who will make them whole?
20	Stuart Styles.	20	Thank you.
21	Stuart Styles. Okay	21	MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.
22	(No response.)	22	Now, your other half, Howard Whitney.
23	MR. YOUNG: Michael Taloff, T-A-L-O-F-F.	23	MR. WHITNEY: Chairman, Board Members, thank you.
24	(No response.)	24	My name is Howard Whitney, W-H-I-T-N-E-Y. I'm a
25		25	professional geologist, certified hydrogeologist, and I
	Page 519		Page 521
1	Wilton Webster.	1	have over 25 years of experience.
2		2	I worked on numerous agricultural
2	(No response.)	2	I worked on numerous agricultural contamination assessments, conducted field
2 3 4	(No response.) MR. YOUNG: C.Z. Whitney.	2 3 4	I worked on numerous agricultural contamination assessments, conducted field investigations, and numerical modeling of chemical based
2 3 4 5	(No response.) MR. YOUNG: C.Z. Whitney. MR. WHITNEY: I'm Howard Whitney.	2 3 4 5	I worked on numerous agricultural contamination assessments, conducted field investigations, and numerical modeling of chemical based transport.
2 3 4 5 6	(No response.) MR. YOUNG: C.Z. Whitney. MR. WHITNEY: I'm Howard Whitney. MR. YOUNG: There are two Whitneys.	2 3 4 5 6	I worked on numerous agricultural contamination assessments, conducted field investigations, and numerical modeling of chemical based transport. I've also personally witnessed the
2 3 4 5 6 7	(No response.) MR. YOUNG: C.Z. Whitney. MR. WHITNEY: I'm Howard Whitney. MR. YOUNG: There are two Whitneys. MR. WHITNEY: C.Z. Whitney. C.Z. W-H-I-T-N-E-Y.	2 3 4 5 6 7	I worked on numerous agricultural contamination assessments, conducted field investigations, and numerical modeling of chemical based transport. I've also personally witnessed the devastating effects of the blue baby syndrome at an Ag
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	(No response.) MR. YOUNG: C.Z. Whitney. MR. WHITNEY: I'm Howard Whitney. MR. YOUNG: There are two Whitneys. MR. WHITNEY: C.Z. Whitney. C.Z. W-H-I-T-N-E-Y. Chairman Young, Board Members, about eight years	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I worked on numerous agricultural contamination assessments, conducted field investigations, and numerical modeling of chemical based transport. I've also personally witnessed the devastating effects of the blue baby syndrome at an Ag site that I sampled when I was a young guy. And it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(No response.) MR. YOUNG: C.Z. Whitney. MR. WHITNEY: I'm Howard Whitney. MR. YOUNG: There are two Whitneys. MR. WHITNEY: C.Z. Whitney. C.Z. W-H-I-T-N-E-Y. Chairman Young, Board Members, about eight years ago under pressure from environmental and political	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I worked on numerous agricultural contamination assessments, conducted field investigations, and numerical modeling of chemical based transport. I've also personally witnessed the devastating effects of the blue baby syndrome at an Ag site that I sampled when I was a young guy. And it sticks with me to this day.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(No response.) MR. YOUNG: C.Z. Whitney. MR. WHITNEY: I'm Howard Whitney. MR. YOUNG: There are two Whitneys. MR. WHITNEY: C.Z. Whitney. C.Z. W-H-I-T-N-E-Y. Chairman Young, Board Members, about eight years ago under pressure from environmental and political activists Central Coast Water Board undertook an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I worked on numerous agricultural contamination assessments, conducted field investigations, and numerical modeling of chemical based transport. I've also personally witnessed the devastating effects of the blue baby syndrome at an Ag site that I sampled when I was a young guy. And it sticks with me to this day. I fully support the staff recommendations for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	(No response.) MR. YOUNG: C.Z. Whitney. MR. WHITNEY: I'm Howard Whitney. MR. YOUNG: There are two Whitneys. MR. WHITNEY: C.Z. Whitney. C.Z. W-H-I-T-N-E-Y. Chairman Young, Board Members, about eight years ago under pressure from environmental and political activists Central Coast Water Board undertook an enforcement action against two north San Luis Obispo	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I worked on numerous agricultural contamination assessments, conducted field investigations, and numerical modeling of chemical based transport. I've also personally witnessed the devastating effects of the blue baby syndrome at an Ag site that I sampled when I was a young guy. And it sticks with me to this day. I fully support the staff recommendations for the water quality monitoring. I applaud the wisdom,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	(No response.) MR. YOUNG: C.Z. Whitney. MR. WHITNEY: I'm Howard Whitney. MR. YOUNG: There are two Whitneys. MR. WHITNEY: C.Z. Whitney. C.Z. W-H-I-T-N-E-Y. Chairman Young, Board Members, about eight years ago under pressure from environmental and political activists Central Coast Water Board undertook an	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I worked on numerous agricultural contamination assessments, conducted field investigations, and numerical modeling of chemical based transport. I've also personally witnessed the devastating effects of the blue baby syndrome at an Ag site that I sampled when I was a young guy. And it sticks with me to this day. I fully support the staff recommendations for the water quality monitoring. I applaud the wisdom, courage and professionalism of the Board, staff to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	(No response.) MR. YOUNG: C.Z. Whitney. MR. WHITNEY: I'm Howard Whitney. MR. YOUNG: There are two Whitneys. MR. WHITNEY: C.Z. Whitney. C.Z. W-H-I-T-N-E-Y. Chairman Young, Board Members, about eight years ago under pressure from environmental and political activists Central Coast Water Board undertook an enforcement action against two north San Luis Obispo County landowners who cleared some brush from the property. Yes, there was some saltation due to an above	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I worked on numerous agricultural contamination assessments, conducted field investigations, and numerical modeling of chemical based transport. I've also personally witnessed the devastating effects of the blue baby syndrome at an Ag site that I sampled when I was a young guy. And it sticks with me to this day. I fully support the staff recommendations for the water quality monitoring. I applaud the wisdom, courage and professionalism of the Board, staff to develop these ground breaking and critically necessary
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	(No response.) MR. YOUNG: C.Z. Whitney. MR. WHITNEY: I'm Howard Whitney. MR. YOUNG: There are two Whitneys. MR. WHITNEY: C.Z. Whitney. C.Z. W-H-I-T-N-E-Y. Chairman Young, Board Members, about eight years ago under pressure from environmental and political activists Central Coast Water Board undertook an enforcement action against two north San Luis Obispo County landowners who cleared some brush from the property. Yes, there was some saltation due to an above average rainy season which followed several months later.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I worked on numerous agricultural contamination assessments, conducted field investigations, and numerical modeling of chemical based transport. I've also personally witnessed the devastating effects of the blue baby syndrome at an Ag site that I sampled when I was a young guy. And it sticks with me to this day. I fully support the staff recommendations for the water quality monitoring. I applaud the wisdom, courage and professionalism of the Board, staff to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	(No response.) MR. YOUNG: C.Z. Whitney. MR. WHITNEY: I'm Howard Whitney. MR. YOUNG: There are two Whitneys. MR. WHITNEY: C.Z. Whitney. C.Z. W-H-I-T-N-E-Y. Chairman Young, Board Members, about eight years ago under pressure from environmental and political activists Central Coast Water Board undertook an enforcement action against two north San Luis Obispo County landowners who cleared some brush from the property. Yes, there was some saltation due to an above	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I worked on numerous agricultural contamination assessments, conducted field investigations, and numerical modeling of chemical based transport. I've also personally witnessed the devastating effects of the blue baby syndrome at an Ag site that I sampled when I was a young guy. And it sticks with me to this day. I fully support the staff recommendations for the water quality monitoring. I applaud the wisdom, courage and professionalism of the Board, staff to develop these ground breaking and critically necessary
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	(No response.) MR. YOUNG: C.Z. Whitney. MR. WHITNEY: I'm Howard Whitney. MR. YOUNG: There are two Whitneys. MR. WHITNEY: C.Z. Whitney. C.Z. W-H-I-T-N-E-Y. Chairman Young, Board Members, about eight years ago under pressure from environmental and political activists Central Coast Water Board undertook an enforcement action against two north San Luis Obispo County landowners who cleared some brush from the property. Yes, there was some saltation due to an above average rainy season which followed several months later.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I worked on numerous agricultural contamination assessments, conducted field investigations, and numerical modeling of chemical based transport. I've also personally witnessed the devastating effects of the blue baby syndrome at an Ag site that I sampled when I was a young guy. And it sticks with me to this day. I fully support the staff recommendations for the water quality monitoring. I applaud the wisdom, courage and professionalism of the Board, staff to develop these ground breaking and critically necessary water quality rules. The Draft Waiver is the most professional technical regulatory document that I've ever seen and I've seen a lot. And there's a lot of wiggle
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	(No response.) MR. YOUNG: C.Z. Whitney. MR. WHITNEY: I'm Howard Whitney. MR. YOUNG: There are two Whitneys. MR. WHITNEY: C.Z. Whitney. C.Z. W-H-I-T-N-E-Y. Chairman Young, Board Members, about eight years ago under pressure from environmental and political activists Central Coast Water Board undertook an enforcement action against two north San Luis Obispo County landowners who cleared some brush from the property. Yes, there was some saltation due to an above average rainy season which followed several months later. However, most of the saltation was more likely due to a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I worked on numerous agricultural contamination assessments, conducted field investigations, and numerical modeling of chemical based transport. I've also personally witnessed the devastating effects of the blue baby syndrome at an Ag site that I sampled when I was a young guy. And it sticks with me to this day. I fully support the staff recommendations for the water quality monitoring. I applaud the wisdom, courage and professionalism of the Board, staff to develop these ground breaking and critically necessary water quality rules. The Draft Waiver is the most professional technical regulatory document that I've ever
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	(No response.) MR. YOUNG: C.Z. Whitney. MR. WHITNEY: I'm Howard Whitney. MR. YOUNG: There are two Whitneys. MR. WHITNEY: C.Z. Whitney. C.Z. W-H-I-T-N-E-Y. Chairman Young, Board Members, about eight years ago under pressure from environmental and political activists Central Coast Water Board undertook an enforcement action against two north San Luis Obispo County landowners who cleared some brush from the property. Yes, there was some saltation due to an above average rainy season which followed several months later. However, most of the saltation was more likely due to a large wild land fire that occurred in the same area just	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I worked on numerous agricultural contamination assessments, conducted field investigations, and numerical modeling of chemical based transport. I've also personally witnessed the devastating effects of the blue baby syndrome at an Ag site that I sampled when I was a young guy. And it sticks with me to this day. I fully support the staff recommendations for the water quality monitoring. I applaud the wisdom, courage and professionalism of the Board, staff to develop these ground breaking and critically necessary water quality rules. The Draft Waiver is the most professional technical regulatory document that I've ever seen and I've seen a lot. And there's a lot of wiggle
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	(No response.) MR. YOUNG: C.Z. Whitney. MR. WHITNEY: I'm Howard Whitney. MR. YOUNG: There are two Whitneys. MR. WHITNEY: C.Z. Whitney. C.Z. W-H-I-T-N-E-Y. Chairman Young, Board Members, about eight years ago under pressure from environmental and political activists Central Coast Water Board undertook an enforcement action against two north San Luis Obispo County landowners who cleared some brush from the property. Yes, there was some saltation due to an above average rainy season which followed several months later. However, most of the saltation was more likely due to a large wild land fire that occurred in the same area just a month or so after the brush was removed.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I worked on numerous agricultural contamination assessments, conducted field investigations, and numerical modeling of chemical based transport. I've also personally witnessed the devastating effects of the blue baby syndrome at an Ag site that I sampled when I was a young guy. And it sticks with me to this day. I fully support the staff recommendations for the water quality monitoring. I applaud the wisdom, courage and professionalism of the Board, staff to develop these ground breaking and critically necessary water quality rules. The Draft Waiver is the most professional technical regulatory document that I've ever seen and I've seen a lot. And there's a lot of wiggle room in this document. There's some comparisons with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	(No response.) MR. YOUNG: C.Z. Whitney. MR. WHITNEY: I'm Howard Whitney. MR. YOUNG: There are two Whitneys. MR. WHITNEY: C.Z. Whitney. C.Z. W-H-I-T-N-E-Y. Chairman Young, Board Members, about eight years ago under pressure from environmental and political activists Central Coast Water Board undertook an enforcement action against two north San Luis Obispo County landowners who cleared some brush from the property. Yes, there was some saltation due to an above average rainy season which followed several months later. However, most of the saltation was more likely due to a large wild land fire that occurred in the same area just a month or so after the brush was removed. To the ensuing administrative adjudication	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I worked on numerous agricultural contamination assessments, conducted field investigations, and numerical modeling of chemical based transport. I've also personally witnessed the devastating effects of the blue baby syndrome at an Ag site that I sampled when I was a young guy. And it sticks with me to this day. I fully support the staff recommendations for the water quality monitoring. I applaud the wisdom, courage and professionalism of the Board, staff to develop these ground breaking and critically necessary water quality rules. The Draft Waiver is the most professional technical regulatory document that I've ever seen and I've seen a lot. And there's a lot of wiggle room in this document. There's some comparisons with point source contamination, completely different.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	(No response.) MR. YOUNG: C.Z. Whitney. MR. WHITNEY: I'm Howard Whitneys. MR. WHITNEY: C.Z. Whitney. C.Z. W-H-I-T-N-E-Y. Chairman Young, Board Members, about eight years ago under pressure from environmental and political activists Central Coast Water Board undertook an enforcement action against two north San Luis Obispo County landowners who cleared some brush from the property. Yes, there was some saltation due to an above average rainy season which followed several months later. However, most of the saltation was more likely due to a large wild land fire that occurred in the same area just a month or so after the brush was removed. To the ensuing administrative adjudication process each landowner agreed to staff recommended	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	I worked on numerous agricultural contamination assessments, conducted field investigations, and numerical modeling of chemical based transport. I've also personally witnessed the devastating effects of the blue baby syndrome at an Ag site that I sampled when I was a young guy. And it sticks with me to this day. I fully support the staff recommendations for the water quality monitoring. I applaud the wisdom, courage and professionalism of the Board, staff to develop these ground breaking and critically necessary water quality rules. The Draft Waiver is the most professional technical regulatory document that I've ever seen and I've seen a lot. And there's a lot of wiggle room in this document. There's some comparisons with point source contamination, completely different. My clients would crawl over broken glass to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	(No response.) MR. YOUNG: C.Z. Whitney. MR. WHITNEY: I'm Howard Whitneys. MR. YOUNG: There are two Whitneys. MR. WHITNEY: C.Z. Whitney. C.Z. W-H-I-T-N-E-Y. Chairman Young, Board Members, about eight years ago under pressure from environmental and political activists Central Coast Water Board undertook an enforcement action against two north San Luis Obispo County landowners who cleared some brush from the property. Yes, there was some saltation due to an above average rainy season which followed several months later. However, most of the saltation was more likely due to a large wild land fire that occurred in the same area just a month or so after the brush was removed. To the ensuing administrative adjudication process each landowner agreed to staff recommended mitigation and a \$24,000 fine. Your Board, however,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I worked on numerous agricultural contamination assessments, conducted field investigations, and numerical modeling of chemical based transport. I've also personally witnessed the devastating effects of the blue baby syndrome at an Ag site that I sampled when I was a young guy. And it sticks with me to this day. I fully support the staff recommendations for the water quality monitoring. I applaud the wisdom, courage and professionalism of the Board, staff to develop these ground breaking and critically necessary water quality rules. The Draft Waiver is the most professional technical regulatory document that I've ever seen and I've seen a lot. And there's a lot of wiggle room in this document. There's some comparisons with point source contamination, completely different. My clients would crawl over broken glass to get this type of regulatory environment in their fields.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	(No response.) MR. YOUNG: C.Z. Whitney. MR. WHITNEY: I'm Howard Whitney. MR. YOUNG: There are two Whitneys. MR. WHITNEY: C.Z. Whitney. C.Z. W-H-I-T-N-E-Y. Chairman Young, Board Members, about eight years ago under pressure from environmental and political activists Central Coast Water Board undertook an enforcement action against two north San Luis Obispo County landowners who cleared some brush from the property. Yes, there was some saltation due to an above average rainy season which followed several months later. However, most of the saltation was more likely due to a large wild land fire that occurred in the same area just a month or so after the brush was removed. To the ensuing administrative adjudication process each landowner agreed to staff recommended mitigation and a \$24,000 fine. Your Board, however, pressed once again by activists, withdrew the agreement	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I worked on numerous agricultural contamination assessments, conducted field investigations, and numerical modeling of chemical based transport. I've also personally witnessed the devastating effects of the blue baby syndrome at an Ag site that I sampled when I was a young guy. And it sticks with me to this day. I fully support the staff recommendations for the water quality monitoring. I applaud the wisdom, courage and professionalism of the Board, staff to develop these ground breaking and critically necessary water quality rules. The Draft Waiver is the most professional technical regulatory document that I've ever seen and I've seen a lot. And there's a lot of wiggle room in this document. There's some comparisons with point source contamination, completely different. My clients would crawl over broken glass to get this type of regulatory environment in their fields. However, the current draft represents the minimum level
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	(No response.) MR. YOUNG: C.Z. Whitney. MR. WHITNEY: I'm Howard Whitney. MR. YOUNG: There are two Whitneys. MR. WHITNEY: C.Z. Whitney. C.Z. W-H-I-T-N-E-Y. Chairman Young, Board Members, about eight years ago under pressure from environmental and political activists Central Coast Water Board undertook an enforcement action against two north San Luis Obispo County landowners who cleared some brush from the property. Yes, there was some saltation due to an above average rainy season which followed several months later. However, most of the saltation was more likely due to a large wild land fire that occurred in the same area just a month or so after the brush was removed. To the ensuing administrative adjudication process each landowner agreed to staff recommended mitigation and a \$24,000 fine. Your Board, however, pressed once again by activists, withdrew the agreement and subsequently fined the landowners \$125,000 apiece.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I worked on numerous agricultural contamination assessments, conducted field investigations, and numerical modeling of chemical based transport. I've also personally witnessed the devastating effects of the blue baby syndrome at an Ag site that I sampled when I was a young guy. And it sticks with me to this day. I fully support the staff recommendations for the water quality monitoring. I applaud the wisdom, courage and professionalism of the Board, staff to develop these ground breaking and critically necessary water quality rules. The Draft Waiver is the most professional technical regulatory document that I've ever seen and I've seen a lot. And there's a lot of wiggle room in this document. There's some comparisons with point source contamination, completely different. My clients would crawl over broken glass to get this type of regulatory environment in their fields. However, the current draft represents the minimum level of monitoring to provide any meaningful water quality
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	(No response.) MR. YOUNG: C.Z. Whitney. MR. WHITNEY: I'm Howard Whitney. MR. YOUNG: There are two Whitneys. MR. WHITNEY: C.Z. Whitney. C.Z. W-H-I-T-N-E-Y. Chairman Young, Board Members, about eight years ago under pressure from environmental and political activists Central Coast Water Board undertook an enforcement action against two north San Luis Obispo County landowners who cleared some brush from the property. Yes, there was some saltation due to an above average rainy season which followed several months later. However, most of the saltation was more likely due to a large wild land fire that occurred in the same area just a month or so after the brush was removed. To the ensuing administrative adjudication process each landowner agreed to staff recommended mitigation and a \$24,000 fine. Your Board, however, pressed once again by activists, withdrew the agreement and subsequently fined the landowners \$125,000 apiece. What concerns me is the proportionality	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I worked on numerous agricultural contamination assessments, conducted field investigations, and numerical modeling of chemical based transport. I've also personally witnessed the devastating effects of the blue baby syndrome at an Ag site that I sampled when I was a young guy. And it sticks with me to this day. I fully support the staff recommendations for the water quality monitoring. I applaud the wisdom, courage and professionalism of the Board, staff to develop these ground breaking and critically necessary water quality rules. The Draft Waiver is the most professional technical regulatory document that I've ever seen and I've seen a lot. And there's a lot of wiggle room in this document. There's some comparisons with point source contamination, completely different. My clients would crawl over broken glass to get this type of regulatory environment in their fields. However, the current draft represents the minimum level of monitoring to provide any meaningful water quality improvements. So I implore the Board, don't water this

A504530

PANEL HEARING MAY 4, 2011 produces the greatest environmental impacts of water 1 what this really means to you as a farmer. 2 2 MR. COSTA: I could go up and pick up and grab the quality resulting in countless exposure pathways that 3 3 degrade human health and aquatic life. No other industry list of things included in Tier 3 that weren't on the 4 or pollution source is even on the same environmental 4 slides to start the meeting. There's about eight reports 5 5 radar screen. and monitoring plans and analysis that are components of 6 6 The Central Coast has some of the most the Nutrient Management Plan. You see the Irrigation 7 7 degraded water quality in the nation. And it's also not Management Plan up there, two extra things that Tier 3 8 8 surprising that our region has the most productive Ag has to do that Tier 2 doesn't. Okay. But when I say the 9 9 devil is in the details, it's in everything that's a part life. 10 10 of that plan. And it's extensive. Let's see. This is going to be very 11 expensive to clean up. I believe that in order for this 11 And as I said, it's exponential, it's not 12 to be successful we need a cleanup fund to do this. And 12 just twice, or three times of somebody else doing it, 13 13 I think that the farmers have been misled by their it's an enormously different work load and task load, and 14 14 consultants in this regard. This is a very serious monitoring and reporting load expected of Tier 3 that's 15 15 problem that requires a lot of very serious work and none not of the others. 16 of their consultants has the proper qualifications 16 And there is a scenario, and it wasn't hard 17 17 required under the Water Code to address water quality to figure out where a vegetable grower that wasn't using 18 investigation and cleanup. 18 Chlorpyrifos and Diazinon, and it wasn't adjacent to the 19 The professionals that they do have that have 19 impaired water bodies would fall all the way to adjacent 20 presented information that's been useful, but it doesn't 20 Tier 1, yet the acreage situation being a 1,000 acres 21 21 address the entire problem. would throw the other into Tier 3. That's why I 22 22 25 years ago when I parachuted over a commented how it could not even be adjacent tiers. But my comment about the exponentially of 23 superfund sites, we didn't know what was going on. There 23 24 24 was no science at that time. We invented it. There's a that load was in great part, most part related to the 25 whole industry of environmental professionals that are Irrigation Management Plan. I want to make sure that Page 523 currently working and wasting their time on underground 1 1 2 2 source tank work that results in almost no exposure 3 3 pathways, and they can get to work on this. But the 4 4 farmers need the funding. 5 5 And, Mr. Ritz, please, have your boss working little subpieces on every bit of that. 6 6 on getting a cleanup fund established to address this And, I mean, in my opinion, I probably looked 7 issue. This is critically important and the farmers need 7 8 the money to do it. They can't do it all on their own. 8 9 9 Thank you. 10 10 MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. 11 11 Joel Weilev. 12 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

UNANNOUNCED SPEAKER: He got detained at a 13 business conference up in Sacramento. 14 Taxpayer and voter USA. 15 MR. YOUNG: Salvador does not wish to testify. 16 Okay. 17 All right. That concludes the list of public 18 speakers. Now, do we go back to --19 MR. JEFFRIES: Before that, Mr. Chairman, I would 20 ask, if I can have Mr. Costa come back, if I may. 21 MR. YOUNG: Sure. 22 MR. JEFFRIES: He addressed, slightly, the Tier 3 23 issue and other people have spoken on this, but I think 24 Mr. Costa has spoken on that more extensively, and I'd like to hear what your real concerns are about Tier 3 and Page 524

everybody sitting behind the table understands all the details, not just the executive summary portion that, you know, Tier 3 is going to have to do, you know, some additional plan, extra work, because there's a lot of

at three or four additional people in my operation, and I fully expect to not be in compliance at some point because there's so much that's due, so much documentation, so much reporting, I feel like we're going to be reporting on the reporting by the time it's over. And I expect to miss a deadline, have my employees miss a deadline and be out of compliance somewhere.

And my concern would be that when I talk about being set up to fail, it's for reasons like that, and I would be concerned about the Board setting themselves up to have something that's not enforceable. What I am fearful of is not being able to comply. Then my next question is, okay, what are you going to do when that happens? Because I think we kind of need to know that. I think a lot of people would want to know that, up front. What is that plan? I mean, it's not a simply thing we're looking at. MR. JEFFRIES: Mr. Costa, can I ask you, I assume that you qualify in Tier 3 what you know is Tier 3.

36 (Pages 523 to 526)

Page 526

1	MR. COSTA: If you did it on a ranch-by-ranch	1	individual monitoring, I mean, it's part of a watershed
2	basis, we would have ranches that would fall into each of	2	group on one of these site creeks in the Salinas Valley,
3	the three tiers. If you look at the operation as a	3	and you can take the point, the monitoring point and
4	whole, then we would fall into Tier 3, if you looked at	4	figure out I thought pretty easily who all the players
5	the whole operation.	5	were that need to be sitting around the tailgate having a
6	MR. JEFFRIES: As a farm operation, if you looked	6	conversation about what we're showing up on the
7	at total acreage, you would qualify for Tier 3. If you	7	monitoring results. And that's what with did. And half
8	looked at individual ranches, then you would be in what	8	of that group is sitting in this room. And it wasn't
9	tier?	9	
10		10	hard to do. It was a cooperative everybody was
11	MR. COSTA: Ultimately, some would be in 2 and		sharing information. We're looking at the results, you
	some would be in one. It's going to depend on chemical	11	know. We've seen, you know, what the trends were and
12	use and crops grown. We have one ranch that's a	12	weren't, and we did do something productive about it from
13	vineyard.	13	the time we left that meeting on somebody's yard adjacent
14	MR. JEFFRIES: So you wouldn't be in Tier 3 at	14	to that creek. It was being monitored. And that's why
15	all?	15	there's such support for that kind of process.
16	MR. COSTA: No. We would have ranch we would	16	I mean, that made sense. Because, I mean, I
17	be in Tier 3.	17	get chills just thinking about it. I get wound up
18	MR. JEFFRIES: As well.	18	thinking about it, just about where this is going and how
19	MR. COSTA: Yeah.	19	much time we're going to spend on a sidetrack versus
20	MR. JEFFRIES: So you have 1, 2 and 3.	20	being out on the ground trying to adjust the problem and
21	MR. COSTA: Yes.	21	being in the middle of it and making management decisions
22	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. Thank you.	22	with the best information we can gain. And the
23	MR. YOUNG: Mr. Costa, before you leave. I was	23	information that, you know, that we get now is a lot
24	reading through the Irrigation and Nutrient Plan	24	different than the information my dad got 30 years ago.
25	Management Plan monitoring requirements during the lunch	25	I'd rather be out on the ground than in an office
	Page 527		Page 529
1	hour. I have a much better feel for the details that	1	managing the staff filling out a bunch of forms.
2	you're speaking of. And they're in there. And is there		
		2	Thank you.
3	anything, specifically, that you think is unduly	3	MR. JEFFRIES: Can I make another comment before
3 4	anything, specifically, that you think is unduly burdensome to have to contend with or is just the breath	3 4	MR. JEFFRIES: Can I make another comment before we go?
3 4 5	anything, specifically, that you think is unduly burdensome to have to contend with or is just the breath of all those components put together that does it?	3 4 5	MR. JEFFRIES: Can I make another comment before we go? MR. YOUNG: Yes.
3 4	anything, specifically, that you think is unduly burdensome to have to contend with or is just the breath	3 4	MR. JEFFRIES: Can I make another comment before we go?
3 4 5	anything, specifically, that you think is unduly burdensome to have to contend with or is just the breath of all those components put together that does it?	3 4 5	MR. JEFFRIES: Can I make another comment before we go? MR. YOUNG: Yes.
3 4 5 6	anything, specifically, that you think is unduly burdensome to have to contend with or is just the breath of all those components put together that does it? MR. COSTA: It's the breath of all the components,	3 4 5 6	MR. JEFFRIES: Can I make another comment before we go? MR. YOUNG: Yes. MR. JEFFRIES: It just brought to a point in
3 4 5 6 7	anything, specifically, that you think is unduly burdensome to have to contend with or is just the breath of all those components put together that does it? MR. COSTA: It's the breath of all the components, but even when you sit and think about discharge	3 4 5 6 7	MR. JEFFRIES: Can I make another comment before we go? MR. YOUNG: Yes. MR. JEFFRIES: It just brought to a point in Watsonville and today there was mention of San Huerado
3 4 5 6 7 8	anything, specifically, that you think is unduly burdensome to have to contend with or is just the breath of all those components put together that does it? MR. COSTA: It's the breath of all the components, but even when you sit and think about discharge monitoring, surface water discharge monitoring, when that	3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. JEFFRIES: Can I make another comment before we go? MR. YOUNG: Yes. MR. JEFFRIES: It just brought to a point in Watsonville and today there was mention of San Huerado area, and there's been a lot of conversation about water
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	anything, specifically, that you think is unduly burdensome to have to contend with or is just the breath of all those components put together that does it? MR. COSTA: It's the breath of all the components, but even when you sit and think about discharge monitoring, surface water discharge monitoring, when that comes to an individual basis, I've tried to talk every	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. JEFFRIES: Can I make another comment before we go? MR. YOUNG: Yes. MR. JEFFRIES: It just brought to a point in Watsonville and today there was mention of San Huerado area, and there's been a lot of conversation about water contamination. Yes, they've had water contamination, but
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	anything, specifically, that you think is unduly burdensome to have to contend with or is just the breath of all those components put together that does it? MR. COSTA: It's the breath of all the components, but even when you sit and think about discharge monitoring, surface water discharge monitoring, when that comes to an individual basis, I've tried to talk every time about how complicated it gets and how fast it gets	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. JEFFRIES: Can I make another comment before we go? MR. YOUNG: Yes. MR. JEFFRIES: It just brought to a point in Watsonville and today there was mention of San Huerado area, and there's been a lot of conversation about water contamination. Yes, they've had water contamination, but that particular place, if you've been around Salinas
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	anything, specifically, that you think is unduly burdensome to have to contend with or is just the breath of all those components put together that does it? MR. COSTA: It's the breath of all the components, but even when you sit and think about discharge monitoring, surface water discharge monitoring, when that comes to an individual basis, I've tried to talk every time about how complicated it gets and how fast it gets complicated, because the definitions still talk about	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. JEFFRIES: Can I make another comment before we go? MR. YOUNG: Yes. MR. JEFFRIES: It just brought to a point in Watsonville and today there was mention of San Huerado area, and there's been a lot of conversation about water contamination. Yes, they've had water contamination, but that particular place, if you've been around Salinas Valley, that has had water problems from day one when it
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	anything, specifically, that you think is unduly burdensome to have to contend with or is just the breath of all those components put together that does it? MR. COSTA: It's the breath of all the components, but even when you sit and think about discharge monitoring, surface water discharge monitoring, when that comes to an individual basis, I've tried to talk every time about how complicated it gets and how fast it gets complicated, because the definitions still talk about run-off as water that leaves the field versus water that	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. JEFFRIES: Can I make another comment before we go? MR. YOUNG: Yes. MR. JEFFRIES: It just brought to a point in Watsonville and today there was mention of San Huerado area, and there's been a lot of conversation about water contamination. Yes, they've had water contamination, but that particular place, if you've been around Salinas Valley, that has had water problems from day one when it was built back in the 1940s when the military occupied
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	anything, specifically, that you think is unduly burdensome to have to contend with or is just the breath of all those components put together that does it? MR. COSTA: It's the breath of all the components, but even when you sit and think about discharge monitoring, surface water discharge monitoring, when that comes to an individual basis, I've tried to talk every time about how complicated it gets and how fast it gets complicated, because the definitions still talk about run-off as water that leaves the field versus water that leaves the ranch. So that already starts to complicate	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. JEFFRIES: Can I make another comment before we go? MR. YOUNG: Yes. MR. JEFFRIES: It just brought to a point in Watsonville and today there was mention of San Huerado area, and there's been a lot of conversation about water contamination. Yes, they've had water contamination, but that particular place, if you've been around Salinas Valley, that has had water problems from day one when it was built back in the 1940s when the military occupied that. It had inadequate septic systems and consequently
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	anything, specifically, that you think is unduly burdensome to have to contend with or is just the breath of all those components put together that does it? MR. COSTA: It's the breath of all the components, but even when you sit and think about discharge monitoring, surface water discharge monitoring, when that comes to an individual basis, I've tried to talk every time about how complicated it gets and how fast it gets complicated, because the definitions still talk about run-off as water that leaves the field versus water that leaves the ranch. So that already starts to complicate everything because, you know, we work on systems where we	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. JEFFRIES: Can I make another comment before we go? MR. YOUNG: Yes. MR. JEFFRIES: It just brought to a point in Watsonville and today there was mention of San Huerado area, and there's been a lot of conversation about water contamination. Yes, they've had water contamination, but that particular place, if you've been around Salinas Valley, that has had water problems from day one when it was built back in the 1940s when the military occupied that. It had inadequate septic systems and consequently over the years it has expanded its problems. And I don't
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	anything, specifically, that you think is unduly burdensome to have to contend with or is just the breath of all those components put together that does it? MR. COSTA: It's the breath of all the components, but even when you sit and think about discharge monitoring, surface water discharge monitoring, when that comes to an individual basis, I've tried to talk every time about how complicated it gets and how fast it gets complicated, because the definitions still talk about run-off as water that leaves the field versus water that leaves the ranch. So that already starts to complicate everything because, you know, we work on systems where we are trying to consolidate water to some point on the ranch in order to be able to deal with it, or treat it,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. JEFFRIES: Can I make another comment before we go? MR. YOUNG: Yes. MR. JEFFRIES: It just brought to a point in Watsonville and today there was mention of San Huerado area, and there's been a lot of conversation about water contamination. Yes, they've had water contamination, but that particular place, if you've been around Salinas Valley, that has had water problems from day one when it was built back in the 1940s when the military occupied that. It had inadequate septic systems and consequently over the years it has expanded its problems. And I don't want people to think that all the issues are attributed to Ag and use of nitrates which has been kind of implied
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	anything, specifically, that you think is unduly burdensome to have to contend with or is just the breath of all those components put together that does it? MR. COSTA: It's the breath of all the components, but even when you sit and think about discharge monitoring, surface water discharge monitoring, when that comes to an individual basis, I've tried to talk every time about how complicated it gets and how fast it gets complicated, because the definitions still talk about run-off as water that leaves the field versus water that leaves the ranch. So that already starts to complicate everything because, you know, we work on systems where we are trying to consolidate water to some point on the ranch in order to be able to deal with it, or treat it, or put it back on the ranch. And so, that definition has	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. JEFFRIES: Can I make another comment before we go? MR. YOUNG: Yes. MR. JEFFRIES: It just brought to a point in Watsonville and today there was mention of San Huerado area, and there's been a lot of conversation about water contamination. Yes, they've had water contamination, but that particular place, if you've been around Salinas Valley, that has had water problems from day one when it was built back in the 1940s when the military occupied that. It had inadequate septic systems and consequently over the years it has expanded its problems. And I don't want people to think that all the issues are attributed to Ag and use of nitrates which has been kind of implied by individual speakers.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	anything, specifically, that you think is unduly burdensome to have to contend with or is just the breath of all those components put together that does it? MR. COSTA: It's the breath of all the components, but even when you sit and think about discharge monitoring, surface water discharge monitoring, when that comes to an individual basis, I've tried to talk every time about how complicated it gets and how fast it gets complicated, because the definitions still talk about run-off as water that leaves the field versus water that leaves the ranch. So that already starts to complicate everything because, you know, we work on systems where we are trying to consolidate water to some point on the ranch in order to be able to deal with it, or treat it, or put it back on the ranch. And so, that definition has never changed. And even if we don't have a drop of water	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. JEFFRIES: Can I make another comment before we go? MR. YOUNG: Yes. MR. JEFFRIES: It just brought to a point in Watsonville and today there was mention of San Huerado area, and there's been a lot of conversation about water contamination. Yes, they've had water contamination, but that particular place, if you've been around Salinas Valley, that has had water problems from day one when it was built back in the 1940s when the military occupied that. It had inadequate septic systems and consequently over the years it has expanded its problems. And I don't want people to think that all the issues are attributed to Ag and use of nitrates which has been kind of implied by individual speakers. So, yes, there is problems there. Yes, there
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	anything, specifically, that you think is unduly burdensome to have to contend with or is just the breath of all those components put together that does it? MR. COSTA: It's the breath of all the components, but even when you sit and think about discharge monitoring, surface water discharge monitoring, when that comes to an individual basis, I've tried to talk every time about how complicated it gets and how fast it gets complicated, because the definitions still talk about run-off as water that leaves the field versus water that leaves the ranch. So that already starts to complicate everything because, you know, we work on systems where we are trying to consolidate water to some point on the ranch in order to be able to deal with it, or treat it, or put it back on the ranch. And so, that definition has never changed. And even if we don't have a drop of water leaving our final collection point and accessing a stream	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. JEFFRIES: Can I make another comment before we go? MR. YOUNG: Yes. MR. JEFFRIES: It just brought to a point in Watsonville and today there was mention of San Huerado area, and there's been a lot of conversation about water contamination. Yes, they've had water contamination, but that particular place, if you've been around Salinas Valley, that has had water problems from day one when it was built back in the 1940s when the military occupied that. It had inadequate septic systems and consequently over the years it has expanded its problems. And I don't want people to think that all the issues are attributed to Ag and use of nitrates which has been kind of implied by individual speakers. So, yes, there is problems there. Yes, there has been new programs, new water developed for that
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	anything, specifically, that you think is unduly burdensome to have to contend with or is just the breath of all those components put together that does it? MR. COSTA: It's the breath of all the components, but even when you sit and think about discharge monitoring, surface water discharge monitoring, when that comes to an individual basis, I've tried to talk every time about how complicated it gets and how fast it gets complicated, because the definitions still talk about run-off as water that leaves the field versus water that leaves the ranch. So that already starts to complicate everything because, you know, we work on systems where we are trying to consolidate water to some point on the ranch in order to be able to deal with it, or treat it, or put it back on the ranch. And so, that definition has never changed. And even if we don't have a drop of water leaving our final collection point and accessing a stream which will determine to have, you know, irrigation	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. JEFFRIES: Can I make another comment before we go? MR. YOUNG: Yes. MR. JEFFRIES: It just brought to a point in Watsonville and today there was mention of San Huerado area, and there's been a lot of conversation about water contamination. Yes, they've had water contamination, but that particular place, if you've been around Salinas Valley, that has had water problems from day one when it was built back in the 1940s when the military occupied that. It had inadequate septic systems and consequently over the years it has expanded its problems. And I don't want people to think that all the issues are attributed to Ag and use of nitrates which has been kind of implied by individual speakers. So, yes, there is problems there. Yes, there has been new programs, new water developed for that particular area, but it goes for a long period of time.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	anything, specifically, that you think is unduly burdensome to have to contend with or is just the breath of all those components put together that does it? MR. COSTA: It's the breath of all the components, but even when you sit and think about discharge monitoring, surface water discharge monitoring, when that comes to an individual basis, I've tried to talk every time about how complicated it gets and how fast it gets complicated, because the definitions still talk about run-off as water that leaves the field versus water that leaves the ranch. So that already starts to complicate everything because, you know, we work on systems where we are trying to consolidate water to some point on the ranch in order to be able to deal with it, or treat it, or put it back on the ranch. And so, that definition has never changed. And even if we don't have a drop of water leaving our final collection point and accessing a stream which will determine to have, you know, irrigation run-off, but yet that water is not leaving the ranch,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. JEFFRIES: Can I make another comment before we go? MR. YOUNG: Yes. MR. JEFFRIES: It just brought to a point in Watsonville and today there was mention of San Huerado area, and there's been a lot of conversation about water contamination. Yes, they've had water contamination, but that particular place, if you've been around Salinas Valley, that has had water problems from day one when it was built back in the 1940s when the military occupied that. It had inadequate septic systems and consequently over the years it has expanded its problems. And I don't want people to think that all the issues are attributed to Ag and use of nitrates which has been kind of implied by individual speakers. So, yes, there is problems there. Yes, there has been new programs, new water developed for that particular area, but it goes for a long period of time. A lot of different types of chemicals that have been used
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	anything, specifically, that you think is unduly burdensome to have to contend with or is just the breath of all those components put together that does it? MR. COSTA: It's the breath of all the components, but even when you sit and think about discharge monitoring, surface water discharge monitoring, when that comes to an individual basis, I've tried to talk every time about how complicated it gets and how fast it gets complicated, because the definitions still talk about run-off as water that leaves the field versus water that leaves the ranch. So that already starts to complicate everything because, you know, we work on systems where we are trying to consolidate water to some point on the ranch in order to be able to deal with it, or treat it, or put it back on the ranch. And so, that definition has never changed. And even if we don't have a drop of water leaving our final collection point and accessing a stream which will determine to have, you know, irrigation run-off, but yet that water is not leaving the ranch, it's leaving the field to get to some other point on the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. JEFFRIES: Can I make another comment before we go? MR. YOUNG: Yes. MR. JEFFRIES: It just brought to a point in Watsonville and today there was mention of San Huerado area, and there's been a lot of conversation about water contamination. Yes, they've had water contamination, but that particular place, if you've been around Salinas Valley, that has had water problems from day one when it was built back in the 1940s when the military occupied that. It had inadequate septic systems and consequently over the years it has expanded its problems. And I don't want people to think that all the issues are attributed to Ag and use of nitrates which has been kind of implied by individual speakers. So, yes, there is problems there. Yes, there has been new programs, new water developed for that particular area, but it goes for a long period of time. A lot of different types of chemicals that have been used from rubber being developed and scientific development
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	anything, specifically, that you think is unduly burdensome to have to contend with or is just the breath of all those components put together that does it? MR. COSTA: It's the breath of all the components, but even when you sit and think about discharge monitoring, surface water discharge monitoring, when that comes to an individual basis, I've tried to talk every time about how complicated it gets and how fast it gets complicated, because the definitions still talk about run-off as water that leaves the field versus water that leaves the ranch. So that already starts to complicate everything because, you know, we work on systems where we are trying to consolidate water to some point on the ranch in order to be able to deal with it, or treat it, or put it back on the ranch. And so, that definition has never changed. And even if we don't have a drop of water leaving our final collection point and accessing a stream which will determine to have, you know, irrigation run-off, but yet that water is not leaving the ranch, it's leaving the field to get to some other point on the ranch where we're dealing with it at that point. I mean	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. JEFFRIES: Can I make another comment before we go? MR. YOUNG: Yes. MR. JEFFRIES: It just brought to a point in Watsonville and today there was mention of San Huerado area, and there's been a lot of conversation about water contamination. Yes, they've had water contamination, but that particular place, if you've been around Salinas Valley, that has had water problems from day one when it was built back in the 1940s when the military occupied that. It had inadequate septic systems and consequently over the years it has expanded its problems. And I don't want people to think that all the issues are attributed to Ag and use of nitrates which has been kind of implied by individual speakers. So, yes, there is problems there. Yes, there has been new programs, new water developed for that particular area, but it goes for a long period of time. A lot of different types of chemicals that have been used from rubber being developed and scientific development from military use of discharge of hydrocarbons directly
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	anything, specifically, that you think is unduly burdensome to have to contend with or is just the breath of all those components put together that does it? MR. COSTA: It's the breath of all the components, but even when you sit and think about discharge monitoring, surface water discharge monitoring, when that comes to an individual basis, I've tried to talk every time about how complicated it gets and how fast it gets complicated, because the definitions still talk about run-off as water that leaves the field versus water that leaves the ranch. So that already starts to complicate everything because, you know, we work on systems where we are trying to consolidate water to some point on the ranch in order to be able to deal with it, or treat it, or put it back on the ranch. And so, that definition has never changed. And even if we don't have a drop of water leaving our final collection point and accessing a stream which will determine to have, you know, irrigation run-off, but yet that water is not leaving the ranch, it's leaving the field to get to some other point on the ranch where we're dealing with it at that point. I mean that is one of the problems.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. JEFFRIES: Can I make another comment before we go? MR. YOUNG: Yes. MR. JEFFRIES: It just brought to a point in Watsonville and today there was mention of San Huerado area, and there's been a lot of conversation about water contamination. Yes, they've had water contamination, but that particular place, if you've been around Salinas Valley, that has had water problems from day one when it was built back in the 1940s when the military occupied that. It had inadequate septic systems and consequently over the years it has expanded its problems. And I don't want people to think that all the issues are attributed to Ag and use of nitrates which has been kind of implied by individual speakers. So, yes, there is problems there. Yes, there has been new programs, new water developed for that particular area, but it goes for a long period of time. A lot of different types of chemicals that have been used from rubber being developed and scientific development from military use of discharge of hydrocarbons directly underground and a whole gamut of things. So I don't want
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	anything, specifically, that you think is unduly burdensome to have to contend with or is just the breath of all those components put together that does it? MR. COSTA: It's the breath of all the components, but even when you sit and think about discharge monitoring, surface water discharge monitoring, when that comes to an individual basis, I've tried to talk every time about how complicated it gets and how fast it gets complicated, because the definitions still talk about run-off as water that leaves the field versus water that leaves the ranch. So that already starts to complicate everything because, you know, we work on systems where we are trying to consolidate water to some point on the ranch in order to be able to deal with it, or treat it, or put it back on the ranch. And so, that definition has never changed. And even if we don't have a drop of water leaving our final collection point and accessing a stream which will determine to have, you know, irrigation run-off, but yet that water is not leaving the ranch, it's leaving the field to get to some other point on the ranch where we're dealing with it at that point. I mean	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. JEFFRIES: Can I make another comment before we go? MR. YOUNG: Yes. MR. JEFFRIES: It just brought to a point in Watsonville and today there was mention of San Huerado area, and there's been a lot of conversation about water contamination. Yes, they've had water contamination, but that particular place, if you've been around Salinas Valley, that has had water problems from day one when it was built back in the 1940s when the military occupied that. It had inadequate septic systems and consequently over the years it has expanded its problems. And I don't want people to think that all the issues are attributed to Ag and use of nitrates which has been kind of implied by individual speakers. So, yes, there is problems there. Yes, there has been new programs, new water developed for that particular area, but it goes for a long period of time. A lot of different types of chemicals that have been used from rubber being developed and scientific development from military use of discharge of hydrocarbons directly

		l	
1	had good water because they have not had good water, but	1	third party coalition group would need to establish a
2	it stems for a lot of years and a lot of uses and not	2	technical advisory committee in order to help them
3	proper uses of that particular land.	3	establish what is the appropriate audit process. That
4	So I just wanted to clarify that.	4	technical advisory committee would consist of people like
5	MR. YOUNG: Ms. Dunham.	5	Professor Marc Los Huertos, who testified here earlier
6	MS. DUNHAM: We have a couple of comments.	6	today. The technical experts who have some in depth
7	MR. YOUNG: Okay.	7	knowledge about agriculture, agronomy and the disciplines
8	MS. DUNHAM: I think there's three of us.	8	that we deal with on a daily basis. And there would
9	MR. YOUNG: Remember to say your names before you	9	normally be grower representation on the technical
10	speak. Okay. Go ahead.	10	advisory committee and their specialities would be
11	MR. MERKLEY: Thank you again, for this whoa,	11	limited and could not be more than 50 percent of their
12	is that loud?	12	committee because it needs to be objective and it needs
13	MR. YOUNG: That's fine.	13	to be technically based.
14	MR. MERKLEY: It's echoing through my mustache.	14	We would also then suggest that there needed
15		15	to be another component that would make sure that as the
16	(Interruption by the court reporter.)	16	auditors conduct their work that there's a way to review
17		17	the audits as done by the auditors. And so the work plan
18	MR. MERKLEY: Danny Merkley, M-E-R-K-L-E-Y.	18	as developed by the third party coalition group would
19	We listened carefully to the March 17th	19	have to have some type of a check balance on that audit
20	meeting. We heard comments made about the groundwater of	20	review process.
21	our proposal, and we have developed language to address	21	Third, we think it is important that a third
22	those comments.	22	party coalition alternative have some input from the
23	Tess Dunham and Rick Tomlinson will present	23	public. And in order to address that we would require
24	that additional information. I'm the window dressing.	24	all the third party coalition groups that would go into
25	MS. DUNHAM: Thank you. You did a fine job.	25	the alternative would need to establish a public advisory
	Page 531		Page 533
	\mathcal{E}		
1	So, again, as Danny said	1	committee so they have that interaction with the public
1 2	So, again, as Danny said MR. YOUNG: Can you spell your name.	1 2	
			committee so they have that interaction with the public
2	MR. YOUNG: Can you spell your name.	2	committee so they have that interaction with the public to talk with the local department of health or the county
2	MR. YOUNG: Can you spell your name. MS. DUNHAM: Yes. I'm sorry. Tess, T-E-S-S,	2	committee so they have that interaction with the public to talk with the local department of health or the county Ag commissioners, and the different other people in their
2 3 4	MR. YOUNG: Can you spell your name. MS. DUNHAM: Yes. I'm sorry. Tess, T-E-S-S, Dunham, D-U-N-H-A-M, Somach, Simmons & Dunn, here	2 3 4	committee so they have that interaction with the public to talk with the local department of health or the county Ag commissioners, and the different other people in their local area in order to help advise them, advise them
2 3 4 5	MR. YOUNG: Can you spell your name. MS. DUNHAM: Yes. I'm sorry. Tess, T-E-S-S, Dunham, D-U-N-H-A-M, Somach, Simmons & Dunn, here representing a number of agricultural groups and the	2 3 4 5	committee so they have that interaction with the public to talk with the local department of health or the county Ag commissioners, and the different other people in their local area in order to help advise them, advise them along the way.
2 3 4 5 6	MR. YOUNG: Can you spell your name. MS. DUNHAM: Yes. I'm sorry. Tess, T-E-S-S, Dunham, D-U-N-H-A-M, Somach, Simmons & Dunn, here representing a number of agricultural groups and the farmers for the water quality.	2 3 4 5 6	committee so they have that interaction with the public to talk with the local department of health or the county Ag commissioners, and the different other people in their local area in order to help advise them, advise them along the way. And, specifically, one of the components of
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. YOUNG: Can you spell your name. MS. DUNHAM: Yes. I'm sorry. Tess, T-E-S-S, Dunham, D-U-N-H-A-M, Somach, Simmons & Dunn, here representing a number of agricultural groups and the farmers for the water quality. So the two key takeaway points that we took	2 3 4 5 6 7	committee so they have that interaction with the public to talk with the local department of health or the county Ag commissioners, and the different other people in their local area in order to help advise them, advise them along the way. And, specifically, one of the components of our proposal was an aggregate audit report annually and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. YOUNG: Can you spell your name. MS. DUNHAM: Yes. I'm sorry. Tess, T-E-S-S, Dunham, D-U-N-H-A-M, Somach, Simmons & Dunn, here representing a number of agricultural groups and the farmers for the water quality. So the two key takeaway points that we took based upon what appeared to be comments from all of you,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	committee so they have that interaction with the public to talk with the local department of health or the county Ag commissioners, and the different other people in their local area in order to help advise them, advise them along the way. And, specifically, one of the components of our proposal was an aggregate audit report annually and this group would be tasked with reviewing that annual
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. YOUNG: Can you spell your name. MS. DUNHAM: Yes. I'm sorry. Tess, T-E-S-S, Dunham, D-U-N-H-A-M, Somach, Simmons & Dunn, here representing a number of agricultural groups and the farmers for the water quality. So the two key takeaway points that we took based upon what appeared to be comments from all of you, were that the need to be a better understanding of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	committee so they have that interaction with the public to talk with the local department of health or the county Ag commissioners, and the different other people in their local area in order to help advise them, advise them along the way. And, specifically, one of the components of our proposal was an aggregate audit report annually and this group would be tasked with reviewing that annual report before it was ever submitted to the Regional Board
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. YOUNG: Can you spell your name. MS. DUNHAM: Yes. I'm sorry. Tess, T-E-S-S, Dunham, D-U-N-H-A-M, Somach, Simmons & Dunn, here representing a number of agricultural groups and the farmers for the water quality. So the two key takeaway points that we took based upon what appeared to be comments from all of you, were that the need to be a better understanding of the audit process. And there was some concerns that our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	committee so they have that interaction with the public to talk with the local department of health or the county Ag commissioners, and the different other people in their local area in order to help advise them, advise them along the way. And, specifically, one of the components of our proposal was an aggregate audit report annually and this group would be tasked with reviewing that annual report before it was ever submitted to the Regional Board to make recommendations back so we have stakeholder and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. YOUNG: Can you spell your name. MS. DUNHAM: Yes. I'm sorry. Tess, T-E-S-S, Dunham, D-U-N-H-A-M, Somach, Simmons & Dunn, here representing a number of agricultural groups and the farmers for the water quality. So the two key takeaway points that we took based upon what appeared to be comments from all of you, were that the need to be a better understanding of the audit process. And there was some concerns that our original proposal in March did not necessarily address	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	committee so they have that interaction with the public to talk with the local department of health or the county Ag commissioners, and the different other people in their local area in order to help advise them, advise them along the way. And, specifically, one of the components of our proposal was an aggregate audit report annually and this group would be tasked with reviewing that annual report before it was ever submitted to the Regional Board to make recommendations back so we have stakeholder and public input into our process.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. YOUNG: Can you spell your name. MS. DUNHAM: Yes. I'm sorry. Tess, T-E-S-S, Dunham, D-U-N-H-A-M, Somach, Simmons & Dunn, here representing a number of agricultural groups and the farmers for the water quality. So the two key takeaway points that we took based upon what appeared to be comments from all of you, were that the need to be a better understanding of the audit process. And there was some concerns that our original proposal in March did not necessarily address groundwater and groundwater monitoring maybe to what this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	committee so they have that interaction with the public to talk with the local department of health or the county Ag commissioners, and the different other people in their local area in order to help advise them, advise them along the way. And, specifically, one of the components of our proposal was an aggregate audit report annually and this group would be tasked with reviewing that annual report before it was ever submitted to the Regional Board to make recommendations back so we have stakeholder and public input into our process. Now, going on to groundwater, which is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. YOUNG: Can you spell your name. MS. DUNHAM: Yes. I'm sorry. Tess, T-E-S-S, Dunham, D-U-N-H-A-M, Somach, Simmons & Dunn, here representing a number of agricultural groups and the farmers for the water quality. So the two key takeaway points that we took based upon what appeared to be comments from all of you, were that the need to be a better understanding of the audit process. And there was some concerns that our original proposal in March did not necessarily address groundwater and groundwater monitoring maybe to what this Board what like to see.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	committee so they have that interaction with the public to talk with the local department of health or the county Ag commissioners, and the different other people in their local area in order to help advise them, advise them along the way. And, specifically, one of the components of our proposal was an aggregate audit report annually and this group would be tasked with reviewing that annual report before it was ever submitted to the Regional Board to make recommendations back so we have stakeholder and public input into our process. Now, going on to groundwater, which is probably a bigger issue. So we went back, based upon the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. YOUNG: Can you spell your name. MS. DUNHAM: Yes. I'm sorry. Tess, T-E-S-S, Dunham, D-U-N-H-A-M, Somach, Simmons & Dunn, here representing a number of agricultural groups and the farmers for the water quality. So the two key takeaway points that we took based upon what appeared to be comments from all of you, were that the need to be a better understanding of the audit process. And there was some concerns that our original proposal in March did not necessarily address groundwater and groundwater monitoring maybe to what this Board what like to see. Due to the circumstances that we have, we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	committee so they have that interaction with the public to talk with the local department of health or the county Ag commissioners, and the different other people in their local area in order to help advise them, advise them along the way. And, specifically, one of the components of our proposal was an aggregate audit report annually and this group would be tasked with reviewing that annual report before it was ever submitted to the Regional Board to make recommendations back so we have stakeholder and public input into our process. Now, going on to groundwater, which is probably a bigger issue. So we went back, based upon the comments received by all of you, and we have developed a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. YOUNG: Can you spell your name. MS. DUNHAM: Yes. I'm sorry. Tess, T-E-S-S, Dunham, D-U-N-H-A-M, Somach, Simmons & Dunn, here representing a number of agricultural groups and the farmers for the water quality. So the two key takeaway points that we took based upon what appeared to be comments from all of you, were that the need to be a better understanding of the audit process. And there was some concerns that our original proposal in March did not necessarily address groundwater and groundwater monitoring maybe to what this Board what like to see. Due to the circumstances that we have, we took that to heart. We went back and we have some	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	committee so they have that interaction with the public to talk with the local department of health or the county Ag commissioners, and the different other people in their local area in order to help advise them, advise them along the way. And, specifically, one of the components of our proposal was an aggregate audit report annually and this group would be tasked with reviewing that annual report before it was ever submitted to the Regional Board to make recommendations back so we have stakeholder and public input into our process. Now, going on to groundwater, which is probably a bigger issue. So we went back, based upon the comments received by all of you, and we have developed a draft groundwater assessment monitoring and reporting program for your consideration that would go along either
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. YOUNG: Can you spell your name. MS. DUNHAM: Yes. I'm sorry. Tess, T-E-S-S, Dunham, D-U-N-H-A-M, Somach, Simmons & Dunn, here representing a number of agricultural groups and the farmers for the water quality. So the two key takeaway points that we took based upon what appeared to be comments from all of you, were that the need to be a better understanding of the audit process. And there was some concerns that our original proposal in March did not necessarily address groundwater and groundwater monitoring maybe to what this Board what like to see. Due to the circumstances that we have, we took that to heart. We went back and we have some suggested changes to our alternative proposal in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	committee so they have that interaction with the public to talk with the local department of health or the county Ag commissioners, and the different other people in their local area in order to help advise them, advise them along the way. And, specifically, one of the components of our proposal was an aggregate audit report annually and this group would be tasked with reviewing that annual report before it was ever submitted to the Regional Board to make recommendations back so we have stakeholder and public input into our process. Now, going on to groundwater, which is probably a bigger issue. So we went back, based upon the comments received by all of you, and we have developed a draft groundwater assessment monitoring and reporting program for your consideration that would go along either as a stand alone for all the groundwater monitoring
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. YOUNG: Can you spell your name. MS. DUNHAM: Yes. I'm sorry. Tess, T-E-S-S, Dunham, D-U-N-H-A-M, Somach, Simmons & Dunn, here representing a number of agricultural groups and the farmers for the water quality. So the two key takeaway points that we took based upon what appeared to be comments from all of you, were that the need to be a better understanding of the audit process. And there was some concerns that our original proposal in March did not necessarily address groundwater and groundwater monitoring maybe to what this Board what like to see. Due to the circumstances that we have, we took that to heart. We went back and we have some suggested changes to our alternative proposal in response.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	committee so they have that interaction with the public to talk with the local department of health or the county Ag commissioners, and the different other people in their local area in order to help advise them, advise them along the way. And, specifically, one of the components of our proposal was an aggregate audit report annually and this group would be tasked with reviewing that annual report before it was ever submitted to the Regional Board to make recommendations back so we have stakeholder and public input into our process. Now, going on to groundwater, which is probably a bigger issue. So we went back, based upon the comments received by all of you, and we have developed a draft groundwater assessment monitoring and reporting program for your consideration that would go along either
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. YOUNG: Can you spell your name. MS. DUNHAM: Yes. I'm sorry. Tess, T-E-S-S, Dunham, D-U-N-H-A-M, Somach, Simmons & Dunn, here representing a number of agricultural groups and the farmers for the water quality. So the two key takeaway points that we took based upon what appeared to be comments from all of you, were that the need to be a better understanding of the audit process. And there was some concerns that our original proposal in March did not necessarily address groundwater and groundwater monitoring maybe to what this Board what like to see. Due to the circumstances that we have, we took that to heart. We went back and we have some suggested changes to our alternative proposal in response. First, the audit process. We have a goal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	committee so they have that interaction with the public to talk with the local department of health or the county Ag commissioners, and the different other people in their local area in order to help advise them, advise them along the way. And, specifically, one of the components of our proposal was an aggregate audit report annually and this group would be tasked with reviewing that annual report before it was ever submitted to the Regional Board to make recommendations back so we have stakeholder and public input into our process. Now, going on to groundwater, which is probably a bigger issue. So we went back, based upon the comments received by all of you, and we have developed a draft groundwater assessment monitoring and reporting program for your consideration that would go along either as a stand alone for all the groundwater monitoring requirements currently within the Order, or also in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. YOUNG: Can you spell your name. MS. DUNHAM: Yes. I'm sorry. Tess, T-E-S-S, Dunham, D-U-N-H-A-M, Somach, Simmons & Dunn, here representing a number of agricultural groups and the farmers for the water quality. So the two key takeaway points that we took based upon what appeared to be comments from all of you, were that the need to be a better understanding of the audit process. And there was some concerns that our original proposal in March did not necessarily address groundwater and groundwater monitoring maybe to what this Board what like to see. Due to the circumstances that we have, we took that to heart. We went back and we have some suggested changes to our alternative proposal in response. First, the audit process. We have a goal that we really wanted to make sure that the audits	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	committee so they have that interaction with the public to talk with the local department of health or the county Ag commissioners, and the different other people in their local area in order to help advise them, advise them along the way. And, specifically, one of the components of our proposal was an aggregate audit report annually and this group would be tasked with reviewing that annual report before it was ever submitted to the Regional Board to make recommendations back so we have stakeholder and public input into our process. Now, going on to groundwater, which is probably a bigger issue. So we went back, based upon the comments received by all of you, and we have developed a draft groundwater assessment monitoring and reporting program for your consideration that would go along either as a stand alone for all the groundwater monitoring requirements currently within the Order, or also in conjunction with the coalition alternative. And the goal here is to set up a process to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. YOUNG: Can you spell your name. MS. DUNHAM: Yes. I'm sorry. Tess, T-E-S-S, Dunham, D-U-N-H-A-M, Somach, Simmons & Dunn, here representing a number of agricultural groups and the farmers for the water quality. So the two key takeaway points that we took based upon what appeared to be comments from all of you, were that the need to be a better understanding of the audit process. And there was some concerns that our original proposal in March did not necessarily address groundwater and groundwater monitoring maybe to what this Board what like to see. Due to the circumstances that we have, we took that to heart. We went back and we have some suggested changes to our alternative proposal in response. First, the audit process. We have a goal that we really wanted to make sure that the audits themselves were objective and based on sound technical	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	committee so they have that interaction with the public to talk with the local department of health or the county Ag commissioners, and the different other people in their local area in order to help advise them, advise them along the way. And, specifically, one of the components of our proposal was an aggregate audit report annually and this group would be tasked with reviewing that annual report before it was ever submitted to the Regional Board to make recommendations back so we have stakeholder and public input into our process. Now, going on to groundwater, which is probably a bigger issue. So we went back, based upon the comments received by all of you, and we have developed a draft groundwater assessment monitoring and reporting program for your consideration that would go along either as a stand alone for all the groundwater monitoring requirements currently within the Order, or also in conjunction with the coalition alternative. And the goal here is to set up a process to assess groundwater quality and to provide feedback for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. YOUNG: Can you spell your name. MS. DUNHAM: Yes. I'm sorry. Tess, T-E-S-S, Dunham, D-U-N-H-A-M, Somach, Simmons & Dunn, here representing a number of agricultural groups and the farmers for the water quality. So the two key takeaway points that we took based upon what appeared to be comments from all of you, were that the need to be a better understanding of the audit process. And there was some concerns that our original proposal in March did not necessarily address groundwater and groundwater monitoring maybe to what this Board what like to see. Due to the circumstances that we have, we took that to heart. We went back and we have some suggested changes to our alternative proposal in response. First, the audit process. We have a goal that we really wanted to make sure that the audits themselves were objective and based on sound technical information. So to achieve that we have created some additions to what was our attachment B from last time to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	committee so they have that interaction with the public to talk with the local department of health or the county Ag commissioners, and the different other people in their local area in order to help advise them, advise them along the way. And, specifically, one of the components of our proposal was an aggregate audit report annually and this group would be tasked with reviewing that annual report before it was ever submitted to the Regional Board to make recommendations back so we have stakeholder and public input into our process. Now, going on to groundwater, which is probably a bigger issue. So we went back, based upon the comments received by all of you, and we have developed a draft groundwater assessment monitoring and reporting program for your consideration that would go along either as a stand alone for all the groundwater monitoring requirements currently within the Order, or also in conjunction with the coalition alternative. And the goal here is to set up a process to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. YOUNG: Can you spell your name. MS. DUNHAM: Yes. I'm sorry. Tess, T-E-S-S, Dunham, D-U-N-H-A-M, Somach, Simmons & Dunn, here representing a number of agricultural groups and the farmers for the water quality. So the two key takeaway points that we took based upon what appeared to be comments from all of you, were that the need to be a better understanding of the audit process. And there was some concerns that our original proposal in March did not necessarily address groundwater and groundwater monitoring maybe to what this Board what like to see. Due to the circumstances that we have, we took that to heart. We went back and we have some suggested changes to our alternative proposal in response. First, the audit process. We have a goal that we really wanted to make sure that the audits themselves were objective and based on sound technical information. So to achieve that we have created some	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	committee so they have that interaction with the public to talk with the local department of health or the county Ag commissioners, and the different other people in their local area in order to help advise them, advise them along the way. And, specifically, one of the components of our proposal was an aggregate audit report annually and this group would be tasked with reviewing that annual report before it was ever submitted to the Regional Board to make recommendations back so we have stakeholder and public input into our process. Now, going on to groundwater, which is probably a bigger issue. So we went back, based upon the comments received by all of you, and we have developed a draft groundwater assessment monitoring and reporting program for your consideration that would go along either as a stand alone for all the groundwater monitoring requirements currently within the Order, or also in conjunction with the coalition alternative. And the goal here is to set up a process to assess groundwater quality and to provide feedback for growers based upon the assessment and the identification

Page 532

38 (Pages 531 to 534)

address: We would -- it would be a cooperative, 1 attachment that we submitted in March. 2 dischargers would be allowed to participate much like the 2 MR. YOUNG: And these were not submitted before 3 3 surface program and coordinate with the existing the cutoff for what reason? 4 programs. 4 MS. DUNHAM: They have been developed through --5 5 You would have to develop a work plan. You just as your staff will probably make adjustments and 6 6 would rely on existing information. You would identify recommendations to you in their presentation, we have 7 7 other additional monitoring sites that may be necessary been listening to you in this process. The cutoff was in 8 8 if there's a lack or a gap in the data information. January, we, obviously, learned a lot between now and 9 There would be a developed monitoring plan. All that 9 January. 10 10 goes to the Regional Board for review and approval. And, They're here for you. You can take them. 11 of course, timelines for collection of data, culminated 11 It's up to you, Chair, whether you want to have them in 12 with a final report that goes back for characterization 12 the record or not; that is your discretion. 13 of assessment, monitoring results, any typical monitoring 13 MR. YOUNG: You can hand them to Miss McChesney. 14 14 type of reports. And then to --MR. BRIGGS: Thank you for your proposal on the 15 15 MR. TOMLINSON: Just simply to conclude, we would groundwater program. Just on that part what you just 16 ask that you direct staff to --16 talked about, which was most of it, aside from the not 17 17 reporting initial results, do you see anything in the 18 18 Draft Order that we have for the Board that would (Interruption by the court reporter.) 19 19 preclude you using that approach? 20 20 MR. TOMLINSON: Rick Tomlinson, T-O-M-L-I-N-S-O-N. MS. DUNHAM: I'm not quite sure I understand. 21 We would just ask that you direct staff to 21 Explain it one more time, the question. 22 22 further incorporate the third party coalition that we MR. BRIGGS: So, aside from not reporting the presented and to work with us on integrating that into a 23 23 individual results, which I gather was not part of your 24 24 draft order. proposal. 25 25 I would just comment that the decision you MS. DUNHAM: Actually, in our proposal we would Page 537 Page 535 have before you is really amazing because we presented 1 report the analytical results, but in -- for the wells 2 2 you with a program that we have not found anywhere else that were determined to be necessary for the assessment, 3 in the nation. Certainly, our proposal, if adopted, 3 you know, that are representative, and spacially 4 would be the strictest Ag Waiver in the state and we representative, there would be reporting of the 5 5 believe in the nation as well. If not the, it certainly analytical results, but just like with Gamma and other 6 will be one of them. There's nothing else that we found 6 data, the wells will be reported and identified on a 7 7 that individually audits individual farms. township section versus ID specific property location, 8 8 And so, you have two choices before you. which is a safety function. 9 9 Either one is going to result in the strictest program in MR. BRIGGS: So, aside from that, is there any --10 10 the state and definitely one of the strictest in the do you know if there's anything in the groundwater 11 11 nation. And so it's amazing that we are not in a monitoring that we've proposed that would preclude you 12 12 collaborative process when agriculture is coming to you from proceeding with the proposal? 13 with that type of a program and yet we still have such 13 MS. DUNHAM: Other than your's is required to be 14 challenges in communication and a lack of cooperation. 14 done individually, this would be on a cooperative, 15 And so some of the comments you heard 15 spacial distribution and then requiring every grower to 16 earlier, I think particularly the Senator about we really 16 have samples in individual wells. 17 need to move from this point forward into a collaborative 17 MR. BRIGGS: So it's a cooperative part. 18 18 process. That's the only way we're going to be MS. DUNHAM: Yes. 19 successful is by working together. Whatever you finally 19 MR. TOMLINSON: In the draft proposed Order it's 20 20 adopt we must have that collaboration, otherwise we're an individual requirement, so once it's done, then there 21 21 all going to end up with failure. is no benefit to doing anything other than what is 22 22 MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you for your comments. required in that tiering proposal, versus a collaborative 23 23 MS. DUNHAM: We do have copies that -- of the or cooperative program, a cooperative monitoring program 24 documents that we have prepared to -- or the groundwater 24 for groundwater that would use existing data and program as well as the additional audit revisions to our 25 supplement that where needed.

Page 536

MR. BRIGGS: Okay. I think we can clarify that.
Okay.
DR. HUNTER: Thank you very much. I have one question on the audit. Just so that I'm clear on the time frame.
The audit first remains an aggregate assessment, but there would be a review by the technical

kind of timeline would that involve?

MS. DUNHAM: Okay. So the -- how the audit process would work on a timing is first the third party group would submit, I think it's within six months, a work plan to Mr. Briggs, the Executive Officer, outlining how they would conduct all the audits within the term of the Order. That's one of the big requirement is that every grower participating in that group would be subject to an audit. And so that work plan has to be submitted within six months. Once that work plan is approved then, of course, you go forward and you start conducting your

committee, or technical assessment committee. And what

The technical advisory committee would probably be established somewhat in parallel pending EO approval of the work plan. And the technical advisory committee's role would be very up front work as we currently can see to help develop what is the process?

between the participant and, perhaps, the results that

- 2 the auditor came up with, we are suggesting within our
- 3 revised attachment "P" that there has to be some process
- 4 for that individual participant, whether you want to call
- 5 it an appeal, or something to go back to the third party
- 6 group to say, "I disagree with these audit results," and
- 7 it's developing a process to address that. And so that
- 8 individual's audit, basically, wouldn't be finalized
- 9 until that appeal had been satisfied, and whether it may
- 10 be, sorry, the auditors claims are absolutely correct,
- 11 and you weren't doing what you were supposed to be doing,
- 12 and, therefore, you need to be subject to make some
- 13 improvements. Or it may be, okay, yeah, we see that
- $14\,$ $\,$ there's some gray, and perhaps, you were doing it and the
- 15 auditor didn't interpret it.

So it has to resolve that before that

person's audit is considered to be finalized.

DR. HUNTER: And is there a timeline for that

19 process?

Page 539

20 MS. DUNHAM: There is. In the revised attachment

B, I think that the individual auditor, basically, or the
 individual participant has to make a challenge to their

audit within, let's see, kind of have -- a lot of that

24 would be developed in the work plan, but -- oh, where did

25 it go? 30 days. Or that's when the group would have to

Page 54

- 1 What is the auditor going to look for? You know, it's
- 2 kind of like to have the professional say, okay, when you
- 3 go out on a farm what are you going to actually look for?
- 4 How are you going to rate it? How are you going to
 - determine if that grower is implementing an appropriate
 - management practice for the crop that he's growing. So
- $7 \quad \ \ \text{the technical advisory committee would be designed to} \\$
 - help set all of that up in a very objective, scientific technical fashion so it's clear as to what the auditors
- would do when they are actually auditing the individual
- 11 participants.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5

6

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

audits.

DR. HUNTER: Then, I also note in the original document of December on page 17 it says that the aggregate report could be subject to appeal and that no reports will be submitted to the Water Board until that appeal is resolved.

MS. DUNHAM: I think the version in March changed it a little bit. And I think what we're talking about there is, first of all, the third party group would have to submit an annual report to the Regional Board summarizing all the results of the audit that was done within that year, aggregate reports.

What we're talking about there is an individual independent audit that has been done on an individual participant. If there's some disagreement Page 540

- 1 terminate the participation if they didn't respond after
- 2 that review process has been set. But I believe we have
- 3 it set up that the third party group would develop as
- 4 part of the work plan, the details of what the
- 5 termination and the appeal process would be. So it would
- 6 probably be like a 30 to 60 day time frame, but I don't
- 7 see it specified here and it would be developed in the
- 8 details of the work plan that would go to the Executive
- 9 Officer for approval.

10

17

- MS. HUNTER: Okay. Thank you.
- MR. TOMLINSON: If there is specific timelines
- 12 that you would suggest we would welcome. That the key
- here is that we just simply want to due process, but
- 14 certainly if someone was to be terminated, that would
- definitely be reported.
- 16 MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you.
 - MR. JEFFRIES: Mr. Chairman.
- 18 MR. YOUNG: Yes.
- MR. JEFFRIES: I have a couple questions.
- Some of this goes back to the presentation,
- 21 and some of the information they have submitted -- I hope
- 22 I can put it in some -- I'm trying to remember. I wrote
- 23 these down what it really means today. But I know you
- 24 addressed the confidential proprietary information. Are
- 25 these farm plans considered part of that? And are the

1			
1	audits considered part of that confidential proprietary	1	MR. BRIGGS: Okay, 93 percent of acreage. I
2	information?	2	assume that there's going to be lack of either acreage or
3	MS. DUNHAM: So that the farm plans under your	3	farms or ranches that will participate in this. Are
4	current program and even as I believe as have staff has	4	we are you going to know? And are we going to know?
5	proposed, continue to remain on the farm in order to	5	MS. DUNHAM: You will know.
6	protect the confidentiality of the farm plan. It would	6	MR. JEFFRIES: We will know?
7	not go into the Regional Board's offices. They currently	7	MS. DUNHAM: You will know. This is not an
8	are and would be under all proposals available for	8	umbrella. The way it has been set up in a strike out on
9	inspection by Regional Board staff upon arrival,	9	an underline version that was we presented to you in
10	basically, on the farm for another inspection.	10	March is people would make it's a voluntary decision
11	So, while they are don't go into the	11	to use the coalition alternative as their choice for
12	Regional Board's office because that would then make them	12	compliance with the Order. And they could say, yep, I
13	a subject to public exposure, they are available to	13	want to go with the Coalition Alternative approach to
14	Regional Board staff for review to determine their	14	comply with the provisions of the Order. Or I'm going to
15	accuracy.	15	stay with whatever you end up adopting, ultimately, and
16	MR. JEFFRIES: I know that's been a real concern	16	whether that maintains the current requirements for Tier
17	for the farming community that some information should	17	2 and Tier 3 or not, then comply with the waiver as you
18	not be released to the public.	18	end up adopting it for other people. It's a voluntary
19	I'm not sure how you're going to put all	19	selection that I want to take this path versus the other
20	these people together. I'm seeing all the signatures	20	path that has been set forward. So you would know who is
21	that were submitted with your letter and your proposal.	21	under what program.
22	What percentage do you think that in our region that you	22	MR. JEFFRIES: Have you taken analysis of the
23	would have enrolled in this program that you're	23	costs between the staff's proposal and your proposal? I
24	proposing?	24	know that the gentleman gave a presentation on behalf of
25	MS. DUNHAM: Boy, you know, I honestly,	25	the grower/shipper, and there was some numbers that were
	Page 543		Page 545
1	Mr. Jeffries, I don't know, but if I I would imagine	1	pretty outstanding in that presentation.
2	people that would follow in their Tier 2 and Tier 3 would	2	MS. DUNHAM: I don't know that we have have a
3	take a very close look at participating. And based upon	3	cost comparison between what it would cost for our
4	the numbers that Mr. Quandt put forward, that would be	4	alternative compared to yours.
5	more than at least half of the acreage within the region,	5	D 0 N 1 1
6	if not the actual number of growers.		Do we? No, we do not.
O	ii not the detail names of grotterer	6	Do we? No, we do not. MR. JEFFRIES: The opinion, and I asked Mr. Costa
7	So you would capture in a fair amount of	6 7	
	5		MR. JEFFRIES: The opinion, and I asked Mr. Costa
7	So you would capture in a fair amount of	7	MR. JEFFRIES: The opinion, and I asked Mr. Costa to come back up to clarify some of his concerns on the
7 8	So you would capture in a fair amount of actual acreage.	7 8	MR. JEFFRIES: The opinion, and I asked Mr. Costa to come back up to clarify some of his concerns on the Tier 3, and I didn't see anything really in your proposal
7 8 9	So you would capture in a fair amount of actual acreage. MR. JEFFRIES: Then if we don't have a hundred	7 8 9	MR. JEFFRIES: The opinion, and I asked Mr. Costa to come back up to clarify some of his concerns on the Tier 3, and I didn't see anything really in your proposal that addressed the tiers per se. The 1,000 acres
7 8 9 10	So you would capture in a fair amount of actual acreage. MR. JEFFRIES: Then if we don't have a hundred percent enrollment, then are you going to submit with	7 8 9 10	MR. JEFFRIES: The opinion, and I asked Mr. Costa to come back up to clarify some of his concerns on the Tier 3, and I didn't see anything really in your proposal that addressed the tiers per se. The 1,000 acres criteria compared from farms to ranch because I looked at
7 8 9 10 11	So you would capture in a fair amount of actual acreage. MR. JEFFRIES: Then if we don't have a hundred percent enrollment, then are you going to submit with your plan would your organization submit that information	7 8 9 10 11	MR. JEFFRIES: The opinion, and I asked Mr. Costa to come back up to clarify some of his concerns on the Tier 3, and I didn't see anything really in your proposal that addressed the tiers per se. The 1,000 acres criteria compared from farms to ranch because I looked at a farm that could be many ranches where a ranch would be
7 8 9 10 11	So you would capture in a fair amount of actual acreage. MR. JEFFRIES: Then if we don't have a hundred percent enrollment, then are you going to submit with your plan would your organization submit that information to the regional staff?	7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. JEFFRIES: The opinion, and I asked Mr. Costa to come back up to clarify some of his concerns on the Tier 3, and I didn't see anything really in your proposal that addressed the tiers per se. The 1,000 acres criteria compared from farms to ranch because I looked at a farm that could be many ranches where a ranch would be a singular facility.
7 8 9 10 11 12	So you would capture in a fair amount of actual acreage. MR. JEFFRIES: Then if we don't have a hundred percent enrollment, then are you going to submit with your plan would your organization submit that information to the regional staff? MS. DUNHAM: Submit what information?	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. JEFFRIES: The opinion, and I asked Mr. Costa to come back up to clarify some of his concerns on the Tier 3, and I didn't see anything really in your proposal that addressed the tiers per se. The 1,000 acres criteria compared from farms to ranch because I looked at a farm that could be many ranches where a ranch would be a singular facility. MS. DUNHAM: So, how basically what our
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	So you would capture in a fair amount of actual acreage. MR. JEFFRIES: Then if we don't have a hundred percent enrollment, then are you going to submit with your plan would your organization submit that information to the regional staff? MS. DUNHAM: Submit what information? MR. JEFFRIES: Well, the remainder of the farmers that did enroll in this program.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. JEFFRIES: The opinion, and I asked Mr. Costa to come back up to clarify some of his concerns on the Tier 3, and I didn't see anything really in your proposal that addressed the tiers per se. The 1,000 acres criteria compared from farms to ranch because I looked at a farm that could be many ranches where a ranch would be a singular facility. MS. DUNHAM: So, how basically what our proposal would do is you would know you would make the selection into the Alternative Coalition Third Party
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	So you would capture in a fair amount of actual acreage. MR. JEFFRIES: Then if we don't have a hundred percent enrollment, then are you going to submit with your plan would your organization submit that information to the regional staff? MS. DUNHAM: Submit what information? MR. JEFFRIES: Well, the remainder of the farmers	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. JEFFRIES: The opinion, and I asked Mr. Costa to come back up to clarify some of his concerns on the Tier 3, and I didn't see anything really in your proposal that addressed the tiers per se. The 1,000 acres criteria compared from farms to ranch because I looked at a farm that could be many ranches where a ranch would be a singular facility. MS. DUNHAM: So, how basically what our proposal would do is you would know you would make the
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So you would capture in a fair amount of actual acreage. MR. JEFFRIES: Then if we don't have a hundred percent enrollment, then are you going to submit with your plan would your organization submit that information to the regional staff? MS. DUNHAM: Submit what information? MR. JEFFRIES: Well, the remainder of the farmers that did enroll in this program. MS. DUNHAM: Well, the way the program would work	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. JEFFRIES: The opinion, and I asked Mr. Costa to come back up to clarify some of his concerns on the Tier 3, and I didn't see anything really in your proposal that addressed the tiers per se. The 1,000 acres criteria compared from farms to ranch because I looked at a farm that could be many ranches where a ranch would be a singular facility. MS. DUNHAM: So, how basically what our proposal would do is you would know you would make the selection into the Alternative Coalition Third Party Group and the current requirements as they are proposed under the staff's Order for Tier 2 and Tier 3 would
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	So you would capture in a fair amount of actual acreage. MR. JEFFRIES: Then if we don't have a hundred percent enrollment, then are you going to submit with your plan would your organization submit that information to the regional staff? MS. DUNHAM: Submit what information? MR. JEFFRIES: Well, the remainder of the farmers that did enroll in this program. MS. DUNHAM: Well, the way the program would work is that the farmers would elect to participate into the third party group and they would notify the Regional	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. JEFFRIES: The opinion, and I asked Mr. Costa to come back up to clarify some of his concerns on the Tier 3, and I didn't see anything really in your proposal that addressed the tiers per se. The 1,000 acres criteria compared from farms to ranch because I looked at a farm that could be many ranches where a ranch would be a singular facility. MS. DUNHAM: So, how basically what our proposal would do is you would know you would make the selection into the Alternative Coalition Third Party Group and the current requirements as they are proposed under the staff's Order for Tier 2 and Tier 3 would basically go away as they exist now and instead you would
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	So you would capture in a fair amount of actual acreage. MR. JEFFRIES: Then if we don't have a hundred percent enrollment, then are you going to submit with your plan would your organization submit that information to the regional staff? MS. DUNHAM: Submit what information? MR. JEFFRIES: Well, the remainder of the farmers that did enroll in this program. MS. DUNHAM: Well, the way the program would work is that the farmers would elect to participate into the third party group and they would notify the Regional Board of their elections. You will know which ones want	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. JEFFRIES: The opinion, and I asked Mr. Costa to come back up to clarify some of his concerns on the Tier 3, and I didn't see anything really in your proposal that addressed the tiers per se. The 1,000 acres criteria compared from farms to ranch because I looked at a farm that could be many ranches where a ranch would be a singular facility. MS. DUNHAM: So, how basically what our proposal would do is you would know you would make the selection into the Alternative Coalition Third Party Group and the current requirements as they are proposed under the staff's Order for Tier 2 and Tier 3 would
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	So you would capture in a fair amount of actual acreage. MR. JEFFRIES: Then if we don't have a hundred percent enrollment, then are you going to submit with your plan would your organization submit that information to the regional staff? MS. DUNHAM: Submit what information? MR. JEFFRIES: Well, the remainder of the farmers that did enroll in this program. MS. DUNHAM: Well, the way the program would work is that the farmers would elect to participate into the third party group and they would notify the Regional Board of their elections. You will know which ones want to participate in this program versus those who have	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. JEFFRIES: The opinion, and I asked Mr. Costa to come back up to clarify some of his concerns on the Tier 3, and I didn't see anything really in your proposal that addressed the tiers per se. The 1,000 acres criteria compared from farms to ranch because I looked at a farm that could be many ranches where a ranch would be a singular facility. MS. DUNHAM: So, how basically what our proposal would do is you would know you would make the selection into the Alternative Coalition Third Party Group and the current requirements as they are proposed under the staff's Order for Tier 2 and Tier 3 would basically go away as they exist now and instead you would be subject to participating in the coalition group and the audit provisions that we are proposing.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So you would capture in a fair amount of actual acreage. MR. JEFFRIES: Then if we don't have a hundred percent enrollment, then are you going to submit with your plan would your organization submit that information to the regional staff? MS. DUNHAM: Submit what information? MR. JEFFRIES: Well, the remainder of the farmers that did enroll in this program. MS. DUNHAM: Well, the way the program would work is that the farmers would elect to participate into the third party group and they would notify the Regional Board of their elections. You will know which ones want to participate in this program versus those who have decided to remain under other components of your Waiver.	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. JEFFRIES: The opinion, and I asked Mr. Costa to come back up to clarify some of his concerns on the Tier 3, and I didn't see anything really in your proposal that addressed the tiers per se. The 1,000 acres criteria compared from farms to ranch because I looked at a farm that could be many ranches where a ranch would be a singular facility. MS. DUNHAM: So, how basically what our proposal would do is you would know you would make the selection into the Alternative Coalition Third Party Group and the current requirements as they are proposed under the staff's Order for Tier 2 and Tier 3 would basically go away as they exist now and instead you would be subject to participating in the coalition group and the audit provisions that we are proposing. And in the audit criteria that we have
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	So you would capture in a fair amount of actual acreage. MR. JEFFRIES: Then if we don't have a hundred percent enrollment, then are you going to submit with your plan would your organization submit that information to the regional staff? MS. DUNHAM: Submit what information? MR. JEFFRIES: Well, the remainder of the farmers that did enroll in this program. MS. DUNHAM: Well, the way the program would work is that the farmers would elect to participate into the third party group and they would notify the Regional Board of their elections. You will know which ones want to participate in this program versus those who have	7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. JEFFRIES: The opinion, and I asked Mr. Costa to come back up to clarify some of his concerns on the Tier 3, and I didn't see anything really in your proposal that addressed the tiers per se. The 1,000 acres criteria compared from farms to ranch because I looked at a farm that could be many ranches where a ranch would be a singular facility. MS. DUNHAM: So, how basically what our proposal would do is you would know you would make the selection into the Alternative Coalition Third Party Group and the current requirements as they are proposed under the staff's Order for Tier 2 and Tier 3 would basically go away as they exist now and instead you would be subject to participating in the coalition group and the audit provisions that we are proposing.

would be risked based.

Page 544

MR. YOUNG: Acreage.

Page 547

And there are four different areas of the risk that we had identified, that would toxicity and sediment, storm water, toxicity in irrigation run-off, nutrient irrigation run-off and nitrate leaching to groundwater. So it's separates out four of the main issues and components. So it's risk based on those versus one collective determination.

And then your, you know, everybody would be audited equally. And the main thing here is that you're implementing management practices to address those areas of risk that you have for your individual operations. It's far more individual operations based versus trying to create nebulous categories that may or may not reflect a risk of an individual operation.

MR. JEFFRIES: My next question you already asked and that was the groundwater. And I was going to ask you why didn't you have the groundwater segment to your proposal, but you addressed that.

What would be your process to notify regional staff of violations or violators?

MS. DUNHAM: We have included within this a participant termination process that once a person's audit has been resolved, if they need to make improvements, they need to make them. If they fail to make those improvements within a certain amount of time,

coalition approach, you know, altogether.

But, the way that the strike out document was offered to you in March was to build upon the fact that the staff proposal did allow for a coalition to be created. But to Mr. Briggs point, it would never be created under the current staff proposal because there's no reason to create it because each -- all those requirements fall on each individual farm. As long as they fall on each individual farm you'll never have the opportunity to work together cooperatively because you're still going to have to do all those individual requirements.

So they're just fundamentally different. Two different ways to get at the same thing.

MR. JEFFRIES: It would be nice if we could have all these resolutions, ordinances and waivers all in laymen's language so we can all understand it clearly.

MS. DUNHAM: But I may be out of a job.

MR. JEFFRIES: Well, I was just going to allude to that, you would have to have half of our audience be attorneys to interpret it to their clients what this really meant. But anyway.

My next question is, have you addressed the tile lands? And the reason I -- I brought this up before because I lived in Salinas, former mayor of Salinas.

Page 549

that, you know, it's been identified that their operation's management practices are deficient, and if

they fail to make improvements, if they fail to improve

their management plan, and they fail to make on-farm improvements, then we will, the third party group, would terminate the individual's participant of participation

within 30 days and that notification would be made to the Regional Board that this person is no longer in the coalition; you need to do something with him now. So we

do have that.

MR. JEFFRIES: Okay.

MR. TOMLINSON: Just to add to that previous question about the staff proposal. We spent a considerable amount of time trying to go through in a strike out mode and off different ideas. As you might recall in March I had some of those comments just in my presentation, but, what happened is it just -- the way the proposal is written there's too many things that cross reference, and so you couldn't really start making the changes and have everything still make sense. And so what our proposal is is truly an alternative.

So it's -- whatever improvements the staff think that might be made, you know, if you so desire, then you can add ours into that and there's an alternative. Or you can just simply go with the

Page 548

West of Salinas is mostly titled irrigated lands, and
 some of the best agricultural land in the world. And I'm

3 concerned not only of loss of economy, but loss of jobs

4 for my citizens in our area. Because I can see some of

5 staff's requirements and I know they're saying, well,

6 we're not stopping agriculture from using tile lands

7 and -- but when you do look at the final it's the

8 run-off, the discharge, and I understand that we have to

9 do something with the discharge, but we can't limit these 10 people to no crops or one crop because of the type of

people to no crops or one crop because of the type of ground that they have and so forth.

So, have you considered that, because not only Salinas Valley has tile land, but I'm sure there's some in Santa Maria, there's some in San Juan Basin that we have to be concerned with.

MS. DUNHAM: So, there's two responses. First of all, we have identified that, you know, the issue of nutrients in the irrigation run-off may also come from operation of tile drains. So, we do recognize that it is an issue, and it is in one of the categories of risk that we have identified that kind of needs to be a part of the audit process.

With the technical advisory committee, I deal with the technical advisory committee is they would convene and then determine. So if we're looking at $Page\ 550$

42 (Pages 547 to 550)

1	auditing someone's operation to evaluate, you know, are	1	back to consideration of what is the appropriate
2	they, you know, what they are doing to address the issue	2	management practice, and, you know, again, this program
3	of potential nutrients within a tile drain, we would be	3	just like yours can't would not be able to specify
4	looking to the technical advisory committee to advise us	4	specific management practices.
5	as to what should we do? What should growers be doing in	5	Now, I would, you know, obviously, take issue
6	those circumstances where we do have tile drains.	6	with the staff's proposal. I think it does try to
7	So we don't have the answer here, but it is	7	specify a 30-foot buffer, riparian buffer corridor in the
8	one of those complex issues where the professionals and	8	MRP, which is a management practice, and I think that
9	the experts that we would look towards from the technical	9	crosses the line, so we have to avoid doing that.
10	advisory committee, which is why it's so important.	10	And so it goes back to what are the
11	MR. JEFFRIES: I think that relates to some of the	11	management practices that individual grower has employed
12	comments we heard earlier that the scientific analysis	12	to deal with sediment. And, perhaps, it would maybe
13	for this hasn't caught up with today's world and needs	13	they're using riparian, if they're able to, but if
14	more investigation.	14	they're not because of food safety, then they're going to
15	I that's my last question	15	have to look at other alternatives. And we believe that
16	MS. DUNHAM: And, actually, and just one other	16	there other alternatives out there that people are using.
17	thing real quick on that. The other thing that we have	17	MR. TOMLINSON: The only thing I would add to that
18	alluded to in here is that there may be some	18	is, at the federal level the Food and Drug Administration
19	circumstances where growers and, you know, common	19	is required now by new federal legislation to implement a
20	drainages or common watersheds, or sub-watersheds might	20	new regulation for individual farms next year. A draft
21	want to implement some type of an electric water	21	of that is expected at the end of this year. And in
22	treatment system in an area where there are tile drains	22	anticipation of that a lot of the retailers and some of
23	and the third party group would look for to help	23	the trade associations have been working on a harmonized
24	facilitate those types of opportunities where it may be	24	metric.
25	necessary and that may be exactly the type of situation	25	So I'm not familiar with what is in the leafy
23	Page 551	23	Page 553
	Tuge 331		1 450 333
1	which something like that might work.	1	green metric, but the harmonized metric calls for
1 2	which something like that might work. MR. JEFERJES: I'm just thinking how many acres of		green metric, but the harmonized metric calls for individual risk assessments, individual farms to make
2	MR. JEFFRIES: I'm just thinking how many acres of	2	individual risk assessments, individual farms to make
2 3	MR. JEFFRIES: I'm just thinking how many acres of land you have to take out of production to do something		individual risk assessments, individual farms to make that decision about how to handle buffers and habitants
2	MR. JEFFRIES: I'm just thinking how many acres of land you have to take out of production to do something like that.	2	individual risk assessments, individual farms to make that decision about how to handle buffers and habitants and so forth.
2 3 4 5	MR. JEFFRIES: I'm just thinking how many acres of land you have to take out of production to do something like that. But the ultimate goal is that we have to	2 3 4	individual risk assessments, individual farms to make that decision about how to handle buffers and habitants and so forth. But all of that will be part of a different
2 3 4 5 6	MR. JEFFRIES: I'm just thinking how many acres of land you have to take out of production to do something like that. But the ultimate goal is that we have to clean up the water. That's the ultimate goal. That's	2 3 4 5	individual risk assessments, individual farms to make that decision about how to handle buffers and habitants and so forth. But all of that will be part of a different regulatory process, but it will start at the end this
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. JEFFRIES: I'm just thinking how many acres of land you have to take out of production to do something like that. But the ultimate goal is that we have to clean up the water. That's the ultimate goal. That's what I'm here for.	2 3 4 5 6	individual risk assessments, individual farms to make that decision about how to handle buffers and habitants and so forth. But all of that will be part of a different regulatory process, but it will start at the end this year and will be governed through the Food and Drug
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. JEFFRIES: I'm just thinking how many acres of land you have to take out of production to do something like that. But the ultimate goal is that we have to clean up the water. That's the ultimate goal. That's what I'm here for. My last question is to deal with the food	2 3 4 5 6 7	individual risk assessments, individual farms to make that decision about how to handle buffers and habitants and so forth. But all of that will be part of a different regulatory process, but it will start at the end this year and will be governed through the Food and Drug Administration.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. JEFFRIES: I'm just thinking how many acres of land you have to take out of production to do something like that. But the ultimate goal is that we have to clean up the water. That's the ultimate goal. That's what I'm here for. My last question is to deal with the food safety, the corridors which I talked to earlier, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	individual risk assessments, individual farms to make that decision about how to handle buffers and habitants and so forth. But all of that will be part of a different regulatory process, but it will start at the end this year and will be governed through the Food and Drug Administration. MR. JEFFRIES: Thank you very much.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. JEFFRIES: I'm just thinking how many acres of land you have to take out of production to do something like that. But the ultimate goal is that we have to clean up the water. That's the ultimate goal. That's what I'm here for. My last question is to deal with the food safety, the corridors which I talked to earlier, the other agency that was here. I didn't see you address	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	individual risk assessments, individual farms to make that decision about how to handle buffers and habitants and so forth. But all of that will be part of a different regulatory process, but it will start at the end this year and will be governed through the Food and Drug Administration. MR. JEFFRIES: Thank you very much. MR. YOUNG: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. JEFFRIES: I'm just thinking how many acres of land you have to take out of production to do something like that. But the ultimate goal is that we have to clean up the water. That's the ultimate goal. That's what I'm here for. My last question is to deal with the food safety, the corridors which I talked to earlier, the other agency that was here. I didn't see you address that totally.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	individual risk assessments, individual farms to make that decision about how to handle buffers and habitants and so forth. But all of that will be part of a different regulatory process, but it will start at the end this year and will be governed through the Food and Drug Administration. MR. JEFFRIES: Thank you very much. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Okay. Well, we're going to take a break,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. JEFFRIES: I'm just thinking how many acres of land you have to take out of production to do something like that. But the ultimate goal is that we have to clean up the water. That's the ultimate goal. That's what I'm here for. My last question is to deal with the food safety, the corridors which I talked to earlier, the other agency that was here. I didn't see you address that totally. MS. DUNHAM: As far as, well, with our proposal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	individual risk assessments, individual farms to make that decision about how to handle buffers and habitants and so forth. But all of that will be part of a different regulatory process, but it will start at the end this year and will be governed through the Food and Drug Administration. MR. JEFFRIES: Thank you very much. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Okay. Well, we're going to take a break, actually, the reporter would like to rest her hands and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. JEFFRIES: I'm just thinking how many acres of land you have to take out of production to do something like that. But the ultimate goal is that we have to clean up the water. That's the ultimate goal. That's what I'm here for. My last question is to deal with the food safety, the corridors which I talked to earlier, the other agency that was here. I didn't see you address that totally. MS. DUNHAM: As far as, well, with our proposal you wouldn't be subject to if you went with the Third	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	individual risk assessments, individual farms to make that decision about how to handle buffers and habitants and so forth. But all of that will be part of a different regulatory process, but it will start at the end this year and will be governed through the Food and Drug Administration. MR. JEFFRIES: Thank you very much. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Okay. Well, we're going to take a break,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. JEFFRIES: I'm just thinking how many acres of land you have to take out of production to do something like that. But the ultimate goal is that we have to clean up the water. That's the ultimate goal. That's what I'm here for. My last question is to deal with the food safety, the corridors which I talked to earlier, the other agency that was here. I didn't see you address that totally. MS. DUNHAM: As far as, well, with our proposal you wouldn't be subject to if you went with the Third Party Coalition Alternative you wouldn't be subject to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	individual risk assessments, individual farms to make that decision about how to handle buffers and habitants and so forth. But all of that will be part of a different regulatory process, but it will start at the end this year and will be governed through the Food and Drug Administration. MR. JEFFRIES: Thank you very much. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Okay. Well, we're going to take a break, actually, the reporter would like to rest her hands and fingers. And 3:30 we'll come back.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. JEFFRIES: I'm just thinking how many acres of land you have to take out of production to do something like that. But the ultimate goal is that we have to clean up the water. That's the ultimate goal. That's what I'm here for. My last question is to deal with the food safety, the corridors which I talked to earlier, the other agency that was here. I didn't see you address that totally. MS. DUNHAM: As far as, well, with our proposal you wouldn't be subject to if you went with the Third Party Coalition Alternative you wouldn't be subject to the water quality buffer plan requirements that were	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	individual risk assessments, individual farms to make that decision about how to handle buffers and habitants and so forth. But all of that will be part of a different regulatory process, but it will start at the end this year and will be governed through the Food and Drug Administration. MR. JEFFRIES: Thank you very much. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Okay. Well, we're going to take a break, actually, the reporter would like to rest her hands and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. JEFFRIES: I'm just thinking how many acres of land you have to take out of production to do something like that. But the ultimate goal is that we have to clean up the water. That's the ultimate goal. That's what I'm here for. My last question is to deal with the food safety, the corridors which I talked to earlier, the other agency that was here. I didn't see you address that totally. MS. DUNHAM: As far as, well, with our proposal you wouldn't be subject to if you went with the Third Party Coalition Alternative you wouldn't be subject to the water quality buffer plan requirements that were within the staff's proposal. So, it would still,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	individual risk assessments, individual farms to make that decision about how to handle buffers and habitants and so forth. But all of that will be part of a different regulatory process, but it will start at the end this year and will be governed through the Food and Drug Administration. MR. JEFFRIES: Thank you very much. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Okay. Well, we're going to take a break, actually, the reporter would like to rest her hands and fingers. And 3:30 we'll come back. (Break taken at 3:12 P.M. to 3:30 P.M.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. JEFFRIES: I'm just thinking how many acres of land you have to take out of production to do something like that. But the ultimate goal is that we have to clean up the water. That's the ultimate goal. That's what I'm here for. My last question is to deal with the food safety, the corridors which I talked to earlier, the other agency that was here. I didn't see you address that totally. MS. DUNHAM: As far as, well, with our proposal you wouldn't be subject to if you went with the Third Party Coalition Alternative you wouldn't be subject to the water quality buffer plan requirements that were within the staff's proposal. So, it would still, obviously, you still need to address sediment run-off,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	individual risk assessments, individual farms to make that decision about how to handle buffers and habitants and so forth. But all of that will be part of a different regulatory process, but it will start at the end this year and will be governed through the Food and Drug Administration. MR. JEFFRIES: Thank you very much. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Okay. Well, we're going to take a break, actually, the reporter would like to rest her hands and fingers. And 3:30 we'll come back. (Break taken at 3:12 P.M. to 3:30 P.M.) MR. YOUNG: Okay, Mr. Briggs, so, we're ready for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. JEFFRIES: I'm just thinking how many acres of land you have to take out of production to do something like that. But the ultimate goal is that we have to clean up the water. That's the ultimate goal. That's what I'm here for. My last question is to deal with the food safety, the corridors which I talked to earlier, the other agency that was here. I didn't see you address that totally. MS. DUNHAM: As far as, well, with our proposal you wouldn't be subject to if you went with the Third Party Coalition Alternative you wouldn't be subject to the water quality buffer plan requirements that were within the staff's proposal. So, it would still, obviously, you still need to look to appropriate management	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	individual risk assessments, individual farms to make that decision about how to handle buffers and habitants and so forth. But all of that will be part of a different regulatory process, but it will start at the end this year and will be governed through the Food and Drug Administration. MR. JEFFRIES: Thank you very much. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Okay. Well, we're going to take a break, actually, the reporter would like to rest her hands and fingers. And 3:30 we'll come back. (Break taken at 3:12 P.M. to 3:30 P.M.) MR. YOUNG: Okay, Mr. Briggs, so, we're ready for staff to give us their comments and response to what they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. JEFFRIES: I'm just thinking how many acres of land you have to take out of production to do something like that. But the ultimate goal is that we have to clean up the water. That's the ultimate goal. That's what I'm here for. My last question is to deal with the food safety, the corridors which I talked to earlier, the other agency that was here. I didn't see you address that totally. MS. DUNHAM: As far as, well, with our proposal you wouldn't be subject to if you went with the Third Party Coalition Alternative you wouldn't be subject to the water quality buffer plan requirements that were within the staff's proposal. So, it would still, obviously, you still need to look to appropriate management practices, but there's no specific riparian buffer	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	individual risk assessments, individual farms to make that decision about how to handle buffers and habitants and so forth. But all of that will be part of a different regulatory process, but it will start at the end this year and will be governed through the Food and Drug Administration. MR. JEFFRIES: Thank you very much. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Okay. Well, we're going to take a break, actually, the reporter would like to rest her hands and fingers. And 3:30 we'll come back. (Break taken at 3:12 P.M. to 3:30 P.M.) MR. YOUNG: Okay, Mr. Briggs, so, we're ready for staff to give us their comments and response to what they heard.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. JEFFRIES: I'm just thinking how many acres of land you have to take out of production to do something like that. But the ultimate goal is that we have to clean up the water. That's the ultimate goal. That's what I'm here for. My last question is to deal with the food safety, the corridors which I talked to earlier, the other agency that was here. I didn't see you address that totally. MS. DUNHAM: As far as, well, with our proposal you wouldn't be subject to if you went with the Third Party Coalition Alternative you wouldn't be subject to the water quality buffer plan requirements that were within the staff's proposal. So, it would still, obviously, you still need to address sediment run-off, you still need to look to appropriate management practices, but there's no specific riparian buffer requirements or vegetative riparian buffer plan	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	individual risk assessments, individual farms to make that decision about how to handle buffers and habitants and so forth. But all of that will be part of a different regulatory process, but it will start at the end this year and will be governed through the Food and Drug Administration. MR. JEFFRIES: Thank you very much. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Okay. Well, we're going to take a break, actually, the reporter would like to rest her hands and fingers. And 3:30 we'll come back. (Break taken at 3:12 P.M. to 3:30 P.M.) MR. YOUNG: Okay, Mr. Briggs, so, we're ready for staff to give us their comments and response to what they heard. MR. BRIGGS: We had a speed meeting and so we have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. JEFFRIES: I'm just thinking how many acres of land you have to take out of production to do something like that. But the ultimate goal is that we have to clean up the water. That's the ultimate goal. That's what I'm here for. My last question is to deal with the food safety, the corridors which I talked to earlier, the other agency that was here. I didn't see you address that totally. MS. DUNHAM: As far as, well, with our proposal you wouldn't be subject to if you went with the Third Party Coalition Alternative you wouldn't be subject to the water quality buffer plan requirements that were within the staff's proposal. So, it would still, obviously, you still need to address sediment run-off, you still need to look to appropriate management practices, but there's no specific riparian buffer requirements or vegetative riparian buffer plan requirement	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	individual risk assessments, individual farms to make that decision about how to handle buffers and habitants and so forth. But all of that will be part of a different regulatory process, but it will start at the end this year and will be governed through the Food and Drug Administration. MR. JEFFRIES: Thank you very much. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Okay. Well, we're going to take a break, actually, the reporter would like to rest her hands and fingers. And 3:30 we'll come back. (Break taken at 3:12 P.M. to 3:30 P.M.) MR. YOUNG: Okay, Mr. Briggs, so, we're ready for staff to give us their comments and response to what they heard. MR. BRIGGS: We had a speed meeting and so we have Monica Barricarte who we introduced to you earlier at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. JEFFRIES: I'm just thinking how many acres of land you have to take out of production to do something like that. But the ultimate goal is that we have to clean up the water. That's the ultimate goal. That's what I'm here for. My last question is to deal with the food safety, the corridors which I talked to earlier, the other agency that was here. I didn't see you address that totally. MS. DUNHAM: As far as, well, with our proposal you wouldn't be subject to if you went with the Third Party Coalition Alternative you wouldn't be subject to the water quality buffer plan requirements that were within the staff's proposal. So, it would still, obviously, you still need to address sediment run-off, you still need to look to appropriate management practices, but there's no specific riparian buffer requirements or vegetative riparian buffer plan requirement MR. JEFFRIES: Was it considered?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	individual risk assessments, individual farms to make that decision about how to handle buffers and habitants and so forth. But all of that will be part of a different regulatory process, but it will start at the end this year and will be governed through the Food and Drug Administration. MR. JEFFRIES: Thank you very much. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Okay. Well, we're going to take a break, actually, the reporter would like to rest her hands and fingers. And 3:30 we'll come back. (Break taken at 3:12 P.M. to 3:30 P.M.) MR. YOUNG: Okay, Mr. Briggs, so, we're ready for staff to give us their comments and response to what they heard. MR. BRIGGS: We had a speed meeting and so we have Monica Barricarte who we introduced to you earlier at the table.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. JEFFRIES: I'm just thinking how many acres of land you have to take out of production to do something like that. But the ultimate goal is that we have to clean up the water. That's the ultimate goal. That's what I'm here for. My last question is to deal with the food safety, the corridors which I talked to earlier, the other agency that was here. I didn't see you address that totally. MS. DUNHAM: As far as, well, with our proposal you wouldn't be subject to if you went with the Third Party Coalition Alternative you wouldn't be subject to the water quality buffer plan requirements that were within the staff's proposal. So, it would still, obviously, you still need to address sediment run-off, you still need to look to appropriate management practices, but there's no specific riparian buffer requirements or vegetative riparian buffer plan requirement MR. JEFFRIES: Was it considered? MS. DUNHAM: What?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	individual risk assessments, individual farms to make that decision about how to handle buffers and habitants and so forth. But all of that will be part of a different regulatory process, but it will start at the end this year and will be governed through the Food and Drug Administration. MR. JEFFRIES: Thank you very much. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Okay. Well, we're going to take a break, actually, the reporter would like to rest her hands and fingers. And 3:30 we'll come back. (Break taken at 3:12 P.M. to 3:30 P.M.) MR. YOUNG: Okay, Mr. Briggs, so, we're ready for staff to give us their comments and response to what they heard. MR. BRIGGS: We had a speed meeting and so we have Monica Barricarte who we introduced to you earlier at the table. Matthew Keeling, and Lisa McCann. Angela
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. JEFFRIES: I'm just thinking how many acres of land you have to take out of production to do something like that. But the ultimate goal is that we have to clean up the water. That's the ultimate goal. That's what I'm here for. My last question is to deal with the food safety, the corridors which I talked to earlier, the other agency that was here. I didn't see you address that totally. MS. DUNHAM: As far as, well, with our proposal you wouldn't be subject to if you went with the Third Party Coalition Alternative you wouldn't be subject to the water quality buffer plan requirements that were within the staff's proposal. So, it would still, obviously, you still need to address sediment run-off, you still need to look to appropriate management practices, but there's no specific riparian buffer requirements or vegetative riparian buffer plan requirement MR. JEFFRIES: Was it considered? MS. DUNHAM: What? MR. JEFFRIES: Was it considered?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	individual risk assessments, individual farms to make that decision about how to handle buffers and habitants and so forth. But all of that will be part of a different regulatory process, but it will start at the end this year and will be governed through the Food and Drug Administration. MR. JEFFRIES: Thank you very much. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Okay. Well, we're going to take a break, actually, the reporter would like to rest her hands and fingers. And 3:30 we'll come back. (Break taken at 3:12 P.M. to 3:30 P.M.) MR. YOUNG: Okay, Mr. Briggs, so, we're ready for staff to give us their comments and response to what they heard. MR. BRIGGS: We had a speed meeting and so we have Monica Barricarte who we introduced to you earlier at the table. Matthew Keeling, and Lisa McCann. Angela will be joining us in a few minutes. I think we will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. JEFFRIES: I'm just thinking how many acres of land you have to take out of production to do something like that. But the ultimate goal is that we have to clean up the water. That's the ultimate goal. That's what I'm here for. My last question is to deal with the food safety, the corridors which I talked to earlier, the other agency that was here. I didn't see you address that totally. MS. DUNHAM: As far as, well, with our proposal you wouldn't be subject to if you went with the Third Party Coalition Alternative you wouldn't be subject to the water quality buffer plan requirements that were within the staff's proposal. So, it would still, obviously, you still need to address sediment run-off, you still need to look to appropriate management practices, but there's no specific riparian buffer requirements or vegetative riparian buffer plan requirement MR. JEFFRIES: Was it considered? MS. DUNHAM: What?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	individual risk assessments, individual farms to make that decision about how to handle buffers and habitants and so forth. But all of that will be part of a different regulatory process, but it will start at the end this year and will be governed through the Food and Drug Administration. MR. JEFFRIES: Thank you very much. MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Okay. Well, we're going to take a break, actually, the reporter would like to rest her hands and fingers. And 3:30 we'll come back. (Break taken at 3:12 P.M. to 3:30 P.M.) MR. YOUNG: Okay, Mr. Briggs, so, we're ready for staff to give us their comments and response to what they heard. MR. BRIGGS: We had a speed meeting and so we have Monica Barricarte who we introduced to you earlier at the table. Matthew Keeling, and Lisa McCann. Angela

1	directly behind Ms. McCann.	1	business industry. And that data should be made
2	So we've taken notes of things you might want	2	available to the public about the impairment caused by
3	more clarification on, responses and that sort of thing.	3	agricultural discharges.
4	Certain things everything that would take a long time,	4	MR. YOUNG: Slow down a little bit, Angie.
5	considering the testimony and all the responses we have	5	MS. SCHROETER: You also heard the Board should
6	received. So we will try to get the important points.	6	not be one-size fits all and that not all farms cause the
7	So are you leading off, Angela?	7	same level of water quality impairment.
8	MS. SCHROETER: I am Angela Schroeter. I am	8	One example of that is testimony heard from a
9	Senior Engineer, Engineering Geologist and Program	9	Strawberry Commission on March 17th, that strawberries
10	Manager for the Agricultural Regulatory Program.	10	should be considered low risk to water quality.
11	Before I begin, I just want to thank you all	11	We also heard about cost and economic
12	for taking the time. It's been one long day. One long	12	issues, both from the perspective of the farmer as well
13	process. Your contribution is appreciated.	13	as costs effected by the pollution agricultural areas.
14	So as Roger mentioned we're going to provide	14	In addition, the Farm Bureau has presented an
15	you with a brief summary of key public comment areas.	15	agricultural industry proposal to regulate agricultural
16	Staff's response to the issues brought up. Some changes	16	discharges, which is based upon third-party coalitions.
17	to the Draft Order that staff is recommending based upon	17	Throughout the process all day we've also
18	testimony heard on March 17th as well as testimony heard	18	have heard some specific comments on the Draft Order.
19	to the continuation today.	19	For example, there's been comments that the Order should
20	You'll also hear from individual staff who	20	tier based upon individual farms instead of operations.
21	worked on specific areas of the Draft Order. And I'll	21	We've heard that acreage is an inappropriate tiering
22	respond to some technical issues.	22	criteria. We've also heard that the Order should include
23	Michael Thomas will speak to make the staff's	23	additional pesticide, like Pyrethroids and others rather
24	final recommendations.	24	than just Chlorpyrifos and Diazinon.
25	So the Board provided a significant	25	We've also heard that the Order shall allow
	Page 555		Page 557
-		_	the constitution of the last contract of the c
1	opportunity for public input to the Draft Order. Staff	1	the use of the University of California Nitrate Hazard
2	has publicly released three versions and continues to	2	Index including soil type.
2	has publicly released three versions and continues to recommend changes that are responsive to many of the	2	Index including soil type. And finally, we've also heard that the
2 3 4	has publicly released three versions and continues to recommend changes that are responsive to many of the issues raised.	2 3 4	Index including soil type. And finally, we've also heard that the Executive Officer should not have the authority to modify
2 3 4 5	has publicly released three versions and continues to recommend changes that are responsive to many of the issues raised. At the March 17th Board Meeting, and again	2 3 4 5	Index including soil type. And finally, we've also heard that the Executive Officer should not have the authority to modify the tiering criteria.
2 3 4 5 6	has publicly released three versions and continues to recommend changes that are responsive to many of the issues raised. At the March 17th Board Meeting, and again today you heard additional testimony that was reflective	2 3 4 5 6	Index including soil type. And finally, we've also heard that the Executive Officer should not have the authority to modify the tiering criteria. Now, to address the public comment areas
2 3 4 5 6 7	has publicly released three versions and continues to recommend changes that are responsive to many of the issues raised. At the March 17th Board Meeting, and again today you heard additional testimony that was reflective of the major public comment areas the Board has heard	2 3 4 5 6 7	Index including soil type. And finally, we've also heard that the Executive Officer should not have the authority to modify the tiering criteria. Now, to address the public comment areas individual technical staff who work on specific areas of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	has publicly released three versions and continues to recommend changes that are responsive to many of the issues raised. At the March 17th Board Meeting, and again today you heard additional testimony that was reflective	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Index including soil type. And finally, we've also heard that the Executive Officer should not have the authority to modify the tiering criteria. Now, to address the public comment areas individual technical staff who work on specific areas of the Draft order will respond to some of the technical
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	has publicly released three versions and continues to recommend changes that are responsive to many of the issues raised. At the March 17th Board Meeting, and again today you heard additional testimony that was reflective of the major public comment areas the Board has heard throughout the process.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Index including soil type. And finally, we've also heard that the Executive Officer should not have the authority to modify the tiering criteria. Now, to address the public comment areas individual technical staff who work on specific areas of the Draft order will respond to some of the technical issues.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	has publicly released three versions and continues to recommend changes that are responsive to many of the issues raised. At the March 17th Board Meeting, and again today you heard additional testimony that was reflective of the major public comment areas the Board has heard	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Index including soil type. And finally, we've also heard that the Executive Officer should not have the authority to modify the tiering criteria. Now, to address the public comment areas individual technical staff who work on specific areas of the Draft order will respond to some of the technical issues. Before we do that, I wanted to just clarify
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	has publicly released three versions and continues to recommend changes that are responsive to many of the issues raised. At the March 17th Board Meeting, and again today you heard additional testimony that was reflective of the major public comment areas the Board has heard throughout the process. (Interruption by the court reporter.)	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Index including soil type. And finally, we've also heard that the Executive Officer should not have the authority to modify the tiering criteria. Now, to address the public comment areas individual technical staff who work on specific areas of the Draft order will respond to some of the technical issues. Before we do that, I wanted to just clarify some issues we just heard on from some of the speakers
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	has publicly released three versions and continues to recommend changes that are responsive to many of the issues raised. At the March 17th Board Meeting, and again today you heard additional testimony that was reflective of the major public comment areas the Board has heard throughout the process. (Interruption by the court reporter.) MR. SCHROETER: Sorry.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Index including soil type. And finally, we've also heard that the Executive Officer should not have the authority to modify the tiering criteria. Now, to address the public comment areas individual technical staff who work on specific areas of the Draft order will respond to some of the technical issues. Before we do that, I wanted to just clarify some issues we just heard on from some of the speakers today, quickly. For example, the issue of pond and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	has publicly released three versions and continues to recommend changes that are responsive to many of the issues raised. At the March 17th Board Meeting, and again today you heard additional testimony that was reflective of the major public comment areas the Board has heard throughout the process. (Interruption by the court reporter.) MR. SCHROETER: Sorry. The Board has heard from individuals about	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Index including soil type. And finally, we've also heard that the Executive Officer should not have the authority to modify the tiering criteria. Now, to address the public comment areas individual technical staff who work on specific areas of the Draft order will respond to some of the technical issues. Before we do that, I wanted to just clarify some issues we just heard on from some of the speakers today, quickly. For example, the issue of pond and lining came up. I just want to clarify there's no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	has publicly released three versions and continues to recommend changes that are responsive to many of the issues raised. At the March 17th Board Meeting, and again today you heard additional testimony that was reflective of the major public comment areas the Board has heard throughout the process. (Interruption by the court reporter.) MR. SCHROETER: Sorry. The Board has heard from individuals about the significant impacts from nitrate loading to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Index including soil type. And finally, we've also heard that the Executive Officer should not have the authority to modify the tiering criteria. Now, to address the public comment areas individual technical staff who work on specific areas of the Draft order will respond to some of the technical issues. Before we do that, I wanted to just clarify some issues we just heard on from some of the speakers today, quickly. For example, the issue of pond and lining came up. I just want to clarify there's no requirement in the Draft Order to line ponds. There is a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	has publicly released three versions and continues to recommend changes that are responsive to many of the issues raised. At the March 17th Board Meeting, and again today you heard additional testimony that was reflective of the major public comment areas the Board has heard throughout the process. (Interruption by the court reporter.) MR. SCHROETER: Sorry. The Board has heard from individuals about the significant impacts from nitrate loading to groundwater in our agricultural wells, as well as impacts	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Index including soil type. And finally, we've also heard that the Executive Officer should not have the authority to modify the tiering criteria. Now, to address the public comment areas individual technical staff who work on specific areas of the Draft order will respond to some of the technical issues. Before we do that, I wanted to just clarify some issues we just heard on from some of the speakers today, quickly. For example, the issue of pond and lining came up. I just want to clarify there's no requirement in the Draft Order to line ponds. There is a requirement that any pond retention basin must be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	has publicly released three versions and continues to recommend changes that are responsive to many of the issues raised. At the March 17th Board Meeting, and again today you heard additional testimony that was reflective of the major public comment areas the Board has heard throughout the process. (Interruption by the court reporter.) MR. SCHROETER: Sorry. The Board has heard from individuals about the significant impacts from nitrate loading to groundwater in our agricultural wells, as well as impacts to public drinking water that supplies private domestic	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Index including soil type. And finally, we've also heard that the Executive Officer should not have the authority to modify the tiering criteria. Now, to address the public comment areas individual technical staff who work on specific areas of the Draft order will respond to some of the technical issues. Before we do that, I wanted to just clarify some issues we just heard on from some of the speakers today, quickly. For example, the issue of pond and lining came up. I just want to clarify there's no requirement in the Draft Order to line ponds. There is a requirement that any pond retention basin must be monitored as part of the MRP, but there's no requirement
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	has publicly released three versions and continues to recommend changes that are responsive to many of the issues raised. At the March 17th Board Meeting, and again today you heard additional testimony that was reflective of the major public comment areas the Board has heard throughout the process. (Interruption by the court reporter.) MR. SCHROETER: Sorry. The Board has heard from individuals about the significant impacts from nitrate loading to groundwater in our agricultural wells, as well as impacts to public drinking water that supplies private domestic wells.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Index including soil type. And finally, we've also heard that the Executive Officer should not have the authority to modify the tiering criteria. Now, to address the public comment areas individual technical staff who work on specific areas of the Draft order will respond to some of the technical issues. Before we do that, I wanted to just clarify some issues we just heard on from some of the speakers today, quickly. For example, the issue of pond and lining came up. I just want to clarify there's no requirement in the Draft Order to line ponds. There is a requirement that any pond retention basin must be monitored as part of the MRP, but there's no requirement that ponds must be lined.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	has publicly released three versions and continues to recommend changes that are responsive to many of the issues raised. At the March 17th Board Meeting, and again today you heard additional testimony that was reflective of the major public comment areas the Board has heard throughout the process. (Interruption by the court reporter.) MR. SCHROETER: Sorry. The Board has heard from individuals about the significant impacts from nitrate loading to groundwater in our agricultural wells, as well as impacts to public drinking water that supplies private domestic wells. The Board has heard from individuals,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Index including soil type. And finally, we've also heard that the Executive Officer should not have the authority to modify the tiering criteria. Now, to address the public comment areas individual technical staff who work on specific areas of the Draft order will respond to some of the technical issues. Before we do that, I wanted to just clarify some issues we just heard on from some of the speakers today, quickly. For example, the issue of pond and lining came up. I just want to clarify there's no requirement in the Draft Order to line ponds. There is a requirement that any pond retention basin must be monitored as part of the MRP, but there's no requirement that ponds must be lined. I also wanted to clarify part of the criteria
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	has publicly released three versions and continues to recommend changes that are responsive to many of the issues raised. At the March 17th Board Meeting, and again today you heard additional testimony that was reflective of the major public comment areas the Board has heard throughout the process. (Interruption by the court reporter.) MR. SCHROETER: Sorry. The Board has heard from individuals about the significant impacts from nitrate loading to groundwater in our agricultural wells, as well as impacts to public drinking water that supplies private domestic wells. The Board has heard from individuals, communities, schools and environmental justice	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Index including soil type. And finally, we've also heard that the Executive Officer should not have the authority to modify the tiering criteria. Now, to address the public comment areas individual technical staff who work on specific areas of the Draft order will respond to some of the technical issues. Before we do that, I wanted to just clarify some issues we just heard on from some of the speakers today, quickly. For example, the issue of pond and lining came up. I just want to clarify there's no requirement in the Draft Order to line ponds. There is a requirement that any pond retention basin must be monitored as part of the MRP, but there's no requirement that ponds must be lined. I also wanted to clarify part of the criteria and issues brought up about whether or not a farm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	has publicly released three versions and continues to recommend changes that are responsive to many of the issues raised. At the March 17th Board Meeting, and again today you heard additional testimony that was reflective of the major public comment areas the Board has heard throughout the process. (Interruption by the court reporter.) MR. SCHROETER: Sorry. The Board has heard from individuals about the significant impacts from nitrate loading to groundwater in our agricultural wells, as well as impacts to public drinking water that supplies private domestic wells. The Board has heard from individuals, communities, schools and environmental justice organizations who are impacted by agricultural discharges	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Index including soil type. And finally, we've also heard that the Executive Officer should not have the authority to modify the tiering criteria. Now, to address the public comment areas individual technical staff who work on specific areas of the Draft order will respond to some of the technical issues. Before we do that, I wanted to just clarify some issues we just heard on from some of the speakers today, quickly. For example, the issue of pond and lining came up. I just want to clarify there's no requirement in the Draft Order to line ponds. There is a requirement that any pond retention basin must be monitored as part of the MRP, but there's no requirement that ponds must be lined. I also wanted to clarify part of the criteria and issues brought up about whether or not a farm actually drains to a water body how someone ends up in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	has publicly released three versions and continues to recommend changes that are responsive to many of the issues raised. At the March 17th Board Meeting, and again today you heard additional testimony that was reflective of the major public comment areas the Board has heard throughout the process. (Interruption by the court reporter.) MR. SCHROETER: Sorry. The Board has heard from individuals about the significant impacts from nitrate loading to groundwater in our agricultural wells, as well as impacts to public drinking water that supplies private domestic wells. The Board has heard from individuals, communities, schools and environmental justice organizations who are impacted by agricultural discharges that protecting drinking water should be among our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Index including soil type. And finally, we've also heard that the Executive Officer should not have the authority to modify the tiering criteria. Now, to address the public comment areas individual technical staff who work on specific areas of the Draft order will respond to some of the technical issues. Before we do that, I wanted to just clarify some issues we just heard on from some of the speakers today, quickly. For example, the issue of pond and lining came up. I just want to clarify there's no requirement in the Draft Order to line ponds. There is a requirement that any pond retention basin must be monitored as part of the MRP, but there's no requirement that ponds must be lined. I also wanted to clarify part of the criteria and issues brought up about whether or not a farm actually drains to a water body how someone ends up in Tier 3 and not even discharge to a surface water body.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	has publicly released three versions and continues to recommend changes that are responsive to many of the issues raised. At the March 17th Board Meeting, and again today you heard additional testimony that was reflective of the major public comment areas the Board has heard throughout the process. (Interruption by the court reporter.) MR. SCHROETER: Sorry. The Board has heard from individuals about the significant impacts from nitrate loading to groundwater in our agricultural wells, as well as impacts to public drinking water that supplies private domestic wells. The Board has heard from individuals, communities, schools and environmental justice organizations who are impacted by agricultural discharges that protecting drinking water should be among our highest priorities.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Index including soil type. And finally, we've also heard that the Executive Officer should not have the authority to modify the tiering criteria. Now, to address the public comment areas individual technical staff who work on specific areas of the Draft order will respond to some of the technical issues. Before we do that, I wanted to just clarify some issues we just heard on from some of the speakers today, quickly. For example, the issue of pond and lining came up. I just want to clarify there's no requirement in the Draft Order to line ponds. There is a requirement that any pond retention basin must be monitored as part of the MRP, but there's no requirement that ponds must be lined. I also wanted to clarify part of the criteria and issues brought up about whether or not a farm actually drains to a water body how someone ends up in Tier 3 and not even discharge to a surface water body. And that change was made in the March 2011 Draft, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	has publicly released three versions and continues to recommend changes that are responsive to many of the issues raised. At the March 17th Board Meeting, and again today you heard additional testimony that was reflective of the major public comment areas the Board has heard throughout the process. (Interruption by the court reporter.) MR. SCHROETER: Sorry. The Board has heard from individuals about the significant impacts from nitrate loading to groundwater in our agricultural wells, as well as impacts to public drinking water that supplies private domestic wells. The Board has heard from individuals, communities, schools and environmental justice organizations who are impacted by agricultural discharges that protecting drinking water should be among our highest priorities. The Board has also heard comments that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Index including soil type. And finally, we've also heard that the Executive Officer should not have the authority to modify the tiering criteria. Now, to address the public comment areas individual technical staff who work on specific areas of the Draft order will respond to some of the technical issues. Before we do that, I wanted to just clarify some issues we just heard on from some of the speakers today, quickly. For example, the issue of pond and lining came up. I just want to clarify there's no requirement in the Draft Order to line ponds. There is a requirement that any pond retention basin must be monitored as part of the MRP, but there's no requirement that ponds must be lined. I also wanted to clarify part of the criteria and issues brought up about whether or not a farm actually drains to a water body how someone ends up in Tier 3 and not even discharge to a surface water body. And that change was made in the March 2011 Draft, and that criteria is now clarified to say drain 2. And I'll
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	has publicly released three versions and continues to recommend changes that are responsive to many of the issues raised. At the March 17th Board Meeting, and again today you heard additional testimony that was reflective of the major public comment areas the Board has heard throughout the process. (Interruption by the court reporter.) MR. SCHROETER: Sorry. The Board has heard from individuals about the significant impacts from nitrate loading to groundwater in our agricultural wells, as well as impacts to public drinking water that supplies private domestic wells. The Board has heard from individuals, communities, schools and environmental justice organizations who are impacted by agricultural discharges that protecting drinking water should be among our highest priorities. The Board has also heard comments that agriculture must be accountable for the associated	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Index including soil type. And finally, we've also heard that the Executive Officer should not have the authority to modify the tiering criteria. Now, to address the public comment areas individual technical staff who work on specific areas of the Draft order will respond to some of the technical issues. Before we do that, I wanted to just clarify some issues we just heard on from some of the speakers today, quickly. For example, the issue of pond and lining came up. I just want to clarify there's no requirement in the Draft Order to line ponds. There is a requirement that any pond retention basin must be monitored as part of the MRP, but there's no requirement that ponds must be lined. I also wanted to clarify part of the criteria and issues brought up about whether or not a farm actually drains to a water body how someone ends up in Tier 3 and not even discharge to a surface water body. And that change was made in the March 2011 Draft, and that criteria is now clarified to say drain 2. And I'll show that in the slides. So that should take care of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	has publicly released three versions and continues to recommend changes that are responsive to many of the issues raised. At the March 17th Board Meeting, and again today you heard additional testimony that was reflective of the major public comment areas the Board has heard throughout the process. (Interruption by the court reporter.) MR. SCHROETER: Sorry. The Board has heard from individuals about the significant impacts from nitrate loading to groundwater in our agricultural wells, as well as impacts to public drinking water that supplies private domestic wells. The Board has heard from individuals, communities, schools and environmental justice organizations who are impacted by agricultural discharges that protecting drinking water should be among our highest priorities. The Board has also heard comments that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Index including soil type. And finally, we've also heard that the Executive Officer should not have the authority to modify the tiering criteria. Now, to address the public comment areas individual technical staff who work on specific areas of the Draft order will respond to some of the technical issues. Before we do that, I wanted to just clarify some issues we just heard on from some of the speakers today, quickly. For example, the issue of pond and lining came up. I just want to clarify there's no requirement in the Draft Order to line ponds. There is a requirement that any pond retention basin must be monitored as part of the MRP, but there's no requirement that ponds must be lined. I also wanted to clarify part of the criteria and issues brought up about whether or not a farm actually drains to a water body how someone ends up in Tier 3 and not even discharge to a surface water body. And that change was made in the March 2011 Draft, and that criteria is now clarified to say drain 2. And I'll

Tille drains, I wanted to bring that up, briefly, because Mr. Jeffries saked a question. Tile drains don't have any other additional requirements than the rest of those types of discharges in the Order. So, Jill North is going to present a response based upon the food safety issues. MR. NORTH: Jill North Till and invalidation of the saked upon the food safety issues. MR. NORTH: Jill North is going to present a response based upon the food safety issues. MR. NORTH: Jill North is going to present a response based upon the food safety issues. MR. NORTH: Leafly Green Marketing Agreement. And they have been wery responsive to our comments and they have been very responsive to our comments and they have been very responsive to our comments and they have been very responsive to our comments and they have been very responsive to our comments and they have been very responsive to our comments and they have been very responsive to our comments and they are not in conflict with any of our buffer requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements tha				
2 birlefly, because Mr. Jeffries asked a question. Tile 3 drains don't have any other additional requirements than 14 the rest of those types of discharges in the Order. 5 So. Jill North is going to present a response to the remain of the standard promiting to mention the beat was also write and the present and a response to the form and the response to the comments, and they have been very response to to uncommental and prometic present the wash and the present the present the wash and they are the response to the remains that we have response to the record of the present and a response to the form and the response to the present and a response to the sol of the remains and the present and a response to the sol of the remains and	1	Tile drains. I wanted to bring that up.	1	MS. NORTH: And animal entry.
drain's don't have any other additional requirements than the rest of those types of discharges in the Order So., Ill North is going to present a response based upon the food safety issues. So. Ill North is going to present a response based upon the food safety issues. MS. NORTH: Ill North, I'm the Environmental sections in the Control Board. Scientist here at the Regional Water Control Board. Dischart is present in a couple of the speakers that addressed mentioned that we had contributed to mention to be been working with food safety and water quality and promoting co-management before the 2006 outbreak and working with the LGMA providing comments and they have been wery responsive to our comments and they have been very responsive to our comments and they have been very responsive to our comments and they are not in conflict with any of our buffer requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to say for the record. MR. YOUNG: What do they require? MR. NORTH: They have buffers that are set, so they wave set for, say, confliend animal units, or for cartile operations, so there may be some 30 foot buffers page 599 To for the I know that's the one cattle, but they don't require vegetation removal at all. And they also have a specific statement within the metrics that you need to ancher to with the state and federal environmental require vegetations for rigarian protection and habitat projections of rigarian protection and habitat projections for rigarian protection and habitat projections. I think they specifically call out any regulations for finances that we that and federal environmental protections and		. .	2	5
the rest of those types of discharges in the Order So. Jill North is going to present a response based upon the food safety issues. MS. NORTH: Jill North. I'm the Environmental Scientist here at the Regional Water Control Board. Jipst want to mention a couple of the speakers that addressed: mentioned that we had conflicts to the LGMA metrics. And Jipst wanted to mention I've been working with food safety and water quality and promoting co-management before the 2006 dubtreak and working with the LGMA providing comments, and they have been very responsive to our comments and the they are not in conflict with any of our buffer requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to so say for the record. MR. VOUNG: What do they require? MS. NORTH: Excuse me? MS. NORTH: Excuse me? MS. NORTH: They have buffers that are set, so they are set for, say, confined animal units, or for cattle operations, so there may be some 30 foot buffers require vegetation removal at all. And they also have a specific statement within the metrics that you need to adhere to with the state and federal environmental require vegetation removal at all. And they also have a specific statement within the metrics that you need to adhere to with the state and federal environmental require vegetation removal at all. And they also have a specific statement within the metrics that you need to adhere to with the state and federal environmental require vegetation removal at all. And they also have a specific statement within the metrics that you need to adhere to with the state and federal environmental require vegetation removal at all. And they also have a specific statement within the metrics that you need to adhere to with the state and federal environmental require vegetation removal at all. And they also have a specific statement within the metrics that you need to adhere to with the state and federal environmental require vegeta		•	3	
5 based upon the food safety issues 7 MS. NORTH: Jill North, I'm the Environmental 8 Scientist here at the Regional Water Control Board. 10 speakers that addressed mentioned that we had conflicts to the LGMA metrics. And I just want to mention a couple of the conflicts to the LGMA metrics. And I just want to mention in the LGMP providing comments, and they have been working with tood safety and water quality and promoting co-management before the 2006 outbreak and working with the LGMP providing comments, and they have been very responsive to our comments and they have the very responsive to our comments and they have the very responsive to our comments and they have the very responsive to our comments and they are the very responsive to our comments and they are the very responsive to our comments and they are the very responsive to our comments and they are the very responsive to our comments and they are the very responsive to our comments and they are the very responsive to our comments and they are the			4	
based upon the food safety issues. MS. NORTH: Jill North, I'm the Environmental Scientist here at the Regional Water Control Board. Jiust want to mention a couple of the speakers that addressed: —mentioned that we had conflicts to the LGMA metrics. And I just wanted to quality and promoting co-management before the 2006 duthreak and working with the CIMA providing comments, and they have been very responsive to our comments and they are not in conflict with any of our buffer requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to remove vegetation in the LGMA metrics. I just wanted to remove vegetation in the LGMA metrics. I just wanted to remove vegetation in the LGMA metrics. I just wanted to remove vegetation in the LGMA metrics. I just wanted to speakers you wanted to they require? MS. NORTH: Excuse me? MS. NORTH: Excuse me? MS. NORTH: They have buffers that are set, so they have sets for, say, confined animal units, or for cattle operations, so there may be some 30 loot buffers require vegetation removal at all. And they also have a specific statement within the metrics that you need to adhere to with the state and federal environmental regulations. I think they specifically call out any regulations for riparian protection and habitat regulations. I think they specifically call out any regulations. I think they specifically call out any morphy with state and federal regulations to protect habitats? MR. YOUNG: Well, I understand that, yeah. How many pages - this is the you call it the Green Levy Marketing Unit? MS. NORTH: Leafy Green Marketing Agreement. MR. YOUNG: Ckay. MR. YOUNG: Gkay. MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. Y		3.	5	
MS. NORTH: Jill North, I'm the Environmental Scientist here at the Regional Water Control Board. 1			6	
Scientist here at the Regional Water Control Board. Just want to mentione a couple of the speakers that addressed — mentioned that we had conflicts to the LGMA metrics. And I just wanted to mentione the well with the desire the 2006 outbreak and working with the desirety and water unaiting and they have been very responsive to our comments, and they have been very responsive to our comments and they have been very responsive to our comments, and they have been very responsive to our comments and they have been very responsive to our comments, and they have been very responsive to our comments and they have been very responsive to our comments and they have been very responsive to our comments and they have been very responsive to our comments and they have been very responsive to our comments and they have set of they are not in conflict with any of our buffer requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to say for the record. MR. YOUNG: What do they require? MS. NORTH:—Excuse me? MS. NORTH:—Excuse me? MS. NORTH:—They have buffers that are set, so that have the operations, so there may be some 30 tool buffers brade to the part of the theory of the value sets for, say, conflined animal units, or for cattle operations, so there may be some 30 tool buffers. Page 559 To for the —I know that's the one cattle, but they don't require vegetation removal at all. And they also have a specific statement within the metrics that you need to specifically call out any regulations. I think they specifically call out any regulations. I think they specifically call out any regulations for riparian protection and habitat protection. MR. YOUNG: Well, I understand that, yeah. MR. YOUNG: Chay. MR. YOUNG: Chay. MR. YOUNG: Okay.		•	7	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			8	•
speakers that addressed mentioned that we had conflicts to the LGMA metrics. And I just wanted to mention I've been working with food safety and water quality and promoting co-management before the 2006 and they have been very responsive to our comments and they have been very responsive to our comments and they are not in conflict with any of our buffer requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to ward for the yare not in conflict with any of our buffer requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to MR. YOUNG: Well, I understand that, yeah. 10		ū	9	
conflicts to the LGMA metrics. And I just wanted to mention I ve been working with food safety and water quality and promoting co-management before the 2006 of they have been very responsive to our comments and they have been very responsive to our comments and they have been very responsive to our comments and they have been very responsive to our comments and they have been very responsive to our comments and they have been very responsive to our comments and they are not in conflict with any of our buffer requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements and they are not in conflict. With any of our buffer of water qualities and they are not in conflict. With any of our buffer of water qualities and the sample of the record. MR. YOUNG: What do they require? MR. YOUNG: What do they require? MR. YOUNG: What do they require? They are not in conflict. With any of our buffers of the record. MR. YOUNG: What do they require? MR. YOUNG: What do they require? They are not in conflict. With any of our buffers of they have a sets for, say, conflined animal units, or for cattle operations, so there may be some 30 foot buffers pages 59 The off the — I know that's the one cattle, but they don't require vegetation removal at all. And they also have a specific statement within the metrics that you need to adhere to with the state and federal removemental protection. That's in the — and then also — That's in the — and then also — MR. YOUNG: Well, I understand that, yeah. MR. YOUNG: That much? MR. YOUNG: That much?		·	10	3 3
mention I've been working with food safety and water quality and promoting co-management before the 2006 outbreak and working with the LGMA providing comments, and they have been very responsive to our comments and they are not in conflict with any of our buffer requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to say for the record. MR. YOUNG: What do they require? MS. NORTH: Excuse me? MS. NORTH: Excuse me? MS. NORTH: It's about that thick, (indicating). That's in the and then also MR. THOMAS: Before you go on. Does that make sense to the Board that the requirements are that they comply with state and federal regulations to protect MR. YOUNG: Well, I understand that, yeah. MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages coes that make MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. YOUNG:		·		
ultify and promoting co-management before the 2006 outbreak and working with the LGMA providing comments, and they have been very responsive to our comments and they are not in conflict with any of our buffer requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to require requirements and we support. NRCF has a document that looks at water quality issues promoting co-management and we support. NRCF has a document that looks at water quality and food safety practices on how you can bring environmental conservation practices along with the food safety practices on how you can bring environmental conservation practices and environmental requirements and we support. NRCF has a document that looks at water quality and food safety practices on how you can bring environmental conservation practices and environmental requirements and we support. NRCF has a document that looks at water quality and food safety practices on how you can bring environmental conservation practices and environmental practices. So, we also working with - that EPA and SRCS is practices and environmental practices and envir				-
outbreak and working with the LGMA providing comments, and they have been very responsive to our comments and they have been very responsive to our comments and they have not in conflict with any of our buffer requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to say for the record. MR. YOUNG: What do they require? MR. YOUNG: What do they require? MR. NORTH: Excuse me? MR. YOUNG: What do they require? MR. NORTH: They have buffers that are set, so they see sif sor, say, conflined animal units, or for cattle operations, so there may be some 30 foot buffers Page 559 To the I know that's the one cattle, but they don't require vegetation removal at all. And they also have a specific statement within the metrics that you need to adhere to with the state and federal environmental and our Order refers to it as well. It has a specific statement within the metrics that you need to regulations. I think they specifically call out any regulations. I think they specifically call out any regulations. I think they specifically call out any regulations for riparian protection and habitat for comply with state and federal requirements are that they comply with state and federal requirements are that they comply with state and federal requirements are that they comply with state and federal requirements are that they comply with state and federal requirements are that they comply with state and federal requirements are that they comply with state and federal requirements are that they comply with state and federal requirements are that they comply with state and federal requirements are that they comply with state and federal requirements are that they comply with state and federal requirements are that they comply with state and federal requirements are that they comply with state and federal requirements are that they comply with state and federal requirements. The formation are required to the federal requirements are that they comply with state and federal r		-		
and they have been very responsive to our comments and they are not in conflict with any of our buffer requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to remove vegetation in the LGMA metrics. I just wanted to say for the record. MR. YOUNG: What do they require? MS. NORTH: Excuse me? MR. YOUNG: What do they require? MS. NORTH: Excuse me? MR. YOUNG: What do they require? MS. NORTH: Excuse me? MR. YOUNG: What do they require? MS. NORTH: Excuse me? MR. YOUNG: What do they require? MR. YOUNG: What				
they are not in conflict with any of our buffer requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to requirements are that they seed and reduced to address that make to with the state and federal regulations. I think they specifically call out any regulations. I think they specifically call out any regulations. Think they specifically call out any regulations for riparian protection and habitat portection. That's in the and then also That's in the and then also That's in the and then also That's in the and federal regulations to protect habitats? MR. YOUNG: Well, I understand that, yeah. How many pages this is the you call it the Green Levy Marketing Unit? MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make up? MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make they of the good and they call they are they to have a specific and the treatment of the page to the page to the good with the state and federal regulations to protect habitats? MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make they of the good and the they call the page to the page to the good with the the requirements are that they they call the green Levy Marketing Unit? MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make they of the good and the page to the pa				·
requirements that we have. They do not state anywhere to remove vegetation in the LGMA metrics. I just wanted to say for the record. MR. YOUNG: What do they require? MR. NORTH: Excuse me? MR. NORTH: They have buffers that are set, so they have sets for, say, confined animal units, or for tatle operations, so there may be some 30 foot buffers page 559 To the or I know that's the one cattle, but they don't require vegetation removal at all. And they also have a address that metrics that you need to addrest to with the state and federal environmental regulations for riparian protection. That's in the and then also yor protection. MR. THOMAS: Before you go on. Does that make to sense to the Board that the requirements are that they comply with state and federal regulations to protect habitats? MR. YOUNG: Well, I understand that, yeah. How many pages this is the you call it the Green Levy Marketing Unit? MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make up? MR. YOUNG: That much? MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. Young backed water quality and food safety and water quality and food safety practices on how you can bring environmental our orderers to it as well. It as a document that looks at water quali				
remove vegetation in the LGMA metrics. I just wanted to say for the record. MR YOUNG: What do they require? MR. NORTH: Excuse me? MR. NORTH: Excuse me? MR. NORTH: They have buffers that are set, so attle operations, so there may be some 30 foot buffers a specific statement within the metrics that you need to adhere to with the state and federal environmental regulations. I think they specifically call out any regulations for riparian protection and habitat protection. MR. TOUNG: What do they require? MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Mover death and the food safety and document that looks at water quality and food safety. The cattle operations, so there may be some 30 foot buffers on how you can bring environmental conservation practices on how you can bring environmental for practices on how you can bring environmental operations and document that looks at water quality and food safety. That's in the and federal environmental and that. MR. YOUNG: Wat they don't and they specifically call out any protection. That's in the and federal environmental and that the requirements are that they offer the work in addition to the food safety. The other thing I'd like to address is want to explain that that y		,		
say for the record. MR. YOUNG: What do they require? MR. YOUNG: What do they require? MR. YOUNG: What do they require? MR. NORTH: Excuse me? MR. YOUNG: What do they require? MR. NORTH: Excuse me? MR. YOUNG: What do they require? MR. NORTH: Excuse me? MR. YOUNG: What do they require? MR. NORTH: They have buffers that are set, so MR. NORTH: They have buffers that are set, so they have sets for, say, confined animal units, or for cattle operations, so there may be some 30 foot buffers Page 559 To the I know that's the one cattle, but they don't require vegetation removal at all. And they also have a specific statement within the metrics that you need to adhere to with the state and federal environmental regulations. I think they specifically call out any regulations for riparian protection and habitat regulations for riparian protection and habitat more protection. MR. THOMAS: Before you go on. Does that make sense to the Board that the requirements are that they comply with state and federal regulations to protect habitats? MR. YOUNG: Well, I understand that, yeah. How many pages this is the you call it the Green Levy Marketing Unit? MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make up? MR. NORTH: Lexify Green Marketing Agreement. MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make? MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make? MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make? MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make? MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make? MR. YOUNG: Folks, please don't comment by mumbling and whatever you're doing. This isn't an event. Listen, you know, the issue I raised about what I what Mr. Quandt had you tyn there I'll just say this is that he was making an assumption that, you know, everything was going to be removed from the buffer. He had numbers attached to it. And my questions, you know, show that that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent.		•		
MR. YOUNG: What do they require? MS. NORTH: Excuse me? MS. NORTH: They have buffers that are set, so they have sets for, say, confined animal units, or for cattle operations, so there may be some 30 foot buffers Page 559 1 for the I know that's the one cattle, but they don't require vegetation removal at all. And they also have a specific statement within the metrics that you need to regulations. I think they specifically call out any regulations for riparian protection and habitat regulations. I think they specifically call out any rotection. MR. THOMAS: Before you go on. Does that make sense to the Board that the requirements are that they comply with state and federal regulations to protect habitats? MR. YOUNG: Well, I understand that, yeah. How many pages this is the you call it the Green Levy Marketing Unit? MS. NORTH: Leafy Green Marketing Agreement. MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make up? MS. NORTH: It's about that thick, (indicating). MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make and remains may be a lot of different they're looking at flooding and water and farm practices, and with the sum of the flood safety and water quality addiction of the saw attent quality and food safety and cocument and our order refers to it as well. It has a document that looks at water quality and food safety and cocument and our order refers to it as well. It has a document that looks at water quality and food safety practices on how you can bring environmental conservation practices into practices into practices into practices into practices on how you can bring environmental conservation practices into practices into practices into practices into practices on how you can bring environmental conservation practices into practices into practices into practices into practices on how you can bring environmental conservation practices on how you can bring environmental practices on how you can bring environmental set to practices on how you can bring environmental practices on how you can bring env				
MS. NORTH: Excuse me? MR. YOUNG: What do they require? MS. NORTH: They have buffers that are set, so MS. NORTH: They have buffers that are set, so MS. NORTH: They have buffers that are set, so they have sets for, say, confined animal units, or for cattle operations, so there may be some 30 foot buffers Page 559 To cattle operations, so there may be some 30 foot buffers Page 559 To require vegetation removal at all. And they also have a specific statement within the metrics that you need to adhere to with the state and federal environmental regulations. I think they specifically call out any regulations for riparian protection and habitat protection. That's in the and then also MR. THOMAS: Before you go on. Does that make somes to the Board that the requirements are that they comply with state and federal regulations to protect habitats? MR. YOUNG: Well, I understand that, yeah. How many pages this is the you call it the Green Levy Marketing Unit? MS. NORTH: Leafy Green Marketing Agreement. MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make up. MR. YOUNG: That much? MR. YOUNG: That much? MR. YOUNG: Okay.		•		
MR. YOUNG: What do they require? MS. NORTH: They have buffers that are set, so they have sets for, say, confined animal units, or for cattle operations, so there may be some 30 foot buffers Page 559 1 for the I know that's the one cattle, but they don't require vegetation removal at all. And they also have a specific statement within the metrics that you need to adhere to with the state and federal environmental regulations. I think they specifically call out any regulations for riparian protection and habitat protection. MR. THOMAS: Before you go on. Does that make MR. YOUNG: Well, I understand that, yeah. MR. YOUNG: Well, I understand that, yeah. MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make MR. YOUNG: That much? MR. YOUNG: That much? MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. Y		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		, ,
MS. NORTH: They have buffers that are set, so they have sets for, say, confined animal units, or for cattle operations, so there may be some 30 foot buffers Page 559 1 for the I know that's the one cattle, but they don't require vegetation removal at all. And they also have a specific statement within the metrics that you need to adhere to with the state and federal environmental regulations. I think they specifically call out any reduction. 3 specific statement within the metrics that you need to adhere to with the state and federal environmental regulations. I think they specifically call out any reduction. 4 That's in the and then also MR. THOMAS: Before you go on. Does that make sees to the Board that the requirements are that they comply with state and federal regulations to protect habitats? 10 sense to the Board that the requirements are that they comply with state and federal regulations to protect habitats? 11 the Green Levy Marketing Unit? 12 MS. NORTH: Leafy Green Marketing Agreement. MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make up? 13 MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make up? 14 MS. NORTH: It's about that thick, (indicating). 15 MS. NORTH: It's about that thick, (indicating). 16 MS. NORTH: They have a lot of different they re looking at flooding and water and farm practices, and they are along a flooding and water and farm practices, and they are along the first would not be set on the water quality and food safety. They have a lot of different they required to the About 80. I'm guessing. 10 MR. YOUNG: Okay. 11 practices. So, we also work with the food safety practices and enuring my retrictices and enurinomental practices and sow rith the 2D and NRCF is working with FDA because they also want to practices and environmental safety in addition to the food safety. So that is coming my retrive required environmental and the regulations for riparian protection and h				
they have sets for, say, confined animal units, or for cattle operations, so there may be some 30 foot buffers Page 559 1 for the I know that's the one cattle, but they don't require vegetation removal at all. And they also have a specific statement within the metrics that you need to adhere to with the state and federal environmental regulations. I think they specifically call out any regulations for riparian protection and habitat protection. 7 protection. 8 That's in the and then also MR. THOMAS: Before you go on. Does that make sense to the Board that the requirements are that they comply with state and federal regulations to protect habitats? 13 MR. YOUNG: Well, I understand that, yeah. How many pages this is the you call it the Green Levy Marketing Unit? 14 MS. NORTH: Leafy Green Marketing Agreement. MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make up? 15 MR. YOUNG: That much? 16 MS. NORTH: It's about that thick, (indicating). About 80. I'm guessing. 17 MR. YOUNG: Okay. 18 MR. YOUNG: Okay. 19 MS. NORTH: They have a lot of different Was and Was NORTH: They have a lot of different Was Now, that that was making an assumption that, you know, the band and requirement and removed from the buffer. He had numbers attached to it. And my questions, you know, to what extent that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent that		- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
25 cattle operations, so there may be some 30 foot buffers Page 559 1 for the I know that's the one cattle, but they don't 2 require vegetation removal at all. And they also have a 3 specific statement within the metrics that you need to 4 adhere to with the state and federal environmental 5 regulations. I think they specifically call out any 6 regulations for riparian protection and habitat 7 protection. 8 That's in the and then also 9 MR. THOMAS: Before you go on. Does that make 10 sense to the Board that the requirements are that they 11 comply with state and federal regulations to protect 12 habitats? 13 MR. VOUNG: Well, I understand that, yeah. 14 How many pages this is the you call it 15 the Green Levy Marketing Unit? 16 MS. NORTH: Leafy Green Marketing Agreement. 17 MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make 18 up? 19 MS. NORTH: It's about that thick, (indicating). 20 MR. YOUNG: That much? 21 MR. YOUNG: Okay. 22 MR. NOOKITH: They have a lot of different 23 they're looking at flooding and water and farm practices, 24 and 25 MR. YOUNG: Okay. 3 practices into practice along with the food safety. 3 practices into practice along with the food safety. 4 practices. So, we also work with them to help develop 4 that. 5 that. 5 othe group that panels with the EPA and 5 NRCF is working with FDA because they also want to 5 promote environmental practices and environmental safety 6 in addition to the food safety. So that is coming down 7 the line. I heard one gentleman talk about it coming up 8 pretty soon here. 10 Mr. Quandt had some acreages, estimated acreages lost to 11 the 30-foot buffers of almost 7,000 acres. If I just 12 want to explain that that only applies to a subset of 13 Tier 3. And if they did chose to go with the 30 foot 14 buffer, it would only affect 83 acres total. So, all of 15 his calculations and finances that went along with the 16 That's all I can say. 17 MR. YOUNG: That much? 18 MR. YOUNG: Folks, please don't comment by 19 mumbling and whatever you're doing. This		-		
Page 559 Page 561 1 for the I know that's the one cattle, but they don't require vegetation removal at all. And they also have a specific statement within the metrics that you need to adhere to with the state and federal environmental regulations. I think they specifically call out any protection. 7 protection. 8 That's in the and then also more than they also the Board that the requirements are that they comply with state and federal regulations to protect the comply with state and federal regulations to protect the Green Levy Marketing Unit? 1 practices. So, we also work with them to help develop that. 3 So the group that panels with the EPA and NRCF is working with FDA because they also want to promote environmental practices and environmental safety in addition to the food safety. So that is coming down the line. I heard one gentleman talk about it coming up pretty soon here. 9 MR. THOMAS: Before you go on. Does that make sense to the Board that the requirements are that they comply with state and federal regulations to protect the adviced by the soon one on the line. I heard one gentleman talk about it coming up pretty soon here. 10 MR. Quandt had some acreages, estimated acreages lost to the 30-foot buffers of almost 7,000 acres. If I just want to explain that that only applies to a subset of the 30-foot buffers of almost 7,000 acres. If I just want to explain that that only applies to a subset of the 30-foot buffers of almost 7,000 acres. If I just want to explain that that only applies to a subset of the 30-foot buffers of almost 7,000 acres. If I just want to explain that that only applies to a subset of the 30-foot buffers of almost 7,000 acres. If I just want to explain that that only applies to a subset of the 30-foot buffers of almost 7,000 acres are not correct. 1 MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make up? 1 MS. NORTH: It's about that thick, (indicating). 2 MS. NORTH: It's about that thick, (indicating). 2 MS. NORTH: They have a lot of different they'		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
1 for the I know that's the one cattle, but they don't 2 require vegetation removal at all. And they also have a 3 specific statement within the metrics that you need to 4 adhere to with the state and federal environmental 5 regulations. I think they specifically call out any 6 regulations for riparian protection and habitat 7 protection. 8 That's in the and then also 9 MR. THOMAS: Before you go on. Does that make 10 sense to the Board that the requirements are that they 11 comply with state and federal regulations to protect 12 habitats? 13 MR. YOUNG: Well, I understand that, yeah. 14 How many pages this is the you call it 15 the Green Levy Marketing Unit? 16 MS. NORTH: Leafy Green Marketing Agreement. 17 MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make 18 up? 19 MS. NORTH: It's about that thick, (indicating). 20 MS. NORTH: It's about that thick, (indicating). 21 MR. YOUNG: That much? 22 MR. YOUNG: Okay. 23 they're looking at flooding and water and farm practices, 24 and 25 MR. YOUNG: Okay. 3 So the group that panels with the EPA and 3 So the group that panels with the EPA and 3 So the group that panels with the EPA and 3 So the group that panels with the EPA and 4 NRCF is working with FDA because they also want to 5 promote environmental practices and environmental safety 6 in addition to the food safety. So that is coming down 7 the line. I heard one gentleman talk about it coming up 8 pretty soon here. 10 The other thing I'd like to address is 11 Wr. Quandt had some acreages, estimated acreages lost to 12 the 30-foot buffers of almost 7,000 acres. If I just 13 want to explain that that only applies to a subset of 14 the 30-foot buffers of almost 7,000 acres that the 40 buffer, it would only affect 83 acres total. So, all of 15 his calculations and finances that went along with the 16 7,000 acres are not correct. 17 That's all I can say. 18 MR. YOUNG: Folks, please don't comment by 19 mumbling and whatever you're doing. This isn't an event. 19 Listen, you know, the issue I raised about 19				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
require vegetation removal at all. And they also have a specific statement within the metrics that you need to adhere to with the state and federal environmental after regulations. I think they specifically call out any regulations for riparian protection and habitat protection. That's in the and then also regulations to the Board that the requirements are that they sense to the Board that the requirements are that they comply with state and federal regulations to protect habitats? MR. YOUNG: Well, I understand that, yeah. How many pages this is the you call it the Green Levy Marketing Unit? MS. NORTH: Leafy Green Marketing Agreement. MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make up? MS. NORTH: It's about that thick, (indicating). MR. YOUNG: That much? MS. NORTH: They have a lot of different they're looking at flooding and water and farm practices, and work that it wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent		1 1190 000		1 1180 0 0 1
3 Specific statement within the metrics that you need to 4 adhere to with the state and federal environmental 7 regulations. I think they specifically call out any 6 regulations for riparian protection and habitat 7 protection. 8 That's in the and then also 9 MR. THOMAS: Before you go on. Does that make 10 sense to the Board that the requirements are that they 11 comply with state and federal regulations to protect 12 habitats? 13 MR. YOUNG: Well, I understand that, yeah. 14 How many pages this is the you call it 15 the Green Levy Marketing Unit? 16 MS. NORTH: Leafy Green Marketing Agreement. 17 MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make 18 up? 19 MS. NORTH: It's about that thick, (indicating). 20 MR. YOUNG: That much? 21 MR. YOUNG: That much? 22 MS. NORTH: They have a lot of different 23 they're looking at flooding and water and farm practices, 24 and 25 MR. YOUNG: Okay. 26 MR. YOUNG: Okay. 27 MR. YOUNG: Okay. 28 So the group that panels with the EPA and NRCF is working with FDA because they also want to promote environmental practices and environmental safety in addition to the food safety. So that is coming down the line. I heard one gentleman talk about it coming up pretty soon here. 9 The other thing I'd like to address is 10 Mr. Quandt had some acreages, estimated acreages lost to the 30-foot buffers of almost 7,000 acres. If I just want to explain that that only applies to a subset of 11 the 30-foot buffers of almost 7,000 acres after they did chose to go with the 30 foot 11 the 30-foot buffers of almost 7,000 acres after they did chose to go with the 30 foot 12 they and if they did chose to go with the 30 foot 13 they if a 30-foot buffers of almost 7,000 acres are not correct. 14 buffer, it would only affect 83 acres total. So, all of 15 his calculations and finances that went along with the 16 7,000 acres are not correct. 17 That's all I can say. 18 MR. YOUNG: Folks, please don't comment by 19 mumbling and whatever you're doing. This isn't an event. 20 what Mr. Qua	1	for the I know that's the one cattle, but they don't	1	practices. So, we also work with them to help develop
3 Specific statement within the metrics that you need to 4 adhere to with the state and federal environmental 7 regulations. I think they specifically call out any 6 regulations for riparian protection and habitat 7 protection. 8 That's in the and then also 9 MR. THOMAS: Before you go on. Does that make 10 sense to the Board that the requirements are that they 11 comply with state and federal regulations to protect 12 habitats? 13 MR. YOUNG: Well, I understand that, yeah. 14 How many pages this is the you call it 15 the Green Levy Marketing Unit? 16 MS. NORTH: Leafy Green Marketing Agreement. 17 MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make 18 up? 19 MS. NORTH: It's about that thick, (indicating). 20 MR. YOUNG: That much? 21 MR. YOUNG: That much? 22 MS. NORTH: They have a lot of different 23 they're looking at flooding and water and farm practices, 24 and 25 MR. YOUNG: Okay. 26 MR. YOUNG: Okay. 27 MR. YOUNG: Okay. 28 So the group that panels with the EPA and NRCF is working with FDA because they also want to promote environmental practices and environmental safety in addition to the food safety. So that is coming down the line. I heard one gentleman talk about it coming up pretty soon here. 9 The other thing I'd like to address is 10 Mr. Quandt had some acreages, estimated acreages lost to the 30-foot buffers of almost 7,000 acres. If I just want to explain that that only applies to a subset of 11 the 30-foot buffers of almost 7,000 acres after they did chose to go with the 30 foot 11 the 30-foot buffers of almost 7,000 acres after they did chose to go with the 30 foot 12 they and if they did chose to go with the 30 foot 13 they if a 30-foot buffers of almost 7,000 acres are not correct. 14 buffer, it would only affect 83 acres total. So, all of 15 his calculations and finances that went along with the 16 7,000 acres are not correct. 17 That's all I can say. 18 MR. YOUNG: Folks, please don't comment by 19 mumbling and whatever you're doing. This isn't an event. 20 what Mr. Qua	2		2	•
regulations. I think they specifically call out any regulations for riparian protection and habitat protection. That's in the and then also RMR. TOUNG: Well, I understand that, yeah. How many pages this is the you call it the Green Levy Marketing Unit? MS. NORTH: Leafy Green Marketing Agreement. RMR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make up? MS. NORTH: It's about that thick, (indicating). MR. YOUNG: That much? MR. YOUNG: Okay.	3	specific statement within the metrics that you need to	3	So the group that panels with the EPA and
for regulations for riparian protection and habitat regulations for riparian protection and habitat rotection. That's in the and then also MR. THOMAS: Before you go on. Does that make MR. THOMAS: Before you go on. Does that make sense to the Board that the requirements are that they comply with state and federal regulations to protect habitats? MR. YOUNG: Well, I understand that, yeah. How many pages this is the you call it the Green Levy Marketing Unit? MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make wp? MS. NORTH: Leafy Green Marketing Agreement. MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make mp? MS. NORTH: It's about that thick, (indicating). MR. YOUNG: That much? MR. YOUNG: That much? MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. YOUNG: That much? MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. YOUNG: That much? MR. YOUNG: That much? MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. YOUNG: That much? MR. YOUNG: That much? MR. YOUNG: Okay.	4	adhere to with the state and federal environmental	4	NRCF is working with FDA because they also want to
7 protection. 8 That's in the and then also 9 MR. THOMAS: Before you go on. Does that make 10 sense to the Board that the requirements are that they 11 comply with state and federal regulations to protect 12 habitats? 13 MR. YOUNG: Well, I understand that, yeah. 14 How many pages this is the you call it 15 the Green Levy Marketing Unit? 16 MS. NORTH: Leafy Green Marketing Agreement. 17 MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make 18 up? 19 MS. NORTH: It's about that thick, (indicating). 20 MS. NORTH: It's about that thick, (indicating). 21 MR. YOUNG: That much? 22 MS. NORTH: They have a lot of different 23 they're looking at flooding and water and farm practices, 24 and 25 MR. YOUNG: Okay. 10 the line. I heard one gentleman talk about it coming up pretty soon here. 9 The other thing I'd like to address is 10 Mr. Quandt had some acreages, estimated acreages lost to the 30-foot buffers of almost 7,000 acres. If I just want to explain that that only applies to a subset of 11 the 30-foot buffers of almost 7,000 acres. If I just want to explain that that only applies to a subset of 12 the 30-foot buffers of almost 7,000 acres. If I just want to explain that that only applies to a subset of 13 Tier 3. And if they did chose to go with the 30 foot buffer, it would only affect 83 acres total. So, all of his calculations and finances that went along with the 15 his calculations and finances that went along with the 16 7,000 acres are not correct. 17 That's all I can say. 18 MR. YOUNG: Folks, please don't comment by 19 mumbling and whatever you're doing. This isn't an event. 20 Listen, you know, the issue I raised about 21 what Mr. Quandt had put up there I'll just say this is 22 that he was making an assumption that, you know, 23 they're looking at flooding and water and farm practices, 24 had numbers attached to it. And my questions, you know, 25 show that that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent	5	regulations. I think they specifically call out any	5	promote environmental practices and environmental safety
That's in the and then also MR. THOMAS: Before you go on. Does that make sense to the Board that the requirements are that they comply with state and federal regulations to protect habitats? MR. YOUNG: Well, I understand that, yeah. How many pages this is the you call it the Green Levy Marketing Unit? MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make up? MS. NORTH: Leafy Green Marketing Agreement. MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make up? MS. NORTH: It's about that thick, (indicating). MR. YOUNG: That much? MR. YOUNG: That much? MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. YOUNG: That much? MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. YOUNG: That much? MR. YOUNG: That much? MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. YOUNG: That much? MR. YOUNG: That much? MR. YOUNG: Okay.	6	regulations for riparian protection and habitat	6	in addition to the food safety. So that is coming down
9 MR. THOMAS: Before you go on. Does that make 10 sense to the Board that the requirements are that they 11 comply with state and federal regulations to protect 12 habitats? 13 MR. YOUNG: Well, I understand that, yeah. 14 How many pages this is the you call it 15 the Green Levy Marketing Unit? 16 MS. NORTH: Leafy Green Marketing Agreement. 17 MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make 18 up? 19 MS. NORTH: It's about that thick, (indicating). 20 About 80. I'm guessing. 21 MR. YOUNG: That much? 22 MS. NORTH: They have a lot of different 23 they're looking at flooding and water and farm practices, 24 and 25 MR. YOUNG: Okay. 26 MR. YOUNG: Okay. 27 MR. YOUNG: Okay. 28 MR. YOUNG: Okay. 39 MR. YOUNG: Okay. 49 MR. THOMAS: Before you go on. Does that make 40 Mr. Quandt had some acreages, estimated acreages lost to 40 Mr. Quandt had some acreages, estimated acreages lost to 41 the 30-foot buffers of almost 7,000 acres. If I just 41 want to explain that that only applies to a subset of 41 Tier 3. And if they did chose to go with the 30 foot 42 buffer, it would only affect 83 acres total. So, all of 43 his calculations and finances that went along with the 44 buffer, it would only affect 83 acres total. So, all of 45 his calculations and finances that went along with the 46 7,000 acres are not correct. 47 That's all I can say. 48 MR. YOUNG: Folks, please don't comment by 49 mumbling and whatever you're doing. This isn't an event. 40 Listen, you know, the issue I raised about 40 what Mr. Quandt had put up there I'll just say this is 41 the 30-foot buffer. 41 the 30-foot buffers of almost 7,000 acres. If I just 41 the 30-foot buffers of almost 7,000 acres are not correct. 41 That's all I can say. 42 WR. YOUNG: Folks, please don't comment by 43 mumbling and whatever you're doing. This isn't an event. 44 what Mr. Quandt had put up there I'll just say this is 45 that he was making an assumption that, you know, 46 everything was going to be removed from the buffer. He 46 had numbers attached to it. And my q	7	protection.	7	the line. I heard one gentleman talk about it coming up
sense to the Board that the requirements are that they comply with state and federal regulations to protect habitats? MR. YOUNG: Well, I understand that, yeah. How many pages this is the you call it the Green Levy Marketing Unit? MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make up? MS. NORTH: Leafy Green Marketing Agreement. MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make up? MS. NORTH: It's about that thick, (indicating). MR. YOUNG: That much? MR. YOUNG: That much? MR. YOUNG: That much? MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. YOUNG: That much? MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. YOUNG: That much? MR. YOUNG: Okay.	8	That's in the and then also	8	pretty soon here.
comply with state and federal regulations to protect habitats? MR. YOUNG: Well, I understand that, yeah. How many pages this is the you call it the Green Levy Marketing Unit? MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make Why out to explain that that only applies to a subset of Tier 3. And if they did chose to go with the 30 foot buffer, it would only affect 83 acres total. So, all of buffer, it would only affect 83 acres total. So, all of his calculations and finances that went along with the 7,000 acres are not correct. That's all I can say. MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make Why out that thick, (indicating). MR. YOUNG: Folks, please don't comment by mumbling and whatever you're doing. This isn't an event. Listen, you know, the issue I raised about what Mr. Quandt had put up there I'll just say this is that he was making an assumption that, you know, everything was going to be removed from the buffer. He had numbers attached to it. And my questions, you know, show that that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent	9	MR. THOMAS: Before you go on. Does that make	9	The other thing I'd like to address is
habitats? MR. YOUNG: Well, I understand that, yeah. How many pages this is the you call it the Green Levy Marketing Unit? MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make up? MS. NORTH: Leafy Green Marketing Agreement. MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make up? MS. NORTH: It's about that thick, (indicating). About 80. I'm guessing. MR. YOUNG: That much? MS. NORTH: They have a lot of different they're looking at flooding and water and farm practices, and MR. YOUNG: Okay.	10	sense to the Board that the requirements are that they	10	Mr. Quandt had some acreages, estimated acreages lost to
13 MR. YOUNG: Well, I understand that, yeah. 14 How many pages this is the you call it 15 the Green Levy Marketing Unit? 16 MS. NORTH: Leafy Green Marketing Agreement. 17 MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make 18 up? 18 MS. NORTH: It's about that thick, (indicating). 20 About 80. I'm guessing. 21 MR. YOUNG: That much? 22 MS. NORTH: They have a lot of different 23 they're looking at flooding and water and farm practices, 24 and 25 MR. YOUNG: Well, I understand that, yeah. 16 How many pages this is the you call it 16 buffer, it would only affect 83 acres total. So, all of 17 his calculations and finances that went along with the 18 Duffer, it would only affect 83 acres total. So, all of 19 his calculations and finances that went along with the 10 7,000 acres are not correct. 17 That's all I can say. 18 MR. YOUNG: Folks, please don't comment by 19 mumbling and whatever you're doing. This isn't an event. 20 Listen, you know, the issue I raised about 21 what Mr. Quandt had put up there I'll just say this is 22 that he was making an assumption that, you know, 23 everything was going to be removed from the buffer. He 24 had numbers attached to it. And my questions, you know, 25 show that that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent	11	comply with state and federal regulations to protect	11	the 30-foot buffers of almost 7,000 acres. If I just
How many pages this is the you call it the Green Levy Marketing Unit? MS. NORTH: Leafy Green Marketing Agreement. MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make up? MS. NORTH: It's about that thick, (indicating). About 80. I'm guessing. MR. YOUNG: That much? MS. NORTH: They have a lot of different MS. NORTH: They have a lot of different they're looking at flooding and water and farm practices, and MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages this is the you call it buffer, it would only affect 83 acres total. So, all of his calculations and finances that went along with the 7,000 acres are not correct. That's all I can say. MR. YOUNG: Folks, please don't comment by mumbling and whatever you're doing. This isn't an event. Listen, you know, the issue I raised about what Mr. Quandt had put up there I'll just say this is that he was making an assumption that, you know, everything was going to be removed from the buffer. He had numbers attached to it. And my questions, you know, show that that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent	12	habitats?	12	want to explain that that only applies to a subset of
the Green Levy Marketing Unit? MS. NORTH: Leafy Green Marketing Agreement. MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make up? MS. NORTH: It's about that thick, (indicating). About 80. I'm guessing. MR. YOUNG: That much? MS. NORTH: They have a lot of different they're looking at flooding and water and farm practices, and MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. YOUNG: Folks, please don't comment by mumbling and whatever you're doing. This isn't an event. Listen, you know, the issue I raised about what Mr. Quandt had put up there I'll just say this is that he was making an assumption that, you know, everything was going to be removed from the buffer. He had numbers attached to it. And my questions, you know, show that that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent	13	MR. YOUNG: Well, I understand that, yeah.	13	Tier 3. And if they did chose to go with the 30 foot
MS. NORTH: Leafy Green Marketing Agreement. MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make up? MS. NORTH: It's about that thick, (indicating). MR. YOUNG: Folks, please don't comment by mumbling and whatever you're doing. This isn't an event. Listen, you know, the issue I raised about what Mr. Quandt had put up there I'll just say this is MS. NORTH: They have a lot of different MS. NORTH: They have a lot of different they're looking at flooding and water and farm practices, and MR. YOUNG: Okay. MR. YOUNG: Folks, please don't comment by mumbling and whatever you're doing. This isn't an event. Listen, you know, the issue I raised about what Mr. Quandt had put up there I'll just say this is that he was making an assumption that, you know, everything was going to be removed from the buffer. He had numbers attached to it. And my questions, you know, show that that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent	14	How many pages this is the you call it	14	buffer, it would only affect 83 acres total. So, all of
17 MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make 18 up? 19 MS. NORTH: It's about that thick, (indicating). 20 About 80. I'm guessing. 21 MR. YOUNG: That much? 22 MS. NORTH: They have a lot of different 23 they're looking at flooding and water and farm practices, 24 and 25 MR. YOUNG: Okay. 26 About 80. I'm guessing. 27 Listen, you know, the issue I raised about 28 what Mr. Quandt had put up there I'll just say this is 29 that he was making an assumption that, you know, 21 everything was going to be removed from the buffer. He 23 had numbers attached to it. And my questions, you know, 24 show that that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent	15	the Green Levy Marketing Unit?	15	his calculations and finances that went along with the
18 up? 19 MS. NORTH: It's about that thick, (indicating). 20 About 80. I'm guessing. 21 MR. YOUNG: That much? 22 MS. NORTH: They have a lot of different 23 they're looking at flooding and water and farm practices, and 24 and 25 MR. YOUNG: Folks, please don't comment by mumbling and whatever you're doing. This isn't an event. 20 Listen, you know, the issue I raised about what Mr. Quandt had put up there I'll just say this is that he was making an assumption that, you know, everything was going to be removed from the buffer. He had numbers attached to it. And my questions, you know, show that that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent	16	MS. NORTH: Leafy Green Marketing Agreement.	16	7,000 acres are not correct.
19 MS. NORTH: It's about that thick, (indicating). 20 About 80. I'm guessing. 21 MR. YOUNG: That much? 22 MS. NORTH: They have a lot of different 23 they're looking at flooding and water and farm practices, and 24 and 25 MR. YOUNG: Okay. 29 mumbling and whatever you're doing. This isn't an event. 20 Listen, you know, the issue I raised about 21 what Mr. Quandt had put up there I'll just say this is 22 that he was making an assumption that, you know, 23 everything was going to be removed from the buffer. He 24 had numbers attached to it. And my questions, you know, 25 show that that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent	17	MR. YOUNG: Okay. How many pages does that make	17	That's all I can say.
About 80. I'm guessing. MR. YOUNG: That much? MS. NORTH: They have a lot of different they're looking at flooding and water and farm practices, and MR. YOUNG: Okay. Listen, you know, the issue I raised about what Mr. Quandt had put up there I'll just say this is that he was making an assumption that, you know, everything was going to be removed from the buffer. He had numbers attached to it. And my questions, you know, show that that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent	18	up?	18	MR. YOUNG: Folks, please don't comment by
About 80. I'm guessing. MR. YOUNG: That much? MS. NORTH: They have a lot of different they're looking at flooding and water and farm practices, and MR. YOUNG: Okay. Listen, you know, the issue I raised about what Mr. Quandt had put up there I'll just say this is that he was making an assumption that, you know, everything was going to be removed from the buffer. He had numbers attached to it. And my questions, you know, show that that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent	19	MS. NORTH: It's about that thick, (indicating).	19	mumbling and whatever you're doing. This isn't an event.
MR. YOUNG: That much? 21 what Mr. Quandt had put up there I'll just say this is 22 they're looking at flooding and water and farm practices, 23 they're looking at flooding and water and farm practices, 24 and 25 MR. YOUNG: Okay. 21 what Mr. Quandt had put up there I'll just say this is 22 that he was making an assumption that, you know, 23 everything was going to be removed from the buffer. He 24 had numbers attached to it. And my questions, you know, 25 show that that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent	20	About 80. I'm guessing.	20	•
MS. NORTH: They have a lot of different they're looking at flooding and water and farm practices, and MR. YOUNG: Okay. MS. NORTH: They have a lot of different they're looking at flooding and water and farm practices, and that he was making an assumption that, you know, everything was going to be removed from the buffer. He had numbers attached to it. And my questions, you know, show that that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent	21	MR. YOUNG: That much?	21	-
they're looking at flooding and water and farm practices, and MR. YOUNG: Okay. 23 everything was going to be removed from the buffer. He had numbers attached to it. And my questions, you know, show that that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent	22	MS. NORTH: They have a lot of different	22	
25 MR. YOUNG: Okay. 25 show that that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent	23	they're looking at flooding and water and farm practices,	23	
3	24	and	24	had numbers attached to it. And my questions, you know,
Page 560 Page 562	25		25	show that that wasn't true. So, I mean, to what extent
		Page 560		Page 562

2.4

then do you accept everything that's in his presentation on those tables. I mean it just leaves some doubt as to what is good and what isn't.

And, you know, if you want to just take, you know, the worst case scenario that all of these situations and proposals and events, it's going to skew things such that it does not help us. So, I'm not surprised that there might be something else in there that's a little bit inaccurate. I wish it would have been looked at a little more carefully before he presented it to us.

Continue.

MS. NORTH: That's all I have to say.

MS. McCANN: I just wanted to clarify one other item about -- on top of what Jill said about the buffer requirement.

My name is Lisa McCann,

M-C-C-A-N-N, Environmental Program Manager.

That also that the water quality buffer plan requirement is for the purpose of controlling sediment discharges, and the Order provides an alternative. The discharges can be controlled by protecting the soil and other notable areas that are impacting the adjacent water bodies that are impaired sediment through temperature.

MS. SCHROETER: So that brings us to Matt Keeling.

Page 563

or group of contaminates in our region and within the state.

Now, although there are other sources of

drinking water supply wells than any other contaminate,

Now, although there are other sources of
nitrate in the groundwater that are relevant, like septic
systems, waste water treatment plants, dairies. A
gentleman brought up poultry facilities, irrigated
agriculture is by far the primary source of loading in
our watershed on a regional basis.

Now land use water use nitrogen isotope

Now, land use, water use, nitrogen isotope studies, fertilizer sale data all point to this fact along with water quality data documenting that there are severe nitrate impacts within our rural areas subject to intensive irrigated agricultural land use.

We've also heard testimony claiming that the impact results of Ladasyn nitrate and that the current loading is either inconsequential or not occurring. Ladasyn nitrate is real and it's significant. We acknowledge that. In many ways the nitrate that can be detected in wells today is clearly from nitrate loading that occurred decades ago. However, relatively recent groundwater studies, fertilizer and irrigation efficiency studies, nitrogen balance and update ratios, I mean we do have some of that data available to us. And shallow groundwater indicate nitrate loading is ongoing and is

MR. KEELING: Matt Keeling, K-E-E-L-I-N-G. I'm a Water Resource Control Engineer on staff here. I was brought into the process as a groundwater quality expert. I'm the primary author of the Environmental Groundwater Quality Condition found in Appendix G of the proposed Order.

I'm just going to speak briefly to you regarding some of the comments that we've heard back in March today regarding our assessment of the nitrate loading and the water quality impacts that we used as the basis for our findings for this Order.

We've heard public testimony indicating nitrate impacts may be more severe in some areas than we previously thought. We've also heard testimony claiming regarding the inflated significance of a nitrate loading that's associated with irrigated agriculture and resulting water quality impacts, or otherwise been wrong in our interpretation of the available information.

I can't emphasize enough how widespread and severe the nitrate impacts are to groundwater and drinking water supplies are in our region. There's really nothing else in our region to compare it. Not even sea water intrusion in Los Osos, the oil field, all combined.

Simply put, nitrate contamination is in our

significant from irrigated agriculture.

Now, nitrate loading as it occurs today will be the legacy nitrate that shows up in our drinking water supplies in years and decades to come.

I also want to speak to -- there was a

comment made by a woman, I think Jeff Young, Chairman, you questioned it regarding the Monterey County water resource agencies nitrate programs. Now, back in 1997 the Monterey County water resource agency they put together a -- let me look at my notes here real quick, there was a Nitrate Technical Advisory Committee and they basically produced a draft document. It was their nitrate management plan, program document. It had a bunch of elements in it. It was a five-year plan. And they haven't completed all the elements of the plan. Most of the elements of the plan were primarily focused on water quality monitoring, source reduction outreach, educational research, and then they also had elements of the groundwater protection program where they went out and they tried to do outreach with domestic well owners

and individual well owners in trying to alert them to the risks of having wells in agricultural areas and what they could do to, you know, be educated about the risk.

The effectiveness of the programs we really

have no idea because they have not been tracking them.

Page 566

1

2

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 They have all been voluntary. 2 If we look at what the water resource agency 3 has done with regard to irrigation efficiency I think 4 they deserve significant cudos. They've done a lot of 5 work in working with the growers in Monterey County who 6 approve irrigation efficiency. I think we can't set that 7 aside from nitrogen loading because the loading is 8 primarily affected by irrigation efficiency as well as 9 fertilizer application efficiency. So there is the 10 likelihood that their irrigation efficiency programs have 11 resulted in, you know, potential improvements in reducing 12 nitrate loading in groundwater. But we do not have any 13 information or data that's been contracted that shows 14 that that's the case. 15 MR. YOUNG: They did submit data to us. 16 MR. KEELING: They submitted data to us that is 17 somewhat censured. They were in a bit of a difficult 18 position. They've gone out and they've had something 19 about 390 agricultural wells that were available to them 20 to sample. They've got voluntary agreements to access

So, the data that we get is a 30,000 foot elevation view of what the groundwater conditions look

they've agreed to keep the well information, the location

and sample those wells. As part of the agreements

information confidential.

21

22

23

24

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Page 567

analyses on those. Some of those wells show decreases, some show increases.

3 Overall, if you compare the 1993 and the 2007 4 the average concentrations have increased and the number 5 of wells had that exceed the drinking water standards has 6 increased. But, again, it's difficult to make that 7 comparison definitively to say that there's been 8 increases because it's not --

MR. YOUNG: It's a gross comparison?

10 MR. KEELING: Yes. 11 MR. YOUNG: Okay.

> MR. KEELING: We've also heard testimony regarding whether quality monitoring for agricultural supply wells is appropriate. You very pointedly, Mr. Chairman, asked questions about that trying to get feedback from some of the people giving testimony. In case we have any doubts regarding this issue, there's essentially three reasons why water quality monitoring for agricultural supply wells is important.

First, growers should be sampling irrigation water for nitrate accounting during irrigation to reduce the amount of additional fertilizer that they're applying to their crops. Available water quality data that we have indicate there are agricultural supply wells in our region that contain nitrate concentration up to 15 times

Page 569

1 like on a map. We can't pinpoint where the wells are, 2 where the hot spots are, you know, within township. 3 We're not even within township range section basis at this point. We could probably work that out from them, 5 but what we really want to get is the individual well 6 data. The problem was they gave that to us, their 7 monitoring program, basically dissolved overnight. Nobody would let them on site if they shared the well 9 information with us.

MR. YOUNG: Is there a trend that can be picked up from the data that was reported that way?

MR. KEELING: Well, in the two most recent sampling events that they conducted, there's one in 1993, and the most recent was 2007. Overall it looks like there's an increase.

MR. YOUNG: An increase?

MR. KEELING: An increase. The problem with that is it needs to be qualified because the wells that they sampled in 1993, the location and the number of wells is not the same as the number and location of the wells that was sampled in 2007. So you can't really make a comparison.

What they have done is they have taken individual wells that they have sampled several times over the last 15, 20 years and they have done trend Page 568 1 drinking water standard. This nitrogen is available for 2 crop update. 3

Accountability for the available nitrate in irrigation water may be one of the most effective ways and immediate ways that we have in reducing nitrogen loading to our groundwater basins in our region. Just think about if they eliminate applying a certain amount of fertilizer and using what's already in the groundwater. That's an off the top reduction in the 10 amount of the amount of applied nitrogen. 11

Secondly, we really need to begin to start collecting water data in these ways now so that we have a baseline that we can use in the future to compare to and we can do trending analyzes so we can see whether we actually made improvements through the Aq Order or other methods that we've implemented over time that have been effective.

This also speaks to the problem that we have with getting the Monterey County Water Resources Agency data. We need to start collecting our own data because we cannot get the well data from the agencies that have them.

And lastly, we need these data to help us prioritize implementation of Ag Order and to protect our drinking water supplies. I think data are necessary to Page 570

47 (Pages 567 to 570)

Page 571

identify drinking water supply wells that may be at risk of nitrate impacts. And to better understand the source of potential problems whether it be permeable soils, improperly constructed or damaged wells, irrigation systems that don't have adequate backflow prevention.

Now, if an individual well or groups of wells within a certain area contain nitrate 10 times the drinking water standard, we should be asking ourselves why and try to figure that out to prioritize our efforts to look at these areas.

MR. YOUNG: What is its legacy, nitrate?

MR. KEELING: In many cases it will be and that's something that we'll have to determine. We go in and look at the wells, the depths of the well in the areas and that may very well be the case, but I think it warrants an additional investigation to rule out the other possibilities that there is continued uploading or impacts that are associated with some problem that could be easily fixed.

MR. YOUNG: So what would we be looking at? The way the data that comes in from the irrigation of the nutrient management plan, because that's only in Tier 3.

MR. KEELING: Yeah.

MR. YOUNG: That's your proposal.

MR. KEELING: One of the things we can check to

should have a short-sighted approach. Why should we try because we'll never get there. I think we should try to see how close we can get to that bar. And if we get to that place we can learn lessons that will enable us to improve our technology.

MS. SCHROETER: To answer your question more

at this point, I don't think so, but I don't think we

MS. SCHROETER: To answer your question more directly. A few of the things that we would look at immediately in your report, what practices were being reported in terms of the general nutrient management of the double tier to have annual compliance forms similar to the management practices checklist that are already required. Look at what practices are being recorded there.

For those individual farmers which had a high nitrate loading risk, we would also be looking at total nitrogen applied.

18 MR. YOUNG: Looking at that last --

MS. SCHROETER: Total nitrogen applied.

MR. YOUNG: Well, I think most farmers are probably willing to cooperate and make improvements in

what they're doing. I think that there's probably a

23 generalized fear that, you know, anything they may do

24 that gets reported to us is going end up with

administrative penalties being assessed against them.

Page 573

look and see, you know, have they provided information regarding backflow prevention for irrigation to make that as kind of a higher order of our level of our review of what information is provided to us on that database.

MR. YOUNG: That seems to be -- that doesn't seem to be as obvious to me as the statement made by the gentleman, I forget who is it is right now, that you have to over-fertilize at least in the crops that he had studied, the plant uptake is just not that efficient. There was -- I'm just kind of --

MR. KEELING: I suggest you look at this in a different way. Plants uptake nitrogen very efficiently. Plants are very efficient. It's how we grow them that's not necessarily efficient. The inefficiency is in the irrigation management and the fertilizer applicant and the timing.

You know, you try to plant the maximum amount of crops in an acre of land and you want to grow it as fast as you can and turn around and bring it to market, it becomes difficult. The efficiencies start to come -- fall away.

Now, this is my own kind of a big picture.

I'm not an expert technologist, I'm not an agronomist,
but I've been looking at a lot of this stuff for a couple
of years now. Whether or not we can reduce that to zero,
Page 572

So, you know, at what point down the line, um, I don't know what I'm looking for. You know, what is compliance? And what can be said to those that are, you know, kind of fearful for, you know, there's, I think, a fear of participating in providing information and because, you know, the more you give a regulatory agency the more it's going to end up biting back at us.

I understand our approach because we are a regulatory agency and that is how we operate and there is some coercive effect in having statutes and regulations set up for us to seek compliance. But it's kind of a very unique program we're trying to implement, and I'm just trying to get a sense for, you know, where this transition lies between collecting information and analyzing and seeing what's going on, and then when the shoe drops and --

MR. THOMAS: Do you want to say something?

MR. BRIGGS: Yeah. You're talking as if you're going to be dropping something and losing control of enforcement in terms of followup, and this is the kind of thing that could come back to you. People are concerned about mandatory minimum penalties with NPDS permitting program, this is not that situation. And it's not like you're giving up your control over enforcement and throwing it into a penalty machine or something and it's Page 574

48 (Pages 571 to 574)

Page 575

going to run wild. You are the ones who would be making those decisions.

And the case of the gentleman mentioned from the north county, that was a decision the Board made based on the facts. Actually, the staff had recommended a much lower penalty. Came to the Board. That's your decision. So, it's not something where you're abdicating authority and it's going to throw people to some, you know, wolf in the closet. Those are things that come back to you.

We would follow up with escalated enforcement actions of an administrative nature, but when you're talking about penalties, that's something that would come back to you.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MR}}.$ KEELING: I'm sorry, you got us off topic there.

MR. THOMAS: I was just going to add what Roger's talking about the process that we go through, two level process; staff level process, then the Board's process and everyday staff is dealing with enforcement issues or potential enforcement issues. We're doing that right now with the Ag Program where we have individuals where we have sent out notices of violations. They then contact us, and talk to us about the situation, their particular situation, and we work with them on that. And we decide

response, the staff's response to the issues raised by the Strawberry Commission during the last meeting we had at Watsonville, March 17th.

I am the person bringing the response today because I was the staff assigned to prepare all the requirements of the Nutrient Management Plan, that we talk about today many times, along with my colleagues and Mr. Thomas that is a hydrologist.

Both of us gathered a small group of experts, a technical advisory committee that provided us equal on the miles factor on the nitrogen ratios that was raised today.

The staff was formed by experts from the University of California Cooperative Extension. They have experience with the fertility and the first layer application of the crops raised in the Central Coast. We also have a certified crop advisor that has experience in limitation of the Nutrient Management Plan for vineyards and a certified crop advisor with experience in Nutrient Management Plan with vegetables. And we also have a colleague from the Central Valley who has experience in the development of a nutrient management plan for the dairy program. And he also worked for the Ag Program in the Central Valley. And he's the one who actually

provided input on how much reporting can staff handle,

Page 577

in some cases in the more egregious cases where a person just ignores or refuses to do it, those are the kinds of cases we relegate to the Board, the others go away or settle. And then when those cases go to the Board then the Board decides whether they're going to take an action.

It would be the same thing in this case. The same thing that's going on with the existing Ag Order that was adopted in 2004 is going on with the new Order, that same two level process. And the staff level would be prioritizing and considering the circumstances of each case and those that warrant actual enforcement action or actual recommendation to the Board for enforcement.

As Roger pointed out, there is no mandatory minimum type of situation in this case. It doesn't exist.

MR. YOUNG: Okay. Continue.
MR. KEELING: They took me off.
MR. YOUNG: They took you off?

MR. YOUNG: They took you off?

MS. SCHROETER: Next we'll hear from Monica
 Barricarte.
 MS. BARRICARTE: Good afternoon. My name

MS. BARRICARTE: Good afternoon. My name is Monica Barricarte. B-A-R-R-I-C-A-R-T-E. I've been here with the Water Board for about three years now. And I am the person that is going to provide -- or present our $Page\ 576$

and how much we can actually evaluate. That's why you see there are parts of the Nutrient Management Plan we only require two elements to be reported to us.

I also worked on the section of an order on the best management practices because I have experience when I worked with the different conservation in the Santa Maria area. I was one of the two people running what is called the irrigation lab. I had a chance to work with growers. And I also am a certified crop advisor. I was certified for about two years.

So, if you remember, during the March 17 meeting, the Strawberry Commission was presenting preliminary information of a study that was suggesting that strawberries should be consider low risk, a crop with low risk for the potential of nitrogen leaching to groundwater. And they concluded that based on that saying that the majority of the acreage we're managing in a manner that the nitrogen was in the groundwater. We, staff, here, it was our response we actually do not agree with that. We disagree with those conclusions for two reasons for that.

First of all, the strawberries have been one of the high risk with a potential of nitrogen leaching to the groundwater by the University of California and the Division of Agriculture of Natural Resources. They

Page 578

49 (Pages 575 to 578)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

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

high risk crops.

evaluate many crops and they concluded that strawberries was a high risk. We did didn't do that.

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

presented yet.

They made the criteria and they made the assessment and those -- the criteria is based on intrinsic characteristics of the crop. One example would be the pruning. Like strawberries are considered higher risk for potential of leaching of nitrate on liquid on the crops. So, they, basically, the University of California Agricultural Natural Resource Division says strawberries are high risk. The Strawberry Coalition said they are low risk.

And secondly, what, we the staff, took a closer look at is the data they had presented, and we actually don't think that the results that were presented prove or can show that strawberries are low risk. And I'm going to go through a few reasons why.

First of all, the study was based on a small subset of growers, about 10 percent for the whole region. We don't consider that to be a significant number.

Then the Santa Maria areas were unrepresented on many levels, but mainly because none of the participant growers applied compost. So, in other words, compost application was not evaluated as part of the studies that was presented. We seen that as a shortcoming.

So, we also wanted to bring this up that we also provided -- we have included incentives for those growers who if, in fact, they are already meeting the targets that we proposed, they could apply to be considered as the low tier. So the growers would have to show the -- actually, show that they are low rate to the

Also, it shows that at least some growers are

already implementing efficient irrigation of the nutrient

management of the crops, and they could minimize the nitrogen loading to the water even when they are growing

11 12 quantity. And in this case, an example would be like 13 they would show recordkeeping of the total amount of

14 nitrogen applied. They have to calculate the target they 15 are already meeting, and that actually compared with the 16 targets that we are proposing, they would be consider as

17 a low for -- qualified low tier. 18

So, as a conclusion staff recommends that nutrient management plant requirement and the least of the crops that are considered to be high risk for potential of nitrogen leaching to groundwater to be adopted as the most reason conditional without any changes.

I would also like to take the opportunity to respond to a few comments, questions there were raised by Page 581

Page 579

Also, the resource person they were from half of the growing season, of the strawberry growing season, they presented data from what they call the production season, which was March on. So they said the window time that is missing that is when the crops are established. And we believe -- suspected that during that time a significant amount, a high amount of leaching of nitrate due to the first application, the compost application. None of that was part of the evaluation. We re-evaluate it as a gradual study, but the data has not been

So, basically, we disagree. We don't think that the results prove the strawberries are low risk, and actually, we thought that the data was insufficient mainly because it boils down that the point of the studies was not to show the level of risk on the strawberries in the region.

We think this data project is the greatest project and is going to actually provide extremely valuable information, especially on the amounts of nitrogen that the strawberries need to grow in the region. We -- I mean a few presenters, people today made that comment that several of the growers have an unknown amount of nitrogen to grow, and so this project is going to provide that information for the strawberries.

Page 580

you before regarding nitrate ratios.

Mr. Borel, Mr. Costa were concerned that ratios that we were proposing are based on how much is removed at harvest, the nitrogen amount removed at harvest. And they said that they don't think they can meet those ratios. We want to clarify to them that the ratios 1.0 and 1.2 is based on what the crops need or what they call the crop uptake. It's actually the total amount of nitrogen applied compared to what the crop needs or uptake, not the amount of nitrogen that is removed at harvest. That's a big difference.

I don't understand why that confusion came along. It was when we were preparing these requirements with the technical advisory committee we did studies that is a tentative ratio target. We actually decided to step down and actually started with a -- with the first step that would be a target based on what the crop needs.

We actually don't think at this point the developed target based on what is removed at harvest like Mr. Borel said we need more data and more technology to actually be able to develop targets for them. We actually do have that. That would be the next step.

Another question that was raised, I guess this would be a good time to answer. We do know that the nitrogen, typical nitrogen update like many crops in the Page 582

50 (Pages 579 to 582)

Page 583

1	Central Coast for the one the crops called high risk
2	crops there are about five crops that we'd like to get
3	data that could be used as a target as a value that would
4	be considered as a typical nitrogen crop. We do need the
5	numbers for broccoli. We have broccoli, celery and a
б	significant amount of lettuce and now strawberries.

Thank you.

2.0

MS. SCHROETER: We do have several other comments on recommended changes.

MS. McCANN: Lisa McCann, M-C-C-A-N-N.

I just wanted to go back around to a couple of issues in response to the Farm Bureau's proposal based on what we heard and what we spoke to you about on March as well as listening to some of the additional aspects of the proposal today.

In general, the Draft Order does support industry use of coalitions and audits. It's Condition 10 on page 12. We do support and encourage industry in their efforts to assist farmers to improve water quality and to work to comply with the Order. And we see this as a continuation of improvements that were initiated and had been in progress in a collaborate way among industry for the existing Order.

In addition, we think industry should be helping farmers to specifically measure, account for and

proposal from the Farm Bureau, then it was not included in the March proposal and then we heard today that it is in some capacity included in the proposal as currently presented.

And the proposal doesn't protect drinking water, Agriculture Proposal does not protect drinking water. We have several requirements including, for example, the requirement to backflow prevention devices on the irrigation systems, and chemicals are applied through the irrigation lines to prevent drinking water from being polluted.

And the last comment is that the Agriculture Proposal as proposed still does not appear to be enforceable. When I say still does not appear, even with the changes that we heard today. Briefly, for example, there's no reporting on any individual discharge on the conditions of that any individual discharge on what management practices would be implemented on whether they're effective, whether loading is being reduced from any particular farm.

And, also, there are no requirements in their proposal to have to comply with water quality standards.

Angela is now going to talk, specifically, about comments that we heard on changes to requirements in the Order and staff's response to those.

Page 585

report individual and specific effectiveness at controlling their individual discharges and reducing pollution loading.

The proposal even with the additional comments made today still in staff minds does not include adequate monitoring, reporting, time schedules or milestones.

The Draft Order does allow cooperative monitoring, as you know, similar to the current cooperative monitoring program for surface water monitoring and also completely provided for the opportunity for growers to join together for cooperative groundwater monitoring as well, but the staff still recommends that that monitoring include individual drinking water wells and irrigation production wells at the various farms. That's two times that those wells would have to be sampled in the entire five year period of the Order.

And, also, wanted to mention that the opportunity for a trained professional to collect that data is also available in the RPS currently. That's the Monitoring and Reporting Program.

Just the issue of groundwater sampling; we've seen some changes and heard some different ideas about how hard sampling was originally proposed in the December ${\bf Page}~584$

MS. SCHROETER: Okay. So one of the things that
we have heard consistently and again today was that
tiering criteria is not based on actual impact to water
quality. One of the challenges with the tiering criteria
is that the only effective way to tier based upon impact
to water quality is to require individual discharge
hydrozation for purposes of tiering.

The staff actually evaluated that as an

The staff actually evaluated that as an option back in November 2010 and the conclusion at that time was it wasn't reasonable to ask every discharger to characterize their discharge for the purposes of putting it in a particular tier.

So the challenge then is you have to select indicators or processes of other items that are more reasonable to collect that would still help establish acceptable water quality.

So one of the specific comments that we have heard is that the office should not use acreage -- I'm sorry, this one draft order action should use individual farms not operations. Staff agrees and is recommending changes to the draft order to reflect this.

So, you might recall the slides I showed in March of the three various individual farms that belong to an operation. So staff's recommending that we change the draft order to tier based upon the individual farms $Page\ 586$

51 (Pages 583 to 586)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

applications.

and not the operations. So this focuses the characteristics of individual farms and is responsive to the concerns that individual farms be pulled into a tier despite their association of a particular operation.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The Board has also heard comments that the use of acreage in a tiering criteria is inappropriate. Staff evaluated fresh water quality specifically relative to nitrate loading risk based upon individual farm acreage and still concluded that farm size is a meaningful tiering criteria for this purpose.

The next few slides will provide details about staff's evaluation. So the purpose of this slide is to show you the range and farm size for those farms that grow crops identified by University of California as having a high potential for nitrogen to groundwater. So of those -- of a total of 3,000 farms that have submitted updated notice of intent about 13072 farms that grow crop types for a high potential for nitrogen to groundwater.

It's important to note that that represents, approximately, 189,000 acres or more than 40% of the totally area in the entire region.

To be clear, again, this is not a graph of all of the farms in the region. It's just the subset growing those crop types.

On the x axis here we have farm acreage

Page 587

So, we have data from lettuce that the 8 average crop uptake for nitrogen is 140 pounds per acre. 9 So if you take this average pound per acre for the spring 10 planting season, you subtract it -- you subtract the crop 11 uptake, you get an excess nitrate on average of about

92 and the lettuce is 17. Average is about 215.

Before I explain this slide, I should point

out this is another example where we have data on crop

uptake value for nitrate. So here, remember, we have

seasonal and fecal applications for lettuce. The high is

12 75 pounds per acre. This is not to say that all 13 vegetable growers apply. I'm just using the example here 14 of what's being presented by the Poly Extension of the 15 average seasonal application.

16 So, again, let's remember that the sort of 17 average excess nitrogen to lettuce is off 75 pounds per 18 acres.

So, this is an evaluation that staff did to look at relative nitrate loading. If we compare farms using acreage, we can evaluate that relative loading starting with the average farm size of 50 acres. So 50 acres was at 75 pounds per acre of potential excess nitrogen. You get about 37, 50 pounds of nitrogen, that is excess on a farm size of about 50 acres. So that's

Page 589

categories. So, for example, here, we have farms that are less than 10 acres, and the second farm we have farms that are between 10 and 49 acres. And then the far right you have farms that are greater than 1,000 acres.

On the y axis we have a number of farms within that acreage category. So, you'll notice that for this first one, for example, we have 91 farms that are less than 10 acres. The second farm you have 331 farms that are between 10 and 49 acres, and then here at the very far end, for example, we have 11 farms that are greater than 1,000 acres.

So what that points out to you here is that the average farm size for those farms for a high potential for nitrate to groundwater is off 50 acres.

MR. YOUNG: Slow down.

MS. SCHROETER: What's interesting about that 50 acres is that it's also the average farm size just overall. So keep that number in mind because it's going to play into how we evaluated the relative risk to groundwater.

So, remember I showed you this slide on March 17th and this is a slide that was used as part of a training irrigation management plan for the University of California Extension. It represents data from more than 100 fields and it shows the seasonal nitrate

1 excess nitrogen for that particular farm, which is the 2 average farm size. 3

If you then look at a 100-acre farm, you'll notice that if you take the 75 pounds per acre, you get 7500 pounds of excess nitrogen.

So in comparison to the average farm in the 50s we have about twice as much nitrogen loading potential. And you can continue to go down on the list. So 500 acres you get 37,500 pounds of nitrogen -- pounds of nitrogen excess, potentially, which is about 10 times relative nitrogen loading.

So you can sort of return to this analysis to do a relative nitrogen loading risk. It's not to say that all farms are loading this amount of nitrogen. My example here is to show that there is some relative risk to farm size if you take the average values. In the actual -- the actual amount of nitrogen applied is going -- can vary by crop. So this is just an example of how we evaluated that data. This is just to show that a smaller -- even smaller farm size you can get a fraction of what you get if you had a 50-acre farm.

22 So staff evaluated sort of relative nitrate 23 loading and tried to create some scenarios on how we can 24 assess relativeness about it. And what we started 25 looking at was magnitude. So if you're between 50 and Page 590

500 acres you're within the average. Once you're in the larger than 500 acres you start getting more of a magnitude higher of potential nitrate loading.

So staff's recommendation is that for this particular criteria that we use this breakdown for tiering criteria. So that would be less than 50 acres for Tier 1, between 50 and 500 for Tier 2, and greater than 500 for Tier 3.

And what I want to point out here is that that results -- now in looking -- remember that we're looking at individual farms, not operations, so that would result in about 69 individual farms or 56,000 acres in Tier 3 for those criteria.

The majority of farms would be -- acres would be in Tier 2, and then a lesser amount would be in Tier 1

So this is how the recommended change would look in the Tier 3 criteria. So assessing operations with 1,000 acres it would say farms greater or equal to 500 acres in growing crop types for the potential of nitrate to groundwater.

So the next change that we elect to recommend in response to the comments that the Draft Order shouldn't allow the use of a nitrate hazard index including soil types. Staff agrees and recommends

Page 591

protective of water quality and addressed the concerns that I just mentioned.

Specifically, the Draft Order includes
 toxicity monitoring of surface receiving water.
 Monitoring for toxicity just like it is currently,

generally shows impacts caused by multiple individualpesticides.

In addition, the Draft Order, MRP, also adds individual pesticide monitoring different from the existing monitoring program of, approximately, 50 of the most common agricultural pesticides in surface receiving water.

This is a new Draft Order, again, different from the existing monitoring program. This will provide a data to identify the detection of and any change in the current receiving water related to the specific individual pesticides.

In addition, the Draft Order also requires
Toxicity Identification Evaluation Studies or TIE to be
conducted where there's persistent unresolved toxicity.
This is another improved aspect in the Draft Order, MRP,
which is different from the existing program.

Then, finally, in terms of the Tier 3
individual discharge monitoring requirements include both toxicity and Chlorphyrifos and Diazinon. The Tier 3 MRP

Page 593

changes to the Draft Order to allow the use of nitrate hazard index to them.

A little bit of background on that is that we considered using that originally but opted not to use the soil aspect nitrate hazard index because we thought it would be too burdensome to growers to have to evaluate the soil types in the Central Coast region.

I have since March 17th talked to Dr. Levy who came and spoke to us on March 17th with the Farm Bureau team and he assured me that farmers could evaluate soil types usually and that the nitrate hazard index available to them can accommodate the soil types on the Central Coast.

The Board also heard comments that the tiering criteria should include additional pesticides rather just Chlorphyrifos and Diazinon. The concerns related to this comment are that the toxicity inherent to agricultural areas are due to more than just Chlorphrifos and Diazinon. That lots of pesticides cause toxicity, not just those two. And that by focusing on these two chemicals you can encourage some growers to switch.

Staff evaluated the possibility of including additional pesticides material in the criteria and concludes that changes are not warranted at this time and that the related requirements in the Draft Order are Page 592

also provides the EO with the authority to add additional pesticides to the individual monitoring based upon pesticides use. So if a grower was to switch from, say, Chlorphyrifos and Diazinon, for example, and there's still persistent toxicity, the EO could change to adapt the monitoring program for that grower.

It's also important to point out that the Draft Order included explicit findings which would allow the Board to modify the pesticide criteria in a program. This is the beginning, not the end. The Draft Order provides the opportunity for staff to recommend for the Board to consider additional pesticides in the future.

Finally, a less significant issue, but important nonetheless, is that there would be conflict consequences to adding new pesticides to the tiering criteria at this time. Staff was attempting to be reasonable in the tiering approach by starting with the chemicals and not a wide variety or amount of them. The specific chemicals that we included are the known sources of severe toxicity on the Central Coast.

Including additional pesticides would elevate in those unknown number of growers to the higher tiers. Tier 3 potentially. This would give staff additional time to evaluate impact to these changes. This would result in an unnecessary delay and order adoptions and Page 594

53 (Pages 591 to 594)

	PANEL HEARING	J	MAY 4, 2011
1	ultimately delays in the water quality program.	1	that question to Karen.
2	The staff concluded that it's not necessary	2	MS. WORCESTER: Karen Worcester,
3	at this time to add additional pesticides to tiering	3	W-O-R-C-E-S-T-E-R.
4	criteria in that the Draft Order and MRP are an	4	In the second year of the program, receiving
5	improvement on the existing Order and are protective of	5	water monitoring program has enhanced components that
6	water quality.	6	include pesticide monitoring along with the toxicity
7	MR. YOUNG: What about we heard testimony that	7	monitoring. So when they do, for example, the sediment
8	they are in use and they are being picked up in receiving	8	toxicity monitoring, they will also do monitoring to
9	waters.	9	anything that's attached to the sediment. It will
10	MS. SCHROETER: And the Draft Order includes	10	ultimately be maybe 10 or 12 that may be requiring
11	adding those individual pesticides to MRP and, also, if a	11	monitoring.
12	grower was to use that pesticide, an individual grower in	12	MS. HUNTER: Two or three
13	Tier 3 the EO could adopt their monitoring requirements	13	MS. WORCESTER: No, this is the receiving water.
14	to include those chemicals.	14	Now, the individual monitoring for Tier 3 what we're
15	MR. YOUNG: Well, what would be the significance	15	discussing now, staff is recommending not adding
16	of adding that now, one additional chemical?	16	additional pesticides, but what we did do is we changed
17	MS. SCHROETER: It's actually a group of	17	the required toxicity monitoring. It originally included
18	chemicals, so it's not just one chemical. So,	18	two tests in water; one that's for invertebrates and one
19	potentially, what we have to do is to go through the	19	for an algae. The invertebrate is sensitive, more
20	database just like we did in the program to evaluate	20	sensitive to OP pesticide. So we substituted the algae
21	where that's been used and how that would impact the	21	test for another type of invertebrate test that is
22	tiering criteria.	22	subjective to pyrethroids.
23	MR. YOUNG: The staff doesn't have the data on how	23	MS. HUNTER: So over the five years you can start
24	many farmers are using pyrethroids in the Central Coast	24	to see some characterization of the pyrethroids problem?
25	region?	25	MS. WORCESTER: Yes.
	Page 595		Page 597
1	MS. SCHROETER: It's a little bit complex for that	1	MS. McCANN: Let me clarify something, Karen, so
2	because we don't have at the regional board the data for	2	that it's clear. We're not recommending adding to every
3	each individual farm. What we have to do is look at the	3	tiering criteria, but as an individual discharger in 2,3
4	pesticide use data as reported by permits.	4	is using a pyrethroid the Executive Officer requires them
5	MR. YOUNG: By who?	5	to monitor for that individual discharger.
6	MS. SCHROETER: By the permit. DPR permit. And	6	MS. HUNTER: And then that could develop from the
7	we have learned that data and figured out who is using it	7	receiving water data?
8	based upon that analysis.	8	MS. McCANN: It could develop from the receiving
9	However, our preliminary analysis shows that	9	water data and it could also develop directly from their
10	it would be a significant increase likely.	10	pesticide use through our knowledge from the regulation
11	So, finally, an easy an additional change	11	use, pesticide use information that is linked to the
12	that we're recommending based upon the comments that the	12	individual farms.
13	Board should have exclusive authority to modify the	13	MS. HUNTER: And would it also come through in the
14	tiering criteria not the Executive Officer. Staff agrees	14	annual compliance report? Are they required to apply
15	recommending changes to the Draft Order to reflect that.	15	MS. McCANN: Yes, yes, they are.
16	And we agree that making this change provides more	16	MS. SCHROETER: So this is the summary of the
17	stability and certainty in the tiering criteria so that	17	recommended changes to the Draft Order; tiering

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 596

54 (Pages 595 to 598)

individual farms instead of operations. Modifying the

Removing the Executive Officer's authority to modify the

administrative, we would need to adjust the dates in the

Order and MRP to reflect Board adoption because those

tiering criteria to look at acreage relative to nitrate

loading. Allow the use of nitrate hazard index.

tiering criteria. And finally just sort of more

dates are getting old at this point.

growers can plan and implement based upon sort of a more

MS. HUNTER: While we're waiting for the

water quality, will we see or pick up any problems

monitoring program to be structured now for receiving

associated with growers or is that data going to somehow

MS. SCHROETER: I believe, yes, but I'll defer

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

predictive tiering criteria.

get implemented?

1 So we feel like these changes will improve 1 see an improvement in surface receiving water over a 2 2 2,3,4 year period and all we have is the collective the Draft Order focusing efforts on the emphasis of the 3 3 characteristics of individual farms, and prioritizing monitoring stations out there in the watersheds. What's 4 dischargers opposed to higher water quality. 4 the next step? What mechanism is in this program for 5 5 These changes do result in some changes trying to further delineate who might be contributing to 6 6 a problem? that -- in numbers in farmers and tiers. Most 7 7 substantively the change from operations to farms and in MS. SCHROETER: Well, there are some mechanisms, 8 8 the acreage. So, we went down from operation of 1,000 but let me first describe that we would conduct 9 acres to a farm of 500 acres or more. 9 implementation of the Order somewhat to what we do now. 10 10 So we wouldn't just be looking at the receiving water, we So, this is sort of a summary of how, 11 11 would be looking at what the Tier 2 growers were overall, the numbers of growers and acreage would fill 12 the tiers. Again, this is just an estimate and it's 12 reporting according to the annual compliance report in 13 13 terms of the practices they're implementing, if based upon the data that we have received from the 14 14 necessary, the total acreage apply if they're are higher updated notice of intent. 15 15 risks in terms nitrate loading. So we would be able to So, for Tier 3 we estimate, approximately, 16 100 farms, individual farms, and this represents about 16 sort of discern within that data the potential water 17 17 20 percent of the acreage. So this is a pretty quality. 18 18 significant reduction from the November Draft. If you The Annual Compliance Report also asks for 19 19 remember, we were at about 230,000 acres before. characteristics of discharge. We would be able to sample 20 20 the volume of receiving water. Things like that. If However, what we do think is that at this reduced acreage 21 the requirements for Tier 3 will be more focused on those 21 receiving water didn't improve, we have -- there are some 22 22 that would be implementing the necessary requirements. options. One, we could adapt the MRP, for example, to 23 23 So, for example, before it was subset, we get more explicit information about that. We can also 24 24 would have to implement the irrigation management plan. look at, basically, the information that we do have 25 potentially elevating some growers if necessary to a So we captured the subset more here versus the entire Page 599 Page 601 1 1 higher reporting level in Tier 3 -operations. 2 2 MR. YOUNG: Based on what? The Board would have However, it's still consistent that for Tier 3 3 to do that, I assume, or are you saying that EEO could 2, which is those requirements that are most similar to 4 the existing Order, they still have a majority of OP elevate people? 5 5 farms and the majority of acreage in that Tier 2. The MS. SCHROETER: The current Draft Order gives the 6 smaller amount of farms, 630 acreage representing what we 6 Executive Officer the authority to elevate growers to a 7 7 would identify as very low threat. higher level. 8 8 So, again, our recommendation is those MR. YOUNG: And vice-versa. 9 9 changes we feel is reasonable and responsible given the MS. SCHROETER: And vise-versa. The discharger 10 10 severity of the water quality conditions. can provide information if they belong to a lower tier. 11 11 We feel that the requirements for Tier 3 are MR. BRIGGS: What we're recommending as far as 12 reasonable given the severity and magnitude of the 12 maintaining the Board authority is on the tiering 13 potential threat to our water quality. And that a 13 criteria itself. 14 majority of the farmers would have similar requirements 14 MR. YOUNG: Now, going back, Angela, to your 15 as they currently do. 15 slides with the breakdown of the high nitrate use crops, 16 16 the nitrate. When I look at that I come up with a MR. YOUNG: Couple of questions for you. 17 Let's say we have a small watershed which has 17 similar reaction as I had when I looked at the slides 18 18 just Tier 2, is there no individual monitoring for -based on the aggregate coming up to 1,000 acres. I just 19 MS. SCHROETER: That's correct. 19 want to throw it out to get your reaction. 20 20 MR. YOUNG: Is there going to be individual The real issue here is just the fact of the 21 21 groundwater for Tier 2? amount of per acre potential excess fertilization, that's 22 22 MS. SCHROETER: That's correct. So -really what the standard that you're using through all of 23 23 MR. YOUNG: For riparian? this. And you could have 10 farms side by side, on one 24 2.4 MS. SCHOETER: Yes. side of a river all in Tier 2. On the other side is the 25 MR. YOUNG: For surface water, what if you don't 25 same amount of acreage combined with one farm is 1,000

Page 600

55 (Pages 599 to 602)

acres and you have two different tiers, but the risk to water quality would be the same.

MS. SCHROETER: So, you're talking about the collective impact of the discharge. That's true. If you look at, for example, we grouped the acreage, so in terms of these categories, these bars, we know how much acreage is within each category, and it's not in significant.

So, a large number of smaller acre ranches do contribute to nitrate loading.

And, in fact, it was a difficult evaluation for staff in terms of trying to assign tiers using this data. If you look at even a 10-acre farm, or a 50-acre farm, 750 pounds of excess nitrogen for a single cropping season that may occur multiple times over the year is not insignificant alone. And so how do you justify putting that particular farm in a lower tier?

But, again, you recognize that we're trying to prioritize and start somewhere and so we made judgment calls, essentially, you know, evaluating the various options. One is what if everybody goes to Tier 3 and/or drawing these different lines.

So, what we -- one reason why staff is comfortable with this recommendation is because each of the tiers includes a level of nutrient management requirements. Tier 3 you have an increase in nutrient

Page 603

thing. It's not like we have a little bit of data that indicates that we may have a problem or that we have a competing body of literature. The overwhelming majority of the literature describes severe water quality problems in our irrigated agriculture.

This Order addresses those water quality problems. When we started this process two-and-a-half years ago the Board made it clear and the Executive Officer made it clear that we have to draft an order that addressed the water quality problems. Our legal counsel also made that clear to us. Otherwise the Order isn't valid. We have to address those problems. We have to address them directly, and we have to achieve water quality standards over time. Also, we need an Order that is enforceable with respect to those water quality samples, otherwise it's not a valid Order.

The tiering approach we think is reasonable. No matter what tiering approach we come up with you criticize it. We have to start someplace.

It's important to remember that in starting someplace we are undoubtedly going to revise that criteria over time. The more we learn, the more information that's submitted to the Board, the more the Board learns about the problems, the more likely it is that we will modify and improve that criteria.

Page 605

management plan. At Tier 2, you have a basic farm plan, plus total nitrogen applied reporting for a subset of those. And then for Tier 1 you have the farm plan without reporting. So we thought that that was a reasonable sort of scale requirement.

THE COURT: Okay. Michael.

MR. THOMAS: Couple of things. Just a couple of things that I wanted to reiterate, but not spend very much time on.

One of them is something we presented to the Board over and over again. And it's established in our staff report and in the Order that the water quality problems in our region are severe, both the groundwater and surface water problems are severe. The water quality conditions report that we submitted to the Board relies heavily on literature and empirical data. It's probably one of the most referenced reports that we have ever written. And we have slides that we can show you if you're interested, that summarizes the number of references and the timeline for those references.

These problems that exist in our region are well known throughout the state, throughout the country. And the studies that have been done on these problems have been done by a multitude of people, a multitude of organizations. And the studies all indicate the same Page 604

The way this Order is set up, the Board has the authority to change that criteria, not the Executive Officers. So we will be bringing that issue back to the Board. So this isn't the end result. It's not intended to be the end result or to be perfect, it's a starting point. We can modify it as we go.

The Order is flexible. It allows growers to implement various management practices to use their own skills, their own expertise to work with professionals that are out there to apply unique approaches on their own properties, but to achieve water quality standards. That is the purpose of this agency to achieve those water quality standards to require achieving those standards over a reasonable amount of time. Growers have flexibility to implement different practices to do that. This order allows that.

Finally, there have been many changes in response to comments. We hear both sides, all side of this issue. We hear that staff is completely unresponsive on one end of the scale. On the other end of scale we hear that staff is bending over backwards to accommodate the Ag industry. That we have changed our draft over the past year and a half, our drafts, multiple drafts to the point where they no longer have any meaning.

56 (Pages 603 to 606)

1	We have changed the draft significantly over	1	the Board deals with, the Water Board must adopt the
2	a year and a half. And Angela just went over additional	2	necessary requirements or they will not be implemented to
3	changes that were made today, or proposing today in	3	do the scale and the areas where they are needed most.
4	responding to comments again. I think the record shows	4	The problems that we have in our watersheds
5	that we have been responsive.	5	are extremely serious. In the areas where good Ag
6	With that, I'll turn it over to you.	6	practices are making improvements, that's great. Those
7	MR. BRIGGS: Thank you, Michael.	7	folks should keep going and keep doing what they're
8	Some of these things will be a bit of a	8	doing. Those operations won't have problems being in
9	reiteration, but I'm going to get the last shot here	9	compliance with this proposed Order. For the other
10		10	operations we need to have a more accountable regulatory
11	(Interruption by the court reporter.)	11	framework to make more progress, and we need to get
12		12	going.
13	(Break taken.)	13	Farmers have been continuously learning
14		14	better ways to operate since the beginning of farming.
15	MR. YOUNG: Okay. Mr. Briggs.	15	They need to continue to do so, but with increased
16	MR. BRIGGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.	16	awareness and emphasis on their the effects of their
17	We heard a lot about the toxicity of the	17	operations on the watersheds, the effects of the drinking
18	surface waters and the contamination of drinking water.	18	water on their downgraded neighbors.
19	These are the most serious issues the Water Board has	19	As we get into implementation we will use
20	ever faced and has addressed. We believe, actually, a	20	adoptive management to change and improve as well. Much
21	couple Board members may have pointed out in their	21	of the interaction that we'll have of growers will come
22	questions, the Water Board is the only agency with the	22	from the information that's submitted according to the
23	authority and responsibility to address and resolve these	23	monitoring reporting program. We can actually
24	issues. There isn't anybody else.	24	adjust that program, administratively, as pointed out
25	The public has a right to clean water, no one	25	here just recently, as we have learned how to make it
	Page 607		Page 609
1	has a right to pollute public waters. But nitrates in	1	work more efficiently for it to be more effective, make
2	groundwater and surface water from agricultural	2	more sense in ways that would minimize the regulatory
3	discharges have been documented for decades; that's the	3	burden on the growers. But we can make those adjustments
4	legacy part, but they continue to increase today in many	4	once we get going with implementation.
5	locations, not everywhere. But overall, we see increases	5	And we've heard a lot of comments that
6	and it's time to reverse that trend.	6	agricultural dischargers must be accountable to the
7	Unfortunately, many Central Coast residents	7	public by recording information that verifies compliance,
8	are drinking water from a new water source that they have	8	and that resolution of the severe water quality problems
9	to pay for because the original drinking water wells	9	requires that accountability just like any other
10	became contaminated. Private individuals and taxpayers,	10	individual business or industry that is regulated by the
11	therefore, are shouldering the burden of costs for	11	Water Board.
12	replacement water both temporarily, for example, bottled	12	Existing and potential water quality
13	water and long term from new and deeper groundwater wells	13	impairment from agricultural waste discharge run-off
14	or wellhead treatment, and we have a lot of examples of	14	takes on added significance and urgency. Given the
15	both.	15	degraded drinking water and the threats of public health
16	But there are solutions, that's the good	16	that are associated with that, the limited sources of
17	news. We've heard a lot about technical assistant	17	drinking water supplies that we have in our region, and
18	providers, researchers and consultants that have shown	18	the proximity of our agricultural lands to critical water
19	examples over and over again of success. That's good	19	dependent habitat. We must not delay the necessary
20	news. Growers indicate many are already implementing	20	actions to correct these problems. It's the again,
21	these practices that are successful and that they're	21	it's the Water Board's role and responsibility on all of
22	achieving targets. That was part of the strawberry	22	those fronts.
23 24	conditions presentation last time.	23	A gentleman today talked about his experience
	And as we've seen in other arenas like	24	with underground tank cases and even postured that all

Page 608

with underground tank cases and even postured that all

those cases pale in comparison to the issue that we're

And as we've seen in other arenas like

storm water and other parts of the regulatory world that

Page 611

looking at today. And I'm not saying that we're talking about solvents spill cases or underground tank cases here, but we are talking about groundwater contamination, it's more widespread than those types of cases.

A couple of you Board members who have more tenure will probably recall some groundwater contamination cases with MTBE or benzene where we actually had buses of people who showed up at our Board meetings. And, Mr. JEFFRIES, I think you might recall you had to tell people they couldn't shake their signs in the back of the room. It was kind of like a demonstration.

These people were pretty excited because they relied on wells that were in the area of these contaminations, and were coming to the Board meeting demanding severe and swift action. And the Board agreed with swift and -- actions and that they adopted aggressive demanding orders with frequent updates on cleanup projects in nearly every meeting for years until the threats were resolved.

The reason I'm pointing this out is for some perspective. Those were cases where the wells were not contaminated. They were not even tainted. There were no detections at all, they were merely threatened by a nearby release. And yet we have stringent Board orders.

Taking the time to chase an unattainable goal of perfection delays what we must do. Such delays would mean that we're ignoring the urgency of the situation, the urgency is the high percentage of surface waters that are toxic and our are groundwater that's polluted.

Now, toxicity is more short term. We should be able to see more short term improvements with that problem. Groundwater is long term, and yes, it will take a lot of years to solve that problem, but as one of our Board members said almost a year ago in response to that notion, well, we better get started. So, I recommend that it's time we adopt the Order.

And the last slide that we have here is just a reminder of the fact that since we have a panel, how does the Board take action? So I recommend that you deliberate as you would as if you were a full Board making a decision today, the only difference is that your vote today is translated into a recommendation to the next quorum of the Board.

And if you want changes, I ask that you please make them specific just as you would if you were adopting an order as a full Board in the form of a motion and a vote, and that way, we, the staff will know without guesswork exactly what it is to bring back to the full quorum of the Board.

Page 613

So contrast that regulatory action for merely threatened wells with the issue that we have today. We have wells all over the region in the heavy duty irrigated Ag areas that are not only threatened or merely tainted, but we have sole source drinking water wells that are degraded, contaminated beyond maximum contaminate levels with many of them two times, five times, 10 times up to 16 times the maximum contaminate level.

And we have on top of that, is if that weren't urgent enough, we have areas that are nutrient ladened, and we have toxic surface waters in a large percentage of the waters in our agricultural areas.

The situation is dire. I've worked on pollution issues in the region for 37 years, and never have we had an issue before us that is as severe, as broad in terms of types of problems, both surface and groundwater and yet the proposed Order is not draconian. It is measured with tiers. It's reasonable, it allows time for improvements.

And while it's not Draconian, another thing that it's not is perfect. We've worked on it for two-and-a-half years. We could continue to debate and revise the Order for two-and-a-half more years and we'd end up with a draft that's, guess what, not perfect.

Page 612

Thank you.

MR. YOUNG: Okay. Who would like to go first? I have my own thoughts on what I would like to see happen, but I don't know if you want me to be the first one to speak. I will if you want me to.

MR. HODGIN: I think it's more in terms of a question for staff. Every workshop --

Let's try this one now. Is that okay? It's interesting. Okay.

Anyway, in every workshop we heard concern about what's the proprietary nature of any kind of well test and what is found in individual wells. I think that's a clear difference. Staff very clearly wants to know the condition in specific wells so that they can begin to map the problem and understand it better.

The data available now is pretty much under regional basis, according to what's been said here. The Ag folks really are very nervous about reporting individual ranch well conditions. And I've heard some people suggest that maybe there would be future problems if their information was reported now.

So, I'd like a comment from staff about is there a middle ground? Is there some way that we can honor the concerns of the Ag industry and still accomplish the Water Board goals?

1 2	MS. McCHESNEY: Can I just say something first?	1 2	say.
3	The Water Code when the Board issues a waiver of distributing pilot, the Water Code requires that you have	3	MS. McCHESNEY: I'm just MR. THOMAS: Perhaps the other option is, Francis,
4	monitoring unless you have some reason of monitoring that	4	we could make it clear what our enforcement priorities or
5	it's not necessary because it's not a high risk problem	5	enforcement and approach would be so that if the concern
6	or not a significant water quality problem. If you	6	is that information submitted to the Board that we take
7	require monitoring, the monitoring is required by the law	7	enforcement action on. We can do a better job of
8	to be recorded publicly. So, if your Order requires	8	explaining what our enforcement priorities are and when
9	monitoring, it has to be recorded.	9	and in what condition we would propose enforcement
10	Now, given that there could be some	10	actions.
11	information about the wells that would not be publicly	11	From staff's prospective, as I was mentioning
12	recorded, but the data is needed to be available.	12	earlier, there's this process that we go through and the
13	Your second question about the proprietary	13	vast majority of enforcement cases or potential
14	information. And there is a section in the Water Code	14	enforcement cases never come to the Board and never ever
15	that requires that the Board requires protect the	15	result in issuing the fine. They resolve at a staff
16	proprietary information, trade secrets, that kind of	16	level. And we work with the dischargers. If we think
17	thing. So it is required to be protected and the	17	there's a problem or a violation we always work with the
18	Board staff feels that they can regularly in making	18	dischargers. They often explain to us what the situation
19	sure that water proprietary information, trade secrets	19	is in their case and then we make a decision on whether
20	are protected from public disclosure.	20	we move forward. And often it is resolved at that level.
21	So they can still answer the question,	21	I understand the fear because this is a
22	there's some middle ground, but I just wanted to let you	22	regulatory enforcement agency. But the reality of it is
23	know if you require monitoring, it needs to be required	23	that most of these cases are resolved without moving the
24	to be recorded.	24	Board, without resulting in
25	MR. HODGIN: Just to go back to your first point,	25	MR. HODGIN: What I'm hearing you saying is we
	Page 615		Page 617
1	you're saying that the suggestion that the Farm Bureau,	1	cooperate now not necessarily be
2	for example, could get together and obtain information on	2	•
3	a kind of a group basis and they might know the	3	(Interruption by the court reporter.)
4	individual ranches, but we won't know here? That's not	4	
5	going to be possible.	5	MS. McCHESNEY: The law requires issuing a waiver
6	MS. McCHESNEY: If you require monitoring by	6	the waiver. The waiver shall include, but need not be
7	individuals, that monitoring data has to be recorded	7	limited to the performance of individual groups of
8	publicly, or cooperatively, or however you require	8	watershed basin monitoring and that the purpose f the
9	monitoring to be developed and submitted. It's required	9	monitoring is to be designed to support the development
10	by law to be reported publicly.	10	and implementation of the waiver program including but
11	MR. YOUNG: What if there's group monitoring?	11	not limited to verifying the adequacy and effectiveness
12	MS. McCHESNEY: The group monitoring has to be	12	of the waiver's conditions.
13	recorded publicly, yes.	13	And you can consider values, duration,
14	MR. YOUNG: Whatever wells they're using?	14	frequency and consistency of the discharge, the extent
15	MS. McCHESNEY: Right. I mean, I'd have to look	15	and type of existing monitoring activities, et cetera.
16	up the specific section of the law, but there is some	16	Monitoring results shall be made available to
17	information about individual drinking water wells that	17	the public.
18	doesn't require to be recorded publicly, but the data has	18	So that's, basically, those are the kinds of
19	to be recorded.	19	things that monitoring is supposed to evaluate. And,
20	MR. HODGIN: I want to make sure I understand	20	yes, monitoring information can be used for enforcement.
21	this. A coalition of some sort could not do the	21	It's required by law to have monitoring and that the
22	monitoring, perhaps, number the wells or something, but a	22	purpose is to evaluate whether, in fact, your conditions
23	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	22	are working and that water availty protection is being
24	number would you would not necessarily know which	23	are working and that water quality protection is being
24 25	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	23 24 25	are working and that water quality protection is being achieved. MS. SCHROETER: Just to follow up on that, just to

Page 616

1 add a little bit of perspective, Mr. Hodgin. 1 Well, I appreciate everything that has come 2 The Draft Order requires for Tier 1 and Tier 2 into the record through the series of meetings and I've 3 3 2, two samples, that's it. Two samples over five years. learned a lot. And as I expected I am -- I continue to 4 So I'm not sure what ramifications or consequences that 4 appreciate the challenges that are -- that we are all 5 5 are being anticipated from two samples. But for context confronted with. And we all have distinct and different 6 6 I think it's important to recognize that there's a lot of purposes for wanting to see some of these problems 7 7 dischargers similar to those that are being regulated by addressed, and we're all considering short term and long 8 8 this Order that would have a similar concern. term impacts on the types of approaches that are going to 9 9 be required. So, for example, in region five as part of 10 10 the dairy order, they also have an irrigation management I'm also, you know, learning a lot about the 11 11 plan. They have been required to sample their wells legacy issues. And I also recognize that the agencies 12 annually over their time period. They're submitting that 12 that have been working on this, and I said this earlier, 13 13 with a lot of passion, the agencies are working on these 14 14 issues I realize that, but, still we see that at the So, in the underground storage tanks, also, 15 15 there is a little bit different type of program, county level the changes aren't being implemented. 16 obviously, but what I wanted to recognize that many of 16 Thank you, Matt, for the update on the 17 17 those dischargers are small family owners and they live Monterey County Park. I had those same questions. I saw 18 at their areas of business and they also have concerns 18 in the report that, you know, these committees were 19 19 about reporting that data. And I think in that context formed, and advisory bodies were formed, five year plans 20 20 there is some level of confidentiality in terms of are put into place, these are all voluntary efforts. And 21 private residence, address, things like that that are not 21 I think, it's commendable that we have seen come out of 22 22 part of public distribution data. those efforts and we see some improvements, but we see 23 So, it's out there. Things -- we're 23 still places that are being -- that are continuing to 24 24 reporting data like this already. drag. 25 MR. HODGIN: I wanted to comment on what you were 25 And when you consider that in rural areas Page 621 Page 619 just saying, and confirm then that we would be able to folks are relying on well water almost 100 percent, I 1 1 2 2 gather the data, but not -- the public would not believe, except where they're buying bottled water, that 3 3 is huge. I know that in the letters we received the necessarily know the street addresses or location of that 4 data? public health agencies supports this Order. And that 5 5 MS. SCHROETER: There are very specific rules tells me something. That tells me that they see this as 6 6 about confidentiality in terms of private -contributing and adding to the tools that are going to be 7 7 MS. McCANN: Private wells and location. put into place in order to start to clean up the water. 8 MS. SCHROETER: Right. I'm not certain what those 8 I do appreciate the legacy component of 9 9 are. But I know, as an example, for the underground nitrate impacting on groundwater, but at the same time I 10 10 storage tank program the way that is being interpreted know that in other aspects of the Regional Board's work 11 there is that if your business is your private residence, 11 that we do hold landowners accountable for whatever the 12 for example, then those well locations don't show up in a 12 conditions are, and clean up has to proceed especially 13 way they can be displayed to the public, but they're 13 when it triggers such serious effects, health effects. 14 14 reported to the Board as part of the reporting Generally, though, those situations are 15 15 requirements. So that's one area that we can at least pretty small and limited to, you know, small segments of 16 16 communities, perhaps, in urban areas, perhaps not, but look into to see how that would affect the reporting. 17 DR. HUNTER: I just want to be sure the very first 17 not on this magnitude. 18 18 line of the section that says that you could require So, again, you know, I have to agree with Mr. 19 individual or group monitoring. 19 Briggs that the magnitude of this issue really requires 20 MS. McCHESNEY: The conditions of the Waiver shall 20 that we take some significant action. 21 21 include but need not be limited to the performance of And thank you for bringing up the MTBE issue 22 22 individual groups or watershed-based monitoring. because while I wasn't part of the Board when the 23 23 DR. HUNTER: Okay. Thank you. majority of that work went on, I certainly was part of 24 MR. YOUNG: Anything else, Monica? 24 the public and very aware of it, you know, seeing the 25 DR. HUNTER: No. Okay. I can go. kind of outcomes that have occurred, it's remarkable. We

Page 620

60 (Pages 619 to 622)

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

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

changed the way things were done. We changed business as usual.

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

So, what I have to say to staff at this point is, you know, I like the changes that have been proposed. I think the effort to be responsive to finding some middle ground, not middle ground in the sense of compromise for the sake of compromise, but some considered evaluation of where our program can be more effective in terms of considering the criteria that we're all trying to keep our eye on.

The farmers have come forward and pointed out 12 that, you know, they don't think the tiering structures is really meeting the need. I'm not sure that that's the case. I think there are some good efforts here to identify some criteria that could start us off, as Michael said, this is a starting point. I certainly regard it as that.

I do have some questions about the individual monitoring, which I think is really at the heart of beginning to characterize what -- where the problems are and what practices need to be innovated in order to address them. And I use that word very carefully. Innovative meaning we need solutions to individual farm operations.

I'm interested in the regional concept in

with the conditions of the waiver and the conditions are the way it's proposed now, is to do these plans, farm plans of monitoring and evaluate, and meet the standards. And if they're not working, if they don't do them, that would be the first level.

Then the second level is if that's not effective, have them submit new plans so the enforcement may issue an order to submit additional plans about what they would do. And issue -- make an order to require people to clean up. The water plan provided for that. We would need to evaluate the information of who among the ten in your example would be responsible for that. Possibly it would be all ten. I have to look. There might be evidence that only some of them are responsible. Just look at the evidence you have about whether you would order all of them to address the problem. You'd have the authority to do that. You'd have the authority to require alternate water supply to be provided which would be more effective.

DR. HUNTER: So there is where I think the alternative farm plan leaves us with a gap in terms of certainty of where the source is and who -- which of the operations we should take action against.

And, you know, it just seems to me to be creating a situation where we have that for a tool other

Page 623

Page 625

terms of the small scale sub-watershed, subset of -- the subset of the monitoring data that could, perhaps, give us the same kind of characterization. And my question would be to Francis. I'm thinking of the alternative farm plan where the coalition is looking at the regional scale. I don't know how small that scale is, so I have questions about that.

Let's say that we have a sub-watershed and we have ten operations going on in that -- or ten farms, in that sub-watershed, and if that sub-watershed was found in five years not to be meeting the criteria, what action would we be able to take? What enforcement could we look at in terms of enforcing the regulations? Would we be able to take action against all ten, or how could we use that farm alternative plan for cooperative development of the MPs and cooperative monitoring and so forth, and still have some way to be able to address non-compliance?

19 MS. McCHESNEY: Well, the way that the Order is 20 set up, and that's typical of this kind of waiver for 21 non-point sources is that if you find that after 22 some period of time that the conditions of the waiver are 23 not being effective, then the first step is to look at 24 the dischargers to see if we could make it more effective. But in terms of enforcement, if they comply Page 624 1 than the continuing modification of the farm plan. 2

So that -- I'm talking about surface water monitoring. Groundwater monitoring I think I've heard everybody today, and I agree, we cannot wait. We need to develop our own data. We need to take the lead, I think, in creating a process in a timeline for aggressive groundwater issues. It is a long term problem. But, apparently, the work that's gone on through the other agencies has had very little effect, so, I think this is our time to take this issue up and develop regulation and get that part of the program going.

I think I'll stop there.

MR. JEFFRIES: I guess I'm next, Mr. Chair.

14 MR. YOUNG: You are, Mr. Vice Chair.

15 MR. JEFFRIES: I'm not going to be redundant. My 16 two colleagues who have already spoke. I hope I won't be 17 anvwav.

I was really impressed with the Ag proposal. I really thought that they did an outstanding job and they came a long ways. The only thing that was lacking in the proposal today was the groundwater monitoring, which I thought was really critical for this plan to work.

Now, also, I think the staff has made some adjustments in -- and come aways, as well. But I think Page 626

61 (Pages 623 to 626)

1

9

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

9

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that for us to proceed we need to instruct the staff to reanalyze the Ag proposal in depth and come back to us.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

I'm concerned with proprietary information. I think that's critical for Ag. I'm concerned about the cost, because all those folks work on small margins to make their farms and ranches work.

The small farmer that has 50 acres or 100 acres, he doesn't have the availability or resources to go out and hire a lot of professional people to do all these specialized work that needs to be done. That's why I think with the joint efforts of putting a group together in watersheds is an important thing for all of us to look at.

I think all the testimony that we heard for the last year or two years has been very important to all of us to come to some conclusion that's going to be beneficial for everybody.

I think you've heard me say over and over again I'm concerned about the economy. Agriculture is one of the biggest economy engines we have in the state of California, as far as that goes, in the world. And especially in our region we're fortunate that we do have this type of Ag business in our area. I'm concerned about jobs. I'm concerned about the land that would have to be put out of production.

Roger pointed that out that, you know, it's been two and

2 half years, and it could be another two-and-a-half years,

3 and another five years. And, you know, I'm here -- my

4 term is up next year, and I would hope and I would think 5 that we can have this done somewhere in the next few

6 months. I don't think we're that far apart. And I think

7 there's a lot of cool heads in this room that could make

8 this happen.

And I've heard a lot of compromise, if you 10 want to call it compromise, but I think they've listened to this Board and the Ag has come back and reasonably 12 said we realize that these are some of the concerns, this 13 is what we're willing to do. And I think the staff has 14 done the same thing.

So, I think, yeah, maybe I don't really want to put a timeline on it, but I would like to see it done -- I'd like to have it done today, or last year, but we're talking about, you know, this isn't an easy issue, this is a gigantic issue. Not only for us but for the whole state of California.

So, Mr. Chair, the hour's getting late, but that would be my recommendation.

23 MR. YOUNG: Okay. And I have some shared thoughts 24 with what everyone has said.

25 It's difficult for me to sit here and listen

Page 629

Page 627

So all those things that we're all concerned about I think that the staff has addressed a lot of those. The Ag proposal has addressed it I think a little bit further because they're used to dealing with those things on a daily basis.

So with that, Mr. Chair, I would recommend that we -- I would propose that we send this back to the staff and take an in-depth analysis of the Ag Waiver compared to what the staff has proposed. I'm not saying compromise.

There's, you know, our job -- and I took an oath to do a certain job is to protect the water quality of the state of California. And I think the ultimate thing is that's what we have to do, but how we get there is another way of handling it. And I surely don't want to put people out of business by implementing some type of a program or an Ag Waiver that would do so.

So that's what I'm looking forward do. And that would be my proposal. I would support the Ag Waiver that was proposed by the Ag Coalition.

MR. HODGIN: Would you be willing to put some kind of a time limit? I think we're all aware that at some point we have to get started trying to clean up and do that as soon as possible. I hate to see it drag on.

MR. JEFFRIES: No, it can't drag on, and I think Page 628 1 to new information, you know, what the California Farm 2 Bureau Group put up for consideration, I would like to

3 have staff take a look at because I can't sit here and do 4 everything that I've got to do and know exactly what

5 they're proposing and give it fair consideration.

6 Can staff take -- I know Miss Dunham, 7 submitted some written material that was in strikeout 8 format and I gave it to Francis. Is that correct?

MS. McCHESNEY: That's correct.

10 MR. YOUNG: Does that have -- does that 11 incorporate the material that you presented today?

12 MS. DUNHAM: There are two different sets of 13 documents. There's the set that we presented --

14 MR. YOUNG: Please talk into the mic.

MS. DUNHAM: There are two different sets of documents, there's the set that was presented at the March hearing and then two documents today that build on what was submitted previously. So they would go collectively together.

MR. YOUNG: Okay. So what I would propose is that we direct staff to take that material and analyze it and compare it to what staff is proposing in their Order so we can see, you know, what the differences are. Where there's common ground, what can be used, how similar they are. Because I can't get a clear enough handle from the Page 630

62 (Pages 627 to 630)

1 presentation that I have down on that. 1 criteria, some of the factors that go in, but I'll tell 2 2 Now, could staff do that and come back to us you something, I'm sure each of us up here and many of 3 3 in July? you would all come up with kind of different variations 4 MS. McCHESNEY: I won't be available in July to be 4 of this, and none of them would be perfect. Some would 5 5 be better than others, but this is what's being here. 6 6 MR. YOUNG: Well, there is another lawyer who is developed. And I think it's very reasonable. 7 7 And I think that this is going to be a available; is that correct? 8 8 MS. McCHESNEY: But I did want to comment on your flexible enough approach that in the end it's going -- it proposal that those documents were submitted after 9 9 should achieve what it does achieve. It should achieve 10 January. 10 what we want it to achieve. 11 MR. YOUNG: I understand that. 11 I want to say one thing about the size of Ag 12 MS. McCHESNEY: And the comments came in --12 as an industry. I continually hear how many billions of 13 13 MR. YOUNG: I understand that, but -- you're dollars it generates for the economy. And I think that 14 14 right. They are. But I think in my sense in how to is a great testament to its success. The flip side of 15 15 approach this whole thing it's not an easy thing for us that is it would appear to me that there's got to be some 16 16 to get our hands around and try to make sure that we way to get the funds from this income stream. Instead of 17 17 considered everything, because we're going to vote at right at the farm level there should be some other effort 18 some point, and it's going to happen soon, and that's 18 employed to tap into that to make this work, and lighten 19 19 going to start a five-year period. the financial burden where it exists. And by that I 20 20 I would like to give the Farm Bureau mean, whether collectively people look at this in terms 21 Proposal, you know, as much consideration as possible. 21 of assessing their cost contribution at the wholesale 22 22 And let's face it, the collaborative approach that we level or some other level, that's something for everybody 23 were hoping was going to work, you know, so over the 23 to work out. And maybe that would be a response to what 24 24 years, it hasn't really worked that well. This is the Board ultimately adopts as an Order. 25 I can see that for an individual there's something we talked about at the big workshop we had in Page 631 Page 633 Salinas in that big hall, essentially, this is the 1 going to be a cost that that individual has to bear and 2 2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

collaborative approach.

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And so, the Board has had a couple of workshops, we have had this meeting, maybe four or five times that we've actually had a shot at hearing and commenting, and it just -- if you lined up all the days maybe it's been about five days for us to get our hands on this and comment on it. It just takes a long time when you stretch it out for us to get to the end result here.

But, the collaborative approach wasn't really working for whatever reasons, whether it was personality or what have you. But that's just the reality of where we're at. This is the approach that is the fall-back approach, it's the Board itself hearing information and getting feedback from staff and continuing this process until we kind of distill it down.

I will say this, I think we are getting closer, if not right there to where, you know, it's going to be. I mean, I'm in favor of the components of staff's proposal at this point. I think we have to get to the water quality issues, you know, sooner than later. I'm not very moved by any voluntary aspects of anybody's plan. I think this has to be a plan, an Order, that affects not everybody. I am concerned about some of the Page 632

it doesn't seem to get reflected of the cost structure because of competition. Somehow with that much money flowing through this industry there's got to be a way for that creativity to be applied to get the funds to make this work.

We have to apply standards regardless of who the source of the pollutants are. We're not authorized to start making distinctions between one industry, one type of discharger and another kind of pollutant. It's just -- I don't see how we can do that under the law without violating it. What I do see, though, is that we have great discretion in timeframes for compliance. And it's always been my feeling that that's where we will exercise our discretion. Certainly, I hope as a Board, and I would hope the staff would do the same in terms of how his order eventually gets implemented and enforced.

But the time is here for us to start to do something and to get moving forward so we can see how it gets implemented and how it may need to be changed. So, I don't look at this as anything static whatsoever. I look at this as something of a starting point or actually the next starting point from where we were. We're now at the second base. We're currently at first base, we're trying to get to second base. And it's going to change Page 634

63 (Pages 631 to 634)

			1
1	and modify as we move on with this.	1	somebody is non-responsive, or there are repetitive
2	But what I would propose, it depends on what	2	problems, and there don't seem to be any other solutions
3	the rest the three of you would like to do, this has	3	and then it has to come back to this Board before there
4	to come back in anyway, what we need is another Board	4	is any fine. Is that correct? I think, you know, that
5	member. So, I would like to give the Farm Bureau's	5	needs to be very clear to the Ag industry is that it's
6	proposal staff's analysis and review.	6	quite a process before there would be anything but
7	•	7	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
8	MR. BRIGGS: Okay. That's what I was going to	8	positive reaction to a problem.
9	Say.	9	DR. HUNTER: Yeah, I can go along with respect to
	MR. YOUNG: By doing that what it would mean is	10	your views, Mr. Jeffries. So, I would ask staff in
10	people would be able to comment again because that would		looking at that alternative Ag Program that you look
11	be a change in potential change in what goes into	11	carefully at the "may require", "may end up in", you
12	staff's proposed Order. So	12	know, the voluntary level of it versus "shall require"
13	MR. JEFFRIES: Can I ask a question before you go?	13	which comes with regulation and, like, see if the
14	MR. YOUNG: Yes.	14	voluntary aspect of this rises to the level of what
15	MR. JEFFRIES: You started out saying that we had	15	we're what we need what we think we need to see in
16	several workshops, you mentioned we had one in Salinas,	16	a regulated program and then what the consequences are of
17	but I think you meant to say in San Luis Obispo at the	17	noncompliance within that program structure.
18	Elks Club; is that correct?	18	Some of that concerns the way that they're
19	MR. YOUNG: You're right.	19	going to work with a collaborative or cooperative kind of
20	MR. JEFFRIES: I thought maybe I missed one.	20	regional scale. If you could kind of characterize that
21	MR. YOUNG: Anything north of Santa Barbara I kind	21	for us so that we understand how small a scale is that.
22	of lose a little perspective.	22	And I'm also, again, concerned about
23	MR. JEFFRIES: I understand.	23	aggregate data and not getting the characterization to
24	MR. YOUNG: You're right, Elks Club.	24	the level that we really need it. So if you could help
25	MR. JEFFRIES: I didn't want these folks to think	25	us to understand how that collaboration working within
	Page 635		Page 637
1	that we had a secret workshop and they weren't involved	1	the farm community, how we can begin to see if we could
	•		THE BITTI CONTINUENTS. HOW WE CAN DECIM TO SEE IT WE COULD IN
	in it		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
2	in it.	2	see, you know, similar level of data coming out of their
3	MR. YOUNG: You're right, San Luis Obispo.	2	see, you know, similar level of data coming out of their process or designing or reporting program, then that's
3 4	MR. YOUNG: You're right, San Luis Obispo. MR. JEFFRIES: I didn't mean to interrupt your	2 3 4	see, you know, similar level of data coming out of their process or designing or reporting program, then that's something to consider. But, you know, as Jeff said, I
3 4 5	MR. YOUNG: You're right, San Luis Obispo. MR. JEFFRIES: I didn't mean to interrupt your thought.	2 3 4 5	see, you know, similar level of data coming out of their process or designing or reporting program, then that's something to consider. But, you know, as Jeff said, I don't, I can't see it the little time that we have with
3 4 5 6	MR. YOUNG: You're right, San Luis Obispo. MR. JEFFRIES: I didn't mean to interrupt your thought. MR. YOUNG: That's okay.	2 3 4 5 6	see, you know, similar level of data coming out of their process or designing or reporting program, then that's something to consider. But, you know, as Jeff said, I don't, I can't see it the little time that we have with the previous amount of information. So that's what I
3 4 5 6 7	MR. YOUNG: You're right, San Luis Obispo. MR. JEFFRIES: I didn't mean to interrupt your thought. MR. YOUNG: That's okay. MR. HODGIN: Okay. I can also support	2 3 4 5 6 7	see, you know, similar level of data coming out of their process or designing or reporting program, then that's something to consider. But, you know, as Jeff said, I don't, I can't see it the little time that we have with the previous amount of information. So that's what I would be looking from staff.
3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. YOUNG: You're right, San Luis Obispo. MR. JEFFRIES: I didn't mean to interrupt your thought. MR. YOUNG: That's okay. MR. HODGIN: Okay. I can also support Mr. JEFFRIES with recommendations. I just want to make	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	see, you know, similar level of data coming out of their process or designing or reporting program, then that's something to consider. But, you know, as Jeff said, I don't, I can't see it the little time that we have with the previous amount of information. So that's what I would be looking from staff. MR. YOUNG: Staff did present a metrics at one
3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. YOUNG: You're right, San Luis Obispo. MR. JEFFRIES: I didn't mean to interrupt your thought. MR. YOUNG: That's okay. MR. HODGIN: Okay. I can also support Mr. JEFFRIES with recommendations. I just want to make sure that everybody I think everybody already accepts	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	see, you know, similar level of data coming out of their process or designing or reporting program, then that's something to consider. But, you know, as Jeff said, I don't, I can't see it the little time that we have with the previous amount of information. So that's what I would be looking from staff. MR. YOUNG: Staff did present a metrics at one point. In March, I don't know, but you've done that, so
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. YOUNG: You're right, San Luis Obispo. MR. JEFFRIES: I didn't mean to interrupt your thought. MR. YOUNG: That's okay. MR. HODGIN: Okay. I can also support Mr. JEFFRIES with recommendations. I just want to make sure that everybody I think everybody already accepts the idea that we really have a serious problem and we got	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	see, you know, similar level of data coming out of their process or designing or reporting program, then that's something to consider. But, you know, as Jeff said, I don't, I can't see it the little time that we have with the previous amount of information. So that's what I would be looking from staff. MR. YOUNG: Staff did present a metrics at one point. In March, I don't know, but you've done that, so what we're looking at here is additional information that
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. YOUNG: You're right, San Luis Obispo. MR. JEFFRIES: I didn't mean to interrupt your thought. MR. YOUNG: That's okay. MR. HODGIN: Okay. I can also support Mr. JEFFRIES with recommendations. I just want to make sure that everybody I think everybody already accepts the idea that we really have a serious problem and we got to start doing something about it. We're not going to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	see, you know, similar level of data coming out of their process or designing or reporting program, then that's something to consider. But, you know, as Jeff said, I don't, I can't see it the little time that we have with the previous amount of information. So that's what I would be looking from staff. MR. YOUNG: Staff did present a metrics at one point. In March, I don't know, but you've done that, so what we're looking at here is additional information that was presented to take that and to compare it and contrast
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. YOUNG: You're right, San Luis Obispo. MR. JEFFRIES: I didn't mean to interrupt your thought. MR. YOUNG: That's okay. MR. HODGIN: Okay. I can also support Mr. JEFFRIES with recommendations. I just want to make sure that everybody I think everybody already accepts the idea that we really have a serious problem and we got to start doing something about it. We're not going to put this thing, the solution off to our grand children or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	see, you know, similar level of data coming out of their process or designing or reporting program, then that's something to consider. But, you know, as Jeff said, I don't, I can't see it the little time that we have with the previous amount of information. So that's what I would be looking from staff. MR. YOUNG: Staff did present a metrics at one point. In March, I don't know, but you've done that, so what we're looking at here is additional information that was presented to take that and to compare it and contrast it.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. YOUNG: You're right, San Luis Obispo. MR. JEFFRIES: I didn't mean to interrupt your thought. MR. YOUNG: That's okay. MR. HODGIN: Okay. I can also support Mr. JEFFRIES with recommendations. I just want to make sure that everybody I think everybody already accepts the idea that we really have a serious problem and we got to start doing something about it. We're not going to put this thing, the solution off to our grand children or our great grand children or whatever it is. We got to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	see, you know, similar level of data coming out of their process or designing or reporting program, then that's something to consider. But, you know, as Jeff said, I don't, I can't see it the little time that we have with the previous amount of information. So that's what I would be looking from staff. MR. YOUNG: Staff did present a metrics at one point. In March, I don't know, but you've done that, so what we're looking at here is additional information that was presented to take that and to compare it and contrast it. MR. JEFFRIES: Well, not only that, but also what
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. YOUNG: You're right, San Luis Obispo. MR. JEFFRIES: I didn't mean to interrupt your thought. MR. YOUNG: That's okay. MR. HODGIN: Okay. I can also support Mr. JEFFRIES with recommendations. I just want to make sure that everybody I think everybody already accepts the idea that we really have a serious problem and we got to start doing something about it. We're not going to put this thing, the solution off to our grand children or our great grand children or whatever it is. We got to get going.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	see, you know, similar level of data coming out of their process or designing or reporting program, then that's something to consider. But, you know, as Jeff said, I don't, I can't see it the little time that we have with the previous amount of information. So that's what I would be looking from staff. MR. YOUNG: Staff did present a metrics at one point. In March, I don't know, but you've done that, so what we're looking at here is additional information that was presented to take that and to compare it and contrast it. MR. JEFFRIES: Well, not only that, but also what they presented today.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. YOUNG: You're right, San Luis Obispo. MR. JEFFRIES: I didn't mean to interrupt your thought. MR. YOUNG: That's okay. MR. HODGIN: Okay. I can also support Mr. JEFFRIES with recommendations. I just want to make sure that everybody I think everybody already accepts the idea that we really have a serious problem and we got to start doing something about it. We're not going to put this thing, the solution off to our grand children or our great grand children or whatever it is. We got to get going. I think maybe with this little bit of delay	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	see, you know, similar level of data coming out of their process or designing or reporting program, then that's something to consider. But, you know, as Jeff said, I don't, I can't see it the little time that we have with the previous amount of information. So that's what I would be looking from staff. MR. YOUNG: Staff did present a metrics at one point. In March, I don't know, but you've done that, so what we're looking at here is additional information that was presented to take that and to compare it and contrast it. MR. JEFFRIES: Well, not only that, but also what they presented today. MR. YOUNG: That's what I meant, March and today
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. YOUNG: You're right, San Luis Obispo. MR. JEFFRIES: I didn't mean to interrupt your thought. MR. YOUNG: That's okay. MR. HODGIN: Okay. I can also support Mr. JEFFRIES with recommendations. I just want to make sure that everybody I think everybody already accepts the idea that we really have a serious problem and we got to start doing something about it. We're not going to put this thing, the solution off to our grand children or our great grand children or whatever it is. We got to get going. I think maybe with this little bit of delay staff could look at the privacy issue and see if there's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	see, you know, similar level of data coming out of their process or designing or reporting program, then that's something to consider. But, you know, as Jeff said, I don't, I can't see it the little time that we have with the previous amount of information. So that's what I would be looking from staff. MR. YOUNG: Staff did present a metrics at one point. In March, I don't know, but you've done that, so what we're looking at here is additional information that was presented to take that and to compare it and contrast it. MR. JEFFRIES: Well, not only that, but also what they presented today. MR. YOUNG: That's what I meant, March and today and to compare and contrast that to what you're proposing
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. YOUNG: You're right, San Luis Obispo. MR. JEFFRIES: I didn't mean to interrupt your thought. MR. YOUNG: That's okay. MR. HODGIN: Okay. I can also support Mr. JEFFRIES with recommendations. I just want to make sure that everybody I think everybody already accepts the idea that we really have a serious problem and we got to start doing something about it. We're not going to put this thing, the solution off to our grand children or our great grand children or whatever it is. We got to get going. I think maybe with this little bit of delay staff could look at the privacy issue and see if there's some way we can accommodate some of those concerns out	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	see, you know, similar level of data coming out of their process or designing or reporting program, then that's something to consider. But, you know, as Jeff said, I don't, I can't see it the little time that we have with the previous amount of information. So that's what I would be looking from staff. MR. YOUNG: Staff did present a metrics at one point. In March, I don't know, but you've done that, so what we're looking at here is additional information that was presented to take that and to compare it and contrast it. MR. JEFFRIES: Well, not only that, but also what they presented today. MR. YOUNG: That's what I meant, March and today and to compare and contrast that to what you're proposing because what you proposed, also, there were some
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. YOUNG: You're right, San Luis Obispo. MR. JEFFRIES: I didn't mean to interrupt your thought. MR. YOUNG: That's okay. MR. HODGIN: Okay. I can also support Mr. JEFFRIES with recommendations. I just want to make sure that everybody I think everybody already accepts the idea that we really have a serious problem and we got to start doing something about it. We're not going to put this thing, the solution off to our grand children or our great grand children or whatever it is. We got to get going. I think maybe with this little bit of delay staff could look at the privacy issue and see if there's some way we can accommodate some of those concerns out there. And I think it might help if it's stated pretty	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	see, you know, similar level of data coming out of their process or designing or reporting program, then that's something to consider. But, you know, as Jeff said, I don't, I can't see it the little time that we have with the previous amount of information. So that's what I would be looking from staff. MR. YOUNG: Staff did present a metrics at one point. In March, I don't know, but you've done that, so what we're looking at here is additional information that was presented to take that and to compare it and contrast it. MR. JEFFRIES: Well, not only that, but also what they presented today. MR. YOUNG: That's what I meant, March and today and to compare and contrast that to what you're proposing because what you proposed, also, there were some modifications that were put up in the end. So
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. YOUNG: You're right, San Luis Obispo. MR. JEFFRIES: I didn't mean to interrupt your thought. MR. YOUNG: That's okay. MR. HODGIN: Okay. I can also support Mr. JEFFRIES with recommendations. I just want to make sure that everybody I think everybody already accepts the idea that we really have a serious problem and we got to start doing something about it. We're not going to put this thing, the solution off to our grand children or our great grand children or whatever it is. We got to get going. I think maybe with this little bit of delay staff could look at the privacy issue and see if there's some way we can accommodate some of those concerns out there. And I think it might help if it's stated pretty clearly in the public meeting like this that if there are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	see, you know, similar level of data coming out of their process or designing or reporting program, then that's something to consider. But, you know, as Jeff said, I don't, I can't see it the little time that we have with the previous amount of information. So that's what I would be looking from staff. MR. YOUNG: Staff did present a metrics at one point. In March, I don't know, but you've done that, so what we're looking at here is additional information that was presented to take that and to compare it and contrast it. MR. JEFFRIES: Well, not only that, but also what they presented today. MR. YOUNG: That's what I meant, March and today and to compare and contrast that to what you're proposing because what you proposed, also, there were some modifications that were put up in the end. So MR. BRIGGS: Are talking about the fact that
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. YOUNG: You're right, San Luis Obispo. MR. JEFFRIES: I didn't mean to interrupt your thought. MR. YOUNG: That's okay. MR. HODGIN: Okay. I can also support Mr. JEFFRIES with recommendations. I just want to make sure that everybody I think everybody already accepts the idea that we really have a serious problem and we got to start doing something about it. We're not going to put this thing, the solution off to our grand children or our great grand children or whatever it is. We got to get going. I think maybe with this little bit of delay staff could look at the privacy issue and see if there's some way we can accommodate some of those concerns out there. And I think it might help if it's stated pretty clearly in the public meeting like this that if there are violations, then staff's response is to work with that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	see, you know, similar level of data coming out of their process or designing or reporting program, then that's something to consider. But, you know, as Jeff said, I don't, I can't see it the little time that we have with the previous amount of information. So that's what I would be looking from staff. MR. YOUNG: Staff did present a metrics at one point. In March, I don't know, but you've done that, so what we're looking at here is additional information that was presented to take that and to compare it and contrast it. MR. JEFFRIES: Well, not only that, but also what they presented today. MR. YOUNG: That's what I meant, March and today and to compare and contrast that to what you're proposing because what you proposed, also, there were some modifications that were put up in the end. So MR. BRIGGS: Are talking about the fact that the Ag folks made changes today and we made changes
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. YOUNG: You're right, San Luis Obispo. MR. JEFFRIES: I didn't mean to interrupt your thought. MR. YOUNG: That's okay. MR. HODGIN: Okay. I can also support Mr. JEFFRIES with recommendations. I just want to make sure that everybody I think everybody already accepts the idea that we really have a serious problem and we got to start doing something about it. We're not going to put this thing, the solution off to our grand children or our great grand children or whatever it is. We got to get going. I think maybe with this little bit of delay staff could look at the privacy issue and see if there's some way we can accommodate some of those concerns out there. And I think it might help if it's stated pretty clearly in the public meeting like this that if there are violations, then staff's response is to work with that discharger and resolve the issue. And as long as the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	see, you know, similar level of data coming out of their process or designing or reporting program, then that's something to consider. But, you know, as Jeff said, I don't, I can't see it the little time that we have with the previous amount of information. So that's what I would be looking from staff. MR. YOUNG: Staff did present a metrics at one point. In March, I don't know, but you've done that, so what we're looking at here is additional information that was presented to take that and to compare it and contrast it. MR. JEFFRIES: Well, not only that, but also what they presented today. MR. YOUNG: That's what I meant, March and today and to compare and contrast that to what you're proposing because what you proposed, also, there were some modifications that were put up in the end. So MR. BRIGGS: Are talking about the fact that the Ag folks made changes today and we made changes today, so the comparison how those end up.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. YOUNG: You're right, San Luis Obispo. MR. JEFFRIES: I didn't mean to interrupt your thought. MR. YOUNG: That's okay. MR. HODGIN: Okay. I can also support Mr. JEFFRIES with recommendations. I just want to make sure that everybody I think everybody already accepts the idea that we really have a serious problem and we got to start doing something about it. We're not going to put this thing, the solution off to our grand children or our great grand children or whatever it is. We got to get going. I think maybe with this little bit of delay staff could look at the privacy issue and see if there's some way we can accommodate some of those concerns out there. And I think it might help if it's stated pretty clearly in the public meeting like this that if there are violations, then staff's response is to work with that discharger and resolve the issue. And as long as the discharger is, correct me if that's in not staff's view,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	see, you know, similar level of data coming out of their process or designing or reporting program, then that's something to consider. But, you know, as Jeff said, I don't, I can't see it the little time that we have with the previous amount of information. So that's what I would be looking from staff. MR. YOUNG: Staff did present a metrics at one point. In March, I don't know, but you've done that, so what we're looking at here is additional information that was presented to take that and to compare it and contrast it. MR. JEFFRIES: Well, not only that, but also what they presented today. MR. YOUNG: That's what I meant, March and today and to compare and contrast that to what you're proposing because what you proposed, also, there were some modifications that were put up in the end. So MR. BRIGGS: Are talking about the fact that the Ag folks made changes today and we made changes today, so the comparison how those end up. MR. YOUNG: Right. Is staff able to do this so
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. YOUNG: You're right, San Luis Obispo. MR. JEFFRIES: I didn't mean to interrupt your thought. MR. YOUNG: That's okay. MR. HODGIN: Okay. I can also support Mr. JEFFRIES with recommendations. I just want to make sure that everybody I think everybody already accepts the idea that we really have a serious problem and we got to start doing something about it. We're not going to put this thing, the solution off to our grand children or our great grand children or whatever it is. We got to get going. I think maybe with this little bit of delay staff could look at the privacy issue and see if there's some way we can accommodate some of those concerns out there. And I think it might help if it's stated pretty clearly in the public meeting like this that if there are violations, then staff's response is to work with that discharger and resolve the issue. And as long as the discharger is, correct me if that's in not staff's view, but I think your view is that as long as that discharger	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	see, you know, similar level of data coming out of their process or designing or reporting program, then that's something to consider. But, you know, as Jeff said, I don't, I can't see it the little time that we have with the previous amount of information. So that's what I would be looking from staff. MR. YOUNG: Staff did present a metrics at one point. In March, I don't know, but you've done that, so what we're looking at here is additional information that was presented to take that and to compare it and contrast it. MR. JEFFRIES: Well, not only that, but also what they presented today. MR. YOUNG: That's what I meant, March and today and to compare and contrast that to what you're proposing because what you proposed, also, there were some modifications that were put up in the end. So MR. BRIGGS: Are talking about the fact that the Ag folks made changes today and we made changes today, so the comparison how those end up.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. YOUNG: You're right, San Luis Obispo. MR. JEFFRIES: I didn't mean to interrupt your thought. MR. YOUNG: That's okay. MR. HODGIN: Okay. I can also support Mr. JEFFRIES with recommendations. I just want to make sure that everybody I think everybody already accepts the idea that we really have a serious problem and we got to start doing something about it. We're not going to put this thing, the solution off to our grand children or our great grand children or whatever it is. We got to get going. I think maybe with this little bit of delay staff could look at the privacy issue and see if there's some way we can accommodate some of those concerns out there. And I think it might help if it's stated pretty clearly in the public meeting like this that if there are violations, then staff's response is to work with that discharger and resolve the issue. And as long as the discharger is, correct me if that's in not staff's view,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	see, you know, similar level of data coming out of their process or designing or reporting program, then that's something to consider. But, you know, as Jeff said, I don't, I can't see it the little time that we have with the previous amount of information. So that's what I would be looking from staff. MR. YOUNG: Staff did present a metrics at one point. In March, I don't know, but you've done that, so what we're looking at here is additional information that was presented to take that and to compare it and contrast it. MR. JEFFRIES: Well, not only that, but also what they presented today. MR. YOUNG: That's what I meant, March and today and to compare and contrast that to what you're proposing because what you proposed, also, there were some modifications that were put up in the end. So MR. BRIGGS: Are talking about the fact that the Ag folks made changes today and we made changes today, so the comparison how those end up. MR. YOUNG: Right. Is staff able to do this so

Page 636

64 (Pages 635 to 638)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I want to clarify getting to answer your question is that to just make a comparison of what we heard today in terms of their changes and the changes we made is not that big a deal because as you said, we have compared the alternatives before. What threw me for a loop is you said another round of comments. So, first of all, I don't really see why comparing the two sets of changes triggers another round of comments, so that's the one thing; why is that the case? And secondly, if that is legitimate in a certain view, then of course, that takes a lot more time. But I don't see why comparing what we've heard today as far as changes triggers another round of comments. MS. McCHESNEY: Well, here's the concern. My concern is that the Board set a January cutoff date to make comments. Now you propose to have staff review new information so that after the cutoff date it's not going to be available to all of the rest of the interested	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	several page analysis with seeing these additional comments, you know, documents you're proposing to make to put into the record. Now, it just depends, it's a little uncertain, unclear to me what you're asking the staff to do, but if what you're asking is to say evaluate this new information and give us a report about what aspects of it the staff would recommend incorporating into the Order or changes, that could be a subject to cover on and that would be okay. MR. YOUNG: All right. And those parts of their submission which staff doesn't agree with and why. MS. McCHESNEY: So, if that's what you're essentially asking for by July, some small report, or by whatever, of what of a further analysis of the proposal, and then people can comment on sort of an addendum to the staff report or something like that. Is that what you're asking for?
19 20 21 22 23 24 25	parties in this matter to they could have in their three minutes or their longer time grant them comment on these other proposals that they have not had that opportunity. The staff reviewed what proposal was submitted by June 3rd and gave you comments and some of those were the proposal was not, some parts of the	19 20 21 22 23 24 25	MR. YOUNG: Yes. Okay. That's what we're asking for. MS. McCHESNEY: So the public process would then likely be an addendum to the staff report and these additional comments with the public comments. MR. YOUNG: Would these additional comments then be limited to
	Page 639		Page 641
1	information they made recommendations, they made changes	1	MS. McCHESNEY: Yes, to that.
1	,		
2	based on the recommendations, but if you're proposing to	2	MR. YOUNG: To the staff addendum to the staff
2	based on the recommendations, but if you're proposing to allow additional comments, significant documents into the	2	MR. YOUNG: To the staff addendum to the staff report?
2	based on the recommendations, but if you're proposing to allow additional comments, significant documents into the record, then I don't know if I could advise you at this	2	MR. YOUNG: To the staff addendum to the staff report? MS. McCHESNEY: Right.
2 3 4	based on the recommendations, but if you're proposing to allow additional comments, significant documents into the record, then I don't know if I could advise you at this point what public process should occur, but, it would	2 3 4	MR. YOUNG: To the staff addendum to the staff report? MS. McCHESNEY: Right. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Any idea, Lisa, a how much time
2 3 4 5	based on the recommendations, but if you're proposing to allow additional comments, significant documents into the record, then I don't know if I could advise you at this	2 3 4 5	MR. YOUNG: To the staff addendum to the staff report? MS. McCHESNEY: Right. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Any idea, Lisa, a how much time staff needs to really do this?
2 3 4 5 6	based on the recommendations, but if you're proposing to allow additional comments, significant documents into the record, then I don't know if I could advise you at this point what public process should occur, but, it would require some additional public process because it hasn't	2 3 4 5 6	MR. YOUNG: To the staff addendum to the staff report? MS. McCHESNEY: Right. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Any idea, Lisa, a how much time
2 3 4 5 6 7	based on the recommendations, but if you're proposing to allow additional comments, significant documents into the record, then I don't know if I could advise you at this point what public process should occur, but, it would require some additional public process because it hasn't been available to all the different wide range of	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. YOUNG: To the staff addendum to the staff report? MS. McCHESNEY: Right. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Any idea, Lisa, a how much time staff needs to really do this? MS. McCANN: I agree with what Roger said to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	based on the recommendations, but if you're proposing to allow additional comments, significant documents into the record, then I don't know if I could advise you at this point what public process should occur, but, it would require some additional public process because it hasn't been available to all the different wide range of interests in this matter, and it has not been made	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. YOUNG: To the staff addendum to the staff report? MS. McCHESNEY: Right. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Any idea, Lisa, a how much time staff needs to really do this? MS. McCANN: I agree with what Roger said to be able to do the analysis in writing and report it in an addendum to the staff report to meet the key dates in getting the staff report out to the public for the July
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	based on the recommendations, but if you're proposing to allow additional comments, significant documents into the record, then I don't know if I could advise you at this point what public process should occur, but, it would require some additional public process because it hasn't been available to all the different wide range of interests in this matter, and it has not been made available to them. And I know for now that some of their proposals are not legal. I mean not comply with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. YOUNG: To the staff addendum to the staff report? MS. McCHESNEY: Right. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Any idea, Lisa, a how much time staff needs to really do this? MS. McCANN: I agree with what Roger said to be able to do the analysis in writing and report it in an addendum to the staff report to meet the key dates in getting the staff report out to the public for the July Board Meeting is doable. The question I have is how long
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	based on the recommendations, but if you're proposing to allow additional comments, significant documents into the record, then I don't know if I could advise you at this point what public process should occur, but, it would require some additional public process because it hasn't been available to all the different wide range of interests in this matter, and it has not been made available to them. And I know for now that some of their proposals are not legal. I mean not comply with the Water Code and the staff has already made those clear and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. YOUNG: To the staff addendum to the staff report? MS. McCHESNEY: Right. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Any idea, Lisa, a how much time staff needs to really do this? MS. McCANN: I agree with what Roger said to be able to do the analysis in writing and report it in an addendum to the staff report to meet the key dates in getting the staff report out to the public for the July Board Meeting is doable. The question I have is how long for public comments, because if it's more than the ten
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	based on the recommendations, but if you're proposing to allow additional comments, significant documents into the record, then I don't know if I could advise you at this point what public process should occur, but, it would require some additional public process because it hasn't been available to all the different wide range of interests in this matter, and it has not been made available to them. And I know for now that some of their proposals are not legal. I mean not comply with the Water Code and the staff has already made those clear and I recommend that you not have a staff re-evaluate what's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. YOUNG: To the staff addendum to the staff report? MS. McCHESNEY: Right. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Any idea, Lisa, a how much time staff needs to really do this? MS. McCANN: I agree with what Roger said to be able to do the analysis in writing and report it in an addendum to the staff report to meet the key dates in getting the staff report out to the public for the July Board Meeting is doable. The question I have is how long for public comments, because if it's more than the ten days between when we post our staff reports and when the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	based on the recommendations, but if you're proposing to allow additional comments, significant documents into the record, then I don't know if I could advise you at this point what public process should occur, but, it would require some additional public process because it hasn't been available to all the different wide range of interests in this matter, and it has not been made available to them. And I know for now that some of their proposals are not legal. I mean not comply with the Water Code and the staff has already made those clear and I recommend that you not have a staff re-evaluate what's legal or not, but they look at the parts that would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. YOUNG: To the staff addendum to the staff report? MS. McCHESNEY: Right. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Any idea, Lisa, a how much time staff needs to really do this? MS. McCANN: I agree with what Roger said to be able to do the analysis in writing and report it in an addendum to the staff report to meet the key dates in getting the staff report out to the public for the July Board Meeting is doable. The question I have is how long for public comments, because if it's more than the ten days between when we post our staff reports and when the Board meeting happens, then I'm not sure we can achieve
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	based on the recommendations, but if you're proposing to allow additional comments, significant documents into the record, then I don't know if I could advise you at this point what public process should occur, but, it would require some additional public process because it hasn't been available to all the different wide range of interests in this matter, and it has not been made available to them. And I know for now that some of their proposals are not legal. I mean not comply with the Water Code and the staff has already made those clear and I recommend that you not have a staff re-evaluate what's legal or not, but they look at the parts that would potentially comply with the law and could be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. YOUNG: To the staff addendum to the staff report? MS. McCHESNEY: Right. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Any idea, Lisa, a how much time staff needs to really do this? MS. McCANN: I agree with what Roger said to be able to do the analysis in writing and report it in an addendum to the staff report to meet the key dates in getting the staff report out to the public for the July Board Meeting is doable. The question I have is how long for public comments, because if it's more than the ten days between when we post our staff reports and when the Board meeting happens, then I'm not sure we can achieve July.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	based on the recommendations, but if you're proposing to allow additional comments, significant documents into the record, then I don't know if I could advise you at this point what public process should occur, but, it would require some additional public process because it hasn't been available to all the different wide range of interests in this matter, and it has not been made available to them. And I know for now that some of their proposals are not legal. I mean not comply with the Water Code and the staff has already made those clear and I recommend that you not have a staff re-evaluate what's legal or not, but they look at the parts that would potentially comply with the law and could be incorporated.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. YOUNG: To the staff addendum to the staff report? MS. McCHESNEY: Right. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Any idea, Lisa, a how much time staff needs to really do this? MS. McCANN: I agree with what Roger said to be able to do the analysis in writing and report it in an addendum to the staff report to meet the key dates in getting the staff report out to the public for the July Board Meeting is doable. The question I have is how long for public comments, because if it's more than the ten days between when we post our staff reports and when the Board meeting happens, then I'm not sure we can achieve July. MS. McCHESNEY: Legally it will only be 10 days,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	based on the recommendations, but if you're proposing to allow additional comments, significant documents into the record, then I don't know if I could advise you at this point what public process should occur, but, it would require some additional public process because it hasn't been available to all the different wide range of interests in this matter, and it has not been made available to them. And I know for now that some of their proposals are not legal. I mean not comply with the Water Code and the staff has already made those clear and I recommend that you not have a staff re-evaluate what's legal or not, but they look at the parts that would potentially comply with the law and could be incorporated. MR. YOUNG: Are you saying you can't advise us	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. YOUNG: To the staff addendum to the staff report? MS. McCHESNEY: Right. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Any idea, Lisa, a how much time staff needs to really do this? MS. McCANN: I agree with what Roger said to be able to do the analysis in writing and report it in an addendum to the staff report to meet the key dates in getting the staff report out to the public for the July Board Meeting is doable. The question I have is how long for public comments, because if it's more than the ten days between when we post our staff reports and when the Board meeting happens, then I'm not sure we can achieve July. MS. McCHESNEY: Legally it will only be 10 days, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	based on the recommendations, but if you're proposing to allow additional comments, significant documents into the record, then I don't know if I could advise you at this point what public process should occur, but, it would require some additional public process because it hasn't been available to all the different wide range of interests in this matter, and it has not been made available to them. And I know for now that some of their proposals are not legal. I mean not comply with the Water Code and the staff has already made those clear and I recommend that you not have a staff re-evaluate what's legal or not, but they look at the parts that would potentially comply with the law and could be incorporated. MR. YOUNG: Are you saying you can't advise us right now what type of public process	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. YOUNG: To the staff addendum to the staff report? MS. McCHESNEY: Right. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Any idea, Lisa, a how much time staff needs to really do this? MS. McCANN: I agree with what Roger said to be able to do the analysis in writing and report it in an addendum to the staff report to meet the key dates in getting the staff report out to the public for the July Board Meeting is doable. The question I have is how long for public comments, because if it's more than the ten days between when we post our staff reports and when the Board meeting happens, then I'm not sure we can achieve July. MS. McCHESNEY: Legally it will only be 10 days, but MS. McCANN: That was my assumption
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	based on the recommendations, but if you're proposing to allow additional comments, significant documents into the record, then I don't know if I could advise you at this point what public process should occur, but, it would require some additional public process because it hasn't been available to all the different wide range of interests in this matter, and it has not been made available to them. And I know for now that some of their proposals are not legal. I mean not comply with the Water Code and the staff has already made those clear and I recommend that you not have a staff re-evaluate what's legal or not, but they look at the parts that would potentially comply with the law and could be incorporated. MR. YOUNG: Are you saying you can't advise us right now what type of public process MS. McCHESNEY: I need to look at, for example, if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. YOUNG: To the staff addendum to the staff report? MS. McCHESNEY: Right. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Any idea, Lisa, a how much time staff needs to really do this? MS. McCANN: I agree with what Roger said to be able to do the analysis in writing and report it in an addendum to the staff report to meet the key dates in getting the staff report out to the public for the July Board Meeting is doable. The question I have is how long for public comments, because if it's more than the ten days between when we post our staff reports and when the Board meeting happens, then I'm not sure we can achieve July. MS. McCHESNEY: Legally it will only be 10 days, but MS. McCANN: That was my assumption MS. McCHESNEY: More than ten days, it won't hurt
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	based on the recommendations, but if you're proposing to allow additional comments, significant documents into the record, then I don't know if I could advise you at this point what public process should occur, but, it would require some additional public process because it hasn't been available to all the different wide range of interests in this matter, and it has not been made available to them. And I know for now that some of their proposals are not legal. I mean not comply with the Water Code and the staff has already made those clear and I recommend that you not have a staff re-evaluate what's legal or not, but they look at the parts that would potentially comply with the law and could be incorporated. MR. YOUNG: Are you saying you can't advise us right now what type of public process MS. McCHESNEY: I need to look at, for example, if you want the staff to come back with just comparing,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. YOUNG: To the staff addendum to the staff report? MS. McCHESNEY: Right. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Any idea, Lisa, a how much time staff needs to really do this? MS. McCANN: I agree with what Roger said to be able to do the analysis in writing and report it in an addendum to the staff report to meet the key dates in getting the staff report out to the public for the July Board Meeting is doable. The question I have is how long for public comments, because if it's more than the ten days between when we post our staff reports and when the Board meeting happens, then I'm not sure we can achieve July. MS. McCHESNEY: Legally it will only be 10 days, but MS. McCANN: That was my assumption MS. McCHESNEY: More than ten days, it won't hurt for July, but I need to confirm that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	based on the recommendations, but if you're proposing to allow additional comments, significant documents into the record, then I don't know if I could advise you at this point what public process should occur, but, it would require some additional public process because it hasn't been available to all the different wide range of interests in this matter, and it has not been made available to them. And I know for now that some of their proposals are not legal. I mean not comply with the Water Code and the staff has already made those clear and I recommend that you not have a staff re-evaluate what's legal or not, but they look at the parts that would potentially comply with the law and could be incorporated. MR. YOUNG: Are you saying you can't advise us right now what type of public process MS. McCHESNEY: I need to look at, for example, if you want the staff to come back with just comparing, okay, they submit these new documents, and it could be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. YOUNG: To the staff addendum to the staff report? MS. McCHESNEY: Right. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Any idea, Lisa, a how much time staff needs to really do this? MS. McCANN: I agree with what Roger said to be able to do the analysis in writing and report it in an addendum to the staff report to meet the key dates in getting the staff report out to the public for the July Board Meeting is doable. The question I have is how long for public comments, because if it's more than the ten days between when we post our staff reports and when the Board meeting happens, then I'm not sure we can achieve July. MS. McCHESNEY: Legally it will only be 10 days, but MS. McCANN: That was my assumption MS. McCHESNEY: More than ten days, it won't hurt for July, but I need to confirm that. MR. BRIGGS: And the form of that public comment,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	based on the recommendations, but if you're proposing to allow additional comments, significant documents into the record, then I don't know if I could advise you at this point what public process should occur, but, it would require some additional public process because it hasn't been available to all the different wide range of interests in this matter, and it has not been made available to them. And I know for now that some of their proposals are not legal. I mean not comply with the Water Code and the staff has already made those clear and I recommend that you not have a staff re-evaluate what's legal or not, but they look at the parts that would potentially comply with the law and could be incorporated. MR. YOUNG: Are you saying you can't advise us right now what type of public process MS. McCHESNEY: I need to look at, for example, if you want the staff to come back with just comparing, okay, they submit these new documents, and it could be the public process could just be a lot of people come and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. YOUNG: To the staff addendum to the staff report? MS. McCHESNEY: Right. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Any idea, Lisa, a how much time staff needs to really do this? MS. McCANN: I agree with what Roger said to be able to do the analysis in writing and report it in an addendum to the staff report to meet the key dates in getting the staff report out to the public for the July Board Meeting is doable. The question I have is how long for public comments, because if it's more than the ten days between when we post our staff reports and when the Board meeting happens, then I'm not sure we can achieve July. MS. McCHESNEY: Legally it will only be 10 days, but MS. McCANN: That was my assumption MS. McCHESNEY: More than ten days, it won't hurt for July, but I need to confirm that. MR. BRIGGS: And the form of that public comment, I mean, that would not be an opportunity for any written
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	based on the recommendations, but if you're proposing to allow additional comments, significant documents into the record, then I don't know if I could advise you at this point what public process should occur, but, it would require some additional public process because it hasn't been available to all the different wide range of interests in this matter, and it has not been made available to them. And I know for now that some of their proposals are not legal. I mean not comply with the Water Code and the staff has already made those clear and I recommend that you not have a staff re-evaluate what's legal or not, but they look at the parts that would potentially comply with the law and could be incorporated. MR. YOUNG: Are you saying you can't advise us right now what type of public process MS. McCHESNEY: I need to look at, for example, if you want the staff to come back with just comparing, okay, they submit these new documents, and it could be the public process could just be a lot of people come and make oral comments, or it could be that the staff makes a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. YOUNG: To the staff addendum to the staff report? MS. McCHESNEY: Right. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Any idea, Lisa, a how much time staff needs to really do this? MS. McCANN: I agree with what Roger said to be able to do the analysis in writing and report it in an addendum to the staff report to meet the key dates in getting the staff report out to the public for the July Board Meeting is doable. The question I have is how long for public comments, because if it's more than the ten days between when we post our staff reports and when the Board meeting happens, then I'm not sure we can achieve July. MS. McCHESNEY: Legally it will only be 10 days, but MS. McCANN: That was my assumption MS. McCHESNEY: More than ten days, it won't hurt for July, but I need to confirm that. MR. BRIGGS: And the form of that public comment, I mean, that would not be an opportunity for any written comments, that would be just an opportunity to review it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	based on the recommendations, but if you're proposing to allow additional comments, significant documents into the record, then I don't know if I could advise you at this point what public process should occur, but, it would require some additional public process because it hasn't been available to all the different wide range of interests in this matter, and it has not been made available to them. And I know for now that some of their proposals are not legal. I mean not comply with the Water Code and the staff has already made those clear and I recommend that you not have a staff re-evaluate what's legal or not, but they look at the parts that would potentially comply with the law and could be incorporated. MR. YOUNG: Are you saying you can't advise us right now what type of public process MS. McCHESNEY: I need to look at, for example, if you want the staff to come back with just comparing, okay, they submit these new documents, and it could be the public process could just be a lot of people come and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. YOUNG: To the staff addendum to the staff report? MS. McCHESNEY: Right. MR. YOUNG: Okay. Any idea, Lisa, a how much time staff needs to really do this? MS. McCANN: I agree with what Roger said to be able to do the analysis in writing and report it in an addendum to the staff report to meet the key dates in getting the staff report out to the public for the July Board Meeting is doable. The question I have is how long for public comments, because if it's more than the ten days between when we post our staff reports and when the Board meeting happens, then I'm not sure we can achieve July. MS. McCHESNEY: Legally it will only be 10 days, but MS. McCANN: That was my assumption MS. McCHESNEY: More than ten days, it won't hurt for July, but I need to confirm that. MR. BRIGGS: And the form of that public comment, I mean, that would not be an opportunity for any written

A504530 PANEL HEARING M

MAY 4, 2011

1	what are we going to do with the comments that we get	1	MS. McCHESNEY: You're not obligated to accept
2	because you received how many hundreds of pages of	2	more proposals.
3	comments in response from us that we responded to all the	3	MR. YOUNG: Okay.
4	comments that were submitted by November 3rd, hundreds of	l	MR. THOMAS: And what Roger just said that is real
5	pages.	5	important, Francis, you said as long as there's an
6	MR. YOUNG: Is the staff required to comment on	6	opportunity to comment. Roger said that would be at the
7	comments? To respond?	7	Board meeting.
8	MS. McCHESNEY: Not on comments	8	MS. McCHESNEY: Right. And that's where I want to
9	THE COURT: No?	9	look. I can't say absolutely for sure that that's an
10	MS. McCHESNEY: No.	10	appropriate process that may be making comments is
11	MR. YOUNG: So people could just submit their	11 12	appropriate. But I will need to
12 13	comments and the Board will just read the comments.	13	MR. YOUNG: You mean staff's written comments?
	MS. McCHESNEY: It's just that it doesn't make a		MS. McCHESNEY: No. You're proposing to accept
14	good record if you don't have a response, but we're not	14 15	comments that were submitted after January 3rd, and all
15	legally obligated to have written responses to comments.		the other comments there were set for submitted in a
16	MR. BRIGGS: A big difference between getting	16	timely manner, everybody got to come here and comment on
17	something out to the public and enough time for them to	17	everything. Now you're proposing to accept more written
18 19	review and then coming and commenting to the Board as	18 19	comments and have staff prepare the addendum to the staff
20	opposed to enough time to review, write comments to us,	20	report. So the question is should the rest of the public
21	for us to compile them and submit them to the Board, it's	21	be allowed to have to submit written comments on this
22	a whole different time period.	22	additional staff report and documents should be accepted
23	MR. THOMAS: I hate to complicate this, but I'm	23	in the record, or will oral comments be sufficient? And
24	going to. What about the other folks that we're going to	24	what I can't say for sure that if oral comments are
25	hear from who are going to say what about us and our view	25	sufficient, which is what Roger is trying to confirm.
25	or our proposal? Page 643	25	MR. YOUNG: What if we allow the cutoff to be Page 645
	1 age 043		1 agc 043
1	MR. YOUNG: You mean the other proposals?	1	period to be the Board meeting itself?
1 2	MR. YOUNG: You mean the other proposals? MR. THOMAS: The other proposals or other counties	1 2	period to be the Board meeting itself? MS. McCHESNEY: Well, if you get 2,000 pages of
	MR. YOUNG: You mean the other proposals? MR. THOMAS: The other proposals or other counties from the other side of the		MS. McCHESNEY: Well, if you get 2,000 pages of
2	MR. THOMAS: The other proposals or other counties from the other side of the	2	
2	MR. THOMAS: The other proposals or other counties from the other side of the MR. YOUNG: Let me just throw this out here. This	2	MS. McCHESNEY: Well, if you get 2,000 pages of written comments it's going to be difficult to read and evaluate those comments.
2 3 4	MR. THOMAS: The other proposals or other counties from the other side of the	2 3 4	MS. McCHESNEY: Well, if you get 2,000 pages of written comments it's going to be difficult to read and
2 3 4 5	MR. THOMAS: The other proposals or other counties from the other side of the MR. YOUNG: Let me just throw this out here. This is my take on what we're doing. And, Francis, if it's wrong, let me know, of course.	2 3 4 5	MS. McCHESNEY: Well, if you get 2,000 pages of written comments it's going to be difficult to read and evaluate those comments. MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Chair, it seems like it would make sense to have an easier course here, and it's
2 3 4 5 6	MR. THOMAS: The other proposals or other counties from the other side of the MR. YOUNG: Let me just throw this out here. This is my take on what we're doing. And, Francis, if it's wrong, let me know, of course. But the Board is deciding what information it	2 3 4 5 6	MS. McCHESNEY: Well, if you get 2,000 pages of written comments it's going to be difficult to read and evaluate those comments. MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Chair, it seems like it would
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. THOMAS: The other proposals or other counties from the other side of the MR. YOUNG: Let me just throw this out here. This is my take on what we're doing. And, Francis, if it's wrong, let me know, of course. But the Board is deciding what information it feels is important right now for consideration that want	2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. McCHESNEY: Well, if you get 2,000 pages of written comments it's going to be difficult to read and evaluate those comments. MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Chair, it seems like it would make sense to have an easier course here, and it's dependent on our counsel determining which procedure will work.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. THOMAS: The other proposals or other counties from the other side of the MR. YOUNG: Let me just throw this out here. This is my take on what we're doing. And, Francis, if it's wrong, let me know, of course. But the Board is deciding what information it feels is important right now for consideration that want staff to comment on. I don't think that opens this up	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. McCHESNEY: Well, if you get 2,000 pages of written comments it's going to be difficult to read and evaluate those comments. MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Chair, it seems like it would make sense to have an easier course here, and it's dependent on our counsel determining which procedure will work. MR. YOUNG: Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. THOMAS: The other proposals or other counties from the other side of the MR. YOUNG: Let me just throw this out here. This is my take on what we're doing. And, Francis, if it's wrong, let me know, of course. But the Board is deciding what information it feels is important right now for consideration that want	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. McCHESNEY: Well, if you get 2,000 pages of written comments it's going to be difficult to read and evaluate those comments. MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Chair, it seems like it would make sense to have an easier course here, and it's dependent on our counsel determining which procedure will work. MR. YOUNG: Right. MR. BRIGGS: So, if it's legal, and it's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. THOMAS: The other proposals or other counties from the other side of the MR. YOUNG: Let me just throw this out here. This is my take on what we're doing. And, Francis, if it's wrong, let me know, of course. But the Board is deciding what information it feels is important right now for consideration that want staff to comment on. I don't think that opens this up that now everyone gets to submit new information to us.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. McCHESNEY: Well, if you get 2,000 pages of written comments it's going to be difficult to read and evaluate those comments. MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Chair, it seems like it would make sense to have an easier course here, and it's dependent on our counsel determining which procedure will work. MR. YOUNG: Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. THOMAS: The other proposals or other counties from the other side of the MR. YOUNG: Let me just throw this out here. This is my take on what we're doing. And, Francis, if it's wrong, let me know, of course. But the Board is deciding what information it feels is important right now for consideration that want staff to comment on. I don't think that opens this up that now everyone gets to submit new information to us. Or that there may be other proposals out there that we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS. McCHESNEY: Well, if you get 2,000 pages of written comments it's going to be difficult to read and evaluate those comments. MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Chair, it seems like it would make sense to have an easier course here, and it's dependent on our counsel determining which procedure will work. MR. YOUNG: Right. MR. BRIGGS: So, if it's legal, and it's satisfactory for the Board to hear comments at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. THOMAS: The other proposals or other counties from the other side of the MR. YOUNG: Let me just throw this out here. This is my take on what we're doing. And, Francis, if it's wrong, let me know, of course. But the Board is deciding what information it feels is important right now for consideration that want staff to comment on. I don't think that opens this up that now everyone gets to submit new information to us. Or that there may be other proposals out there that we kind of decided, okay, we've heard them, we're just not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. McCHESNEY: Well, if you get 2,000 pages of written comments it's going to be difficult to read and evaluate those comments. MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Chair, it seems like it would make sense to have an easier course here, and it's dependent on our counsel determining which procedure will work. MR. YOUNG: Right. MR. BRIGGS: So, if it's legal, and it's satisfactory for the Board to hear comments at the meeting as opposed to receiving written comments, I think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. THOMAS: The other proposals or other counties from the other side of the MR. YOUNG: Let me just throw this out here. This is my take on what we're doing. And, Francis, if it's wrong, let me know, of course. But the Board is deciding what information it feels is important right now for consideration that want staff to comment on. I don't think that opens this up that now everyone gets to submit new information to us. Or that there may be other proposals out there that we kind of decided, okay, we've heard them, we're just not interested in having any further comments on them. This	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. McCHESNEY: Well, if you get 2,000 pages of written comments it's going to be difficult to read and evaluate those comments. MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Chair, it seems like it would make sense to have an easier course here, and it's dependent on our counsel determining which procedure will work. MR. YOUNG: Right. MR. BRIGGS: So, if it's legal, and it's satisfactory for the Board to hear comments at the meeting as opposed to receiving written comments, I think that's doable for July.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. THOMAS: The other proposals or other counties from the other side of the MR. YOUNG: Let me just throw this out here. This is my take on what we're doing. And, Francis, if it's wrong, let me know, of course. But the Board is deciding what information it feels is important right now for consideration that want staff to comment on. I don't think that opens this up that now everyone gets to submit new information to us. Or that there may be other proposals out there that we kind of decided, okay, we've heard them, we're just not interested in having any further comments on them. This is what we've heard, we would like to hear more about it.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. McCHESNEY: Well, if you get 2,000 pages of written comments it's going to be difficult to read and evaluate those comments. MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Chair, it seems like it would make sense to have an easier course here, and it's dependent on our counsel determining which procedure will work. MR. YOUNG: Right. MR. BRIGGS: So, if it's legal, and it's satisfactory for the Board to hear comments at the meeting as opposed to receiving written comments, I think that's doable for July. MS. McCANN: Schedule-wise it's doable. I'm not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. THOMAS: The other proposals or other counties from the other side of the MR. YOUNG: Let me just throw this out here. This is my take on what we're doing. And, Francis, if it's wrong, let me know, of course. But the Board is deciding what information it feels is important right now for consideration that want staff to comment on. I don't think that opens this up that now everyone gets to submit new information to us. Or that there may be other proposals out there that we kind of decided, okay, we've heard them, we're just not interested in having any further comments on them. This is what we've heard, we would like to hear more about it. And we're trying to narrow this down, and the Board's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. McCHESNEY: Well, if you get 2,000 pages of written comments it's going to be difficult to read and evaluate those comments. MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Chair, it seems like it would make sense to have an easier course here, and it's dependent on our counsel determining which procedure will work. MR. YOUNG: Right. MR. BRIGGS: So, if it's legal, and it's satisfactory for the Board to hear comments at the meeting as opposed to receiving written comments, I think that's doable for July. MS. McCANN: Schedule-wise it's doable. I'm not sure what people's availability is.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. THOMAS: The other proposals or other counties from the other side of the MR. YOUNG: Let me just throw this out here. This is my take on what we're doing. And, Francis, if it's wrong, let me know, of course. But the Board is deciding what information it feels is important right now for consideration that want staff to comment on. I don't think that opens this up that now everyone gets to submit new information to us. Or that there may be other proposals out there that we kind of decided, okay, we've heard them, we're just not interested in having any further comments on them. This is what we've heard, we would like to hear more about it. And we're trying to narrow this down, and the Board's making the decision to do that. Is that okay?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. McCHESNEY: Well, if you get 2,000 pages of written comments it's going to be difficult to read and evaluate those comments. MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Chair, it seems like it would make sense to have an easier course here, and it's dependent on our counsel determining which procedure will work. MR. YOUNG: Right. MR. BRIGGS: So, if it's legal, and it's satisfactory for the Board to hear comments at the meeting as opposed to receiving written comments, I think that's doable for July. MS. McCANN: Schedule-wise it's doable. I'm not sure what people's availability is. MR. BRIGGS: Okay. But if our counsel determines
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. THOMAS: The other proposals or other counties from the other side of the MR. YOUNG: Let me just throw this out here. This is my take on what we're doing. And, Francis, if it's wrong, let me know, of course. But the Board is deciding what information it feels is important right now for consideration that want staff to comment on. I don't think that opens this up that now everyone gets to submit new information to us. Or that there may be other proposals out there that we kind of decided, okay, we've heard them, we're just not interested in having any further comments on them. This is what we've heard, we would like to hear more about it. And we're trying to narrow this down, and the Board's making the decision to do that. Is that okay? MS. McCHESNEY: Yes, as long as there's a public	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. McCHESNEY: Well, if you get 2,000 pages of written comments it's going to be difficult to read and evaluate those comments. MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Chair, it seems like it would make sense to have an easier course here, and it's dependent on our counsel determining which procedure will work. MR. YOUNG: Right. MR. BRIGGS: So, if it's legal, and it's satisfactory for the Board to hear comments at the meeting as opposed to receiving written comments, I think that's doable for July. MS. McCANN: Schedule-wise it's doable. I'm not sure what people's availability is. MR. BRIGGS: Okay. But if our counsel determines that we have to have another round of written comments,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. THOMAS: The other proposals or other counties from the other side of the MR. YOUNG: Let me just throw this out here. This is my take on what we're doing. And, Francis, if it's wrong, let me know, of course. But the Board is deciding what information it feels is important right now for consideration that want staff to comment on. I don't think that opens this up that now everyone gets to submit new information to us. Or that there may be other proposals out there that we kind of decided, okay, we've heard them, we're just not interested in having any further comments on them. This is what we've heard, we would like to hear more about it. And we're trying to narrow this down, and the Board's making the decision to do that. Is that okay? MS. McCHESNEY: Yes, as long as there's a public comment period on the staff's response to your question.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. McCHESNEY: Well, if you get 2,000 pages of written comments it's going to be difficult to read and evaluate those comments. MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Chair, it seems like it would make sense to have an easier course here, and it's dependent on our counsel determining which procedure will work. MR. YOUNG: Right. MR. BRIGGS: So, if it's legal, and it's satisfactory for the Board to hear comments at the meeting as opposed to receiving written comments, I think that's doable for July. MS. McCANN: Schedule-wise it's doable. I'm not sure what people's availability is. MR. BRIGGS: Okay. But if our counsel determines that we have to have another round of written comments, then it's not doable.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. THOMAS: The other proposals or other counties from the other side of the MR. YOUNG: Let me just throw this out here. This is my take on what we're doing. And, Francis, if it's wrong, let me know, of course. But the Board is deciding what information it feels is important right now for consideration that want staff to comment on. I don't think that opens this up that now everyone gets to submit new information to us. Or that there may be other proposals out there that we kind of decided, okay, we've heard them, we're just not interested in having any further comments on them. This is what we've heard, we would like to hear more about it. And we're trying to narrow this down, and the Board's making the decision to do that. Is that okay? MS. McCHESNEY: Yes, as long as there's a public comment period on the staff's response to your question. MR. YOUNG: Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. McCHESNEY: Well, if you get 2,000 pages of written comments it's going to be difficult to read and evaluate those comments. MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Chair, it seems like it would make sense to have an easier course here, and it's dependent on our counsel determining which procedure will work. MR. YOUNG: Right. MR. BRIGGS: So, if it's legal, and it's satisfactory for the Board to hear comments at the meeting as opposed to receiving written comments, I think that's doable for July. MS. McCANN: Schedule-wise it's doable. I'm not sure what people's availability is. MR. BRIGGS: Okay. But if our counsel determines that we have to have another round of written comments, then it's not doable. MS. McCANN: Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. THOMAS: The other proposals or other counties from the other side of the MR. YOUNG: Let me just throw this out here. This is my take on what we're doing. And, Francis, if it's wrong, let me know, of course. But the Board is deciding what information it feels is important right now for consideration that want staff to comment on. I don't think that opens this up that now everyone gets to submit new information to us. Or that there may be other proposals out there that we kind of decided, okay, we've heard them, we're just not interested in having any further comments on them. This is what we've heard, we would like to hear more about it. And we're trying to narrow this down, and the Board's making the decision to do that. Is that okay? MS. McCHESNEY: Yes, as long as there's a public comment period on the staff's response to your question. MR. YOUNG: Okay. MS. McCHESNEY: Which would include commenting on	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. McCHESNEY: Well, if you get 2,000 pages of written comments it's going to be difficult to read and evaluate those comments. MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Chair, it seems like it would make sense to have an easier course here, and it's dependent on our counsel determining which procedure will work. MR. YOUNG: Right. MR. BRIGGS: So, if it's legal, and it's satisfactory for the Board to hear comments at the meeting as opposed to receiving written comments, I think that's doable for July. MS. McCANN: Schedule-wise it's doable. I'm not sure what people's availability is. MR. BRIGGS: Okay. But if our counsel determines that we have to have another round of written comments, then it's not doable. MS. McCANN: Right. MR. BRIGGS: So I think we may just have to leave
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. THOMAS: The other proposals or other counties from the other side of the MR. YOUNG: Let me just throw this out here. This is my take on what we're doing. And, Francis, if it's wrong, let me know, of course. But the Board is deciding what information it feels is important right now for consideration that want staff to comment on. I don't think that opens this up that now everyone gets to submit new information to us. Or that there may be other proposals out there that we kind of decided, okay, we've heard them, we're just not interested in having any further comments on them. This is what we've heard, we would like to hear more about it. And we're trying to narrow this down, and the Board's making the decision to do that. Is that okay? MS. McCHESNEY: Yes, as long as there's a public comment period on the staff's response to your question. MR. YOUNG: Okay. MS. McCHESNEY: Which would include commenting on the agricultural proposal that has not been made	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. McCHESNEY: Well, if you get 2,000 pages of written comments it's going to be difficult to read and evaluate those comments. MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Chair, it seems like it would make sense to have an easier course here, and it's dependent on our counsel determining which procedure will work. MR. YOUNG: Right. MR. BRIGGS: So, if it's legal, and it's satisfactory for the Board to hear comments at the meeting as opposed to receiving written comments, I think that's doable for July. MS. McCANN: Schedule-wise it's doable. I'm not sure what people's availability is. MR. BRIGGS: Okay. But if our counsel determines that we have to have another round of written comments, then it's not doable. MS. McCANN: Right. MR. BRIGGS: So I think we may just have to leave it at that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. THOMAS: The other proposals or other counties from the other side of the MR. YOUNG: Let me just throw this out here. This is my take on what we're doing. And, Francis, if it's wrong, let me know, of course. But the Board is deciding what information it feels is important right now for consideration that want staff to comment on. I don't think that opens this up that now everyone gets to submit new information to us. Or that there may be other proposals out there that we kind of decided, okay, we've heard them, we're just not interested in having any further comments on them. This is what we've heard, we would like to hear more about it. And we're trying to narrow this down, and the Board's making the decision to do that. Is that okay? MS. McCHESNEY: Yes, as long as there's a public comment period on the staff's response to your question. MR. YOUNG: Okay. MS. McCHESNEY: Which would include commenting on the agricultural proposal that has not been made available publicly.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. McCHESNEY: Well, if you get 2,000 pages of written comments it's going to be difficult to read and evaluate those comments. MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Chair, it seems like it would make sense to have an easier course here, and it's dependent on our counsel determining which procedure will work. MR. YOUNG: Right. MR. BRIGGS: So, if it's legal, and it's satisfactory for the Board to hear comments at the meeting as opposed to receiving written comments, I think that's doable for July. MS. McCANN: Schedule-wise it's doable. I'm not sure what people's availability is. MR. BRIGGS: Okay. But if our counsel determines that we have to have another round of written comments, then it's not doable. MS. McCANN: Right. MR. BRIGGS: So I think we may just have to leave it at that. MR. YOUNG: What about then the September Board
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. THOMAS: The other proposals or other counties from the other side of the MR. YOUNG: Let me just throw this out here. This is my take on what we're doing. And, Francis, if it's wrong, let me know, of course. But the Board is deciding what information it feels is important right now for consideration that want staff to comment on. I don't think that opens this up that now everyone gets to submit new information to us. Or that there may be other proposals out there that we kind of decided, okay, we've heard them, we're just not interested in having any further comments on them. This is what we've heard, we would like to hear more about it. And we're trying to narrow this down, and the Board's making the decision to do that. Is that okay? MS. McCHESNEY: Yes, as long as there's a public comment period on the staff's response to your question. MR. YOUNG: Okay. MS. McCHESNEY: Which would include commenting on the agricultural proposal that has not been made available publicly. MR. YOUNG: Okay. But I think what Michael was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. McCHESNEY: Well, if you get 2,000 pages of written comments it's going to be difficult to read and evaluate those comments. MR. BRIGGS: Mr. Chair, it seems like it would make sense to have an easier course here, and it's dependent on our counsel determining which procedure will work. MR. YOUNG: Right. MR. BRIGGS: So, if it's legal, and it's satisfactory for the Board to hear comments at the meeting as opposed to receiving written comments, I think that's doable for July. MS. McCANN: Schedule-wise it's doable. I'm not sure what people's availability is. MR. BRIGGS: Okay. But if our counsel determines that we have to have another round of written comments, then it's not doable. MS. McCANN: Right. MR. BRIGGS: So I think we may just have to leave it at that. MR. YOUNG: What about then the September Board Meeting?

1	county.	1	look at that.
2	MR. JEFFRIES: Can I ask our counsel a question?	2	I mean, does July versus September make that
3	What's the difference between oral comments and written	3	much difference in the long run? Because I think what
4	comments?	4	we're going to have once this comes back we're going to
5	MS. McCHESNEY: If you if there's a limited	5	be ready to vote. We're probably going to have a fifth
6	time period and people are submitting written comments to	6	board member.
7	do the last minute, it's not possible for you and the	7	MR. JEFFRIES: I would hope by September we would.
8	staff and everybody to read those comments in a timely	8	MR. YOUNG: Yeah.
9	manner.	9	MR. JEFFRIES: Would cancelling the June meeting
10	MR. JEFFRIES: I understand that, but	10	and putting that information on the July meeting would we
11	MS. McCHESNEY: There's a time issue.	11	have adequate time even if staff could get it ready?
12	MR. JEFFRIES: There was oral comments made by a	12	MR. BRIGGS: I don't think that's a factor.
13	whole lot of people. There was oral comments made by the	13	MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. That's not a factor. All
14	Ag Coalition, so, why is it different than submitting	14	right.
15	written comments?	15	MR. YOUNG: So that's our direction.
16	MS. McCHESNEY: Because you're asking staff to	16	MR. BRIGGS: Yes.
17	prepare a new staff report, addendum to the staff report	17	MR. YOUNG: Is everyone kind of clear with what we
18	commenting on new information in the record, and I just	18	want to do?
19	can't tell you right now without researching the law	19	MR. SHIMEK: I just need you to restate what it is
20	whether there are obligations for you to provide an	20	that you're doing.
21	opportunity for written comments. And I'll have to let	21	MR. YOUNG: What we are directing staff to do is
22	the staff know to schedule a meeting.	22	to take the California Farm Bureau written submission
23	MR. BRIGGS: So the time would be dependent on	23	that was from March 17th and their submission today
24	results of that research?	24	directing staff to compare and contrast and comment on
25	MR. JEFFRIES: I will bow to that decision.	25	what parts of that submission are doable, for what
	Page 647		Page 649
1	MR. YOUNG: If we put this off to September does	1	reasons, which parts are not doable for what other
2	that supply offer enough time for written comments to	2	reasons, which parts are not doable for what other reasons. So that we can get some further analysis of
	that supply offer enough time for written comments to come in and staff to reply on the written comments?	2	•
2 3 4	that supply offer enough time for written comments to come in and staff to reply on the written comments? MS. McCANN: I don't think time is the issue, I	2 3 4	reasons. So that we can get some further analysis of that. And to have that done we would like the
2 3 4 5	that supply offer enough time for written comments to come in and staff to reply on the written comments? MS. McCANN: I don't think time is the issue, I think clarity about the process is what we need to	2 3 4 5	reasons. So that we can get some further analysis of that. And to have that done we would like the Board meeting to be in September where we can get an
2 3 4 5 6	that supply offer enough time for written comments to come in and staff to reply on the written comments? MS. McCANN: I don't think time is the issue, I think clarity about the process is what we need to resolve for sure.	2 3 4 5 6	reasons. So that we can get some further analysis of that. And to have that done we would like the Board meeting to be in September where we can get an addendum to the staff report limited to those items for
2 3 4 5 6 7	that supply offer enough time for written comments to come in and staff to reply on the written comments? MS. McCANN: I don't think time is the issue, I think clarity about the process is what we need to resolve for sure. MR. YOUNG: Well, the clarity would be that the	2 3 4 5 6 7	reasons. So that we can get some further analysis of that. And to have that done we would like the Board meeting to be in September where we can get an addendum to the staff report limited to those items for our consideration.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that supply offer enough time for written comments to come in and staff to reply on the written comments? MS. McCANN: I don't think time is the issue, I think clarity about the process is what we need to resolve for sure. MR. YOUNG: Well, the clarity would be that the people submit written comments, if they want to, and do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	reasons. So that we can get some further analysis of that. And to have that done we would like the Board meeting to be in September where we can get an addendum to the staff report limited to those items for our consideration. MR. BRIGGS: And compare it with the changes that
2 3 4 5 6 7	that supply offer enough time for written comments to come in and staff to reply on the written comments? MS. McCANN: I don't think time is the issue, I think clarity about the process is what we need to resolve for sure. MR. YOUNG: Well, the clarity would be that the people submit written comments, if they want to, and do this the normal way, which is staff comes out with a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	reasons. So that we can get some further analysis of that. And to have that done we would like the Board meeting to be in September where we can get an addendum to the staff report limited to those items for our consideration.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that supply offer enough time for written comments to come in and staff to reply on the written comments? MS. McCANN: I don't think time is the issue, I think clarity about the process is what we need to resolve for sure. MR. YOUNG: Well, the clarity would be that the people submit written comments, if they want to, and do this the normal way, which is staff comes out with a staff an addendum to the staff report, these items	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	reasons. So that we can get some further analysis of that. And to have that done we would like the Board meeting to be in September where we can get an addendum to the staff report limited to those items for our consideration. MR. BRIGGS: And compare it with the changes that we recommended today. MR. YOUNG: Yes. It's essentially taking the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that supply offer enough time for written comments to come in and staff to reply on the written comments? MS. McCANN: I don't think time is the issue, I think clarity about the process is what we need to resolve for sure. MR. YOUNG: Well, the clarity would be that the people submit written comments, if they want to, and do this the normal way, which is staff comes out with a staff an addendum to the staff report, these items that we've identified dealing with the California Farm	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	reasons. So that we can get some further analysis of that. And to have that done we would like the Board meeting to be in September where we can get an addendum to the staff report limited to those items for our consideration. MR. BRIGGS: And compare it with the changes that we recommended today. MR. YOUNG: Yes. It's essentially taking the matrix that staff put together a couple of board meetings
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	that supply offer enough time for written comments to come in and staff to reply on the written comments? MS. McCANN: I don't think time is the issue, I think clarity about the process is what we need to resolve for sure. MR. YOUNG: Well, the clarity would be that the people submit written comments, if they want to, and do this the normal way, which is staff comes out with a staff an addendum to the staff report, these items that we've identified dealing with the California Farm Bureau proposal, and the people have an opportunity to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	reasons. So that we can get some further analysis of that. And to have that done we would like the Board meeting to be in September where we can get an addendum to the staff report limited to those items for our consideration. MR. BRIGGS: And compare it with the changes that we recommended today. MR. YOUNG: Yes. It's essentially taking the matrix that staff put together a couple of board meetings ago, whenever it was, and to just update that. That
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that supply offer enough time for written comments to come in and staff to reply on the written comments? MS. McCANN: I don't think time is the issue, I think clarity about the process is what we need to resolve for sure. MR. YOUNG: Well, the clarity would be that the people submit written comments, if they want to, and do this the normal way, which is staff comes out with a staff an addendum to the staff report, these items that we've identified dealing with the California Farm Bureau proposal, and the people have an opportunity to submit written comments by a certain date, and staff	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	reasons. So that we can get some further analysis of that. And to have that done we would like the Board meeting to be in September where we can get an addendum to the staff report limited to those items for our consideration. MR. BRIGGS: And compare it with the changes that we recommended today. MR. YOUNG: Yes. It's essentially taking the matrix that staff put together a couple of board meetings ago, whenever it was, and to just update that. That approach is fine.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that supply offer enough time for written comments to come in and staff to reply on the written comments? MS. McCANN: I don't think time is the issue, I think clarity about the process is what we need to resolve for sure. MR. YOUNG: Well, the clarity would be that the people submit written comments, if they want to, and do this the normal way, which is staff comes out with a staff an addendum to the staff report, these items that we've identified dealing with the California Farm Bureau proposal, and the people have an opportunity to submit written comments by a certain date, and staff provides a reply.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	reasons. So that we can get some further analysis of that. And to have that done we would like the Board meeting to be in September where we can get an addendum to the staff report limited to those items for our consideration. MR. BRIGGS: And compare it with the changes that we recommended today. MR. YOUNG: Yes. It's essentially taking the matrix that staff put together a couple of board meetings ago, whenever it was, and to just update that. That approach is fine. So is that clear, Mr. Shimek?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that supply offer enough time for written comments to come in and staff to reply on the written comments? MS. McCANN: I don't think time is the issue, I think clarity about the process is what we need to resolve for sure. MR. YOUNG: Well, the clarity would be that the people submit written comments, if they want to, and do this the normal way, which is staff comes out with a staff an addendum to the staff report, these items that we've identified dealing with the California Farm Bureau proposal, and the people have an opportunity to submit written comments by a certain date, and staff	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	reasons. So that we can get some further analysis of that. And to have that done we would like the Board meeting to be in September where we can get an addendum to the staff report limited to those items for our consideration. MR. BRIGGS: And compare it with the changes that we recommended today. MR. YOUNG: Yes. It's essentially taking the matrix that staff put together a couple of board meetings ago, whenever it was, and to just update that. That approach is fine.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that supply offer enough time for written comments to come in and staff to reply on the written comments? MS. McCANN: I don't think time is the issue, I think clarity about the process is what we need to resolve for sure. MR. YOUNG: Well, the clarity would be that the people submit written comments, if they want to, and do this the normal way, which is staff comes out with a staff an addendum to the staff report, these items that we've identified dealing with the California Farm Bureau proposal, and the people have an opportunity to submit written comments by a certain date, and staff provides a reply. MR. JEFFRIES: On that addendum. MR. YOUNG: On that addendum.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	reasons. So that we can get some further analysis of that. And to have that done we would like the Board meeting to be in September where we can get an addendum to the staff report limited to those items for our consideration. MR. BRIGGS: And compare it with the changes that we recommended today. MR. YOUNG: Yes. It's essentially taking the matrix that staff put together a couple of board meetings ago, whenever it was, and to just update that. That approach is fine. So is that clear, Mr. Shimek? All right, folks, I think that that brings this meeting to a close.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that supply offer enough time for written comments to come in and staff to reply on the written comments? MS. McCANN: I don't think time is the issue, I think clarity about the process is what we need to resolve for sure. MR. YOUNG: Well, the clarity would be that the people submit written comments, if they want to, and do this the normal way, which is staff comes out with a staff an addendum to the staff report, these items that we've identified dealing with the California Farm Bureau proposal, and the people have an opportunity to submit written comments by a certain date, and staff provides a reply. MR. JEFFRIES: On that addendum. MR. YOUNG: On that addendum. MR. JEFFRIES: Only.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	reasons. So that we can get some further analysis of that. And to have that done we would like the Board meeting to be in September where we can get an addendum to the staff report limited to those items for our consideration. MR. BRIGGS: And compare it with the changes that we recommended today. MR. YOUNG: Yes. It's essentially taking the matrix that staff put together a couple of board meetings ago, whenever it was, and to just update that. That approach is fine. So is that clear, Mr. Shimek? All right, folks, I think that that brings this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that supply offer enough time for written comments to come in and staff to reply on the written comments? MS. McCANN: I don't think time is the issue, I think clarity about the process is what we need to resolve for sure. MR. YOUNG: Well, the clarity would be that the people submit written comments, if they want to, and do this the normal way, which is staff comes out with a staff an addendum to the staff report, these items that we've identified dealing with the California Farm Bureau proposal, and the people have an opportunity to submit written comments by a certain date, and staff provides a reply. MR. JEFFRIES: On that addendum. MR. YOUNG: On that addendum. MR. YOUNG: Only. Yeah.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	reasons. So that we can get some further analysis of that. And to have that done we would like the Board meeting to be in September where we can get an addendum to the staff report limited to those items for our consideration. MR. BRIGGS: And compare it with the changes that we recommended today. MR. YOUNG: Yes. It's essentially taking the matrix that staff put together a couple of board meetings ago, whenever it was, and to just update that. That approach is fine. So is that clear, Mr. Shimek? All right, folks, I think that that brings this meeting to a close. Any further comments from the Board?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	that supply offer enough time for written comments to come in and staff to reply on the written comments? MS. McCANN: I don't think time is the issue, I think clarity about the process is what we need to resolve for sure. MR. YOUNG: Well, the clarity would be that the people submit written comments, if they want to, and do this the normal way, which is staff comes out with a staff an addendum to the staff report, these items that we've identified dealing with the California Farm Bureau proposal, and the people have an opportunity to submit written comments by a certain date, and staff provides a reply. MR. JEFFRIES: On that addendum. MR. YOUNG: On that addendum. MR. YOUNG: Only. Yeah. MR. BRIGGS: I think it would be September.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	reasons. So that we can get some further analysis of that. And to have that done we would like the Board meeting to be in September where we can get an addendum to the staff report limited to those items for our consideration. MR. BRIGGS: And compare it with the changes that we recommended today. MR. YOUNG: Yes. It's essentially taking the matrix that staff put together a couple of board meetings ago, whenever it was, and to just update that. That approach is fine. So is that clear, Mr. Shimek? All right, folks, I think that that brings this meeting to a close.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that supply offer enough time for written comments to come in and staff to reply on the written comments? MS. McCANN: I don't think time is the issue, I think clarity about the process is what we need to resolve for sure. MR. YOUNG: Well, the clarity would be that the people submit written comments, if they want to, and do this the normal way, which is staff comes out with a staff an addendum to the staff report, these items that we've identified dealing with the California Farm Bureau proposal, and the people have an opportunity to submit written comments by a certain date, and staff provides a reply. MR. JEFFRIES: On that addendum. MR. YOUNG: On that addendum. MR. YOUNG: Only. Yeah. MR. BRIGGS: I think it would be September. MR. YOUNG: Is there an objection with the rest of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	reasons. So that we can get some further analysis of that. And to have that done we would like the Board meeting to be in September where we can get an addendum to the staff report limited to those items for our consideration. MR. BRIGGS: And compare it with the changes that we recommended today. MR. YOUNG: Yes. It's essentially taking the matrix that staff put together a couple of board meetings ago, whenever it was, and to just update that. That approach is fine. So is that clear, Mr. Shimek? All right, folks, I think that that brings this meeting to a close. Any further comments from the Board? (No response.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that supply offer enough time for written comments to come in and staff to reply on the written comments? MS. McCANN: I don't think time is the issue, I think clarity about the process is what we need to resolve for sure. MR. YOUNG: Well, the clarity would be that the people submit written comments, if they want to, and do this the normal way, which is staff comes out with a staff an addendum to the staff report, these items that we've identified dealing with the California Farm Bureau proposal, and the people have an opportunity to submit written comments by a certain date, and staff provides a reply. MR. JEFFRIES: On that addendum. MR. YOUNG: On that addendum. MR. YOUNG: Only. Yeah. MR. BRIGGS: I think it would be September. MR. YOUNG: Is there an objection with the rest of you?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	reasons. So that we can get some further analysis of that. And to have that done we would like the Board meeting to be in September where we can get an addendum to the staff report limited to those items for our consideration. MR. BRIGGS: And compare it with the changes that we recommended today. MR. YOUNG: Yes. It's essentially taking the matrix that staff put together a couple of board meetings ago, whenever it was, and to just update that. That approach is fine. So is that clear, Mr. Shimek? All right, folks, I think that that brings this meeting to a close. Any further comments from the Board? (No response.) MR. YOUNG: We're done.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that supply offer enough time for written comments to come in and staff to reply on the written comments? MS. McCANN: I don't think time is the issue, I think clarity about the process is what we need to resolve for sure. MR. YOUNG: Well, the clarity would be that the people submit written comments, if they want to, and do this the normal way, which is staff comes out with a staff an addendum to the staff report, these items that we've identified dealing with the California Farm Bureau proposal, and the people have an opportunity to submit written comments by a certain date, and staff provides a reply. MR. JEFFRIES: On that addendum. MR. YOUNG: On that addendum. MR. YOUNG: Only. Yeah. MR. BRIGGS: I think it would be September. MR. YOUNG: Is there an objection with the rest of you? MR. HODGIN: Are we giving up on July?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	reasons. So that we can get some further analysis of that. And to have that done we would like the Board meeting to be in September where we can get an addendum to the staff report limited to those items for our consideration. MR. BRIGGS: And compare it with the changes that we recommended today. MR. YOUNG: Yes. It's essentially taking the matrix that staff put together a couple of board meetings ago, whenever it was, and to just update that. That approach is fine. So is that clear, Mr. Shimek? All right, folks, I think that that brings this meeting to a close. Any further comments from the Board? (No response.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that supply offer enough time for written comments to come in and staff to reply on the written comments? MS. McCANN: I don't think time is the issue, I think clarity about the process is what we need to resolve for sure. MR. YOUNG: Well, the clarity would be that the people submit written comments, if they want to, and do this the normal way, which is staff comes out with a staff an addendum to the staff report, these items that we've identified dealing with the California Farm Bureau proposal, and the people have an opportunity to submit written comments by a certain date, and staff provides a reply. MR. JEFFRIES: On that addendum. MR. YOUNG: On that addendum. MR. YOUNG: Only. Yeah. MR. BRIGGS: I think it would be September. MR. YOUNG: Is there an objection with the rest of you? MR. HODGIN: Are we giving up on July? MR. YOUNG: It looks like July we're forcing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	reasons. So that we can get some further analysis of that. And to have that done we would like the Board meeting to be in September where we can get an addendum to the staff report limited to those items for our consideration. MR. BRIGGS: And compare it with the changes that we recommended today. MR. YOUNG: Yes. It's essentially taking the matrix that staff put together a couple of board meetings ago, whenever it was, and to just update that. That approach is fine. So is that clear, Mr. Shimek? All right, folks, I think that that brings this meeting to a close. Any further comments from the Board? (No response.) MR. YOUNG: We're done. Thank you very much
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that supply offer enough time for written comments to come in and staff to reply on the written comments? MS. McCANN: I don't think time is the issue, I think clarity about the process is what we need to resolve for sure. MR. YOUNG: Well, the clarity would be that the people submit written comments, if they want to, and do this the normal way, which is staff comes out with a staff an addendum to the staff report, these items that we've identified dealing with the California Farm Bureau proposal, and the people have an opportunity to submit written comments by a certain date, and staff provides a reply. MR. JEFFRIES: On that addendum. MR. YOUNG: On that addendum. MR. YOUNG: Only. Yeah. MR. BRIGGS: I think it would be September. MR. YOUNG: Is there an objection with the rest of you? MR. HODGIN: Are we giving up on July?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	reasons. So that we can get some further analysis of that. And to have that done we would like the Board meeting to be in September where we can get an addendum to the staff report limited to those items for our consideration. MR. BRIGGS: And compare it with the changes that we recommended today. MR. YOUNG: Yes. It's essentially taking the matrix that staff put together a couple of board meetings ago, whenever it was, and to just update that. That approach is fine. So is that clear, Mr. Shimek? All right, folks, I think that that brings this meeting to a close. Any further comments from the Board? (No response.) MR. YOUNG: We're done.

1 2	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	
3	STATE OF CALIFORNIA)	
4) Ss COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO)	
5	I, Carol C. Coon, a Certified Shorthand	
6	Reporter Number 11701 and Registered Professional	
7	<i>f</i> :7/2	
8	Reporter, do hereby certify:	
9	That said deposition was taken down by me	
10	in shorthand at the time and place therein named	
	and thereafter reduced to computerized transcription	
11	under my direction.	
12	I further certify that I am not of counsel	
13	nor attorney for nor related to the parties hereto.	
14		
15	and that I have no interest in the event of the	
16	action.	
17	WITNESS my hand this 16th day of May 2011.	
18		
19	Carol C. Coon CSR 11701	
20	Registered Professional Reporter	
21 22		
23		
24 25		
	Page 651	
1		

Α abdicating 575:7 ability 411:14 412:3 414:21 420:25 446:15 476:18 517:7 able 390:12 403:12 406:5 413:18 414:15 418:9 419:3 422:5 423:10 431:18.19 432:1 437:21,24 456:6 467:9 482:8 484:19 485:9 491:1,11 526:18 528:16 553:3,13 582:21 601:15,19 613:7 620:1 624:12,14 624:17 635:10 638:22 642:8 about 393:6,8,13 394:20 395:1.8 397:21 399:6 399:15,16 401:11 402:1,2 408:17 413:6 417:12 419:1 421:6 430:9 431:6,22 437:20 438:10.20 439:19.21 439:24 440:1 455:4 457:23 462:9 464:22 465:9.23 469:12.20.21 478:16 482:3 487:15 487:22 488:19,20,22 489:2,3,4 491:4 492:18,22 493:6 494:22 496:6.15.16.17 496:20 498:15 501:25 502:1,22,22,24,25 506:7.9 508:13.17 510:21 512:21 513:7 513:24,24 515:6,9,21 515:22 520:8 524:25 525:4,23 526:15,16 528:7,10,11 529:6,12 529:17,18,18 530:8 531:20 533:7 536:16 537:16 540:18,23 544:23 548:13 554:3 556:13 557:2.11 558:19 560:19,20 561:10 562:7,20 563:15.15 566:23 567:19 569:15 570:7 574:22 575:13,18,24 576:24 577:7 578:10 579:18 583:2,13 584:24 585:23 587:12 587:17 588:16 589:6 589:11,24,25 590:7,10 590:24 591:12 595:7 599:16,19 601:23 603:3 605:24 607:17 608:17 610:23 611:2,3 614:11,18,22 615:11 615:13 616:17 619:19 620:6 621:10 623:18 624:7 625:8,15 626:2 627:4,19,24,24 628:2 629:18 631:25 632:7 632:25 633:11 636:11

637:22 638:19 641:7

643:23,24 644:14

```
646:22 648:5
above 436:9 488:6
  520:13
absent 451:5
absolutely 541:10 645:9
accept 563:1 645:1,13
  645:17
acceptable 586:16
accepted 645:21
accepting 414:4
accepts 636:9
access 404:17 405:10
  518:7 567:20
accessing 528:19
accommodate 592:12
  606:22 636:17
accommodating 433:18
accomplish 451:25
  495:21 614:25
accordance 500:6
according 521:1 544:24
  601:12 609:22 614:17
account 476:6 497:1
  583:25
accountability 472:6
  570:3 610:9
accountable 448:3
  556:24 609:10 610:6
  622:11
accounting 569:21
accuracy 443:4 519:6,7
  543:15
accurate 421:3
achievable 510:11
achieve 414:5,13 418:14
  418:20 427:10 448:4
  519:7 532:21 605:13
  606:11,12 633:9,9,9
  633:10 642:14
achieved 513:10 618:24
achieves 448.2
achieving 441:21 606:13
  608:22
acknowledge 412:7
  565:19
acknowledges 425:23
acre 410:9 438:6 439:19
  439:20 440:4 442:8
  470:9.10 507:17
  572:18 589:8,9,12,23
  590:4 602:21 603:8
acreage 431:25 439:23
  525:20 527:7 544:5,8
  544:25 545:1.2 557:21
  578:17 586:18 587:6,9
  587:25 588:6 589:21
  598:19 599:8,11,17,20
  600:5,6 601:14 602:25
  603:5.6
acreages 562:10,10
acres 408:17 425:24
  431:24 441:17.18
  442:6 488:11 506:2,9
  506:10 507:6 525:20
```

```
599:9,9,19 602:18
  603:1 627:7.8
across 420:8 449:15
act 402:7,8,10 428:16,16
  445:1 494:25 512:24
  561:12
acting 402:10
action 392:17 396:11
  437:7 452:13 467:20
  505:2 520:11 576:6,12
  586:19 611:16 612:1
  613:15 617:7 622:20
  624:11,14 625:23
  636:25 651:15
actions 429:6 467:25
  575:12 610:20 611:17
  617:10
active 497:13 515:25
activists 520:10,21
activities 492:14 618:15
activity 474:20 516:11
actual 435:2 442:11
  500:20 544:6,8 576:12
  576:13 586:3 590:17
  590:17
actually 392:2,23 395:19
  398:12 403:5 431:20
  445:12 473:4 481:12
  484:25 486:5,13 492:2
  495:8 499:8 500:19,21
  501:4,22 502:24
  503:20 537:25 540:3
  540:10 546:22 551:16
  554:12 558:20 570:15
  575:5 577:24 578:1,19
  579:14 580:14.19
  581:11,15 582:8,15,16
  582:18,21,22 586:8
  595:17 607:20 609:23
  611:8 632:5 634:22
ad 459:23
adapt 594:5 601:22
add 395:3 433:11 517:4
  517:5 548:12,24
  553:17 575:17 594:1
  595:3 619:1
added 395:22 412:7
  433:5,8 532:25 610:14
addendum 641:17,22
  642:2,9 645:18 647:17
  648:10,15,16 650:6
adding 494:13 594:15
  595:11,16 597:15
  598:2 622:6
addition 395:15 403:13
  433:13 456:25 471:13
  471:13 517:21 557:14
  562:6 583:24 593:8,18
additional 426:3 438:1
  441:8 519:7,16 526:4
  526:7 531:24 535:7
  536:25 556:6 557:23
  559:3 569:22 571:16
  583:14 584:4 592:15
  592:23 594:1,12,21,23
  595:3,16 596:11
  597:16 607:2 625:8
  638:10 640:3,6 641:1
  641:23,24 645:21
```

```
Additionally 469:25
  471:11
additions 532:22 534:25
address 405:9 407:14
  421:23 454:1 458:10
  468:6 472:13 473:10
  473:17.19.25 474:2
  475:4,24 476:23 482:4
  482:4 483:10 508:18
  523:17,21 524:6
  531:21 532:11 533:23
  535:1 541:7 547:10
  551:2 552:10,17 558:6
  561:20 562:9 605:12
  605:13 607:23 619:21
  623:22 624:17 625:16
addressed 411:13,17
  524:22 542:24 546:9
  547:18 549:23 559:10
  593:1 605:10 607:20
  621:7 628:2,3
addresses 393:11 605:6
  620:3
addressing 449:10
  482:19 508:17
adds 394:18 593:8
adequacy 618:11
adequate 571:5 584:6
  649:11
adequately 519:14
adhere 560:4
adjacent 395:20 425:20
  476:2,4 479:7,9 488:8
  507:3 525:18,19,22
  529:13 563:23
adjudication 520:18
adjunct 476:14
adjust 529:20 598:23
  609:24
adjusted 452:21
adjustments 537:5
  610:3 626:25
administered 496:13
Administration 553:18
  554:8
administrative 520:18
  521:2 573:25 575:12
  598:23
administratively 609:24
admit 458:4 482:3
adopt 429:3 437:8 494:2
  500:24 518:13 519:2
  536:20 595:13 609:1
  613:12
adopted 394:2 521:5
  536:3 576:9 581:22
```

611:17

613:22

adopting 545:15,18

adoptions 594:25

adoptive 609:20

adopts 633:24

Adrain 475:7

advice 425:9

advised 518:8

adviser 425:2

adoption 518:12 598:24

advise 433:16 534:4,4

551:4 640:4,17

```
advisor 452:12 491:21
  577:17,19 578:10
advisors 430:12 451:13
advisory 469:5 533:2,4
  533:10,25 539:21,23
  540:7 550:23,24 551:4
  551:10 566:11 577:10
  582:14 621:19
advocate 446:15 461:19
advocates 430:13.23
affect 504:13 562:14
  620:16
affected 567:8
affects 632:25
afford 437:25
aforementioned 454:21
after 392:19,25 396:5
  397:23 398:19 406:13
  407:9 413:13 428:12
  456:5 463:20 487:23
  512:3 513:4,10,14
  520:17 542:1 624:21
  631:9 639:17 645:14
afternoon 475:19 489:23
  509:4 576:22
Ag 411:20 416:1,14,19
  417:8,10,19 419:11
  420:17 421:22 422:3,4
  422:15 428:18 431:17
  439:9 444:12 446:4,24
  447:8,15 448:4,18,24
  452:5 459:1 476:21
  482:1,3,6 483:12
  485:9 486:14,17 487:8
  494:21 495:4,7,8,12
  496:6 497:7,10 498:23
  498:25 499:1,6,7,9,14
  499:18.21 500:14
  504:19 505:24 509:19
  518:4 522:7,25 523:8
  530:16 534:3 536:4
  570:15,24 575:22
  576:8 577:23 606:22
  609:5 612:4 614:18,24
  626:18 627:2,4,23
  628:3,8,17,19,20
  629:11 633:11 637:5
  637:10 638:20 647:14
again 391:15 393:5
  434:10 437:10 452:3
  456:14 472:14 473:13
  473:18 476:12 488:14
  501:8 502:2,8 520:21
  531:11 532:1 552:25
  553:2 556:5 569:6
  586:2 587:22 589:16
  593:13 599:12 600:8
  603:17 604:11 607:4
  608:19 610:20 622:18
  627:19 635:10 637:22
against 406:22 420:10
  460:18 520:11 573:25
  624:14 625:23
agencies 421:8,12
  430:23 455:21 457:24
  462:15,17,19 465:21
  472:6 473:12 497:3
  509:20 566:8 570:21
  621:11,13 622:4 626:9
```

546:9 552:2 562:11,14

562:16 587:20 588:2,3

589:18,22,23,25 590:9

591:1,2,6,12,14,19,20

588:4,8,9,11,14,17

agency 402:15 434:11	Α
451:20 456:8 457:24	al
459:6 465:12,21 466:4	
473:5,9,24 474:7,20 474:20 486:11,12	ai
552:10 566:9 567:2	ai
570:19 574:6,9 606:12	Α
607:22 617:22	
agenda 407:3 agents 477:8	A
aggregate 534:7 539:6	al
540:14,22 602:18	al
637:23 aggressive 611:18 626:6	al
ago 392:2 394:2 410:9	Α
422:2 438:14,15	al
487:23 488:1 516:12	al
520:9 523:22 529:24 565:21 605:8 613:10	al A
650:12	^
agree 420:1 439:2 443:4	al
447:15 509:17 516:7 578:19 596:16 622:18	al
626:4 641:12 642:7	
agreed 520:19 567:22	
611:16	
agreement 458:4,5 476:21,21 520:21	
560:16 561:9	al
agreements 476:22	
567:20,21 agrees 586:20 591:25	al
596:14	
agricultural 387:12	al
416:7 418:14 421:18 427:5 430:13 433:18	
435:25 439:10 441:25	al
445:8 446:13,14	al
447:12 448:9 450:14	al
467:19 472:1 475:22 475:22 476:4,7,10,16	
505:3 509:14,24 510:7	al
513:1 522:2 532:5	
550:2 555:10 556:15 556:20 557:3,13,15,15	al
565:14 566:22 567:19	
569:13,18,24 579:9	
592:18 593:11 608:2 610:6,13,18 612:13	۰.
644:21	al
agriculturalists 430:20	al
agriculture 410:5 417:1	al
418:1,7 419:8 422:13 427:13 431:16 446:21	
447:2,5,25 449:5	
456:25 457:11 465:3,6	
465:8 479:17,19 491:1 495:9,11,15 533:7	al al
536:12 550:6 556:24	aı
561:20 564:16 565:8	
566:1 578:25 585:6,12 605:5 627:19	
agronomically 413:25	
agronomics 456:7	
agronomist 572:23	

agronomists 456:4

agronomy 491:22 498:1

498:2 516:9,17 533:7

491:20

```
g's 417:16
 head 396:15 401:5.9
  407:8 435:6 441:6
  468:25 480:2 531:10
 ir 435:8 436:9,10,16
 isle 409:22
 kin 388:4 467:4,6,13
  468:16,16 492:25,25
 kins 492:24
 ktos 467:8
 lert 566:21
 Ifalfa 441:18
 Igae 428:24 517:3
  597:19,20
 lice 443:17 446:5
 lign 513:15
 Ilegation 409:22
 Ilegations 520:24
 Iliance 400:17 408:13
  410:25 412:5
 Ilocation 400:4
 llow 399:22,25 400:19
  400:23 401:5 414:10
  415:5 417:9 420:4
  448:8 514:21 549:4
  557:25 584:8 591:24
  592:1 594:8 598:20
  640:3 645:25
 llowed 406:19 414:12
  535:2 645:20
 llowing 400:8 402:18
  406:12,16 427:12
  451:19 482:7 496:5
 Illows 410:4 412:8
  421:22 448:5 459:2
  482:9 606:7,16 612:19
 Ilude 549:19
 Iluded 551:18
 lmost 404:18 483:8
  524:2 562:11 613:10
  622:1
 lone 459:3,6,8 460:3
  534:17 603:15
 long 415:6 437:5
  445:24 447:4 486:14
  534.5 16 561.25
  562:15 565:12 577:7
  582:13 597:6 637:8
 Iphabetical 397:1
  407:25
 Inhabetized 466:21
 Iready 417:15 487:11
  528:13 547:15 570:8
  573:12 581:2,8,15
  608:20 619:24 626:16
  636:9 640:12
 Iternate 625:18
 Iternative 416:2 417:19
  427:7 431:17 439:9
  466:7 477:11,13 510:7
  532:16 533:22,25
  534:19 545:11,13
  546:4,15 548:21,25
  552:14 563:21 624:4
  624:15 625:21 637:10
alternatives 477:9 510:7
```

```
565:4
altogether 549:1
always 407:4 471:2
  617:17 634:14
amazing 536:1,11
American 409:8 491:21
among 447:9 450:16
  556:21 583:22 625:11
amongst 411:7 476:23
amonia 471:3
amount 425:14 436:16
  471:7.8 489:20 497:2
  544:7 547:25 548:14
  569:22 570:7,10,10
  572:17 580:7.7.24
  581:13 582:4,9,10
  583:6 590:14,17
  591:15 594:18 600:6
  602:21,25 606:14
  638:6
amounts 425:24 521:8
  580:20
ample 521:3
analyses 465:7 569:1
analysis 426:13 434:18
  437:1,2 438:10 454:19
  454:25 457:8 465:4
  487:22 525:5 545:22
  551:12 590:12 596:8,9
  628:8 635:6 640:24
  641:1,15 642:8 650:2
analyst 487:22
analytical 538:1,5
analyze 630:21
analyzed 425:3 442:12
  457:9 469:19 501:3
analyzes 570:14
analyzing 574:15
Andy 387:17 404:11
  415:17 417:25
and/or 476:2 521:16
  603:20
anemia 470:14
Angela 387:12 388:12
  554:23 555:7,8 585:23
  602:14 607:2
Angie 557:4
angle 455:14
animal 559:24 561:1
Ann 499:24 502:17
Anne 423:21 459:20
annual 394:15 395:11
  458:22 506:17,21
  534:8 540:20 573:11
  598:14 601:12,18
annually 534:7 619:12
anomalies 447:21
  496:15
anomaly 496:18
another 407:10 412:6
  414:11 424:22,22
  470:9,10 486:23
  513:12 530:3 533:15
  543:10 582:23 589:3
  593:21 597:21 612:21
  628:15 629:2,3 631:6
  634:10 635:4 639:6,8
  639:13 646:17
answer 420:25 421:4,8
```

```
421:14 422:14 452:23
  503:15 510:19.24
  511:24 514:25 551:7
  573:7 582:24 615:21
  639.1
answered 511:25 512:2
  512:3.4
answers 450:17 511:6
Anthony 447:17 509:7
anticipate 487:4
anticipated 619:5
anticipating 396:25
anticipation 553:22
anybody 404:2 458:5
  466:19,24 489:8
  502:22 505:9 517:6
  607:24
anybody's 632:23
anymore 389:23
anyone 400:8 401:5,21
  407:14 458:9 503:1
  521:7
anything 398:5 474:14
  489:2,3,4 508:18
  514:25 528:3 537:17
  538:10,21 546:8
  573:23 597:9 620:24
  634:21 635:21 637:6
anyway 467:6 549:22
  614:10 626:17 635:4
anywhere 456:7 536:2
apart 629:6
apiece 520:22
apologize 472:25
apostrophe 500:2
apparently 408:23 626:8
appeal 540:14,16 541:5
  541:9 542:5
appear 585:13,14 633:15
APPEARANCES 388:1
appeared 532:8
appears 431:15 438:21
  513:17 517:20
Appendix 494:24 564:5
applaud 427:22 522:11
apple 434:4
apples 495:5
applicant 572:15
application 425:1,5
  433:7 434:25 435:9
  450:3 452:20 453:7
  463:2,22 464:7 471:14
  479:7 567:9 577:16
  579:23 580:8,8 589:15
applications 589:1,5
applied 410:8 428:19
  468:11 469:19 471:9
  570:10 573:17.19
  579:22 581:14 582:9
  585:9 590:17 604:2
  634:5
applies 394:14 435:3
  498:2,18 562:12
apply 465:16 480:23
  500:16 504:16 581:9
  589:13 598:14 601:14
  606:10 634:7
applying 425:3 481:17
```

```
569:22 570:7
appreciable 499:14
appreciate 397:7 404:17
  412:2 420:23 432:17
  456:5 500:6 511:20
  512:6 621:1,4 622:8
appreciated 555:13
appreciates 446:22
appreciative 405:7
approach 419:12 420:6
  423:17 431:15,17
  432:4 447:14 448:5
  453:24 455:13 464:23
  500:18 537:19 545:13
  549:1 573:2 574:8
  594:17 605:17,18
  617:5 631:15,22 632:2
  632:11,14,15 633:8
  650:13
approaches 486:10
  606:10 621:8
appropriate 482:13
  490:1 502:6 509:20
  518:13 533:3 540:5
  552:18 553:1 569:14
  645:10,11
approval 482:11 535:10
  539:23 542:9
approve 567:6
approved 539:18
approximately 497:14
  506:8 507:5 515:16
  587:20 593:10 599:15
approximation 455:10
April 405:2,3
aquacludes 489:4
aquatic 523:3
aquifer 483:18,19
  488:25 489:3
aquifers 429:5 468:1
Araujo 408:3
arbitrary 423:6 438:6
area 390:23 418:6
  436:12 437:22 439:23
  445:6 467:18 468:5
  478:16,16 483:12
  494:16 497:20 501:13
  508:18 510:5 512:21
  513:8 515:8,10 520:16
  530:8,20 534:4 550:4
  551:22 571:7 578:7
  587:21 611:14 620:15
  627:23
areas 395:19 419:16
  423:17 424:12 428:9
  430:17 457:15 462:21
  463:16 464:5 478:15
  478:18 501:17 504:17
  516:17 517:8 534:23
  547:1,10 555:15,21
  556:7 557:13 558:6,7
  563:23 564:13 565:13
  566:22 571:10,14
  579:20 592:18 609:3.5
  612:4,11,13 619:18
  621:25 622:16
arenas 608:24
arque 410:13
argues 513:19
```

553:15,16 639:5

although 390:8 391:23

401:4 409:11 501:18

arose 476:23 477:2 around 404:19 420:8	
529:5 530:10 572:19 583:11 631:16 arrangements 390:16 Arrianne 479:24 492:24 arrival 543:9 arrive 414:7 Arroyo 443:10 art 417:2 aside 537:16,22 538:9 567:7 asked 396:13 398:11,14 399:12 406:5 413:23 419:1 420:23 421:5 432:22 453:16 456:25 457:15,22 502:22,25 503:1,4,16,17,20 515:17 546:6 547:15 559:2 569:14 asking 397:25 405:21 410:16 419:13,23 449:18,25 453:10 455:19 460:15 464:11 464:25 477:11 508:8 515:9 571:8 641:5,6 641:14,18,19 647:16 asks 445:13 601:18 aspect 592:5 593:21 637:14 aspects 454:14 583:14 622:10 632:23 641:7 assessing 591:18 633:21 assessment 497:24 518:3 534:15,22 535:13 538:2 539:7,8 564:9 579:4 assessments 518:16 522:3 554:2 assets 521:13 assigned 390:7 577:5 assist 390:8 583:19 assistance 398:22 485:8 485:18 assistant 387:11 608:17 assisting 390:7 577:5 assist 390:8 583:19 assistance 398:22 485:8 485:18 assistant 387:11 608:17 assisting 390:7 398:25 associated 428:23 495:3 521:10 556:24 564:16 571:18 596:23 610:16 association 440:22 441:3,6 505:10,18 587:4 associations 416:14 553:23 assume 526:24 545:2 602:3 assumed 441:25 442:22 480:24 assumption 442:4 516:10 562:22 642:18	around 404:19 420:8 428:13 432:14 486:4 486:16 487:8 492:13
Arrianne 479:24 492:24 arrival 543:9 arrive 414:7 Arroyo 443:10 art 417:2 aside 537:16,22 538:9 567:7 asked 396:13 398:11,14 399:12 406:5 413:23 419:1 420:23 421:5 432:22 453:16 456:25 457:15,22 502:22,25 503:1,4,16,17,20 515:17 546:6 547:15 559:2 569:14 asking 397:25 405:21 410:16 419:13,23 449:18,25 453:10 455:19 460:15 464:11 464:25 477:11 508:8 515:9 571:8 641:5,6 641:14,18,19 647:16 asks 445:13 601:18 aspect 592:5 593:21 637:14 aspects 454:14 583:14 622:10 632:23 641:7 assess 534:21 590:24 assessed 573:25 assessing 591:18 633:21 assessment 497:24 518:3 534:15,22 535:13 538:2 539:7,8 564:9 579:4 assessments 518:16 522:3 554:2 assets 521:13 assign 603:11 assigned 390:7 577:5 assist 390:8 583:19 assistance 398:22 485:8 485:18 assistant 387:11 608:17 assisting 390:7 398:25 associated 428:23 495:3 521:10 556:24 564:16 571:18 596:23 610:16 associations 416:14 553:23 assume 526:24 545:2 602:3 assumed 441:25 442:22 480:24 assumption 442:4 516:10 562:22 642:18	529:5 530:10 572:19 583:11 631:16
Arroyo 443:10 art 417:2 aside 537:16,22 538:9 567:7 asked 396:13 398:11,14 399:12 406:5 413:23 419:1 420:23 421:5 432:22 453:16 456:25 457:15,22 502:22,25 503:1,4,16,17,20 515:17 546:6 547:15 559:2 569:14 asking 397:25 405:21 410:16 419:13,23 449:18,25 453:10 455:19 460:15 464:11 464:25 477:11 508:8 515:9 571:8 641:5,6 641:14,18,19 647:16 asks 445:13 601:18 aspect 592:5 593:21 637:14 aspects 454:14 583:14 622:10 632:23 641:7 assess 534:21 590:24 assessed 573:25 assessing 591:18 633:21 assessment 497:24 518:3 534:15,22 535:13 538:2 539:7,8 564:9 579:4 assessments 518:16 522:3 554:2 assets 521:13 assign 603:11 assigned 390:7 577:5 assist 390:8 583:19 assistance 398:22 485:8 485:18 assistant 387:11 608:17 assisting 390:7 398:25 associated 428:23 495:3 521:10 556:24 564:16 571:18 596:23 610:16 association 440:22 441:3,6 505:10,18 587:4 associations 416:14 553:23 assume 526:24 545:2 602:3 assumed 441:25 442:22 480:24 assumption 442:4 516:10 562:22 642:18	Arrianne 479:24 492:24
aside 537:16,22 538:9 567:7 asked 396:13 398:11,14 399:12 406:5 413:23 419:1 420:23 421:5 432:22 453:16 456:25 457:15,22 502:22,25 503:1,4,16,17,20 515:17 546:6 547:15 559:2 569:14 asking 397:25 405:21 410:16 419:13,23 449:18,25 453:10 455:19 460:15 464:11 464:25 477:11 508:8 515:9 571:8 641:5,6 641:14,18,19 647:16 asks 445:13 601:18 aspect 592:5 593:21 637:14 aspects 454:14 583:14 622:10 632:23 641:7 assess 534:21 590:24 assessed 573:25 assessing 591:18 633:21 assessment 497:24 518:3 534:15,22 535:13 538:2 539:7,8 564:9 579:4 assessments 518:16 522:3 554:2 assets 521:13 assign 603:11 assigned 390:7 577:5 assist 390:8 583:19 assistance 398:22 485:8 485:18 assistant 387:11 608:17 assisting 390:7 398:25 associated 428:23 495:3 521:10 556:24 564:16 571:18 596:23 610:16 association 440:22 441:3,6 505:10,18 587:4 associations 416:14 553:23 assumed 441:25 442:22 480:24 assumption 442:4 516:10 562:22 642:18	Arroyo 443:10
399:12 406:5 413:23 419:1 420:23 421:5 432:22 453:16 456:25 457:15,22 502:22,25 503:1,4,16,17,20 515:17 546:6 547:15 559:2 569:14 asking 397:25 405:21 410:16 419:13,23 449:18,25 453:10 455:19 460:15 464:11 464:25 477:11 508:8 515:9 571:8 641:5,6 641:14,18,19 647:16 asks 445:13 601:18 aspect 592:5 593:21 637:14 aspects 454:14 583:14 622:10 632:23 641:7 assess 534:21 590:24 assessed 573:25 assessing 591:18 633:21 assessment 497:24 518:3 534:15,22 535:13 538:2 539:7,8 564:9 579:4 assessments 518:16 522:3 554:2 assets 521:13 assign 603:11 assigned 390:7 577:5 assist 390:8 583:19 assistance 398:22 485:8 485:18 assistant 387:11 608:17 assisting 390:7 398:25 associated 428:23 495:3 521:10 556:24 564:16 571:18 596:23 610:16 association 440:22 441:3,6 505:10,18 587:4 associations 416:14 553:23 assume 526:24 545:2 602:3 assumed 441:25 442:22 480:24 assumption 442:4 516:10 562:22 642:18	aside 537:16,22 538:9
457:15,22 502:22,25 503:1,4,16,17,20 515:17 546:6 547:15 559:2 569:14 asking 397:25 405:21 410:16 419:13,23 449:18,25 453:10 455:19 460:15 464:11 464:25 477:11 508:8 515:9 571:8 641:5,6 641:14,18,19 647:16 asks 445:13 601:18 aspect 592:5 593:21 637:14 aspects 454:14 583:14 622:10 632:23 641:7 assess 534:21 590:24 assessed 573:25 assessing 591:18 633:21 assessment 497:24 518:3 534:15,22 535:13 538:2 539:7,8 564:9 579:4 assessments 518:16 522:3 554:2 assets 521:13 assigned 390:7 577:5 assist 390:8 583:19 assistance 398:22 485:8 485:18 assistant 387:11 608:17 assisting 390:7 398:25 associated 428:23 495:3 521:10 556:24 564:16 571:18 596:23 610:16 association 440:22 441:3,6 505:10,18 587:4 associations 416:14 553:23 assume 526:24 545:2 602:3 assumed 441:25 442:22 480:24 assumption 442:4 516:10 562:22 642:18	399:12 406:5 413:23 419:1 420:23 421:5
559:2 569:14 asking 397:25 405:21 410:16 419:13,23 449:18,25 453:10 455:19 460:15 464:11 464:25 477:11 508:8 515:9 571:8 641:5,6 641:14,18,19 647:16 asks 445:13 601:18 aspect 592:5 593:21 637:14 aspects 454:14 583:14 622:10 632:23 641:7 assess 534:21 590:24 assessed 573:25 assessing 591:18 633:21 assessment 497:24 518:3 534:15,22 535:13 538:2 539:7,8 564:9 579:4 assessments 518:16 522:3 554:2 assets 521:13 assign 603:11 assigned 390:7 577:5 assist 390:8 583:19 assistant 387:11 608:17 assistant 387:11 608:17 assisting 390:7 398:25 associated 428:23 495:3 521:10 556:24 564:16 571:18 596:23 610:16 association 440:22 441:3,6 505:10,18 587:4 associations 416:14 553:23 assume 526:24 545:2 602:3 assumed 441:25 442:22 480:24 assumption 442:4 516:10 562:22 642:18	457:15,22 502:22,25 503:1,4,16,17,20
455:19 460:15 464:11 464:25 477:11 508:8 515:9 571:8 641:5,6 641:14,18,19 647:16 asks 445:13 601:18 aspect 592:5 593:21 637:14 aspects 454:14 583:14 622:10 632:23 641:7 assess 534:21 590:24 assessed 573:25 assessing 591:18 633:21 assessment 497:24 518:3 534:15,22 535:13 538:2 539:7,8 564:9 579:4 assessments 518:16 522:3 554:2 assets 521:13 assign 603:11 assigned 390:7 577:5 assist 390:8 583:19 assistance 398:22 485:8 485:18 assistant 387:11 608:17 assisting 390:7 398:25 associated 428:23 495:3 521:10 556:24 564:16 571:18 596:23 610:16 association 440:22 441:3,6 505:10,18 587:4 associations 416:14 553:23 assume 526:24 545:2 602:3 assumed 441:25 442:22 480:24 assumption 442:4 516:10 562:22 642:18	559:2 569:14 asking 397:25 405:21 410:16 419:13,23
641:14,18,19 647:16 asks 445:13 601:18 aspect 592:5 593:21 637:14 aspects 454:14 583:14 622:10 632:23 641:7 assess 534:21 590:24 assessed 573:25 assessing 591:18 633:21 assessment 497:24 518:3 534:15,22 535:13 538:2 539:7,8 564:9 579:4 assessments 518:16 522:3 554:2 assets 521:13 assign 603:11 assigned 390:7 577:5 assist 390:8 583:19 assistance 398:22 485:8 485:18 assistant 387:11 608:17 assisting 390:7 398:25 associated 428:23 495:3 521:10 556:24 564:16 571:18 596:23 610:16 association 440:22 441:3,6 505:10,18 587:4 associations 416:14 553:23 assume 526:24 545:2 602:3 assumed 441:25 442:22 480:24 assumption 442:4 516:10 562:22 642:18	449:18,25 453:10 455:19 460:15 464:11 464:25 477:11 508:8 515:9 571:8 641:5,6
637:14 aspects 454:14 583:14 622:10 632:23 641:7 assess 534:21 590:24 assessed 573:25 assessing 591:18 633:21 assessment 497:24 518:3 534:15,22 535:13 538:2 539:7,8 564:9 579:4 assessments 518:16 522:3 554:2 assets 521:13 assign 603:11 assigned 390:7 577:5 assist 390:8 583:19 assistance 398:22 485:8 485:18 assistant 387:11 608:17 assisting 390:7 398:25 associated 428:23 495:3 521:10 556:24 564:16 571:18 596:23 610:16 association 440:22 441:3,6 505:10,18 587:4 associations 416:14 553:23 assume 526:24 545:2 602:3 assumed 441:25 442:22 480:24 assumption 442:4 516:10 562:22 642:18	641:14,18,19 647:16 asks 445:13 601:18
assess 534:21 590:24 assessed 573:25 assessing 591:18 633:21 assessment 497:24 518:3 534:15,22 535:13 538:2 539:7,8 564:9 579:4 assessments 518:16 522:3 554:2 assets 521:13 assign 603:11 assigned 390:7 577:5 assist 390:8 583:19 assistance 398:22 485:8 485:18 assistant 387:11 608:17 assisting 390:7 398:25 associated 428:23 495:3 521:10 556:24 564:16 571:18 596:23 610:16 association 440:22 441:3,6 505:10,18 587:4 associations 416:14 553:23 assume 526:24 545:2 602:3 assumed 441:25 442:22 480:24 assumption 442:4 516:10 562:22 642:18	637:14 aspects 454:14 583:14
633:21 assessment 497:24 518:3 534:15,22 535:13 538:2 539:7,8 564:9 579:4 assessments 518:16 522:3 554:2 assets 521:13 assign 603:11 assigned 390:7 577:5 assist 390:8 583:19 assistance 398:22 485:8 485:18 assistant 387:11 608:17 assisting 390:7 398:25 associated 428:23 495:3 521:10 556:24 564:16 571:18 596:23 610:16 association 440:22 441:3,6 505:10,18 587:4 associations 416:14 553:23 assume 526:24 545:2 602:3 assumed 441:25 442:22 480:24 assumption 442:4 516:10 562:22 642:18	assess 534:21 590:24
518:3 534:15,22 535:13 538:2 539:7,8 564:9 579:4 assessments 518:16 522:3 554:2 assets 521:13 assign 603:11 assigned 390:7 577:5 assist 390:8 583:19 assistance 398:22 485:8 485:18 assistant 387:11 608:17 assisting 390:7 398:25 associated 428:23 495:3 521:10 556:24 564:16 571:18 596:23 610:16 association 440:22 441:3,6 505:10,18 587:4 associations 416:14 553:23 assume 526:24 545:2 602:3 assumed 441:25 442:22 480:24 assumption 442:4 516:10 562:22 642:18	633:21
522:3 554:2 assets 521:13 assign 603:11 assigned 390:7 577:5 assist 390:8 583:19 assistance 398:22 485:8 485:18 assistant 387:11 608:17 assisting 390:7 398:25 associated 428:23 495:3 521:10 556:24 564:16 571:18 596:23 610:16 association 440:22 441:3,6 505:10,18 587:4 associations 416:14 553:23 assume 526:24 545:2 602:3 assumed 441:25 442:22 480:24 assumption 442:4 516:10 562:22 642:18	518:3 534:15,22 535:13 538:2 539:7,8 564:9 579:4
assign 603:11 assigned 390:7 577:5 assist 390:8 583:19 assistance 398:22 485:8 485:18 assistant 387:11 608:17 assisting 390:7 398:25 associated 428:23 495:3 521:10 556:24 564:16 571:18 596:23 610:16 association 440:22 441:3,6 505:10,18 587:4 associations 416:14 553:23 assume 526:24 545:2 602:3 assumed 441:25 442:22 480:24 assumption 442:4 516:10 562:22 642:18	522:3 554:2
485:18 assistant 387:11 608:17 assisting 390:7 398:25 associated 428:23 495:3 521:10 556:24 564:16 571:18 596:23 610:16 association 440:22 441:3,6 505:10,18 587:4 associations 416:14 553:23 assume 526:24 545:2 602:3 assumed 441:25 442:22 480:24 assumption 442:4 516:10 562:22 642:18	assign 603:11 assigned 390:7 577:5
assisting 390:7 398:25 associated 428:23 495:3 521:10 556:24 564:16 571:18 596:23 610:16 association 440:22 441:3,6 505:10,18 587:4 associations 416:14 553:23 assume 526:24 545:2 602:3 assumed 441:25 442:22 480:24 assumption 442:4 516:10 562:22 642:18	485:18
association 440:22 441:3,6 505:10,18 587:4 associations 416:14 553:23 assume 526:24 545:2 602:3 assumed 441:25 442:22 480:24 assumption 442:4 516:10 562:22 642:18	assisting 390:7 398:25 associated 428:23 495:3 521:10 556:24 564:16
553:23 assume 526:24 545:2 602:3 assumed 441:25 442:22 480:24 assumption 442:4 516:10 562:22 642:18	association 440:22 441:3,6 505:10,18
602:3 assumed 441:25 442:22 480:24 assumption 442:4 516:10 562:22 642:18	553:23
480:24 assumption 442:4 516:10 562:22 642:18	602:3
	480:24 assumption 442:4
511:13	assumptions 447:20

assurance 494:18 assurances 518:15 assured 592:10 **ATKINSON-BAKER** 386:19 atmosphere 471:3 attached 562:24 597:9 attachment 532:22 537:1 541:3,20 attachments 393:11 attempting 477:2 594:16 attempts 507:11 attend 402:4 attended 420:21 attention 403:3 418:13 478:25 501:7,14 attorney 475:20 651:13 attorneys 549:21 attractive 482:9 attribute 498:22 attributed 530:15 attributing 498:22 attribution 498:25 audience 458:6 466:19 549:20 audit 532:10,18,24 533:3 533:19 534:7 536:25 539:4,6,10,17 540:21 540:24 541:6,8,17,23 546:20,21,24 547:23 550:22 audited 547:9 auditing 540:10 551:1 auditor 540:1 541:2,15 541:21 auditors 533:16.17 540:9 541:10 audits 532:19 533:17 536:7 539:14,20 543:1 583:17 author 564.4 authority 412:22,23 413:21 449:14,20 450:2 472:16 473:1,14 558:4 575:8 594:1 596:13 598:21 602:6 602:12 606:2 607:23 625:17,17 authorized 634:8 automatic 440:5 489:17 automatically 413:14 460:11 485:16 494:12 availability 627:8 646:15 available 418:22 425:7 434:6 485:8 543:8,13 557:2 561:5 564:18 565:24 567:19 569:23 570:1,3 584:21 592:12 614:16 615:12 618:16 631:4,7 639:18 640:7 640:9 644:22 646:24 average 520:14 569:4 588:13,17 589:6,8,9 589:11,15,17,22 590:2 590:6,16 591:1 avocado 442:8 507:15 avocados 441:17 avoid 424:20 553:9

avoiding 493:14 aware 403:20 413:23 436:1 447:2 458:7 470:1 474:14 475:2,3 517:14 622:24 628:22 awareness 609:16 away 438:2 476:11 546:18 572:21 576:3 aways 626:25 axis 587:25 588:5 A-K-I-N 468:17 492:25 A.M 389:2 A504530 386:25 В **B** 459:2 460:1 532:22 541:21 **babies** 479:12 baby 522:7 back 390:19 398:22 400:12 414:7 415:13 434:5 439:4 456:17 457:25 459:9 461:16 472:24 473:15 480:18 483:23 487:3 489:12 503:22 516:20 524:18 524:20 528:17 530:12 532:15 534:10.13 535:12 541:5 542:20 546:7 553:1,10 554:13 564:8 566:8 574:7,21 575:10,14 583:11 586:9 602:14 606:3 611:11 613:24 615:25 627:2 628:7 629:11 631:2 635:4 637:3 640:20 649:4 backflow 395:5 571:5 572:2 585:8 background 419:15 592:3 backup 447:21 backwards 606:22 bacteria 495:3 bad 489:14 Baglakeen 402:7,8 balance 396:2 399:16 413:7,14 414:18 455:1 456:24 459:22 533:19 565:23 balancing 457:1 band 468:9 bar 573:4 Barbara 404:13 405:10 418:1 420:16 499:24 502:17 505:9 635:21 bare 451:22 Barricarte 387:13 388:14 398:24 554:21 576:21,22,23

bars 603:6

base 634:24,24,25

based 409:7 413:14

418:22 421:19 423:12

423:14 425:1 442:2,18

458:24 472:4,9 486:23

445:18,23 447:20,23

452:23,25 453:9,11

486:24 495:7 506:13 512:17 514:6 521:16 522:4 532:8,20 533:13 534:13,22 544:3 546:25 547:6,12 555:17 557:16,20 559:6 561:4 575:5 578:16 579:4,17 582:3 582:7,17,19 583:12 586:3.5.25 587:8 594:2 596:8,12,18 599:13 602:2.18 640:2 baseline 453:1 460:24 464:7 570:13 bases 458:22 basic 459:3 604:1 **basically** 394:1,19 396:12,15 397:11 464:1 484:4 489:18 511:19 541:8.21 543:10 546:13,18 566:12 568:7 579:8 580:12 601:24 618:18 basin 472:4 512:21,25 513:8.13 550:14 558:15 618:8 basins 424:21 570:6 basis 454:15,16 472:5 516:9 527:2 528:9 533:8 564:11 565:9 568:3 614:17 616:3 628:5 **bathing** 479:16 Bay 428:25 429:4 436:12 478:15 480:4 bear 634:1 beautiful 443:23 became 608:10 become 430:15 445:14 490:14 521:13 becomes 521:14,15 572:20 beeper 397:13 **before** 402:9 416:19 418:3,15 421:16 422:4 423:3 425:3 428:12 430:5 446:4 456:2 461:15 462:16 474:3 474:12 496:5.7 502:21 514:24 515:18 516:10 516:24 524:19 527:23 530:3 531:9 534:9 536:1,8 537:2 541:16 549:24 555:11 558:10 559:13 560:9 563:10 582:1 589:2 599:19,23 612:16 635:13 637:3,6 639:5 bea 418:12 420:9 begin 393:20 502:21 555:11 570:11 614:15 638-1

beginning 594:10

begins 466:21

609:14 623:20

behalf 394:11 400:7,20

404:7 407:22 408:12

477:19 478:8 503:12

437:15 441:2,5 475:23

503:25 505:10,16 510:12 545:24 behavior 490:1 behind 461:12 526:1 555:1 being 392:10 394:10 421:7 425:21 426:15 428:8,17 432:23 433:23 435:24 437:5 437:21 440:6 445:12 449:23 450:1 454:11 456:24 461:1.2 468:9 471:9 476:13 491:1 492:8 494:11,23 495:11.15 498:2.3.3.4 498:4,5 501:13 504:11 525:20 526:15,18 529:14,20,21 530:22 573:9,13,25 585:11,19 589:14 595:8 609:8 618:23 619:5,7 620:10 621:15,23 624:23 633:5 belabor 481:1 believe 418:3 426:8,14 428:21 429:2 448:17 456:10 458:5 467:5 472:14 473:1,13,19 474:1 475:10 494:19 500:7 515:25 518:22 523:11 536:5 542:2 543:4 553:15 580:6 596:25 607:20 622:2 believes 453:22 belong 586:23 602:10 bending 606:21 beneficial 414:22,22 460:20 461:5 465:8.13 493:23 627:17 benefit 408:22 538:21 benefits 424:23 445:2 Bennet 428:11 benzene 611:7 Berkley 514:5 best 416:15,16 418:17 418:22 430:16 431:16 437:6 442:6 446:16 463:7 465:2 466:1 469:18 473:17 480:11 481:19,21 483:25 509:18 521:5 529:22 550:2 578:5 better 399:18 414:4 425:15 439:1 445:9 458:6 490:21 491:12 528:1 532:9 571:2 609:14 613:11 614:15 617:7 633:5 between 421:9.11 430:11 433:21 434:12 434:19 435:12 456:24 457:23 480:21 485:7 495:12 501:23 502:3 506:22 507:15,16 509:19 518:25 520:24 537:8 541:1 545:23 546:3 574:14 588:3,9 590:25 591:7 634:9

avoidable 418:13

642:13 643:16 647:3

405:25 407:24 410:21

511:17,21,24 537:14

537:22 538:9,17 539:1

468:14,18 503:2

beyond 416:9 612:6
Bhatnagar 388:5 477:18 477:21,21,25
Biaggini 408:8
big 397:19 404:15 489:24 496:10 539:15
572:22 582:11 631:25 632:1 639:3 643:16
bigger 517:7 534:13
biggest 627:20 Bill 388:8 415:17 422:21
505:14 509:5
billions 633:12 biochemistry 480:6
biogeochemical 481:15
bit 393:5,13 395:12 410:10 435:11 480:19
483:11 501:23 526:5 540:18 554:25 557:4
563:9 567:17 592:3
596:1 605:1 607:8 619:1,15 628:4 636:15
bite 434:4
biting 574:7 blast 435:8
blind 397:5
block 457:10 470:8,9,10 blocks 470:3
bloom 517:3
blue 522:7 BMPs 416:5
board 386:1 387:4 389:7 389:23 390:5,11 391:9
392:11,18 393:2 394:2
396:9 399:22 401:17 401:20 402:9,16
404:15 405:1,10 406:7
406:16,18 409:17 411:9 415:19 417:15
420:8,22,24 421:5,9 422:1,9,11 423:7
427:6,22 429:3,9
430:4 435:25 436:2,11 437:1,7 441:21 443:3
443:20 444:25 449:11
455:20,21,24 456:1 457:13 458:25 459:12
460:13,18,18 463:6
464:19 467:14 472:23 474:2 475:19 478:4,22
482:12 485:18,21 486:14 491:6,11 492:4
493:4,22,24 499:3
500:10 501:1 502:4,13 509:19 510:6 517:12
520:8,10,20 521:2,23
522:12,23 526:16 532:13 534:9 535:10
537:18 540:15,20
543:9,14 544:19 548:8 555:25 556:5,7,13,18
556:23 557:5 559:8 560:10 575:4,6 576:3
576:4,5,13,24 587:5
592:14 594:9,12 596:2 596:13 598:24 602:2
602:12 604:11,16
605:8,23,24 606:1,4 607:19,21,22 609:1,1
333,21,22 333.1,1

```
610:11 611:5,8,15,16
  611:25 613:10,15,16
  613:19,22,25 614:25
  615:2,15,18 617:6,14
  617:24 620:14 622:22
  629:11 632:3,15
  633:24 634:15 635:4
  637:3 639:15 642:11
  642:14,24 643:12,18
  643:20 644:7 645:7
  646:1,11,22 649:6
  650:5.11.17
Board's 423:11 470:1
  543:7,12 575:19
  610:21 622:10 644:15
Bob 387:20 415:17
  420:13,14
bodies 433:1 455:16
  494:23 495:2 498:12
  498:20,24 499:4,13,19
  501:11,13 525:19
  563:24 621:19
body 411:18 442:15
  443:13 453:1 459:7
  460:17 464:8 476:8.12
  487:25 488:3 494:12
  494:13 506:5 507:3,9
  558:20,21 605:3
boil 480:9
boils 463:5 580:15
Borel 387:19 408:14
  413:5,5 582:2,20
born 444:1
boss 524:5
both 398:25 418:4 440:6
  441:14 469:7 480:15
  495:21 500:11 557:12
  577:9 593:24 604:13
  606:18 608:12,15
  612:17 616:25
bottled 479:3 608:12
  622:2
bottom 409:20 468:21
bought 408:23
boundaries 447:19
  472.15
bow 647:25
box 429:7,19 517:7
Boy 543:25
brain 393:5
branch 466:5
break 397:23,25 424:17
  466:11,14 554:11,15
  607:13
breakdown 430:11
  591:5 602:15
breakdowns 485:17
breaking 522:13
breath 528:4.6
Brian 486:14
Bridge 442:20
Bridget 466:17
brief 555:15
briefly 432:21 559:2
  564:7 585:15
Briggs 387:10 389:11,14
  389:16,18,20,24 390:1
  390:2 391:5,25 392:1
  398:9 400:16 401:8,10
```

```
539:13 545:1 549:5
  554:17,20 574:18
  602:11 607:7.15.16
  622:19 635:7 638:19
  638:25 642:21 643:16
  646:5.10.16.20.24
  647:23 648:19 649:12
  649:16 650:8
bring 439:18 511:1,3
  516:17 559:1 561:24
  572:19 581:6 613:24
bringing 451:3 577:4
  606:3 622:21
brings 544:22 563:25
  650:15
broad 501:10 612:17
Broadhurst 387:18
  408:15,16,16
broccoli 444:5 583:5,5
broke 506:3
broken 431:2 485:14.16
  522:19
brought 402:12 428:10
  432:20 478:23 488:1
  512:4 530:6 549:24
  555:16 558:19 564:3
  565:7
Brown 412:24
brush 520:12,17,24
buck 465:15
bucks 489:11 490:6,7
budget 470:5
budgets 470:7
buffer 395:18 421:6
  439:25 456:9,14,16,20
  457:9,23 458:1 481:11
  481:12,18 484:3 507:1
  508:6,15,16 552:15,19
  552:20 553:7,7 559:16
  562:14,23 563:15,19
buffers 439:24 457:4,15
  457:18.20 458:7
  476:15 477:3,4,10
  502:23,24,25 507:14
  507:22,23 554:3
  559:23,25 562:11
build 549:3 630:17
built 514:6,18,21 530:12
bulk 449:23
Bullet 504:18,21,24
bump 494:20
bumped 486:23
bunch 465:3,6 484:18
  530:1 566:14
Bunn 387:20 415:16.19
  415:21
burden 426:3 608:11
  610:3 633:19
burdens 426:8 479:12
burdensome 501:5
  528:4 592:6
Bureau 398:10,18
  437:16 446:12 448:22
  557:14 585:1 592:10
  616:1 630:2 631:20
```

```
648:12 649:22
                          capacity 431:9 516:14
Bureaus 416:13
                             516:15 585:3
Bureau's 583:12 635:5
                          Capsin 468:10
buses 611:8
                          capture 489:22 544:7
business 420:19 524:13
                          captured 488:10 599:25
  557:1 610:10 619:18
                          carbon 515:11
  620:11 623:1 627:23
                          carcinogen 468:10
  628:16
                          card 402:5 404:3 468:21
businesses 418:1 472:2
                             503:11
buy 409:6
                          cards 396:18,20,23
buying 622:2
                             397:21,23 398:19
byproduct 515:8
                             399:4.6.17 400:3.6.12
B-A-R-R-I-C-A-R-T-E
                             401:15 406:4.9
  576:23
                          care 409:3 410:14
                             479:11 517:3 558:24
B-H-A-T-N-A-G-A-R
  477:22
                             638:23
B-O-R-E-L 413:5
                          carefully 464:2 531:19
B-R-O-A-D-H-U-R-S-T
                             563:10 623:22 637:11
                           Carmel 493:3
  408:17
B-U-N-N 415:21
                          Carol 386:24 387:16
                             390:15 401:24 651:5
                             651:18
           C
                          Carpauli 472:10
C 386:24 387:1 651:5,18
                           carried 428:1
cadre 490:9
                          Carrothers 415:18
Cal 420:17 480:3 485:25
                             422:21.21
  514:5
                          cart 461:14
calculate 581:14
                          Carter 387:19 410:24,24
calculated 507:14,24
                          case 412:13 443:6 487:5
calculating 506:7
                             495:5 521:14 563:5
calculations 506:7
                             567:14 569:16 571:15
  562:15
                             575:3 576:7,12,15
Caldwell 387:17 404:11
                             581:12 617:19 623:14
  404:11 415:17 417:23
                             639:9
  417:24,24,25
                          cases 421:2 507:7,9
California 386:3 389:1
                             571:12 576:1,1,3,4
  412:5 415:22 419:8
                             610:24,25 611:2,2,4,7
  420:22 423:2 449:4
                             611:22 617:13,14,23
  451:17 457:11 459:20
                           Castorville 515:15
  465:12 469:3 472:18
                          categories 547:13
  473:2 481:13 485:25
                             550:20 588:1 603:6
  497:11.12 505:4 510:1
                          category 500:5 588:6
  558:1 577:14 578:24
                             603:7
  579:9 587:14 588:24
                          cattle 441:15 559:25
  627:21 628:13 629:20
                             560:1
  630:1 648:11 649:22
                          Cattlemen 440:21 441:2
  651:3
                             441:6
call 389:13 391:7 400:21
                           Cattlemen's 505:9
  415:14 433:16 441:7
                          caught 440:6 551:13
  519:6 541:4 560:5,14
                          causation 480:24
  580:3 582:8 629:10
                          cause 412:12 425:25
called 403:10 432:24
                             447:18 513:19 514:19
  446:1 578:8 583:1
                             514:22,23 516:21,24
calls 554:1 603:19
                             557:6 592:19
Cambria 408:15.18
                          caused 408:25 557:2
  441:11 494:10
                             593:6
came 390:22 403:3
                          causing 494:12
  413:8 455:12 457:25
                           CCA 425:5
  478:24 502:23 515:9
                          CCAs 425:8
  541:2 558:13 575:6
                           CDFA's 502:23
  582:12 592:9 626:20
                          ceased 514:16
  631:12
                          ceases 513:5
Campbell 387:20 415:17
                          cede 400:8
  420:13,14,15
                          celery 583:5
cancelling 649:9
                           censured 567:17
Canella 447:17 509:7,9
                          center 393:23
  509:15 510:5,12
                          central 386:1 387:4
Cann 452:10
```

389:6 392:5 418:19

429:3 445:25 447:4

capability 459:5

455:25 460:13 462:7,7	586
467:13 478:3 483:13	594
492:4 493:4,5,12,25	599
497:12,16 500:2 520:10 523:6 577:16	606 621
577:21,24 583:1 592:7	638
592:13 594:20 595:24	640
608:7	chang
certain 431:8 454:14	chaot
463:15 475:10 497:24 507:9 547:25 555:4	chara 587
570:7 571:7 620:8	chara
628:12 639:11 648:13	597
certainly 420:6 436:2,14	chara
468:7 479:18 500:6	623
511:5 512:5 536:3,5 542:14 622:23 623:16	charg 517
634:15	chase
certainty 596:17 625:22	cheap
CERTIFICATE 651:1	check
certification 412:3 491:8	533
491:15 certified 425:2 490:5	check chemi
491:5,19,21 500:5,8	595
519:15 521:25 577:17	chemi
577:19 578:9,10 651:5	585
certify 651:7,12	594
cessation 513:6,10,14 cetera 410:3 485:13	Chief childr
618:15	636
CFA's 449:12	chills
Chair 389:5,24,24 391:4	chime
392:1,22 396:13,17 397:18 398:13 401:10	Chitte Chlore
464:19 472:11 473:18	Chlor
537:11 626:13,14	Chlor
628:6 629:21 646:5	433
Chairman 387:5 404:11	593
413:9 415:19 419:1 424:10 432:22 435:17	Chlor 525
443:19 509:4,13	choic
512:13 517:11 520:8	616
521:23 524:19 542:17	choic
566:6 569:14 607:16 Chalame 441:13 442:15	chose 562
442:20	Chris
challenge 541:22 586:13	415
challenges 422:8 478:23	Christ
536:14 586:4 621:4	Christ 475
Chamberlin 387:21 422:23,25 423:1	Churc
chance 415:5 417:14	circur
422:8 442:2 578:8	circur
change 516:20 519:9	551
558:22 586:24 591:17 591:22 593:15 594:5	cite 44
596:11,16 599:7 606:2	citizer
609:20 634:25 635:11	citize
635:11	City 3
changed 494:16 518:21 528:18 540:17 597:16	civil 4
606:23 607:1 623:1,1	claimi
634:20	claims
changes 393:15,17	Clara
406:14,17 412:21	clarifi
422:6 485:1 517:21	410

532:16 548:20 555:16

556:3 581:23 583:9

584:24 585:15,24

```
3:21 592:1,24
      :24 596:15 598:17
      :1,5,5 600:9
      5:17 607:3 613:20
      :15 623:4 638:20
      3:20 639:3,3,7,13
      ):1 641:9 650:8
      ging 486:21
      ic 431:11
      cteristics 579:5
      :2 599:3 601:19
      cterization 535:12
      :24 624:3 637:23
      cterize 586:11
      3:20 637:20
      e 409:7 417:6
      ·6
      613:1
      410:15,17
     k 397:10 419:14
      :19 571:25
      dist 573:12
      ical 522:4 527:11
      :16.18
      icals 497:8 530:21
      5:9 592:21 594:18
      :19 595:14,18
      390:6
      en 467:16 478:11
      5:12,13
      529:17
     e 638:25
      enden 488<sup>.</sup>6
      opherpheral 468:8
      phrifos 592:18
     phyrifos 411:17
      3:12 504:12 592:16
      3:25 594:4
      pyrifos 506:5
      5:18 557:24
      e 423:7 545:11
      :25
      es 536:8
     e 408:20 430:8
      2:13
      387:20 388:7
      :16,21
      tie 477:21
      tine 388:5,5 471:19
      5:17,20
      ch 400:17
      mstance 487:10
      mstances 532:14
      :6,19 576:11
      43:13
      438:12,13 479:4
      n 467:14,15
      ns 550:4
      96:12
      .01:25
      450:1
      ing 564:14 565:15
      s 449:17,24 541:10
      488:7
      cation 401:8
     0:21 555:3
clarified 476:3 558:23
                            Cochran 422:24 423:25
```

```
558:10,13,18 563:14
  582:6 598:1 639:1
clarity 648:5,7
class 418:4,10,11
  419:11 433:3
classes 403:16
clauses 472:18
clean 408:25 418:16
  419:19 429:9 445:8
  479:18 494:24 495:11
  500:24 509:17 523:11
  552:6 607:25 622:7.12
  625:10 628:23
cleanup 523:12,18 524:6
  611:19
clear 394:7 402:8 421:2
  428:14 439:17 467:24
  470:11 486:8 500:11
  515:2 539:4 540:9
  587:22 598:2 605:8.9
  605:11 614:13 617:4
  630:25 637:5 640:12
  649:17 650:14
cleared 520:12
clearing 520:24
clearly 549:17 565:20
  614:13 636:19
clients 475:23 522:19
  549:21
Cliff 440:15,15 441:12
climate 410:4 455:9
  481:14,16
close 544:3 573:4
  650:16
closed 396:9 401:12
closer 579:13 632:19
closet 575:9
closing 446:3
Club 427:21 635:18,24
clue 516:13
CMP 484:21,23 485:1,10
  489:17
CMPs 485:1
coalition 405:17 417:25
  429:21 431:17 432:4
  439.9 448.24 471.22
  471:25 472:22 512:13
  533:1,18,22,24 534:19
  535:22 545:11.13
  546:15,19 548:9 549:1
  549:4 552:14 561:19
  579:10 616:21 624:5
  628:20 647:14
coalitions 557:16 583:17
coast 386:1 387:4 389:6
  413:22 418:19 429:3
  445:25 447:4 462:7
  467:13 478:3,12,14
  483:13 492:4 493:4.5
  493:12,25 497:12,16
  500:2 520:10 523:6
  577:16 583:1 592:7.13
  594:20 595:24 608:7
Coastal 402:23 403:2
  419:8 428:16
Coates 422:23 423:21
```

```
523:17 615:2,3,14
  640:12
coercive 574:10
COLAB 404:12
cold 410:2
collaborate 511:21
  583:22
collaborated 416:3
collaboration 449:8
  457:12 462:8 485:10
  511:22 512:1 536:20
  637:25
collaborative 459:8
  509:19 511:2 536:12
  536:17 538:22 631:22
  632:2,11 637:19
colleague 391:21 577:21
colleagues 577:7 626:16
collect 443:14 584:20
  586:15
collected 447:7
collecting 486:24 570:12
  570:20 574:14
collection 528:19 535:11
collective 516:5 547:7
  601:2 603:4
collectively 448:10
  460:3,4 630:19 633:20
Collins 424:3,3
Cologne 445:1
column 393:23
combination 398:17
combined 564:24
  602:25
come 392:16 396:16,25
  405:22 407:11 408:25
  409:24 410:3 415:6
  431:2 446:23 454:17
  454:21 463:6 464:12
  465:21 467:3 468:20
  484:16 485:19 486:10
  487:2 496:5 502:13
  513:16 519:8,16
  524:20 546:7 550:18
  554:13 566:4 572:20
  574.21 575.9 13
  598:13 602:16 605:18
  609:21 617:14 621:1
  621:21 623:11 626:25
  627:2,16 629:11 631:2
  633:3 635:4 637:3
  640:20,22 645:16
  648:3
comes 397:9,14 409:3
  410:22 424:14 463:8
  513:22 528:9 571:21
  636:25 637:13 648:9
  649:4
comfortable 603:23
coming 407:4 438:23
  449:6 455:14 456:7
  459:18 465:4 476:25
  488:12,13 495:13
  536:12 562:6.7 602:18
  611:15 638:2 643:18
command 420:5
commend 469:8
commendable 467:22
  621:21
```

```
comment 401:11 406:17
  407:6.11 415:13
  435:23 436:25 457:25
  525:23 530:3 535:25
  555:15 556:7 558:6,25
  561:4 562:18 566:6
  580:23 585:12 592:17
  614:22 619:25 631:8
  632:8 635:10 639:20
  641:16 642:21 643:6
  644:9,18 645:6,16
  649:24
commented 525:22
commenting 402:1
  632:6 643:18 644:20
  647:18
comments 392:20,25
  393:18,18 395:8 396:5
  396:8,22 397:1,3
  398:2,15,17 399:13
  400:10,12 401:11
  402:9,20 403:19
  405:15 406:13 407:1
  410:20 413:3 415:11
  417:22 420:12 422:20
  423:20 426:17 427:15
  429:13 432:7,16,19
  435:20.22 437:5.11
  439:13,18 440:19,25
  441:2,5,7,8 443:16
  446:2 449:1,6 455:2
  456:11 462:9,11 463:4
  464:11 466:10 467:1
  470:18 471:18 473:22
  474:14 475:15 477:16
  479:21 480:8 494:6
  495:23 498:14 502:16
  503:4.8.9.23 505:7
  508:2 509:15 510:6
  512:17 513:24 514:13
  515:4 517:9.16 519:19
  521:21 524:10 531:6
  531:20,22 532:8
  534:14 536:15,22
  548:16 551:12 554:18
  556:23 557:18.19
  559:14,15 561:10
  564:8 581:25 583:8
  584:5 585:24 586:17
  587:5 591:23 592:14
  596:12 606:18 607:4
  610:5 631:12 639:6,8
  639:13,16,24 640:3,23
  641:2,23,23,24 642:12
  642:23 643:1,3,4,7,8
  643:12.12.15.19
  644:13 645:10,12,14
  645:15,18,20,22,23
  646:3.4.11.12.17
  647:3,4,6,8,12,13,15
  647:21 648:2,3,8,13
  650.17
commercial 425:12
Commission 505:25
  557:9 577:2 578:12
commissioners 534:3
commitment 416:20
commitments 402:3
committed 447:3
```

clarify 469:10 514:4

531:4 539:1 546:7

423:25

Code 412:5 459:2 473:2

committee 459:23 469:5	528:11
474:5,5 475:7 509:14	comply 472:5 526:18
533:2,4,10,12 534:1	545:14,17 560:11
539:8,8,21 540:7	583:20 585:22 624:25
550:23,24 551:4,10	640:11,15
566:11 577:10 582:14	component 394:13
committees 621:18	395:3 477:12 490:3
committee's 539:24	510:18 533:15 622:8
commodities 431:19	components 506:19
common 446:25 447:14	510:22 525:5 528:5,6
448:5,8 451:11,15	532:25 534:6 544:21
551:19,20 593:11	547:6 597:5 632:20
630:24	compost 579:22,23
commonly 504:12	580:8
communicate 462:7	comprehensive 504:16
communication 430:11	comprised 472:1
536:14	compromise 623:7,7
communities 478:12,19	628:10 629:9,10
478:24 480:16 485:7 493:9 509:23 556:19	compute 463:10,11 computerized 651:10
622:16	concentration 569:25
community 404:16	concentrations 483:5,8
411:2 417:8,10 418:14	569:4
419:24 429:8 430:12	concept 623:25
430:21,22 431:11	concern 404:14 436:5
439:11 445:8 446:14	436:19 439:18 447:19
450:14 479:10,15,18	526:14 534:23 543:16
480:23 509:20 543:17	614:10 617:5 619:8
638:1	639:14,15 642:25
companies 409:3,6,14	concerned 437:19
company 391:21 408:13	439:21 467:14,15
415:16 469:6	469:11 493:6 501:25
compare 564:22 569:3	504:10 508:10 526:16
570:13 589:20 630:22	550:3,15 574:21 582:2
638:11,16 649:24 650:8	627:3,4,19,23,24 628:1 632:25 637:22
compared 426:5 471:23	concerning 392:6
546:4,10 581:15 582:9	435:22 448:19
628:9 639:4	concerns 422:3 436:8,9
comparing 639:7,12	450:3,4 473:8 504:7
640:20	520:23 521:3 524:25
comparison 512:22	532:10 546:7 587:3
546:3 568:22 569:7,9	592:16 593:1 614:24
590:6 610:25 638:21	619:18 629:12 636:17
639:2	637:18
comparisons 433:20	conclude 410:16 535:15
522:17	concluded 414:2 578:16
competing 465:19 605:3	579:1 587:9 595:2
competition 450:16 634:3	650:24 concludes 524:17
compile 643:20	592:24
completed 396:10	conclusion 392:16
566:15	393:1 397:12 398:15
completely 409:17 451:5	414:13 448:18 581:18
522:18 584:11 606:19	586:9 627:16
complex 417:1 431:4	conclusions 578:20
438:24 471:6 551:8	concur 509:20
596:1	condition 564:5 583:17
compliance 394:15,19	614:14 617:9
395:11 426:12 495:20	conditional 392:6 402:1
504:5 506:21 526:8,13	504:3 510:8 581:22
545:12 573:11 574:3 574:11 598:14 601:12	conditions 450:12 495:20 567:25 585:17
574.11 596.14 601.12	495.20 507.25 565.17

601:18 609:9 610:7

complicate 528:13

complicated 438:24

496:12 513:15 528:10

634:13

643:22

```
601:8
                        conducted 394:11 425:1
                          452:8 522:3 568:13
                          593:20
                        conducting 539:19
                        conductivity 516:16
                        conference 524:13
                        confidential 542:24
                          543:1 567:23
                        confidentiality 543:6
                          619:20 620:6
                        confined 559:24
                        confining 489:4
                        confirm 406:7 620:1
                          642:20 645:24
                        conflict 412:19 421:7,8
                          421:11 457:14,17,23
                          476:19 477:5 513:4
                          559:16 594:14
                        conflicts 390:13 426:23
                          507:21 559:11
                        confronted 621:5
                       confused 424:19
                        confusing 501:24
                        confusion 394:8 582:12
                        Congregation 467:7,9
                          493:3
                        conjunction 432:1
                          534:19
                        connected 488:25
                        consequence 438:7
                        consequences 411:8
                          444:13 445:3 594:15
550:3,15 574:21 582:2
                          619:4 637:16
                        consequently 515:20
                          530:13
                        conservation 428:15
                          430:21 442:6 443:15
                          561:24 578:6
                        conservationists 430:13
                        consider 409:4,4 422:15
                          463:17 467:1 501:12
                          578:14 579:19 581:16
                          594:12 618:13 621:25
                          638:4
nclude 410:16 535:15
                        considerable 548:14
ncluded 414:2 578:16
                        consideration 418:23
                          468:12 476:13 494:19
                          510:13 534:16 553:1
                          561:14 630:2,5 631:21
                          644:8 650:7
                        considered 437:5 471:8
                          504:11 541:17 542:25
                          543:1 550:12 552:22
                          552:24 557:10 579:6
                          581:10,20 583:4 592:4
                          623:8 631:17
                        considering 407:5
                          504:15 555:5 576:11
                          621:7 623:9
                        consist 533:4
                        consistency 618:14
                        consistent 465:5 600:2
```

consistently 586:2

consolation 426:10

consolidate 528:15

constituent 495:10

constituents 411:16

consists 441:16

```
Constitution 472:19
constructed 571:4
construction 412:9
constructively 462:8
consultants 461:10
  523:14,16 608:18
consultation 464:19
consulted 496:25
consulting 469:6
consumers 409:8
  410:13 493:15
consumption 445:13.17
contact 390:17 575:23
contain 445:22 504:4
  569:25 571:7
containment 445:4
contaminants 504:23
contaminate 504:14
  565:1 612:7,8
contaminated 429:5
  504:8 608:10 611:23
  612:6
contaminates 565:2
contamination 419:17
  479:6.13 480:7 488:23
  488:23 493:6,10,19
  504:13 505:1 514:22
  522:3,18 530:9,9
  564:25 607:18 611:3,7
contaminations 611:15
contend 528:4
contention 470:15
contentious 465:18
contents 481:15
context 457:5 619:5,19
continually 407:3 561:3
  633:12
continuation 386:10
  389:9 392:2,5,14
  396:22 555:19 583:21
continue 390:8 392:20
  397:3 411:25 412:10
  414:21 422:7 437:25
  448:6 472:7 502:12
  511:2 518:1 543:5
  563:12 576:17 590:8
  608:4 609:15 612:23
  621:3
continued 485:9,12
  513:13 571:17
continues 411:13
  500:16 501:17 556:2
continuing 621:23 626:1
  632:16
continuity 518:25
continuously 609:13
contours 507:9
contracted 567:13
contractors 518:9
contradictory 501:23
contrary 425:9
contrast 612:1 638:11
  638:16 649:24
contribute 444:19 603:8
contributed 416:12
contributing 445:20
  488:9 601:5 622:6
```

contribution 555:13

633:21

```
contributor 411:21
  513:18
contributors 443:5
control 386:1 387:4
  389:6 390:5 393:14
  400:24 412:17,22
  417:4 418:22 420:5,21
  421:9 428:3 436:11
  456:1 457:8 478:4
  490:12 497:9 499:3
  500:22 508:20 559:8
  564:2 574:19.24
controllable 442:23
controlled 563:22
controlling 563:20 584:2
CONT'D 388:1
convene 550:25
convened 561:17
conversation 529:6
  530:8
converted 419:10
cooking 479:16
cool 413:22 492:12
  629:7
Coon 386:24 390:15
  651:5,18
cooperate 397:19
  418:20 441:21 486:1
  487:6 510:6 573:21
  618:1
cooperating 419:16
  486:19
cooperation 418:18
  419:13 447:9,11
  486:24 487:2 512:1
  536:14
cooperative 394:11
  443:7 485:6.23 517:15
  517:16,20 518:1,6,14
  518:23 529:9 535:1
  538:14,17,23,23
  577:14 584:8,10,12
  624:15,16 636:24
  637:19
cooperatively 411:1
  549:10 616:8
coordinate 535:3
coordination 462:16
coordinator 432:11
  437:17
coordinators 484:15
copies 429:15,15 536:23
correct 458:2,2 508:6,11
  508:12 514:2 515:3
  541:10 562:16 600:19
  600:22 610:20 630:8,9
  631:7 635:18 636:22
  637:4
correctly 421:15 457:25
correlation 480:21,23
  481:1
correlative 481:4
corridor 553:7
corridors 428:2,6,7
  456:9,15,16,20 465:25
  552:9
cost 405:8 409:1,7
  410:17 419:9 438:15
```

625:1.1

600:10 604:15 608:23

620:20 622:12 624:22

519:15 533:16 539:14

614:19 618:12,22

conduct 518:2,9 519:11

453:13 479:3 493:13

505:20 506:13,17 519:16 546:3,3 557:11 627:5 633:21 634:1,2 Costa 387:21 424:7,10 424:11 431:22 477:25 478:8 524:20,24 525:2 526:24 527:1,10,16,19 527:21,23 528:6 546:6
582:2 costly 438:18 costs 405:11 409:5 438:2,3,13,15 518:15 519:7 521:10 545:23
557:13 608:11 cotton 469:16 470:21 counsel 387:7,8 390:4,6 390:6 518:8 605:10 646:7,16 647:2 651:12
count 450:21 counter 412:24 counties 418:2 644:2 countless 523:2 country 410:25 486:16 604:22
county 404:13 405:10 420:16 427:24 437:16 441:14,15 446:11 448:22 452:12 463:23 469:4,7 470:14 473:5 473:8,9,24 478:15 483:12 488:7 498:19 499:5 505:9 506:3 509:11,12,23 515:15 520:12 534:2 566:7,9 567:5 570:19 575:4
621:15,17 647:1 651:4 couple 400:1 401:18 452:18 480:8 489:20 496:17 512:14 531:6 542:19 559:9 572:24 583:11 600:16 604:7,7 607:21 611:5 632:3 650:11
courage 522:12 course 436:17,22 462:6 468:3 489:22 535:11 539:19 639:11 644:6 646:6
court 386:20 390:15 531:16 535:18 556:10 604:6 607:11 618:3 643:9 cover 430:8 494:17
641:9 covered 481:4 covers 478:16 497:19 cow 516:15 cows 442:21 515:22,22 516:12
co-management 559:13 561:21 co-wrote 486:13 cracker 509:5 crawl 522:19 crazy 409:11 create 411:6 412:21

419:18 450:7 465:14

487:10 500:11 509:25

510:11 532:23 547:13

487:17 491:5 625:25 626:6 creative 397:16 482:18 creativity 634:5 credibility 450:8 credible 450:7 521:3 credit 447:4 creek 442:15.20 483:7 494:11 529:14 creeks 529:2 crisis 413:1 criteria 395:10 411:23 412:3 476:9 486:22 488:14 494:22 495:7 499:16,20 504:24 506:4 546:10,21,24 557:22 558:5,18,23 579:3,4 586:3,4 587:6 587:10 591:5,6,13,18 592:15,23 594:9,16 595:4.22 596:14.17.19 598:3,19,22 602:13 605:22,25 606:2 623:9 623:15 624:11 633:1 criterias 506:2 critical 428:2,5,8,11 429:16 482:21 610:18 626:22 627:4 critically 522:13 524:7 criticize 605:19 **critters** 432:14 **crop** 413:19 414:5,6,18 420:17 425:2 451:12 451:13 456:16 457:10 460:22 471:16 489:14 491:21 494:18 498:3 507:6 540:6 550:10 570:2 577:17,19 578:9 578:14 579:5 582:8,9 582:17 583:4 587:17 587:24 589:3,8,10 590:18 591:20 cropping 424:17 603:13 crops 410:3 419:9 424:16 425:18 443:25 444:9 450:21,22 451:10 452:2,3,24 453:11,18 455:4,10 456:6 457:4 458:17 461:6,12,13,20 463:1 463:8 464:6 465:4,7 468:11 470:3 483:22 497:15,16 507:13 513:20 527:12 550:10 569:23 572:8.18 577:16 579:1,8 580:5 581:3,5,20 582:7,25 583:1,2,2 587:14 602:15 cross 548:19 crosses 553:9 Crown 415:16 Cruz 427:20,24 443:10 488:6 498:19 499:5,13 515:15

549:7 590:23

creates 450:6

created 532:21 549:5,6

creating 418:8 483:20

CSR 386:24 651:19 CSU 451:17 cudos 567:4 culminated 535:11 culprits 408:20 **culture** 479:17 curious 510:17 511:8 **current** 437:8 447:8 496:7 500:13 501:4,5 517:17,19 518:4 522:21 543:4 545:16 546:16 549:6 565:16 584:9 593:16 602:5 currently 394:3 420:17 444:2 450:10.19 453:9 454:19 489:7,8 524:1 534:18 539:25 543:7 584:21 585:3 593:5 600:15 634:24 curtailing 444:14 **Curtis** 474:2 curve 460:1 curves 451:12.15 cut 428:14 648:24 cutoff 396:7 406:13 429:11 430:1 537:3,7 639:15,17 645:25 cutting 418:5 648:25 cycle 424:18 C-A-L-D-W-E-L-L 404:12 417:24 C-A-M-P-B-E-L-L 420:15 C-A-R-T-E-R 410:24 C-H-A-M-B-E-R-L-I-N 423:1 C-O-S-T-A 424:11 C.Z 388:9 520:4,7,7

D

dad 529:24 daily 533:8 628:5 dairies 513:1 565:6 dairy 460:13 515:22.24 577:23 619:10 damage 408:25 428:17 damaged 571:4 Dana 499:25 502:17,18 503:23,25 505:6 Danny 388:10 531:18 532:1 Darlene 387:23 426:19 427:16.18 430:3 Darnst 512:18 data 424:14 434:6.8 443:12,15 447:7,21,24 451:8 463:14 466:1 475:2 479:14 484:20 486:2,20,23 487:9 506:22 516:9 535:8,11 538:6,24 557:1 565:11 565:12,24 567:13,15 567:16,24 568:6,11 569:23 570:12,20,20 570:21.23.25 571:21 579:13 580:3,10,14,18 582:20 583:3 584:21 588:24 589:3.7 590:19 593:15 595:23 596:2,4

596:7,23 598:7,9 599:13 601:16 603:12 604:16 605:1 614:16 615:12 616:7,18 619:13,19,22,24 620:2 620:4 624:2 626:5 637:23 638:2 database 486:20 572:4 595:20 date 404:25 406:13 429:11 430:1 451:21 459:10 464:24 639:15 639:17 648:13 dates 598:23,25 642:9 dating 479:4 daughters 443:23 Dave 389:14 David 387:6,21 424:7,11 431:22 Davis 413:21 469:3 514:5 day 401:14 405:12 489:18 522:9 530:11 542:6 555:12 557:17 651:16 days 541:25 548:7 632:6 632:7 642:13,16,19 daytime 489:15 De 427:18 429:20,25 477:25 478:8 dead 429:4 deadline 526:12,13 deal 414.9 477.2 491.11 506:19 528:16 533:8 550:23 552:8 553:12 639:4 dealing 484:15 517:18 528:23 575:20 628:4 648:11

deals 435:23 609:1 Dear 478:3 death 487:7 debate 612:23 decade 479:3 decades 410:6 444:10 483:14 565:21 566:4 608:3 December 540:13 584:25 decide 499:16 575:25 decided 400:5,19 544:21 582:15 644:12 **decides** 576:5 deciding 644:7 decision 399:3,20 423:3 448:9 465:16 535:25 545:10 554:3 575:4,7 613:17 617:19 644:16 647:25 decisions 433:9 434:12 529:21 575:2 **decline** 437:8 decreases 569:1 dedicated 391:23 deeper 608:13 defective 521:16 defer 596:25 deficient 548:2 deficit 413:16

define 434:3 494:23 defining 433:6 definitely 437:3 536:10 542:15 definition 418:11 476:3 528:17 definitions 528:11 definitively 569:7 Degenara 442:19 degrade 523:3 degraded 444:10 477:8 523:7 610:15 612:6 **Deirdre** 387:22 426:18 427:16 delay 594:25 610:19 636:15 delays 595:1 613:2,2 deliberate 393:2 399:23 399:23 613:16 deliberated 396:10 **Delihant** 424:8 426:18 426:22 delineate 601:5 delineation 495:12 demanding 611:16,18 demands 409:20 demonstrate 414:20 443:8 demonstrated 419:14 450:14 454:22 demonstrates 414:13 demonstrating 449:18 demonstration 611:12 demonstrations 419:19 dental 478:19 department 433:11 449:5 452:5 455:20 458:19 461:22 462:1.6 464:18 473:8 478:20 485:18 496:25 534:2 depend 527:11 dependent 509:24 610:19 646:7 647:23 depending 457:4 471:13 499:15 depends 635:2 641:4 deployed 447:8 deposition 651:8 depth 412:8 484:15 533:6 627:2 depths 571:14 derive 514:24 Des 387:22 426:18 427:16,18 429:14,23 describe 601:8 describes 605:4 deserve 567:4 deserves 510:10 design 484:25 designated 428:11 429:15 designed 484:23 540:7 618:9 designing 638:3 desire 548:23 despite 424:24 501:15 587:4 destroy 517:1

detail 393:9 396:1

detailed 395:23 details 426:6 525:9 526:2 528:1 542:4,8 587:11
detained 524:12 detected 432:25 433:2 565:20
detection 502:3 593:15 detections 433:15 611:24
determination 547:7 determine 419:7 430:24 453:18 505:25 514:21
516:22 518:16 528:20 540:5 543:14 550:25 571:13
determined 507:5 538:2 determines 646:16 determining 646:7
devalue 517:1 devastating 522:7
develop 482:8 509:21 522:13 535:5 539:25 542:3 562:1 582:21
598:6,8,9 626:5,10 developed 506:14 530:19,22 531:21
533:18 534:14 535:9 537:4 541:24 542:7 582:19 616:9 633:6
developing 447:15 485:10 486:18 541:7 development 530:22
577:22 618:9 624:15 deviated 460:2
devices 585:8 devil 426:6 525:9 devil's 461:19
diaries 515:16 Diazinon 411:18 433:11 434:19 435:4 504:11
506:6 525:18 557:24 592:16,19 593:25 594:4
diazoma 433:7 Dick 482:14 483:23,24 dictate 453:2
dictating 456:22 diesel 436:12 difference 411:15
425:20 434:19,20,24 435:12 582:11 613:17
614:13 643:16 647:3 649:3 differences 630:23
different 403:24 419:12 430:14 438:24 439:3 445:16 500:25 503:5
515:18,19 516:1 522:18 525:13 529:24 530:21 534:3 546:22
546:23 547:1 548:15 549:13,14 554:5 560:22 572:12 578:6
584:24 593:9,13,22 603:1,21 606:15 619:15 621:5 630:12
630:15 633:3 640:7 643:21 647:14

```
567:17 569:6 572:20
  603:10 629:25 646:3
digital 499:3
DIL 434:22,24
Dillon 387:23 427:17
  432:8.10.10 435:13
dilution 517:4
Din 387:23 426:19
  427:16 430:3,3
dinosaurs 516:12
dire 612:14
direct 457:13 535:16,21
  630:21
directing 649:21,24
direction 425:9 500:11
  501:1,15 649:15
  651:11
directions 501:8
directly 449:6 488:15
  510:25 530:23 555:1
  573:8 598:9 605:13
Director 435:25 446:11
  478:1 479:20 517:12
Dirk 443:17.21
disagree 501:3 541:6
  578:20 580:12
disagreement 540:25
disappointed 420:24
  463:19 504:6
discern 601:16
discharge 386:12 392:7
  425.24 442.3 7 445.15
  508:17,19,21 528:7,8
  528:25 530:23 550:8,9
  558:21 585:16.17
  586:6,11 593:24
  601:19 603:4 610:13
  618:14
discharged 386:13
  392:7 506:20
discharger 586:10 598:3
  598:5 602:9 634:10
  636:21,22,23
dischargers 408:19
  412:12 506:8 535:2
  599:4 610:6 617:16,18
  619:7,17 624:24
discharges 443:5 495:8
  495:12 505:4 556:20
  557:3,16 559:4 563:21
  563:22 584:2 608:3
discharging 441:25
  506:4
disciplines 533:7
disclosed 412:18
disclosure 615:20
discretion 537:12
  634:13.15
discuss 451:21
discussed 474:4
discussing 446:18
  597:15
discussions 406:17
  434:10 518:23
dismay 446:23
dispel 409:2
displayed 620:13
disproportionate 450:11
```

difficult 469:21 487:10

```
disprove 516:24
disrupted 425:13
dissertation 469:15
  481:11
disservice 406:15,16
dissolved 568:7
distill 632:17
distinct 621:5
distinction 454:17
  492:11
distinctions 634:9
distinguish 396:1
distort 463:4
distributed 401:17,20
  406:7 449:15
distributing 615:3
distribution 538:15
  619:22
district 509:6,10,11
ditch 435:6
division 449:22 578:25
  579:9
doable 642:11 646:13,14
  646:18 649:25 650:1
Doctor 514:2
document 443:12 458:6
  522:15,17 540:13
  549:2 561:22.23
  566:12,13
documentation 426:11
  526:10
documented 393:10
  395:2 608:3
documenting 565:12
documents 536:24
  630:13.16.17 631:9
  640:3,21 641:2 645:21
Dodd 486:14
doing 392:9,13,24
  393:23 406:15 414:22
  426:15 456:16 459:10
  491:13,14 511:8
  525:12 538:21 541:11
  541:11,14 551:2,5
  553:9 562:19 573:22
  575:21 609:7.8 635:9
  636:11 644:5 649:20
Doladall 496:16
dollars 458:24 490:15
  507:25 633:13
domestic 444:2.10
  556:16 566:20
Don 466:16 467:4
  468.12
done 390:2 392:19
  399:24 400:5,11
  401:18 428:17 431:7
  437:1,2 439:10,22
  443:7 450:24 453:6
  454:15 455:18,24
  458:20 464:25 473:11
  486:9.12.16 494:14
  497:3 502:11 517:24
  517:25 533:17 538:14
  538:20 540:21,24
  567:3,4 568:23,25
  604:23,24 623:1
  627:10 629:5,14,17,17
  638:9 650:4.21
```

```
doubt 563:2
doubtful 496:12
doubts 569:16
Dow 509:8
down 391:3 392:4
  407:24 428:25 430:24
  431:18 433:10,15
  454:5 456:14 463:5
  467:9 476:6 480:10
  487:10 489:10 490:6
  506:3 515:6 521:15
  522:24 542:23 557:4
  562:6 574:1 580:15
  582:16 588:15 590:8
  599:8 631:1 632:17
  644:15 646:25 651:8
downgraded 609:18
DPR 465:25 496:25
  497:20 505:24 596:6
Dr 389:20,21 391:20,24
  413:20 425:12 439:14
  439:15 440:2,9 452:10
  452:10 462:12 463:5
  463:10,14 464:10
  467:4,8 468:23 469:1
  485:4,5 514:1,14,15
  539:3 540:12 541:18
  561:7 592:8 620:17,23
  620:25 625:20 637:8
draconian 612:18,21
draft 414:12 424:12
  425:2 426:10 428:7
  430:6 441:23 444:15
  445:2,7,13,25 494:1,3
  496:6,7,18,23 500:4
  500:16 501:4,17,19
  504:2,8 517:17,19
  522:14,21 534:15
  535:24 537:18 538:19
  553:20 555:17,21
  556:1 557:18 558:8,14
  558:22 566:12 583:16
  584:8 586:19,21,25
  591:23 592:1,25 593:3
  593:8,13,18,21 594:8
  594:10 595:4,10
  596:15 598:17 599:2
  599:18 602:5 605:9
  606:23 607:1 612:25
  619:2
drafted 450:10 454:19
drafts 606:24,24
drag 621:24 628:24,25
drain 551:3 558:23
drainage 476:11 483:18
drainages 551:20
drained 435:1 483:1,1,2
draining 444:4
drains 483:3,3 550:19
  551:6,22 558:20 559:1
  559:3
drawing 603:21
dressing 531:24
drink 445:11 448:11
drinking 408:22 444:2,8
  445:9,17 470:15 479:2
  479:16 493:14 494:2
```

Don's 468:14

double 457:19 573:11

504:7 556:16,21 564:21 565:1 566:3 569:5 570:1,25 571:1 571:8 584:15 585:5,6 585:10 607:18 608:8,9 609:17 610:15,17 612:5 616:17 drip 416:10 drive 488:22 489:8 490:6 driving 476:6 489:9 drop 528:18 dropping 574:19 drops 574:16 Drug 553:18 554:7 dry 391:23 441:18 481:17 **DTD** 427:25 due 390:13 396:6 402:3 411:20 445:1 519:1 520:13.15 526:9 532:14 542:13 580:8 592:18 Dunham 388:11 531:5,6 531:8,23,25 532:3,4 534:25 536:23 537:4 537:20,25 538:13,18 539:10 540:17 541:20 543:3,25 544:13,16 545:5,7 546:2,13 547:21 549:18 550:16 551:16 552:12,23,25 630:6,12,15 Dunn 532:4 duplicate 472:17 duplication 412:23 duplicative 473:14 duration 618:13 during 391:7 411:10 424:15 430:6 443:15 502:23 527:25 569:21 577:2 578:11 580:6 duties 390:8 duty 612:3 **D-E-S** 427:19 **D-I-L-L-O-N** 432:11 D-I-N 430:3 D-U-N-H-A-M 532:4

Е

E 387:1,1 each 410:9 442:11 451:12 458:24 470:5 520:19 527:2 549:7,8 549:9 576:11 596:3 603:7,23 633:2 earlier 424:17 472:22 512:16 513:23 533:5 536:16 551:12 552:9 554:21 617:12 621:12 early 428:14 462:18 earth 439:6,7 easement 428:15 442:6 443:15 easier 646:6 easily 529:4 571:19 east 482:25 easy 408:1 596:11 629:18 631:15

eat 413:17 448:12
echoing 531:14
Ecoli 422:2 442:16 443:11 476:24 495:2
495:24
economic 411:7 437:1,2 438:10,11 450:12
493:7 557:11
economically 516:25 economy 418:24 420:4
509:25 550:3 627:19
627:20 633:13 ecosystem 414:25
edge 457:19
edit 561:3
educated 566:23 education 394:13
403:22,23 452:4 490:4
504:1 educational 490:3
566:18
Edward 388:3 443:17 449:3,4
EEO 602:3
effect 436:8 450:11 514:19,23,23 516:22
516:24 574:10 626:9
effected 557:13 effective 394:4 449:16
454:20 467:18,23
570:4,17 585:19 586:5 610:1 623:9 624:23,25
625:7,19
effectively 453:13 490:8
effectiveness 566:24 584:1 618:11
effects 522:7 609:16,17
622:13,13 efficaciously 453:12
efficacy 449:25
efficiencies 572:20 efficiency 565:22 567:3
567:6,8,9,10
efficient 470:22 572:9,13 572:14 581:2
efficiently 572:12 610:1
effort 422:12 443:7 448:16,21 449:9 451:2
463:21 485:12 486:9
623:5 633:17 efforts 411:3 412:19,24
436:11 450:14 509:19
571:9 583:19 599:2 621:20,22 623:14
627:11
egregious 576:1
eight 458:22 520:8 525:4 Eighties 462:18
either 421:4 443:5
458:22 534:16 536:9 545:2 565:17
elaborate 456:12
elderly 479:13 elect 544:17 591:22
elections 544:19
electric 516:15 551:21 element 446:25
elements 492:5 566:14
566:15,16,18 578:3
İ

```
elevate 594:21 602:4,6
elevating 601:25
elevation 567:25
eliminate 442:7 570:7
Elks 635:18,24
Elliott 387:24 432:8
  435:15,17,18
else's 503:4
empathize 434:11
emphasis 599:2 609:16
emphasize 564:19
empirical 604:16
employed 553:11 633:18
employee 402:15
employees 526:12
empty 390:20 436:17
enable 573:5
enact 468:5
encounter 516:9
encourage 411:25 427:6
  434:14 462:8 502:4
  583:18 592:21
end 395:17 401:14
  410:11 415:13 421:10
  423:13 431:1.21
  439:24 444:4 504:20
  536:21 545:15,18
  553:21 554:6 573:24
  574:7 588:10 594:10
  606:4,5,20,20 612:25
  632:9 633:8 637:11
  638:18,21
endangered 428:16
ended 404:24
ends 425:21,22 440:6
  484:16 558:20
enforce 417:7,19 473:3
enforceable 526:17
  585:14 605:15
enforced 496:13 634:17
enforcement 449:22
  467:24 520:11 574:20
  574:24 575:11,20,21
  576:12,13 617:4,5,7,8
  617:9,13,14,22 618:20
  624:12,25 625:7
  636:25,25
enforcing 624:13
engaged 393:5 459:10
engineer 401:25 519:10
  555:9 564:2
Engineering 555:9
engineers 456:2
engines 436:12 627:20
enhanced 597:5
enormously 525:13
enough 399:25 409:11
  416:18 433:3,5 437:25
  451:21 491:1 564:19
  612:11 630:25 633:8
  638:24 643:17,19
  648.2
enroll 544:15
enrolled 420:17 543:23
enrollment 506:12
  544:10,24
ensuing 520:18
ensure 427:9 449:16
  456:23
```

```
enter 448:8
entering 425:17
entire 411:18 436:19
  523:21 584:17 587:21
  599:25
entirety 406:11
entity 400:20 407:21,22
  416:7 486:3
entry 394:20 561:1
environment 417:4
  418:16 436:7 446:23
  448:7 456:24 457:1
  465:8 509:17 522:20
environmental 429:21
  430:14.21 445:3
  450:12 480:15 481:2
  493:7 497:2 502:20
  520:9 523:1,4,25
  556:19 559:7 560:4
  561:14,24 562:5,5
  563:18 564:4
enzymes 477:8 517:4,5
EO 539:22 594:1.5
  595:13
EPA 496:25 561:17
  562:3
EPR 497:18
EPRs 497:17
equal 471:7 472:17
  577:10 591:19
equally 547:9
equate 502:9
equation 425:17 455:6
  495:18
equipment 521:12
equipped 412:9
eroding 412:17
errors 496:19
eruption 428:3
ESA 432:13
escalated 575:11
especially 442:14
  467:16 580:20 622:12
  627:22
essence 418:5
essential 428:4 509:18
essentially 435:19
  445:14 455:21 464:25
  569:17 603:19 632:1
  641:14 650:10
establish 452:15 455:1
  514:23 533:1,3,25
  586:15
established 451:16
  459:23 524:6 539:22
  546:22 580:5 604:11
establishment 451:11
estimate 506:12 599:12
  599:15
estimated 505:20 562:10
et 410:3 485:13 618:15
Europe 468:9
evaluate 453:18 551:1
  578:1 579:1 589:21
  592:6,10 594:24
  595:20 618:19,22
  625:3,11 641:6 646:4
evaluated 450:23 452:24
  579:23 586:8 587:7
```

```
588:19 590:19,22
                             588:7,10 589:3,13
                             590:15,18 594:4 597:7
  592:22
evaluates 449:22
                             599:23 601:22 603:5
evaluating 452:6 457:3
                             608:12 616:2 619:9
  463:13 603:19
                             620:9,12 625:12
evaluation 451:7,15
                             640:19
  455:15 458:16,20,25
                          examples 507:11 519:8
  464:24 580:9 587:12
                            608:14,19
                          excedent 443:11
  589:19 593:19 603:10
  623:8
                          exceed 569:5
evaluations 426:13
  459:15.17
even 424:17 425:20
  426:6 430:8 442:1
  445:24 459:22 461:12
  483:19 484:10 485:25
  498:24 499:15 502:1
  513:6,13 523:4 525:22
  528:7,18 543:4 558:21
  564:23 568:3 581:4
  584:4 585:14 590:20
  603:12 610:24 611:23
  617:14 649:11
event 421:15 562:19
  651:14
events 393:3 563:6
  568:13
eventually 423:14
  634:17
ever 428:21 450:23
  469:18 522:15 534:9
  604:18 607:20
Everett 432.8
every 410:8 467:16
  468:6 493:17 526:5
  528:9 538:15 539:16
  586:10 598:2 611:19
  614:7.10
everybody 399:7 405:22
  439:3 526:1 529:9
  547:8 603:20 626:4
  627:17 632:25 633:22
  636:9,9 645:16 647:8
everyday 575:20
everyone 399:9,11
  405:21 407:10 431:13
  503:19 629:24 644:10
  649:17
everyone's 509:18
everything 393:25
  419:25 436:18 492:7
  525:9 528:14 548:20
  555:4 562:23 563:1
  621:1 630:4 631:17
  645:17
everywhere 522:25
  608:5
evidence 504:7 517:2
  625:14.15
evident 521:15
```

exactly 393:21 404:24

613:24 630:4

example 396:1 415:1

421:5 428:10 443:9

484:2 488:5,22 490:4

557:8,19 558:12 579:5

581:12 585:8,15 588:1

413:25 455:8 461:25

493:18 516:14 551:25

explicit 481:25 594:8

601:23 explicitly 432:24 433:6 433:16 exponential 426:5 525:11 exponentially 525:23 exposure 523:2 524:2 543:13 express 427:13 Extension 577:14 588:24 589:14 extensive 393:10 416:5 517:21 525:10 extensively 394:21 524:24 extent 562:25 618:14 extent 562:25 618:14	families 415:24,25 478:11 family 415:23 420:1 619:17 far 390:3 435:21 44 448:16 450:5 511 547:12 552:12 56 588:3,10 602:11 627:21 629:6 639 farm 394:6 398:10, 408:17 411:24 41 416:13 430:23 43 443:24,25 444:21 446:11 448:22 45 452:11 476:19 47 485:7 489:5 494:
extra 415:5 525:7 526:4 extrapolating 453:19	527:6 540:3 542:2 543:3,5,6,10 546:
extremely 450:5 464:21 509:24 580:19 609:5	549:8,9 557:14 59 560:23 561:18 58
eye 623:10 E-L-L-I-O-T-T 435:18	585:1,20 587:8,9, 587:25 588:2,8,1; 589:22,25 590:1,;
F	590:16,20,21 592
f 618:8 face 456:19 457:3 631:22	596:3 599:9 602:2 603:12,13,16 604 616:1 623:23 624 625:2,21 626:1 63
faced 607:20 facilitate 404:17 451:8 451:11 551:24	631:20 633:17 63 638:1 648:11 649
facilities 565:7 facility 546:12	farmed 417:18 farmer 391:17,17 4: 439:17 443:3,22
facing 421:24 461:25 487:11 fact 402:10 409:10 410:1	444:22 493:17 51 525:1 557:12 627
431:24 438:21 439:4 439:21 454:18 462:18	farmers 408:19,24 409:10,15 415:8
496:13 502:21 519:1 549:3 565:11 581:8	416:21 417:2 423 436:20 441:20 44

602:20 603:10 613:14

618:22 638:19

factor 505:1 577:11

492:20 633:1

facts 459:3 575:5

faculty 480:3

536:21

630:5

572:21

falls 509:10

factory 438:23 439:5

fail 426:15,15 526:15

547:24 548:3,3,4

failure 421:19 422:13

fair 395:8 399:10 400:22

fall 493:14 506:8 525:19

400:22 493:13 544:7

fails 445:19 472:19

fairly 394:21 485:19

486:15 491:15

527:2,4 549:8,9

familiar 486:15 487:16

515:14 553:25

fairness 495:18

fall-back 632:14

faltered 521:18

factors 445:20 455:11

465:19 487:15,16,18

649:12,13

amily 415:23 420:19 619:17 ar 390:3 435:21 445:16 448:16 450:5 511:5 547:12 552:12 565:8 588:3,10 602:11 627:21 629:6 639:13 arm 394:6 398:10,18 408:17 411:24 415:2 416:13 430:23 437:16 443:24,25 444:21 446:11 448:22 451:4 452:11 476:19 479:2 485:7 489:5 494:20 527:6 540:3 542:25 543:3,5,6,10 546:11 549:8,9 557:14 558:19 560:23 561:18 583:12 585:1,20 587:8,9,13 587:25 588:2,8,13,17 589:22,25 590:1,2,3,6 590:16,20,21 592:9 596:3 599:9 602:25 603:12,13,16 604:1,3 616:1 623:23 624:5,15 625:2,21 626:1 630:1 631:20 633:17 635:5 638:1 648:11 649:22 armed 417:18 armer 391:17,17 420:16 439 17 443 3 22 444:22 493:17 513:7 525:1 557:12 627:7 armers 408:19.24 409:10,15 415:8 416:3 416:21 417:2 423:10 436:20 441:20 443:5 444:16 445:13,21 446:15,19 454:6 462:25 463:21,21,24 464:12 467:20 468:4 472:2,19 476:23 477:1 493:16 494:11,16 495:19 505:22 516:4 518:17,19,19 521:6 523:13 524:4,7 532:6 544:14,17 573:15,20 583:19,25 592:10 595:24 599:6 600:14 609:13 623:11 Farmer's 505:16 farming 391:23 414:21 415:22 416:4 441:16 441:19 446:16 448:6 480:5,16,23 494:14 513:5,14,17,19,20 543:17 609:14 farms 408:15 436:15 476:17 478:24 488:11 488:13 506:1 513:1,11 517:1 536:7 545:3 546:10 553:20 554:2 557:6,20 584:16 586:20,23,25 587:2,3 587:13,16,17,23 588:1 588:2,4,5,7,8,10,13 589:20 590:14 591:11

591:12,14,19 598:12 598:18 599:3,7,16,16 600:5,6 602:23 624:9 627:6 Farr 447:17 fashion 540:9 fast 507:20 528:10 572:19 fate 471:1 faulty 409:2 favor 632:20 FDA 561:10.11.16.19 562:4 fear 573:23 574:5 617:21 fearful 526:18 574:4 feasible 468:3 February 433:21 494:3 fecal 589:5 fed 514:10 federal 428:16 455:21 476:24 479:1 553:18 553:19 560:4,11 561:11 feedback 437:17 534:21 569:15 632:16 feeds 510:1 feel 400:21,22 428:5 481:23 487:17 526:10 528:1 599:1 600:9,11 feeling 634:14 feels 466:24 512:1 615:18 644:8 fees 521:9 feet 476:2,5,5 507:7 fell 506:1 Fellowship 493:3 felt 399:10 430:7 480:16 511:23 fencing 507:24 fertility 469:6 489:1,6 490:22 577:15 fertilization 425:14 602:21 fertilize 414:15 464:7 fertilizer 409:14 410:8 410:10 424:15 449:13 452:4 471:7 479:7 565:11,22 567:9 569:22 570:8 572:15 fertilizers 449:14,15,23 462:20 463:2 467:21 493:15 494:14 495:15 few 390:20 394:18 433:20 473:23 509:15 510:15 554:24 573:8 579:16 580:22 581:25 587:11 629:5 fiduciary 457:16 field 476:7 507:10 522:3 528:12,22 564:23 fields 445:16 467:19,21 470:4 476:4,11 479:9 507:8 522:20 588:25 fifth 415:22 649:5 figure 398:1 450:20 455:22 460:5,19 461:23 484:12 492:8 525:17 529:4 571:9 figured 465:22 484:7

596:7 file 386:25 390:24 filed 436:1 fill 402:5 599:11 **filling** 530:1 filtration 428:3 final 398:1 436:25 528:19 535:12 550:7 555:24 561:5 finalized 541:8,17 561:2 finally 495:9 510:9 536:19 558:3 593:23 594:13 596:11 598:22 606:17 **finances** 562:15 financial 485:18 521:11 633:19 financial-wide 412:25 find 410:13 415:7 430:17 430:18 431:14 432:4 447:17 449:9 450:17 461:10 466:2 470:9,10 479:13 487:6 511:14 624:21 finding 487:5 496:23 623:5 findings 564:11 594:8 fine 400:11 407:23 457:6 464:5 510:16 520:20 531:13,25 617:15 637:4 650:13 fined 520:22 fines 521:1.9 fingers 554:13 finish 397:14,23 482:5 488:19 514:3 **finished** 424:16 fire 520:16 firm 472:10 475:21 first 397:10 408:3 409:2 415:6 416:3,18 419:17 420:21 421:17 426:25 434:4 435:23 487:14 491:7 496:8,20,24 497:6 505:24 532:18 539:6.11 540:19 550:16 569:20 577:15 578:22 579:17 580:8 582:16 588:7 601:8 614:2,4 615:1,25 620:17 624:23 625:5 634:24 639:6 fish 429:1 465:23 497:1 Fisheries 432:12 fit 461:7 fits 416:25 475:25 557:6 Fitzhugh 387:24 435:16 437:12,13,13 439:20 440:4 five 398:14 411:10 416:4 417:3 419:14 434:5 448:1 484:22 485:2 486:3 487:3,8 499:9 583:2 584:17 597:23 612:7 619:3,9 621:19 624:11 629:3 632:4,7 five-year 566:14 631:19 fix 484:12 486:5 fixed 396:20 571:19

flawed 521:17 flea 414:24 445:19,24 flea's 445:21 flexibility 606:15 flexible 606:7 633:8 flip 633:14 flooding 560:23 flow 489:21 flower 479:17 flowers 479:10 flowing 634:4 focus 394:25 411:11 419:16,17 501:14,15 focused 490:3 496:9 566:16 599:21 **focuses** 587:1 focusing 515:12 592:20 599:2 folks 392:21 398:10,18 398:21 405:19 419:23 477:4 530:25 562:18 609:7 614:18 622:1 627:5 635:25 638:20 643:23 650:15 follow 423:4.5.9.11.16 438:8,9 465:16 507:8 544:2 575:11 618:25 followed 426:18 432:8 435:15 475:17 512:8 520:14 follows 436:24 441:24 followup 470:19 489:16 574.20 folocating 477:8 font 393:25 food 409:3,3,6 410:17 413:16 421:7,12 422:3 422:6 446:20 448:12 449:5 452:5 457:11,14 457:17,20,24 458:1 459.1 479.10 507.21 519:13 552:8 553:14 553:18 554:7 559:6,12 561:20,23,25 562:6 foolish 459:4 foot 559:25 562:13 567:24 foray 390:23 forced 392:10 483:17 521:8 forcing 648:23 forget 572:7 form 395:11 406:9 435:3 465:20 561:2,5 613:22 642:21 formally 462:23 format 630:8 formation 488:24 formed 577:13 621:19 621:19 former 389:24 446:13 549:25 forms 393:24 513:22 530:1 573:11 formulated 448:25 formulation 435:2 formulations 514:24 forth 437:22 439:24

446:24 450:1 455:6

511:4 512:4 550:11
554:4 624:16 fortunate 416:18 627:22
forward 392:16 401:1
402:12 423:6 431:2
450:9 451:2 459:13 467:3 468:20 536:17
539:19 544:4 545:20
617:20 623:11 628:18 634:19
found 414:20 431:12
438:5 443:11 452:6 480:13 481:11 487:24
495:10 536:2,6 564:5
614:12 624:10 foundation 393:24
454:20
four 391:2 424:16
478:19 517:22,23 526:7 547:1,5 632:4
fourth 443:22
fraction 590:20 fractional 521:6
frame 420:2 421:20,25
539:5 542:6 framework 500:13
609:11
Fran 390:12
FRANCES 387:7 Francis 390:4,7,8 456:2
617:3 624:4 630:8
644:5 645:5 648:25 frankly 486:10
Fred 387:21 422:23,25
Frediani 432:9 435:16 440:10
frequency 618:14
frequent 611:18 fresh 587:7
friend 489:8
from 386:13 390:5,6
391:18 392:7 394:1 395:3 396:22 400:9
391:18 392:7 394:1 395:3 396:22 400:9 402:22 403:7,7,14,22
391:18 392:7 394:1 395:3 396:22 400:9
391:18 392:7 394:1 395:3 396:22 400:9 402:22 403:7,7,14,22 404:19 407:2,9,9 409:4,6,24 410:3 412:16 413:21 414:8
391:18 392:7 394:1 395:3 396:22 400:9 402:22 403:7,7,14,22 404:19 407:2,9,9 409:4,6,24 410:3
391:18 392:7 394:1 395:3 396:22 400:9 402:22 403:7,7,14,22 404:19 407:2,9,9 409:4,6,24 410:3 412:16 413:21 414:8 415:18,21 421:21 422:12 430:25 437:17 438:12,13,23,24 442:8
391:18 392:7 394:1 395:3 396:22 400:9 402:22 403:7,7,14,22 404:19 407:2,9,9 409:4,6,24 410:3 412:16 413:21 414:8 415:18,21 421:21 422:12 430:25 437:17 438:12,13,23,24 442:8 442:10,18 443:11
391:18 392:7 394:1 395:3 396:22 400:9 402:22 403:7,7,14,22 404:19 407:2,9,9 409:4,6,24 410:3 412:16 413:21 414:8 415:18,21 421:21 422:12 430:25 437:17 438:12,13,23,24 442:8 442:10,18 443:11 445:7,15 447:7,10,11 447:12,13 448:18
391:18 392:7 394:1 395:3 396:22 400:9 402:22 403:7,7,14,22 404:19 407:2,9,9 409:4,6,24 410:3 412:16 413:21 414:8 415:18,21 421:21 422:12 430:25 437:17 438:12,13,23,24 442:8 442:10,18 443:11 445:7,15 447:7,10,11 447:12,13 448:18 449:6 451:5 452:12
391:18 392:7 394:1 395:3 396:22 400:9 402:22 403:7,7,14,22 404:19 407:2,9,9 409:4,6,24 410:3 412:16 413:21 414:8 415:18,21 421:21 422:12 430:25 437:17 438:12,13,23,24 442:8 442:10,18 443:11 445:7,15 447:7,10,11 447:12,13 448:18 449:6 451:5 452:12 455:14 457:25 460:1,2 464:8 467:4,7,8,15,19
391:18 392:7 394:1 395:3 396:22 400:9 402:22 403:7,7,14,22 404:19 407:2,9,9 409:4,6,24 410:3 412:16 413:21 414:8 415:18,21 421:21 422:12 430:25 437:17 438:12,13,23,24 442:8 442:10,18 443:11 445:7,15 447:7,10,11 447:12,13 448:18 449:6 451:5 452:12 455:14 457:25 460:1,2 464:8 467:4,7,8,15,19 467:21 469:3 473:19
391:18 392:7 394:1 395:3 396:22 400:9 402:22 403:7,7,14,22 404:19 407:2,9,9 409:4,6,24 410:3 412:16 413:21 414:8 415:18,21 421:21 422:12 430:25 437:17 438:12,13,23,24 442:8 442:10,18 443:11 445:7,15 447:7,10,11 447:12,13 448:18 449:6 451:5 452:12 455:14 457:25 460:1,2 464:8 467:4,7,8,15,19 467:21 469:3 473:19 476:12,17 479:5,13 481:17 485:13,13,21
391:18 392:7 394:1 395:3 396:22 400:9 402:22 403:7,7,14,22 404:19 407:2,9,9 409:4,6,24 410:3 412:16 413:21 414:8 415:18,21 421:21 422:12 430:25 437:17 438:12,13,23,24 442:8 442:10,18 443:11 445:7,15 447:7,10,11 447:12,13 448:18 449:6 451:5 452:12 455:14 457:25 460:1,2 464:8 467:4,7,8,15,19 467:21 469:3 473:19 476:12,17 479:5,13 481:17 485:13,13,21 486:23 493:19 495:13
391:18 392:7 394:1 395:3 396:22 400:9 402:22 403:7,7,14,22 404:19 407:2,9,9 409:4,6,24 410:3 412:16 413:21 414:8 415:18,21 421:21 422:12 430:25 437:17 438:12,13,23,24 442:8 442:10,18 443:11 445:7,15 447:7,10,11 447:12,13 448:18 449:6 451:5 452:12 455:14 457:25 460:1,2 464:8 467:4,7,8,15,19 467:21 469:3 473:19 476:12,17 479:5,13 481:17 485:13,13,21 486:23 493:19 495:13 499:2 502:5,20 504:7 505:9 507:14 509:15
391:18 392:7 394:1 395:3 396:22 400:9 402:22 403:7,7,14,22 404:19 407:2,9,9 409:4,6,24 410:3 412:16 413:21 414:8 415:18,21 421:21 422:12 430:25 437:17 438:12,13,23,24 442:8 442:10,18 443:11 445:7,15 447:7,10,11 447:12,13 448:18 449:6 451:5 452:12 455:14 457:25 460:1,2 464:8 467:4,7,8,15,19 467:21 469:3 473:19 476:12,17 479:5,13 481:17 485:13,13,21 486:23 493:19 495:13 499:2 502:5,20 504:7 505:9 507:14 509:15 513:3,3,7,16 515:16
391:18 392:7 394:1 395:3 396:22 400:9 402:22 403:7,7,14,22 404:19 407:2,9,9 409:4,6,24 410:3 412:16 413:21 414:8 415:18,21 421:21 422:12 430:25 437:17 438:12,13,23,24 442:8 442:10,18 443:11 445:7,15 447:7,10,11 447:12,13 448:18 449:6 451:5 452:12 455:14 457:25 460:1,2 464:8 467:4,7,8,15,19 467:21 469:3 473:19 476:12,17 479:5,13 481:17 485:13,13,21 486:23 493:19 495:13 499:2 502:5,20 504:7 505:9 507:14 509:15 513:3,3,7,16 515:16 516:1 518:6 519:10 520:9,12 529:12
391:18 392:7 394:1 395:3 396:22 400:9 402:22 403:7,7,14,22 404:19 407:2,9,9 409:4,6,24 410:3 412:16 413:21 414:8 415:18,21 421:21 422:12 430:25 437:17 438:12,13,23,24 442:8 442:10,18 443:11 445:7,15 447:7,10,11 447:12,13 448:18 449:6 451:5 452:12 455:14 457:25 460:1,2 464:8 467:4,7,8,15,19 467:21 469:3 473:19 476:12,17 479:5,13 481:17 485:13,13,21 486:23 493:19 495:13 499:2 502:5,20 504:7 505:9 507:14 509:15 513:3,3,7,16 515:16 516:1 518:6 519:10 520:9,12 529:12 530:11,22,23 532:8,22
391:18 392:7 394:1 395:3 396:22 400:9 402:22 403:7,7,14,22 404:19 407:2,9,9 409:4,6,24 410:3 412:16 413:21 414:8 415:18,21 421:21 422:12 430:25 437:17 438:12,13,23,24 442:8 442:10,18 443:11 445:7,15 447:7,10,11 447:12,13 448:18 449:6 451:5 452:12 455:14 457:25 460:1,2 464:8 467:4,7,8,15,19 467:21 469:3 473:19 476:12,17 479:5,13 481:17 485:13,13,21 486:23 493:19 495:13 499:2 502:5,20 504:7 505:9 507:14 509:15 513:3,3,7,16 515:16 516:1 518:6 519:10 520:9,12 529:12
391:18 392:7 394:1 395:3 396:22 400:9 402:22 403:7,7,14,22 404:19 407:2,9,9 409:4,6,24 410:3 412:16 413:21 414:8 415:18,21 421:21 422:12 430:25 437:17 438:12,13,23,24 442:8 442:10,18 443:11 445:7,15 447:7,10,11 447:12,13 448:18 449:6 451:5 452:12 455:14 457:25 460:1,2 464:8 467:4,7,8,15,19 476:12,17 479:5,13 481:17 485:13,13,21 486:23 493:19 495:13 499:2 502:5,20 504:7 505:9 507:14 509:15 513:3,3,7,16 515:16 516:1 518:6 519:10 520:9,12 529:12 530:11,22,23 532:8,22 533:22 536:17 537:16

554:25 555:20 556:13 556:14.18 557:8.12 558:11 562:23 565:20 566:1 567:7 568:4,11 569:15 570:21 571:21 575:3 576:20 577:13 577:21 580:1.3 585:1 585:11,19 588:24 589:7 593:9,14,22 594:3 598:6.8.9.10 599:7,8,13,18 608:2,8 608:13 609:22 610:13 614:22 615:20 617:11 619:5 630:25 632:16 633:16 634:23 638:7 643:3,24 644:3 649:23 650:17 front 408:1 435:2 526:22 539:24 fronts 610:22 frustration 487:2 full 399:11 402:7 435:8 613:16.22.24 fully 447:2 522:10 526:8 function 446:15 538:8 fund 403:23 502:20 504:1 523:12 524:6 fundamental 516:8 fundamentally 549:13 funded 485:23 funding 452:1 457:13 485:13,21 486:19 524.4 funds 633:16 634:5 fungicide 468:10 further 535:22 601:5 628:4 641:15 644:13

518:15 570:13 594:12 614:20 **F-I-T-Z-H-U-G-H** 437:14

G

650:2,17 651:12 **future** 417:13 424:14

G 564:5 Gail 424:8 426:18,22 gain 529:22 game 431:21 465:23 497:1 Gamma 538:5 gamut 530:24 gap 535:8 625:21 gardens 495:14 garner 419:13 Garrison 440:15,15 441:12 gas 471:3 gate 434:2 gather 537:23 620:2 gathered 429:8 577:9 gauges 489:17 gave 545:24 568:6 630:8 general 410:4 411:1 442:13 480:13 490:20 573:10 583:16 generalized 573:23 generally 409:10 480:21

481:24 483:8 593:6 622:14 generates 633:13 generation 415:22 420:15 443:22 generations 417:13,18 genetic 481:16 gentleman 545:24 562:7 565:7 572:7 575:3 610:23 geographical 497:19 geologic 488:24 geologist 521:25 555:9 geologists 456:3 gets 419:10 456:14 465:20 485:14 528:10 528:10 573:24 634:17 634:20 644:10 getting 397:11 400:13 429:1 459:9 466:2 491:14 524:6 570:19 591:2 598:25 629:21 632:16.18 637:23 639:1 642:10 643:16 Giannini 443:17.19.21 446:3 gigantic 629:19 give 393:4 399:9.11.13 401:2,5,22 405:12 406:19 407:15 417:13 429:17 441:6,7 450:22 451:23 503:7,8,22 554.18 574.6 594.23 624:2 630:5 631:20 635:5 641:7 given 422:8 425:10 447:5 451:21 453:16 515:10 519:1 600:9.12 610:14 615:10 gives 435:4 514:8 602:5 **giving** 503:3 569:16 574:24 648:22 glass 522:19 glitch 391:6 go 392:16 396:15 399:1 400:25 401:4,7,9 404:19 405:3 407:8 410:23 415:8 420:4 433:15 435:7 439:4,6 441:6 459:25 468:25 470:7 480:2 488:3 491:14 498:7 510:24 516:20 524:18 525:2 530:4 531:10 533:24 534:16 539:19 540:3 541:5,25 542:8 543:7 543:11 545:13 546:18

548:14,25 560:9

562:13 571:13 575:18

576:3,4 579:16 583:11

590:8 595:19 606:6

614:2 615:25 617:12

620:25 627:9 630:18

495:17 532:18 534:20

goals 414:14 418:15,17

633:1 635:13 637:8

646:24

goal 459:23 462:5

552:5,6 613:1

418:20 420:1 421:20 421:24 422:14 441:22 510:11 614:25 God 417:3 goes 397:13 407:13 471:2 485:24 530:20 535:10.12 542:20 553:10 603:20 627:21 635:11 640:24 going 392:8 397:17,21 397:25 399:7,17,18 400:5 401:3.6 405:2.7 407:12,15 418:5 419:2 419:22 420:1,2,3,4 431:22 434:8.13 436:15,21 437:24 438:18 451:2,13,18 452:14,23 453:3,8 455:23,23 456:5 457:21 459:19 460:5 460:19 461:13,18,21 463:13 464:5 465:7,10 466:11,25 472:14 473:6,7 484:11 485:6 486:2 489:7 491:11.18 501:14 507:20 512:14 514:1 516:21 517:16 518:15 523:10.23 526:3,10,19 527:11 529:18,19 534:12 536:9,18,21 540:1,3,4 540:4 543:19 544:10 545:2,4,4,14 547:16 549:11,19 552:25 553:14 554:11 555:14 559:5 562:23 563:6 564:7 573:24 574:7,15 574:19 575:1.8.17 576:5,8,9,25 579:16 580:19,24 585:23 588:18 590:17 596:23 600:20 602:14 605:21 607:9 609:7,12 610:4 616:5 621:8 622:6 624:9 626:11,15 627:16 631:17.18.19 631:23 632:19 633:7,8 634:1,25 635:7 636:11 636:14 637:19 639:17 643:1,23,23,24 646:3 649:4.4.5 gone 438:16 447:18 567:18 626:8 good 389:5 408:16 409:11 413:5 415:19 420:14 422:17,25 426:20 432:10,18

435:17 437:13 439:8

439:15 443:9.19 449:4

461:24 475:19 481:2,6

481:14 482:16 486:9

493:21 509:4 531:1,1

563:3 576:22 582:24

608:16,19 609:5

623:14 643:14

gotten 484:7

govern 417:20

governed 554:7

governing 472:6

government 412:25 416:23 417:7 421:12 451:4 455:17 governmental 411:2 governments 412:19 government's 493:20 Governor 412:24 Governor's 453:25 grab 525:2 grading 428:23 gradual 580:10 graduates 420:19 grand 636:12,13 grandson 420:16 grant 419:19 457:11 487:6 639:20 granted 398:13 472:16 473:2.4 granulated 464:6 granule 434:19 435:3,12 graph 587:22 grappling 516:3 gray 541:14 grazing 441:16 great 410:5 436:11 499:12 525:24 609:6 633:14 634:13 636:13 greater 425:24,25 478:15 493:21 588:4 588:11 591:7,19 greatest 523:1 580:18 greatly 436:16 green 432:13 458:3 476:21 507:23 554:1 560:15,16 561:9 Green's 502:5 Gregorio 478:13,18 Grip 443:17 446:5 Groot 388:3 443:17 446:9,10,10 448:14,17 448.23 449.2 gross 569:9 ground 482:12 484:14 491:13 516:2 522:13 529:20,25 550:11 614:23 615:22 623:6,6 630:24 groundwater 394:22,25 395:2,6,6 412:8,11 428:24 444:14,19 445:1,4,22 448:15,20 452:7 453:21 454:7 459:1 463:13 473:10 473:25 474:25 475:13 480:6 488:23 493:7 496:16 501:18 504:8 504:13,20,25 510:17 512:25 513:8,9 516:3 519:9 531:20 532:12 532:12 534:12,15,17 534:21 536:24 537:15 538:10.24 547:5.16.17 556:15 564:3,4,20 565:5.22.25 566:19 567:12,25 570:6,9 578:16,18,24 581:21

584:13,23 587:15,18

600:21 604:14 608:2

588:14,20 591:21

```
608:13 611:3.6 612:18
  613:5,8 622:9 626:3,7
  626:21
group 411:25 448:24
  484:18 495:20 529:2,8
  533:1,18 534:8 539:12
  539:16 540:19 541:6
  541:25 542:3 544:18
  546:16,19 548:5
  551:23 562:3 565:2
  577:9 595:17 616:3,11
  616:12 620:19 627:11
  630:2
grouped 603:5
groups 403:3 416:19
  427:20 430:14 431:10
  482:8,10 532:5 533:24
  571:6 618:7 620:22
grow 413:16,18,18 419:3
  419:4 509:25 513:20
  572:13,18 580:21,24
  587:14,17
grower 409:24 414:12
  414:25 425:21,22
  431:23.24.25 438:7
  456:22 484:2 492:14
  499:12 501:22 506:23
  525:17 533:9 538:15
  539:16 540:5 553:11
  594:3,6 595:12,12
growers 414:20 415:5
  415:17 418:19 421:22
  425:18 426:3,9,14,21
  426:22 427:8,9 431:22
  437:18 450:17,20
  451:12,14 453:17
  456:24 460:20 461:7
  461:10 470:2 475:6
  482:15 483:17,24
  484:11,14,16,17,19
  485:22 486:1,22 487:5
  487:6 488:8 490:21
  499:12 500:5,12,22
  506:14 507:2,15,23
  534:22 544:6 551:5,19
  567:5 569:20 578:9
  579:18,22 580:23
  581:1,8,10 584:12
  589:13 592:6,21
  594:22 596:18,23
  599:11 601:11.25
  602:6 606:7,14 608:20
  609:21 610:3
Grower-Shipper 505:18
grower/shipper 545:25
growing 460:22 540:6
  580:2,2 581:4 587:24
  591:20
grown 419:7 443:25
  450:21 455:5 527:12
guarantees 449:17
guess 391:14 491:3,24
  582:23 612:25 626:13
guessing 560:20
guesswork 613:24
guilty 409:18 500:14
guy 522:8
guys 499:16
G-I-A-N-N-I-N-I 443:21
```

G-R-O-O-T 446:10 391:12,14,19 hazard 558:1 591:24 592:2,5,11 598:20 hazardous 467:19 habitant 418:4,8 428:12 hazards 467:15 habitants 418:16 554:3 heads 409:24 460:4 habitat 429:16 518:3,5 629:7 560:6 561:15 610:19 health 428:4 442:25 habitats 427:23 560:12 457:19 467:14,16,17 half 391:23 458:23 467:25 468:1 473:8 521:22 529:7 544:5 479:4,10,11,14 493:11 549:20 580:1 606:23 607:2 629:2 hall 632:1 Hamily 475:21 hand 421:21 425:7 537:13 651:16 handed 401:15 handle 401:3 407:16 554:3 577:25 630:25 handling 392:12 628:15 hands 396:14 554:12 631:16 632:7 hands-on 417:16,17 happen 399:25 419:21 423:15 614:3 629:8 631.18 happened 499:11 548:17 happening 498:6 happens 410:14 521:17 526:20 642:14 happy 502:15 Haram 472:10 hard 388:3 431:21 434:13 443:18 449:3,4 449:4 451:24 452:19 452:23 453:9,16,22 454:8.12.17.25 455:3 455:8 456:10.13 457:10 458:3,12,18,21 459:18 460:9.12 461:2 463:4,8,12,24 464:17 464:18 466:3 472:22 473:16 482:15,22 486:1 525:16 529:9 584:25 hardware 478:20 harmonized 553:23 554:1 **Harold** 408:8 Hartz 413:21 425:12 452:10 harvest 413:15,17,23 414:16 482:15 582:4,5 582:11,19 harvested 425:15 hate 473:15 628:24

523:3 534:2 610:15 622:4.13 healthy 418:16 448:12 509:17.25 hear 433:22 448:17 462:22 463:19 482:20 492:8 498:15,17 524:25 554:25 555:20 576:20 606:18,19,21 633:12 643:24 644:14 646:11 heard 392:10 402:12 416:24,25 417:15 418:25 428:1 434:2 447:22 462:16 465:23 474:2,9 476:16 498:1 512:5 513:24 531:20 536:15 551:12 554:19 555:18,18 556:6,7,13 556:18,23 557:5,8,11 557:18,21,22,25 558:3 558:11 562:7 564:8 12 564:14 565:15 569:12 583:13 584:24 585:2 585:15,24 586:2,18 587:5 592:14 595:7 607:17 608:17 610:5 614:10,19 626:3 627:14,18 629:9 639:2 639:12 644:12.14 hearing 386:2,12 391:18 392:6,9,12,22 393:8 396:8,9,10 401:4,13 404:25 407:9 442:10 454:2 463:3 616:25 617:25 630:17 632:5 632:15 Hearst 441:13,17 442:5 heart 532:15 623:19 heavily 431:23 604:16 heavy 435:4 450:5 612:3 Hector 398:22 Hello 496:4 help 397:8,19 398:23 427:10 433:14,15 448:4 452:13 459:12 465:5,6 493:25 500:23 533:2 534:4 539:25 540:8 551:23 562:1 563:7 570:23 586:15 636:18 637:24 helped 484:25 helpful 396:24 helping 420:7 583:25 her 390:5,16,17 415:15 432:2 464:25 477:19 493:18 554:12 herbicides 497:10

hesitant 485:22 491:25 Hi 502:18,19 high 419:9 452:2 470:16 483:2,3,4,12,21 490:24 573:15 578:23 579:2,10 580:7 581:5 581:20 583:1 587:15 587:18 588:13 589:5 602:15 613:4 615:5 higher 442:15,17 494:21 572:3 579:6 591:3 594:22 599:4 601:14 602:1,7 highest 393:14 427:25 428:20 483:13 556:22 highlight 480:25 hills 499:13 him 400:7 413:23 415:14 422:22 432:1 548:9 hire 461:11 627:9 hired 451:14 history 416:6 467:22 hoc 459:23 Hodgin 387:6 389:14,15 458:15,16 459:14 614:6 615:25 616:20 617:25 619:1,25 628:21 636:7 648:22 Hoernschemever 466:17 467:5,8 468:13 Hoff 475:21 hold 405:18 516:4,18 622:11 holdover 394:1 Homeowners 495:14 homes 415:24 443:24 Honda 478:13,18 honestly 543:25 honor 614:24 616:25 Hoover 466:17 hope 431:6 481:9 485:15 542:21 626:16 629:4 634:15,16 649:7 hopefully 392:18 437:10 458:13 hoping 420:18 486:25 631:23 **HOROWITZ** 387:11 horse 461:15 464:21 hostage 516:4 hot 568:2 hour 407:9 489:11 490:6 490:7 528:1 hour's 629:21 housing 479:9 Howard 388:10 520:5 521:22,24 Huerado 493:9 530:7 Huertos 388:6 475:18 479:23,23 480:1,3 482:6,22 485:15 487:19,21 488:18 490:20 491:24 492:6 492:10,17,21 533:5 huge 426:4 488:13

hereto 651:13 heretofore 455:13

herself 400:7

Hernandez 398:22

489:20 493:24 521:2 622:3 human 523:3 hundred 476:1,2,5 501:11,11 544:9 hundreds 410:7 643:2,4 hunt 487:9 Hunter 387:6 389:16,17 391:9 403:21 439:14 439:15 440:2,9 462:12 462:13 463:5,10,14 464:10 485:4.5 514:1 514:14,15 515:1 539:3 540:12 541:18 542:10 561:7 596:20 597:12 597:23 598:6,13 620:17,23,25 625:20 637:8 hurt 642:19 hydrocarbons 530:23 hydrogeologist 521:25 hydrologic 473:19 hydrologist 472:11 512:17 519:11 577:8 hydrologists 445:14 hydrology 516:8 hydromorthology 498:6 hydrozation 586:7 hypothesis 513:17 516:23 H-U-E-R-T-O-S 480:1 **ID** 538:7 idea 463:7 482:16 566:25 636:10 642:5 ideas 480:10 548:15 584:24 identification 451:8 534:22 593:19 identified 411:5.16.21 452:1,3 459:21 538:6 547:2 548:1 550:17,21 587:14 648:11 identify 451:25 462:8 535:6 571:1 593:15 600:7 623:15 ignorance 419:6 ignorant 418:25 ignore 482:22 **ignores** 576:2 **ignoring** 397:17 613:3 II 386:8 illegal 435:24 illustrate 409:21

643:22

haunt 487:3

644:13

hav 441:19

having 393:14 404:25

407:11 426:8 434:9

460:12 465:23,24

436:14 437:22 455:25

490:21 491:14 529:5

566:22 574:10 587:15

Hayashi 389:18,19 391:9

ill-prepared 421:14

436:4 544:1

immediate 570:5

immense 504:7

immediately 573:9

impact 418:4,10,11

595:21 603:4

impacted 556:20

419:11 452:21 462:21

565:16 586:3.5 594:24

impacting 563:23 622:9

impacts 418:8,13 436:6

imagine 403:25 409:22

538:16,20 540:10,24

540:25 541:4,21,22

547:11,12,14 549:8,9

512:25 523:1 556:14 556:15,25 564:10,13 564:17,20 565:13
571:2,18 593:6 621:8 impaired 411:18 442:14
443:10 494:23 498:12 498:12,20 499:13,20
506:5 507:3 525:19 563:24
impairment 455:11 481:8 482:1 486:5
488:15 494:13 498:16 499:18 557:2,7 610:13
impairments 411:20 447:2
impasse 466:1 impermeable 444:15 445:4,23
impetus 465:21
implement 416:16 473:3 476:25 551:21 553:19
574:12 596:18 599:24 606:8,15
implementable 496:14
implementation 438:2 438:17 570:24 601:9
609:19 610:4 618:10
implemented 570:16 585:18 596:24 609:2
621:15 634:17,20 implementing 540:5
547:10 581:2 599:22
601:13 608:20 628:16 implication 402:7
implicit 408:21
implied 530:16 implore 522:23
importance 462:16
important 399:24 417:17 430:10 431:5 446:22
477:12 490:14 510:4
524:7 533:21 551:10 555:6 569:19 587:19
594:7,14 605:20 619:6 627:12,15 644:8 645:5
imported 483:16,16
imposed 521:12 imposes 472:16
impossible 469:22
479:11 impractical 413:25
impressed 626:18
improperly 571:4 improve 447:3 486:25
495:17 548:3 573:6 583:19 599:1 601:21
605:25 609:20
improved 447:6 593:21 improvement 427:7
462:9 496:11 504:2
595:5 601:1 improvements 416:12
447:5 448:2 453:8 462:10 464:13 516:19
516:21 522:23 541:13
516:21 522:23 541:13 547:24,25 548:3,5,22
516:21 522:23 541:13

improving 411:15 448:6 inability 518:2 519:2 inaccurate 421:19 443:12 563:9 inadequate 521:16 inappropriate 487:18 557:21 587:6 Inc 386:19 502:6 517:13 517:14 544:23 incentive 411:25 incentives 581:7 incentivize 500:24 incentivizes 500:12 incentivizing 500:18 incidence 470:14 include 414:19 415:4 468:8 501:17 504:25 510:10 546:24 557:22 584:5.14 592:15 593:24 595:14 597:6 618:6 620:21 644:20 included 393:12 394:23 412:6 448:23 497:16 497:18 501:20 504:22 525:3 547:21 581:7 585:1,3 594:8,19 597:17 includes 472:3 497:19 593:3 595:10 603:24 including 394:24 412:2 444:13 478:17 500:5 502:1 558:2 585:7 591:25 592:22 594:21 income 521:13 633:16 incomplete 521:5,16 inconsequential 565:17 incorporate 491:23 535:22 630:11 incorporated 640:16 incorporating 641:8 increase 436:16 483:18 513:2,13 568:15,16,17 596:10 603:25 608:4 **increased** 569:4,6 609:15 increases 435:5 493:16 569:2.8 608:5 increasing 463:16 483:4 510:3 Indeed 519:13 independent 540:24 index 558:2 591:24 592:2,5,11 598:20 indicate 513:9 565:25 569:24 604:25 608:20 indicated 506:22 indicates 605:2 indicating 560:19 564:12 indicator 414:25 495:3 indicators 504:20 586:14 individual 395:14,16 400:6,9 438:25 461:13 465:3 484:20 516:10

549:11 553:11,20 554:2,2 555:20 556:25 557:20 558:7 566:21 568:5,24 571:6 573:15 584:1,2,14 585:16,17 586:6,19,23,25 587:2 587:3,8 591:11,12 593:6,9,17,24 594:2 595:11.12 596:3 597:14 598:3,5,12,18 599:3,16 600:18,20 610:10 614:12.19 616:4,17 618:7 620:19 620:22 623:18,23 633:25 634:1 individually 442:12 458:23 536:7 538:14 individuals 401:22 403:15 452:9 465:7 556:13,18 575:22 608:10 616:7 individual's 541:8 548:6 Indoprofen 468:9 industries 411:1 industry 394:11 421:18 421:22 422:3,4,16 448:4 493:20 509:24 510:4 523:3,25 557:1 557:15 583:17,18,22 583:24 606:22 610:10 614:24 633:12 634:4,9 industry's 421:10 inefficiency 572:14 inexcusable 421:15 infants 479:12 infeasible 412:18 **inflated** 564:15 inform 464:20 information 393:10 399:20 400:13 402:11 402:14 407:4,7 411:6 412:10 421:3,19 433:14 452:12 501:2 503:1 510:20 511:13 523:20 529:10 22 23 529:24 531:24 532:21 535:6,8 542:21,24 543:2,17 544:11,13 564:18 567:13,22,23 568:9 572:1.4 574:5 574:14 578:13 580:20 580:25 598:11 601:23 601:24 602:10 605:23 609:22 610:7 614:21 615:11.14.16.19.616:2 616:17 617:6 618:20 625:11 627:3 630:1 632:15 638:6,10 639:17 640:1 641:7 644:7,10 647:18 649:10 ingrated 499:2 ingredients 497:14 inhabited 442:20 **inherent** 592:17

initial 537:17 initiated 583:21 innocent 500:15 innovated 623:21 innovations 416:10 Innovative 623:23 inordinate 521:8 input 402:18 407:2 447:12 517:8 533:22 534:11 556:1 577:25 insensitive 438:3 insignificant 603:15 insolvency 521:14 inspection 479:4 499:4 543:9.10 install 445:14 507:2,23 507:24 installing 483:25 instance 436:10 instantly 499:14 instead 405:25 491:3 497:22 546:18 557:20 598:18 633:16 institute 467:18 instruct 437:9 627:1 insufficient 580:14 integrate 462:5 integrated 455:12 integrating 535:23 intended 401:16 405:1 485:11 606:4 intensive 565:14 intent 402:8 587:17 599:14 intention 405:5 intents 456:21 interaction 534:1 609:21 interchangeably 502:3 interest 434:2 449:12 454:18 521:6 651:14 interested 390:16 462:14 604:19 623:25 639:18 644:13,24 interesting 483:14 513:12 588:16 614:9 interests 433:18 449:13 465:2 509:18 640:8 international 480:20 interpret 541:15 549:21 interpretation 564:18 interpreted 620:10 interrupt 397:18 636:4 Interruption 402:24 531:16 535:18 556:10 607:11 618:3 intersect 430:17 intervals 443:8 interviews 506:13 intrinsic 579:5 introduced 554:21 introductions 390:1 intrusion 564:23 invented 523:24 invertebrate 597:19.21 invertebrates 597:18 investigation 523:18 551:14 571:16 investigations 522:4 Investigators 512:24

investing 490:21 investment 425:11 invitation 503:18 involve 421:22 539:9 involved 419:18 420:20 485:6 497:25 513:2 636:1 involvement 430:9 in-depth 628:8 ironic 480:15 irregular 507:8 irreversibly 429:5 irrigate 441:24 irrigated 386:14 391:16 392:7 441:19 495:3.7 495:8 498:23,25 499:1 499:6,7,9,14,18,21 505:3 550:1 564:16 565:7,14 566:1 605:5 612:4 irrigates 391:17 irrigation 395:21,23,25 416:10 435:1.5 460:9 461:4 469:6 471:10 477:12 489:1.6 490:5 490:8,10,12,17,22 491:10 494:17 525:6 525:25 527:24 528:20 547:3,4 550:18 565:22 567:3,6,8,10 569:20 569:21 570:4 571:4,21 572:2,15 578:8 581:2 584:15 585:9,10 588:23 599:24 619:10 irrigators 491:6 Isakson 387:18 405:16 405:16 406:3 466:17 471:19.20.21 473:23 474:1,12,15,18,25 475:5,10,13,16 isotope 565:10 issue 402:2 422:8 431:4 451:21 455:17 456:13 463:25 465:18 466:6 484:12 488:15,21 502:12 509:16 512:2 513:17 514:22 516:5 524:7,23 530:25 534:13 550:17,20 551:2 553:5 558:12 562:20 569:17 584:23 594:13 602:20 606:3 606:19 610:25 612:2 612:16 622:19.21 625:8,9 626:10 629:18 629:19 636:16,21,24 647:11 648:4 issued 521:1 issues 395:1 411:12 421:23 438:11 454:1 462:6,24 468:5 469:10 472:13 475:24 480:5,6 480:12 482:21 483:10 496:7 511:5 530:15 547:6 551:8 555:16,22 556:4 557:12 558:9,11 558:19 559:6 561:21 575:20,21 577:1 583:12 607:19.24

527:8 528:9 529:1

530:17 536:7 537:23

550:1,6 610:18

612:15 615:2 621:11 621:14 626:7 632:22 issuing 617:15 618:5 item 389:9 392:1,3,11 407:3 454:5 516:22 563:15 items 394:18 412:15 433:25 517:2 519:4 586:14 648:10 650:6 I-S-A-K-S-O-N 405:17 471:21

Jack 441:18 January 396:7 406:13 429:11,19 537:8,9 561:12 631:10 639:15 645:14 Japanese 415:24,25 Jardins 387:22 426:18 427:16,18,18 429:14 429:20,23,25 Jeff 389:5 566:6 638:4 JEFFREY 387:5 Jeffries 387:7 389:22,25 391:9 432:22 434:17 434:18,23 435:11,14 455:4 456:8 12 457:8 457:22 458:10,13,19 482:19 485:3 498:17 503:10.11.14 515:5.12 524:19,22 526:24 527:6,14,18,20,22 530:3,6 542:17,19 543:16 544:1,9,14,22 545:6,22 546:6 547:15 548:11 549:15,19 551:11 552:2.22.24 554:9 559:2 611:9 626:13,15 628:25 635:13.15.20.23.25 636:4,8 637:9 638:13 647:2,10,12,25 648:15 648:17 649:7,9,13 jeopardize 411:6 Jessica 387:8 390:9,10 Jill 388:12 554:25 559:5 559:7 561:7 563:15 **Jim** 422:23 423:25,25 job 410:5 434:7 463:24 465:14 486:9 531:25 549:18 617:7 626:19 628:11,12 jobs 509:25 550:3 627:24 Jody 432:9 435:16 440:10 Joe 387:23 427:17 432:8 432:10 Joel 524:11 join 478:6 584:12 joining 554:24

joint 627:11

Jov 387:24 435:16

judgment 603:18

437:12,13 439:15

Juan 482:14,20,21,24

483:7,10,13 550:14

July 411:10 474:13 631:3,4 638:23 641:14 642:10,15,20 646:13 648:22,23 649:2,10 June 639:24 649:9 jurisdiction 412:22 432:13 462:19 463:12 466:7 473:3 jurisdictional 449:14 450:2 455:15 jurisdictions 411:7 just 391:8 392:1,8,9,23 393:4 394:7 395:17,23 395:25 396:4,21 397:17.18.20 398:7 399:1,10 400:5,21,22 400:25 402:1 403:15 405:5,19 406:1 407:5 407:6 408:25 409:1,18 414:24 415:12 417:11 419:2 420:9 424:16 428:17 431:23 432:3 432:21 433:1.24 436:21 438:14 439:17 440:2 446:4 453:18 454:4 459:14 462:4 464:14 466:3,4 469:23 470:10,19 471:16,24 472:14 477:9 480:18 480:25 481:19,22 483:5 485:14 487:25 491:17 497:23 498:16 501:5 503:15 508:4 510:16 511:8,14 512:1 512:23 514:4,15 515:1 515:13 519:14 520:16 525:12 526:2 528:4 529:17,18 530:6 531:4 535:15,21,25 537:5,15 537:15 538:5 539:4 542:13 548:12,16,17 548:25 549:13,19 551:16 552:2 553:3 555:11 557:24 558:10 558:11,13 559:9,11,18 561:11 562:11.21 563:2,4,14 564:7 570:6 572:9,10 574:13 575:17 576:2 583:11 584:23 587:23 588:17 589:13 590:18.19 592:16,18,20 593:2,5 595:18,20 598:22 599:12 600:18 601:10 602:18,20 604:7 607:2 609:25 610:9 613:13 613:21 615:1,22,25 617:2 618:25,25 620:1 620:17 625:15.24 632:6,8,13 634:11 636:8 639:2 640:20,22 641:4 642:23 643:11 643:12,13 644:4,12 645:4 646:20 647:18

K Karen 388:14 408:3 449:7 597:1,2 598:1 Kathy 474:7 Kay 388:6 494:7 496:3,4 Keeling 387:13 388:13 554:23 563:25 564:1,1 567:16 568:12,17 569:10,12 571:12,23 571:25 572:11 575:15 576:18 keep 391:21 567:22 588:18 609:7,7 623:10 Keith 388:8 505:14 512:8,10,12 Kemp 388:5 475:17,19 475:20 Kerry 475:17 477:17 478:1 479:20 Kevin 424:3,3 key 446:25 449:11 492:4 532:7.25 542:12 555:15 642:9 Khan 471:19 475:21 kicked 396:12 kicks 413:14 **killing** 429:1 kind 393:5,24 395:7 399:1 403:15 405:4 416:20 428:17 439:6 460:2 461:9 485:10 490:13 492:12.13 497:6 510:17 514:24 516:25 526:20 529:15 530:16 539:9 540:2 541:23 546:23 550:21 572:3,10,22 574:4,11 574:20 611:11 614:11 615:16 616:3 622:25 624:3,20 628:21 632:17 633:3 634:10 635:21 637:19,20 644:12 649:17 kinds 416:11 490:13 576:2 618:18 Kirk 388:9 512:8,10 517:10,12 knew 401:13 know 396:24 400:25 403:11,15,20,23 404:2 404:14,23,25 405:5 407:2,6 413:13 416:15 419:21 421:10,13 422:4 438:15,22 447:7 449:12 453:6,9 459:25 460:12,16 461:12 463:14,24 464:7,8 465:22,24 466:20 468:15 474:4,15,20 475:8 482:14 485:14 488:18 493:17 498:1 501:12 502:9 508:14 510:22 511:22 513:19 515:18 518:20 522:25 523:23 526:3,3,20,21 526:25 528:14,20 529:11,11,23 538:3,10

540:1 542:23 543:16

543:25 544:1,19 545:4 545:4,5,6,7,20,24 546:2,14 547:8 548:1 548:23 549:1 550:5,17 551:1,2,19 552:25 553:2,5 560:1 561:8 562:20,22,24 563:4,5 566:23 567:11 568:2 572:1,17 573:23 574:1 574:2,2,4,4,6,13 575:9 582:24 584:9 603:6,19 613:23 614:4.14 615:23 616:3,4,23 620:3,9 621:10,18 622:3,10,15,18,24 623:4,12 624:6 625:24 628:11 629:1,3,18 630:1,4,6,23 631:21 631:23 632:19,22 637:4,12 638:2,4,9 640:4,10,24 641:2 644:6 647:22 648:25 knowing 404:24 486:2 491:13 knowledge 533:7 598:10 knowledgeable 435:21 **known** 468:6 594:19 604:22 knows 446:21 458:6 466:4 502:22 Kris 499:24 500:1 K-E-E-L-I-N-G 564:1 **K-E-M-P** 475:20 **K-R-I-S** 500:1

La 477:25 478:8,12,18 lab 445:19 578:8 label 449:18 labelled 469:16 labels 449:17,18 labor 430:13,23 449:21 Laboratory 512:19 lack 408:21 447:10 450:8 519:1 535:8 536:14 545:2 lacking 454:19 626:20 lacks 446:25 Ladasyn 565:16,18 ladened 612:12 lag 430:9 431:3 lake 427:24,25 428:4,20 428:21,25 land 409:12 410:6 418:7 419:6,9,10 439:25 441:16 456:20 476:16 476:19 480:21 513:1 517:1 520:16 521:12 531:3 550:2,13 552:3 565:10,14 572:18 627:24 **Landing** 515:15 landowner 520:19 landowners 419:16.18 472:1 520:12,22 521:6 622:11 lands 386:14 392:7

395:20,20 549:24

landscape 487:25 495:14 language 412:7 501:21 502:2,7 531:21 549:17 large 520:16 603:8 612:12 larger 470:4 591:2 Larry 494:7 499:24 laser 476:11 last 392:13,22 393:6,8 393:16.21 394:21 397:2 418:25 419:14 422:10 424:25 427:1 433:20 442:10 449:10 468:16 474:11 477:22 478:24 481:22 508:1 516:5 532:22 551:15 552:8 568:25 573:18 577:2 585:12 607:9 608:23 613:13 627:15 629:17 647:7 lastly 416:23 438:20 570:23 lasts 480:10 late 428:14 462:18 511:7 515:16,17 629:21 later 392:18 411:13 434:13 446:4 448:17 470:8,9 472:12 520:14 632:22 latest 500:4 501:17 laundromats 478:20 law 406:23,25 418:21 465:16 472:9 475:21 561:13.15 615:7 616:10,16 618:5,21 634:11 640:15 647:19 lawns 495:13 laws 416:9 472:5 514:6,7 lawver 631:6 layer 473:14 577:15 layers 489:4 laymen's 549:17 leaching 547:4 578:15 578:23 579:7 580:7 581:21 lead 387:9 422:5 626:5 leading 413:21 555:7 leads 426:14 leaf 425:3 leafy 458:3 476:21 507:23 553:25 560:16 561.9 learn 417:5 573:5 605:22 learned 464:14 537:8 596:7 609:25 621:3 learning 609:13 621:10 learns 605:24 least 390:25 436:6,8 452:10 470:21 479:5 482:4 485:2.23 487:5 544:5 572:8 581:1,19 620:15 leave 414:6 440:16,17 471:5 489:12 527:23 646:20

556:19

justify 603:15

649:19 650:12

justice 430:14 493:8

J-A-R-D-I-N-S 427:19

leaves 445:9 528:12,13

563:2 625:21

525:3 590:8

listed 432:13 437:21

439:23 487:25 488:3

leaving 414:14 528:19	
left 389:22 390:4,6,14	leaving 414:14 528:19
399:16 405:20 419:8 529:13 legacy 427:25 566:3 571:11 608:4 621:11 622:8 legal 457:6 472:13 518:7 521:9 605:10 640:11 640:14 646:10 legally 415:2 642:16 643:15 legislation 426:23 476:25 553:19 legislative 472:16 legislative 472:16 legislature 465:15 legislature 465:15 legislative 539:10 length 518:12 less 421:3 425:23 490:14,14 501:4 588:2 588:8 591:6 594:13 lesser 591:15 lessons 573:5 let 396:24 409:2 410:16 415:6 417:20 462:4 473:11 480:18 488:19 566:10 568:8 598:1 601:8 615:22 644:4,6 647:21 letter 467:4,11 478:2 502:20 511:18 543:21 letterhead 403:8,25 letters 403:12,14,14,16 406:6,10,20 429:7,10 409:18,19,22,24,25 432:16 500:7 622:3 letting 403:15 lettuce 409:23,24 410:2 444:5 470:8 583:6 589:5,6,7,77 let's 390:18 503:21 523:10 541:23 589:16 600:17 614:8 624:8 631:22 level 406:18 412:11 414:18 427:25 445:9 481:23 485:12 521:2 522:21 553:18 557:7 572:3 575:18,19 576:10,10 580:16 602:1,7 603:24 612:9 617:16,20 619:20 621:15 625:5,6 633:17 633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	528:21,22
legacy 427:25 566:3	
571:11 608:4 621:11 622:8 legal 457:6 472:13 518:7 521:9 605:10 640:11 640:14 646:10 legally 415:2 642:16 643:15 legislation 426:23	529:13
legal 457:6 472:13 518:7 521:9 605:10 640:11 640:14 646:10 legally 415:2 642:16 643:15 legislation 426:23 476:25 553:19 legislative 472:16 legislature 465:15 lessons 573:5 let 396:24 409:2 410:16 415:6 417:20 462:4 473:11 480:18 488:19 566:10 568:8 598:1 601:8 615:22 644:4,6 647:21 letter 467:4,11 478:2 502:20 511:18 543:21 letterhead 403:8,25 letters 403:12,14,14,16 406:6,10,20 429:7,10 429:18,19,22,24,25 432:16 500:7 622:3 letting 403:15 lettuce 409:23,24 410:2 444:5 470:8 583:6 589:5,6,7,17 let's 390:18 503:21 523:10 541:23 589:16 600:17 614:8 624:8 631:22 level 406:18 412:11 414:18 427:25 445:9 481:23 485:12 521:2 522:21 553:18 557:7 572:3 575:18,19 576:10,10 580:16 602:1,7 603:24 612:9 617:16,20 619:20 621:15 625:5,6 633:17 633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 level 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	
521:9 605:10 640:11 640:14 646:10 legally 415:2 642:16 643:15 legislation 426:23 476:25 553:19 legislative 472:16 legislators 447:16 legislature 465:15 legislature 465:15 legitimate 639:10 length 518:12 less 421:3 425:23 490:14,14 501:4 588:2 588:8 591:6 594:13 lesser 591:15 lessons 573:5 let 396:24 409:2 410:16 415:6 417:20 462:4 473:11 480:18 488:19 566:10 568:8 598:1 601:8 615:22 644:4,6 647:21 letter 467:4,11 478:2 502:20 511:18 543:21 letterhead 403:8,25 letters 403:12,14,14,16 406:6,10,20 429:7,10 429:18,19,22,24,25 432:16 500:7 622:3 letting 403:15 lettuce 409:23,24 410:2 444:5 470:8 583:6 589:5,6,7,17 let's 390:18 503:21 523:10 541:23 589:16 600:17 614:8 624:8 631:22 level 406:18 412:11 414:18 427:25 445:9 481:23 485:12 521:2 522:21 553:18 557:7 572:3 575:18,19 576:10,10 580:16 602:1,7 603:24 612:9 617:16,20 619:20 621:15 625:5,6 633:17 633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	
640:14 646:10 legally 415:2 642:16 643:15 legislation 426:23 476:25 553:19 legislative 472:16 legislators 447:16 legislature 465:15 legitimate 639:10 length 518:12 less 421:3 425:23 490:14,14 501:4 588:2 588:8 591:6 594:13 lesser 591:15 lessons 573:5 let 396:24 409:2 410:16 415:6 417:20 462:4 473:11 480:18 488:19 566:10 568:8 598:1 601:8 615:22 644:4,6 647:21 letter 467:4,11 478:2 502:20 511:18 543:21 letterhead 403:8,25 letters 403:12,14,14,16 406:6,10,20 429:7,10 429:18,19,22,24,25 432:16 500:7 622:3 letting 403:15 lettuce 409:23,24 410:2 444:5 470:8 583:6 589:5,6,7,77 let's 390:18 503:21 523:10 541:23 589:16 600:17 614:8 624:8 631:22 level 406:18 412:11 414:18 427:25 445:9 481:23 485:12 521:2 522:21 553:18 557:7 572:3 575:18,19 576:10,10 580:16 602:1,7 603:24 612:9 617:16,20 619:20 621:15 625:5,6 633:17 633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	_
legally 415:2 642:16 643:15 legislation 426:23 476:25 553:19 legislative 472:16 legislators 447:16 legislature 465:15 legitimate 639:10 length 518:12 less 421:3 425:23 490:14,14 501:4 588:2 58:8 591:6 594:13 lesser 591:15 lessons 573:5 let 396:24 409:2 410:16 415:6 417:20 462:4 473:11 480:18 488:19 566:10 568:8 598:1 601:8 615:22 644:4,6 647:21 letter 467:4,11 478:2 502:20 511:18 543:21 letterhead 403:8,25 letters 403:12,14,14,16 406:6,10,20 429:7,10 429:18,19,22,24,25 432:16 500:7 622:3 letting 403:15 lettuce 409:23,24 410:2 444:5 470:8 583:6 589:5,6,7,17 let's 390:18 503:21 523:10 541:23 589:16 600:17 614:8 624:8 631:22 level 406:18 412:11 414:18 427:25 445:9 481:23 485:12 521:2 522:21 553:18 557:7 572:3 575:18,19 576:10,10 580:16 602:1,7 603:24 612:9 617:16,20 619:20 621:15 625:5,6 633:17 633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	
legislation 426:23	
476:25 553:19 legislative 472:16 legislators 447:16 legislature 465:15 legitimate 639:10 length 518:12 less 421:3 425:23	
legislative 472:16 legislators 447:16 legislature 465:15 legitimate 639:10 length 518:12 less 421:3 425:23	
legislature 465:15 legitimate 639:10 length 518:12 less 421:3 425:23	legislative 472:16
legitimate 639:10 length 518:12 less 421:3 425:23	
less 421:3 425:23	_
490:14,14 501:4 588:2 588:8 591:6 594:13 lesser 591:15 lessons 573:5 let 396:24 409:2 410:16 415:6 417:20 462:4 473:11 480:18 488:19 566:10 568:8 598:1 601:8 615:22 644:4,6 647:21 letter 467:4,11 478:2 502:20 511:18 543:21 letterhead 403:8,25 letters 403:12,14,14,16 406:6,10,20 429:7,10 429:18,19,22,24,25 432:16 500:7 622:3 letting 403:15 lettuce 409:23,24 410:2 444:5 470:8 583:6 589:5,6,7,17 let's 390:18 503:21 523:10 541:23 589:16 600:17 614:8 624:8 631:22 level 406:18 412:11 414:18 427:25 445:9 481:23 485:12 521:2 522:21 553:18 557:7 572:3 575:18,19 576:10,10 580:16 602:1,7 603:24 612:9 617:16,20 619:20 621:15 625:5,6 633:17 633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	
588:8 591:6 594:13 lesser 591:15 lessons 573:5 let 396:24 409:2 410:16 415:6 417:20 462:4 473:11 480:18 488:19 566:10 568:8 598:1 601:8 615:22 644:4,6 647:21 letter 467:4,11 478:2 502:20 511:18 543:21 letterhead 403:8,25 letters 403:12,14,14,16 406:6,10,20 429:7,10 429:18,19,22,24,25 432:16 500:7 622:3 letting 403:15 lettuce 409:23,24 410:2 444:5 470:8 583:6 589:5,6,7,17 let's 390:18 503:21 523:10 541:23 589:16 600:17 614:8 624:8 631:22 level 406:18 412:11 414:18 427:25 445:9 481:23 485:12 521:2 522:21 553:18 557:7 572:3 575:18,19 576:10,10 580:16 602:1,7 603:24 612:9 617:16,20 619:20 621:15 625:5,6 633:17 633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	
lessons 573:5 let 396:24 409:2 410:16 415:6 417:20 462:4 473:11 480:18 488:19 566:10 568:8 598:1 601:8 615:22 644:4,6 647:21 letter 467:4,11 478:2 502:20 511:18 543:21 letterhead 403:8,25 letters 403:12,14,14,16 406:6,10,20 429:7,10 429:18,19,22,24,25 432:16 500:7 622:3 letting 403:15 lettuce 409:23,24 410:2 444:5 470:8 583:6 589:5,67,77 let's 390:18 503:21 523:10 541:23 589:16 600:17 614:8 624:8 631:22 level 406:18 412:11 414:18 427:25 445:9 481:23 485:12 521:2 522:21 553:18 557:7 572:3 575:18,19 576:10,10 580:16 602:1,7 603:24 612:9 617:16,20 619:20 621:15 625:5,6 633:17 633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	
let 396:24 409:2 410:16 415:6 417:20 462:4 473:11 480:18 488:19 566:10 568:8 598:1 601:8 615:22 644:4,6 647:21 letter 467:4,11 478:2 502:20 511:18 543:21 letterhead 403:8,25 letters 403:12,14,14,16 406:6,10,20 429:7,10 429:18,19,22,24,25 432:16 500:7 622:3 letting 403:15 lettuce 409:23,24 410:2 444:5 470:8 583:6 589:5,6,7,17 let's 390:18 503:21 523:10 541:23 589:16 600:17 614:8 624:8 631:22 level 406:18 412:11 414:18 427:25 445:9 481:23 485:12 521:2 522:21 553:18 557:7 572:3 575:18,19 576:10,10 580:16 602:1,7 603:24 612:9 617:16,20 619:20 621:15 625:5,6 633:17 633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	
415:6 417:20 462:4 473:11 480:18 488:19 566:10 568:8 598:1 601:8 615:22 644:4,6 647:21 letter 467:4,11 478:2 502:20 511:18 543:21 letterhead 403:8,25 letters 403:12,14,14,16 406:6,10,20 429:7,10 429:18,19,22,24,25 432:16 500:7 622:3 letting 403:15 lettuce 409:23,24 410:2 444:5 470:8 583:6 589:5,6,7,17 let's 390:18 503:21 523:10 541:23 589:16 600:17 614:8 624:8 631:22 level 406:18 412:11 414:18 427:25 445:9 481:23 485:12 521:2 522:21 553:18 557:7 572:3 575:18,19 576:10,10 580:16 602:1,7 603:24 612:9 617:16,20 619:20 621:15 625:5,6 633:17 633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	
566:10 568:8 598:1 601:8 615:22 644:4,6 647:21 letter 467:4,11 478:2 502:20 511:18 543:21 letterhead 403:8,25 letters 403:12,14,14,16 406:6,10,20 429:7,10 429:18,19,22,24,25 432:16 500:7 622:3 letting 403:15 lettuce 409:23,24 410:2 444:5 470:8 583:6 589:5,6,7,17 let's 390:18 503:21 523:10 541:23 589:16 600:17 614:8 624:8 631:22 level 406:18 412:11 414:18 427:25 445:9 481:23 485:12 521:2 522:21 553:18 557:7 572:3 575:18,19 576:10,10 580:16 602:1,7 603:24 612:9 617:16,20 619:20 621:15 625:5,6 633:17 633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	415:6 417:20 462:4
601:8 615:22 644:4,6 647:21 letter 467:4,11 478:2 502:20 511:18 543:21 letterhead 403:8,25 letters 403:12,14,14,16 406:6,10,20 429:7,10 429:18,19,22,24,25 432:16 500:7 622:3 letting 403:15 lettuce 409:23,24 410:2 444:5 470:8 583:6 589:5,6,7,17 let's 390:18 503:21 523:10 541:23 589:16 600:17 614:8 624:8 631:22 level 406:18 412:11 414:18 427:25 445:9 481:23 485:12 521:2 522:21 553:18 557:7 572:3 575:18,19 576:10,10 580:16 602:1,7 603:24 612:9 617:16,20 619:20 621:15 625:5,6 633:17 633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	
647:21 letter 467:4,11 478:2 502:20 511:18 543:21 letterhead 403:8,25 letters 403:12,14,14,16 406:6,10,20 429:7,10 429:18,19,22,24,25 432:16 500:7 622:3 letting 403:15 lettuce 409:23,24 410:2 444:5 470:8 583:6 589:5,6,7,17 let's 390:18 503:21 523:10 541:23 589:16 600:17 614:8 624:8 631:22 level 406:18 412:11 414:18 427:25 445:9 481:23 485:12 521:2 522:21 553:18 557:7 572:3 575:18,19 576:10,10 580:16 602:1,7 603:24 612:9 617:16,20 619:20 621:15 625:5,6 633:17 633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	
502:20 511:18 543:21 letterhead 403:8,25 letters 403:12,14,14,16 406:6,10,20 429:7,10 429:18,19,22,24,25 432:16 500:7 622:3 letting 403:15 lettuce 409:23,24 410:2 444:5 470:8 583:6 589:5,6,7,17 let's 390:18 503:21 523:10 541:23 589:16 600:17 614:8 624:8 631:22 level 406:18 412:11 414:18 427:25 445:9 481:23 485:12 521:2 522:21 553:18 557:7 572:3 575:18,19 576:10,10 580:16 602:1,7 603:24 612:9 617:16,20 619:20 621:15 625:5,6 633:17 633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	_
letterhead 403:8,25 letters 403:12,14,14,16	
406:6,10,20 429:7,10 429:18,19,22,24,25 432:16 500:7 622:3 letting 403:15 lettuce 409:23,24 410:2 444:5 470:8 583:6 589:5,6,7,17 let's 390:18 503:21 523:10 541:23 589:16 600:17 614:8 624:8 631:22 level 406:18 412:11 414:18 427:25 445:9 481:23 485:12 521:2 522:21 553:18 557:7 572:3 575:18,19 576:10,10 580:16 602:1,7 603:24 612:9 617:16,20 619:20 621:15 625:5,6 633:17 633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	
429:18,19,22,24,25 432:16 500:7 622:3 letting 403:15 lettuce 409:23,24 410:2 444:5 470:8 583:6 589:5,6,7,17 let's 390:18 503:21 523:10 541:23 589:16 600:17 614:8 624:8 631:22 level 406:18 412:11 414:18 427:25 445:9 481:23 485:12 521:2 522:21 553:18 557:7 572:3 575:18,19 576:10,10 580:16 602:1,7 603:24 612:9 617:16,20 619:20 621:15 625:5,6 633:17 633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	
432:16 500:7 622:3 letting 403:15 lettuce 409:23,24 410:2 444:5 470:8 583:6 589:5,6,7,17 let's 390:18 503:21 523:10 541:23 589:16 600:17 614:8 624:8 631:22 level 406:18 412:11 414:18 427:25 445:9 481:23 485:12 521:2 522:21 553:18 557:7 572:3 575:18,19 576:10,10 580:16 602:1,7 603:24 612:9 617:16,20 619:20 621:15 625:5,6 633:17 633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	
lettuce 409:23,24 410:2 444:5 470:8 583:6 589:5,6,7,17 let's 390:18 503:21 523:10 541:23 589:16 600:17 614:8 624:8 631:22 level 406:18 412:11 414:18 427:25 445:9 481:23 485:12 521:2 522:21 553:18 557:7 572:3 575:18,19 576:10,10 580:16 602:1,7 603:24 612:9 617:16,20 619:20 621:15 625:5,6 633:17 633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	432:16 500:7 622:3
444:5 470:8 583:6 589:5,6,7,17 let's 390:18 503:21 523:10 541:23 589:16 600:17 614:8 624:8 631:22 level 406:18 412:11 414:18 427:25 445:9 481:23 485:12 521:2 522:21 553:18 557:7 572:3 575:18,19 576:10,10 580:16 602:1,7 603:24 612:9 617:16,20 619:20 621:15 625:5,6 633:17 633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	
589:5,6,7,17 let's 390:18 503:21 523:10 541:23 589:16 600:17 614:8 624:8 631:22 level 406:18 412:11 414:18 427:25 445:9 481:23 485:12 521:2 522:21 553:18 557:7 572:3 575:18,19 576:10,10 580:16 602:1,7 603:24 612:9 617:16,20 619:20 621:15 625:5,6 633:17 633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	
523:10 541:23 589:16 600:17 614:8 624:8 631:22 level 406:18 412:11 414:18 427:25 445:9 481:23 485:12 521:2 522:21 553:18 557:7 572:3 575:18,19 576:10,10 580:16 602:1,7 603:24 612:9 617:16,20 619:20 621:15 625:5,6 633:17 633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	589:5,6,7,17
600:17 614:8 624:8 631:22 level 406:18 412:11 414:18 427:25 445:9 481:23 485:12 521:2 522:21 553:18 557:7 572:3 575:18,19 576:10,10 580:16 602:1,7 603:24 612:9 617:16,20 619:20 621:15 625:5,6 633:17 633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	
level 406:18 412:11 414:18 427:25 445:9 481:23 485:12 521:2 522:21 553:18 557:7 572:3 575:18,19 576:10,10 580:16 602:1,7 603:24 612:9 617:16,20 619:20 621:15 625:5,6 633:17 633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	
414:18 427:25 445:9 481:23 485:12 521:2 522:21 553:18 557:7 572:3 575:18,19 576:10,10 580:16 602:1,7 603:24 612:9 617:16,20 619:20 621:15 625:5,6 633:17 633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	
481:23 485:12 521:2 522:21 553:18 557:7 572:3 575:18,19 576:10,10 580:16 602:1,7 603:24 612:9 617:16,20 619:20 621:15 625:5,6 633:17 633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	
572:3 575:18,19 576:10,10 580:16 602:1,7 603:24 612:9 617:16,20 619:20 621:15 625:5,6 633:17 633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	
576:10,10 580:16 602:1,7 603:24 612:9 617:16,20 619:20 621:15 625:5,6 633:17 633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	
617:16,20 619:20 621:15 625:5,6 633:17 633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	576:10,10 580:16
621:15 625:5,6 633:17 633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	
633:22,22 637:12,14 637:24 638:2 leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	
leveling 476:10,11 levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	633:22,22 637:12,14
levels 416:11 419:15 428:20 477:7 510:3 520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	
520:25 579:21 612:7 leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	
leverage 451:25 levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	428:20 477:7 510:3
levies 476:6 levy 476:7 488:2,3 560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	
560:15 592:8 LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	
LGMA 502:24 559:11,14 559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	
559:18 561:7 liability 518:8	
	559:18 561:7
1141 30 11 330.12	
•	11 011 030.12

libraries 478:21 license 449:20 lies 450:3 574:14 life 460:1 523:3,9 561:14 light 396:13 397:9,14 410:22 482:23 507:22 liahten 633:18 lights 397:6 like 391:8 399:9 403:6,7 403:9.11 404:25 405:4 405:19 406:9 413:6,9 414:24 417:2 422:3 432:21 440:20 446:3 448:12 459:14 461:9 470:1 481:23 482:3,19 482:20 488:25 489:19 490:19 495:5 496:17 496:20 500:19 502:8 502:21 505:19 509:5 511:10 524:25 526:10 526:15 532:13 533:4 535:2 538:5 540:2 542:6 552:1,4 553:3 554:12 557:23 562:9 565:5 568:1,15 574:23 579:6 581:12,24 582:19,25 583:2 593:5 595:20 599:1 601:20 605:1 608:24 610:9 611:11 614:2,3,22 619:21,24 623:4 629:16,17 630:2 631:20 635:3,5 636:19 637:13 641:17 644:14 646:5 648:23 650:4 likelihood 567:10 likely 479:6 504:20 520:15 521:8 596:10 605:24 641:22 limit 402:16 410:6 479:1 550:9 628:22 limitation 577:18 limited 473:1 533:11 610:16 618:7,11 620:21 622:15 641:25 647:5 650:6 line 553:9 558:14 562:7 574:1 620:18 lined 424:20 444:21 558:17 632:6 lines 585:10 603:21 lining 558:13 link 488:15 492:13 linkage 481:25 482:6 485:14,16,17 linked 598:11 linking 486:20 489:25 liquid 434:19 435:12 464:6 579:7 **Lisa** 387:11 388:13 554:23 563:17 583:10 642.5 list 396:21 402:9 408:1 411:18 432:25 433:8 442:16 443:10 466:20 468:21 490:24 494:25 496:20 497:5,7 498:11 498:21 499:5,19 501:9 504:16,22 524:17

494:10,11 495:2 496:22 listen 391:1 562:20 629:25 listened 433:23 531:19 629:10 listening 407:5 408:18 425:15 492:7 537:7 583:14 listing 442:18 literature 604:16 605:3,4 litigation 402:17 423:14 little 392:8,19 393:4,13 395:11 410:10 417:4 419:8 421:18 480:18 483:11 488:14,19 526:5 540:18 554:25 557:4 563:9,10 592:3 596:1 605:1 619:1,15 626:9 628:3 635:22 636:15 638:5 641:4 live 423:1 441:11 443:24 479:8,19 494:3,10 619:17 lived 549:25 livelihood 446:19 Livermore 512:18 living 478:11 Lloyd 472:10 load 513:7,18 525:13,13 525:14,24 loaded 512:20 loading 512:25 556:14 564:10,15 565:8,17,20 565:25 566:2 567:7.7 567:12 570:6 573:16 581:4 584:3 585:19 587:8 589:20,21 590:7 590:11,13,14,23 591:3 598:20 601:15 603:9 loads 428:22 513:3,4 Lobel 475:18 477:17 478:1 479:20 local 409:23 412:19,22 446:14 467:7 473:11 473:12 495:10 534:2.4 located 415:23 507:2 location 490:13 494:19 538:7 567:22 568:19 568:20 620:3,7 locations 608:5 620:12 logistics 397:20 Lomamal 478:13,18 Lompoc 415:17 LON 434:22,24 long 407:21 410:9,14,14 432:25 434:8 459:14 484:11,24 489:20 509:21.21 516:1 530:20 549:8 555:4,12 555:12 608:13 613:8 621:7 626:7,20 632:8 636:21,23 642:11 644:17 645:5 649:3 longer 518:9 548:8 606:24 639:20

438:6 439:8 464:2,3,6 473:16 489:14 490:7 502:4 511:2 527:3 528:25 540:1,3 544:3 550:7 551:9,23 552:18 553:15 566:10 567:2 567:25 571:10.14 572:1,11 573:8,13 579:13 589:20 590:3 591:18 596:3 598:19 601:24 602:16 603:5 603:12 616:15 620:16 624:12,23 625:13,15 627:13 630:3 633:20 634:21,22 636:16 637:10 640:14,19 645:9 649:1 looked 413:20 430:16,25 436:6 438:10 497:6 506:17 510:23 526:6 527:4,6,8 546:10 563:10 602:17 looking 393:22 409:23 431:13 438:3,5,21 439:4,9 440:5 456:19 465:25 469:15 500:18 500:20 502:10 526:23 529:10 546:22 550:25 551:4 560:23 571:20 572:24 573:16,18 574:2 590:25 591:10 591:11 601:10,11 611:1 624:5 628:18 637:10 638:7,10 looks 433:11 561:23 568:14 648:23 loop 639:5 Los 388:6 423:2 475:18 479:23,23 480:1,3 482:6,22 485:15 487:19,21 488:18 490:20 491:24 492:6 492:10,17,21 533:5 564:23 lose 635:22 losing 574:19 loss 418:7 476:18 507:7 521:12 550:3,3 losses 469:23 lost 507:6,10,15 562:10 lot 416:22 430:1 433:25 434:1 435:6 438:18 443:12 451:2 465:19 469:9 470:15 471:4 480:19 481:10 483:21 485:6.24 486:9 488:18 489:5 496:9 501:6 502:12 512:5 516:16 522:16,16 523:15 526:4,21 529:23 530:8 530:21 531:2,2 537:8 541:23 553:22 560:22 567:4 572:24 607:17 608:14,17 610:5 613:9 619:6 621:3,10,13 627:9 628:2 629:7,9

longest 397:16

look 409:18 431:18,20

432:3 433:24 437:22

639:11 640:22 647:13 lots 592:19 loud 531:12 Louie 447:17 love 409:12 low 405:8 513:9 557:10 578:14,15 579:11,15 580:13 581:10,11,17 581:17 600:7 Lowell 388:4 468:23 469:1 lower 415:23 444:4 517:5 575:6 602:10 603:16 lowest 409:6 Luis 386:3 389:1,8 404:12 418:1 437:15 441:14 469:4 478:7 500:10 520:11 635:17 636:3 646:25 651:4 lumped 455:12 lunch 397:23 466:14 527:25 lutes 428:24 L-O-S 480:1 **1985** 513:4,4

М

M 387:7 machine 436:22 574:25 machines 436:15,17,22 made 399:3,19 400:21 406:14 409:13 416:5 436:20 437:5 447:5,20 456:11 464:10 474:14 485:21 495:8 512:20 529:16 531:20 548:7 548:23 557:1 558:22 566:6 570:15 572:6 575:4 579:3,3 580:22 584:5 603:18 605:8,9 605:11 607:3 618:16 626:24 638:20,20 639:3 640:1,1,8,12 644:21 647:12,13 magnitude 510:9 590:25 591:3 600:12 622:17 622:19 main 446:14 506:19 513:19 547:5,9 mainly 579:21 580:15 maintain 509:25 maintaining 427:22 602:12 maintains 545:16 major 416:12 418:18.19 556:7 majority 410:2 578:17 591:14 600:4,5,14 605:3 617:13 622:23 make 396:14 400:2,3,4 401:19 403:7 404:21 404:22 408:1 411:14 415:12 423:4.8 431:15 432:2 434:12,20,24 435:19,23 448:18 466:3 470:10 471:6 480:9 482:12 487:12

488:16 489:12 491:1 492:11,15 493:19 499:16,20 502:6 511:12 516:10,19,21 516:24 521:19 525:25 530:3 532:19 533:15 534:10 537:5 541:12 541:22 543:12 545:10 546:14 547:23,24,25 548:3,4,20 554:2 555:23 560:9,17 568:21 569:6 572:2 573:21 609:11,25 610:1,3 613:21 616:20 617:4,19 624:24 625:9 627:6 629:7 631:16 633:18 634:5 636:8
639:2,16 640:23 641:2 643:13 646:6 649:2
makes 454:20 481:9 513:15 640:23
making 390:16 406:20 422:5 433:9 449:24 453:7 465:15 491:16 491:17 529:21 548:19 562:22 575:1 596:16 609:6 613:17 615:18 634:9 644:16 645:10 mammals 467:17 man 417:11
manage 399:20 400:24
443:14 490:8 managed 501:2
management 394:6 395:21,24,25,25 442:7 442:25 452:15 453:12 460:7,9 461:1 466:5 471:17 472:3 480:7,21 481:19,21 483:25 486:19 489:1,1,5 490:10,12,16,18,22 491:4,10 494:20 497:18 525:6,7,25 527:25 529:21 540:6 547:10 548:2,4 552:18 553:2,4,8,11 566:13 571:22 572:15 573:10 573:12 577:6,18,20,22 578:2,5 581:3,19 585:18 588:23 599:24 603:24 604:1 606:8 609:20 619:10 manager 387:11 441:12 555:10 563:18 managers 490:5 manaing 530:1 578:17 mandate 459:1 493:22 494:3 mandated 461:1,2 465:12
mandates 416:9
mandating 425:8,9 mandatory 416:4 454:16
574:22 576:14 manner 444:18 511:2
578:18 645:16 647:9 manure 515:8,9,22,23 many 393:15,18 400:23 408:23 416:24 421:2

```
421:14 424:12 429:10
  430:7.7 432:16 467:20
  475:22 476:15 479:8
  490:25 495:14 497:7
  500:8 507:7,8 514:8
  517:1 546:11 548:18
  552:2 556:3 560:14.17
  565:19 571:12 577:7
  579:1,21 582:25
  595:24 606:17 608:4,7
  608:20 612:7 619:16
  633:2.12 643:2
map 568:1 614:15
Marc 388:6 475:18
  479:23 533:5
March 389:10,11,12
  392:3 398:11 401:13
  402:4,12 404:3 406:4
  413:8 433:21 457:22
  474:2,11 496:17 502:2
  505:22 531:19 532:11
  537:1 540:17 545:10
  548:16 549:3 555:18
  556:5 557:9 558:22
  564:9 577:3 578:11
  580:4 583:13 585:2
  586:23 588:21 592:8,9
  630:17 638:9.15
  649:23
Marche 478:24
Marchish 481:17
margin 437:25
margins 627:5
Maria 550:14 578:7
  579:20
marine 432:12 467:17
Marino 509:12
market 572:19
marketing 458:3 560:15
  560:16 561:9
Martin 479:24 492:24
Maryellen 482:14 483:23
  483:24
massive 410:5 428:24
  429:4
masters 420:7
Mateo 478:12,15 488:6
material 402:6 502:9
  592:23 630:7,11,21
materials 516:18
matrix 650:11
Matt 563:25 564:1
  621:16
matter 410:1 516:16
  605:18 639:19 640:8
Matthew 387:13 388:13
  554:23
maximum 514:7,7,9
  572:17 612:6.8
may 386:4 389:2,8
  400:21,22 405:3 407:8
  411:10 412:18 425:24
  436:1 439:24 444:19
  456:11,16,16 461:4,5
  461:7,11,11 465:19,20
  474:6 476:4,11,25
  479:12 488:9 500:10
  501:1,8,15 504:13
  507:13 518:13 524:20
```

```
535:7 541:9,13 547:13
  547:13 549:18 550:18
  551:18,24,25 559:25
  564:13 570:4 571:1,15
  573:23 597:10 603:14
  605:2 607:21 625:8
  634:20 637:11,11
  638:25 644:11 645:10
  646:20 648:24 651:16
maybe 397:10 398:12
  401:18 431:25 492:10
  499:15 511:7 515:23
  521:14 532:12 553:12
  597:10 614:20 629:15
  632:4,7 633:23 635:20
  636:15
mayor 549:25
Ma'am 468:14
McCANN 387:11 388:13
  554:23 555:1 563:14
  563:17 583:10,10
  598:1,8,15 620:7
  642:7,18 646:14,19
  648:4
McCarthy 479:25 493:1
  493:2,5 494:4
McCHESNEY 387:7
  390:4 398:7 404:2.6
  429:17,22 537:13
  615:1 616:6,12,15
  617:2 618:5 620:20
  624:19 630:9 631:4,8
  631:12 639:14 640:19
  641:13,21 642:1,4,16
  642:19 643:8,10,13
  644:17,20 645:1,8,13
  646:2 647:5,11,16
McDONALD 387:25
  440:16,19,23,25 441:4
  441:9,10 494:7,8,9,9
  496:1 498:9,11,15,18
mean 397:15 426:14
  433:2 450:18 460:12
  461:20 463:2 465:18
  474:16 487:9 488:24
  494.12 499.7 513.23
  526:6,22 528:23 529:1
  529:16,16 562:25
  563:2 565:23 580:22
  613:3 616:15 632:20
  633:20 635:9 636:4
  640:11 642:22 644:1
  645:12 649:2
meaning 606:25 623:23
meaningful 522:22
  587:10
means 392:15 418:9
  444:20 481:5 497:8
  525:1 542:23
meant 398:9 549:22
  635:17 638:15
measurable 448:3 499:6
  499:7.8
measure 395:7 479:11
  489:18 583:25
measured 416:10
  428:21 612:19
measurements 411:22
  443:4
```

```
measures 394:6 412:16
  457:14
measuring 518:5
mechanism 481:23
  601.4
mechanisms 481:7
  482:1 601:7
medical 478:19
Mediterranean 481:13
  481:16
meet 420:1 427:7 431:8
  449:17 453:2.3.13.17
  518:18,19 582:6 625:3
  642:9
meeting 390:13 394:21
  394:24 396:11,14,18
  396:19 398:11 400:24
  401:14 402:4,6 406:5
  406:25 407:13,16
  413:9 414:4 420:22.24
  422:10 426:8 437:23
  449:24 457:22 505:20
  506:17 525:4 529:13
  531:20 554:20 556:5
  577:2 578:12 581:8.15
  611:15,19 623:13
  624:11 632:4 636:19
  642:11,14 645:7 646:1
  646:12,23 647:22
  649:9,10 650:5,16,24
meetings 393:19 404:16
  416:22 431:12 611:9
  621:2 650:11
meets 444:8
member 390:11 421:5
  469:4 480:3 486:14
  493:2 635:5 649:6
members 391:9 392:10
  401:17,20 407:3
  415:20 416:15 420:24
  422:9 423:7 427:10
  429:8 430:21 443:20
  467:13 475:19 478:2,3
  478:22 517:11 520:8
  521:23 607:21 611:5
  613:10
memo 502:5
men 478:11
mention 398:9 459:19
  470:12 502:21 530:7
  559:9.12 584:19
mentioned 392:2 401:10
  442:9 452:9 501:22
  512:16 555:14 559:10
  575:3 593:2 635:16
mentioning 617:11
Mercer 388:6 494:7
  496:3,4,4
merely 611:24 612:1,4
merge 461:24
Merkley 388:10 531:11
  531:14,18,18
mess 410:12
message 511:1
met 394:5 436:23 447:13
  502:24
metals 517:23,24
meters 518:5,6
methemoglobin 470:14
```

method 471:14 518:2 methodology 417:12 methods 477:11,12,13 570:16 Methylidyne 504:21 metric 553:24 554:1,1 metrics 514:21 559:11 559:18 560:3 638:8 Meyer 494:7 499:24 Mibs 479:24 493:1,2,5 494:4 mic 508:24 630:14 Michael 387:11 388:15 519:23 555:23 604:6 607:7 623:16 644:23 micro 428:21 microbial 484:5 microclimate 483:15 middle 395:4 414:4 489:21 529:21 614:23 615:22 623:6,6 might 393:22 396:24 397:9 407:11 435:5.9 438:7 439:22 486:20 488:2 499:12 521:7 548:15,23 551:20 552:1 555:2 563:8 586:22 601:5 611:9 616:3 625:14 636:18 Mike 387:18 408:15,16 miles 405:12 443:13 478:17 512:21 577:11 milestones 426:12 584:7 military 530:12,23 million 458:23 483:9 484:9.10 507:25 mind 399:4 588:18 minds 584:5 Mineo 488:7 mini 511:20 minimize 467:20 581:3 610:2 minimum 416:11 522:21 574:22 576:15 minus 395:11 minute 392:2 399:9 410:22 451:22,23 457:18 464:4,9 647:7 minutes 398:12.13.15 399:11,17 405:8,13 430:8 480:10 503:22 554:24 639:20 minute-and-a-half 401:23 misapplication 481:20 misapplying 481:7 misled 523:13 miss 389:16,17 398:5 473:23 526:12.12 537:13 630:6 missed 409:18 635:20 missing 447:16 489:24 580:5 mission 472:3 478:10 mitigation 510:4 520:20 521:9 mixing 495:5 **mobilize** 416:16

mode 548:15

model 500:17 512:18,21 512:24 514:18,19
modeling 522:4
models 513:2 514:6 Modernization 561:12
modification 436:3
453:7 626:1 modifications 437:8
638:18
modify 484:20 558:4 594:9 596:13 598:21
605:25 606:6 635:1
Modifying 598:18 Monetary 411:23
money 419:19 457:12
485:24 491:2 521:9 524:8 634:3
Monica 387:6,13 388:14
398:23,24 554:21 576:20,23 620:24
monitor 475:1 484:18
488:11,13 598:5 monitored 474:19
529:14 558:16
monitoring 394:7,9,10 394:12 395:14,15,16
395:16 411:4,22 412:11,14 416:6
426:12 433:13 434:6
438:1 442:19 443:2,12 443:15 448:15,20
453:22 475:1 482:8
483:7 484:17,20,25 489:16 497:17 504:5
505:21 506:18,20
510:18 517:15,17,20 517:22,23 518:1,6,10
518:14,24 522:11,22
525:5,14 527:25 528:8 528:8,25 529:1,3,7
532:12 534:15,17 535:7,9,13,13 538:11
538:23 566:17 568:7
569:13,18 584:6,9,10 584:11,13,14,22 593:4
593:5,9,10,14,24
594:2,6 595:13 596:21 597:5,6,7,8,8,11,14,17
600:18 601:3 609:23
615:4,4,7,7,9,23 616:6 616:7,9,11,12,22
618:8,9,15,16,19,20
618:21 620:19,22 623:19 624:2,16 625:3
626:3,3,21
Monterey 402:23 403:1 428:25 429:4 436:12
441:14 446:11 448:22
452:12 463:23 469:7 470:14 473:4,8,9,24
474:17 480:4 483:14
485:25 493:3 509:11 509:23 566:7,9 567:5
570:19 621:17
month 520:17 months 520:14 539:12
539:18 629:6
moonglows 515:24 morals 408:21

more 393:13,14 395:23 396:1 398:13 399:10 407:6,11 413:17 417:5 421:18 425:3 429:10 430:1 433:17,25 434:1 434:6 435:21 438:18 439:21 451:22,23 456:8 466:4 471:12,17 479:3 487:10 490:3,4 490:10.21.22 492:15 501:2,19 502:1 504:16 507:7 511:23 512:1.1 520:15 521:3 524:24 532:23 533:11 537:21 544:5 547:12 551:14 555:3 563:10 564:13 573:7 574:6,7 576:1 582:20,20 586:14 587:20 588:24 591:2 592:18 596:16,18 597:19 598:22 599:9 599:21,25 601:23 605:22.22.23.24 609:10,11 610:1,1,2 611:4.5 612:24 613:6 613:7 614:6 623:8 624:24 625:19 639:11 642:12,19 644:14 645:2,17 morning 389:5 408:16 413:5 415:19 420:14 422:25 426:20 432:10 435:17 437:13 440:18 443:19 449:4 morphed 393:16 mortality 445:21,23 Moss 515:15 most 416:5 418:19.25 419:16 431:5 438:18 462:14 464:4 469:11 478:15 507:22 520:15 522:14 523:6,8 525:24 537:16 561:4 566:16 568:12,14 570:4 573:20 581:22 593:11 599:6 600:3 604:17 607:19 609:3 617:23 mostly 478:16 480:5,19 550:1 mother 439:6,6 motion 613:22 move 431:13 459:13 472:25 500:25 536:17 617:20 635:1 moved 507:14 632:23 moves 513:23 moving 404:18 405:4

483:20 484:7 490:3.4 498:5,13 509:2 526:9 526:9,10 528:1 529:19 535:2 539:3 554:9 560:21 575:6 577:25 578:1 582:3 590:7 603:6 604:9 609:20 614:16 631:21 634:3 642:5 649:3 650:22 Mullen 475:21 multiple 446:24 447:10 593:6 603:14 606:24 multitude 604:24.24 mumbling 562:19 municipalities 419:25 445:11 must 417:5 425:3 442:11 443:2 444:21 446:1 468:3,20 495:18 504:25 509:20 536:20 556:24 558:15,17 609:1 610:6,19 613:2 mustache 531:14 myself 391:22 402:15 487:22 M-C-C-A-N-N 563:18 583:10 M-C-C-A-R-T-H-Y 494:5

M-E-R-K-L-E-Y 531:18 Ν

M-C-D-O-N-A-L-D

441:10 494:10

M-E-R-C-E-R 496:4

N 387:1 469:13,14

name 397:2 401:24 402:22,25 403:10 406:1 415:21 420:14 422:25 424:10 426:20 426:24,25 427:1,18 432:10 435:18 441:10 443:21 446:10 466:21 467:6.10 468:15.15.16 475:20 477:20,21,22 493:4 503:24 505:17 509:5 521:24 532:2 563:17 576:22 named 651:9 names 405:22 459:19 Nancy 387:18 405:16 466:17 471:19,21 512:16 narrow 454:4 507:8 644:15 nation 416:17 523:7 536:3,5,11 national 432:12 480:19 486:11 512:18 natural 424:17 507:9 578:25 579:9 nature 463:25 464:23 475:25 575:12 614:11 near 408:17 494:11 nearby 611:25 nearly 479:15 501:11 611:19 **nebulous** 547:13

necessarily 476:20 532:11 572:14 616:23 618:1 620:3 necessary 391:1 395:3 411:14 422:6 453:23 456:17 522:13 535:7 538:2 551:25 570:25 595:2 599:22 601:14 601:25 609:2 610:19 615:5 necessity 436:17 need 398:21 415:14 428:18 438:6 451:15 456:17 459:25 460:4 470:7 472:24 473:15 473:16,20 477:13 490:21 491:19 492:1 508:19,20 516:22 523:12 524:4,7 526:20 529:5 532:9 533:1.25 536:17 541:12 546:24 547:23,24 548:9 552:17,18 560:3 570:11,20,23 580:21 582:7.20 583:4 598:23 605:14 609:10,11,15 618:6 620:21 623:13 623:21.23 625:11 626:4,5 627:1 634:20 635:4 637:15,15,24 640:19 642:20 645:11 648:5 649:19 needed 399.8 453.24 512:2 514:10 533:14 538:25 609:3 615:12 needs 405:21 411:24 414:10 431:7 444:3 451:9 457:1.2 466:22 471:16 476:3 504:15 533:12,12 550:21 551:13 568:18 582:10 582:17 615:23 627:10 637:5 642:6 **negative** 411:7 445:3 negotiations 510:10 neighbor 409:19 609:18 528:18 549:5,9 573:3 612:15 617:14,14 407:4 412:16 429:22 501:19 512:6 530:19 530:19 553:19,20 576:9 593:13 594:15 608:8,13 625:7 630:1 639:16 640:21 641:6 644:10 647:17,18 393:13,20 396:5,14 408:14 409:18,19

neighbors 494:11 neither 411:21 nervous 486:22 614:18 network 561:19 never 407:12 422:3 nevertheless 500:13 new 394:17 402:6,11,13 429:24,25 445:2 487:8 Newman 387:8 390:9 news 608:17,20 next 391:14,15 392:17

411:10 413:4 415:14 448:1 466:16 488:2.2 505:23 506:11,16,24 507:4,12,19 518:17,20 518:25 519:1 526:19 547:15 549:23 553:20 576:20 582:22 587:11 591:22 601:4 613:19 626:13 629:4,5 634:23 646:24 nice 484:13 490:23 549:15 night 489:9,18,21,22 nine 505:19 Nineties 462:19 nitrate 443:5 448:15 452:6 453:21 454:7 455:1 458:25 462:20 469:16 470:16 473:8 473:10,25 474:24 475:1,4 478:23 479:6 481:19,20 483:10,21 484:4,5,8,11 488:12 488:13,23 493:6 501:16 504:25 512:25 513:3,7,9,12,18 515:11 516:5 520:25 547:4 556:14 558:1 564:9,13,15,20,25 565:5,13,16,18,19,20 565:25 566:2,3,8,11 566:13 567:12 569:21 569:25 570:3 571:2 7 571:11 573:16 579:7 580:7 582:1 587:8 588:14,25 589:4,11,20 590:22 591:3,21,24 592:1,5,11 598:19,20 601:15 602:15,16 603:9 622:9 nitrates 411:11,17 419:4 475:11 479:1 496:17 513:3,16,16 516:2 530:16 608:1 nitric 479:13 483:5 nitrogen 396:2 413:7,17 413:22,24 414:17 415:2 424:14 425:4,14 425:14 451:9,12 452:2 452:20,25 453:18 455:5 459:22 460:23 461:14 463:7,13,16 464:24 469:12,17,19 469:24 470:22 471:1,5 471:7,8,9,12,17 480:5 481:15 513:20,22 565:10,23 567:7 570:1 570:5,10 572:12 573:17.19 577:11 578:15,18,23 580:21 580:24 581:4,14,21 582:4,9,10,25,25 583:4 587:15,18 589:8 589:17,24,24 590:1,5 590:7,9,10,11,13,14 590:17 603:13 604:2 nobody 461:24 568:8 noncompliance 637:17 none 523:15 579:21

472:25 484:7 617:23

553:8 558:16 593:8.21

MRP 518:20,23 519:5

593:25 595:4,11

598:24 601:22

MTBE 611:7 622:21

much 404:17 411:14

414:2 417:15 418:6

433:23 434:25 435:9

469:17 471:17 479:21

634:19

MPs 624:16

500 0 000 4	144 44 400 4 470 7	450 45 454 4 0 455 0	400 44 407 00	
580:9 633:4	441:14 469:4 478:7	453:15 454:4,9 455:2	ones 469:11 487:20	options 453:23 463:18
nonetheless 594:14 non-compliance 624:18	500:11 520:11 635:17 636:3 646:25 651:4	456:17 457:18 461:24 466:9,12,16 467:3,12	515:25 544:19 575:1 one-size 557:6	601:22 603:20 oral 396:8 640:23 645:22
non-point 438:25 500:17	object 406:12 411:22	468:25 471:18 474:23	one-to-one 469:21	645:23 647:3,12,13
624:21	412:10 448:3	475:12 479:22,24	ongoing 394:10 424:15	oranges 495:5
non-profit 478:9	objection 401:3,6	492:6 494:8 498:13	497:17 565:25	orchard 442:8
non-responsive 637:1	406:22 407:15 648:20	508:13 509:2 511:12	online 394:20 561:5	orchards 508:25
Norm 388:3 443:17 446:9,10	objections 401:22 objective 456:23 532:20	511:15,16 512:7 514:7 515:1 519:21 524:16	only 389:9 409:4 411:16 416:4 418:6 419:9	order 393:3,11,15 394:1 394:3,16,22,23 395:9
normal 648:9	533:12 540:8	525:8 526:19 527:22	421:8 425:19,20 426:9	397:2 407:25 411:17
normally 533:9	objectively 464:3	531:7,10 534:25	428:23 432:23 436:18	411:23 412:11,16
north 388:12 520:11	objectives 411:9	536:22 539:1,2,10	436:22 437:6 442:19	413:11,14 414:3,6,9
554:25 559:5,7,7,21	objectivity 532:23	540:2 541:13 542:10	450:23 455:14 459:15	414:12 418:21 424:13
559:23 560:16,19,22 561:1,3,9 563:13	obligated 643:15 645:1 obligations 647:20	542:16 545:1 548:11 554:11,17 560:17,25	465:5,6 469:13 470:24 480:10 497:15 499:6	425:2 428:18 435:25 435:25 436:3,4 438:21
575:4 635:21	observation 416:8	561:6 569:11 576:17	503:6 504:10,15 510:1	441:23 442:10 444:12
northern 392:3	observed 416:21	586:1 604:6 607:15	515:24,25 516:20	444:16 445:2,7,13
notable 563:23	obtain 469:21 616:2	614:2,8,9 620:23,25	536:18 550:3,13	446:1,24 447:8,15
note 406:9 415:12 540:12 587:19	obtaining 421:24 obvious 489:12 496:24	629:23 630:20 635:7	553:17 562:12,14 571:22 578:3 586:5	448:4 450:4,13 454:25 465:20 466:22 467:1
notes 401:15 501:10	572:6	636:6,7 640:21 641:10 641:19 642:5 644:12	607:22 612:4 613:17	472:15,23 473:1,13
544:24 555:2 566:10	obviously 418:15 444:7	644:16,19,23 645:3	625:14 626:20 629:19	485:9 487:8 494:24
nothing 405:11 439:21	502:11 537:8 552:17	646:16 649:13	638:13 642:16 648:17	496:18,23 500:11
536:6 564:22	553:5 619:16	old 478:9 598:25	648:18	504:2,8 506:18 510:22
notice 587:17 588:6 590:4 599:14	occupied 530:12	Olivos 423:2	on-farm 548:4 oo0oo 650:25	518:18,21 521:4,5,7
noticed 396:11 410:21	occur 468:7 603:14 640:5	omissions 496:19 once 520:21 538:20	OP 597:20 600:4	521:15 523:11 528:16 533:2,23 534:4,18
notices 575:23	occurred 406:18 416:9	539:18 547:22 591:1	open 406:22 407:5	535:24 537:18 538:19
notification 548:7	455:13 520:16 565:21	610:4 649:4	503:18	539:15 543:5 545:12
notify 544:18 547:19	622:25	one 391:3,23 395:22	opens 644:9	545:14 546:17 555:17
notion 408:24 613:11	occurring 565:17	397:4,20 401:8,18	operate 436:17 441:14	555:21 556:1 557:18
November 481:17 494:1 586:9 599:18 643:4	occurs 566:2 ocean 432:15	405:1,8,8,25 408:8,12 408:14 409:8 410:22	442:5 472:8 574:9 609:14	557:19,22,25 558:8,14 559:4 561:22 563:21
no-brainer 395:7	oceans 468:1	416:24 418:25 421:5	operated 472:7	564:6,11 570:15,24
NPDS 574:22	October 424:14	422:9 424:20 425:7,21	operating 415:8	572:3 576:8,9 578:4
NRCF 561:21 562:4	odd 483:11	428:20 431:5,23	operation 414:14,23	583:16,20,23 584:8,18
NRCS 412:20 430:22 455:21	Odds 409:23 off 397:13 414:4 418:5	432:20 433:1,3 436:7 439:1,7 442:19 446:25	415:3 425:21 441:15 441:16 494:21 506:15	585:25 586:19,21,25 591:23 592:1,25 593:3
number 396:20 409:8	435:6 447:18 488:12	448:2 449:11 450:22	514:16 526:7 527:3,5	593:8,13,18,21 594:8
437:18 444:13 464:12	488:13 489:10 548:15	451:22,23 452:10,10	527:6 546:23 547:14	594:10,25 595:4,5,10
464:13 469:10,20	555:7 570:9 575:15	452:11 454:5 456:8	550:19 551:1 586:24	596:15 598:17,24
470:2,3 504:13 506:1	576:18,19 588:14	458:23 459:6 460:10	587:4 599:8	599:2 600:4 601:9
532:5 544:6 568:19,20 569:4 579:19 588:5,18	589:17 623:15 636:12 648:1,24,25	462:4,14 463:16 464:2 465:11 469:13 470:5	operations 425:23 441:12 444:21 500:8	602:5 604:12 605:6,9 605:11,14,16 606:1,7
594:22 603:8 604:19	offenders 408:20	470:12,12 475:25	507:2 547:11,12	606:16 609:9 612:18
616:22,23 651:6	offer 648:2	480:12 482:2 486:23	557:20 559:25 586:20	612:24 613:12,22
numbers 515:3 544:4	offered 496:10 549:3	489:14 498:10,11	587:1 591:11,18	615:8 619:2,8,10
545:25 562:24 583:5	office 390:6 452:5 454:1	499:9,9 501:8 503:13	598:18 599:7 600:1	622:4,7 623:21 624:19
599:6,11 numerical 522:4	510:18,23 529:25 543:12 586:18	503:14 506:25 513:24 513:25 514:8,15	609:8,10,17 623:24 624:9 625:23	625:8,9,16 630:22 632:24 633:24 634:17
numerous 420:23	Officer 387:10,11 518:22	515:23,24 516:3,10	operation's 548:2	635:12 641:8
504:19 522:2	539:13 542:9 558:4	519:8 527:11,12	operators 500:14 521:6	ordered 495:11
Nunes 408:14 413:6	596:14 598:4 602:6	528:24 529:2 530:11	opinion 426:14 434:18	orders 430:6 611:18,25
nutrient 395:21,24,25	605:9	534:6 536:6,9,10	526:6 546:6	ordinances 549:16
428:22 450:20 454:25	Officers 606:3 Officer's 598:21	537:21 539:3,15 547:7 550:10,20 551:8,16	opportunities 551:24 opportunity 396:18	Oren 459:20 organic 432:23 486:13
460:7,9,10 461:1,6 470:5,6 490:17 525:6	offices 543:7	555:12,12 557:8 560:1	398:18 427:13 430:4	488:11 501:16 516:16
527:24 547:4 571:22	official's 430:22	561:7 562:7 563:14	478:5 549:10 556:1	organization 400:14,20
573:10 577:6,18,19,22	often 426:10 433:2,4	568:13 570:4 571:25	581:24 584:12,20	403:1 404:7,8 407:22
578:2 581:2,19 603:24	617:18,20	577:24 578:7,22 579:5	594:11 639:22 642:22	472:1 477:24 478:10
603:25 612:11 nutrients 495:1 498:21	Ogle 499:24 502:17 oh 398:9 438:13 466:18	583:1 586:1,4,17,19 588:7 505:16 18	642:23 645:6 647:21 648:12	544:11
498:23 550:18 551:3	474:15 482:16 541:24	588:7 595:16,18 597:18,18 601:22	opposed 599:4 643:19	organizational 403:8,14 416:20
.55.25 555.15 551.6	oil 564:23	602:23,25 603:20,22	646:12	organizations 400:19
0	okay 390:25 396:17	604:10,17 606:20	opposing 398:8	403:8 416:14 418:18
oath 628:12	398:6 407:14,20,23	607:25 613:9 614:4,8	opted 399:13 441:24	556:20 604:25
Obispo 386:3 389:1,8	422:21 424:9 427:3 430:2 435:15 440:2,14	620:15 627:20 633:11	592:4 option 460:19 461:3	organize 403:6 organized 404:15
404:12 418:2 437:16	430.2 435.15 440.2,14	634:9,9 635:16,20 638:8 25 639:8	586:9 617:3	organized 404.15

638:8,25 639:8

586:9 617:3

440:21,24 448:21

organizing 403:4

organophosphates
411:11 original 428:7 429:8
532:11 540:12 608:9
originally 405:1 584:25 592:4 597:17
Osos 564:23
other 390:8,13 397:20 401:8,18 403:4 405:25
411:20 412:4 414:15
416:14 419:10 421:14 421:21 425:8,22 426:6
430:12,20 432:14
433:10 442:21 445:20
452:11 454:2 455:6 465:21 466:7 469:11
470:12 471:4,4 474:9
474:14 477:4,6 486:7 488:21 490:25 493:12
495:3,13 496:18 499:5
510:21 517:2 521:9,13 521:22 523:3 524:23
525:21 528:22 534:3
535:7 538:5,13,21 544:21 545:18,19
551:16,17 552:10
553:15,16 556:25 559:3 562:9 563:14,23
565:1,4 570:15 571:17
579:22 583:8 586:14
602:24 606:20 608:24 608:25 609:9 610:9
617:3 622:10 625:25
626:8 633:17,22 637:2 639:21 643:23 644:1,2
644:2,3,11,24,24
645:15 650:1 others 525:15 557:23
576:3 633:5
otherwise 410:9 521:17 536:20 564:17 605:11
605:16
otters 429:1 467:17 ought 477:9
ourselves 410:13 465:14
571:8 out 389:22 390:14,21,22
390:25 393:7 396:12
397:4 398:1 399:8,8 402:5 403:5 404:20,24
405:3,6 424:14 431:14
432:24 436:10 438:23 441:25 450:20 451:14
453:19 455:12,23
456:17,21 458:25 460:5,19 461:23 465:4
465:22 466:22 467:1
476:23 483:13 484:7 489:23 492:8 497:13
498:22 501:19 511:14
517:1 518:15 519:8 525:17 526:13 529:4
529:20,25 530:1 540:3
545:8 547:5 548:15
549:2,18 552:3 553:16 560:5 566:19 567:18
568:4 571:9,16 575:23
576:14 588:12 589:3 591:9 594:7 596:7

601:3 602:19 606:10 607:21 609:24 611:21 619:23 621:21 623:11 627:9,25 628:16 629:1 632:9 633:23 635:15 636:17 638:2 640:25 642:10 643:17 644:4 644:11 648:9 outbreak 422:2 559:14 outcome 450:7 outcomes 622:25 outline 418:21 outlining 462:24 539:13 outreach 566:17,20 outside 434:1 outstanding 546:1 626:19 over 390:14,18 393:9 395:24 398:23 399:1 402:17 405:20 410:6 415:25 416:3 419:14 431:24 432:13 434:10 436:9.9 437:9 443:25 444:9 450:2 452:5 455:15 462:19 467:5 472:24 473:16 480:5 496:11,11 500:22 503:22 519:12 522:1 522:19 523:22 526:11 530:14 568:25 570:16 574:24 597:23 601:1 603:14 604:11,11 605:14,22 606:14,21 606:23 607:1,2,6 608:19,19 612:3 619:3 619:12 627:18,18 631:23

619:12 627:18,18
631:23
overall 435:22 442:24
448:16 568:14 569:3
588:18 599:11 608:5
overdriven 411:5
overlow 390:22
overlap 412:19,22
overlight 419:22,22
422:11 568:7
oversees 474:7
oversight 421:25
oversteps 472:15 473:14
473:14
overview 392:8,19,24
393:5
overwhelming 605:3

over-application 470:25 over-fertilize 470:20 572:8 own 397:14 408:17,22 438:8 440:25 443:14 445:22 448:10 451:14 463:1 479:3 499:17 524:8 570:20 572:22 606:8,9,11 614:3

626:5 owners 521:7 566:20,21 619:17 owning 469:5

Oxnard 401:25 O'Connor 388:7 499:24 500:1,1

P **P** 387:1,1 541:3 pack 439:1,2 packages 449:23 Packing 415:16 page 387:15 388:2 540:13 583:18 640:24 pages 560:14,17 643:2.5 646:2 paid 491:14 pale 610:25 panel 386:2 392:9,12,15 392:16 393:2 448:18 451:2 503:16 561:17 613:14 panels 562:3 paper 486:13 papers 480:20 parachuted 523:22 paragraph 424:20,22,22 paragraphs 501:23 parallel 516:23 539:22 paralyzed 430:15 parcel 435:1 pardon 451:3 455:18 parenthetically 395:23 parents 443:23 444:3 Park 621:17 part 392:4,5 394:16 399:18 412:11 414:3 415:22 428:11 436:6 437:3 438:13 448:24 455:6,17 459:11 461:1 463:23 464:20 465:9 469:14,15 474:5 483:9 483:12 485:17 486:6,7 486:7 487:14 490:18 495:18 508:21 509:10 509:11 510:22 525:9 525:24,24 529:1 537:15,23 538:17 542:4.25 543:1 546:23 550:21 554:5 558:16 558:18 567:21 579:23 580:9 588:22 608:4,22 619:9,22 620:14 622:22.23 626:11 participant 540:25 541:1 541:4,22 547:22 548:6 579:22 participants 540:11 participate 459:12 485:23 535:2 544:17 544:20 545:3 participated 561:18 participating 539:16 544:3 546:19 574:5 participation 542:1 548:6

particular 405:1 424:13

454:5 460:22 461:7

530:10,20 531:3

587:4 590:1 591:5

particularly 402:17

603:16

462:20 475:25 481:14

575:24 585:20 586:12

445:5 495:13 498:18 536:16 parties 509:20 511:3 639:19 651:13 partners 411:2 partnership 415:25 parts 484:9,10 513:13 515:15 546:23 578:2 608:25 639:25 640:14 641:11 649:25 650:1 party 409:18 495:20 533:1.18.22.24 535:22 539:11 540:19 541:5 542:3 544:18 546:15 548:5 551:23 552:14 Paso 400:16 408:13 410:25 469:7 pass 409:1 passed 465:20 512:14 561:12 passion 416:21 621:13 past 416:4,9 436:2 469:9 514:16 517:25 606:23 pastor 417:2 **pastures** 441:19 path 433:15 450:9 521:13 545:19,20 pathway 414:19 pathways 523:2 524:3 pay 408:25 410:17 608:9 paying 490:6,7 493:10 493:11 501:7 penalties 573:25 574:22 575:13 penalty 574:25 575:6 **pending** 539:22 people 390:19 399:17 400:1,11,21,22,23 401:12 403:4,5,7 404:19,21,22 405:11 406:12 407:7 408:21 409:11,13 417:8,18,20 433:23 435:20 438:18 440:1,4 468:2 470:15 474:6 482:12 488:22 489:9 490:9,16 491:5 491:7,13 492:13 500:24 501:7 517:1 524:23 526:7,21 530:15 533:4 534:3 543:20 544:2 545:10 545:18 550:10 553:16 561:8 569:16 574:21 575:8 578:7 580:22 602:4 604:24 611:8,10 611:13 614:20 625:10 627:9 628:16 633:20 635:10 640:22,25 641:16 643:11 647:6 647:13 648:8,12 people's 403:4 646:15 per 483:9 484:9,10 506:15,23,23 507:15 507:17 512:24 546:9

589:8,9,12,17,23

percent 417:3 469:18

470:25 481:4,5,8

497:14,15,20 499:9,10

590:4 602:21

506:10 507:10 513:7 533:11 544:10.23 545:1 579:18 599:17 622:1 percentage 483:2 543:22 612:13 613:4 percolating 424:23 percolation 424:20,21 perennial 507:13 perfect 460:15 483:15 606:5 612:22,25 633:4 perfection 613:2 perform 451:6 465:1 performance 618:7 620:21 performed 512:18 perhaps 511:14 541:1 541:14 553:12 616:22 617:3 622:16,16 624:2 period 401:11 530:20 584:17 601:2 619:12 624:22 631:19 643:21 644:18 646:1 647:6 Perls 499:25 502:17 503:23.25 505:6 permeable 571:3 permit 497:19 596:6,6 permits 497:21 596:4 permitted 477:13 permitting 574:22 perpetrators 408:20 persistent 593:20 594:5 person 397:10 400:7.9 401:18 404:6 405:1 467:16 474:8 478:1 503:6 516:11 519:12 548:8 576:1,25 577:4 580:1 personality 632:12 personally 474:19 522:6 persons 387:9 644:24 person's 541:17 547:22 perspective 464:9 557:12 611:22 619:1 635:22 Pescadero 478:12,18 pessimist 434:7 pest 480:7 pesticide 403:9,18 433:1 433:4 477:7 497:18 502:20 503:8 504:1.19 504:22,25 505:25 506:5 517:21 520:25 557:23 593:9 594:9 595:12 596:4 597:6,20 598:10,11 pesticides 404:1 410:8 410:11 428:1 432:23 432:25 467:21 468:8 488:19 492:18,19,22 493:16 494:14 495:1 495:15 496:21,22 497:3,7,13,21 499:16 502:1 504:11.12.14.15 504:16 592:15,19,23 593:7,11,17 594:2,3 594:12,15,21 595:3,11 597:16

petition 436:1

Petrovich 505:8
pharmacies 478:20
phonetic 459:20 475:7 496:16
phosphate 432:23
501:16 photos 428:13 429:15
physical 518:3
Ph.D 469:2,15
pick 525:2 596:22 picked 568:10 595:8
picture 572:22
pictures 428:10
pieces 449:11 pigs 442:21
pilot 419:15,18 484:5
615:3 pinpoint 568:1
Pinto 427:24 428:20
pipe 438:23
place 394:4 434:13 436:14 442:20 444:6
460:15,16 473:10
475:1 476:22 477:9 481:24 505:3 516:18
530:10 573:5 621:20
622:7 651:9
placed 426:3 445:19 479:12
places 419:2 433:10
442:16 463:15 464:13
621:23 placing 436:8
plan 394:6 395:18,22,24
416:16 460:7,9,20 461:4 490:18 491:4,18
492:3 506:21 508:16
508:21 510:11 525:6,7 525:10,25 526:4,22
527:24,25 533:17
535:5,9 539:13,17,18
539:23 541:24 542:4,8 543:6 544:11 548:4
552:15.20 563:19
566:13,14,15,16 571:22 577:6,18,20,22
571:22 577:6,18,20,22 578:2 588:23 596:18
599:24 604:1,1,3
619:11 624:5,15 625:10,21 626:1,22
632:24,24
PLANNING 387:12
plans 482:8 484:25 491:10,19,25 525:5
542:25 543:3 621:19
625:2,3,7,8
plant 413:18 425:7 464:2 469:2,19 470:2 471:2
572:9,17 581:19
planting 424:16 589:10 plantings 464:1 470:5
plants 413:17 416:4
469:23 484:4 565:6 572:12 13
572:12,13 play 454:21 516:17
588:19
players 529:4 please 397:13,19 417:19
422:15 451:22 463:4

```
494:2 503:8 505:23
  506:11,16,24 507:4,12
  507:19 508:1 524:5
  562:18 613:21 630:14
plows 435:4
plus 395:14 604:2
pocket 511:9
podium 396:16 397:7
point 390:14 395:3 397:4
  397:5,20 411:19
  417:17 426:2 430:25
  434:4 438:22,22 453:5
  460:1,1 471:20,23
  473:19 500:16 504:18
  504:21,24 514:19
  516:6 519:3 522:18
  526:8 528:15,19,22,23
  529:3,3 530:6 536:17
  549:5 565:11 568:4
  573:1 574:1 580:15
  582:18 589:2 591:9
  594:7 598:25 606:6.24
  615:25 623:3,16
  628:23 631:18 632:21
  634:22,23 638:9 640:5
pointed 393:7 436:10
  576:14 607:21 609:24
  623:11 629:1
pointedly 569:14
pointing 611:21
points 402:10 430:7
  462:4 532:7 555:6
  588:12
policy 461:23 462:1,5
political 520:9
pollutant 468:6 634:10
pollutants 411:20
  495:10,11 634:8
pollute 471:12 608:1
polluted 408:22 488:5
  493:14 585:11 613:5
polluters 500:14
pollution 436:16 467:15
  467:24 481:23 523:4
  557:13 584:3 612:15
Poly 420:17 514:5,5
  589:14
pond 558:12,15
ponds 424:20 444:14,17
  444:20.24 445:23
  517:6 558:14,17
poor 493:9
poorly 483:1,2
Poplar 488:5,8,8,9
population 481:8
Porter 445:1
portfolio 453:24
portion 391:22 526:2
portrays 408:19
pose 414:11 500:8
posing 457:18
position 434:11 448:22
  448:23 453:20 454:6
  454:10,13 456:9
  510:16 567:18
positive 637:7
possibilities 571:17
possibility 592:22
```

```
possible 391:6 400:23
  403:11 616:5.24
  628:24 631:21 647:7
possibly 440:6 625:13
post 642:13
postured 610:24
potential 394:8 456:20
  457:5 481:18 482:4
  486:21 487:2 551:3
  567:11 571:3 575:21
  578:15,23 579:7
  581:21 587:15.18
  588:14 589:23 590:8
  591:3,20 600:13
  601:16 602:21 610:12
  617:13 635:11
potentially 435:13 470:6
  482:10 486:3 590:10
  594:23 595:19 601:25
  640:15
poultry 513:1,5,6,10,14
  514:16 515:6,7,8,8,13
  515:22 565:7
pound 469:13 471:13
  589:9
pounds 410:7 468:10
  471:12 589:8,12,17,23
  589:24 590:4,5,9,9
  603:13
power 417:7 465:24,25
  471:20,23
powered 436:12
practical 421:24 439:10
practice 425:9 445:3
  452:15 453:12 461:2
  461:10.10.11 481:19
  481:21 540:6 553:2,8
  561:25
practices 394:5 412:6
  414:22 425:19 442:7
  442:25 443:3 447:6
  460:16,17,19,25 461:3
  461:4 463:7 464:11
  480:7,22 484:1,21
  486:19 489:25 494:17
  494:20 500:12 547:10
  548:2 552:19 553:4,11
  560:23 561:14,24,25
  562:1,5 573:9,12,13
  578:5 585:18 601:13
  606:8,15 608:21 609:6
  623:21
prearranged 398:11
PREASLEY 387:16
  401:24
precious 417:12
preclude 537:19 538:11
predictive 596:19
preliminary 398:3
  578:13 596:9
prepare 470:4 577:5
  645:18 647:17
prepared 458:19,21
  471:20 536:24
preparing 582:13
preposterous 409:21
  452:16
prescribe 431:21 460:17
prescribed 428:6
```

```
prescribing 464:11
prescriptive 463:25
  485:11
presence 464:20 479:1
present 389:15,17,19,21
  391:10 478:5 531:23
  559:5 576:25 638:8
presentation 406:20,21
  420:25 502:23 519:9
  537:6 542:20 545:24
  546:1 548:17 563:1
  608:23 631:1
presented 402:6,11
  421:3,17 422:16
  523:20 535:23 536:1
  545:9 557:14 563:11
  579:13,14,24 580:3,11
  585:4 589:14 604:10
  630:11,13,16 638:11
  638:14
presenters 580:22
presenting 578:12
preservation 502:5
  504:5 517:12,14
  544:23
preserve 427:23
president 471:22 505:18
Presley 401:24
Press 486:14
pressed 520:21
pressure 520:9
presumes 500:13
presumption 445:18
pretty 409:11 507:20
  529:4 546:1 562:8
  599:17 611:13 614:16
  622:15 636:18
prevent 494:17 585:10
prevention 395:5,6
  571:5 572:2 585:8
previous 416:25 428:2
  500:7,20 501:22 507:1
  548:12 638:6
previously 412:18 437:6
  444:24 509:7 510:5
  564:14 630:18
pre-nitrogen 424:25
price 409:8
prices 409:20
Pricilla 388:4 467:6
  468:16 492:24,25
pride 444:9
primarily 441:15 566:16
  567:8
primary 564:4 565:8
print 457:6
prior 398:11,14 437:16
  438:9 459:18
priorities 458:24 556:22
  617:4,8
prioritize 504:3 570:24
  571:9 603:18
prioritizing 576:11 599:3
priority 409:8 501:13
pristine 409:24
privacy 636:16
private 399:23 556:16
  608:10 619:21 620:6,7
  620:11
```

```
probably 390:22 397:5
  397:21 409:15 422:4
  453:1 462:15 474:13
  484:21 489:11 515:17
  526:6 534:13 537:5
  539:22 542:6 568:4
  573:21.22 604:17
  611:6 649:5
problem 413:10,12
  414:19 419:21 423:5
  423:10 430:17 441:1
  442:22 459:21 461:19
  461:22,23,25 462:21
  466:5 473:17 476:23
  476:24 477:2 480:22
  518:2 523:15,21
  529:20 568:6,17
  570:18 571:18 597:24
  601:6 605:2 613:8,9
  614:15 615:5,6 617:17
  625:16 626:7 636:10
  637:7
problematic 424:13
  433:3,5 476:15 481:13
  482:24 487:25
problems 393:9,12
  395:2 416:24 423:18
  434:9 449:9 462:24
  478:24 479:4 528:24
  530:11,14,18 571:3
  596:22 604:13,14,21
  604:23 605:4,7,10,12
  605:24 609:4 8 610:8
  610:20 612:17 614:20
  621:6 623:20 637:2
procedure 519:13 646:7
proceed 622:12 627:1
proceeding 401:4
  538:12
process 402:2 421:23
  430:9,15 431:1 435:20
  447:13,18 449:13
  450:5,6,9 451:5,20
  452:14 456:7 458:12
  459:12,15 462:8,9
  463:23 465:5 485:24
  491:8,15 520:19
  529:15 532:10,18,24
  533:3,20 534:11,20
  536:12,18 537:7
  539:11,25 541:3,7,19
  542:2,5,13 547:19,22
  550:22 554:6 555:13
  556:8 557:17 564:3
  575:18,19,19,19
  576:10 605:7 617:12
  626:6 632:16 637:6
  638:3 640:5,6,18,22
  641:21 645:10 648:5
processes 430:7 482:2
  484:5 488:1,22 586:14
produce 409:6,22 410:7
  410:10 418:8,9 475:3
  510:1
produced 566:12
producer 409:7 446:13
produces 523:1
product 425:15 435:9
  449:19,20 497:23
```

proved 422:4

proven 477:6

production 425:13
439:25 444:6,9 447:6 456:21 476:17 479:9
483:21 507:6 514:9
552:3 580:3 584:15
627:25 productive 523:8 529:12
productive 323.6 329.12 productivity 476:18
professional 491:20,20
519:10 521:25 522:15
540:2 584:20 627:9 651:6,19
professionalism 522:12
professionals 491:22
523:19,25 551:8 606:9
Professor 533:5 profit 472:1 493:16
profitable 420:19
profitably 415:9
program 394:12 403:25 412:3,6 420:18 425:1
438:18,22 452:4 456:2
457:11 460:14,14
461:1 473:24 475:3,6
475:8 486:15 489:17 490:5 497:17 500:17
517:15,17,20 518:1,14
518:20,24 534:16
535:3 536:2,9,13,25
537:15 538:23,23 543:4,23 544:15,16,20
545:21 553:2 555:9,10
563:18 566:13,19
568:7 574:12,23 575:22 577:23,23
584:10,22 593:10,14
593:22 594:6,9 595:1
595:20 596:21 597:4,5
601:4 609:23,24 618:10 619:15 620:10
623:8 626:11 628:17
637:10,16,17 638:3
programs 412:1,4,20 473:9 474:16.21.23
485:11 530:19 535:4
566:8,24 567:10
PROGRAM/BASIN
387:12 progress 583:22 609:11
prohibits 444:18
project 419:18 493:25
580:18,19,24 projects 419:15 424:21
457:13 458:22 484:6
611:19
prominently 433:19
promote 424:21 472:6 562:5
promoting 424:23
559:13 561:21
promulgated 455:16
Prop 487:6 propensity 461:17
proper 468:4 523:16
531:3
properties 518:4,7
606:11

property 391:23 442:11

498:2

457:7 520:13 538:7 proportionality 520:23 proposal 411:13 416:2 417:19 421:6,17,21 422:15 427:5,9,14 433:25 435:22 437:9 446:4.24 448:9.19 482:3,7 494:1 501:6 505:22 517:18 519:9 531:21 532:11.16 534:7 536:3 537:14,24 537:25 538:12.22 543:21 545:23,23 546:8,14 547:18 548:13.18.21 549:4.6 552:12,16 553:6 557:15 571:24 583:12 583:15 584:4 585:1,2 585:3,5,6,13,22 626:18,21 627:2 628:3 628:19 631:9,21 632:21 635:6 639:23 639:25 641:16 643:25 644:21 648:12 proposals 421:16 427:11 447:10,23 543:8 563:6 639:21 640:11 644:1,2,11,24 644:25 645:2 propose 617:9 628:7 630:20 635:2 639:16 proposed 394:17 396:4 424:13 444:12 451:7 454:11 472:15,23 517:17 521:4,5 538:11 538:19 543:5 546:16 564:5 581:9 584:25 585:13 609:9 612:18 623:4 625:2 628:9,20 635:12 638:17 proposing 454:15 460:8 508:5 543:24 546:20 581:16 582:3 607:3 630:5,22 638:16 640:2 641:2 645:13,17 proposition 444:22 proprietary 411:6,24 472:19 542:24 543:1 614:11 615:13,16,19 627:3 prospective 617:11 protect 467:25 472:19 493:22 494:2,18 500:23 502:14 543:6 560:11 570:24 585:5,6 615:15 628:12 protected 415:8 417:13 428:8 500:19 505:5 615:17.20 protecting 556:21 563:22 protection 395:6 465:12 472:18 486:12 560:6,7 566:19 618:23 protective 593:1 595:5 protocol 518:4 protracted 518:12

provide 412:9 478:10 522:22 534:21 555:14 576:25 580:19,25 587:11 593:14 602:10 647:20 provided 501:1 502:5 555:25 572:1,4 577:10 577:25 581:7 584:11 625:10,18 providers 478:19 608:18 provides 448:10 473:13 494:24 563:21 594:1 594:11 596:16 648:14 providing 457:20 559:14 574.5 provisions 504:5 545:14 546:20 proximity 442:14 487:24 610:18 prudent 402:16 427:6 pruning 579:6 public 392:20,25 396:5 397:3 398:15 402:2.9 402:13,15,18 404:17 405:10 406:16,23,25 407:3,6 408:23 419:23 420:7,7 430:9,22,22 431:16 457:1,19 458:12 478:25 486:2 524:17 533:23,25 534 1 11 543 13 18 555:15 556:1,7,16 557:2 558:6 561:4 564:12 607:25 608:1 610:7,15 615:20 618:17 619:22 620:2 620:13 622:4,24 636:19 640:5,6,18,22 640:25 641:21.23 642:10,12,21 643:17 644:17 645:19 publicly 399:24 556:2 615:8,11 616:8,10,13 616.18 644.22 Puente 477:25 478:8,9 478:14,16 pulled 587:3 pulling 490:25 purification 436:14 **purpose** 511:23 563:20 587:10,12 606:12 618:8,22 purposes 456:21 586:7 586:11 621:6 pursue 418:15 **purview** 455:15 pushed 405:3 410:6 put 401:21 407:24 423:6 427:4 433:20 442:15 442:16 446:24 448:19 450:1 451:3 460:4,16 469:13 471:11 476:22 477:9 480:18 489:17 490:15,19 505:2 514:8 517:1 528:5,17 542:22 543:19 544:4 562:21 564:25 566:9 621:20

622:7 627:25 628:16 628:21 629:16 630:2 636:12 638:18 641:3 648:1 650:11 puts 451:1 putting 461:14 471:16 586:11 603:15 627:11 649:10 **PWEF** 504:6,10 pyrethroid 598:4 pyrethroids 433:4,8,16 557:23 595:24 597:22 597:24 pyrophosphate 433:7 P.M 554:15,15 650:24 a qualifications 523:16 qualified 491:22 492:21 568:18 581:17 qualify 492:8 526:25 527:7 qualifying 412:6 quality 386:1 387:4 389:6 393:8,12 394:4 394:24 395:1.18 409:4 409:9 410:18 411:15 414:14.23 415:8 416:6 416:12,12,16,19 421:9 421:23 422:10,17 424:24 426:1 430:18 430:24 431:20 432:5 432:11 436:9,9,11 441:21 443:8,14 444:11,20 446:22 447:4,7,22 448:2 453:3,8,13 456:1 457:21 465:13,17 466:6,6 478:4 480:4 480:14,20,22 481:7 486:5.25 493:23 494:18 495:17,19 500:9,19,23 502:14 504:4 505:17 508:16 517:18 518:14,24 522:11,14,22 523:2,7 523:17 532:6 534:21 552:15 556:25 557:7 557:10 559:13 561:20 561:23 563:19 564:3,5 564:10,17 565:12 566:17 569:13,18,23 583:19 585:22 586:4,6 586:16 587:7 593:1 595:1,6 596:22 599:4 600:10.13 601:17 603:2 604:12,15 605:4 605:6,10,14,15 606:11 606:13 610:8,12 615:6 618:23 628:12 632:22 quandary 451:1 Quandt 388:7 505:14,16 505:17 508:3,10 509:3

544:4 562:10.21

question 414:11 419:1

434:23 446:1 448:14

quantifies 411:9

quantity 581:12

456:8 457:23 459:11 470:19 492:17 494:22 502:22,25 503:16 508:4,9 514:1,15 515:18 526:19 537:21 539:4 544:22 547:15 548:13 549:23 551:15 552:8 559:2 561:7 573:7 582:23 597:1 614:7 615:13.21 624:3 635:13 639:1 642:11 642:25 644:18 645:19 647:2 questioned 566:7 questioning 459:16 questions 420:23 421:1 421:4,15 427:4 452:18 454:21 469:9 470:13 473:23 487:13 503:5 510:15 542:19 562:24 569:15 581:25 600:16 607:22 621:17 623:18 624:7 quick 498:16 551:17 566:10 quickly 558:12 quite 435:11 464:12 501:23 537:20 637:6 quorum 392:11,17 453:2 519:2 613:19,25 quote 413:9 417:2 **Q-U-A-N-D-T** 505:17 R **R** 387:1 481:3,6 race 464:22 radar 495:24 523:5 rainy 520:14 raise 426:2 480:12 raised 444:1,3 483:16 556:4 562:20 577:1.11 577:16 581:25 582:23 **Raising** 483:17 ramifications 619:4 ran 404:20,24 ranch 423:1 441:17,18 442:5,17 443:1 444:1 444:4 445:9 527:12,16 528:13,16,17,21,23 546:10,11 614:19 616:24 rancher 420:16 444:22 ranchers 416:21 444:16 446:16.19 ranches 441:13 527:2,8 545:3 546:11 603:8 616:4 627:6 ranching 446:17 448:6 ranch-by-ranch 527:1

prove 417:10 500:15

516:23 579:15 580:13

range 441:15 506:14,15

rate 414:15,16 434:25

rates 413:15 453:7

rather 392:18 397:17

640:7

592:16

506:22 568:3 587:13

515:19 540:4 581:11

504:15 529:25 557:23

redundant 626:15

refer 394:12

ratio 413:14,24 414:5,18 469:13 582:15 ratios 413:7 565:23
577:11 582:1,3,6,7
RCD 430:22 485:24 RCDs 412:20 455:22
RCS 485:13 RCUs 485:13
reach 422:17 reached 422:11
react 461:14
reaction 460:10 602:17 602:19 637:7
read 403:4,9,12 406:11 426:9 440:20 457:6
477:18 480:19 498:21 503:2 512:23 643:12
646:3 647:8
reading 430:6 467:4 477:23 487:23 492:25
527:24 ready 554:17 649:5,11
real 410:17 482:21 498:16 524:25 543:16
551:17 565:18 566:10 602:20 645:4
reality 617:22 632:13
realize 468:14 621:14 629:12
really 394:25 397:7 399:12 405:21 406:15
409:1 410:12 417:17
423:7 424:19 432:3 436:19,20,25 462:17
472:21 481:2 486:22 487:4 489:14 490:1,9
490:9 491:12 496:8,25 497:24 500:18 501:3
501:12,14 502:4,9,10
515:12 525:1 532:19 536:1,16 542:23 546:8
548:19 549:22 564:22 566:24 568:5,21
570:11 602:22 614:18 622:19 623:13,19
626:18,19,22 629:15
631:24 632:11 636:10 637:24 639:7 642:6
reanalyze 627:2 reason 393:23 397:8
418:22 425:16 426:2 514:9 516:8 519:6
537:3 549:7,24 581:22
603:22 611:21 615:4 reasonable 417:11
420:2 421:25 433:18 434:3,4 468:4 492:20
509:21 586:10,15 594:17 600:9,12 604:5
605:17 606:14 612:19
633:6 reasonableness 445:25
reasonably 629:11 reasons 411:4 472:21
476:15 493:8 519:5 522:25 526:15 569:17
578:21 579:16 632:12
650:1,2 reassure 438:4

```
recall 393:22 548:16
  586:22 611:6.9
received 393:18 395:8
  396:5,8 534:14 555:6
  599:13 622:3 643:2
receiving 412:13 452:21
  593:4,11,16 595:8
  596:21 597:4,13 598:7
  598:8 601:1,10,20,21
  646:12
recent 565:21 568:12,14
recently 442:15 609:25
recharge 424:21 444:14
  444:19 445:2,5,21
recognition 500:6
recognize 398:7 550:19
  603:17 619:6,16
  621:11
recognized 412:4
recommend 412:4 556:3
  591:22 594:11 613:11
  613:15 628:6 640:13
  641:8
recommendation 392:17
  393:1 423:12.13
  576:13 591:4 600:8
  603:23 613:18 629:22
recommendations 450:4
  451:6 522:10 534:10
  537:6 555:24 636:8
  640:1,2
recommended 433:25
  444:25 520:19 575:5
  583:9 591:17 598:17
recommending 555:17
  586:20,24 596:12,15
  597:15 598:2 602:11
recommends 581:18
  584:14 591:25
reconstruct 444:18
record 391:8 400:13
  401:22 403:9,12
  406:12 427:5 433:24
  537:12 559:19 607:4
  621.2 640.4 641.3
  643:14 645:22 647:18
recorded 573:13 615:8,9
  615:12,24 616:7,13,18
  616:19
recorder 391:7
recording 610:7
recordkeeping 581:13
recover 469:18
recuse 391:22
recused 391:15,18
  392:10
red 397:14 482:22
reduce 412:24 457:21
  477:7 484:8 569:21
  572:25
reduced 585:19 599:20
  651:10
reducing 462:21 475:11
  567:11 570:5 584:2
reduction 513:9 566:17
  570:9 599:18
redundancy 411:6
  412:21,23
```

```
reference 411:19 548:19
referenced 604:17
references 604:20,20
referring 454:23 644:24
refers 394:9 561:22
refining 486:21
reflect 547:13 586:21
  596:15 598:24
reflected 634:2
reflective 556:6
refuses 576:2
regard 436:2 523:14
  567:3 623:17
regarding 452:16 564:8
  564:9,15 566:7 569:12
  569:17 572:2 582:1
regardless 445:20 634:7
regards 425:16
regime 423:4,6
region 392:4,5 404:15
  404:19 419:10 447:11
  447:25 448:7 450:12
  450:15.22 452:22
  455:9 459:22 461:7,13
  468:11 478:14 479:8
  493:25 506:10 509:10
  515:14 523:8 543:22
  544:5 564:21,22 565:2
  569:25 570:6 579:18
  580:17,22 587:21,23
  592.7 595.25 604.13
  604:21 610:17 612:3
  612:15 619:9 627:22
regional 386:1 387:4
  389:6 404:14 420:21
  422:10 427:22 432:11
  441:21 444:25 447:3
  455:20 456:1 459:12
  467:13 478:3 493:4,22
  499:3 534:9 535:10
  540:20 543:7,9,12,14
  544:12,18 547:19
  548:8 559:8 565:9
  596:2 614:17 622:10
  623:25 624:5 637:20
regions 415:23 456:6
registered 401:25 497:4
  497:11,11 504:21
  651:6.19
registration 449:21
regret 478:6
regs 438:8
regularly 444:8 615:18
regulate 453:2 461:17
  461:21 493:20 557:15
regulated 419:24 430:12
  431:11.23 610:10
  619:7 637:16
regulates 439:6
regulating 477:3
regulation 411:3 412:21
  432:24 433:6 450:18
  451:7 453:10,10
  454:18,20 462:2
  463:25 467:19 496:9
  496:10 499:20 510:3,9
  521:11 553:20 598:10
```

```
626:10 637:13
regulations 421:12
  428:3,7,18 429:9
  442:2 455:15 458:1
  467:24 468:3,6 472:5
  472:17 473:4 476:20
  476:20 477:1 560:5.6
  560:11 574:10 624:13
regulatory 387:12
  412:23 421:7 431:7
  450:4,5,8,9 451:3
  454:16 455:16 459:7
  464:8,23 465:24,25
  466:4 500:17 516:25
  521:18 522:15.20
  554:6 555:10 574:6,9
  608:25 609:10 610:2
  612:1 617:22
reiterate 470:1 604:8
reiteration 607:9
reject 437:8
rejected 472:23
relate 480:14
related 451:9 456:15
  475:25 480:17 481:5
  500:22 525:24 592:17
  592:25 593:16 651:13
relates 415:2 551:11
relation 469:3
relationship 469:22
  481:5
relative 458:7 587:7
  588:19 589:20,21
  590:11,13,15,22
  598:19
relatively 482:25 483:3
  483:18 565:21
relativeness 590:24
release 611:25
released 543:18 556:2
relegate 576:3
relevant 565:5
relied 611:14
relies 604:16
relocation 507:16
rely 451:13 479:15,17
  535:6
relying 622:1
remain 411:24 499:5.8
  543:5 544:21
remainder 544:14
remaining 398:7 499:4
remains 504:8 539:6
remarkable 622:25
remarks 398:4 464:15
  478:6
remember 405:23
  433:24 457:25 489:19
  531:9 542:22 578:11
  588:21 589:4,16
  591:10 599:19 605:20
remind 502:8
reminder 396:4 398:20
  613:14
removal 413:15 414:16
  507:16 560:2
remove 457:15 481:15
  481:19 484:4,5 508:18
  559:18
```

```
removed 425:14 469:14
  471:8 508:6,14,19,20
  520:17 562:23 582:4,4
  582:11,19
removes 476:16 513:7
removing 508:22 598:21
renewal 435:24 436:3
Repeat 508:9
repetitive 637:1
replacement 493:11
  608:12
reply 648:3.14
report 393:11 394:15,19
  425:23 438:5,11 499:2
  505:25 511:20 534:7.9
  535:12 538:1 540:14
  540:20 573:9 584:1
  598:14 601:12,18
  604:12,15 621:18
  641:7,14,17,22 642:3
  642:8,9,10 645:19,21
  647:17,17 648:10
  650:6
reported 386:24 396:2
  486:2 538:6 542:15
  568:11 573:10.24
  578:3 596:4 614:21
  616:10 620:14
reporter 390:15 402:24
  405:19 531:16 535:18
  554:12 556:10 607:11
  618:3 651:6,7,19
RFPORTERS 386:20
REPORTER'S 651:1
reporting 394:23 411:24
  412:8 424:14 426:11
  438:1 485:20 505:21
  506:18.21 525:14
  526:10,11,11 534:15
  537:17,22 538:4
  577:25 584:6.22
  585:16 601:12 602:1
  604:2,4 609:23 614:18
  619:19,24 620:14,16
  638:3
reports 447:23 479:4
  487:23 498:21 499:17
  525:4 535:14 540:15
  540:22 604:17 642:13
represent 399:4 418:4
  .
419:23,24,24 426:22
  442:24 475:22
representation 533:9
representative 509:6
  538:3,4
representing 404:6
  407:21 417:25 418:18
  446:14 506:9 532:5
  600:6
represents 448:21
  522:21 587:19 588:24
  599-16
request 400:4,14 401:2
  407:20 466:21
requests 400:1 472:22
require 413:17 422:11
  424:19 426:9 477:3
  497:21 501:2 519:16
  533:23 559:20,22
```

retention 444:14,17,24

558:15

560:2 578:3 586:6
606:13 615:7,23 616:6 616:8,18 620:18 625:9
625:18 637:11,12
640:6
required 394:6 426:13 437:1 444:15,17
445:22 467:25 470:4
491:8 501:6 523:17 538:13,22 553:19
573:13 597:17 598:14
615:7,17,23 616:9 618:21 619:11 621:9
643:6
requirement 445:16
471:7 476:14 502:25 506:21 508:17,22
509:1 538:20 539:15
552:21 558:14,15,16 563:16,20 581:19
585:8 604:5
requirements 386:13 392:7 393:14 395:14
426:5 427:7,10,23
433:21,22 437:23
450:6 469:12 476:12 485:20 504:4 505:3.21
506:18,20 527:25
534:18 545:16 546:16 549:8,12 550:5 552:15
552:20 559:3,17
560:10 577:6 582:13 585:7,21,24 592:25
593:24 595:13 599:21
599:22 600:3,11,14
603:25 609:2 620:15 requires 394:3,4,22
410:7 411:4 412:16
518:3,5 523:15 593:18 598:4 610:9 615:3,8
615:15,15 618:5 619:2
622:19 requiring 445:7 454:6
477:10 519:10 538:15
597:10 research 390:5 413:23
413:25 428:22 452:4,8
459:3 463:13 481:10 566:18 647:24
researchers 608:18
researching 647:19 reservation 444:21
reserve 398:14
reservoirs 444:17,25 reside 401:25
residence 619:21 620:11
resident 493:5 residents 478:14 479:2
479:8 493:10,12 505:4
608:7 resistance 447:13
resolution 480:20 610:8
resolutions 549:16 resolve 541:16 607:23
617:15 636:21,24
648:6 resolved 462:25 466:2
540:16 547:23 611:20
617.20.22

617:20.23

```
resource 416:15 446:20
  473:5.9 474:20 502:15
  564:2 566:8,9 567:2
  579:9 580:1
resources 417:12
   446:21 451:25 469:5
  570:19 578:25 627:8
respect 414:3 453:21
   454:6,10,14,24 476:1
  487:14 510:17 605:15
  637:8
respond 402:13 407:8
   460:23 464:6 511:17
   542:1 555:22 558:8
  581:25 640:25 643:7
responded 643:3
responding 469:8 607:4
responds 402:5
response 393:18 398:1
  407:18 408:6,10
   423:23 424:1,5 432:18
  436:19 440:12 446:7
  470:16 482:11 505:12
  511:19 519:22,24
  520:3 532:17 554:18
  555:16 559:5 577:1,1
  577:4 578:19 583:12
  585:25 591:23 606:18
  613:10 633:23 636:20
  643:3,14 644:18
  650:19
responses 432:18
  550:16 555:3,5 643:15
responsibility 409:13
  417:9,10 448:11
  493:20 520:25 607:23
  610:21
responsible 410:12
   457:16 493:19 495:9
   600:9 625:12,14
responsive 398:17 556:3
   559:15 587:2 607:5
  623:5
rest 396:17 417:3 482:20
  554:12 559:4 635:3
  639:18 645:19 648:20
restate 649:19
restored 505:5
restoring 428:4
restrict 517:16
restricted 490:4 497:20
restricting 425:13
restrooms 390:18
result 411:7 453:8
   513:12 536:9 591:12
  594:25 599:5 606:4,5
  617:15 632:9
resulted 447:6 567:11
resulting 523:2 564:17
  617:24
results 506:6 513:8
   524:2 529:7,10 535:13
  537:17,23 538:1,5
  540:21 541:1,6 565:16
  579:14 580:13 591:10
  618:16 647:24
retailers 553:22
retain 472:9
retained 472:10 512:16
```

```
return 466:11 590:12
revealed 478:25
reverse 608:6
reverses 445:2
review 390:24 449:21
  533:16,20 535:10
  539:7 542:2 543:14
  572:3 635:6 639:16
  642:23 643:18,19
reviewed 505:24 639:23
reviewing 534:8
revise 605:21 612:24
revised 541:3,20
revisions 536:25
revisit 432:21
rewards 500:12
re-evaluate 580:9 640:13
Richard 388:7 505:14,17
Rick 388:11 531:23
  535:20
right 391:2,3,3,11,24
  398:9,23 401:7 402:13
  415:14 424:7 434:1
  437:10 460:6,12
  470:23 475:14 484:6
  503:17,21,24 510:21
  511:8 513:21 516:14
  524:17 572:7 575:21
  588:3 607:25 608:1
  616:15 620:8 631:14
  632:19 633:17 635:19
  635:24 636:3 638:22
  640:18 641:11 642:4
  644:8 645:8 646:9.19
  647:19 649:14 650:15
rights 472:20
riparian 395:19 411:12
  427:23 428:2,6,13
  465:24 501:17 552:19
  552:20 553:7,13 560:6
  600:23
rises 637:14
risk 402:16 425:25 442:7
  442:11,17 452:2
  480:17 487:15,16,18
  487:21,22 489:25
  490:15 492:20 497:24
  500:20,22 547:2,6,11
  547:14 550:20 554:2
  557:10 566:23 571:1
  573:16 578:14,15,23
  579:2,7,10,11,15
  580:13,16 581:5,20
  583:1 587:8 588:19
  590:13,15 603:1 615:5
risked 546:25
risks 480:14 546:22
  566:22 601:15
Ritz 388:8 505:14 509:4
  509:5 510:15,19,24
  511:10,15,19,22,25
  512:7 524:5
river 472:4 488:5,9,9
  602:24
rivers 467:25
road 521:15
roadside 497:9
```

```
Robert 496:15
Roberts 388:8 473:18
  505:15 512:8,10,12,12
  514:4,12,18 515:3,5,7
  516:6
Robes 408:13
Robles 400:17 410:25
  469:7
rock 409:20 434:13
Roger 387:10 555:14
  576:14 629:1 642:7
  645:4.6.24
Roger's 575:17
role 468:4 539:24 610:21
roll 389:13 391:7
room 390:20 396:12
  398:22 474:6 522:17
  529:8 611:11 629:7
root 434:21
Ross 449:7
rotate 404:16
rotation 481:16
round 407:10 410:4
  639:6,8,13 646:17
rounded 491:15
RPR 386:24
RPS 584:21
rubber 530:22
rule 418:3 571:16
rules 418:21 485:20
  522:14 620:5
rule-based 423:6
run 435:5 459:6,7 575:1
  649:3
running 432:14 476:8
  492:13 578:7
run-off 395:14,16 412:17
  428:1 435:10 467:19
  467:21 477:7 493:18
  494:14,17 504:19,22
  528:12,21 547:3,4
  550:8,18 552:17
  610:13
run-on 397:16 482:18
rural 478:12,15 479:18
  565:13 621:25
RUSSELL 387:7
R-I-T-Z 509:5
R-O-B-E-R-T-S 512:12
           S
S 387:1,5,6
Sacramento 426:23
  524:13
safe 448:12 449:16
  493:19
safely 494:15
safety 421:7,12 422:3,6
  457:14,17,20,24 458:1
  476:19 507:21 519:13
```

538:8 552:9 553:14

561:25 562:5,6

salamanders 428:12

426:25 427:2,2,4

Salas 387:22 426:20,20

sake 623:7

sale 565:11

559:6,12 561:18,20,23

```
Salejo 447:17
Salinas 405:16 409:25
  410:3 413:6 415:18,22
  415:23 436:13,15
  443:22,24 445:6
  463:15,15 468:7 470:2
  471:22,25 472:2,4
  475:21 489:9 512:13
  512:22,22 515:14,25
  529:2 530:10 549:25
  549:25 550:1,13 632:1
  635:16
saltation 520:13,15
salty 483:19
Salvador 524:15
Sam 447:16
same 393:21 395:10
  403:6 418:15 425:19
  431:25 444:2 448:11
  457:17 461:22 462:17
  493:13 495:14 520:16
  523:4 549:14 557:7
  568:20 576:7,8,10
  602:25 603:2 604:25
  621:17 622:9 624:3
  629:14 634:16
sample 415:1 443:11
  445:19 489:23.23
  519:15 567:20,21
  601:19 619:11
sampled 522:8 568:19
  568:21,24 584:17
samples 425:3 442:18
  442:24 538:16 605:16
  619:3,3,5
sampling 394:22 443:2,7
  447:24 453:21 454:10
  517:25 519:11.17
  568:13 569:20 584:23
  584:25
San 386:3 389:1,8
  404:12 418:1 437:15
  441:13,14 442:5 443:9
  469:4 478:7,12,13,15
  478:18 482:14,20,21
  482:24 483:7,10,13
  488:6,7 493:9 500:10
  509:11 520:11 530:7
  550:14 635:17 636:3
  646:25 651:4
Santa 404:12 405:10
  418:1 420:16 427:20
  427:24 488:6,6 498:18
  499:5,12 505:9 515:15
  550:14 578:7 579:20
  635:21
Sara 502:5
satellite 428:13
satisfactory 646:11
satisfied 541:9
saw 390:22 393:21
  416:19 438:12 476:6
  489:20 621:17
saying 418:19 453:5
  459:9 461:3,16 462:22
  464:9 470:20 490:24
  497:23 516:19 550:5
  578:17 602:3 611:1
  616:1 617:25 620:1
```

628:9 635:15 640:17 says 425:12,23 452:14 457:18 491:19 492:2 540:13 579:9 620:18
scale 394:9 410:5 604:5 606:20,21 609:3 624:1 624:6,6 637:20,21 scales 456:18
scared 487:7 scenario 425:18 525:16 563:5
scenarios 590:23 SCFU 451:4 schedule 394:14 647:22 schedules 584:6
Schedule-wise 646:14 scheme 431:7 Schmidt 388:9 512:8,10
517:10,11,12 SCHOETER 600:24 schools 556:19 Schroeter 387:12 388:12
508:9,16 555:8,8 556:12 557:5 563:25 573:7,19 576:20 583:8
586:1 588:16 595:10 595:17 596:1,6,25 598:16 600:19,22 601:7 602:5,9 603:3
618:25 620:5,8 science 414:2,7,9 415:6 417:1,11 418:22 420:3 420:17 423:9,12,14
431:3,8,20 435:21 443:3 447:21 452:15 452:24 453:6 454:22
454:23 455:17,18 456:15,20 457:3 461:11,22,23 462:2,5 462:23,23 463:20
465:11 510:11 521:4 521:17 523:24 sciences 481:3
science-based 423:4,17 scientific 450:17,18 451:4,7,8 454:19 458:16 459:16 472:5 514:20 516:9 530:22
540:8 551:12 scientifically 450:1,7,23 450:25 464:3
scientist 515:20 559:8 scientists 456:3 485:7 491:20 screen 523:5
SCU 455:22 se 546:9 sea 429:1 467:17 564:23
search 390:21 season 413:22 424:15 481:17 520:14 580:2,2 580:4 589:10 603:14
seasonal 588:25 589:5 589:15 seat 409:19 seating 390:22,24
seating 390.22,24 seats 390:20 391:2,2 second 405:18 408:8

409:10 461:17 497:5

```
506:4 513:24,25
  517:22,23 519:4 588:2
  588:8 597:4 615:13
  625:6 634:24,25
Secondary 411:12
secondly 416:13 418:7
  436:5 570:11 579:12
  639:10
seconds 397:10 399:9
  534:24
secret 636:1
Secretary 449:7 453:20
  453:22 454:1,5,9,13
secrets 615:16,19
section 387:11 494:25
  538:7 568:3 578:4
  615:14 616:16 620:18
sediment 411:12 428:1
  457:21 477:7 495:1
  498:21,22 547:3
  552:17 553:12 563:20
  563:24 597:7,9
sediments 433:13
see 390:18,20 391:15
  395:24 397:22 420:3
  421:16 422:22 439:15
  473:6 481:25 484:24
  485:1.9.12 490:2
  496:7 506:6,14,19
  523:10 525:6 532:13
  537:17 539:25 541:13
  541:23 542:7 546:8
  550:4 552:10 570:14
  572:1 573:4 578:2
  583:20 596:22 597:24
  601:1 608:5 613:7
  614:3 620:16 621:6,14
  621:22.22 622:5
  624:24 628:24 629:16
  630:23 633:25 634:11
  634:12,19 636:16
  637:13,15 638:1,2,5
  639:7,12
seeing 543:20 574:15
  622:24 641:1
seek 414:12,20 574:11
seem 457:4 509:16
  572:5 634:2 637:2
seemingly 409:21
seems 395:7 406:9
  493:17 495:5 501:18
  518:11 572:5 625:24
  646:5
seen 416:15 417:1
  464:13 466:20 485:16
  522:16,16 529:11
  579:24 584:24 608:24
  621:21
segment 547:17
segments 622:15
select 458:22 586:13
selection 545:19 546:15
self-imposed 477:1
self-regulated 476:22
self-regulation 467:23
sell 409:14 418:9
Senate 509:13
Senator 509:7,7,9,9,13
  509:15 510:5,12,25
```

```
536:16
Senator's 511:17
send 628:7
Senior 387:7 555:9
sense 444:9 447:1,14
  448:5,8 481:9 487:12
  488:16 491:16,17
  492:15 529:16 548:20
  560:10 574:13 610:2
  623:6 631:14 646:6
sensitive 428:8 464:4
  597:19.20
sent 489:22 575:23
sentence 397:15,16
  482:5.18 498:10.11
  514:3
sentiment 457:8
sentinal 429:2
separates 547:5
September 646:22 648:1
  648:19 649:2,7 650:5
septic 530:13 565:5
SEQUA 437:3
series 621:2
serious 439:8 523:14.15
  607:19 609:5 622:13
  636:10
seriously 422:15 464:21
servant 417:8
servants 420:7
served 445:12
service 432:12 436:18
  478.16 480.6
services 472:9,11
  478:10
session 401:15
set 414:17 421:18,20
  422:10 423:5 426:15
  442:14 451:11,15
  472:17 482:10,10,11
  526:15 534:20 540:8
  542:2,3 545:8,20
  559:23 567:6 574:11
  606:1 624:20 630:13
  630:16 639:15 645:15
sets 413:15 559:24
  630:12,15 639:7
setting 422:13 445:19
  503:22 526:16
settle 576:4
seven 394:2 499:9
several 422:2 449:10
  462:15 475:22 520:14
  568:24 580:23 583:8
  585:7 635:16 640:24
  641:1
severe 419:17 564:13,20
  565:13 594:20 604:13
  604:14 605:4 610:8
  611:16 612:16
severely 425:13 504:14
severity 393:8 600:10,12
shake 611:10
shallow 565:24
share 409:12 448:11
shared 479:8 568:8
  629:23
sharing 529:10
shell 429:1
```

```
Shimek 387:17 402:21
  402:22,22,25,25 403:1
  403:20,22 404:9
  407:21 502:19,19
  503:6,11,13,15,20,24
  503:25 649:19 650:14
Shimek's 407:20
ship 409:14
shipped 510:2
shippers 416:13
shocked 497:6
shocks 515:24
shoe 574:16
shops 409:19
short 450:6 613:6,7
  621:7
shortcoming 579:25
shorthand 651:5,9
shortly 454:2
short-sighted 573:2
shot 607:9 632:5
shouldering 608:11
show 396:14 399:12.13
  400:8 416:8 428:13,22
  434:8 438:14.15
  484:21 507:11 558:24
  562:25 569:1,2 579:15
  580:16 581:11,11,13
  587:13 590:15,19
  604:18 620:12
showed 392:21 586:22
  588:21 611:8
showing 414:21 463:15
  463:17 529:6
shown 433:4 467:22
  475:10 608:18
shows 428:17 466:1
  566:3 567:13 581:1
  588:25 593:6 596:9
  607:4
side 414:9 479:19,19
  482:25 483:1 509:16
  602:23,23,24,24
  606:18 633:14 644:3
sides 511:3 606:18
sidetrack 529:19
Sierra 427:21
signatures 543:20
significance 564:15
  595:15 610:14
significant 418:11
  476:18 504:14 555:25
  556:14 565:18 566:1
  567:4 579:19 580:7
  583:6 594:13 596:10
  599:18 603:7 615:6
  622:20 640:3
significantly 403:24
  504:9 607:1
signing 394:5
signs 611:10
Simeon 441:13 442:5
  443:9
similar 393:21 395:9
  425:18,24,25 460:14
  517:19 556:25 573:11
  584:9 600:3,14 602:17
  619:7,8 630:24 638:2
similarly 491:22
```

Simmons 532:4 simple 415:1,4 421:4 471:15 **simpler** 395:12 simplified 394:19 519:5 simply 421:10 427:4 437:2 516:11,12 521:13 526:22 535:15 542:13 548:25 564:25 simulated 514:19 simulation 512:20 513:8 since 391:22 392:11 441:16 444:6 462:18 592:8 609:14 613:14 single 603:13 singular 511:23 546:12 Sir 468:20 sit 430:23 431:18 528:7 629:25 630:3 site 442:19 484:21 485:2 518:6 521:1 522:8 529:2 568:8 sites 484:23 517:21 523:23 535:7 sitting 392:12 405:20 526:1 529:5,8 554:25 situation 413:16 493:13 525:20 551:25 574:23 575:24,25 576:15 612:14 613:3 617:18 625:25 situations 496:18 563:6 622.14 six 441:17 442:8 458:22 479:1 539:12,18 **size** 425:16,21 444:23 475:25 488:14 587:9 587:13 588:13.17 589:22,25 590:2,16,20 633:11 skew 563:6 skills 416:20 606:9 **skip** 512:14 Slew 428:11,14 slide 393:13,20 395:22 406:21 505:23.24 506:11,16,24 507:1,4 507:10,12,19 508:1 515:5 587:12 588:21 588:22 589:2 613:13 slides 393:4 426:7 433:19 501:4 505:19 512:14 525:4 558:24 586:22 587:11 602:15 602:17 604:18 slightly 524:22 slow 467:23 557:4 588:15 small 437:18,20,25 438:7 439:17,23 469:5 470:3 476:17 493:9 577:9 579:17 600:17 619:17 622:15,15 624:1.6 627:5.7 637:21 641:14 smaller 431:25 590:20 590:20 600:6 603:8 social 493:7

Society 491:21

soil 410:9 415:1 416:11 425:1,6 455:6,8 469:2 483:2 491:20 498:5 512:24 513:23 515:18 516:15 558:2 563:22 591:25 592:5,7,11,12 soils 483:1,2 488:24
571:3 sold 449:15,23 sole 411:21 454:18 513:18 612:5 solely 443:14
solid 464:24 solution 415:7 416:24 430:24 431:1,10 448:1 448:10 496:8 497:22 502:13 509:21 515:11 636:12
solutions 414:8,8,10,19 414:20 415:4 421:25 430:19 431:21 432:5 473:12,17 496:10 509:22 608:16 623:23
637:2 solve 416:24 423:5,5,10 430:16 431:23 449:9 455:23 460:5 613:9 solved 419:22 423:11 solvents 611:2
Somach 532:4 some 390:19 391:2 393:9 396:1 397:21 398:17,22 400:4,11,12 400:21,22 401:13 403:5 404:21,22 409:2 410:10 411:19 415:4 416:5 419:2,15 422:12 425:16 426:8 432:14 432:18,19 433:14,15 433:18 434:9 437:20
441:8,23 454:2 462:21 464:13 465:23 469:11 471:24 473:3 474:6 476:16,17 481:23 482:21 485:7,17,19 487:13,24 489:16,21 492:4 494:22 496:19 497:8,10,11,24 499:12 500:19 501:3,18,21
502:2 507:11 511:25 512:17 513:22 517:20 519:4 520:12,13,24 522:17 523:6 526:3,8 527:10,11 528:15,22 532:10,15,21,23,25 533:6,19,22 536:15 540:25 541:3,12,14
542:20,21,22 543:17 545:25 546:7 548:16 550:2,4,14,14 551:11 551:18,21 553:22 555:16,22 557:18 558:8,11,11 559:25 562:10 563:2 564:8,13 565:24 569:1,2,15 571:18 574:10 575:8 576:1 581:1 583:14 584:24,24 585:3 590:15,23 592:21

597:24 599:5 601:7,21 601:25 607:8 611:6,21 614:19,23 615:4,10,22 616:16,21,24 619:20 621:6,22 622:20 623:5 623:7,14,15,18 624:17 624:22 625:14 626:24 627:16 628:16,21,22 629:12,23 630:7 631:18 632:25 633:1.4 633:15,17,22 636:17 636:17 637:18 638:17 639:24,25 640:6,10 641:14 648:24 650:2 somebody 439:5 458:10 501:10 525:12 637:1 **somebody's** 529:13 somehow 487:7 596:23 634:3 someone 400:9.19 401:2 425:15 435:3 486:4 490:6,7 498:1 503:4,4 503:12.17 519:12.14 519:16 542:14 558:20 someone's 551:1 someplace 605:19,21 something 391:12 399:9 401:10 406:10 407:8,9 419:4 435:8 438:20,23 480:10 486:11 489:19 490:19,23,24 526:17 529:12 541:5 548:9 550:9 552:1.3 563:8 567:18 571:13 574:17 574:19,25 575:7,13 598:1 604:10 615:1 616:22 622:5 631:25 633:2.22 634:19.22 636:11 638:4 641:17 643:17 648:24 sometime 428:14 sometimes 483:9 somewhat 539:22 567:17 601:9 somewhere 466:23 526:13 603:18 629:5 Sonya 387:22 426:20,25 soon 403:11 562:8 628:24 631:18 sooner 392:18 434:13 632:22 sophisticated 490:10,22 sorry 473:6 475:16 482:16 499:7 532:3 541:10 556:12 575:15 586:19 **sort** 436:23 453:23 459:2 459:25 460:14 481:2 491:7.8 501:13 555:3 589:16 590:12,22 596:18 598:22 599:10 601:16 604:5 616:21 641:16 sound 414:2 443:3 510:11 532:20 source 438:22,22 479:6 481:25 499:18 500:16 500:17 522:18 523:4 524:2 565:8 566:17

571:2 608:8 612:5 625:22 634:8 sources 438:25 442:21 443:6 495:13 513:3 565:4 594:19 610:16 624:21 south 392:4 478:12,14 **spacial** 538:15 spacially 538:3 Spanish 398:21 speak 400:2,20,23 404:7 404:23 405:21 407:22 416:1 430:5 456:25 459:19 462:16 466:22 468:5 472:11 475:23 488:21 503:7 508:24 531:10 555:23 564:7 566:5 614:5 speaker 390:25 399:3,6 399:16 400:6,6 406:4 408:3,12 413:4 415:12 415:14 438:9 466:16 524:12 speakers 387:15 388:2 397:24 399:2.15.21 407:10 433:20 437:6 469:20 488:1 500:20 524:18 530:17 558:11 559:10 speaking 398:21 400:7 404:22 406:2 427:20 437:15 481:20 503:3 503:12,25 505:10 528:2 speaks 419:6 570:18 **special** 561:17 specialist 452:11 specialities 533:10 Speciality 457:10 specialized 627:10 species 428:16 429:2 specific 473:7 475:24 497:19 503:5 510:22 515:7 516:22 517:3,5 517:8 538:7 542:11 552:19 553:4 555:21 557:18 558:7 560:3 584:1 586:17 593:16 594:19 613:21 614:14 616:16,24 620:5 specifically 398:14 402:10 451:9 452:2 455:22 458:8 474:4,22 528:3 534:6 560:5 583:25 585:23 587:7 593:3 specifics 474:19 specified 542:7 specify 553:3,7 spectrum 440:6 speculation 436:21 speed 554:20 spell 405:22 426:24 467:10 532:2 spelled 468:16 spelling 406:1 467:5 spend 521:8 529:19

604:8 spending 412:25 spent 424:25 548:13 spikes 489:24 spill 611:2 spinach 410:2 476:24 **spirit** 449:8 spite 428:15 504:6 splitting 399:3 spoke 417:11 503:14 583:13 592:9 626:16 spoken 469:20 524:23 524:24 spots 568:2 sprayer 435:8 spraying 435:7 **spring** 478:24 589:9 springboard 452:13 sprinklers 489:10 square 478:17 481:3 **SRCS** 561:17 Ss 651:3 stability 596:17 **stable** 411:5 staff 387:9 392:25 393:7 393:10 397:25 398:24 405:25 406:2.14 407:2 407:8,11 408:19 409:17 412:2,7,21 415:20 419:4 421:3,6 421:13,17 423:6,12 425:22,23 430:12,22 436:8,19 437:2,9 444:12,16 445:7 446:1 446:25 447:10,13,19 447:20,23 454:11,14 456:5 457:25 460:7 469:8 470:13 474:8 486:8 487:16 489:23 491:11 492:1 496:13 496:24 502:13 508:5,8 509:19 511:20 520:19 522:10,12 530:1 535:16,21 537:5 543:4 543:9,14 544:12 547:20 548:13,22 549:4,6 554:18 555:17 555:20 556:1 558:7 564:2 575:5,19,20 576:10 577:5,13,25 578:19 579:12 581:18 584:5,13 586:8,20 587:7 589:19 590:22 591:25 592:22 594:11 594:16,23 595:2,23 596:14 597:15 603:11 603:22 604:12 606:19 606:21 613:23 614:7 614:13,22 615:18 617:15 623:3 626:24 627:1 628:2,8,9 629:13 630:3,6,21,22 631:2 632:16 634:16 636:16 637:9 638:7.8 638:22 639:16,23 640:12,13,20,23 641:5 641:8,12,17,22 642:2 642:2,6,9,10,13 643:6 644:9 645:18,18,21 647:8,16,17,17,22 648:3,9,10,10,13

649:11,21,24 650:6,11 staff's 395:3 411:13 420:25 432:17 433:25 505:22 545:23 546:17 550:5 552:16 553:6 555:16,23 577:1 585:25 586:24 587:12 591:4 617:11 632:20 635:6,12 636:20,22 644:18 645:12 stakeholder 534:10 stakeholders 447:9.11 447:12,15 510:10 stand 459:4 534:17 standard 445:18 448:5 477:10 570:1 571:8 602:22 standards 394:4,24,24 422:6,10 424:24 431:8 436:23 444:8,20 445:10,12 453:3,13 465:17 482:10 569:5 585:22 605:14 606:11 606:13,13 625:3 634:7 standing 390:19 409:22 426:21 453:4 stands 450:7,19 start 414:6 426:7 431:20 437:9 439:4 472:24 473:15 483:25 503:22 518:23 525:4 539:19 548:19 554:6 570:11 570:20 572:20 591:2 597:23 603:18 605:19 622:7 623:15 631:19 634:9.18 636:11 started 389:10 393:22 431:13 482:19 487:23 582:16 590:24 605:7 613:11 628:23 635:15 starting 434:4 484:9 589:22 594:17 605:20 606:5 623:16 634:22 634:23 starts 486:4 528:13 state 390:5,11 413:1 427:25 428:16 436:1 442:1 444:8 449:16 451:4,16,20 455:16,20 457:12 458:25 464:19 465:12 480:4 485:20 485:23,25 486:11,20 497:2,3 499:3 509:6,9 514:5 536:4.10 559:17 560:4,11 565:3 604:22 627:20 628:13 629:20 651:3 stated 414:1 422:9 636:18 statement 402:5 472:3,3 477:18 503:2 560:3 572.6 statements 403:4,7 states 425:2 472:18 510:2 Statewide 463:12 static 634:21 stations 484:17 490:8

601:3

542:12 572:11 614:20

490:18 491:23 541:2

515:10 532:16

578:13

statistic 481:6
statistical 480:25
statutes 574:10 stay 401:13 406:5 460:2
545:15
stems 449:13 531:2 step 461:16 472:24
473:15 491:7 582:15
582:16,22 601:4 624:23
stepped 447:25
Steve 387:17,19 402:22 402:25 410:24 502:19
503:21,24
sticks 522:9 still 390:20 394:18
399:18 420:18 425:17
433:16,22 440:25 469:11 476:9 500:7,13
501:10,11 528:11
536:13 548:20 549:11
552:16,17,18 584:5,13 585:13,14 586:15
587:9 594:5 600:2,4
614:24 615:21 621:14 621:23 624:17
stipulation 458:7
stop 626:12 stopping 550:6
stops 465:15
storage 619:14 620:10 stores 478:20
storm 412:17 445:23
501:17,21 547:3 608:25
strain 521:12
strangers 478:22 strawberries 419:3
506:3 557:9 578:14,22
579:1,6,10,15 580:13 580:17,21,25 583:6
strawberry 444:5 557:9
577:2 578:12 579:10 580:2 608:22
stream 437:22 439:23
442:25 455:11 528:19 633:16
streamlined 394:20
street 620:3 stretch 409:16 457:5
632:9
strict 434:1 485:20 505:3 518:8
strictest 536:4,9,10
strike 545:8 548:15 549:2
strikeout 630:7
stringent 490:4 611:25 strips 481:11,12,18
strive 411:1
struck 412:16 433:19 462:17
structure 491:5 634:2
637:17 structured 596:21
structures 445:4 623:12
Stuart 512:10 519:20,21 studied 572:9
studies 565:11,22,23

579:24 580:16 582:14 suggest 423:16 533:14 593:19 604:23.25 study 512:25 578:13 suggested 447:24 579:17 580:10 stuff 491:12 492:3 512:5 suggesting 462:25 sturgeon 432:14 Styles 512:11 519:20,21 subject 402:7 411:23 412:13 476:9 521:7 539:16 540:14 541:12 543:13 546:19 552:13 552:14 565:13 641:9 subjective 597:22 submission 641:12 649:22,23,25 submissions 436:10 submit 403:19 406:4,13 429:14 470:13 539:12 540:20 544:10.11.13 567:15 625:7,8 640:21 643:11,20 644:10 645:20 648:8.13 submitted 396:22 400:2 400:10 401:19 404:3 406:6 429:19,20 432:16 469:9 470:7 478:2 492:1,3 510:5 534:9 537:1,2 539:17 540:15 542:21 543:21 567:16 587:16 604:15 605:23 609:22 616:9 617 6 630 7 18 631 9 639:24 643:4 645:14 645:15 **submitting** 407:7 619:12 647:6,14 subpieces 526:5 Subsection 459:2 subsequent 406:17 433:10 435:1 subsequently 406:6 520:22 subset 395:19 426:9 433:7 447:21 562:12 579:18 587:23 599:23 599:25 604:2 624:1,2 substantial 425:11 445:5 substantively 599:7 substations 484:19 substituted 597:20 subtract 589:10,10 sub-watershed 431:18 624:1,8,10,10 sub-watersheds 484:19 551:20 success 450:8 608:19 633:14 successful 431:24 450:13 475:9 523:12 536:19 608:21 successfully 447:8 483:25 sudden 499:17 suffering 469:23 **sufficiency** 469:12,16 sufficient 469:24 645:22

suggestion 516:25 616:1 suggestions 454:3 suing 486:4 Sul 477:25 478:9 sum 458:23 summarize 471:24 472:14 473:7 505:20 summarized 506:25 summarizes 604:19 summarizing 504:18 540:21 summary 393:9 398:17 506:13 526:2 555:15 598:16 599:10 summer 518:19 superfund 523:23 supermarket 409:23 supermarkets 409:19 478:21 supplement 538:25 supplementals 396:6,7 supplies 556:16 564:21 566:4 570:25 610:17 supply 418:6 565:1 569:13,18,24 571:1 625:18 648:2 support 425:5 427:5,6 427:13 429:8,9 441:20 442:3,9,13 446:4 448:9 463:20 470:15 485:13 495:19 519:6 522:10 529:15 561:21 583:16,18 618:9 628:19 636:7 supported 425:10 443:2 supportive 448:15 supports 622:4 **supposed** 541:11 618:19 sure 402:25 432:17 440:2 449:24 455:3 458:10 464:14 466:3 469:25 470:10 496:14 502:6 524:21 525:25 532:19 533:15 537:20 543:19 550:13 615:19 616:20 619:4 620:17 623:13 631:16 633:2 636:9 642:14 645:9,23 646:15 648:6 surely 628:15 surface 394:7,25 395:15 411:11 424:23 466:8 476:2,2,5 483:6 497:17 501:16 504:18 506:20 517:18 518:13 518:24 528:8 535:3 558:21 584:10 593:4 593:11 600:25 601:1 604:14 607:18 608:2 612:12,17 613:4 626:2 surprised 484:24 563:8 surprising 523:8 surrounded 444:5 survive 445:20,24 491:2 Susan 387:25 441:10 494:7,8,9 505:8 suspected 580:6 **sustain** 479:17 sustainable 412:5,5 459:5.6 **swallows** 442:21 sweep 453:23 swift 611:16,17 switch 592:21 594:3 sword 457:19 syncs 471:4 syndrome 522:7 **system** 415:1 471:5 475:1 480:13,16 483:20 490:2 514:5,20 551:22 systems 445:15 484:8 528:14 530:13 565:6 571:5 585:9 S-A-L-A-S 426:25 S-C-H-M-I-D-T 517:13 **S-H-I-M-E-K** 403:1 502:19

т T 387:6 table 446:20 448:19 483:4,4,17,17 494:24 526:1 554:22 tables 563:2 tags 406:1 tail 412:12 445:8 tailgate 529:5 tainted 611:23 612:5 take 389:13 391:12 397:21 399:18 411:13 414:24,25 417:5,10 418:23 419:12 429:6 433:24 434:14 438:2 439:8 450:22 456:20 466:11 467:20 484:11 505:2 516:1 517:3 518:13 529:3 537:10 544:3 545:19 552:3 553:5 554:11 555:4 558:24 561:13 563:4 576:5 581:24 589:9 590:4,16 613:8,15 617:6 622:20 624:12 624:14 625:23 626:5 626:10 628:8 630:3.6 630:21 638:11,23 644:5 649:22 takeaway 532:7 taken 396:11 436:11 437:7 442:18 443:11 456:9 466:14 469:17 471:2 476:13 501:19 516:6 545:22 554:15 555:2 568:23 607:13 651:8 takes 394:17 453:17 481:24 610:14 632:8

639:11 taking 422:5 439:25 457:6 464:21 467:1 469:24 470:22 493:24 497:1 555:12 613:1 650:10 talk 393:12 413:6 430:8 439:24 492:21 496:6 496:15,17,20 526:14 528:9.11 534:2 562:7 575:24 577:7 585:23 630:14 642:24 talked 394:20 395:1 431:22 438:10 455:4 496:16 513:23 515:6 537:16 552:9 592:8 610:23 631:25 talking 393:6 502:6 514:11 515:21,22 540:18,23 574:18 575:13,18 603:3 611:1 611:3 626:2 629:18 638:19 Taloff 519:23 tank 524:2 610:24 611:2 620:10 tanks 619:14 tap 633:18 target 404:18 405:5 413:10,12 464:5 581:14 582:15,17,19 targeted 495:16 targets 482:10,11,13 484:16 581:9,16 582:21 608:22 task 420:6 525:13 tasked 534:8 taught 487:22 Taxpayer 524:14 taxpayers 493:15 608:10 team 500:3 502:11 592:10 Tech 514:5 technical 430:12 431:9 485:8 522:15 532:20 533:2,4,6,9 539:7,8,21 539:23 540:7,9 550:23 550:24 551:4,9 555:22 558:7,8 566:11 577:10 582:14 608:17 technically 533:13 techniques 447:24 technologies 418:23 technologist 572:23 technology 420:3 573:6 582:20 teleconferencing 405:9 tell 436:20 452:24 461:20 462:4 474:18 474:21 484:6 491:9 611:10 633:1 647:19 telling 425:6 465:10 487:15 tells 464:1 622:5,5 temperature 495:1

645:24

563:24

temporarily 608:12

ten 438:14 483:8 484:22

	I	I	I	I
485:2 487:3 624:9,9	477:15,16 478:5	501:19,19 512:3,6	508:4 513:6 622:14	490:2,18,19 494:21
624:14 625:12,13	479:21 482:17 485:3	516:3,13 517:5 525:3	634:12	495:4,4 497:24 499:14
642:12,19	492:23 493:24 494:4,6	525:7 530:24 548:18	thought 405:2 474:1,3	499:15 500:5 501:25
tendency 416:23	495:22,23 496:5	555:2,4 563:7 571:25	480:14 529:4 564:14	502:2 505:21 506:1,8
tens 470:6	498:13 499:22,23	573:8 575:9 586:1	580:14 592:5 604:4	506:12,14,23 507:1
tense 514:16	500:4 502:16 505:7,16	601:20 604:7,8 607:8	626:19,22 635:20	524:22,25 525:3,7,8
tentative 582:15	507:18 508:2 509:2	616:25 618:19 619:21	636:5	525:14,20,21 526:3,25
tenure 611:6	510:12,14 512:7	619:23 623:1 628:1,5	thoughts 441:23 614:3	526:25 527:4,7,9,14
ten-year 478:9	514:12 515:4 517:9	638:25 648:24	629:23	527:17 544:2,2 545:16
term 434:8 459:14	519:18,19 521:20,21	think 395:7 397:9 398:3	thousand 476:5	545:17 546:8,17,17
484:24 509:21,21	521:23 524:9,10	400:11 402:16 406:14	thousands 470:6 493:12	557:20 558:21 562:13
539:14 608:13 613:6,7	527:22 530:2 531:11	406:22 414:3,8 417:9	threat 457:19 600:7,13	571:22 573:11 581:10
		417:15 423:3 430:16	threaten 510:4	
613:8 621:7,8 626:7 629:4	531:25 536:22 537:14			581:17 586:5,12,25
	539:3 542:10,16 554:9	431:6 433:17 434:8	threatened 611:24 612:2	587:3 591:7,7,8,13,15
terminate 542:1 548:6	554:10 555:11 583:7	435:20 436:5,7 437:4	612:4	591:15,18 593:23,25
terminated 542:14	607:7,16 614:1 620:23	438:5,17,19 439:4	threats 500:9 610:15	594:23 595:13 597:14
termination 542:5	621:16 622:21 650:22	449:11 452:20 456:13	611:20	599:15,21 600:2,5,11
547:22	their 395:20,20 399:13	459:15 464:14 469:22	three 393:12 396:3	600:18,21 601:11
termitacides 497:8	401:3,5,15,15,21	471:15,16 472:23	399:11,17 405:8,13	602:1,10,24 603:16,20
termites 497:9	403:10 405:12,22	473:15 474:10,11	413:13 415:6 424:16	603:25 604:1,3 619:2
terms 396:25 399:2,3	407:15 414:22 416:15	483:11 485:8 486:8,22	430:8 435:19 439:1,2	619:2
449:25 465:15 481:1	416:21 418:8 420:25	487:1,1,4 489:18	447:11 453:17 480:10	tiering 433:9 476:9
487:5,25 489:6 490:14	421:6,8,22 439:25	491:9,10 496:10 501:9	484:22 486:3 487:3,8	480:13,16 487:15
491:1,4 495:19 497:5	445:16,22 449:24,25	511:25 512:9 515:17	487:23 496:6 503:22	492:20 499:16 504:24
505:20 506:25 507:21	451:14 452:25 455:10	517:7 523:13 524:23	525:12 526:7 527:3	538:22 557:21 558:5
573:10 574:20 593:23	456:1 463:1,24 466:25	526:20,21 528:3,7	531:8 556:2 569:17	586:3,4,7 587:6,10
601:13,15 603:5,11	467:21 475:23 476:18	530:15 531:8 533:21	576:24 586:23 597:12	591:6 592:15 594:15
612:17 614:6 619:20	476:19 479:3 483:18	536:16 539:1,12	635:3 639:20	594:17 595:3,22
620:6 623:9 624:1,13	483:19 486:24 493:11	540:17,18 541:21	three-minute 397:1	596:14,17,19 598:3,17
624:25 625:21 633:20	505:10,22 514:6	543:22 548:23 551:11	threw 639:5	598:19,22 602:12
634:16 639:2	522:20 523:13,16	553:6,8 554:24 560:5	through 391:3 393:16	605:17,18 623:12
Tess 388:11 531:23	524:1,8 533:10,11,16	566:6 567:3,6 570:7	398:10 399:7,19	tiers 393:12,20,24 396:3
532:3	534:3 537:6 541:22	570:25 571:15 573:1,1	400:24 401:7,14 407:3	425:16,20 426:6 433:6
test 454:6 504:19 597:21	543:14 544:2,19	573:3,20,22 574:4	407:13 412:15 417:11	439:1,3 442:10,13
597:21 614:12	545:11 548:1,4 549:21	579:14 580:12,18	418:17 423:13 431:19	450:19 451:10 452:1,2
testament 633:14	554:18 566:12 567:10	582:5,18 583:24	431:19 434:20 435:7	453:11,11 487:17
tested 444:7	568:6 569:23 575:24	599:20 605:17 607:4	438:7,11 439:21	500:21,25 525:22
testified 533:5	583:19 584:2 585:21	611:9 614:6,12 617:16	450:15 452:4 457:10	527:3 546:9 594:22
testify 396:15 524:15	586:11 587:4 595:13	619:6,19 621:21 623:5	461:3,10 472:25 473:2	599:6,12 603:1,11,24
testimony 402:12 416:25	598:9 606:8,9,10	623:12,14,19 625:20	473:6 481:24 482:1,2	612:19
417:16 428:2 521:4	607:21 609:16,16,18	626:3,5,9,12,24,25	484:8 485:24 488:3	tile 483:3,3,18 549:24
555:5,18,18 556:6	611:10 614:21 617:19	627:4,11,14,18 628:2	491:6,15 495:20	550:6,13,19 551:3,6
557:8 564:12,14	619:11,12,18 627:6	628:3,13,22,25 629:4	515:19 516:2 527:24	551:22 559:1,2
565:15 569:12,16	630:22 633:21 638:2	629:6,6,10,13,15	531:14 537:4 548:14	tiles 483:5
595:7 627:14	639:3,19,20 640:10	631:14 632:18,21,24	554:7 563:24 570:15	till 435:5
testing 416:6,11 425:1	641:11 643:11 649:23	633:6,7,13 635:17,25	575:18 579:16 585:10	tillage 416:11
484:2	themselves 526:17	636:9,15,18,23 637:4	595:19 598:10,13	Tim 387:19 408:14 413:5
tests 478:25 597:18	532:20	637:15 644:9,23	602:22 617:12 621:2	413:21 425:12
thank 391:5,11,24	theory 481:6	646:12,20 648:4,5,19	626:8 634:4	time 391:14,15 392:13
398:10,20,25 402:19	thick 560:19	649:3,12 650:15	throughout 404:16	392:22 393:1,6,21
7 7		'	418:6 436:15 447:7	394:13 396:23 399:22
402:20 403:17 404:10 405:14,15,24 406:3,24	thing 403:6 405:25 439:7	thinking 409:2,15	455:9 556:8 557:17	
407:1 408:18 410:19	470:12 481:22 482:2 484:13 489:12 514:8	460:25 491:4 529:17 529:18 552:2 624:4		399:25 400:9 404:18 404:20,24 407:6,11
	484:13 489:12 514:8		604:22,22 throw 525:21 575:8	
410:20 413:2,3 415:10	516:11 517:6 519:4	third 408:12 420:15	throw 525:21 575:8	412:25 419:1 420:2
415:11 417:21,22	526:23 547:9 549:14	436:25 495:20 533:1	602:19 644:4	421:20,25 422:12
420:11,12 422:19,20	551:17,17 553:17	533:18,21,21,24	throwing 574:25	430:9 431:3,15 437:10
423:19,20 424:10	555:3 562:9 574:21	535:22 539:11 540:19	thrown 438:8	451:19,21 457:17
426:16,17 427:3,12,15	576:7,8 605:1 612:21	541:5 542:3 544:18	thwarted 411:3	462:17 466:25 467:2
429:12,13 430:4 432:6	615:17 626:20 627:12	546:15 548:5 551:23	tie 516:8 593:19	473:6 474:3,12 480:9
432:7 434:16 435:14	628:14 629:14 631:15	552:13	tied 442:11	484:11 489:12 503:14
437:11 439:12,13,15	631:15 633:11 636:12	third-party 557:16	tier 393:14,14,23 394:17	512:6 516:23 518:12
440:8,9 441:9 443:16	639:9	Thomas 387:11 388:15	395:4,10,10,13,13,17	518:22 523:24 524:1
446:2 448:13 449:1	things 394:14 395:22	391:6 508:11,22,25	412:3 425:19,22,22	526:11 528:10 529:13
451:19,24 452:17	397:4 418:25 431:6	555:23 560:9 574:17	426:3,5,6,7,9,13,14	529:19 530:20 532:22
455:2 458:14 462:11	433:22 437:4 438:12	575:17 577:8 604:7	428:23 431:22 437:20	537:21 539:5 542:6
462:13 464:16,17	438:12 439:6 459:25	617:3 642:25 643:22	437:23 438:8 440:7	547:25 548:14 555:4
466:10,12 468:12,18	462:14 471:4,24	644:2 645:4	442:9,15,17 461:20,20	555:12 570:16 580:4,6
468:19 470:18 471:18	487:24 488:25 490:13	Thomasberg 474:7	461:21,21 464:4,4	582:24 584:6 586:10
473:21,22 475:14,16	490:25 498:6,7 500:24	though 469:13 502:21	486:18,18,18,21,23	592:24 594:16,24
	I	I	I	I

				_
E0E:2 604:0 60E:14 22	622-6	603:4	T-E-S-S 532:3	unirrigated 506:10
595:3 604:9 605:14,22	622:6	603:4		_
606:14 608:6,23	top 496:6 563:15 570:9	truly 417:20 505:4	T-O-M-L-I-N-S-O-N	Unit 560:15
612:20 613:1,12	612:10	548:21	535:20	Unitarian 400:17 467:7
619:12 622:9 624:22	topic 413:8 432:20 460:2	truth 409:17 484:6 491:9		493:2
626:10 628:22 632:8	502:1 575:15	try 399:20 405:23 414:5	U	United 472:18 510:1
634:18 638:5,24	total 398:12 506:10	430:23 462:7 465:22	UC 413:21 451:4 452:11	units 514:8 559:24
639:11,20 642:5	527:7 562:14 573:16	466:2 502:13 506:12	455:22 459:10 485:25	Universalist 467:7 493:3
643:17,19,21 647:6,11	573:19 581:13 582:8	532:23 553:6 555:6	514:4	universities 514:6
647:23 648:2,4 649:11	587:16 601:14 604:2	571:9 572:17 573:2,3	ultimate 552:5,6 628:13	University 451:16,17
651:9	totality 436:7	614:8 631:16	ultimately 468:1 527:10	459:20 469:3 485:25
timeframes 634:13	totally 516:7 552:11	trying 400:23 418:12	545:15 595:1 597:10	558:1 577:14 578:24
timeline 396:13 453:16	587:21	431:14 438:4,25 439:2	633:24	579:8 587:14 588:23
539:9 541:18 604:20	touch 464:18	450:20 457:21 461:22	um 574:2	unjust 521:18
626:6 629:16	tough 434:12	466:1 486:5,10 492:7	umbrella 545:8	unknown 580:23 594:22
timelines 426:12 482:13	towards 430:18 431:1,10	492:11 503:15 511:14	unable 402:3,4 421:4	unless 399:8 516:20
535:11 542:11	432:4 502:3 551:9	511:21,24 528:15	426:22 478:6	518:19 615:4
timely 505:2 645:16	township 538:7 568:2,3	529:20 542:22 547:12	UNANNOUNCED 524:12	unlike 518:21
647:8	toxic 428:24 468:8	548:14 566:21 569:15	unattainable 421:20	unnecessary 594:25
timer 397:6	612:12 613:5	574:12,13 601:5	613:1	unobtainable 422:14
times 416:24 470:3	toxicity 454:10 494:25	603:11,17 623:10	unavoidable 418:12	unrepresentative 443:13
479:1 516:1 517:22,23	502:4 547:2,3 592:17	628:23 634:25 636:24	uncertain 641:5	unrepresented 579:21
525:12 568:24 569:25	592:19 593:4,5,19,20	644:15 645:24	unclear 641:5	unresolved 593:20
571:7 577:7 584:16	593:25 594:5,20 597:6	turn 483:23 487:8	uncontrollable 442:21	unresponsive 606:20
590:10 603:14 612:7,8	597:8,17 607:17 613:6	499:19 572:19 607:6	443:6	unsustainable 413:16
612:8,8 632:5	toxicological 497:2	turned 396:18 434:7		450:9 464:23
timing 471:14 539:11	toxins 428:21	turning 489:10	under 442:6,19 444:15 477:13 485:9 506:21	until 397:18 429:4
572:16	track 447:18 469:17	turns 405:3 480:24		445:12 454:22 481:17
titled 550:1	tracking 566:25	481:3 483:12 486:4	520:9 521:18 523:17 543:3,8 544:21 545:21	500:14 515:16 540:15
today 389:9 390:13	tracks 472:21	twice 525:12 590:7	1	541:9 611:19 632:17
392:5,9,24 393:3	trade 553:23 615:16,19	twist 418:10	546:17 549:6 614:16	unwilling 421:4,14
397:24 399:2,12 400:2	train 488:19	two 392:10 393:4 400:16	634:11 651:11	update 561:4 565:23
400:3,25 401:4,6	trained 490:9 491:8,13	403:16 407:9 421:16	underground 524:1	570:2 582:25 621:16
406:20 413:11 418:13	519:12,15 584:20	425:18 443:23 450:22	530:24 610:24 611:2	650:12
422:7 431:6 435:19	training 588:23	450:23,24 452:8,10	619:14 620:9	updated 587:17 599:14
437:5,7,16 439:16,18	transcription 651:10	453:17,18 459:15	underline 545:9	updates 611:18
444:3 446:4,23 449:6	transit 443:8	461:25 470:8,9 475:24	undermining 450:13	uploading 571:17
	transition 574:14	•	underplay 530:25	upstream 518:6
452:9 462:22 464:15		484:22 488:1 492:19	understand 408:24	· ·
464:20 476:7,16 478:7	translated 613:18	499:8 504:12,15 506:1	434:23 456:15 463:1,1	uptake 414:5,6,18 425:7
478:8 489:8 511:1	translates 481:3	515:23,25 520:6,11	463:22 466:9 490:10	450:20,23 451:9,12
512:3,5 516:4 530:7	transparency 532:23	525:7 532:7 536:8	492:16 505:8 513:21	452:2,16,25 453:18
533:6 542:23 555:19	transport 502:10 522:5	549:13 550:16 568:12	515:1 537:20 549:17	454:25 455:5 461:6,14
556:6 558:12 564:9	travel 405:12 516:2	575:18 576:10 578:3,7	550:8 560:13 571:2	464:24 469:16 572:9
565:20 566:2 577:4,7	travels 434:20 515:19	578:10,20 584:16	574:8 582:12 614:15	572:12 582:8,10 589:4
577:12 580:22 583:15	treat 528:16	592:20,20 597:12,18	616:20 617:21 631:11	589:8,11
584:5 585:2,15 586:2	treated 445:11	603:1 612:7 619:3,3,5	631:13 635:23 637:21	urban 495:13 622:16
607:3,3 608:4 610:23	treating 493:13	626:16 627:15 629:1	637:25 647:10	urge 414:17 422:14
611:1 612:2 613:17,18	treatment 445:15 484:3	630:12,15,17 639:7	understanding 406:8	439:8 467:18 468:5
626:4,21 629:17	551:22 565:6 608:14	two-and-a-half 393:16	460:21 475:5 508:5	505:2
630:11,17 638:14,15	tree 507:16	605:7 612:23,24 629:2	532:9	urgency 610:14 613:3,4
638:20,21 639:2,12	trees 508:5,19,25	two-and-a-half-hours	understands 526:1	urgent 612:11
649:23 650:9	tremendously 438:16	397:22 399:19	understatement 426:4	urging 510:6
today's 396:19 551:13	trend 568:10,25 608:6	type 498:5 517:25	understood 440:3	uria 471:4
together 398:1 422:16	trending 570:14	518:10 522:20 533:19	464:15	USA 524:14
431:13 455:12,19,22	trends 475:11 484:24	535:14 536:13 550:10	undertook 520:10	usage 413:24
460:4 465:22 492:14	529:11	551:21,25 558:2	under-irrrigate 489:13	USDA 457:12
528:5 536:19 543:20	trespassing 518:4,8	576:15 597:21 618:15	undeveloped 478:17	use 397:8 400:6 419:3
549:10 566:10 584:12	trickle 433:9	619:15 627:23 628:16	undoubtedly 605:21	425:8 430:8 436:11,22
616:2 627:12 630:19	tried 434:3 528:9 566:20	634:10 640:18	unduly 528:3	442:6 444:2,16 447:21
650:11	590:23	typed 401:16	unfair 406:22	453:12 457:9 458:24
told 403:5 406:10	trigger 425:6 438:6	types 455:6,10 504:10	unfortunately 430:15	461:3 462:20 469:12
Tomlinson 388:11	439:19,20 440:5 495:4	513:23 515:18 530:21	431:2 434:7 480:9	469:16 480:21 483:19
531:23 535:15,20,20	501:12,25 502:2	551:24 559:4 587:18	483:15 608:7	484:20 492:19,20
538:19 542:11 548:12	triggered 515:13	587:24 591:20,25	unfounded 521:18	493:15 494:17 495:14
553:17	triggers 500:21 622:13	592:7,11,12 611:4	uniformly 428:19	497:20,23 498:1 501:9
Tomorrow 511:11	639:8,13	612:17 621:8	unincorporated 478:17	505:25 527:12 530:16
tonight 446:21	trip 407:10	typical 535:13 582:25	unintended 444:13	530:23 538:24 545:11
tons 488:12	triviality 402:17	583:4 624:20	unique 574:12 606:10	558:1 565:10,10,14
tool 625:25	troubling 465:9 479:14	typo 514:17	uniquely 438:25	570:13 583:17 586:18
tools 411:14 463:18	true 421:11 501:5 562:25	T-A-L-O-F-F 519:23		586:19 587:6 591:5,24
	I		I	1

592:1,4 594:3 595:8 595:12 596:4 598:10 598:11,11,20 602:15 606:8 609:19 623:22 624:14 used 416:5 487:9,17 494:20,23 497:9,10,12 497:14,15 498:3,3,4,4 498:4,5 499:2 502:3 504:12 506:2 512:24 518:4 519:13 530:21 564:10 583:3 588:22 595:21 618:20 628:4 630:24 useful 523:20 users 421:10 uses 419:10 465:13 493:23 531:2,3 using 433:14 447:9 460:11,20,23 477:7 481:15 483:22 484:4 506:5 525:17 537:19 550:6 553:13,16 570:8 589:13,21 592:4 595:24 596:7 598:4 602:22 603:11 616:14 usual 623:2 usually 467:23 592:11 utilized 461:8 **U.S** 410:2

V

valid 450:25 454:22 605:12,16 valley 405:17 409:25 410:3 415:24 436:13 436:15 443:22 445:6 456:1 460:13 462:7 468:7 470:2 471:22.25 472:2 482:14,20,21,24 482:25 483:11 488:8 489:9,10 490:7 491:2 512:13.22.22 515:14 515:25 529:2 530:11 550:13 577:21,24 valuable 580:20 value 446:21 455:5 459:16 483:22 583:3 589.4 valued 419:9 values 419:7 450:21,24 451:9 452:3,16,25 453:4,19 461:6 590:16 618:13 variability 455:9 variant 481:4 variation 455:8 variations 633:3 variety 594:18 various 394:5 432:25 455:10 456:17 457:15

465:4,7 513:22 584:16

586:23 603:19 606:8

470:2 525:17 589:13

vegetables 408:14 413:6

vegetable 425:12,18

vary 590:18

vast 617:13

413:22 419:3 506:2 577:20 vegetation 428:13 457:13 559:18 560:2 vegetative 421:6 481:11 481:12,18 484:3 507:1 507:14,22 552:20 vehicle 460:15 verifiable 448:3 verifies 610:7 verifying 618:11 version 540:17 545:9 versions 446:24 556:2 versus 405:8 420:7,10 454:15 489:1 492:8 528:12 529:19 538:7 538:22 544:20 545:19 547:7,12 599:25 637:12 649:2 very 390:2 393:21 394:18 395:9 404:17 405:7,8 406:22 417:1 419:7 421:2 428:8 431:21 432:18 433:19 435:9 437:19 438:24 438:24 439:3,3 444:22 446:18,19 447:22 460:14 463:19 465:18 467:23 470:22 479:21 481:6,12 482:9,15,16 482:24 483:1,4,14,24 483:25 485:21 486:1,9 486.9 498.13 501.23 504:6 509:2 510:4 513:9,15 517:19 523:10,14,15 539:3,24 540:8 544:3 554:9 559:15 569:14 571:15 572:12,13 574:12 588:10 600:7 604:8 614:13,18 620:5,17 622:24 623:22 626:9 627:15 632:23 633:6 637:5 650:22 viable 418:16 427:6 448.1 Vice 389:24 626:14 vice-versa 602:8

video 405:9 view 395:3 430:25 435:24 436:8 567:25 636:22,23 639:11 643:24 views 637:9 Villa 443:10 vines 508:14 vineyard 400:15 500:2 502:11 527:13 vineyards 412:13 507:16 508:13,20,23,25 577:18 violates 472:17 violating 634:12 violation 617:17 violations 547:20 575:23 636:20 violators 547:20

vise-versa 602:9 vis-a-vis 397:22 vital 478:10 509:25 voice 406:21 431:14 volatilizes 471:3 volition 397:14 volume 386:8 426:11 444:23 601:20 voluntary 454:15 545:10 545:18 567:1,20 621:20 632:23 637:12 637:14 voluntary-based 411:25 vote 434:14 613:18,23

631:17 649:5 voter 524:14 W **W** 387:10 wait 392:23 414:7 429:4 429:24 457:18 464:3,9 466:25 508:2 626:4 waiting 596:20 waiver 386:12 392:6 402:2 416:2,19 476:1 477:14 482:1 486:15 486:17 496:6 501:5 504:3 510:8 517:15 518:12 519:2 522:14 536:4 544:21 545:17 615:2 618:5,6,6,10 620:20 624:20,22 625:1 628:8,17,19 waivers 549:16 waiver's 618:12 want 390:21 398:16 399:10 406:21 416:1 422:17 427:12 438:20 454:4 458:9 459:12 466:3 467:18,20 469:8 470:12 471:24 472:13 477:4 480:8,12 481:1 481:22 485:14 489:13 489:22 496:6.15 498:15,17 500:4 525:25 526:21 530:15 530:24 537:11 541:4 542:13 544:19 545:13 545:19 551:21 555:2 555:11 558:13 559:9 561:11 562:4,12 563:4 566:5 568:5 572:18 574:17 582:6 591:9 602:19 613:20 614:4,5 616:20 620:17 628:15 629:10.15 631:8 633:10,11 635:25 636:8 639:1 640:20 644:8 645:8 648:8 649:18 wanted 396:15 397:4 399:1,22 400:25 406:6 429:14 435:23 440:2 464:14 470:10 475:24 511:3 514:4 515:1 531:4 532:19 558:10

558:18 559:1.11.18

563:14 581:6 583:11

584:19 604:8 615:22 619:16,25 wanting 621:6 wants 401:5,21 614:13 warning 397:11 warrant 576:12 warranted 592:24 **warrants** 571:16 washing 428:25 wasn't 475:3 480:16 503:18 515:12 525:16 525:17,18 529:8 562:25 586:10 622:22 632:11 waste 386:12 392:6 412:25 425:25 442:1,7 445:14 517:6 565:6 610:13 wasting 524:1 Watch 403:9,18,23 502:20 503:8 504:1 water 386:1 387:4 389:6 390:5 393:8.11 394:4 394:7,24,25 395:1,15 395:18 405:17 408:22 410:11,17 411:11,15 411:18 412:12,14,17 414:14,14,23 415:7 416:6,12,16,19 417:12 418:6,16 420:21 421:9 421:23 422:10,18 424:23,24 425:25 427:7 429:3,9,21 430:18,23,24 431:20 432:5,11 433:1 435:5 436:9,14 441:21 442:14,20 443:3,8,13 443:14 444:3.8.10.20 444:21,25 445:8,8,10 445:11,12,14,15,17,19 445:22,23 446:22 447:4,6,22 448:2,11 452:22 453:3,8,13 455:21 456:1 457:12 457:21 458:25 460:18 461:4 463:17 464:19 465:13,17 466:5,6,6,8 467:15 468:6 469:3,4 470:16 471:9,22,25 472:22 473:2,5,24 474:5,7,19,20 476:2,3 476:5,8,8,12 478:3,23 478:25 479:3,16,18 480:4,6,14,20,22 481:7,24 482:1 483:4 483:4,6,16,16,16,17 483:19,21 484:7 485:21,23 486:4,11,20 486:25 488:3.4 491:6 491:10 492:4 493:4,11 493:14,23 494:2,12,13 494:18,23,25 495:2,17 495:19 497:17 498:12 498:20.24 499:3.4.13 499:19 500:9,19,23,24 501:11,13,16,18,21 502:14 504:4,7,19 505:4,17 506:5,20 507:3,9 508:16 509:17

512:13 515:18 517:4 517:18 518:13.24 520:10 522:11,14,22 522:23 523:1,7,17,17 525:19 528:8,12,12,15 528:18,21 530:8,9,11 530:19 531:1,1 532:6 540:15 547:3 551:21 552:6,15 556:16,21,25 557:7.10 558:20.21 559:8,12 560:23 561:20.23 563:19.23 564:2,10,17,21,23 565:1,6,10,12 566:3,7 566:9.17 567:2 569:5 569:18,21,23 570:1,4 570:12,19,25 571:1,8 576:24 581:4 583:19 584:10,15 585:6,7,10 585:22 586:3,6,16 587:7 593:1,4,12,16 595:1,6 596:22 597:5 597:13,18 598:7,9 599:4 600:10,13,25 601:1.10.16.20.21 603:2 604:12,14,15 605:4,6,10,13,15 606:11,12 607:18,19 607:22,25 608:2,8,8,9 608:12,13,25 609:1,18 610:8,11,12,15,17,18 610:21 612:5 614:25 615:2.3.6.14.19 616:17 618:23 622:1,2 622:7 625:10,18 626:2 628:12 632:22 640:12 watering 394:9 waters 442:1 446:18 595:9 607:18 608:1 612:12,13 613:4 watershed 394:9 395:15 428:22 431:18 432:1 437:17 447:3 481:24 482:2,9,9 484:14,18 498:7 529:1 565:9 600:17 618:8 watersheds 437:18 482:7,7 489:21 492:13 495:10 551:20 601:3 609:4,17 627:12 watershed-based 620:22 Watsonville 389:10 392:3,22 396:8,16 399:14,15 404:20,20 405:20 413:9 420:22 432:20 433:20 447:22 474:3,10 480:15 530:7 577:3 638:23 way 399:7 401:3 405:6 405:11 406:11 407:12 407:13,15,25 414:11 418:17 420:8 430:16 430:18 432:4 436:23 441:24 459:6,6,25 461:18 464:22 466:2 470:24 486:17 487:4

virtually 405:11

virtue 402:12 437:20

490:11,23 495:21,24

500:23 516:21 525:19

533:16 534:5 536:18 544:16 545:8 548:17 549:2 568:11 571:21 572:12 583:22 586:5 606:1 613:23 614:23 616:24 620:10,13 623:1 624:17,19 625:2 628:15 633:16 634:4 636:17 637:18 648:9 ways 405:9 449:9 459:8 471:5 477:6,6 549:14 565:19 570:4,5,12 609:14 610:2 626:20 weak 494:1 weaker 504:9 weaknesses 435:22 web 521:1 Weber 390:12 Webster 520:1
WEDNESDAY 389:2
week 436:2 489:19 Weekes 474:2,10
weeks 424:16 470:8,9
487:23 489:20 Weiley 524:11
weird 488:14
welcome 389:8 390:10 449:2 542:12
well 390:2,2,9 392:13
395:1 398:12 400:16
401:20 405:2 406:2 419:2,6 433:1 436:20
437:21 438:5 440:24
441:1,18 443:23 444:2 444:4,7,10 455:7,20
456:13 457:18 459:9
461:9 463:5,14 464:10
465:9 469:5 477:9 479:7 480:7 482:25
484:15 487:21 490:9
490:17 491:8,12,17 492:2,19 511:7 515:7
515:12 516:6 517:22
527:18 536:5,25 544:14,16,22 549:19
550:5 552:12 554:11
555:18 556:15 557:12
560:13 561:22 566:20 566:21 567:8,22 568:5
568:8,12 570:21 571:6
571:14,15 573:20 583:14 584:13 595:15
601:7 604:22 609:20
613:11 614:11,19 620:12 621:1 622:1
624:19 626:25 631:6
631:24 638:13 639:14
646:2 648:7 wellhead 608:14
wells 412:9 479:16
519:12 538:1,6,16 556:15,17 565:1,20
566:22 567:19,21
568:1,18,19,20,24 569:1,5,13,19,24
571:1,4,6,14 584:15
584:15,16 608:9,13
611:14,22 612:2,3,5 614:12,14 615:11

```
616:14,17,22 619:11
  620:7
went 393:9 403:5 532:15
  534:13 552:13 562:15
  566:19 599:8 607:2
  622:23
were 392:13 393:6 396:6
  400:16,18 403:3
  404:23 406:8,9,10,19
  407:21 412:18 420:23
  429:19,20 430:7
  432:18.23 433:7.8
  437:18 438:11,12,12
  444:25 468:11 484:23
  487:15 500:18 511:24
  511:25 529:5,11 532:9
  532:20 537:2 538:2
  541:11,14 543:21
  545:25 552:15 566:16
  567:17.19 573:9
  579:14,20 580:1
  581:25 582:2,3,13
  583:21 599:19 601:11
  607:3 611:13,14,15,20
  611:22.22.23.23.24
  613:16,21 619:25
  621:18,19 623:1 631:9
  631:23 634:23 638:17
  638:18 639:25 643:4
  645:14,15
weren't 406:5 525:3
  529:12 541:11 612:11
  636.1
west 483:1 550:1
Western 426:21,22
  427:8
wetlands 484:4
we'll 391:21 392:25
  407:12,25 419:25
  434:9 554:13 571:13
  573:3 576:20 609:21
we're 392:4,8,12,24
  399:2 401:3,6 405:7
  407:4,15 419:13,23
  420:1,2,2,4 422:8
  437:24 438:25 439:2,5
  440:1 446:18 455:19
  455:23 457:20 459:4
  460:5 461:9,16,25
  464:5,9,11,11 465:2
  465:10,25 466:1,11
  477:11 490:5 501:14
  502:6,15 506:7 511:7
  511:21 526:10.23
  528:23 529:6,10,19
  536:18,20 540:18,23
  550:6,25 554:11,17
  555:14 568:3 574:12
  575:21 578:17 591:10
  596:12,20 597:14
  598:2 602:11 603:17
  610:25 611:1 613:3
  619:23 621:7 623:9
  627:22 628:1.22 629:6
  629:13,18 631:17
  632:14 634:8,23,24,24
  636:11 637:15 638:10
  641:19 643:14,23
  644:5,12,15 648:23
```

```
649:4,4,5 650:21
we've 393:15.16 395:1
  401:2,17 430:25 449:9
  456:6 465:23 517:24
  517:24 529:11 538:11
  555:2 557:17,21,22,25
  558:3 564:8,12,14
  565:15 569:12 570:16
  584:23 608:17,24
  610:5 612:22 632:5
  639:12 644:12,14
  648:11
whatsoever 395:9
  634:21
while 394:23 414:21
  420:22 421:13 424:22
  448:6 504:12 543:11
  596:20 612:21 622:22
white 393:25,25
Whitney 388:9,10 520:4
  520:5,5,7,7 521:22,23
  521:24
Whitneys 520:6
whoa 531:11
whole 405:12 413:18
  439:25 456:23 469:19
  484:18 515:14 521:19
  523:25 527:4,5 530:24
  579:18 629:20 631:15
  643:21 647:13
wholesale 481:18
  633:21
wide 594:18 640:7
widespread 564:19
  611:4
width 428:6
wife 443:23
wiggle 522:16
wild 445:24 520:16
  561:14 575:1
wildlife 418:4 443:6
William 387:24 432:8
  435:15,18
willing 418:14,20 422:5
  427:9 448:19 573:21
  628:21 629:13
Wilton 520:1
window 531:24 580:4
wine 400:17 408:13
  410:25,25 412:5
wisdom 522:11
wish 407:14 524:15
  563:9
withdrew 520:21
withstand 521:11
WITNESS 651:16
witnessed 522:6
wolf 575:9
Wolff 389:20.21 391:9
  391:20,21,24
woman 566:6
women 478:11
wonder 469:25 491:18
wondering 495:2 515:20
  515:21
Worcester 388:14 597:2
  597:2,13,25
```

word 408:20 485:22

623:22

```
words 579:23
work 402:3 407:12 411:1
  413:20 415:5 416:18
  417:3,5 419:25 420:9
  422:16 423:9,17 427:9
  430:18 431:3,15,16,19
  432:1,2,4 460:17
  473:12 475:6 484:2
  485:5,6 497:2,2 501:6
  502:12.12 516:22
  517:1,8 523:15 524:2
  524:3 525:13 526:4
  528:14 533:16,17
  535:5,23 539:11,13,17
  539:18.23.24 541:24
  542:4,8 544:16 549:10
  552:1 558:7 562:1
  567:5 568:4 575:25
  578:9 583:20 606:9
  610:1 617:16.17
  622:10,23 626:8,23
  627:5,6,10 631:23
  633:18.23 634:6
  636:20 637:19 646:8
workable 414:10 415:7
  448:1
worked 405:6 430:20
  455:25 460:13 482:15
  509:7 522:2 555:21
  561:19 577:23 578:4,6
  612:14,22 631:24
worker 430:23
working 393:17 431:1,10
  437:19 448:24 453:25
  456:2 462:15 465:2
  480:4 482:7 483:24
  524:1,5 536:19 553:23
  559:12.14 561:16.18
  562:4 567:5 618:23
  621:12,13 625:4
  632:12 637:25
workshop 500:10 614:7
  614:10 631:25 636:1
workshops 393:19
  411:10 632:4 635:16
world 510:2 514:10
  550:2 551:13 608:25
  627:21
world's 397:16
worried 440:1
worse 461:19
worst 563:5
wouldn't 491:22 527:14
  541:8 552:13,14
  601:10
wound 529:17
wrap 498:8,9
write 431:7 478:8 643:19
writer 467:14
writing 393:19 642:8
written 396:6,7 400:10
  401:11,11 403:19
  406:13 440:19 478:6
  486:17 510:5 548:18
  561:13,15 604:18
  630:7 640:24 642:22
  643:15 645:12,17,20
```

647:15,21 648:2,3,8

```
648:13 649:22
                        wrong 564:17 644:6
                        wrote 542:22
                        www.depo.com 386:21
                        W-H-I-T-N-E-Y 520:7
                          521:24
                        W-O-R-C-E-S-T-E-R
                          597:3
                                   X
                        x 587:25
                        y 588:5
                        yard 529:13
                        yeah 439:15 460:10
                          485:15 492:21 527:19
                          541:13 560:13 561:3.4
                          571:23 574:18 629:15
                          637:8 648:18 649:8
                        year 410:3,8 424:25
                          458:24 470:3 506:23
                          517:22.23 518:17.20
                          518:25 519:1,1 540:22
                          553:20,21 554:7
                          584:17 597:4 601:2
                          603:14 606:23 607:2
                          613:10 621:19 627:15
                          629:4,17
                        years 393:16 394:2
                          411:10 413:13 415:6
                          415:25 416:4,10
                          419:14 422:2 423:13
                          434:5 438:14,15 444:1
                          448:1 449:10 452:5,6
                          453:17 458:21 459:11
                          463:6 465:11,11,11
                          472:7 473:11 480:5
                          483:8 484:22 485:2
                          486:3 487:3,8 513:10
                          516:5,12 520:8 521:15
                          522:1 523:22 529:24
                          530:14 531:2 566:4
                          568:25 572:25 576:24
                          578:10 597:23 605:8
                          611:19 612:15.23.24
                          613:9 619:3 624:11
                          627:15 629:2,2,3
                          631:24
                        yellow 397:9 410:22
                        yep 545:12
                        yield 469:23
                        yields 483:13
                        yoke 521:18
                        young 387:5 389:5,5,12
                          390:1 391:5,11,16,20
                          391:24 399:1 400:18
                          401:9,10,21 402:20
                          403:18 404:5.11
                          405:15,18 407:1,20
                          408:8,12 410:20 413:3
                          413:9 415:11.19
                          417:11,22 419:1
                          420:12 422:20 423:20
                          423:25 424:3,7,10
                          426:17,24 427:1,3,15
                          429:13,24 430:2 432:7
646:3,12,17 647:3,6
                          432:22 434:16 435:15
```

435:17 437:11 439:13 440:10,14,17,21,24 441:1,5 443:16,19 446:2,5,9 448:14,21
449:1,3 451:23 452:18 452:20 453:5,15,20 454:4,9,13,23 455:2
458:14 460:6,10,25 462:11 464:17 465:9 466:9,16 467:10 468:19,23,25 470:19
470:24 471:18 473:22 474:9,13,17,23 475:2 475:8,12,14,17 477:16 477:20,23 479:21,24
480:2 482:5,18 485:4 487:13,20 488:17 490:17 491:17 492:2,7
492:16,19,23 494:6 495:23 496:2 498:8,10 498:13 499:23 502:16 502:18 503:3,7,10,17
503:21 505:7,14 508:2 508:10,12,24 509:2,4 510:15,21 511:7,12,16 512:7 513:25 514:12
515:4 517:9,11 519:19 519:23 520:4,6,8 521:21 522:8 524:10 524:15,21 527:23
530:5 531:5,7,9,13 532:2 534:24 536:22 537:2,13 542:16,18 544:25 554:10,17
557:4 559:20,22 560:13,17,21,25 561:2 561:6 562:18 566:6
567:15 568:10,16 569:9,11 571:11,20,24 572:5 573:18,20 576:17,19 588:15
595:7,15,23 596:5 600:16,20,23,25 602:2 602:8,14 607:15 614:2 616:11,14 620:24
626:14 629:23 630:10 630:14,20 631:6,11,13 635:9,14,19,21,24 636:3,6 638:8,15,22
640:17 641:11,19,24 642:2,5 643:6,11 644:1,4,19,23 645:3
645:12,25 646:9,22,25 648:1,7,16,18,20,23 649:8,15,17,21 650:10 650:21
your's 538:13

____Z

Z 466:22 Zelinski 388:4 468:22,23 468:24 469:1,1 470:23 471:1 zero 442:9 572:25 zone 429:4 434:21 457:23 zones 421:7 457:9 458:1 484:3 497:18

Z-E-L-I-N-S-K-I 469:2

\$119,000 424:25 \$125,000 520:22 \$24,000 520:20 \$6 506:22 \$9,000 506:23

0 0-C-O-N-N-O-R 500:2 1 395:10 412:3 418:4,10 418:11 419:11 425:22 484:8 486:18 494:24 500:5 525:20 527:20 591.7 16 604.3 619.2 1st 424:14 1,000 425:24 431:24 438:6 439:19,20 440:4 506:2 525:20 546:9 588:4.11 591:19 599:8 602:18,25 1.0 413:14 414:5,15,18 582:7 1.2 582:7 1:00 466:11 **1:30** 466:23 **10** 489:11 571:7 579:18 583:17 588:2 3 8 9 590:10 597:10 602:23 612:8 642:16 10-acre 603:12 10-plus 416:9 **10:00** 389:2 **100** 405:12 501:12 518:5 588:25 599:16 622:1 627.7 100s 442:20 100-acre 590:3 **11** 588:10 **11.2** 443:13 **1100** 507:17 **11701** 386:24 651:6,19 **12** 456:11 489:11 490:6 498:22,24 509:10 583:18 597:10 13 497:13.15.20 13072 587:17 **14** 489:11 **140** 589:8 1411 459:2 **15** 480:5 499:6,6,7 512:21 568:25 569:25 150 441:17 513:10 516:5 **16** 612:8 16th 651:16

1865 441:16 189,000 587:20 19 515:17 1940s 530:12 1945 513:3 1970s 444:6 1990 438:12 458:25 459:24 1993 568:14,19 569:3 1997 566:8

2

2 393:23 394:17 395:11 395:13 426:6 461:20 461:21 464:4 466:23 484:9 486:18 489:23 490:19 495:4 499:14 504:18 521:14 525:8 527:10,20 544:2 545:17 546:17 558:23 591:7,15 600:3,5,18 600:21 601:11 602:24 604:1 619:3 2,000 646:2 **2,3** 598:3 2.3.4 601:2 20 399:15 408:17 438:14 472:7 568:25 599:17 **200-pound** 471:13 2004 394:1,16 428:14 435:25 479:5 504:3 576:9 2005 428:14 2006 443:11 512:19 559:13 2007 568:14,21 569:3 2009 468:11 2010 411:10 433:21 456:11 474:13 494:1,3 494:24 496:11 586:9 2011 386:4 389:2 416:2 420:22 433:21 504:2,8 558:22 561:12 651:16 2014 424:15 453:17,19 2045 513:5 514:17 21 452:6 458:21 459:11 463:6 **215** 589:6 218 506:9 **219,000** 506:9 **230,000** 599:19 25 490:7 507:10 522:1 523:22 **25.000** 506:15 250 518:5

3 3 393:14 395:13,17 425:22 426:3,5,7,9,13 426:14 431:22 437:20 437:23 438:8 440:7 461:20,21 464:4 470:9 470:10 484:9 486:18 490:18 495:4 499:15 504:21 505:21 506:1,8 506:12,14,23 507:1 521:14 524:22,25

29 498:20

525:3,7,14,21 526:3 526:25,25 527:4,7,14 527:17,20 544:2 545:17 546:8,17 558:21 562:13 571:22 591:8,13,18 593:23,25 594:23 595:13 597:14 599:15,21 600:11 602:1 603:20,25 3rd 396:7 429:11 639:24 643:4 645:14 3.000 519:12 587:16 3-acre 470:8 **3:12** 554:15 3:30 554:13.15 30 397:10 399:9 507:7 529:24 534:24 541:25 542:6 548:7 559:25 562:13 30.000 506:15 567:24 30-foot 507:1 553:7 562:11 300.000 468:10 **303** 487:24 488:2 303D 411:18 437:21 439:22 442:16 494:10 494:25 495:2 501:9 325 506:7 **331** 588:8 **35** 412:15 **36** 481:3,4 37 497:17 589:24 612:15 **37.500** 590.9 **3700** 507:17 390 567:19

4 386:4 389:2 392:1 504:24 4th 389:8 40 483:9 484:10 40% 587:20 400 515:16 401 387:16 402 387:17 404 387:17 **405** 387:18 408 387:18 410 387:19 413 387:19 415 387:20 **420** 387:20 422 387:21 424 387:21 426 387:22 427 387:22 430 387:23 **431** 387:18 432 387:23 435 387:24 437 387:24 440,441 387:25 **446** 388:3 **449** 388:3 467,468 388:4

469 388:4

475 388:5

477 388:5

479 388:6 **49** 588:3,9 **496** 388:6 **499** 388:7

5 521:15 **5,000** 507:15 50 397:20 469:18 470:25 471:12,12 484:10 513:7 516:12 533:11 588:14,16 589:22,23 589:24,25 590:25 591:6,7 593:10 627:7 **50s** 483:9 590:7 **50-acre** 590:21 603:12 500 429:7 488:11 590:9 591:1,2,7,8,20 599:9 501C3 478:9 502 387:17 505 388:7 509 388:8 **512** 388:8 **517** 388:9 **52** 450:21,22 452:24 455:4 458:16 461:12 463:8 497:16 **520** 388:9 **521** 388:10 **525** 387:21 **53** 506:10 **531** 388:10 **532** 388:11 **535** 388:11 **55** 399:16 **555,573** 388:12 559 388:12 **56,000** 591:12 **563** 388:13 564 388:13 **576** 388:14 58 496:23 **597** 388:14 6

6 481:2,6 6,000 507:15 6,870 507:6 6:25 650:24 60 398:12,13 412:15 542:6 60s 483:9 515:17 604 388:15 630 600:6 64 481:5 68 507:6 69 591:12

7,000 562:11,16 **74** 481:8 **75** 399:6 589:12,17,23 590:4 **750** 603:13 **7500** 590:5

160 478:16

1600 506:8

17 402:4 499:5 540:13

17th 389:11,12 392:3

592:8,9 649:23

1800s 515:16

398:11 402:13 406:4

531:19 555:18 556:5

557:9 577:3 588:22

578:11 589:6

			Page
0 445.05 444.4 407.44	I	I	1
0 415:25 444:1 497:14 497:15 560:20			
0,000 442:6 00-acre 428:15			
00-288-3376 386:22			
2 507:25 3 562:14			
487:6 496:22 497:13			
497:15,20			
9			
588:7			
! 589:6 ! 544:23 545:1			
512:19			
438:13 499:4			