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listen if that's necessary.
There's four seats right here. Some seats right down through here. One right there. And that's it, Mr. Chair.

MR. YOUNG: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Briggs.
MR. THOMAS: We had a possible glitch with the recorder during the roll call.

I 'd just like for the record to say that the Board members Hayashi, Hunter, JEFFRIES, Wolff are present.

MR. YOUNG: Thank you. All right.
I take it, Mr. Hayashi, you have something to say.

MR. HAYASHI: Yes. For the next time, I guess. I'm recused again. So I will see you next time.

MR. YOUNG: That is because you're an irrigated farmer. You're a farmer that irrigates, that's why you're recused from this hearing?

MR. HAYASHI: Yes.
MR. YOUNG: Dr. Wolff.
MR. WOLFF: We'll keep company to my colleague here. I will recuse myself. Since a portion of my property is dedicated, although one half is dry farming.

MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Dr. Wolff. All right. Mr. Briggs.
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MR. BRIGGS: Item 4 is, as the Chair just mentioned a minute ago, is actually a continuation of the March 17th item that we had in Watsonville, the northern part of the region. And so we're down here in the south central part of our region today for the continuation of that hearing. Concerning the Conditional Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements Discharged from Irrigated Lands.

So just a little overview of what we're going to be doing today. This is a panel hearing, as you just heard, two of our members are forced to being recused on this item, and since we don't have a quorum of the Board sitting up here, we're handling it as a panel hearing, which is what we were doing last time as well, the continuation of that.

What that means is then the panel will then come to a conclusion of the panel that will go forward as a recommendation for action to the next quorum of the Board, which is, hopefully, sooner rather than later.

So, after I get done with my little overview here we will continue with the public comments.

So, we had folks who showed up for the hearing last time in Watsonville, and what our Chair did is -- actually, I'll wait on that explanation. Just an overview of what we're doing today.

So, after public comments we'll have a staff
conclusion and recommendation, and then will be time for the Board Panel to deliberate.

So that's the order of events today.
I just have two slides now that give a little
bit of an overview, kind of get our brain engaged again on what we were talking about last time.

So, the staff will have pointed out at the last hearing about the severity of the water quality problems. We went over that in some detail with summary of the extensive information documented in our staff report and attachments. The Order addresses those water quality problems. It included three tiers, and I'll talk about that a little bit more in the next slide with the highest tier, Tier 3, having more control requirements.

We've had many changes to the Order as it has morphed through the last two-and-a-half years that we've been working on this. And those changes have been in response to many comments that we received. Comments in workshops, in meetings and in writing.

Next. So, to begin the tiers, this slide is very similar, not exactly the same as we saw last time. And so you might recall that we started looking at the center column in Tier 2. And the reason for doing that is because it kind of forms the foundation for the Tiers. So everything that's in white here, the white font, is Page 393
basically a holdover from the existing 2004 Order the Board adopted seven years ago.

So, that Order requires -- is currently in place and effective -- requires water quality standards to be met, signing up. It has the various practices, management measures that are required in the Farm Plan.

Surface water monitoring. Just to be clear, because there's a potential for confusion here, so the watering monitoring refers to the watershed scale monitoring, which is ongoing now. That's what's being conducted on behalf of the industry by the Cooperative Monitoring Program. So that's what we refer to there.

There was the education component time schedule that applies to all of these things.

And then Annual Compliance Report. So that's all part of the existing 2004 Order.

So now for our proposed new Tier 2, it takes all the existing and it adds very few items. It still has the compliance report, but it's basically simplified, streamlined to be an online entry. We talked about that fairly extensively at the last meeting.

The Order requires groundwater sampling and reporting. While the existing Order included what -meeting water quality standards, all standards including groundwater, the focus was really on surface water. And
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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.

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 nutrient management and irrigation management. So just
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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 J anuary 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 completed the hearing, could have deliberated, could have taken action at that meeting, it was noticed to do that. But, basically, we got kicked out of room by the City. So in light of that timeline our Chair asked those who could not make it to the next meeting, show of hands, basically, and those who wanted to go ahead and testify in Watsonville, we had them come up to the podium and 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.

And I'll let you know, it might be helpful
for -- in terms of anticipating when to come up for the
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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
can get together and figure out what our final response 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. Thank you. That the Farm Bureau folks through prearranged, prior to the March 17th meeting asked that they have a total of 60 minutes -- well, maybe actually more than that, it was granted by the Chair, 60 minutes. And they specifically asked prior to that to reserve five minutes at the conclusion of all the public comments for them to have whatever they want to do, whether it's a summary or some responsive comments or a combination. So, the Farm Bureau folks will have an opportunity for that after all the cards.

Thank you for that reminder.
If there are any Spanish speaking folks need some assistance, Hector Hernandez is in the back room over here and can help with that. Monica is right here, Monica Barricarte, our staff.

Thank you both for assisting.
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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.
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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 Vineyard --

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
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.
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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.
Mr. Shimek.
MR. SHIMEK: My name is Steve Shimek from the Monterey Coastal --
(Interruption by the reporter.)
MR. SHIMEK: Sure. My name is Steve Shimek,
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Shimek, S-H-I-M-E-K. The organization is Monterey Coastal.

It came to our attention that the groups were organizing people to read other people's statements. And so, we actually went out and we told some people that we would like to organize the same thing. So we have statements from people like -- that cannot make it from organizations on organizational letterhead such as Pesticide Watch that they would like read into the record when their name is called.

So, we would like to know as soon as possible if we will be able to read those letters into the record.

There are also in addition to the
organizational letters, there are letters from
individuals. So I'm just letting you know it's kind of two classes of letters.

Thank you.
MR. YOUNG: As to the Pesticide Watch did they submit written comments?

MR. SHIMEK: I am not aware, so I don't know.
MS. HUNTER: Yes, they did.
MR. SHIMEK: They did? This is from the Education
Watch Education Fund. I don't know if that's
significantly different, but that's what's on the letterhead. I would imagine that it is a program of
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pesticides.
MS. McCHESNEY: Does anybody know if they submitted a card in March?

Yes, we did.
MR. YOUNG: Yes.
MS. McCHESNEY: So there's a person representing
the organization that could speak on behalf of the organization?

MR. SHIMEK: That would be me.
Thank you.
MR. CALDWELL: Chairman Young, I'm Andy Caldwell,
C-A-L-D-W-E-L-L, with COLAB in San Luis Obispo in Santa
Barbara County.
Our concern with -- you know, the Regional
Board is organized because you have such a big region you rotate your meetings throughout the community to facilitate public access which we very much appreciate.

But it's almost a moving target this time around where people from this region had to go up to Watsonville, but you ran out of time in Watsonville, so then some people that couldn't make it there couldn't make it here aren't speaking. Some of the people that were there that, you know, couldn't speak there because they ran out of time ended up not knowing exactly what date you would be having this hearing. And, like, I know
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one particular person your Board originally intended to have it in April thought, well, I'm going to be here in April, I'll go, it turns out you pushed it to May now she can't be here. And so it's kind of like it's a moving target. And I know this is not your intention, it's just the way it worked out.

I'm very appreciative we're going to get three minutes versus one, but one of the very low cost ways to address this is to have video teleconferencing for public access. Santa Barbara County Board does it. It costs virtually nothing. And that way people aren't expected to give up their whole day and travel 100 miles for three minutes.

Thank you.
MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.
MS. ISAKSON: I'm Nancy Isakson with the Salinas Valley Water Coalition. I-S-A-K-S-O-N.

MR. YOUNG: Hold on for a second.
So, folks, we have a reporter here, just like we did in Watsonville sitting over here to my left. So, everyone really needs to speak up, and she's asking everybody to spell their names when they come to the podium. So try to remember that.

Thank you.
MR. BRIGGS: One other thing for staff, instead of Page 405
spelling it, just say who you are. We do have name tags up here when the staff is speaking as well.

MS. ISAKSON: Thank you.
We did submit speaker cards at the March 17th meeting and weren't able to stay, and so we had asked to have our letters submitted. And, subsequently, I wanted to confirm that they have been distributed to the Board. And my understanding is that they were not because they were not -- seems like in the form of note cards and that they were letters, something that I was told there would be no way you could read them, the entirety into the record. If I could object to you not allowing people to submit written comments after your January cutoff date.

Staff changes have been made, and I think that it is really -- you're doing a disservice to this Board and a disservice to the public by not allowing us to comment on the changes and the subsequent discussions that have occurred at the Board level.

So, we were not allowed to give you our letters, and but we are making a presentation today, a slide presentation, but we -- I do want to voice my objection I think that's very unfair and against the open public law.

Thank you.
Public Meeting Law.
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MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.
You know, we have input from staff and members of the public continually through an agenda item, so new information is always coming up that we're considering and listening to. That doesn't just open up, you know, more time for public comment just because people are submitting information to us.

Staff may go ahead and respond to something an hour or two from now after hearing something from speakers that doesn't trip another round of everyone having more time to comment on what staff might come up with. It's not going to work that way. We'll never get through it, with the meeting, if it goes on that way.

Okay. Does anyone else wish to address us and give us their objection to the way we're going to handle this meeting?
(No response.)

MR. YOUNG: Okay. As to Mr. Shimek's request, Mr. Shimek, as long as you were representing an entity, an organization, you can speak on behalf of that entity. That's fine. Okay.

These have all been put down by Mr. Briggs in alphabetical order. So we'll do it that way because it
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will make it easy for me. I've got a list in front of 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 just come clean and pay for the damage they caused
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because they'll just pass on the cost. Really.
Let me dispel some faulty thinking. First of all, all food companies don't care where your food comes from, nor do they consider quality; they only consider costs.

Food companies buy produce from the lowest cost producer based upon what they can charge you, American consumers, whose number one priority is price, not quality.

And second, farmers are, in fact, generally pretty good people, although crazy enough to do what we do because we love the land. So, who should share the responsibility here? Could it be the people who made the fertilizer? Those who ship it? The companies who sell to the farmers? You're probably thinking that's a stretch.

The truth is the Board staff has completely missed the guilty party. Just look next to you; your neighbor in the next seat who shops at supermarkets and demands rock bottom prices.

To illustrate my seemingly preposterous allegation imagine yourself standing in a produce aisle at your local supermarket looking at lettuce. Odds are those pristine heads of lettuce come from a grower in the Salinas Valley.
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The fact is no matter where you are in the 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.
The Paso Robles Wine Country Alliance and the wine Page 410
industries in general strive to work cooperatively with our governmental and community partners. But these efforts can be thwarted by excessive regulation that requires monitoring for reasons that have not been identified, are not stable overdriven, they can jeopardize proprietary information, create redundancy amongst jurisdictions or result in negative economic 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
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programs.
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 and overlap of local jurisdiction control authority. This redundancy and duplication in regulatory authority is counter to the efforts of Governor Brown to reduce government spending and waste in a time of financial-wide
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.

When the topic came up in March at the Watsonville meeting, Chairman Young, I'd like to quote you. You said you don't have a problem with the target in the Order. And I'm here today to say for me the 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
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## 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 needs to allow for workable solutions.

I'll pose it another way in a question. 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
simple soil sample as an example of the system on his farm and how it relates to the nitrogen legally on his operation.

Some simple solutions that we can include in there to allow growers the chance to do the extra work in the first three years and let the science come along with us and then we can find a workable solution where water quality is protected and farmers can go on operating profitably.

Thank you.
MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.
Would you make just a note what that speaker
said at the end he can back to us with a comment.
All right. Next speaker. I need to call him or her.

Chris Bunn, Crown Packing Company.
Andy Caldwell. Bob Campbell, Lompoc Growers. Bill Carrothers from Salinas.

MR. BUNN: Good morning, Chairman Young, Board Members and Staff.

My name is Chris Bunn, B-U-N-N. I'm from Salinas, California. Part of a fifth generation farming family located in the lower regions of the Salinas Valley. We have homes there with the J apanese families. The J apanese families partnership of over 80 years.
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I want to speak to the Ag
Alternative Proposal for the 2011 Waiver.
First; farmers have collaborated over the past five years on only mandatory farming plants, but have used BMPs and made some of the most extensive testing monitoring for water quality in history of any 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 fits all. As in previous testimony as you have heard and
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seen how agriculture is such a very complex science and art. I'd like to quote a pastor who said, "Farmers do five percent of the work, God does the rest."

We have so little control of our environment and must learn more on how to work with it and take charge of it.

Government has the power to enforce as a servant, you all to us, the people, the Ag community, you have a responsibility. But I think if you allow us to take the responsibility as an Ag community to prove through reasonable science, as this young man just spoke about, and methodology that our precious water resources can be protected for future generations if you give us a chance to do that.

I think your Board has already heard much testimony to Ag's expertise and hands-on experience, that's really an important point, hands-on experience, people who have farmed for generations here.

Please enforce the Ag Alternative Proposal and let the people truly govern.

Thank you.
MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.
Mr. Caldwell.
MR. CALDWELL: Caldwell, C-A-L-D-W-E-L-L.
I'm Andy Caldwell representing the Coalition
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of Agriculture and Businesses, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo Counties.

We do believe on the rule before you will represent a Class 1 impact both to wildlife habitant because in essence you're going to be cutting off the only water supply it has throughout much of the area and 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.

One of the most ignorant things I heard last
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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 ask you to take a different approach.
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
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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
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> 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
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```
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.
            Mr. Fred Chamberlin, and Coates and then Jim
Cochran.
    MR. CHAMBERLIN: Good morning. My name is Fred
                            Page 422
```

Chamberlin, C-H-A-M-B-E-R-L-I-N. I live on a ranch in Los Olivos, California.

I think you have before you a decision to make as to whether you follow a science-based regime to solve the problem you set up to solve or follow an arbitrary rule-based regime put forward by staff. And that's really the choice that you Board members have to make.

If you will follow science and work with the farmers you will be able to solve the problem. If you don't, it won't be solved. If you follow your Board's recommendation, which is not based on science, your staff recommendation, this will end up through years of litigation and eventually if it's not based on science, it won't happen.

I would suggest then that you follow the science-based approach and that you work on the areas where the problems are.

Thank you.
MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.
Anne Coates.
(No response.)

MR. YOUNG: Jim Cochran. Jim Cochran.
Page 423
(No response.)

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.

Last year I spent \$119,000 on a pre-nitrogen Page 424
application soil based testing program conducted by a certified crop adviser. But the Draft Order states that leaf samples must be analyzed before applying more nitrogen.

My CCA doesn't support this as an application trigger because it's not telling you what's in the soil available for plant uptake. So on the one hand you're mandating the use of CCAs, yet on the other you're mandating a practice contrary to the advice and direction that they've given me in which I 've supported with substantial investment.

When Dr. Tim Hartz says commercial vegetable production would be severely disrupted by restricting nitrogen fertilization to the amount of nitrogen removed in the harvested product, someone better be listening.

With regards to tiers, for some reason size is still entering into the equation. And there's a scenario where two vegetable growers with similar crops and practices are not only not in the same tier they're not even in the adjacent tiers. With the only difference being the size of the operation, one grower ends up in Tier 3 and the other grower ends in Tier 1, yet the staff report says that "staff acknowledges that operations less than 1,000 acres may discharge similar or greater amounts of waste and thus cause similar or greater risk to water Page 425

## quality."

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?
MS. SALAS: Yes. S-A-L-A-S. First name is Sonya.
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MR. YOUNG: That was your last name?
MS. SALAS: Salas.
MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you.
MS. SALAS: So I'm here simply to put questions on the record in support of the agricultural proposal and encourage the Board to also support a viable and prudent alternative to meet requirements for water improvement.

I'm also here to say that Western Growers are willing to work with the growers to ensure the proposal and to help the members achieve the requirements in these proposals.

With that I want to thank you for allowing me the opportunity to express the support of the agriculture proposal.

MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.
Deirdre Des Jardins, and Darlene Din, and then Joe Dillon.

MS. DE JARDINS: My name is Darlene Des Jardins, D-E-S, J-A-R-D-I-N-S.

I'm speaking for the Santa Cruz Groups of the Sierra Club.

We applaud the Regional Board for maintaining requirements to preserve riparian habitats.

Pinto Lake in Santa Cruz County has the
highest level of DTD of any lake in the state. Legacy
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pesticides are carried by sediment run-off. As you heard in previous testimony, riparian corridors are critical for eruption control of filtration so these regulations are essential to restoring the health of this lake.

However, we feel that it is critical to have a prescribed width for riparian corridors as there was in the original draft regulations because these corridors are being in a critical and very sensitive and protected areas.

As an example, I brought these pictures of Bennet Slew, which is part of the designated critical habitant for salamanders. These before and after satellite photos show that the riparian vegetation around the Slew was clear cut sometime in late 2004, early 2005 in spite of an 800-acre conservation easement, the federal endangered Species Act and the State Coastal Act. This just shows you the kind of damage that is being done and this is why we need these regulations in the Ag Order so it's applied uniformly.

Pinto Lake also has one of the highest levels of micro toxins ever measured in a lake. We believe that research will show that nutrient loads in the watershed are associated not only with the tier grading groundwater, but with massive toxic algae lutes in the lake, which are washing down into Monterey Bay and
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getting into the shell fish and killing sea otters. This is a sentinal species, and we believe that we should adopt the -- the Central Coast Water Board should not wait until there's a massive dead zone in Monterey Bay and we have irreversibly contaminated the aquifers to take these actions.

I have here a box of 500 letters that was gathered by community members in support of the original regulations and in support of clean water. The Board -there would have been many more letters but for the J anuary 3rd cutoff date.

Thank you.
MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.
MS. DES JARDINS: I also wanted to submit these photos. I've got copies and copies of the designated critical habitat.

MS. McCHESNEY: Excuse me. Can you give those to me? Do you have -- are those letters you have are those letters that were submitted in January? That box?

MS. DE JARDINS: Yes. They were submitted by the Environmental Coalition for Water.

MS. McCHESNEY: They're not new letters?
MS. DES JARDINS: Yes.
MR. YOUNG: Wait. Are they new letters?
MS. DE JARDINS: No, they're not new letters.
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There would have been a lot more but for the cutoff date.
MR. YOUNG: Okay.
MS. DIN: Darlene Din, D-I-N.
Thank you, Board, for the opportunity to speak before you.

In reading the Draft Orders for -- during the many processes there were too many points that I felt to even cover, that I chose to use my three minutes to talk about process and lag time and public involvement.

And why this is so important is that there's been a breakdown in the communication between the regulated community, the staff, other technical advisors, conservationists, labor, agricultural, advocates, environmental justice, the different groups have, unfortunately, become paralyzed within this process. And when I looked at that I think that the best way to solve a problem is to find the areas that we intersect or how we can find a way to work towards water quality solutions.

So, I have worked with other agriculturalists and members of the environmental community conservation community, NRCS, RCD, public official's staff, public water agencies, labor farm worker advocates to try to sit down and determine what would a solution to water quality be. Because from the point of view that we've looked at
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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 Page 431
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
the water bodies. Well, just because the one pesticide 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 Chlorphyrifos.

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,
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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. J effries:
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
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subsequent irrigation and how the parcel is drained as it does with the actual formulation up front.

If someone applies the granule form of Diazinon and plows it in and then gives it a heavy irrigation and increases the till water they might run a lot of that off -- up ahead and into the ditch.

If they go through and they're spraying with an air blast sprayer or something and they get a full application of the product they might not get very much run-off at all. So --

MR. JEFFRIES: So there is quite a bit of difference between the liquid and the granule?

MR. DILLON: Potentially, yes.
MR. JEFFRIES: Thank you.
MR. YOUNG: Okay. William Elliott, followed by Joy Fitzhugh, and then Jody Frediani.

MR. ELLIOTT: Good morning, Chairman Young. My name is William Elliott. That's E-L-L-I-O-T-T.

I 'm here today to make essentially three comments on process because I think there are people here who are far more knowledgeable in science than I, comments concerning weaknesses in this overall proposal.

The first comment I wanted to make deals with what I view as being illegal renewal by the Executive Director Order of the 2004 Agricultural Order. The Board
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may be aware a petition was filed by me with the State Board this past week in that regard. Certainly, if the renewal of an executive order is not a modification of an executive order I can't imagine what is.

Secondly, I think there is a concern, at least on my part, with the impacts not looked at and the totality of the environment. One of those I think in my view at least, the staff is in effect placing concerns over water quality above concerns over air quality. For instance, as we pointed out in our submissions, the Air Quality Board has taken great efforts to control the use of diesel powered engines in the Monterey Bay area and Salinas Valley.

Certainly having to place water purification machines on farms throughout the Salinas Valley is going to greatly increase the amount of air pollution as will, of course, the necessity to operate the machines to empty them, to service them and everything else. The only response really to this entire concern that the staff made was, well, we can't really tell what the farmers what to do, so it's just speculation if you're going to use the machine. Of course, these machines are the only way in which these standards can be met. So, it sort of follows.

The third and final comment, really, is the
Page 436
economic analysis that was done. The Board required an economic analysis which was simply not done by the staff. Now, that's definitely part of SEQUA.

So I think that when all these things are considered, along with the comments being made today and previously by all of the speakers, the best and the only action that should be taken by this Board today is to decline to adopt the modifications, to reject the current proposal and to instruct the staff to start all over again, and, hopefully, this time do it right.

MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. Joy Fitzhugh.
MS. FITZHUGH: Good morning. Joy Fitzhugh, F-I-T-Z-H-U-G-H.

And I'm speaking on behalf of the San Luis Obispo County Farm Bureau today, and also as a prior watershed coordinator. And I've had feedback from a number of the small growers that were in the watersheds that I was working with. And they're very concerned about the Tier 3 because some of them are small by virtue of not being able to -- well, they're in a 303D listed stream area and so forth, and they're having to look at meeting the Tier 3 requirements.

They say we're not going to be able to continue. We can't afford -- our margin is small enough
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that the additional reporting monitoring and implementation will take away all costs -- all insensitive with the costs. So that I'm looking at trying to reassure them that this isn't so, but I haven't found that in the report. And I think as well as looking at this arbitrary 1,000 acre trigger you need to look at the small grower who might through no consequence of his own, be thrown into Tier 3 and have to follow those regs.

And I have to follow the prior speaker when he talked about the economic analysis. When I looked through the economic issues that were in this report, and I saw things that were cited from 1990, things that were cited from '99 as part of the costs, and they said, oh, this is just to show the expense. No. Ten years ago, 20 years ago does not show the cost. As we all know costs have gone up tremendously.

And I think the implementation of this program is going to be a lot more costly than most people think.

Lastly, I want to say something about the fact that we have an Order that appears to be looking at the program as point source. As we know point source coming out of a pipe that -- from a factory or something is very different from the very complicated, complex, uniquely individual non-point sources. And we're trying
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to pack them into three tiers, which is better than one, I'll agree, but we're trying to pack this into three tiers when everybody is very, very different. And I think we have to go back and start looking at the fact that we aren't all a factory, we're all -- somebody said mother earth kind of regulates how things go, and mother earth is not one thing.

I do urge you to take a good serious look at the Ag Coalition Alternative, it is looking at what is practical and what can be done by our agricultural community.

Thank you.
MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.
Dr. Hunter.
DR. HUNTER: Yeah. Thank you, Joy, good to see you here today.

Just so I'm clear on the small farmer
comments that you bring into us today and your concern about the 1,000 acre trigger. Are you --

MS. FITZHUGH: Not the 1,000 acre trigger, I'm more concerned about the fact that through no -- nothing that they have done, because they might be on a 303D listed stream within that area, and small acreage, when you talk about buffers and so forth, you may end up taking their whole production land with a buffer. So Page 439
that's what we're -- what these people are worried about.
DR. HUNTER: Okay. I just wanted to be sure I understood it.

MS. FITZHUGH: But the 1,000 acre people do have an automatic trigger which -- also. So you're looking at both ends of the spectrum possibly being caught in this Tier 3.

Thank you.
DR. HUNTER: Thank you.
MR. YOUNG: Jody Frediani.
(No response.)
MR. YOUNG: Okay.
Cliff Garrison. Cliff Garrison.
MS. McDONALD: He had to leave.
MR. YOUNG: He had to leave. Was he here this morning?

MS. McDONALD: I have written comments if you would like for me to read it.

MR. YOUNG: Okay. Are these for the Cattlemen Association?

MS. McDONALD: Yes.
MR. YOUNG: Okay. Well, why don't you --
MS. McDONALD: I still have my own comments.
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MR. YOUNG: Well, I don't have a problem with that. You have comments on behalf of the Cattlemen Association?

MS. McDONALD: Yes.
MR. YOUNG: If you have comments on behalf of the Cattlemen Association, go ahead and give us those comments. And then I'll call you up and you can give us some additional comments.

MS. McDONALD: Thank you.
My name is Susan McDonald, M-C-D-O-N-A-L-D. I live in Cambria.

Cliff Garrison is the operations manager for the Hearst Ranches in San Simeon and in Chalame. We operate in both San Luis Obispo County and Monterey County. We are primarily a cattle operation with range land grazing since 1865. Our farming operation consists of six acres of avocados at the Hearst Ranch and 150 acres of alfalfa and our Jack Ranch, as well as dry farming hay in irrigated pastures.

I'm here, also, in support of our farmers and Regional Board to cooperate in achieving water quality goals.

Some of our thoughts on the Draft Order are as follows. If you irrigate, there's no way to opted out. You are assumed to be discharging agricultural Page 441
waste into waters of the state even if you do not do so.
The regulations are based on the chance that we could discharge, and we can not support that assumption.

At the Hearst Ranch in San Simeon we operate 80,000 acres under a conservation easement and use best management practices to eliminate risk of waste discharge from our six acre avocado orchard.

We support tier zero, as mentioned at the last hearing and an exception from the Order. Tiers should be tied to actual risk, each property must be individually analyzed.

In general, we do not support how the tiers are set up, especially how proximity to an impaired water body put us into a higher tier. Recently Chalame Creek was put on the 303D list for Ecoli and that places our ranch in a higher risk tier.

The listing was based on samples taken from the one and only monitoring site under the Degenara Water Bridge on Chalame Creek, a place inhabited by 100 s of swallows, pigs and other uncontrollable sources. Cows are assumed to be a problem because they are controllable.

These samples do not represent the overall health of our stream or the management practices of our
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ranch.
Sampling and monitoring must be supported by science and sound practices the farmer and water board can agree on. There has to be accuracy of measurements on the farmers, either nitrate contributors or discharges for uncontrollable sources; in our case wildlife.

Sampling should be a cooperative effort done at intervals to demonstrate transit water quality.

A good example of this is at San Simeon at the Arroyo Villa Cruz, it's on the impaired list for excedent of Ecoli from a sample taken in 2006. I found a lot of inaccurate data in the document. The monitoring cite was unrepresentative of 11.2 miles of water body that we manage solely. We collect our own water quality data during conservation easement monitoring.

MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.
Dirk Giannini, Alice Grip, Norm Groot, Edward
Hard.
MR. GIANNINI: Good morning, Chairman Young and Board Members.

My name is Dirk Giannini, G-I-A-N-N-I-N-I. I'm a fourth generation farmer in the Salinas Valley. My wife and two beautiful daughters as well as my parents live in homes on a farm in Salinas.

We have grown crops on this farm for over
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80 years. I was born and raised on this ranch and we 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.

Previously, these retention ponds and
reservoirs were recommended by the Regional Water Board
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and the Porter Cologne Act due to the groundwater recharge benefits. This new Draft Order reverses this practice and the negative environmental consequences of impermeable containment structures on groundwater recharge would be substantial, particularly in the Salinas Valley area.

The Draft Order from staff is requiring an agricultural community to clean tail water. Water that leaves the ranch to a level that is better than drinking water standards.

Municipalities do not drink treated water to these standards until the water is actually being served up for consumption. This Draft Order asks farmers to become hydrologists and essentially install waste water treatment systems if they are to discharge any water from their fields, which is a far different requirement than drinking water consumption.

This standard is based on a presumption that a flea placed in a lab water sample setting fails to survive regardless of any other contributing factors to the flea's mortality. The farmers can not recharge groundwater and are required to contain their own water and storm water in impermeable ponds based on a mortality of a flea that does not even survive in the wild along the Central Coast, then the reasonableness of this Draft
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Order by staff must be called into question.
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 multiple versions of the Ag Order Proposal put forth by your staff lacks one key element, and that is common
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sense.
Agriculture is fully aware of the impairments within our regional watershed and is committed to improve water quality along the Central Coast. No credit has been given to agriculture for the improvements made to production practices that resulted in improved water quality. We know this from the data collected throughout the current Ag Order when that was successfully deployed using cooperation among the stakeholders.

The multiple proposals from your staff lack any cooperation from any stakeholders within region three and any input from agricultural stakeholders in this process has been met by resistance from your staff.

This exclusion of common sense approach to developing an Ag Order that all stakeholders can agree to is what's missing here. If our legislators, such as Sam Farr, Anthony Canella and Louie Salejo find that this process has gone off track, then there's cause for concern that your staff has exceeded its boundaries.

The assumptions made by staff are based on data anomalies and use subset science as a backup. As you've heard in Watsonville the very water quality reports that the staff proposals are based on has suggested data sampling techniques.

Agriculture within your region has stepped up
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with a workable viable solution for the next five years. One that achieves water quality improvements that are measurable, accountable and verifiable. The object of any Ag Order should be to help this industry achieve this standard with a common sense approach that allows farming and ranching to continue while improving our environment within the region.

I ask that you allow common sense to enter into this decision and support the agricultural proposal that provides a solution that we all collectively own a share of responsibility. We all drink the same water and we all like to eat safe, healthy food.

Thank you.
MR. YOUNG: I have a question for you, Mr. Groot. Are you supportive of groundwater monitoring for nitrate as far as this overall effort?

MR. GROOT: I believe that you will hear later from the Ag Panel that will make a conclusion that, yes, we are willing to put a proposal on the table concerning groundwater monitoring.

MR. YOUNG: Okay. That effort represents the Monterey County Farm Bureau position?

MR. GROOT: Our position is included in that because we are part of the Ag working group coalition and it's formulated that, yes.
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MR. YOUNG: Thank for your comments.
MR. GROOT: You're welcome.
MR. YOUNG: Edward Hard.
MR. HARD: Good morning. Edward Hard, California
Department of Food and Agriculture.
My comments today are coming directly from the Secretary, Karen Ross.

We are here in spirit in collaboration in an effort to find ways to solve these problems that we've been addressing to you for the last several years.

I think one of the key pieces that this Board should know is what is the CFA's interest in this process? Our interests stems fertilizer. We have jurisdictional authority for fertilizers -- for fertilizers that are sold and distributed across the state. We ensure that they are safe, effective and the claims that are on the labels meet the guarantees for what the labels are asking or demonstrating on the label, not the product.

We have authority to license and have product labor review and registration. We also have an enforcement division that evaluates whether or not the fertilizers that are being sold in bulk or in packages are making sure that their claims are meeting what they're asking for in terms of their efficacy,
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scientifically and what is being put forth in the claim. We do not have jurisdictional authority over application, but herein lies our concerns with this Order. We have concerns and recommendations. Regulatory process thus far is extremely heavy on regulatory requirements, but short on process that creates a scientifically credible outcome. This stands to create a lack of credibility and success of this regulatory process. This regulatory path forward is unsustainable as it is currently drafted.

There's a disproportionate effect within the economic and environmental conditions in this region within this Order. It will be undermining successful efforts that this agricultural community has demonstrated through this region.

There'll be excessive competition among growers to find scientific answers that are not scientific. What do I mean by that? This regulation as it currently stands, that's in all tiers, would have growers trying to figure out what the nutrient uptake values are. There are 52, by our count, crops grown in this region, give or take one of two. Of those 52 crops only two have ever had scientifically evaluated uptake values. And those two that have been done are not scientifically valid.


So, this puts us in a quandary. We have a panel going forward without a lot of effort that's been put into bringing in the regulatory -- pardon me, the scientific farm of state government, UC SCFU, they're completely absent from this process.

Our recommendations are this. Perform a scientific evaluation of the proposed regulation. Facilitate the identification and scientific data and needs specifically related to the nitrogen uptake values for all the crops, all tiers.

Facilitate the establishment of common set of nitrogen uptake curves for each crop that growers and rely upon. You can't have all these crop advisors going out that are hired by growers to have their own evaluation of what the curves are. We need a common set established by the state which is the University of -CSU and the University of California.

How are we going to do this?
Thank you for allowing me time. We are a state agency in this process and we have been, to this date, not given enough time to discuss this issue, so, please, bare with me for one more minute.

MR. YOUNG: I'll give you one more minute.
MR. HARD: Thank you.
Identify and leverage resources to accomplish
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funding in all tiers that you have identified. All 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?

MR. HARD: I'm going to answer this based on what the science would tell us. If 52 crops are evaluated based upon their nitrogen uptake values, we will then
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have a baseline by which this body can then probably regulate and dictate to meet our quorum. How are we going to meet that water quality standards. You can't do it without standing what those values are.

MR. YOUNG: So you're saying at this point you don't know because the science hasn't been done whether or not in making any modification to application rates is going to result in improvements to water quality.

MR. HARD: We do not know currently, based upon what this regulation -- regulation is asking in all the tiers, based on all the crops within those tiers how we would use a management practice that would efficaciously cost effectively meet the water quality standards. We don't have that.

MR. YOUNG: Okay.
MR. HARD: Given that timeline that you've asked growers to meet this, 2014, it takes two to three years just to evaluate two crops to determine nitrogen uptake values. So extrapolating that out is not 2014.

MR. YOUNG: Does the Secretary have a position with respect to sampling the groundwater for nitrate?

MR. HARD: The Secretary believes that monitoring of any sort is necessary in any sweep of options. A portfolio approach is needed.

She has been working with the Governor's Page 453
office as was the Secretary to address these issues. And 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 with respect to --

MR. HARD: Nutrient uptake analysis in order to Page 454
establish a nitrate balance.
MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you for your comments.
MR. HARD: Sure.
MR. JEFFRIES: You talked about the 52 crops that are grown and the uptake for the nitrogen value and so forth, isn't the other part of equation the soil types as well?

MR. HARD: Exactly. The soil variation, the climate variability throughout this region, and the various types of crops and their approximation to whether it's a stream of impairment, all of that factors in. And these all came out lumped in together. The integrated approach which heretofore has not occurred. And we are only coming at it from the angle that we do have jurisdictional purview over evaluation of regulations that are promulgated by regulatory bodies and state government. And part of the issue here is the science. Pardon me, the science hasn't been done.

So what we're asking here is together, our department as well as the Regional Board and the State Water Board, essentially federal agencies, such as NRCS, specifically the RCDs, the UC, SCU get together to figure out how we're going to solve this Because it's not going to be done by this Board.

You have -- having worked with the Central
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Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board on their program before, working with Francis. We have engineers. We have scientists, and we have geologists. These are not agronomists.

I'm not going after staff. I appreciate what 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 asked to do. We speak for agriculture in addition to
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balancing what the public needs and what the environment needs.

On its face, without evaluating the science depending on what those crops are, buffers seem to be a stretch in the context of there's a potential there. If you read the legal fine print that we are taking of that property.

MR. JEFFRIES: Your analysis of sentiment control by the use of buffer zones, have you analyzed that?

MR. HARD: We, through the Speciality Crop Block Grant Program, California Food and Agriculture, which is the USDA money in collaboration with the State Water Board funding projects, vegetation, but we have a direct conflict with the food safety. Those measures have been asked to remove those buffers in various areas.

So, here you have a fiduciary responsible and at the same time you have a food safety conflict. That says, well wait a minute, okay, these buffers are posing a threat to public health. It's a double edge sword. The buffers are providing a food safety because we're trying to reduce the sediment going into water quality.

MR. JEFFRIES: At the March meeting I asked the question about the buffer zone and the conflict between the food safety agencies and this agency. And if I remember correctly, the comment came back from our staff
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that there is no food safety regulations on buffer zones. Is that correct or not correct?

MR. HARD: We have a leafy green marketing agreement. I'm not an expert, I admit, on that agreement. I do not believe -- if there's anybody in the 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 out of the State Water Board 1990 Evaluation of Nitrate
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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.

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
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 baseline.

MR. YOUNG: What practices are you thinking are
being mandated as part of nutrient management program.
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 nutrient uptake values for those crops that those particular growers, wherever they may fit in this region, 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.
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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
understand their own crops and they don't understand the application of fertilizers. I mean that's what I'm hearing you say.

MR. HARD: Please don't distort my comments.
DR. HUNTER: Well, this is what it boils down to.
When you come to the Board and you say within 21 years we have no idea what best practices are for nitrogen.

MR. HARD: When it comes to these 52 crops, we do not.

DR. HUNTER: That doesn't compute. That doesn't compute.

MR. HARD: Statewide is our jurisdiction for evaluating research on nitrogen going to groundwater.

DR. HUNTER: Well, what we know is the data is showing that in certain places in Salinas -- or Salinas is one of those areas, nitrogen is increasing, and it's showing in water. So, what we have to do is consider what tools we have, what options we have.

But I'm very disappointed to hear you say that we have no science to support that. After all the effort that farmers did, and that farmers also don't understand how to do this application. They have been part of that process as have Monterey County. So --

MR. HARD: Farmers do know how to do their job. The issue is in regulation that is prescriptive in nature
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basically tells them that they have to do plantings, but 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 date because there's no solid nitrogen uptake evaluation that has been done. And essentially you're asking her to
perform.
We're working in the best interests of agriculture. We can't have a bunch of individual analysis coming out for various crops. It has to be consistent. It will only help your process, and it will only help agriculture. If you have a bunch of individuals analyses for various crops is not going to be beneficial to agriculture or the environment.

MR. YOUNG: Well, the troubling part about what you're telling us is that we're not going to have the science for years and years and years. This is the one agency in the State of California mandated for protection of water quality and all beneficial uses.

We didn't create this job for ourselves, the legislature did. The buck stops here in terms of making the decision as to whether we follow the law and apply the water quality standards.

So, I mean, this is a very contentious issue. There's a lot of competing factors. It may be that whatever form this Order gets passed, it may be the impetus for your agency and other agencies to come together and try to get this figured out. But, you know, we've heard about the Fish and Game having some, you know, having regulatory power with the riparian corridors, DPR has regulatory power. We're looking at
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the data that shows impasse. So we're trying our best to 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 .

So if there's anybody that feels that they're got going to have time, if they wait to get their
comments in, I'll consider taking you out of order at this time.

Okay. Why don't you come forward.
MS. AKIN: I am reading the letter from Dr. Don Hoernschemeyer. I believe you have the spelling over there. My name is Pricilla Akin of the -- anyway, I'm from the Local Unitarian Universalist Congregation.

Dr. Hoernschemeyer is from the Aktos Congregation and was not able to get down here.

MR. YOUNG: Can you spell the name or do you have the letter?

Okay.
MS. AKIN: Members of the Central Coast Regional Board, as a concerned citizen writer on the health hazards from water pollution and as a citizen concerned with the health of every person, and especially children, and the health of sea otters and marine mammals in our area, I want to urge you to institute effective regulation of hazardous run-off from agricultural fields.

Many farmers want to take action to minimize run-off of fertilizers and pesticides from their fields, and that is commendable, however, history has shown self-regulation is very slow and usually not effective.

Pollution regulations with clear enforcement actions are required to protect the health of our rivers,
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oceans and aquifers and, ultimately, the health of the 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 I ndoprofen, 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.
MR. YOUNG: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. ZELINSKI: Dr. Lowell Zelinski, Z-E-L-I-N-S-K-I. And I have a Ph.D in soil plant and water relation from the University of California Davis. And I am a member of the San Luis Obispo County Water Resources Advisory Committee as well as owning a small company that does irrigation and fertility consulting in both Monterey County and in Paso Robles.

I want to commend the staff for responding a to a lot of questions I had submitted in the past and they did clarify a number of issues that I had. There are still some other ones. But what I am most concerned about is the nitrogen use sufficiency requirements, you can only put on, though, the ratio of one pound of N for part of N removed.

Part of my Ph.D dissertation was looking at nitrate uptake sufficiency of cotton, and we use labelled nitrogen so we could track how much was taken up. The best we could ever do was recover 50 percent of the nitrogen we applied in the whole plant that we analyzed. So there's -- a number of speakers have spoken about this about how it would be difficult to obtain that one-to-one relationship, and I think it's impossible without suffering yield losses. The plants are not just that sufficient in taking up nitrogen.

Additionally, I wonder -- I'm sure the
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Board's aware, but I 'd like to reiterate, that the 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 50 percent into it is with an over-application.

MR. ZELINSKI: Yes, because the fate of nitrogen, where it goes, it isn't always taken up by the plant. So it volatilizes into the atmosphere of amonia gas, or other things, or uria. So there's a lot of other syncs, or ways the nitrogen can leave the system.

And I say that it's complex. If you make the nitrogen fertilizer requirement equal to the amount of nitrogen removed, have you considered the amount of nitrogen in the water that was being applied with the irrigation.

Additionally, you can -- if you put on 50 pounds of nitrogen, you can pollute more with that 50 pound addition, than with a 200 -pound addition depending on the timing and the method of application.

So I think it's not as simple as you would
think of just putting on what the crop needs. There's much more to nitrogen management than that.

MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you for your comments. Nancy Isakson, and then Christine Khan.
MS. ISAKSON: I prepared a power point.
Nancy Isakson, I-S-A-K-S-O-N, and I'm here as
President of Salinas Valley Water Coalition.
And I had compared a power point for you. I
just want to summarize some things for you.
Salinas Valley Water Coalition is a not for
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profit organization comprised of agricultural landowners, 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 need to step back and start over.

So, moving -- I apologize. Move through --
we believe the Order oversteps the limited authority granted to you through the California Water Code and that jurisdiction to implement and enforce some of these regulations have actually been granted to the Monterey County Water Resource Agency.

I'm sorry, I see this is going through time.
I'm going to summarize this. That specific to nitrate concerns the Monterey County Health Department and Monterey County Resource Agency have programs in place to address the nitrate in the groundwater. They've done this for years. And we ask that you let the local agencies work with the local solutions.

Again, we believe that the Order provides a duplicative layer and oversteps your authority, and we think we do need to step back, and I hate to say start over, but we need to look at, as Mr. Hard said, what is the problem and how do we best address the solutions.

Again, our Chair, Mr. Roberts, who will address from a hydrologic point because we believe that that's what you need to do.

Thank you.
MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.
Miss Isakson, I have a few questions for you.
Does the Monterey County Water Agency have any program to address nitrate in the groundwater?
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MS. ISAKSON: I believe they do. I thought I 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 nitrate?

MS. ISAKSON: Yes. And they have groundwater
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monitoring system in place to monitor that nitrate.
MR. YOUNG: I'm aware of all the data they produce, but I wasn't aware that they had a program to address the nitrate.

MS. ISAKSON: It's my understanding that they do
have a program. They work with the growers, there's a Adrain (phonetic) Committee.

MR. YOUNG: Do you know if the program has been successful?

MS. ISAKSON: I believe that it has shown certain trends to reducing nitrates, yes.

MR. YOUNG: Okay.
MS. ISAKSON: In the groundwater.
MR. YOUNG: All right. Thank you for your comments.

MS. ISAKSON: Sorry. Thank you.
MR. YOUNG: Christine Kemp, followed by Kerry Lobel, and then Marc Los Huertos.

MS. KEMP: Good afternoon members of the Board. My name is Christine Kemp, K-E-M-P. I'm an attorney with the law firm of Mullen, Hamily, Khan and Hoff in Salinas. We represent several agricultural, many agricultural clients and I'm here to speak on their behalf.

I wanted to address two specific issues, in particular related to the one size fits all nature of the Page 475
waiver. And with respect to the hundred -- within a hundred feet of surface water and/or adjacent to surface water that definition needs to be clarified because you have agricultural fields that may be adjacent to surface water within a hundred feet, a thousand feet, but it doesn't account for levies, which we saw driving down today, you have a levy, you have an agricultural field, the water is not running into the water body, but they're still subject to the tiering criteria.

You also have leveling of agricultural
fields, laser leveling where the drainage may be away from the water body, but again, those requirements are not being taken into consideration.

An adjunct to that is the requirement of buffers. This is problematic for many reasons, and you heard some of that today. It removes agricultural land from production, and for some small farms that could be a significant loss of their productivity in the ability to farm their land. It does conflict with the safety regulations -- not necessarily regulations, but the agreement, the Leafy Green Ag Agreement that if it's been put in place, and those are self-regulated agreements amongst the farmers to address the problem that arose out of the spinach and the Ecoli problem. And federal legislation may be coming to implement those. So these
are self-imposed regulations that the farmers are attempting to deal with a problem which arose and are regulating it. So if you require buffers and then they can't have buffers because other folks don't want it, you have a conflict.

And there are other ways, proven ways, to reduce the run-off sediment and pesticide levels using the folocating agents and the degraded enzymes, and those alternatives ought to be put in place as well just requiring standard buffers.

So we're asking that alternative methods that are an important component with the irrigation methods, and those alternative methods need to be permitted under the waiver.

Thank you.
MR. YOUNG: Thank for your comments.
Kerry Lobel.
MS. BHATNAGAR: I'm here to read a statement on her behalf.

MR. YOUNG: Your name.
MS. BHATNAGAR: My name is Christie Bhatnagar. Last name is, B-H-A-T-N-A-G-A-R.

MR. YOUNG: And your reading this for which organization?

MS. BHATNAGAR: For Puente De La Costa Sul. And
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the person is Kerry Lobel. She's the Executive Director. She submitted a letter for the members.
"Dear Members of the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Thank you for the opportunity to present written remarks. I regret that I'm unable to join you in San Luis Obispo today.

I write today on behalf of Puente De La Costa
Sul. Puente is a ten-year old 501C3 non-profit organization. It's mission is to provide vital services for men and women and children and families living in rural San Mateo South Coast communities of Pescadero, La Honda, Lomamal and San Gregorio.

Puente region residents on the South Coast of San Mateo County, the most rural areas in the greater Bay Area or Puente service area, it covers about 160 mostly undeveloped square miles, including the unincorporated areas of Pescadero, San Gregorio, La Honda and Lomamal. The four communities have no dental or medical providers pharmacies, laundromats, department or hardware stores, libraries or supermarkets.

Members of this Board are no strangers to the challenges that nitrate in water have brought to our communities. Last spring problems at Marche Farms came to public attention when water tests revealed the
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presence of nitrates at six times the federal limit.
Residents at the farm had been drinking bottled water at their own cost for more than a decade. And health inspection reports had cited problems dating from at least 2004.

A likely source of the nitrate contamination was fertilizer application adjacent to the well.

Many residents of our region live in shared housing adjacent to fields that are in production for food or flowers. Because our community has no health care it is impossible for us to measure the health burdens that may be placed on babies, infants and the elderly from nitric contamination. However, we find the health data troubling.

Nearly all of us in our community rely on wells for water for our drinking, cooking and bathing.
We also rely on agriculture and flower culture to sustain our rural community. Certainly clean water and agriculture can live side by side.

Kerry Lobel, Executive Director."
MR. YOUNG: Thank very much for your comments.
Okay.
MR. LOS HUERTOS: Marc Los Huertos.
MR. YOUNG: Okay. Arrianne Martin and then Mibs McCarthy.

Page 479

MR. LOS HUERTOS: L-O-S H-U-E-R-T-O-S.
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 turns into an assumed causation.

And just to highlight this in statistical
terms. I don't want to belabor this, but the correlation of .6 , which is really good in sort of environmental sciences, turns into a R square of .36, which translates to 36 percent of the variant covered by that correlative relationship, but that means 64 percent is not related. And so, in theory with a very good $R$ statistic of .6 you could be misapplying the mechanisms of water quality impairment up to 74 percent of the population.

I hope that makes sense.
So, I also did a lot of research on vegetative buffer strips for my dissertation, and I found that vegetative buffer strips actually are very problematic in California because of the Mediterranean climate. In particular, we don't have a good biogeochemical contents to remove the nitrogen using genetic rotation in the Mediterranean climate because of the dry season from Marchish until November. So applying the vegetative buffer strips, wholesale, as a potential best management practice to remove nitrate, and I'm just speaking for nitrate, is I would say a misapplication of that best management practice.

And the last thing I just want to say is that I, on some level, feel like the mechanism of pollution generally takes place through a watershed or water source. And I didn't see an explicit linkage to the
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mechanisms or water impairment through the Ag Waiver 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.

But San Juan Valley is very problematic.
It's on the east side of the valley, relatively well
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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 aquifer 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
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practices.
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
the CMPs, I was not expecting to see changes in the CMP site for at least five to ten years.

MR. JEFFRIES: Thank you.
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.

MR. LOS HUERTOS: Yeah. I hope that I didn't say 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, Page 485

So it's been very hard for us to get growers to cooperate knowing that data is going to be reported into a public entity. And then, potentially, in three to five years someone turns around and starts suing them for water quality impairment that they're actually trying to fix. 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.
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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?
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 three weeks ago after I started reading the reports. Some of the things I found that was proximity to a 303 listed body is problematic just in terms landscape Page 487
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,
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 aquifer, 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
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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
at agriculture in terms of being able to make enough money to survive in the valley.

So I guess what I would say is instead of thinking about it in terms of a management plan, but creating a structure where people would be certified irrigators through the Water Board and that that would be sort of the first step so that you have people that are well trained and required sort of a certification process because I think that -- to tell you the truth, all these irrigation management plans, I don't think the Water Board, the staff is going to be able to deal with all of that stuff. It would be better to have really well trained people on the ground knowing what they're doing and getting paid for what they're doing and having to go through a fairly rounded certification process.

I'm not making sense?
MR. YOUNG: Well, you're making sense, I just wonder if you're going with what's in the plan. Because it says here that these plans need to be certified by professional soil scientists, professional agronomists, or crop advisor certified by the American Society of Agronomy, or similarly qualified professionals. Wouldn't they incorporate what you're suggesting?

MR. LOS HUERTOS: Yes, it would. I guess what I'm hesitant to do is to say, therefore, then all these plans

Page 491
need to get submitted to the staff. So --
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.
Arrianne Martin, Pricilla Akins.
MS. AKIN: Pricilla Akin, A-K-I-N. I'm reading
for Mibs McCarthy.
Mibs McCarthy is a member of the Unitarian Universalist Fellowship in Carmel, Monterey Congregation.
"To Central Coast Regional Water Board. My name is Mibs McCarthy and I'm a resident of the Central Coast. I'm concerned about the nitrate contamination of our groundwater for environmental, social and economic justice reasons.

Small, poor communities such as San Huerado, which our residents are paying for this contamination with their health and also paying for replacement water. Thousands of other Central Coast residents are in the same situation. It isn't fair that the cost of treating or avoiding polluted drinking water should fall on taxpayers or consumers when the use of fertilizers and pesticides increases the farmers' profit.

It seems to me that every farmer should know exactly what is in his or her run-off, and should be responsible to make it safe from contamination. It is the government's responsibility to regulate industry for the greater good.

The Regional Board has a mandate to protect water quality for all beneficial uses.

I thank the Board for taking up this huge project to help our Central Coast region.
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The November 2010 Draft Proposal is so weak 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 Order. Table 1 of Appendix A provides the 2010 Clean Water Act, Section 303D list at -- for toxicity,
pesticides, nutrients, temperature, sediment. I 'm wondering, are water bodies in 303D listed for Ecoli and other indicator bacteria not associated with irrigated Ag, are they also a trigger for Tier 2 and Tier 3. If that's the case, it seems like mixing apples and oranges to me.

The criteria for irrigated Ag should be based on discharges actually made by irrigated Ag.

Finally, agriculture is not responsible for all the constituent pollutants found in local watersheds. If agriculture is being ordered to clean up pollutants without any delineation between Ag discharges and those coming from other sources, particularly urban lawns, landscape and gardens. Homeowners use many of the same fertilizers, pesticides yet agriculture is being targeted.

The goal is to improve water quality, but
fairness must be a part of the equation.
I support the farmers for water quality terms and conditions for compliance through a third party group as a way to accomplish both.

Thank you.
MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.
And, by the way, Ecoli is not on the radar for this.
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## MS. McDONALD: It's not?

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.
First of all, staff, it's obvious they
haven't really consulted with EPA and DPR and Department
of Fish and Game. They're not taking into account the amount of environmental state work and toxicological work that's done by the state agencies when these pesticides are registered.

Second of all, in terms of the list itself, I was kind of shocked when I first looked at it because many of the pesticides that are on the list aren't Ag chemicals. Some of them are termitacides, which means they're used to control termites. They're roadside herbicides, they're not used by Ag. Some are not registered in California. Some are registered in California, but aren't used on the Central Coast.

So, out of the 84 pesticides 13 of the active ingredients are used on, approximately, 80 percent of the crops. Only 13 of the 84 are used on 80 percent of the crops on the Central Coast. 52 of those are included in EPRs ongoing surface water monitoring program. 37 are included in EPR pesticide management zones, which includes a permit, and covers a specific geographical area. 13 of those 84 percent are DPR restricted use pesticides which require permits.

So what's the solution to this? Instead of just saying you use this product, therefore, you're in a certain tier. It really should have some risk assessment involved with it.
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You know, I heard someone say use agronomy. 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.

So you have 12 water bodies that don't even have irrigated Ag on there, and there are no attribution
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to irrigated Ag .
I did a -- used ingrated report from the State Water Regional Control Board and did a digital inspection of the remaining, all 99 water bodies. The other 17 in Santa Cruz County that remain on the list only 15 of those had any measurable irrigated Ag. 15. I mean -- I'm sorry 15 had no measurable irrigated Ag. The two that remain that actually had any measurable irrigated Ag , one had five percent, one had seven percent.

So, you have -- so what happened is you have growers, you might have some great grower up in the Santa Cruz hills that is now on impaired water bodies that has no appreciable irrigated Ag that's instantly in Tier 2. And so -- or maybe even in Tier 3, depending on what pesticides you guys decide to make a tiering criteria.

And so all of a sudden your own reports say that irrigated Ag is not a source of impairment and then you turn around and have -- list these water bodies as impaired and make it a criteria in a regulation for irrigated Ag.

Thank you.
MR. YOUNG: Thank you.
Larry Meyer, Kris O'Connor, Barbara Ann Ogle, and then Dana Perls.

Page 499

MS. O'CONNOR: I'm Kris O'Connor, K-R-I-S, apostrophe $0-\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{R}$, with the Central Coast Vineyard Team.

I want to thank you for the latest Draft including certified growers in the Tier 1 category. We certainly appreciate this recognition, but in accordance with our previous letters we still believe that there are many operations that are not certified that do not pose threats to water quality.

In the May Board Workshop here in San Luis Obispo the direction was clear, create an Order that both incentivizes practices and rewards growers. But, nevertheless, the current framework still presumes that Ag operators are polluters, that they're guilty until they can prove they're innocent.

This Draft continues to apply a point source regulatory model for a non-point source program. So, really, if we were looking at an incentivizing approach that actually protected water quality like some of the previous speakers, we would be looking at actual risk. We would have tiers that had triggers that actually growers had control over and that related to a risk and to help protect water quality. And that way you would incentivize people to adopt things with clean water and move into different tiers.

In May the Board also provided direction to not require more information that could be managed or analyzed. I would really disagree with some of the slides that say that the current draft is actually less burdensome than the current waiver. It's just not true. So, there is a lot of work required by this proposal and people should be paying attention to that.

Again, in May one of the directions was to not use the 303D list because -- I think I had in my notes somebody said because it's too broad. Still this hundred -- nearly hundred water bodies is still in there as a trigger. You know, I don't really consider 100 water bodies as being sort of priority for the area if we're really going to focus our attention.

So, despite the May direction to focus on surface water and nitrate and organic phosphate, this latest Draft continues to include riparian areas, storm water and groundwater. It seems that although some things get taken out in the new draft that more things get included.

There was some language around storm water. It was mentioned by a previous grower. That was actually very contradictory between paragraphs and quite a bit confusing.

We are also concerned about the tier trigger Page 501
about the topic of even including more pesticides as this tier trigger. Again, in March some of the language was used interchangeably between towards detection and toxicity. I would really encourage the Board to look at Sara Green's memo that she provided from Preservation Inc. and make sure that we're talking in the appropriate language.

So, again, I would also like to remind you that, you know, the material does not really equate, we really have to be looking at transport, also.

So, the Vineyard Team has, obviously, done a lot of work on this issue. We continue to work with the staff and the Board to try to come up with a solution to protect water quality.

We're happy to be a resource.
MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.
Barbara Ann Ogle. Dana Perls.
MR. YOUNG: Hi, Dana.
MR. SHIMEK: Hi. Steve Shimek, S-H-I-M-E-K. I have a letter from Pesticide Watch Environmental Fund. Before I begin, though, I would like to mention the fact that you asked the question about if anybody knows about the buffers; it came up during the CDFA's presentation. I actually met with LGMA about buffers and there is a requirement about buffers. They asked the question and

Page 502

## PANEL HEARING

they asked if anyone had any information.
MR. BRIGGS: He's here to read a statement.
MR. YOUNG: You're here speaking -- you're giving someone else's comments, so if someone had asked for specific questions it would be different.

MR. SHIMEK: So the only person --
MR. YOUNG: You're here to speak -- to give comments for Pesticide Watch, please give us those comments.

MR. YOUNG: Yes, Mr. Jeffries.
MR. J EFFRIES: Does Mr. Shimek have a card? Or is he speaking on behalf of someone else?

MR. SHIMEK: No, I do not have one.
MR. JEFFRIES: You spoke at one time.
MR. SHIMEK: I was just trying to answer the question the panel had asked.

MR. YOUNG: Right, but it was asked of someone else. So, I'm not -- it wasn't an open invitation for everyone else.

MR. SHIMEK: Actually, it was when you asked it.
MR. YOUNG: All right. Steve, let's do this. I'm setting this back to three minutes. Start over. Give me Dana Perls' comments.

MR. SHIMEK: All right. My name is it Steve Shimek, and I'm speaking on behalf of Dana Perls,
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Pesticide Watch Education Fund.
"The 2011 Draft Order is an improvement on the 2004 Conditional Waiver which did not prioritize water quality requirements and did not contain any compliance or preservation of monitoring provisions. However, PWEF is very disappointed that in spite of the immense evidence in drinking water concerns from contaminated groundwater the 2011 Draft Order remains significantly weaker than it could be.

PWEF is concerned that the only types of pesticides which are being considered are Diazinon and Chlorphyrifos. While these two commonly used pesticides which may affect groundwater contamination a number of pesticides which severely contaminate is significant. Rather than only considering two pesticides there needs 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.

Bullet Point 4: The criteria for tiering must include groundwater nitrate and pesticide
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```
contamination as a factor.
    We urge you to take timely action to put in
place strict requirements for irrigated agricultural
discharges so the California residents and water is truly
protected and restored.
            Dana Perls."
    MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.
    Susan Petrovich. I understand she's not here. Is
there anybody from the Santa Barbara County Cattlemen's
Association speaking on their behalf?
(No response.)
    MR. YOUNG: Richard Quandt. Then Bill Ritz, Keith
Roberts.
    MR. QUANDT: Thank you on behalf of Farmer's for
Water Quality. My name is Richard Quandt, Q-U-A-N-D-T.
I'm president of Grower-Shipper Association.
    I have nine slides that I would like to
summarize in terms of estimated cost of meeting the
monitoring and the reporting requirements for Tier 3
farmers and their staff's March proposal.
    Next slide, please.
    This slide is -- we first reviewed DPR and Ag
Commission of Pesticide Use Report to determine the
```
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    number of farms that fell within Tier 3. The two
criterias we used was 1,000 acres of vegetables and
strawberries and we broke it down by county.
The second criteria was discharging to an
impaired water body and using the pesticide Chlorpyrifos
and Diazinon. You can see the results of the
calculations. We're calculating about 325 of the,
approximately, 1600 dischargers would fall within Tier 3
representing $218-219,000$, acres, which is about
53 percent of the total unirrigated acres in the region.
Next slide, please.
We did try to estimate the Tier 3 enrollment
cost. This was based on the summary of interviews with
Tier 3 growers. We developed a range, and you can see
the range is 25,000 to 30,000 per operation.
Next slide, please.
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.
In terms of one expense not summarized, the
Page 506

## PANEL HEARING

previous slide is a 30-foot vegetative buffer that Tier 3 growers would have to install for operations located on or adjacent to an impaired water body.

Next slide, please.
We determined there is, approximately, $68-$ - 6,870 acres in crop production that would be lost. In many cases the loss would be more than 30 feet because many fields are narrow and irregular and they follow the contours of the natural water body. In certain cases 25 percent of the field would be lost. This slide attempts to show some examples of that.

Next slide, please.
There are also perennial crops that may have to be moved from the vegetative buffers. We calculated a lost for avocado growers of between 5,000 and 6,000 per tree and for removal and relocation. Vineyards between 3700 and 1100 per acre.

Thank you.
Next slide, please.
I'm going pretty fast.
In terms of the conflicts with food safety in light of what we have with these vegetative buffers most of the leafy green growers would have to install buffers, they would have to install fencing that we calculated at 82 million dollars.

Page 507

And the last slide, please.
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.
MR. THOMAS: Vineyards or trees and orchards, no
> requirement.
> MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Quandt.

> MR. RITZ: Good afternoon, Chairman Young. My name is Bill Ritz, R-I-T-Z, like a cracker.

> I'm District Representative for State
> Senator -- Anthony Canella, previously worked for Senator Dow.

> State Senator Canella is a Senator of District 12. Part of the region falls within his district, which would be part of Monterey County and San Marino County.

> The Senator is also the Senate Chairman of Agricultural Committee.

> I have a few comments from Senator Canella.
> It would seem that all side of this issue agree that clean water and healthy environment are in everyone's best interests. It's essential that collaborative efforts between the Board, staff, the Ag community, appropriate agencies, all parties, must concur to develop a reasonable long term solution. Long term solutions.

> Communities such as Monterey County are extremely dependent on the agricultural industry to maintain a vital economy, create jobs to grow healthy Page 509
produce that feeds not only California, the United 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.

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 ask the Senator directly.

The message that I bring today is that we continue to look at this in a collaborative manner. All sides, all parties. That's what he wanted to bring forth.

As far as those issues, I can certainly get those answers for you.

MR. YOUNG: Well, it maybe too late for what we're doing. I was just curious whether you had them right now in your pocket.

MR. RITZ: I don't. When would you like them? Tomorrow?
MR. YOUNG: Now. But that's okay. I didn't make any assumptions that I did have any information. I was just trying to find out, perhaps, if you do.

MR. RITZ: Okay. No, I don't.
MR. YOUNG: Okay.
MR. BRIGGS: Also, we did respond to the Senator's letter.

MR. RITZ: Yes. We got your response. Basically a mini staff report. And we appreciate that.

MR. BRIGGS: We're trying to collaborate.
MR. RITZ: I don't know if it's collaboration or more if it was how you felt in a singular purpose.

MR. BRIGGS: We were trying to answer it.
MR. RITZ: Some of them were answered. I think he
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just feels that more collaboration, more cooperation is needed in this issue. If -- that should be answered today, it should be answered after all these things have been answered and brought forth.

I heard a lot of stuff today that certainly
is new things. So, I appreciate your time.
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 study impacts of nitrate loading to the groundwater basin
for poultry farms, dairies and agricultural land."
And the models there involved increase of nitrate loads from all sources of nitrates from 1945 to 1985, and conflict loads after 1985, except that the poultry farming ceases in 2045.

Even though the cessation of the poultry farmer removes about 50 percent of the nitrate load from the area groundwater basin, the simulation results indicate that very low reduction of groundwater nitrate is achieved in 150 years after cessation of poultry farms.

Another interesting result is that nitrate continued to increase within parts of the basin even after the cessation of poultry farming.

So, this makes it very complicated to align where nitrates come from, or if the nitrates are an issue. It appears that your hypothesis is that farming is the sole contributor to the nitrate load. And this argues that farming is not the main cause. So, you know, farming you can't grow crops without nitrogen. You all understand that, right?

Nitrogen comes in various forms. Some of it moves -- I mean the soil types. Earlier on we talked about the -- I heard comments about the -- one second? MR. YOUNG: One second.
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Dr. Hunter is going to have a question for you. Correct, Doctor?

Finish your sentence.
MR. ROBERTS: I just wanted to clarify the UC system, Berkley, Davis, Poly Tech, Cal Poly, state 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 answer for anything.
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MR. HUNTER: Okay. I understand. I just wanted to be clear.

MR. ROBERTS: Those are correct numbers.
MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.
MR. JEFFRIES: Mr. Roberts, you took that slide down, but you talked about poultry.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, poultry is -- on that specific area, poultry is manure. The byproduct of poultry is manure. If you're asking how that came about it was because it was a given area that was suggested that it was carbon nitrate solution.

MR. JEFFRIES: Well, I wasn't really focusing on poultry, but it just triggered that -- and I'm not familiar with the whole region -- but in Salinas Valley, Castorville, Moss Landing, parts of Santa Cruz County had approximately 400 diaries from the late 1800 s until probably 19 -- late '60s. And I think I've asked this question before. I know in different soil types water travels through those at a different rate. And so, consequently, I'm wondering -- and I'm not a scientist, but I'm wondering with all -- you're talking about poultry manure, I'm talking about cows, dairy cows manure, which don't exist except for maybe one or two moonglows is the only one -- and shocks, dairy, is the only two active ones that I believe in the Salinas Valley
from different times. How long does that take, those nitrates to travel through the ground to get to groundwater? And one of the things I'm grappling with is why do we hold hostage all these farmers today for the issue of collective nitrate for the last 150 years?

MR. ROBERTS: That's a point well taken. I
totally agree with you. That's -- this is the fundamental reason why you have to tie hydrology, agronomy and scientific basis to encounter all the data before you can make an assumption that one individual person, thing, activity. It could be as simply as dinosaurs, it can be as simply as cows, 50 years ago, it could be things that we don't have a clue.

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.

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
destroy farms, devalue land, put many people out of work. And the evidence is there are other items that could take care of specific -- algae bloom, there's enzymes, there's dilution. You can add water, you can add enzymes, you can do things to lower the specific thing. And anybody that has waste charge into ponds has that ability to do it. So why not think in a bigger box and work on the specific areas of input.

MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments. Kirk Schmidt.
MR. SCHMIDT: Chairman Young, Members of the Board. Kirk Schmidt, Executive Director of Preservation, Inc. S-C-H-M-I-D-T.

I'm, as you're aware, Preservation, Inc., the Cooperative Monitoring Program and the existing waiver. I'm going to restrict my comments to the Cooperative Monitoring Program as proposed in the current Draft.

Dealing with surface water quality the proposal in the current Draft is very similar to the existing Cooperative Monitoring Program. There appears to be some changes in sites, and in addition of extensive pesticide monitoring, four times in the second year, as well as metals, monitoring four times in second year.

We've done, with exception of metals, we've done those type of sampling in the past for the

Page 517

Cooperative Monitoring Program. However, we continue to have a problem with our inability to conduct method and physical habitat assessment because it requires trespassing on Ag properties. The current protocol used requires measuring the habitat for 100 meters to 250 meters upstream from the cooperative monitoring site. We do not have access to those properties. Our legal counsel advised us that trespassing is a strict liability and we can no longer ask our contractors to conduct that type of monitoring.

However, it seems that because of the 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
year and next year given the fact of -- due to a lack of quorum you have an inability to adopt a waiver at this point.

The second thing is there are some items in the MRP that could be simplified. There's reasons to support accuracy, but there's no reason to call for additional costs to achieve that accuracy.

One of the examples, which will come out on the presentation, is a change in the groundwater proposal that they have from requiring a professional engineer or a hydrologist to conduct the sampling at what will be over 3,000 wells to someone who is a trained person. I ndeed, this is the procedure that's used for food safety now where you just have to have someone adequately certified and trained to conduct the sample and not require someone at an additional cost to come do the sampling.

Thank you.
MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.
Stuart Styles.
Stuart Styles. Okay
(No response.)
MR. YOUNG: Michael Taloff, T-A-L-O-F-F.
(No response.)
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Wilton Webster.
(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
between clearing some brush and allegations of responsibility for nitrate and pesticide levels.

According to your web site fines issued by your Board at the administrative level are huge. What concerns me more is that there is ample credible testimony that the science on the proposed Order is at best incomplete. If the Order is adopted as proposed, farmers, operators, landowners, fractional interest owners and anyone else who might be subject to this Order will likely be forced to spend inordinate amounts of money on mitigation, fines, legal fees, and other associated costs.

Can the regulation withstand the financial strain imposed on them or will loss of land, equipment income and other assets simply become a path to insolvency. And if that becomes the case, in 2, 3, maybe 5 years down the road, it becomes evident that the Order is based on inadequate, incomplete, defective, and/or otherwise flawed science. What happens to those who have faltered under an unjust and unfounded regulatory yoke, and who will make them whole?

Thank you.
MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.
Now, your other half, Howard Whitney.
MR. WHITNEY: Chairman, Board Members, thank you.
My name is Howard Whitney, W-H-I-T-N-E-Y. I'm a professional geologist, certified hydrogeologist, and I
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have over 25 years of experience.
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 down.

Why? You know the reasons. Ag everywhere
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produces the greatest environmental impacts of water quality resulting in countless exposure pathways that degrade human health and aquatic life. No other industry or pollution source is even on the same environmental radar screen.

The Central Coast has some of the most degraded water quality in the nation. And it's also not surprising that our region has the most productive Ag life.

Let's see. This is going to be very expensive to clean up. I believe that in order for this to be successful we need a cleanup fund to do this. And I think that the farmers have been misled by their consultants in this regard. This is a very serious problem that requires a lot of very serious work and none of their consultants has the proper qualifications required under the Water Code to address water quality investigation and cleanup.

The professionals that they do have that have presented information that's been useful, but it doesn't address the entire problem.

25 years ago when I parachuted over a superfund sites, we didn't know what was going on. There was no science at that time. We invented it. There's a whole industry of environmental professionals that are
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currently working and wasting their time on underground source tank work that results in almost no exposure pathways, and they can get to work on this. But the farmers need the funding.

And, Mr. Ritz, please, have your boss working on getting a cleanup fund established to address this issue. This is critically important and the farmers need the money to do it. They can't do it all on their own.

Thank you.
MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comments.
J oel Weiley.
UNANNOUNCED SPEAKER: He got detained at a business conference up in Sacramento.

Taxpayer and voter USA.
MR. YOUNG: Salvador does not wish to testify.
Okay.
All right. That concludes the list of public speakers. Now, do we go back to --

MR. JEFFRIES: Before that, Mr. Chairman, I would ask, if I can have Mr. Costa come back, if I may.

MR. YOUNG: Sure.
MR. JEFFRIES: He addressed, slightly, the Tier 3 issue and other people have spoken on this, but I think Mr. Costa has spoken on that more extensively, and I'd like to hear what your real concerns are about Tier 3 and
what this really means to you as a farmer.
MR. COSTA: I could go up and pick up and grab the list of things included in Tier 3 that weren't on the slides to start the meeting. There's about eight reports and monitoring plans and analysis that are components of the Nutrient Management Plan. You see the Irrigation Management Plan up there, two extra things that Tier 3 has to do that Tier 2 doesn't. Okay. But when I say the devil is in the details, it's in everything that's a part of that plan. And it's extensive.

And as I said, it's exponential, it's not just twice, or three times of somebody else doing it, it's an enormously different work load and task load, and monitoring and reporting load expected of Tier 3 that's not of the others.

And there is a scenario, and it wasn't hard to figure out where a vegetable grower that wasn't using Chlorpyrifos and Diazinon, and it wasn't adjacent to the impaired water bodies would fall all the way to adjacent Tier 1 , yet the acreage situation being a 1,000 acres would throw the other into Tier 3. That's why I commented how it could not even be adjacent tiers.

But my comment about the exponentially of that load was in great part, most part related to the Irrigation Management Plan. I want to make sure that
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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 little subpieces on every bit of that.

And, I mean, in my opinion, I probably looked 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. J EFFRIES: Mr. Costa, can I ask you, I assume that you qualify in Tier 3 what you know is Tier 3.
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MR. COSTA: If you did it on a ranch-by-ranch basis, we would have ranches that would fall into each of the three tiers. If you look at the operation as a whole, then we would fall into Tier 3, if you looked at the whole operation.

MR. JEFFRIES: As a farm operation, if you looked at total acreage, you would qualify for Tier 3. If you looked at individual ranches, then you would be in what tier?

MR. COSTA: Ultimately, some would be in 2 and some would be in one. It's going to depend on chemical use and crops grown. We have one ranch that's a vineyard.

MR. JEFFRIES: So you wouldn't be in Tier 3 at all?

MR. COSTA: No. We would have ranch -- we would be in Tier 3.

MR. JEFFRIES: As well.
MR. COSTA: Yeah.
MR. JEFFRIES: So you have 1, 2 and 3.
MR. COSTA: Yes.
MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. Thank you.
MR. YOUNG: Mr. Costa, before you leave. I was reading through the Irrigation and Nutrient Plan Management Plan monitoring requirements during the lunch
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hour. I have a much better feel for the details that you're speaking of. And they're in there. And is there 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.

When I look at the discharge monitoring,
individual monitoring, I mean, it's part of a watershed group on one of these site creeks in the Salinas Valley, and you can take the point, the monitoring point and figure out I thought pretty easily who all the players were that need to be sitting around the tailgate having a conversation about what we're showing up on the monitoring results. And that's what with did. And half of that group is sitting in this room. And it wasn't hard to do. It was a cooperative -- everybody was sharing information. We're looking at the results, you know. We've seen, you know, what the trends were and weren't, and we did do something productive about it from the time we left that meeting on somebody's yard adjacent to that creek. It was being monitored. And that's why there's such support for that kind of process.

I mean, that made sense. Because, I mean, I get chills just thinking about it. I get wound up thinking about it, just about where this is going and how much time we're going to spend on a sidetrack versus being out on the ground trying to adjust the problem and being in the middle of it and making management decisions with the best information we can gain. And the information that, you know, that we get now is a lot different than the information my dad got 30 years ago. I'd rather be out on the ground than in an office
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managing the staff filling out a bunch of forms.
Thank you.
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 to underplay that -- the issue that those folks have not
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had good water because they have not had good water, but it stems for a lot of years and a lot of uses and not proper uses of that particular land.

So I just wanted to clarify that.
MR. YOUNG: Ms. Dunham.
MS. DUNHAM: We have a couple of comments.
MR. YOUNG: Okay.
MS. DUNHAM: I think there's three of us.
MR. YOUNG: Remember to say your names before you speak. Okay. Go ahead.

MR. MERKLEY: Thank you again, for this -- whoa,
is that loud?
MR. YOUNG: That's fine.
MR. MERKLEY: It's echoing through my mustache.
(Interruption by the court reporter.)

MR. MERKLEY: Danny Merkley, M-E-R-K-L-E-Y. We listened carefully to the March 17th meeting. We heard comments made about the groundwater of our proposal, and we have developed language to address those comments.

Tess Dunham and Rick Tomlinson will present that additional information. I'm the window dressing.

MS. DUNHAM: Thank you. You did a fine job.
Page 531

So, again, as Danny said --
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 try to create some more objectivity and transparency in the audit process.

So we have added some key components that the the alternative would need to establish a public advisory Page 533
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 of areas of concern.

MR. YOUNG: 30 seconds.
MS. DUNHAM: Okay. So, to -- additions to
address: We would -- it would be a cooperative, dischargers would be allowed to participate much like the surface program and coordinate with the existing programs.

You would have to develop a work plan. You would rely on existing information. You would identify other additional monitoring sites that may be necessary if there's a lack or a gap in the data information. There would be a developed monitoring plan. All that goes to the Regional Board for review and approval. And, of course, timelines for collection of data, culminated with a final report that goes back for characterization of assessment, monitoring results, any typical monitoring type of reports. And then to --

MR. TOMLINSON: Just simply to conclude, we would ask that you direct staff to --
(Interruption by the court reporter.)

MR. TOMLINSON: Rick Tomlinson, T-O-M-L-I-N-S-O-N.
We would just ask that you direct staff to
further incorporate the third party coalition that we presented and to work with us on integrating that into a draft order.

I would just comment that the decision you
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have before you is really amazing because we presented you with a program that we have not found anywhere else in the nation. Certainly, our proposal, if adopted, would be the strictest Ag Waiver in the state and we believe in the nation as well. If not the, it certainly will be one of them. There's nothing else that we found that individually audits individual farms.

And so, you have two choices before you.
Either one is going to result in the strictest program in the state and definitely one of the strictest in the nation. And so it's amazing that we are not in a collaborative process when agriculture is coming to you with that type of a program and yet we still have such challenges in communication and a lack of cooperation.

And so some of the comments you heard earlier, I think particularly the Senator about we really need to move from this point forward into a collaborative process. That's the only way we're going to be successful is by working together. Whatever you finally adopt we must have that collaboration, otherwise we're all going to end up with failure.

MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you for your comments.
MS. DUNHAM: We do have copies that -- of the documents that we have prepared to -- or the groundwater program as well as the additional audit revisions to our
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attachment that we submitted in March.
MR. YOUNG: And these were not submitted before the cutoff for what reason?

MS. DUNHAM: They have been developed through -just as your staff will probably make adjustments and recommendations to you in their presentation, we have been listening to you in this process. The cutoff was in J anuary, we, obviously, learned a lot between now and J anuary.

They're here for you. You can take them. It's up to you, Chair, whether you want to have them in the record or not; that is your discretion.

MR. YOUNG: You can hand them to Miss McChesney.
MR. BRIGGS: Thank you for your proposal on the groundwater program. Just on that part what you just talked about, which was most of it, aside from the not reporting initial results, do you see anything in the Draft Order that we have for the Board that would preclude you using that approach?

MS. DUNHAM: I'm not quite sure I understand. Explain it one more time, the question.

MR. BRIGGS: So, aside from not reporting the individual results, which I gather was not part of your proposal.

MS. DUNHAM: Actually, in our proposal we would Page 537
report the analytical results, but in -- for the wells that were determined to be necessary for the assessment, you know, that are representative, and spacially representative, there would be reporting of the analytical results, but just like with Gamma and other data, the wells will be reported and identified on a township section versus ID specific property location, which is a safety function.

MR. BRIGGS: So, aside from that, is there any -do you know if there's anything in the groundwater monitoring that we've proposed that would preclude you from proceeding with the proposal?

MS. DUNHAM: Other than your's is required to be done individually, this would be on a cooperative, spacial distribution and then requiring every grower to have samples in individual wells.

MR. BRIGGS: So it's a cooperative part.
MS. DUNHAM: Yes.
MR. TOMLINSON: In the draft proposed Order it's an individual requirement, so once it's done, then there is no benefit to doing anything other than what is required in that tiering proposal, versus a collaborative or cooperative program, a cooperative monitoring program for groundwater that would use existing data and supplement that where needed.
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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 committee, or technical assessment committee. And what 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 audits.

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?
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What is the auditor going to look for? You know, it's kind of like to have the professional say, okay, when you go out on a farm what are you going to actually look for? 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 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 participants.

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

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 would be developed in the work plan, but -- oh, where did it go? 30 days. Or that's when the group would have to
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terminate the participation if they didn't respond after that review process has been set. But I believe we have it set up that the third party group would develop as part of the work plan, the details of what the termination and the appeal process would be. So it would probably be like a 30 to 60 day time frame, but I don't see it specified here and it would be developed in the details of the work plan that would go to the Executive Officer for approval.

MS. HUNTER: Okay. Thank you.
MR. TOMLINSON: If there is specific timelines that you would suggest we would welcome. That the key here is that we just simply want to due process, but certainly if someone was to be terminated, that would definitely be reported.

MR. YOUNG: Okay. Thank you.
MR. JEFFRIES: Mr. Chairman.
MR. YOUNG: Yes.
MR. JEFFRIES: I have a couple questions.
Some of this goes back to the presentation, and some of the information they have submitted -- I hope I can put it in some -- I'm trying to remember. I wrote these down what it really means today. But I know you addressed the confidential proprietary information. Are these farm plans considered part of that? And are the
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audits considered part of that confidential proprietary information?

MS. DUNHAM: So that the farm plans under your current program and even as I believe as have staff has proposed, continue to remain on the farm in order to protect the confidentiality of the farm plan. It would not go into the Regional Board's offices. They currently are and would be under all proposals available for inspection by Regional Board staff upon arrival, basically, on the farm for another inspection.

So, while they are -- don't go into the Regional Board's office because that would then make them a subject to public exposure, they are available to Regional Board staff for review to determine their accuracy.

MR. JEFFRIES: I know that's been a real concern for the farming community that some information should not be released to the public.

I'm not sure how you're going to put all these people together. I'm seeing all the signatures that were submitted with your letter and your proposal. What percentage do you think that in our region that you would have enrolled in this program that you're proposing?

MS. DUNHAM: Boy, you know, I honestly,
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Mr. J effries, I don't know, but if I -- I would imagine people that would follow in their Tier 2 and Tier 3 would take a very close look at participating. And based upon the numbers that Mr. Quandt put forward, that would be more than at least half of the acreage within the region, if not the actual number of growers.

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. J EFFRIES: 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.

MR. J EFFRIES: Well, what brings my question is because Preservation, Inc., has about 93 percent enrollment, according to my notes --

MR. YOUNG: Acreage.

MR. BRIGGS: Okay, 93 percent of acreage. I assume that there's going to be lack of either acreage or farms or ranches that will participate in this. Are we -- are you going to know? And are we going to know?

MS. DUNHAM: You will know.
MR. JEFFRIES: We will know?
MS. DUNHAM: You will know. This is not an umbrella. The way it has been set up in a strike out on an underline version that was we presented to you in March is people would make -- it's a voluntary decision to use the coalition alternative as their choice for compliance with the Order. And they could say, yep, I want to go with the Coalition Alternative approach to comply with the provisions of the Order. Or I'm going to stay with whatever you end up adopting, ultimately, and whether that maintains the current requirements for Tier 2 and Tier 3 or not, then comply with the waiver as you end up adopting it for other people. It's a voluntary selection that I want to take this path versus the other path that has been set forward. So you would know who is under what program.

MR. JEFFRIES: Have you taken analysis of the costs between the staff's proposal and your proposal? I know that the gentleman gave a presentation on behalf of the grower/shipper, and there was some numbers that were Page 545
pretty outstanding in that presentation.
MS. DUNHAM: I don't know that we have -- have a cost comparison between what it would cost for our alternative compared to yours.

Do we? No, we do not.
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 established it's actually looking at different risks for different parts of your operation, would be kind of part of what the audit criteria would need to include and would be risked based.

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,
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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
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.
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West of Salinas is mostly titled irrigated lands, and some of the best agricultural land in the world. And I'm concerned not only of loss of economy, but loss of jobs for my citizens in our area. Because I can see some of staff's requirements and I know they're saying, well, we're not stopping agriculture from using tile lands and -- but when you do look at the final it's the run-off, the discharge, and I understand that we have to do something with the discharge, but we can't limit these 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
auditing someone's operation to evaluate, you know, are they, you know, what they are doing to address the issue of potential nutrients within a tile drain, we would be looking to the technical advisory committee to advise us as to what should we do? What should growers be doing in those circumstances where we do have tile drains.

So we don't have the answer here, but it is one of those complex issues where the professionals and the experts that we would look towards from the technical advisory committee, which is why it's so important.

MR. JEFFRIES: I think that relates to some of the comments we heard earlier that the scientific analysis for this hasn't caught up with today's world and needs more investigation.

I that's my last question --
MS. DUNHAM: And, actually, and just one other thing real quick on that. The other thing that we have alluded to in here is that there may be some circumstances where growers and, you know, common drainages or common watersheds, or sub-watersheds might want to implement some type of an electric water treatment system in an area where there are tile drains and the third party group would look for to help facilitate those types of opportunities where it may be necessary and that may be exactly the type of situation
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which something like that might work.
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?
MR. DUNHAM: You know, we did, but, again, going
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back to consideration of what is the appropriate management practice, and, you know, again, this program just like yours can't -- would not be able to specify specific management practices.

Now, I would, you know, obviously, take issue with the staff's proposal. I think it does try to specify a 30 -foot buffer, riparian buffer corridor in the MRP, which is a management practice, and I think that crosses the line, so we have to avoid doing that.

And so it goes back to what are the management practices that individual grower has employed to deal with sediment. And, perhaps, it would -- maybe they're using riparian, if they're able to, but if they're not because of food safety, then they're going to have to look at other alternatives. And we believe that there other alternatives out there that people are using.

MR. TOMLINSON: The only thing I would add to that is, at the federal level the Food and Drug Administration is required now by new federal legislation to implement a new regulation for individual farms next year. A draft of that is expected at the end of this year. And in anticipation of that a lot of the retailers and some of the trade associations have been working on a harmonized metric.
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green metric, but the harmonized metric calls for 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 hear a little bit from Jill North, who is sitting
directly behind Ms. McCann.
So we've taken notes of things you might want more clarification on, responses and that sort of thing. Certain things -- everything that would take a long time, considering the testimony and all the responses we have received. So we will try to get the important points.

So are you leading off, Angela?
MS. SCHROETER: I am Angela Schroeter. I am Senior Engineer, Engineering Geologist and Program Manager for the Agricultural Regulatory Program.

Before I begin, I just want to thank you all for taking the time. It's been one long day. One long process. Your contribution is appreciated.

So as Roger mentioned we're going to provide you with a brief summary of key public comment areas. Staff's response to the issues brought up. Some changes to the Draft Order that staff is recommending based upon testimony heard on March 17th as well as testimony heard to the continuation today.

You'll also hear from individual staff who worked on specific areas of the Draft Order. And I'll respond to some technical issues.

Michael Thomas will speak to make the staff's final recommendations.

So the Board provided a significant
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opportunity for public input to the Draft Order. Staff 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 impacts to water quality, similar to any other individual
business industry. And that data should be made available to the public about the impairment caused by agricultural discharges.

MR. YOUNG: Slow down a little bit, Angie.
MS. SCHROETER: You also heard the Board should not be one-size fits all and that not all farms cause the same level of water quality impairment.

One example of that is testimony heard from a Strawberry Commission on March 17th, that strawberries should be considered low risk to water quality.

We also heard about cost and economic issues, both from the perspective of the farmer as well as costs effected by the pollution agricultural areas.

In addition, the Farm Bureau has presented an agricultural industry proposal to regulate agricultural discharges, which is based upon third-party coalitions.

Throughout the process all day we've also have heard some specific comments on the Draft Order. For example, there's been comments that the Order should tier based upon individual farms instead of operations. We've heard that acreage is an inappropriate tiering criteria. We've also heard that the Order should include additional pesticide, like Pyrethroids and others rather than just Chlorpyrifos and Diazinon.
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the use of the University of California Nitrate Hazard 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 that comment too.

Tile drains, I wanted to bring that up, briefly, because Mr. Jeffries asked 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.

MS. NORTH: Jill North, I'm the Environmental Scientist here at the Regional Water Control Board.

I just want to mention a couple of the 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 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 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: 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
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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.

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?
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.
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MS. NORTH: And animal entry.
MR. YOUNG: Is that in a finalized form?
MS. NORTH: Yeah. They continually edit it and will update it based on public comment, yeah. The most final form is available online.

MR. YOUNG: Okay.
DR. HUNTER: Jill, one question. LGMA, can you say what that is for people who don't know.

MS. NORTH: Leafy Green Marketing Agreement. And then there's also been comments about the FDA. And I just want to say the FDA, that's the Federal Modernization Act that was passed in January of 2011 that has written into the law that would take into consideration environmental practices and also wild life habitat written into that law.

And the FDA is also working -- they have a special panel convened with -- that EPA and SRCS is working with. And I participated in the farm safety coalition network that has also worked with FDA and agriculture to address the food safety and water quality issues promoting co-management and we support. NRCF has a document 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 practice along with the food safety
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practices. So, we also work with them to help develop that.

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.

The other thing I'd like to address is
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 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 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

Page 562
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

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
drinking water supply wells than any other contaminate, or group of contaminates in our region and within the state.

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 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
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## 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 J eff 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

They have all been voluntary.
If we look at what the water resource agency has done with regard to irrigation efficiency I think they deserve significant cudos. They've done a lot of work in working with the growers in Monterey County who approve irrigation efficiency. I think we can't set that aside from nitrogen loading because the loading is primarily affected by irrigation efficiency as well as fertilizer application efficiency. So there is the likelihood that their irrigation efficiency programs have resulted in, you know, potential improvements in reducing nitrate loading in groundwater. But we do not have any information or data that's been contracted that shows that that's the case.

MR. YOUNG: They did submit data to us.
MR. KEELING: They submitted data to us that is somewhat censured. They were in a bit of a difficult position. They've gone out and they've had something about 390 agricultural wells that were available to them to sample. They've got voluntary agreements to access and sample those wells. As part of the agreements they've agreed to keep the well information, the location information confidential.

So, the data that we get is a 30,000 foot elevation view of what the groundwater conditions look
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like on a map. We can't pinpoint where the wells are, where the hot spots are, you know, within township. We're not even within township range section basis at this point. We could probably work that out from them, but what we really want to get is the individual well data. The problem was they gave that to us, their monitoring program, basically dissolved overnight. Nobody would let them on site if they shared the well 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
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analyses on those. Some of those wells show decreases, some show increases.

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

MR. YOUNG: It's a gross comparison?
MR. KEELING: Yes.
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
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drinking water standard. This nitrogen is available for crop update.

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 amount of the amount of applied nitrogen.

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

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 generalized fear that, you know, anything they may do that gets reported to us is going end up with administrative penalties being assessed against them.
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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
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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.

MR. KEELI NG: 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 Page 575
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?
MS. SCHROETER: Next we'll hear from Monica Barricarte.

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

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.

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 presented yet.

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.

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 high risk crops.

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 quantity. And in this case, an example would be like they would show recordkeeping of the total amount of nitrogen applied. They have to calculate the target they are already meeting, and that actually compared with the targets that we are proposing, they would be consider as a low for -- qualified low tier.

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

Thank you.
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
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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
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.
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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 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
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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.

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

So, we have data from lettuce that the average crop uptake for nitrogen is 140 pounds per acre. So if you take this average pound per acre for the spring planting season, you subtract it -- you subtract the crop uptake, you get an excess nitrate on average of about 75 pounds per acre. This is not to say that all vegetable growers apply. I'm just using the example here of what's being presented by the Poly Extension of the average seasonal application.

So, again, let's remember that the sort of average excess nitrogen to lettuce is off 75 pounds per 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
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excess nitrogen for that particular farm, which is the average farm size.

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 50 s 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.

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

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
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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
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ultimately delays in the water quality program.
The staff concluded that it's not necessary at this time to add additional pesticides to tiering criteria in that the Draft Order and MRP are an improvement on the existing Order and are protective of water quality.

MR. YOUNG: What about we heard testimony that they are in use and they are being picked up in receiving waters.

MS. SCHROETER: And the Draft Order includes adding those individual pesticides to MRP and, also, if a grower was to use that pesticide, an individual grower in Tier 3 the EO could adopt their monitoring requirements to include those chemicals.

MR. YOUNG: Well, what would be the significance of adding that now, one additional chemical?

MS. SCHROETER: It's actually a group of chemicals, so it's not just one chemical. So, potentially, what we have to do is to go through the database just like we did in the program to evaluate where that's been used and how that would impact the tiering criteria.

MR. YOUNG: The staff doesn't have the data on how many farmers are using pyrethroids in the Central Coast region?
that question to Karen.
MS. WORCESTER: Karen Worcester,
W-O-R-C-E-S-T-E-R.
In the second year of the program, receiving water monitoring program has enhanced components that include pesticide monitoring along with the toxicity monitoring. So when they do, for example, the sediment toxicity monitoring, they will also do monitoring to anything that's attached to the sediment. It will ultimately be maybe 10 or 12 that may be requiring monitoring.

MS. HUNTER: Two or three --
MS. WORCESTER: No, this is the receiving water. Now, the individual monitoring for Tier 3 what we're discussing now, staff is recommending not adding additional pesticides, but what we did do is we changed the required toxicity monitoring. It originally included two tests in water; one that's for invertebrates and one for an algae. The invertebrate is sensitive, more sensitive to OP pesticide. So we substituted the algae test for another type of invertebrate test that is subjective to pyrethroids.

MS. HUNTER: So over the five years you can start to see some characterization of the pyrethroids problem?

MS. WORCESTER: Yes.
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MS. McCANN: Let me clarify something, Karen, so that it's clear. We're not recommending adding to every tiering criteria, but as an individual discharger in 2,3 is using a pyrethroid the Executive Officer requires them to monitor for that individual discharger.

MS. HUNTER: And then that could develop from the receiving water data?

MS. McCANN: It could develop from the receiving water data and it could also develop directly from their pesticide use through our knowledge from the regulation use, pesticide use information that is linked to the individual farms.

MS. HUNTER: And would it also come through in the annual compliance report? Are they required to apply --

MS. McCANN: Yes, yes, they are.
MS. SCHROETER: So this is the summary of the recommended changes to the Draft Order; tiering individual farms instead of operations. Modifying the tiering criteria to look at acreage relative to nitrate loading. Allow the use of nitrate hazard index. Removing the Executive Officer's authority to modify the tiering criteria. And finally just sort of more administrative, we would need to adjust the dates in the Order and MRP to reflect Board adoption because those dates are getting old at this point.

So we feel like these changes will improve the Draft Order focusing efforts on the emphasis of the characteristics of individual farms, and prioritizing dischargers opposed to higher water quality.

These changes do result in some changes that -- in numbers in farmers and tiers. Most substantively the change from operations to farms and in the acreage. So, we went down from operation of 1,000 acres to a farm of 500 acres or more.

So, this is sort of a summary of how, overall, the numbers of growers and acreage would fill the tiers. Again, this is just an estimate and it's based upon the data that we have received from the updated notice of intent.

So, for Tier 3 we estimate, approximately, 100 farms, individual farms, and this represents about 20 percent of the acreage. So this is a pretty significant reduction from the November Draft. If you remember, we were at about 230,000 acres before. However, what we do think is that at this reduced acreage the requirements for Tier 3 will be more focused on those that would be implementing the necessary requirements.

So, for example, before it was subset, we would have to implement the irrigation management plan. So we captured the subset more here versus the entire

Page 599

```
operations.
            However, it's still consistent that for Tier
2, which is those requirements that are most similar to
the existing Order, they still have a majority of OP
farms and the majority of acreage in that Tier 2. The
smaller amount of farms, 630 acreage representing what we
would identify as very low threat.
So, again, our recommendation is those changes we feel is reasonable and responsible given the severity of the water quality conditions.
We feel that the requirements for Tier 3 are reasonable given the severity and magnitude of the potential threat to our water quality. And that a majority of the farmers would have similar requirements as they currently do.
MR. YOUNG: Couple of questions for you.
Let's say we have a small watershed which has
just Tier 2, is there no individual monitoring for --
MS. SCHROETER: That's correct.
MR. YOUNG: Is there going to be individual groundwater for Tier 2?
MS. SCHROETER: That's correct. So --
MR. YOUNG: For riparian?
MS. SCHOETER: Yes.
MR. YOUNG: For surface water, what if you don't
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see an improvement in surface receiving water over a 2,3,4 year period and all we have is the collective monitoring stations out there in the watersheds. What's the next step? What mechanism is in this program for trying to further delineate who might be contributing to a problem?

MS. SCHROETER: Well, there are some mechanisms, but let me first describe that we would conduct implementation of the Order somewhat to what we do now. So we wouldn't just be looking at the receiving water, we would be looking at what the Tier 2 growers were reporting according to the annual compliance report in terms of the practices they're implementing, if necessary, the total acreage apply if they're are higher risks in terms nitrate loading. So we would be able to sort of discern within that data the potential water quality.

The Annual Compliance Report also asks for characteristics of discharge. We would be able to sample the volume of receiving water. Things like that. If receiving water didn't improve, we have -- there are some options. One, we could adapt the MRP, for example, to get more explicit information about that. We can also look at, basically, the information that we do have potentially elevating some growers if necessary to a
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higher reporting level in Tier 3 --
MR. YOUNG: Based on what? The Board would have to do that, I assume, or are you saying that EEO could elevate people?

MS. SCHROETER: The current Draft Order gives the Executive Officer the authority to elevate growers to a higher level.

MR. YOUNG: And vice-versa.
MS. SCHROETER: And vise-versa. The discharger can provide information if they belong to a lower tier.

MR. BRIGGS: What we're recommending as far as maintaining the Board authority is on the tiering criteria itself.

MR. YOUNG: Now, going back, Angela, to your slides with the breakdown of the high nitrate use crops, the nitrate. When I look at that I come up with a similar reaction as I had when I looked at the slides based on the aggregate coming up to 1,000 acres. I just want to throw it out to get your reaction.

The real issue here is just the fact of the amount of per acre potential excess fertilization, that's really what the standard that you're using through all of this. And you could have 10 farms side by side, on one side of a river all in Tier 2 . On the other side is the same amount of acreage combined with one farm is 1,000
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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
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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
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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.
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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.
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We have changed the draft significantly over a year and a half. And Angela just went over additional changes that were made today, or proposing today in responding to comments again. I think the record shows that we have been responsive.

With that, I 'll turn it over to you.
MR. BRIGGS: Thank you, Michael.
Some of these things will be a bit of a reiteration, but I'm going to get the last shot here --
(Interruption by the court reporter.)
(Break taken.)
MR. YOUNG: Okay. Mr. Briggs.
MR. BRIGGS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
We heard a lot about the toxicity of the
surface waters and the contamination of drinking water. These are the most serious issues the Water Board has ever faced and has addressed. We believe, actually, a couple Board members may have pointed out in their questions, the Water Board is the only agency with the authority and responsibility to address and resolve these issues. There isn't anybody else.

The public has a right to clean water, no one
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has a right to pollute public waters. But nitrates in groundwater and surface water from agricultural discharges have been documented for decades; that's the legacy part, but they continue to increase today in many locations, not everywhere. But overall, we see increases and it's time to reverse that trend.

Unfortunately, many Central Coast residents are drinking water from a new water source that they have to pay for because the original drinking water wells became contaminated. Private individuals and taxpayers, therefore, are shouldering the burden of costs for replacement water both temporarily, for example, bottled water and long term from new and deeper groundwater wells or wellhead treatment, and we have a lot of examples of both.

But there are solutions, that's the good news. We've heard a lot about technical assistant providers, researchers and consultants that have shown examples over and over again of success. That's good news. Growers indicate many are already implementing these practices that are successful and that they're achieving targets. That was part of the strawberry conditions presentation last time.

And as we've seen in other arenas like storm water and other parts of the regulatory world that
the Board deals with, the Water Board must adopt the necessary requirements or they will not be implemented to do the scale and the areas where they are needed most.

The problems that we have in our watersheds are extremely serious. In the areas where good Ag practices are making improvements, that's great. Those folks should keep going and keep doing what they're doing. Those operations won't have problems being in compliance with this proposed Order. For the other operations we need to have a more accountable regulatory framework to make more progress, and we need to get going.

Farmers have been continuously learning better ways to operate since the beginning of farming. They need to continue to do so, but with increased awareness and emphasis on their -- the effects of their operations on the watersheds, the effects of the drinking water on their downgraded neighbors.

As we get into implementation we will use adoptive management to change and improve as well. Much of the interaction that we'll have of growers will come from the information that's submitted according to the monitoring reporting program. We can actually adjust that program, administratively, as pointed out here just recently, as we have learned how to make it Page 609
work more efficiently for it to be more effective, make more sense in ways that would minimize the regulatory burden on the growers. But we can make those adjustments once we get going with implementation.

And we've heard a lot of comments that agricultural dischargers must be accountable to the public by recording information that verifies compliance, and that resolution of the severe water quality problems requires that accountability just like any other individual business or industry that is regulated by the Water Board.

Existing and potential water quality impairment from agricultural waste discharge run-off takes on added significance and urgency. Given the degraded drinking water and the threats of public health that are associated with that, the limited sources of drinking water supplies that we have in our region, and the proximity of our agricultural lands to critical water dependent habitat. We must not delay the necessary actions to correct these problems. It's the -- again, it's the Water Board's role and responsibility on all of those fronts.

A gentleman today talked about his experience with underground tank cases and even postured that all those cases pale in comparison to the issue that we're
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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.

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.
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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.
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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?

MS. McCHESNEY: Can I just say something first? The Water Code -- when the Board issues a waiver of distributing pilot, the Water Code requires that you have monitoring unless you have some reason of monitoring that it's not necessary because it's not a high risk problem or not a significant water quality problem. If you require monitoring, the monitoring is required by the law to be recorded publicly. So, if your Order requires monitoring, it has to be recorded.

Now, given that there could be some information about the wells that would not be publicly recorded, but the data is needed to be available.

Your second question about the proprietary information. And there is a section in the Water Code that requires that the Board requires protect the proprietary information, trade secrets, that kind of thing. So it is required to be protected and the Board -- staff feels that they can regularly in making sure that water proprietary information, trade secrets are protected from public disclosure.

So they can still answer the question, there's some middle ground, but I just wanted to let you know if you require monitoring, it needs to be required to be recorded.

MR. HODGIN: Just to go back to your first point,
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you're saying that the suggestion that the Farm Bureau, for example, could get together and obtain information on a kind of a group basis and they might know the individual ranches, but we won't know here? That's not going to be possible.

MS. McCHESNEY: If you require monitoring by individuals, that monitoring data has to be recorded publicly, or cooperatively, or however you require monitoring to be developed and submitted. It's required by law to be reported publicly.

MR. YOUNG: What if there's group monitoring?
MS. McCHESNEY: The group monitoring has to be recorded publicly, yes.

MR. YOUNG: Whatever wells they're using?
MS. McCHESNEY: Right. I mean, I'd have to look up the specific section of the law, but there is some information about individual drinking water wells that doesn't require to be recorded publicly, but the data has to be recorded.

MR. HODGIN: I want to make sure I understand this. A coalition of some sort could not do the monitoring, perhaps, number the wells or something, but a number would -- you would not necessarily know which specific ranch it was on? There's some possible way to honor both things. It's not a choice, I'm hearing you
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## say.

MS. McCHESNEY: I'm just --
MR. THOMAS: Perhaps the other option is, Francis, we could make it clear what our enforcement priorities or enforcement and approach would be so that if the concern is that information submitted to the Board that we take enforcement action on. We can do a better job of explaining what our enforcement priorities are and when and in what condition we would propose enforcement actions.

From staff's prospective, as I was mentioning earlier, there's this process that we go through and the vast majority of enforcement cases or potential enforcement cases never come to the Board and never even result in issuing the fine. They resolve at a staff level. And we work with the dischargers. If we think there's a problem or a violation we always work with the dischargers. They often explain to us what the situation is in their case and then we make a decision on whether we move forward. And often it is resolved at that level.

I understand the fear because this is a regulatory enforcement agency. But the reality of it is that most of these cases are resolved without moving the Board, without resulting in --

MR. HODGIN: What I'm hearing you saying is we Page 617
cooperate now not necessarily be --
(Interruption by the court reporter.)

MS. McCHESNEY: The law requires issuing a waiver the waiver. The waiver shall include, but need not be limited to the performance of individual groups of watershed basin monitoring and that the purpose $f$ the monitoring is to be designed to support the development and implementation of the waiver program including but not limited to verifying the adequacy and effectiveness of the waiver's conditions.

And you can consider values, duration, frequency and consistency of the discharge, the extent and type of existing monitoring activities, et cetera.

Monitoring results shall be made available to the public.

So that's, basically, those are the kinds of things that monitoring is supposed to evaluate. And, yes, monitoring information can be used for enforcement. It's required by law to have monitoring and that the purpose is to evaluate whether, in fact, your conditions are working and that water quality protection is being achieved.

MS. SCHROETER: Just to follow up on that, just to Page 618
add a little bit of perspective, Mr. Hodgin.
The Draft Order requires for Tier 1 and Tier 2, two samples, that's it. Two samples over five years. So I'm not sure what ramifications or consequences that are being anticipated from two samples. But for context I think it's important to recognize that there's a lot of dischargers similar to those that are being regulated by this Order that would have a similar concern.

So, for example, in region five as part of the dairy order, they also have an irrigation management plan. They have been required to sample their wells annually over their time period. They're submitting that data.

So, in the underground storage tanks, also, there is a little bit different type of program, obviously, but what I wanted to recognize that many of those dischargers are small family owners and they live at their areas of business and they also have concerns about reporting that data. And I think in that context there is some level of confidentiality in terms of private residence, address, things like that that are not part of public distribution data.

So, it's out there. Things -- we're
reporting data like this already.
MR. HODGIN: I wanted to comment on what you were
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just saying, and confirm then that we would be able to gather the data, but not -- the public would not necessarily know the street addresses or location of that data?

MS. SCHROETER: There are very specific rules about confidentiality in terms of private --

MS. McCANN: Private wells and location.
MS. SCHROETER: Right. I'm not certain what those are. But I know, as an example, for the underground storage tank program the way that is being interpreted there is that if your business is your private residence, for example, then those well locations don't show up in a way they can be displayed to the public, but they're reported to the Board as part of the reporting requirements. So that's one area that we can at least look into to see how that would affect the reporting.

DR. HUNTER: I just want to be sure the very first line of the section that says that you could require individual or group monitoring.

MS. McCHESNEY: The conditions of the Waiver shall include but need not be limited to the performance of individual groups or watershed-based monitoring.

DR. HUNTER: Okay. Thank you.
MR. YOUNG: Anything else, Monica?
DR. HUNTER: No. Okay. I can go.

Well, I appreciate everything that has come into the record through the series of meetings and I've learned a lot. And as I expected I am -- I continue to appreciate the challenges that are -- that we are all confronted with. And we all have distinct and different purposes for wanting to see some of these problems addressed, and we're all considering short term and long term impacts on the types of approaches that are going to be required.

I'm also, you know, learning a lot about the legacy issues. And I also recognize that the agencies that have been working on this, and I said this earlier, with a lot of passion, the agencies are working on these issues I realize that, but, still we see that at the county level the changes aren't being implemented.

Thank you, Matt, for the update on the Monterey County Park. I had those same questions. I saw in the report that, you know, these committees were formed, and advisory bodies were formed, five year plans are put into place, these are all voluntary efforts. And I think, it's commendable that we have seen come out of those efforts and we see some improvements, but we see still places that are being -- that are continuing to drag.

And when you consider that in rural areas Page 621
folks are relying on well water almost 100 percent, I believe, except where they're buying bottled water, that is huge. I know that in the letters we received the public health agencies supports this Order. And that tells me something. That tells me that they see this as contributing and adding to the tools that are going to be put into place in order to start to clean up the water.

I do appreciate the legacy component of nitrate impacting on groundwater, but at the same time I know that in other aspects of the Regional Board's work that we do hold landowners accountable for whatever the conditions are, and clean up has to proceed especially when it triggers such serious effects, health effects.

Generally, though, those situations are pretty small and limited to, you know, small segments of communities, perhaps, in urban areas, perhaps not, but not on this magnitude.

So, again, you know, I have to agree with Mr. Briggs that the magnitude of this issue really requires that we take some significant action.

And thank you for bringing up the MTBE issue because while I wasn't part of the Board when the majority of that work went on, I certainly was part of the public and very aware of it, you know, seeing the kind of outcomes that have occurred, it's remarkable. We
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changed the way things were done. We changed business as usual.

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 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
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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?

MS. McCHESNEY: Well, the way that the Order is set up, and that's typical of this kind of waiver for non-point sources is that if you find that after some period of time that the conditions of the waiver are not being effective, then the first step is to look at the dischargers to see if we could make it more effective. But in terms of enforcement, if they comply Page 624
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 625
than the continuing modification of the farm plan.
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. J EFFRIES: I guess I'm next, Mr. Chair.
MR. YOUNG: You are, Mr. Vice Chair.
MR. J EFFRIES: I'm not going to be redundant. My two colleagues who have already spoke. I hope I won't be anyway.

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

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.

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

Roger pointed that out that, you know, it's been two and half years, and it could be another two-and-a-half years, and another five years. And, you know, I'm here -- my term is up next year, and I would hope and I would think that we can have this done somewhere in the next few months. I don't think we're that far apart. And I think there's a lot of cool heads in this room that could make this happen.

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

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

It's difficult for me to sit here and listen
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to new information, you know, what the California Farm Bureau Group put up for consideration, I would like to have staff take a look at because I can't sit here and do everything that I've got to do and know exactly what they're proposing and give it fair consideration.

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

MS. McCHESNEY: That's correct.
MR. YOUNG: Does that have -- does that incorporate the material that you presented today?

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

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
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presentation that I have down on that.
Now, could staff do that and come back to us in July?

MS. McCHESNEY: I won't be available in July to be here.

MR. YOUNG: Well, there is another lawyer who is available; is that correct?

MS. McCHESNEY: But I did want to comment on your proposal that those documents were submitted after J anuary.

MR. YOUNG: I understand that.
MS. McCHESNEY: And the comments came in --
MR. YOUNG: I understand that, but -- you're
right. They are. But I think in my sense in how to
approach this whole thing it's not an easy thing for us
to get our hands around and try to make sure that we considered everything, because we're going to vote at
some point, and it's going to happen soon, and that's going to start a five-year period.

I would like to give the Farm Bureau
Proposal, you know, as much consideration as possible. And let's face it, the collaborative approach that we were hoping was going to work, you know, so over the years, it hasn't really worked that well. This is something we talked about at the big workshop we had in
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Salinas in that big hall, essentially, this is the collaborative approach.

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
criteria, some of the factors that go in, but I'll tell you something, I'm sure each of us up here and many of you would all come up with kind of different variations of this, and none of them would be perfect. Some would be better than others, but this is what's being developed. And I think it's very reasonable.

And I think that this is going to be a flexible enough approach that in the end it's going -- it should achieve what it does achieve. It should achieve what we want it to achieve.

I want to say one thing about the size of Ag as an industry. I continually hear how many billions of dollars it generates for the economy. And I think that is a great testament to its success. The flip side of that is it would appear to me that there's got to be some way to get the funds from this income stream. Instead of right at the farm level there should be some other effort employed to tap into that to make this work, and lighten the financial burden where it exists. And by that I mean, whether collectively people look at this in terms of assessing their cost contribution at the wholesale level or some other level, that's something for everybody to work out. And maybe that would be a response to what the Board ultimately adopts as an Order.

I can see that for an individual there's
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going to be a cost that that individual has to bear and 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
and modify as we move on with this.
But what I would propose, it depends on what the rest -- the three of you would like to do, this has to come back in anyway, what we need is another Board member. So, I would like to give the Farm Bureau's proposal staff's analysis and review.

MR. BRIGGS: Okay. That's what I was going to say.

MR. YOUNG: By doing that what it would mean is people would be able to comment again because that would be a change in -- potential change in what goes into staff's proposed Order. So --

MR. JEFFRIES: Can I ask a question before you go?
MR. YOUNG: Yes.
MR. JEFFRIES: You started out saying that we had several workshops, you mentioned we had one in Salinas, but I think you meant to say in San Luis Obispo at the Elks Club; is that correct?

MR. YOUNG: You're right.
MR. JEFFRIES: I thought maybe I missed one.
MR. YOUNG: Anything north of Santa Barbara I kind of lose a little perspective.

MR. JEFFRIES: I understand.
MR. YOUNG: You're right, Elks Club.
MR. JEFFRIES: I didn't want these folks to think
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that we had a secret workshop and they weren't involved in it.

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 is cooperative in trying to resolve the issue, that there is no enforcement action. Enforcement comes when
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somebody is non-responsive, or there are repetitive problems, and there don't seem to be any other solutions and then it has to come back to this Board before there is any fine. Is that correct? I think, you know, that needs to be very clear to the Ag industry is that it's quite a process before there would be anything but positive reaction to a problem.

DR. HUNTER: Yeah, I can go along with respect to your views, Mr. Jeffries. So, I would ask staff in looking at that alternative Ag Program that you look carefully at the "may require", "may end up in", you know, the voluntary level of it versus "shall require" which comes with regulation and, like, see if the voluntary aspect of this rises to the level of what we're -- what we need -- what we think we need to see in a regulated program and then what the consequences are of noncompliance within that program structure.

Some of that concerns the way that they're going to work with a collaborative or cooperative kind of regional scale. If you could kind of characterize that for us so that we understand how small a scale is that.

And I'm also, again, concerned about aggregate data and not getting the characterization to the level that we really need it. So if you could help us to understand how that collaboration working within Page 637
the farm community, how we can begin to see if we could 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 that we could take care of this in Watsonville in July? Is there enough time for that or not?

MR. BRIGGS: You may chime in. One of the things
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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 J anuary 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 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
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information they made recommendations, they made changes 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 written, you know, several page analysis and that goes out to the public and then people can respond to that
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?

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 --
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MS. McCHESNEY: Yes, to that.
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 and then talk with the Board.

MR. THOMAS: That's my question. My concern is
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what are we going to do with the comments that we get because you received how many hundreds of pages of comments in response from us that we responded to all the comments that were submitted by November 3rd, hundreds of pages.

MR. YOUNG: Is the staff required to comment on comments? To respond?

MS. McCHESNEY: Not on comments --
THE COURT: No?
MS. McCHESNEY: No.
MR. YOUNG: So people could just submit their comments and the Board will just read the comments.

MS. McCHESNEY: It's just that it doesn't make a good record if you don't have a response, but we're not legally obligated to have written responses to comments.

MR. BRIGGS: A big difference between getting something out to the public and enough time for them to review and then coming and commenting to the Board as opposed to enough time to review, write comments to us, for us to compile them and submit them to the Board, it's a whole different time period.

MR. THOMAS: I hate to complicate this, but I'm going to. What about the other folks that we're going to hear from who are going to say what about us and our view or our proposal?
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MR. YOUNG: You mean the other proposals?
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 referring to is other proposals, other interested persons that have had proposals.

MS. McCHESNEY: You're not obligated to accept more proposals.

MR. YOUNG: Okay.
MR. THOMAS: And what Roger just said that is real important, Francis, you said as long as there's an opportunity to comment. Roger said that would be at the Board meeting.

MS. McCHESNEY: Right. And that's where I want to look. I can't say absolutely for sure that that's an appropriate process that may be making comments is appropriate. But I will need to --

MR. YOUNG: You mean staff's written comments?
MS. McCHESNEY: No. You're proposing to accept comments that were submitted after January 3rd, and all the other comments there were set for -- submitted in a timely manner, everybody got to come here and comment on everything. Now you're proposing to accept more written comments and have staff prepare the addendum to the staff report. So the question is should the rest of the public be allowed to have -- to submit written comments on this additional staff report and documents should be accepted in the record, or will oral comments be sufficient? And what I can't say for sure that if oral comments are sufficient, which is what Roger is trying to confirm.

MR. YOUNG: What if we allow the cutoff to be
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## period to be the Board meeting itself?

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?

MR. BRIGGS: We can go to the next available --
MR. YOUNG: Which is down here in San Luis Obispo
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county.
MR. JEFFRIES: Can I ask our counsel a question? What's the difference between oral comments and written comments?

MS. McCHESNEY: If you -- if there's a limited time period and people are submitting written comments to do the last minute, it's not possible for you and the staff and everybody to read those comments in a timely manner.

MR. JEFFRIES: I understand that, but --
MS. McCHESNEY: There's a time issue.
MR. JEFFRIES: There was oral comments made by a
whole lot of people. There was oral comments made by the
Ag Coalition, so, why is it different than submitting written comments?

MS. McCHESNEY: Because you're asking staff to prepare a new staff report, addendum to the staff report commenting on new information in the record, and I just can't tell you right now without researching the law whether there are obligations for you to provide an opportunity for written comments. And I'll have to let the staff know to schedule a meeting.

MR. BRIGGS: So the time would be dependent on results of that research?

MR. JEFFRIES: I will bow to that decision.
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MR. YOUNG: If we put this off to September does 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.
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
something that we may cut some things off that we should not be cutting off. We don't know yet. Francis has to
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look at that.
I mean, does J uly versus September make that much difference in the long run? Because I think what we're going to have once this comes back we're going to be ready to vote. We're probably going to have a fifth board member.

MR. JEFFRIES: I would hope by September we would.
MR. YOUNG: Yeah.
MR. J EFFRIES: Would cancelling the J une meeting and putting that information on the July meeting would we have adequate time even if staff could get it ready?

MR. BRIGGS: I don't think that's a factor.
MR. JEFFRIES: Okay. That's not a factor. All right.

MR. YOUNG: So that's our direction.
MR. BRIGGS: Yes.
MR. YOUNG: Is everyone kind of clear with what we want to do?

MR. SHIMEK: I just need you to restate what it is that you're doing.

MR. YOUNG: What we are directing staff to do is to take the California Farm Bureau written submission that was from March 17th and their submission today directing staff to compare and contrast and comment on what parts of that submission are doable, for what
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reasons, which parts are not doable for what other 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
(The meeting was concluded at 6:25 P.M.) --00000--
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[^0]:    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

