

DRAFT Meeting Summary

Meeting #5 Long-term Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program (ILRP) Stakeholder Advisory Workgroup (Workgroup)

MEETING DATE: 20 August 2009

LOCATION: Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
11020 Sun Center Drive, #200
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670-6114

ATTENDEES: See Attachment A

Action Items

1. Staff will post the 2nd Draft ILRP Alternatives presentation online and email it to the Workgroup.
2. Staff will follow-up with Jennifer Clary, Clean Water Action, to further discuss the difference between a third-party group and a "legal entity" lead entity.
3. Staff will revise long-term ILRP Goals and Objectives (Goal 4, Objective 1) that did not receive Workgroup consensus. Staff will send the revised goal and objective to the Workgroup to try and get consensus by email.
4. Workgroup comments on the 2nd Draft Alternatives Document are due by September 10, 2009.

Announcements and Updates

May 19 Workgroup Meeting Summary: Adam Laputz, staff, reported that the draft meeting summary for the May 19th Workgroup meeting was sent to the Workgroup on June 1st. No comments were received from meeting participants. The Workgroup adopted the meeting summary as the final version.

ILRP Process Update and Next Steps (Schedule): Meeting facilitator, Dave Ceppos, Center for Collaborative Policy, announced the beginning of the Workgroup meeting. Mr. Ceppos announced that this is the final formal Stakeholder Advisory Workgroup meeting.

The Workgroup reviewed the Schedule and Milestones. Water Board staff (staff) and ICF Jones and Stokes discussed the next steps in transitioning from the alternatives development process to the EIR process. At the October 8th Central Valley Water Board meeting, staff will update the Board on the Workgroup process, proposed ILRP alternatives, and next steps in the EIR process.

During the EIR process, the Central Valley Water Board will also be evaluating economics and policy aspects of each alternative (e.g., how well each alternative meets statutory requirements). During the draft EIR process staff intends to continue to engage stakeholders through public informational updates. Also, staff indicated that additional information will be needed to evaluate the environmental, economic, and policy aspects of each alternative. Staff will be engaging stakeholders to ensure that the best possible information is used in the evaluation process.

Discussion:

- A participant asked whether there will be opportunity for more discussion and input on the economics analysis of the ILRP alternatives. Staff responded that they intended to continue to update and gather input from stakeholders regarding the details of the economics and impacts analysis.
- A meeting participant asked when staff will bring a recommended alternative before the Central Valley Water Board. Staff responded that this will occur in the spring of 2010. The recommended alternative will be identified when the draft EIR is released.
- A participant asked whether alternatives can be changed during the EIR process. Russ Grimes, ICF Jones and Stokes, responded that alternatives could be modified through mitigation measures. Changing aspects of alternatives is appropriate based on EIR/economics analysis; however, major changes or creating new alternatives should be avoided.
- A participant asked whether Central Valley Water Board members will be at the Draft EIR public meeting(s) scheduled for Spring 2010 (see Schedule and Milestones). Staff responded that they would need to

consult with Central Valley Water Board counsel to see if Board members could take part in the meetings.

2nd Draft ILRP Alternatives

Mr. Ceppos reviewed the [Workgroup Charter](#) document and explained that the Workgroup has fulfilled the general goal:

"...Provide input on matters related to the development of the long-term program for waste discharges from irrigated agricultural lands to waters of the State. Specifically, the Workgroup will advise and provide comment to Water Board staff (Staff) on the development of ILRP alternatives, ideas, and evaluation measures."

Mr. Ceppos stated that it is unlikely that the Workgroup would ever come to unanimous consensus (as required by the Workgroup Charter) on any one alternative; given the wide range of interests represented. Instead, he indicated that staff would be asking for Workgroup consensus on the Goals and Objectives and the "range" of the alternatives.

Mr. Laputz explained that the [2nd Draft ILRP Alternatives](#) were developed from the [1st Draft Alternatives](#). The 1st Draft Alternatives, developed by Workgroup members and staff, were discussed by the Workgroup at the May 19th Workgroup meeting. At the May 19th meeting, the Workgroup asked staff to develop a range of complete, stand-alone alternatives from the 1st Draft Alternatives. The 2nd Draft ILRP Alternatives were developed considering comments received and the Workgroup's direction to develop stand-alone alternatives.

ILRP Goals /Objectives

- Changes were made based on Workgroup comments (see the [Workgroup Comments Matrix](#)).
- Major changes included adding a 4th goal: "ensure that irrigated agricultural waste discharge to water designated as municipal supply is of sufficient quality to provide Central Valley communities a sustainable source of drinking water."
- A participant stated that "sustainable" should be defined.
- A participant asked whether the long-term ILRP will include an "economics test" that would be used to exempt operations that would not be viable if required to implement the ILRP (see goal number 3). Staff responded that the California Water Code has a reasonableness requirement for cost that the Central Valley Water Board is required to consider.
- Other major changes include modifying the 2nd objective to read: "Implement management practices that improve water quality in keeping with the first objective without jeopardizing the economic viability for all sizes of irrigated agricultural operations in the Central

Valley or placing an undue burden on rural communities to provide safe drinking water.”

ILRP Alternatives

Mr. Laputz explained that the major aspects of each alternative are summarized in Attachment A of the 2nd Draft Alternatives document. Major changes to the alternatives include the addition of a Basin Plan conditional prohibition of waste discharge from irrigated agricultural lands. This action would essentially prohibit waste discharge from irrigated agricultural lands unless the discharge is covered by a waiver of waste discharge requirements or waste discharge requirements. This conditional prohibition would help the Central Valley Water Board enforce participation in the ILRP and ultimately work to provide consistency among the regulated community (the Workgroup agreed to discuss the conditional prohibition following the presentation of the range of alternatives).

Alternative 1 – No Change

- This alternative would continue the current ILRP. It is the “no action” alternative.
- The alternative would not include any new requirements for protection of groundwater from agricultural waste discharges.

Alternative 2 – Third-party Lead Entity

- This alternative was created by combining the current ILRP, “low threat” alternative developed by El Dorado County, the Coalition Groups’ groundwater quality management plan (GQMP) alternative, and the Southern San Joaquin Water Quality Coalition’s local groundwater quality management plan alternative [see 1st Draft Alternatives document – SW/GW1, SW2, GW2].
- These alternatives were combined to create a “stand-alone” alternative that would be implemented by a “third-party” lead entity.
- The alternative would be similar to the current program for discharges to surface water, but would also allow for reduced water quality monitoring under “low threat” conditions. This alternative includes requirements for the protection of groundwater.
- This alternative does not contain a monitoring component for groundwater under the Coalition Groups’ GQMPs; however, a participant pointed out that under local groundwater quality management plans, groundwater quality monitoring would be required.
- A participant asked whether the focused management practice studies under GQMPs would be optional or mandatory. Staff responded that this is a detail that must be clarified before the EIR and economics analysis may be conducted on the alternative. As written, the studies would be optional.
- A participant was concerned that GQMPs would not be able to require more efficient irrigation practices due to the following requirement (see Attachment C of the 2nd Draft ILRP Alternatives): “The GQMP would

not include or address issues related to groundwater supply, including issues regarding the volume of groundwater pumped or used by growers within a groundwater management area.” Coalition group representatives responded that irrigation practices would be considered in the GQMP.

Alternative 3 – Individual Farm Water Quality Management Plan (FWQMP)

- Under this alternative growers would enroll directly with the Central Valley Water Board. Growers would be required to develop and implement an individual FWQMP. The FWQMP would be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board for review and approval.
- This alternative also has an option for the Central Valley Water Board to enter into a memorandum of understanding with an implementing entity.
- A participant asked whether enrollment under Alternatives 3-5 would involve grower submission of a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD), or a Notice of Intent (NOI). The participant remarked that the cost of putting together a ROWD is much higher than an NOI. Staff responded that the intent is that growers would be submitting NOIs, not ROWDs. ***The alternatives document will be modified to provide clarification.***
- A participant asked whether water quality monitoring would be conducted under this alternative. Staff responded that water quality monitoring is not the focus of this alternative. Instead, the alternative will rely on field experts (farm-level visual monitoring, inspections) to determine if there is a problem, and how best to address it. The participant suggested that the alternative be modified to require that the Central Valley Water Board consider water quality monitoring data from other programs in implementing this alternative. ***The alternative will be modified as suggested.***
- A participant remarked that this alternative does allow the Central Valley Water Board to require water quality monitoring in the FWQMP process (see page 16, line 26).
- A participant asked whether each alternative will undergo a detailed economic analysis. Russ Grimes, ICF Jones and Stokes, responded that each alternative will be evaluated equally for environmental and economic impacts. The participant remarked that details regarding whether or not water quality monitoring would be required would need to be known before economic impacts can be determined. Staff agreed.
- A participant asked if this alternative would be considered the “individual” option that could be utilized in conjunction with Alternative 2. Staff responded that this is entirely possible depending on the results of the EIR/economics evaluation.

Alternative 4 – Direct Oversight with Regional Monitoring

- This alternative was developed by merging an alternative based on the Central Coast Water Board ILRP program with the tiered groundwater alternatives [see 1st Draft Alternatives document – SW/GW4(a), GW3(a), GW3(b)]. The alternative provides a tiered, threat to water quality-based approach for establishing regulatory requirements.
- Under this alternative growers would enroll directly with the Central Valley Water Board. This alternative also allows a “legal entity” or Joint Powers Authority to represent a group of growers. Growers would be required to develop and implement an individual FWQMP and attend 15-hours water quality education. This alternative allows growers to select between individual or regional water quality monitoring.
- A participant stated that basing the groundwater tiering system on nitrate data collected within a square mile section may result in agricultural fields being considered high threat when nearby urban sources are the cause of high levels. Staff stated that the tiering system needs to be modified to account for other known sources. ***The alternative will be modified as suggested.***
- A participant asked whether the tier system assumes the same threat level for surface and groundwater. Staff responded that tiering would be separate for surface and groundwater. This makes the system more complicated, but provides flexibility. The reasoning behind this is that certain areas may have water that immediately percolates to groundwater. In these areas, the threat to surface water may be minimal, while the threat to groundwater may be high.
- A participant asked if surface water quality exceedances of water quality objectives within a subwatershed would automatically move growers into a higher threat level for all constituents, or would it be constituent specific. Staff responded that the exceedances would move growers within the subwatershed into the higher threat level, this would require more comprehensive monitoring. However, the alternative does not specify whether the more comprehensive monitoring would be for the constituent for which the exceedances occurred, or for all constituents. ***The alternative will be modified to clarify whether higher monitoring frequencies can be constituent specific.***
- A participant suggested that the alternative focus on nutrients, pesticides, and sediment; not dissolved oxygen and pH. Dissolved oxygen and pH problems could have a multitude of causes, while agriculture is a known contributing source of nutrients, pesticides, and sediment. Staff agreed that the tiering system should be focused on nutrients, pesticides, and sediment.
- A participant asked if growers could be added to the higher threat tier based on just pesticide use alone. For example, if the grower uses a pesticide that is identified as causing water quality exceedances in three or more subbasins; would the grower be in a higher threat tier regardless of management practices? Staff responded that, as written,

- A participant asked what would qualify as a “legal entity.” Staff responded that a Joint Powers Authority would qualify. The “legal entity” must have authority to require that members implement program requirements. One example would be the Grasslands Bypass Project, operated by the Bureau of Reclamation and the San Luis & Delta-Mendota Water Authority.
- A participant asked how the Central Valley Water Board will determine whether growers have fertilizer application rates that are not expected to result in nitrogen exceedances in a groundwater basin (see page 18, line 2 of the 2nd Draft Alternatives document). Staff responded that additional detail will be necessary for this requirement. In the previous version of this alternative, fertilizer application rates greater than 0.9 of the amount expected to be taken up by the crop would have been considered higher threat. Staff could not find a reference for the ratio of 0.9. **Staff are now searching for a scientific reference that would be appropriate for characterizing potential threat to water quality using rates of fertilizer application.**
- A participant suggested that a matrix could be developed to summarize and clarify the tiering system. **Staff agreed to develop a table or matrix summarizing the tiering system.**
- A participant asked whether a third-party group could implement this alternative. The participant was concerned that the alternative could be too costly if implemented at the grower level, and did not want the concepts of the alternative to be lost just because of the potentially high costs. Staff responded that, as written, a third-party group would not be able to be the lead entity. However, staff will have the flexibility to create an alternative based on the best attributes of the current range of alternatives; based on the results of the EIR, economics, and policy analysis. **Staff will follow-up with Jennifer Clary, Clean Water Action, to further discuss the difference between a third-party group and a “legal entity” lead entity.**
- A participant asked whether the regional monitoring program would require monitoring for pesticides in addition to DPR’s monitoring program. Staff responded that this alternative would require that the Central Valley Water Board coordinate with DPR. The focus of this alternative is really nitrates and salts. Where DPR is already conducting monitoring for pesticides, the Central Valley Water Board would coordinate with DPR to gather the information. Where no samples are collected, and there are potential problems (e.g., existing monitoring has shown that pesticides are reaching groundwater in the area), then the Central Valley Water Board would require sampling or work with DPR to coordinate sampling.

Alternative 5 – Direct Oversight with Farm Monitoring

- This alternative is based on the Central Valley Water Board's Dairy Program.
- Under this alternative growers would enroll directly with the Central Valley Water Board. Growers would be required to develop and implement an individual FWQMP and a nutrient management plan. This alternative would require growers to conduct individual water quality monitoring of tailwater, stormwater, tile drainage, and existing wells.
- A participant asked whether the Central Valley Water Board would consider groundwater monitoring technology other than monitoring wells (e.g., hydro-punch). Staff responded that other techniques would be acceptable as long as the goals of the monitoring are met. **Staff agreed to modify the alternative to provide flexibility for groundwater monitoring technology.**

Range of Alternatives

- A participant suggested that the financial burden on growers needs to be considered in the economic analysis. Staff responded that the economics analysis will include estimating the burden on growers.
- A participant asked staff to summarize the incentives for each alternative. Staff responded:
 - Alternative 2 – Reduced monitoring in areas implementing watershed or area management objectives plans.
 - Alternative 3 – Central Valley Water Board certification that individual growers are implementing practices that protect water quality.
 - Alternative 4 – Tiering system, with reduced monitoring and regulatory requirements for lower threat operations.
 - Alternative 5 – Not incentive-based.
- A participant asked whether a general order could be used to implement Alternatives 2, 3, and 4. Staff responded that a general order could be used to implement all or portions of any of the alternatives.
- A participant asked if the staff recommended program could be a blending of the alternatives. Staff responded that depending on the results of the EIR, economics, and policy analyses, the recommended staff alternative could be a blending of all or any number of the alternatives.
- A participant remarked that Alternatives 3, 4, and 5 are: bad, worse, and terrible, respectively. Why are so many alternatives necessary? Why not just 1, 2, and 5? Russ Grimes responded that there is no required number of alternatives for an EIR. The range includes the ideas developed by the Workgroup and staff.
- Participants asked whether the requirement for 100% enrollment is flexible enough given that some growers may want to enroll individually

and others may be covered by another program (e.g., Dairy Program). Staff responded that growers have the option to individually apply with the Central Valley Water Board for waste discharge requirements or a waiver, regardless of the alternative. **Staff will modify the alternatives document to clarify that the individual option exists for all alternatives.**

- Several participants indicated that they would like an opportunity to submit written comments on the 2nd Draft Alternatives. Participants agreed that staff do not need to formally respond to these comments. **The Workgroup agreed to provide any written comments on the 2nd Draft Alternatives by September 10.**
- A participant asked whether the economics analysis will be detailed enough to allow the blending of alternative components in any staff recommended alternative. The participant also asked whether the staff recommended alternative will be circulated for public review with the Draft EIR. Russ Grimes responded that the goal of the economics analysis will be to provide enough detail to blend components of different alternatives. Staff responded that the staff recommended alternative will be circulated with the Draft EIR in spring 2010.
- Participants discussed the appropriateness of the range of alternatives. One participant felt alternatives 1 and 5 should not be considered because the alternatives do not have incentives per federal nonpoint source program requirements.
- A participant stated that the Central Valley Water Board is required to conduct an adequate antidegradation analysis when evaluating the alternatives.

Workgroup Consensus Voting

Range of Alternatives

Mr. Ceppos asked seated Workgroup members, per the Workgroup Charter, to provide their vote regarding the following question: Does the current set of five alternatives provide a reasonable range of alternatives for the Central Valley Water Board to conduct an EIR per the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act?

- **All seated Workgroup members agreed that the range of alternatives was reasonable.**

Goals and Objectives

Mr. Ceppos asked seated Workgroup members, per the Workgroup Charter, to provide their vote regarding each of the Goals and Objectives.

Goal 1: “restore and/or maintain the highest reasonable quality of state waters considering all the demands being placed on the water,” **All seated Workgroup members agreed.**

Goal 2: “minimize waste discharge from irrigated agricultural lands that could degrade the quality of state waters,” **All seated Workgroup members agreed (some abstention).**

Goal 3: “maintain the economic viability of agriculture in California’s Central Valley,” **All seated Workgroup members agreed.**

Goal 4: “ensure that irrigated agricultural waste discharge to water designated as municipal supply is of sufficient quality to provide Central Valley communities a sustainable source of drinking water.” **Split decision, several Workgroup members did not agree.**

- Several participants were concerned that use of the term “water designated as municipal supply” would basically mean that all waste discharges from agriculture would be required to meet Basin Plan municipal water quality objectives due to the Sources of Drinking Water Policy. Staff suggested that “designated” be replaced with “used” –several members of the Workgroup did not agree with the proposed change.
- A participant suggested that the term “sustainable” be defined.
- **Staff will redraft Goal 4 and circulate it to the Workgroup.**

Objective 1: “Restore and/or maintain appropriate beneficial uses established in Central Valley Water Board Water Quality Control Plans by ensuring that all state waters meet applicable water quality objectives.” **Split decision, one Workgroup member did not agree.**

- A participant was concerned that this objective would require that Tulare Lake Basin saline waters be restored to Basin Plan water quality objective levels. The participant did not think that this would be feasible.
- **Staff will redraft Objective 1 and circulate it to the Workgroup.**

Objective 2: “Implement management practices that improve water quality in keeping with the first objective without jeopardizing the economic viability for all sizes of irrigated agricultural operations in the Central Valley or placing an undue burden on rural communities to provide safe drinking water.” **All seated Workgroup members agreed provided the following changes are made.**

- Provided that “burden on rural communities” covers a range of potential impacts to rural communities.
- New wording: “~~Implement~~ Encourage implementation of...”

Objective 3: “Provide incentives for agricultural operations to minimize waste discharge to state waters from their operations.” **All seated Workgroup members agreed.**

Objective 4: “Where third-party groups would be working with the Central Valley Water Board on behalf of irrigated lands owners (growers) for program compliance, minimum requirements need to be instituted that 1) ensure that the roles and responsibilities of growers and the entity(ies) comprising the third-party

group are clearly described, 2) ensure revenue and expenditures for the third-party group are transparent and have appropriate fiscal oversight mechanisms, and 3) ensure participants are made aware of Central Valley Water Board requirements and the third-party group's compliance with program requirements.

Split decision, many Workgroup members did not agree. Staff agreed to remove this objective, provided that the requirement is placed elsewhere.

- One participant asked what having “transparent” revenue and expenditures would mean for a third-party group. Staff responded that this would mean third-party groups would be required to provide members with information regarding expenditures of fees collected for implementing the requirements of the ILRP.
- Several participants voiced concern that the Central Valley Water Board does not have authority over the business operations of third-party groups.
- A participant stated that this requirement is not appropriate as a program objective and is not needed for the EIR. Another participant remarked that the concern is appropriate and could be dealt with in another way. **Staff agreed, and asked that Workgroup participants make suggestions of how to work this requirement into alternatives.**

Objective 5: “Coordinate with other Central Valley Water Board programs, such as the Grasslands Bypass Project waste discharge requirements for agricultural lands, the Westlands Water District’s effort to develop waste discharge requirements for agricultural lands, total maximum daily load development, CV-Salts, and waste discharge requirements for dairies.” **All seated Workgroup members agreed.**

Objective 6: “Promote coordination with other regulatory and non-regulatory programs associated with agricultural operations (e.g., the California Department of Pesticide Regulation [DPR], the California Department of Public Health [DPH] Drinking Water Program, the California Air Resources Board, the California Department of Food and Agriculture, Resource Conservation Districts, the University of California Extension, and the Natural Resource Conservation Service) to minimize duplicative regulatory oversight while ensuring program effectiveness.” **All seated Workgroup members agreed provided the following changes are made.**

- Participants suggested the following groups be added: National Organic Program, California Agricultural Commissioners, State Water Resources Control Board Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment program, United States Geological Survey, and local groundwater programs (SB 1938, AB 3030, Integrated Regional Water Management Plans).

Proposed Basin Plan Conditional Prohibition

The 2nd Draft Alternatives document includes a Basin Plan conditional prohibition of waste discharge from irrigated agricultural lands. This action would essentially

prohibit waste discharge from irrigated agricultural lands unless the discharge is covered by a waiver of waste discharge requirements or waste discharge requirements.

- Several participants remarked that the proposed conditional prohibition has not been discussed by the Workgroup at any of the previous meetings.
- One participant asked why the conditional prohibition is necessary. Staff responded that the prohibition would allow the Central Valley Water Board to take more immediate enforcement action where agricultural waste is being discharged without coverage under a waiver or waste discharge requirements.
- A participant stated that the Central Valley Water Board already has the authority to take enforcement action on dischargers that do not have regulatory coverage. Staff agreed. However, the enforcement route would be less direct. Essentially, the Central Valley Water Board would need to require the discharger to submit a Report of Waste Discharge prior to initiating any enforcement action. The proposed prohibition is intended to encourage program participation and provide consistency in the regulated community.
- A participant was concerned that the prohibition would be used to circumvent due process for enforcement.
- A participant stated that the proposed prohibition should be dropped. The prohibition is a major leap in policy that has not been discussed before.
- Staff agreed to go back and re-think the necessity of the proposed prohibition. The prohibition is not intended to be punitive, but to encourage fairness among the regulated community. Staff will consider removing the proposed prohibition.

Dave Ceppos thanked the Workgroup for their time, effort, and patience in the development of the long-term ILRP alternatives. Staff thanked the Workgroup on the behalf of the Central Valley Water Board and stated that the process has been very beneficial, providing the Board with a range of alternatives to evaluate in an EIR.

Meeting Adjourned

Attachment A: 20 August 2009 Long-term ILRP Meeting Attendees

Adam Laputz	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB)
Ben Letton	CVRWQCB
Bill Thomas	Southern San Joaquin Valley Water Quality Coalition
Bob Blakely	California Citrus Mutual
Bruce Houdesheldt	Sacramento Valley Water Quality Coalition/Northern California Water Association
Bud Hoekstra	Farmer
Camron King	California Association of Winegrape Growers
Carol Dobbas	Upper Feather River Watershed Group
Casey Creamer	California Cotton Growers Association
Chris Valadez	California Grape and Tree Fruit League
Claus Suverkropp	Larry Walker Associates/Sacramento Valley Coalition
Dan Hinrichs	El Dorado Subwatershed Group
Danny Merkley	California Farm Bureau Federation
Dave Ceppos	California State University Sacramento Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP)
David Sholes	CVRWQCB
Dennis Heiman	CVRWQCB
Henry Giacomini	Northeastern California Water Association
Jeff Pylman	Nevada County Agricultural Commissioner
Jennifer Clary	Clean Water Action
Jim Atherstone	South San Joaquin Irrigation District
Jodi Pontureri	State Water Resources Control Board
Joe Karkoski	CVRWQCB
Joe McGahan	Westside Water Quality Coalition, Summers Engineering
Joel Miller	Consultant, Fish and Wildlife Service
John Young	Sacramento Valley Agricultural Commissioners
Kandi Manhart	Colusa-Glenn Subwatershed Program
Kari Fisher	California Farm Bureau Federation
Kevin King	Oakdale Irrigation District
Larry Domenighini	Colusa-Glenn Subwatershed Program
Larry Lloyd	Sutter County Resource Conservation District
Laurel Firestone	Community Water Center
Lisa Ross	DPR
Lloyd Fryer	Southern San Joaquin Valley Water Quality Coalition
Mark Larsen	Kaweah Delta Water Conservation District
Martha Guzman	California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
Mike Niemi	Modesto Irrigation District

Mike Wackman	San Joaquin County and Delta Water Quality Coalition
Nasser Dean	Western Plant Health Association
Nick Konovaloff	Regional Council of Rural Counties
Orvil McKinnis	Westlands Water District
Parry Klassen	East San Joaquin Water Quality Coalition
Patricia Matteson	DPR
Richard Price	Sacramento Valley Agricultural Commissioners
Rick Landon	Sacramento Valley Agricultural Commissioners
Roberta Firoved	California Rice Commission
Rolf Frankenbach	California Department of Food and Agriculture
Ryan Bonea	Sutter County Resource Conservation District
Russ Grimes	ICF Jones & Stokes
Sam Magill	CCP
Stephen Fagundes	State Water Resources Control Board
Tess Dunham	Pyrethroid Working Group
Tim Johnson	California Rice Commission
Tom Aguilar	Placer-Nevada-South Sutter-North Sacramento Subwatershed Group
Tracy Curry	California Association of Resource Conservation Districts