



Blue Ribbon Committee for the Rehabilitation of Clear Lake

Technical Subcommittee Meeting #16

1:00 – 3:00 pm

June 23 , 2022

Meeting Summary

Attendees:

Attendees are listed In Attachment A.

Action Items:

1. In advance of the next Technical Subcommittee (Subcommittee) meeting, Sam Magill, Sacramento State Consensus and Collaboration Program, will follow up with participants unable to attend the June 21st meeting for updates on:
 - a. UC Davis bathymetric survey and ongoing contracts for in-lake research
 - b. The Big Valley Band of Pomo Indians Kelsey Creek Fish Ladder restoration, tule replanting, and Best Management Practices (BMP) review projects

Welcome and Introductions

Sam Magill, Sacramento State Consensus and Collaboration Program (CCP), opened 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. Mr. Magill reviewed the agenda and noted the California Natural Resources Agency (Resources) was able to include \$1.2 million in the Governor's May Revise Budget to fully fund the US Geological Survey (USGS) Upper Watershed Modeling and Mercury Modeling projects approved by the Committee in 2021.

Update on Previously Approved Projects

Mr. Magill requested updates on approved/funded projects for the Subcommittee's consideration.

Distributed Watershed Modeling and Basin-wide monitoring Project Update

Charlie Alpers, USGS, provided updates on upper watershed modeling/monitoring efforts. USGS has worked closely with the Big Valley Band of Pomo Indians, UC Davis and Lake County Water

Resources Department on site selection for in-stream monitoring sites. Mr. Alpers will provide a full presentation to the Technical Subcommittee and Committee on request.

Participants made the following comments:

- Angela DePalma-Dow, Lake County Water Resources Department, noted that additional information on publicly accessible sites and easements can be provide by the County. As final monitoring sites are selected, USGS should notify County staff before work begins.

Bathymetric Survey and Ongoing in-Lake Research

UC Davis representatives were unable to attend. Mr. Magill will follow up with UC Davis for updates at a future meeting (**see Action Item #1**).

Review of Existing BMP's

Representatives from the Big Valley Band of Pomo Indians were unable to attend. Mr. Magill will follow up with Sarah Ryan for an update on BMP review at a future meeting (**see Action Item #1**).

Public Assessment of Watershed Attitudes and Behaviors Project and Limnological Sampling Project

Ms. Depalma-Dow provided an update on Public Assessment of Watershed Attitudes and Behaviors Project and limnological sampling projects. The limnological sampling project has an executed contract and work will begin in July 2022. Ms. DePalma-Dow added that Lake County will request a long-term continuation of limnological sampling in the next funding request to the Committee. For the public assessment, she noted that Lake County Water Resources has the contract written up and is waiting for approval from the Resources grant administrator. She noted that she has requested that the project start in September due to her absence in the coming months. Once she returns, she plans to have the RFP written up , along with identifying a third party contractor to assist in conducting the assessment.

Lake County Storm Water Infrastructure and Program Improvement

Ms. DePalma-Dow provided an update on Lake County trash cleanup and stormwater planning implementation. She stated that the project was split into two parts and the first part of the project that was approved was the trash implementation. She noted that there are now sub-projects under item one for the trash clean-up and illicit discharge in which Daniella Cazares, Lake County Water Resources Department, is assigned to the project. Ms. Cazares has finished separating the budgets and has submitted the paperwork to Resources. Ms. DePalma-Dow noted that if management approves, the grant agreement should be finalized at the beginning of July.

Participants made the following comments:

- Robert Larsen, Resources , noted that the projects were split since illicit discharge work is considered planning while the other work is considered implementation. He thanked Ms. DePalma-Dow and Resrouces for identifying the distinction between the two.

Local Update: Dilapidated Structure Abatement

William Fox, Lake County Water Resources Department discussed the ongoing efforts to inventory dilapidated shoreline structures and failing seawall abatement. He mentioned that they are still in the contracting phase and noted that the CEQA process led to the delay in finalizing the contract. There has been a continuous internal discussion regarding the rationale of the CEQA exemption on whether it will meet the requirements. He noted that they received confirmation that they will be able to move forward but are still determining the CEQA process for the contracting agreement.

Participants made the following comments:

- Mr. Magill stated that the current work is being funded by the existing funding through the county and asked if there is additional abatement being conducted. Mr. Fox responded that currently there is only one and he is waiting to go through the Board of Supervisors to do the whole assessment and the lien process. He would like to have a revolving fund based on securing warrants to be on the properties, so essentially all funds can be allocated to research related tasks to continue the process. He noted they received \$70,000 and have only spent \$20,000. He hopes to finish utilizing the county funds to dilapidate a few more structures. He highlighted that they have huge support from the legal aspect and the Board of Supervisors. He highly suggested that all projects should consider going through the CEQA process prior to the project being approved due to the extensive time needed for the funding and contracting process.
- Temashio Anderson, Robinson Rancheria, noted that it is vital to have support from Tribal leadership. He also suggested that the funding be spent on the prevention and causes of the issues.
- Mr. Magill noted that there needs to be an increase in transparency regarding Tribal agreements and cultural resources. Additionally, he noted there be a follow-up regarding consistent involvement from the Tribes. He mentioned that there has been discussion about providing updates and information on the various projects to the community and organizations.
- Mr. Anderson asked what the budget was and how those funds are allocated. Mr. Magill said that he will send him the information on the budget.

Kelsey Creek Fish Ladder Restoration Project

Mr. Magill mentioned that no representatives for Big Valley were present to present an update. Mr. Magill gave a brief update and noted that they have been working on right of way access for restoration of the fish ladder (**see Action Item #1**).

Tule Replanting/ Invasive Species

Mr. Magill mentioned that no representatives for Big Valley were present to present an update. Mr. Magill gave a brief update and noted that they are in the final stage for executing the agreement for the replanting and invasive species project (**see Action Item #1**).

Mercury Modeling

Mr. Alpers provided an update on the mercury modeling funding. He thanked everyone involved in getting the funding into the Governor's revised budget. He mentioned that he and his team are excited and plans to coordinate a thorough update on the project in July.

Participants made the following comments:

- Mr. Alpers asked what the timeline is for the Governor pass the budget. Geneva Thompson, Resources, responded that the budget has not been passed and will be in touch once it has been passed and the funds are available.
- Mr. Alpers noted that the funding will go through UC Davis through an amendment to their existing agreement.
- He proposes that the project be extended to a 3-year project.

Proposals approved by the Committee in 2022

Mr. Magill gave a brief review of the proposals approved by the committee in 2022. He noted that eight out of the eleven proposals were unanimously approved by fourteen out of the fifteen members that were present at the May 25th meeting. Three of the proposals (Lake County AEM Survey, Scotts Valley Aquifer Evaluation, and Hypolimnetic Oxygenation Pilot Project) from the May 25th BRC were modified and those projects were unanimously approved by ten out of the ten members that were present at the June 22nd BRC meeting. He thanked the proposal presenters for doing their due diligence and addressing the questions asked by the BRC committee members. Mr. Magill noted that when projects are being approved by the committee, that the goal is to have it be done in an open public forum.

Participants made the following comments:

- Mr. Anderson asked if voting community members that are a part of the project can vote for a project they are associated with, Mr. Magill responded that he has asked for those members to abstain.

Setting Priorities for 2022

Mr. Magill reviewed the major concerns and priorities. He asked members to think about a potential prioritization mechanism for future proposals in the absence of full funding. He then invited members to express their priorities.

- Mr. Anderson noted that his priority is how each project is built in the community capacity, not only in the research realm, but also education and outreach. He would like

to see more inclusivity, including the involvement of Tribal scientists in project design. He mentioned that he is working on an institutional review board (IRB) with Robinson Rancheria. He noted that an IRB could benefit projects such as the hypolimnetic oxygenation proposal from UC Davis by providing local and Tribal representatives with opportunities to help design the project to consider impacts to human health and the community at large.

- Dr. Schladow agreed that they should hire local staff (Tribal scientists) for the hypolimnetic oxygenation project. Additionally, he suggested coordinating a meeting with local governing bodies to figure the resources and individuals needed to move forward.
- Mr. Magill noted the current projects that are focused on outreach and educating individuals within the community.
- Ms. Thompson hopes the programs/partnerships with state agencies will lead to a support network for the research being done in Lake County.
- Mr. Magill suggested that Ms. Thompson give a follow-up presentation from the Conservation Corp. regarding the information sharing and understanding what the needs are for the partnerships.
- Mr. Anderson stressed the importance of increasing the outreach within the community. There are misconceptions/ concerns about research and restoration activities without more to impacted communities.
- Jim Steele, Subcommittee member, suggested creating an umbrella plan as a priority would be useful since the effort will drive future decisions. The studies conducted by the program needs a useful goal for Lake County's Clear Lake and Basin. He noted that the perceived problems are caused by nutrients and pollutants. At a minimum, a nutrient pathways study is needed. He gave an example of taking high-profile components from an overall strategy: e.g., develop a strategy for managing nutrients and key mitigating features such as nutrient types, resident time, lockup processes, lake nutrient isotope tracking, nutrient deposit hotspots, legacy loading, storm inputs; and tules, wetlands, watershed stability in a lake and watershed management plan.
- Mr. Anderson sent a link of an example that University of Fairbanks in Alaska is doing with research and indigenous peoples. He noted that it is also being done with tribes in New Mexico. <https://www.uaf.edu/irb/indigenous/>
- Dr. Schladow mentioned that there is a good understanding of where nutrients are coming from in the watershed. He noted that the tests are included in USGS's 3-year work plan for monitoring in the watershed. In response to Mr. Magill's question about Models, he noted that models are a mathematical representation of what is known. The USGS data on nutrients from various parts of the watershed and the results from their models will be included in their models. That information will be reflected moving forward.
- Mr. Alpers noted that they will be performing an analysis of the representative biota from the lake. They are hoping to address the various monitoring and modeling efforts that are currently happening. He noted additional studies could be useful.

- Mr. Alpers mentioned that it would be beneficial give a more detailed description of what has been done and the ongoing work which he hopes will satisfy a lot of the concerns about the project. Additionally, Mr. Magill encouraged individuals who seek more information on the hypolimnetic oxygenation project to reach out to him and presentations can be put together to address any further questions.
- Dr. Schladow agrees that there is a need for a management plan and noted that there were a lot of knowledge gaps that needed to be addressed. Now that there is more information and data, it is an opportunity to create a plan.
- Mr. Fox suggested a proposal for Code Enforcement improvements for environmental violations. He noted the crucial need for additional staffing and tools for existing code enforcement relations. Mr. Steele responded that direct funding would not be appropriate, but the tools necessary to discover what is going on such as satellite work for determining heavy disturbances in the watershed and sediment coming in from key areas would substantiate a request for funding.
 - Ms. DePalma-Dow followed up on Mr. Fox's proposal and noted that having the tools and the ability to remove trash that could essentially encourage individuals to be accountable could be included in the request for funding.
- Mr. Magill asked members if they feel it is necessary to have a prioritization ranking method for proposals. Both Dr. Schladow and Ms. DePalma-Dow agreed that a ranking system should be used. Additionally, Ms. DePalma-Dow expressed that the prioritization would be helpful for agencies that have to plan budgets in advance. Dr. Schladow also suggested it be based on proposals that ask over a certain amount of funding. Mr. Steele noted that he supports the concept of prioritization, but in relation to the overall goal of finding a plan.
- Ms. Thompson supports the idea of a town hall meeting that highlights the work that is being done in the community.

Proposals for Future Consideration

Ms. DePalma-Dow proposed three proposals for future consideration. The proposals included a Clear Lake management plan, a stewardship program, and the continuation of the Clear Lake limnological ambient program .

Clear Lake Management Plan

The Clear Lake management plan will supplement an update to the Clear Lake Integrated Watershed Management Plan, State of the Lake Reports, TMDL attainment plans, Source Water Protection Plans, and Clear Lake Basin Watershed Assessment. The estimated budget range is: \$150,000- \$300,000.

Enhancing Implementation of a Natural Shoreline Stewards Program in Clear Lake, CA

The proposed project is the enhancing implementation of a natural shoreline stewards program in Clear Lake, CA. This project will follow through on the already provided \$60,000+ effort by WRD and AmeriCorps to plan, develop, and implement a natural shoreline stewards program. The estimated budget range is: \$450,00-\$600,00 for three years.

Continuation of the Clear Lake Limnological Ambient Monitoring and Sediment Monitoring Program

The proposed project is the continuation of the Clear Lake limnological ambient monitoring and sediment monitoring program. This project will continue a monthly ambient monitoring of Clear Lake in all three arms. The estimated budget range is: \$450,000 with an anticipated WRD contribution of \$120,000 over the span of the project.

The following discussion was recorded:

- Regarding the stewards program, Ms. Thompson asked if this will be an opportunity to incorporate a job training program or a restoration crew that will help landowners in the restoration of their land. Ms. DePalma-Dow responded that there are two aspects; a shoreline ambassador that will take the lead and get/share the information with the community and the other aspect will be the local certified contractors that help train and build knowledge to complete the work. She noted that this could add to the budget if implemented.
- Ms. DePalma-Dow noted that she sent out a notice to her department at WRD to elicit any priority projects that could be presented to the BRC.
- Dr. Schladow suggests that oppose to replicating the 16-year-old data plan, there should be an extension of the plan. He expressed that he would like to help in developing a long-term data repository for the county.

Public Comment

- Ms. DePalma-Dow shared information on Lake County Water Resources Department Water Quality Wednesdays that will be held on July 6th, 2022, at 6 pm. The webinar can be accessed via Zoom Webinar, the Facebook of the County of Lake, and Peg TV. The presentations will be on Shoreline science and management.

Adjourn

ATTACHMENT A: Roster of Participants

Meeting Participants & Staff		
First	Last	Organization
Charlie	Alpers	United States Geological Survey
Temashio	Anderson	Robinson Rancheria
Michaela	Bush	
Alicia	Cortes	UC Davis, Tahoe Environmental Research Center
Angela	DePalma-Dow	Lake County Water Resources Department
Joe	Domagalski	
Alex	Forrest	UC Davis, Tahoe Environmental Research Center
Karola	Kennedy	Koi Nation of Northern California
Robert	Larsen	
Sarah	Ryan	Big Valley Band of Pomo Indians
Geoff	Schladow	UC Davis, Tahoe Environmental Research Center
Jim	Steele	Lake County resident
Broc	Zoller	Lake County Farm Bureau
Terre	Logsdon	Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians
William	Fox	Lake County
Sam	Magill	California State University, Sacramento
Jessica	Walker	California State University, Sacramento