



Blue Ribbon Committee for the Rehabilitation of Clear Lake

Technical Subcommittee

1:00 – 3:00 pm

April 22, 2021

Meeting Summary #16

Attendees:

Attendees are listed in Attachment A.

Action Items:

1. Subcommittee members will send any edits for the March 25 summary to CCP by close of business April 23.
2. Ms. DePalma-Dow will provide a deadline for the shoreline survey to the Subcommittee.
3. Mr. Alpers will send stratification data to Mr. Magill for distribution to the Subcommittee if stratification is detected.
4. CCP will circulate the vision document for the Clear Lake Water Lab Proposal.
5. All Subcommittee members will look at the vision document for the Clear Lake Water Lab proposal within two weeks, identify data gaps, and determine if this is something that the Subcommittee should endorse or recommend to the Blue Ribbon Committee.
6. All Subcommittee members to view the priority projects list created in the April 1 Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting and rank their own priorities by the May 27th meeting.
7. Ms. DePalma-Dow will provide a list of projects that align with themes on the priority list.
8. Ms. DePalma-Dow will invite new Middle Creek Program Coordinator to the Technical Subcommittee meetings moving forward.

Welcome and Introductions

Sam Magill (Facilitator), Sacramento State Consensus and Collaboration Program (CCP), convened by webinar the sixteenth meeting of the Technical Subcommittee (Subcommittee) of the Blue Ribbon Committee for the Rehabilitation of Clear Lake (Committee). A full list of participants is included in Attachment A. Eric Sklar, Committee Chair provided welcoming remarks thanking the Subcommittee members for their work thus far and outlining the path forward for the Committee overall. The Facilitator asked Mr. Sklar to provide an update on when more information could be availability regarding State funding. Mr. Sklar replied that new

information will be available when the Governor releases the May budget revise. The final budget should be established in the next couple of months following that.

The Facilitator reviewed the meeting agenda and invited subcommittee members to add issues to the agenda, which would be provided during the Housekeeping Items and Local Updates agenda item, using the chat feature. He then convened a round of introductions.

Confirm Meeting Summary from January 29 Technical Subcommittee Meeting

The Facilitator asked the Subcommittee if they had any proposed edits to the March 25 Subcommittee summary. The Subcommittee did not indicate any edits. He asked the Subcommittee to send any final edits to the CCP team by 5pm on April 23 (**Action Item #1**), after which CCP will finalize and post the summary.

Local Updates

Sarah Ryan, Big Valley Band of Pomo Indians, announced that Big Valley is conducting cyanobacteria monitoring next week. She is expecting to see toxins in the sampling event based on a visual bloom. This is part of the monthly monitoring, which will shift to every other week starting in May.

Geoff Schladow shared that one of his UC Davis classes has a capstone project program that allows students to design conceptual projects, and about half of the class is interested in creating their design project on Clear Lake. The Facilitator invited those students to present their ideas to the Subcommittee once complete.

Ms. De-Palma-Dow announced that the County is conducting a public survey about shoreline features with support from the Civic Spark fellows. This survey will allow the County to get the public's perception on dilapidated structures along the Lake. She asked Subcommittee members to complete the survey and share it as appropriate. There is not currently a deadline, but the fellows leave the County in August and will need time to process the data. She will check with the fellows about the deadline and let the Subcommittee know (**Action Item #2**).

The survey may be found at this link:

docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSfodem_tNnoHFwkDpMxlZv5N7EAcQXDFHmUat6eTr6eZ9f1w/viewform?fbclid=IwAR2oSnw89aZ-y6sPepNWh0hRM3ofxI5cIIYxm45cEVk5bwebnia-cA0sHKU

Charlie Alpers, US Geological Survey, informed the Subcommittee that USGS is collecting water samples in the Oaks Arm today. He asked if anyone was aware of stratification in the Lake at this point. Ms. DePalma-Dow said that she would share the data collected by the County with Mr. Alpers, but did not have the results quickly accessible. Ms. Cortes said she would send the UC Davis data to Mr. Alpers as well but did not currently see stratification. Mr. Alpers said he would share the results of the data being collected today with the Facilitator to distribute to the Subcommittee (**Action Item #3**).

Presentation: Clear Lake Water Lab Proposal (Jim Steele)

Jim Steele, Lake County Resident, provided a presentation on the Clear Lake Water Lab Proposal, a project that would development of a water quality laboratory in Lake County that would serve the water quality analysis needs within the County. The building where this laboratory would be built, would also serve as an education center where universities could send students for hands-on experience conducting water quality analysis. He reviewed the features of the site that is currently being considered for the lab, the Lucerne “Castle” which was developed in the 1930’s as a hotel, but fell into disrepair. It has since been designated for use as a college/community conference center. The lab would support three primary areas: a water quality lab to meet local needs, a research center to meet the needs of universities and colleges across the state, and a dock space to access the lake for sampling and research purposes. Mr. Steele has sent an introductory letter to multiple campuses informing them of the potential opportunity to use this research facility, and has an ongoing conversation with University of San Francisco, who is very interested in such an opportunity. He outlined why a private entity is better equipped to lead the development of this project due to the County’s many competing priorities. The first phase of this project would be a freshwater laboratory, which will support a unified plan of the overall project. Local, research, and teaching needs would support the operational costs. The overall vision would focus all efforts to rejuvenate the region. He estimated the cost of the first year of operations to be \$1.1 million, but the exact business plan still needs to be developed.

The Facilitator reminded the Subcommittee of previous discussions around the availability of water quality labs and whether there is a local need great enough to support such a lab. He then opened the floor for Subcommittee member comments and questions for Mr. Steele. The following questions and comments were posed.

- Ms. Ryan inquired about the ownership structure of the laboratory. She specified that it is an important consideration if Committee funding is being discussed. to understand because there are already other water quality labs in the County with various types of owners.
 - Mr. Steele replied that the facility could be funded by shared interests including agreements signed by interested parties in a shared capacity, including universities. The current private owner, Earth Ways is a nonprofit/private non-benefit and is interested in shared public ownership.
- The Facilitator asked about New Paradigm’s current role in the project.
 - Mr. Steele clarified that New Paradigm was the organization trying to put together a new college. They are still interested in the project as are other private universities. All tenants would share responsibilities.
 - Bill Stanger, a member of the group working on the new college project, clarified that the New Paradigm non-profit exists in Santa Cruz and is occupied with other projects. Some of the members of that organization who are interested in this project have continued interest in this project and the name of the new college has been changed to California College of Regenerative Design. There is a lot of

interest to make this a fully functional college wherein the lab would be a key service and education.

- Alex Forest, UC Davis TERC, shared that in TERC's experience, it is difficult to remain competitive with smaller water lab companies who can undercut the public entities who need to observe stricter labor conditions. He asked how the new entity would plan around that.
 - Mr. Steele replied that they have been in discussion with a Canadian firm that refurbishes state-of-the-art equipment and sells it for significantly less cost. There also is significant local support for maintaining the equipment. Because of the nonprofit nature, it should be able to remain competitive.
 - Mr. Forest followed up stating that the staff to maintain such equipment makes keeping costs competitive difficult.
 - Mr. Steele specified that a benefit of private ownership is that remaining competitive is made easier.
- Mr. Forest asked if individuals could come in to use the equipment themselves or if they would need to hand samples off to facility staff for processing.
 - Mr. Steele replied that it could work both ways. There would be a shared agreement of use that all interested parties would abide by. People could use the equipment themselves or hire the staff to do the lab work. There could be various equipment assigned to students versus staff.
- Ms. DePalma-Dow asked Mr. Steele to clarify what he is asking of the Technical Subcommittee and whether there is a funding tie in. Given the goal of boosting local capacity for water science and creation of jobs, it may be appropriate to also present to the Socioeconomic Subcommittee. Establishing whether the location could attract the individuals for the jobs that are being created is an important consideration.
 - Mr. Sklar clarified that the Subcommittee should be determining whether this project is something that should be passed along to the full Committee. Also, the Subcommittee should be determining if the project idea warrants the development of a full business plan. The volume and capacity needed to remain running would require local interest as well as statewide interest which would require marketing. Regarding the jobs, the goal would be to train local individuals through the college, creating jobs for locals rather than attracting lab staff from other areas.
 - Mr. Steele added that training local workers is a priority. Educating and training on a statewide basis is also important. He also stated that he brought this to the Subcommittee because it is a good starting point for people with the technical background to tease out the ideas before it goes to the full Committee. He is aiming to build consensus on next steps to move this project forward.

The Facilitator asked the Subcommittee what everyone thought about the proposal and if it was something they thought there was an immediate need for and if it is something that should be passed along to the full Committee. Mr. Steele brought forth the issue of a rural counties taking development on for themselves rather than having the state be the primary driver. The

floor was once again opened for input from Subcommittee members. The following input was heard at that point:

- Ms. Ryan expressed overall interest in the project and agreed that amount of sampling demand paired with the research component makes the project an interesting prospect. She asked for further clarification regarding the ownership structure especially in terms of the Committee potentially funding part of the development. She pointed out the distinction between a business opportunity versus a nonprofit venture. If there was a buy-in, that could in an interesting arrangement; UC Davis TERC is doing something similar.
 - Mr. Steele stated that the facility would be an opportunity for various interested entities to conduct activities. He said that at one point, he approached TERC about moving operations to this facility and the vision has developed further since then. He said that the ideal next step is to develop a full business plan for further consideration.
- The Facilitator asked Mr. Steele what he would like to see as next steps. Mr. Steele expressed interest in receiving an endorsement for the ideas presented from the Technical Subcommittee so that the full Committee can consider the proposal (in it's preliminary form).
- Mr. Schladow expressed agreement that a business plan is a necessary next step before a recommendation can be considered. He also brought up the topic of resilience and how things such as remote location and wildfires may affect the viability of operations in the region.
 - Mr. Steele responded that a recommendation could be made prior to a business plan with the caveat that a business plan is needed. From the standpoint of fire, the facility itself is fireproof. Lake County also has promising fire reliance activity and fire risk reduction could be one of the things that is taught at the college itself.
- The Facilitator asked the Subcommittee once again if this is an idea that should be moved forward with to fill the data gaps and pursue Committee support.
 - Ms. DePalma-Dow voiced concern that the Committee has a lot of restoration, management, and mitigation projects that need to be prioritized and that a project like this may be a distraction. While the project seems like a great concept and she would like more details, but that the focus should be high-impact projects on the Lake. Further, she seeks more clarity on what exactly is being sought from the Committee, perhaps if it was a letter of support for investors, it could be done without taking too much time from the Committees other activities.
 - Ms. Ryan agreed with Ms. DePalma-Dow's sentiment. She expressed a desire to see it fleshed out, but thinks it is a good idea. She thinks entities investing in local activity is a good opportunity.
 - Mr. Alpers brought up the issue of data continuity in the types of analyses that are currently done by other labs. Conducting the exact same sort of collection

and analysis would be imperative for entities to make the switch from a different lab.

- Mr. Steele confirmed that this continuity would be part of the plan. There are ways to bridge differences and make sure that the new work is consistent with the historical work.
- Mr. Sklar highlighted the fact that the Committee does not fund things, it makes recommendations to the elected officials to fund things. He made clear that the only thing the Committee would do is seek more information from the business plan and then make the decision whether to endorse it to Assemblywoman Aguiar-Curry.
- The Facilitator confirmed that this is consistent with how recommendations have come about on past efforts.

The Facilitator asked that all members review the vision document for the project, identify data gaps, send them to CCP for forwarding to Mr. Steele, and determine if this is something that the Subcommittee should endorse or recommend to the Blue Ribbon Committee. This review should take place prior to the May Subcommittee meeting (Action Item #5). CCP will circulate the document to ensure everyone has access to it (Action Item #4).

Presentation: Committee Priorities and Suggested Recommendations

The Facilitator brought up the list of priority projects that were brainstormed in the April 1 Blue Ribbon Committee meeting. He highlighted that many of the topics that arose during this session are things that have previously been discussed in the Subcommittee. He asked Subcommittee members to review the list and provide input on where they think the priority should be in the coming months. The following input was heard at that time.

- Ms. Ryan discussed the need for more public education on all of the issues related to water management and how the community's actions are impacting erosion and sediment issues. There are some avenues where information around the cyanobacteria monitoring is shared, and it has yielded engagement in citizen science. She asserted that education and outreach should be a high priority for the Committee.
 - The Facilitator mentioned that public workshops have been discussed several times but the pandemic had affected the timeline of such activities. It may be possible to implement such workshops, at least in a virtual capacity almost immediately.
- Ms. Ryan mentioned that she is working with a consultant to develop a curriculum around HABS, fish kills, and overall water quality. Pending additional funding, there will be self-paced online classes that the community can take. She would be interested in coordinating with others who are doing that type of work.
- Ms. DePalma-Dow requested this list of projects be circulated. She then discussed the overlap that this list has with ongoing County efforts, such as a trash clean up management plan, wildfire projects, oxygenation pilot project, and proposals for invasive species removal (grants have not been accepted previously). Ms. DePalma-Dow

would like to leverage the information that the County already has with the priorities of the Committee. She also concurred with Ms. Ryan's comments that outreach and education be considered a high priority with an emphasis understanding what the public does and does not already know. Ms. DePalma-Dow will provide a list of projects that align with themes on the priority list (**Action Item #7**). Ms. DePalma-Dow will also invite new Middle Creek Program Coordinator to the Technical Subcommittee meetings moving forward (**Action Item #8**).

- Mr. Steele asked about invasive species such as Quagga mussels and whether this has been included in the invasive species monitoring.
 - Ms. DePalma-Dow confirmed that yes there is a lot of funding around Quagga mussel prevention.
 - Mr. Steele said that there should be an opportunity to review efforts to ensure that the correct actions have been taken on this subject.
- Mr. Schladow recommended that reviewing, ranking, adding to this list should be the top priority of the Subcommittee. He suggested that the next Subcommittee meeting be dedicated to a refinement of this list to guide the Committee.
- The Facilitator agreed that review and refinement of this list be the primary subject of the next meeting. He asked that between now and the next meeting, all Subcommittee members view the priority projects list, which will be recirculated in its current iteration (**Action Item #9**).
- Ms. DePalma-Dow clarified that the ranked projects would go towards the 2022 recommendation for requested funding or Committee support.
 - The Facilitator confirmed that this would be the intent of the ranking.
- Mr. Schladow asked for an operational definition of short-term vs long-term.
 - The Facilitator stated that it is not precise, but that 1-5 years could be considered short-term, and longer than that could be considered long-term.
- Mr. Alpers clarified that the monitoring and modeling work was originally scoped for 6 years, while only the first 3 years are currently being funded through the approved recommendations. This means that the additional 3 years should still be considered for future funding.

Adjourn

The Facilitator restated the goal to have all Subcommittee members view the priority projects list created in the April 1 Blue Ribbon Committee Meeting and rank their own priorities by the May 27th meeting. Ms. Ryan provided closing comments thanking presenters and Subcommittee members for their participation. She also expressed excitement for the Subcommittee's refinement of the priority projects list. The Facilitator thanked the Subcommittee and adjourned the meeting.

ATTACHMENT A: Roster of Participants

Subcommittee Members & Staff		
First	Last	Organization
Charlie	Alpers	United States Geological Survey (USGS)
Alicia	Cortes Cortes	UC Davis, Tahoe Environmental Research Center
Angela	DePalma-Dow	Lake County Water Resources Department
Alex	Forrest	UC Davis, Tahoe Environmental Research Center
Sarah	Ryan	Big Valley Band of Pomo Indians
Geoff	Schladow	UC Davis, Tahoe Environmental Research Center
Jim	Steele	Lake County resident
Sam	Magill	California State University, Sacramento
Danaka	DeBow	California State University, Sacramento

Guests & Members of the Public		
First	Last	Organization
Dina	Saleh	USGS
Eric	Sklar	Blue Ribbon Committee Chair
Joe	Domagalski	USGS
Bill	Stanger	Working on New College of Lucerne