Blue Ribbon Committee for the Rehabilitation of Clear Lake (Committee)

Meeting #7
9:00 am-5:00 pm
September 26, 2019

Meeting Summary[1]

Attendees:

See Appendix A

Action Items:

1. CCP will circulate the Final Committee Charter and post it to the Committee website
2. CCP will send Outlook Calendar invitations to the Committee members for all of these meetings
3. Before the March 2020 meeting, CCP will follow up with the Committee about the need for a meeting in Sacramento or Davis
4. CCP will develop separate proposals describing a Socioeconomic Subcommittee and a Cultural Resources Subcommittee and will send these to a small group of Committee members for review
5. CCP will reinstate the language about the TMDL in the Report
6. Sarah Ryan will provide more detailed language about cyanotoxins to CCP to include in the Report
7. CRC will work with the CCP to include regular updates for the Committee and provide opportunities for input into CRC's June 2020 report
8. Jan Coppinger will reach out to Sara Waterson at CRC for data to inform a grant to complete a sewer line around the south end of Clear Lake
9. CRC will provide a preliminary version of their economic analysis to CCP for distribution to the Committee
10. Ms. DePalma-Dow will see if the County has watershed Global Information System (GIS) layers of soil type and ground slope information
11. CCP will follow up with Jennifer LaBay and Jan Coppinger about their organizations' input on the bathymetric survey Recommendation
12. Tom Gibson will circulate the AB 1755 Legislative Progress report to the Committee
13. Ms. Logsdon said she will need to speak with the Scotts Valley Tribal Council about their support of a letter to the U.S. House of Representatives endorsing the Middle Creek Restoration Project
14. CCP will send an updated version of the Report out for the Committee's review in two weeks

[1] Except as specifically noted, all comments reflected in the summary were derived from Committee Member statements. Where applicable, specific responses are provided to individual comments/questions.

Welcome and Introductions

Thomas Gibson, Deputy Secretary and Special Counsel for Water, California Natural Resources Agency (Resources), opened the meeting. He introduced himself as the new designee to chair the Committee, after Caroline Godkin's appointment to California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA). Mr. Gibson previously held positions at Resources as the Undersecretary and General Counsel, and also served as staff at the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and as City Attorney for the City of Clear Lake. He thanked the Habematolel of Upper Lake for hosting the meeting.

Sam Magill (Facilitator), Senior Facilitator, Sacramento State Consensus and Collaboration Program (CCP) reviewed the purpose of the meeting: to review the Recommendations to be included in the Committee's first Annual Recommendations Report (Report) to the Legislature and the Governor's Office.

Informational presentations were dispersed throughout the meeting, but this document summarizes the presentations and refinement of the Recommendations categorically and not necessarily chronologically.

Items for Committee Approval

August 15, 2019 Meeting Summary

The Committee approved the previous meeting's Summary. Jennifer LaBay, Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB), requested circulation of the final version of the Charter to the Committee and posted to the Committee website (see Action Item #1).

2020 Schedule

The Facilitator proposed the following dates for 2020 Quarterly Blue Ribbon Committee meetings:

- March 11
- June 24
- September 23
- December 9

Committee members approved the dates for the 2020 quarterly meetings. The CCP Facilitation team will send Outlook Calendar Invitations to the Committee members for all of these meetings (see Action Item #2). The Committee discussed holding a 2020 meeting in Sacramento or at UC Davis, to meet with legislators or University researchers, if warranted by the legislature's reception of the Report or the nature of the Recommendations. CCP will follow up with the Committee about this possibility before the March 2020 meeting (see Action Item #3).

Socioeconomic and Cultural/Natural Resources Subcommittee Proposal

The Facilitator reviewed the Socioeconomic and Cultural/Natural Resources Subcommittee. He invited Jonathan London, Center for Regional Change (CRC), UC Davis, to comment on the relationship between cultural and socioeconomic resources: Dr. London said CRC considers the Lake and the humans around it as one system. CRC anticipates that a Socioeconomic Subcommittee would help guide the work that CRC is doing, and that CRC will be able to inform the Subcommittee's deliberations and recommendations.

The following comments were recorded:

- There should be two new subcommittees, one addressing socioeconomics and one cultural resources
- There should be a shared review of recommendations between all subcommittees during an open comment period, but no subcommittee may overrule another's recommendations
- The subcommittees' comments on all recommendations should come before the full Committee
- The subcommittees should be action-oriented
- The Cultural Resources Subcommittee should have an emphasis on Tribal concerns, but also consider all cultures that rely on the Lake
- Mention of "natural resources" should be removed from the charge and description of all three subcommittees. It is relevant to all three, but narrowly defining natural resources could be counterproductive to the purposes of the Committee in the future
- The Cultural Resources Subcommittee should promote the application of Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK)
- The addition of two new subcommittees could increase Committee members' workload substantially; it might be necessary for every Committee member to sit on a subcommittee

CCP will develop separate proposals describing a Socioeconomic Subcommittee and a Cultural Resources Subcommittee that reflect the above comments (see Action Item #4). These proposals will be circulated to a small group of Committee members for further refinement, and discussed/approved in front of the full Committee at the December 11 meeting.

Review 2019 Annual Report and Recommendations

Draft Report Outline

The Facilitator reviewed the 2019 Draft Recommendations Report and the timeline for Report approval by the Committee. CCP will continue refining the Report, and asking for feedback from the Committee, with the hope of coming to approval on a final version at the December 11th meeting. An interim meeting may be necessary in October or November. Mr. Gibson indicated that the Report might merit a signed cover letter by the Committee.

The following comments were recorded:

- It is reasonable for the Committee to request feedback on the Report from the Legislature and/or Resources since it is a platform for subsequent funding requests
- Language about the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) was accidentally removed from the most current version of the Report and will be replaced in the next draft (see Action Item #5)
- Ms. Ryan will provide more detailed language about cyanotoxins to CCP to include in the Report (see Action Item #6)

Recommendation Overview and Committee Survey Results

Sophie Carrillo-Mandel, Associate Facilitator, CCP, presented the results of a survey sent to the Committee members to receive their input on barriers to water quality in Clear Lake, their level of support and prioritization for each of the nine current Recommendations, cost estimates for each Recommendation, information needs to refine their understanding, and suggestions for other entities that may benefit from the recommended actions. The survey results that she presented can be found in the CSUS Presentation.

The current Recommendations include:

- Conduct a Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) survey of the entire Clear Lake watershed
- Conduct a bathymetric survey of Clear Lake
- Analyze satellite imagery of nutrients and algal blooms throughout the watershed
- Maintain and improve consistent monitoring of the upper watershed and urban sources
- Develop a model of the upper watershed
- Analyze existing Clear Lake data and compile it in an accessible unified database, with database management staff
- Assess the public's perceptions, attitudes, and knowledge gaps towards water quality in order to improve education and ultimately human impacts on Clear Lake
- Review the implementation and efficacy of existing tribal, local, state, and federal programs, Best Management Practices (BMPs), and other management requirements in the Clear Lake Basin
- Expedite the Middle Creek Restoration Project

Informational Presentations

CRC Presentation

Dr. London presented on the overall purpose, goals, activities, and timelines of the three branches of the CRC team: socioeconomic analysis lead by Noli Brazil, community economic development lead by Keith Taylor, and Tribal engagement lead by Clare Cannon and Anne Visser. He acknowledged that the primary direction of Assembly Bill (AB) 707 is about the physical restoration of Clear Lake, but also encompasses TEK and socioeconomic rehabilitation. CRC's work seeks to develop recommendations specific to socioeconomic rehabilitation.

Dr. London will go on sabbatical the week of September 30th; Dr. Clare Cannon will take over as the lead principal investigator for this project. CRC will develop a revised socioeconomic analysis report by the end of the year, and a final report by June. Keith Taylor will host multi-stakeholder workshops in December discussing increased access to broadband internet. The workshops will be publicly noticed. CRC developed a website as an archive of all relevant plans and analyses from Tribes and local governments related to the rehabilitation of Clear Lake.

The following comments were recorded:

- CRC will work with CCP to include regular updates and opportunities for Committee input in CRC's June 2020 report (see Action Item #7)
- Jan Coppinger, Lake County Special Districts, will reach out to Sara Waterson at CRC regarding potential grants to complete the Circle Pipeline (see Action Item #8)
- CRC will provide a preliminary version of their economic analysis to CCP for distribution to the Committee (see Action Item #9)

Barriers to Water Quality

Information for the Barriers to Water Quality section of the Report has been provided by findings from the UC Davis Tahoe Environmental Research Center (TERC) and from Committee members' responses to the CCP survey. The Facilitator advised the Committee not to dismiss or deprioritize Recommendations simply because of cost.

Previously identified barriers to water quality include:

- Institutional barriers:
    - Data deficiency: lack of quantitative data across the watershed
    - Resource limitations: limited funding for specific restoration projects
    - Institutional: lack of support to resolve the data deficiency and to implement the needed remediation projects
- Physical barriers:
    - Increasing lake temperatures
    - Low dissolved oxygen, especially episodic deep-water events
    - Nutrient inputs
    - Increasing frequency of cyanobacteria blooms
    - High mercury levels
    - Macrophyte dominance vs turbid phytoplankton dominance

The following comments were recorded:

- Data is deficient in significant part because of the lack of political priority for environmental restoration and resources to enforce mandated monitoring
    - The TMDL update identified that many responsible parties didn't have enough data to show they have met their allocation reductions

    - BMPs related to the TMDL, the grading ordinance, and environmental health requirements have not been monitored because of this lack of political will and resources
- It is not just a lack of data that is a barrier to water quality improvements, but a lack of the right kind of monitoring and coordinated monitoring
- Loss of tule marshland, which would reduce sediment input, is another barrier to water quality
    - Something like tule replanting grant programs could be paid for with the $5 million AB 707 funds
    - A grant program would further community investment in the rehabilitation of the Lake
- Changes in land use are barriers to water quality (i.e., grading for development, agricultural conversion, etc.)
- Lake temperature is a factor in poor water quality but not a barrier that can be removed. That should be characterized clearly in the Report
- The difference between cyanobacteria and cyanotoxins needs to be clarified. Toxin levels impede use of the Lake
- Impacts to wildlife are mentioned in AB 707 and could be included in the Report
    - Climate Change Cap Wildlife Investigations Group and US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) have done studies on fish that may inform the Report
    - State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) receives relevant reports on dog influences and wildlife impacts through the statewide Hazardous Algal Bloom (HAB) portal
- Impacts to public health and drinking water should be mentioned in the Report
- The Report should have links to recreation and drinking water regulations

Angela DePalma-Dow, Lake County Water Resources Department (WRD), commented as a member of the Technical Subcommittee that addressing all of these barriers are priorities of WRD, identified in a sub-bullet of Item 10 of the 2028 County Vision, but resources to address them are limited.

<u>TERC Presentation</u>

Geoff Schladow, TERC, presented on the purpose and need for a distributed watershed model. He also provided some explanation on LiDAR, satellite imagery, and bathymetry, and how each might or might not feed into a distributed watershed model. In a distributed model, the watershed is broken up into subwatersheds that are categorized by characteristics such as vegetation, land use, and soil type. A small number of each category of subwatershed is monitored to gather data on nutrient outputs and other factors, and that is then applied in the distributed model to all of the subwatersheds of that category. Using a range of theoretical assumptions and empirical observations, the flow of water can then be related to concentrations of contaminants such as nutrients and suspended sediments, providing estimates of contaminant loads from individual parts of the watershed. Once calibrated and validated, the model can be used as a management tool to estimate the delivery of nutrients to the streams and the Lake.

LiDAR surveys the topography of the land by bouncing lasers from a plane to the ground. A LiDAR survey was taken of Lake County in 2016 and a new flight could show where soil has eroded or

accumulated since the fires, or how tree density has changed. Dr. Schladow said that a new LiDAR survey would not be necessary for a watershed model; the 2016 LiDAR data would be sufficient. Karola Kennedy, Koi Nation, commented that recent erosion information has been captured in the Mendocino Complex Fire Burned Area Emergency Response (BAER) reports from the previous year. Ms. DePalma-Dow will see if the County has watershed Global Information System (GIS) layers of soil type and ground slope information, because erosion potential can inform the watershed model (see Action Item #10).

Dr. Schladow recommended that, since satellites can observe a wide variety of data, the Committee should identify their data needs before determining what kind of satellite data, if any, could or should be utilized. Meteorological data would be helpful to inform the watershed model, as well as the internal lake model that UC Davis is developing as part of their current contract. Dr. Schladow identified weather stations as perhaps the largest data gap for the watershed model, though there is great potential to install and coordinate weather data collection systems. Meteorological data could be provided from a satellite or from other sources. Committee members also suggested looking into the existing Countywide network of agriculture related weather stations, and Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E)'s small weather stations as sources of potential meteorological data. Bathymetric data, or the shape of the Lake underwater, will not affect the watershed model but is a missing and important component to the internal lake model.

It takes approximately one to two years to set up and calibrate the watershed model and a second year to validate the model. On-the-ground sampling to groundtruth modeled predictions would be part of validating the model. Dr. Schladow said that existing monitoring data is not sufficient to calibrate a watershed model, and the model can't predict any characteristics that aren't monitored. CVRWQCB previously engaged in a much smaller but similar modeling process to develop the TMDL. When a distributed model was created for Lake Tahoe, it showed that 80% of the contamination to the Lake was coming from the 20% of the Lake shore that was urban, which allowed water managers to focus their efforts on only the areas of the shore with greatest impact. The model of the watershed can also provide the internal lake model with information about external nutrient and sediment loading.

Recommendations Refinement

Considerations regarding each Recommendation are summarized below. Comments from Technical Subcommittee members Ms. DePalma-Dow, Dr. Schladow, and Jim Steele are incorporated in the Committee comments. Only Committee members participated in votes for approval of the Recommendations. These votes represent approval for the Recommendation to move forward in some capacity, not a final vote of approval for the Recommendations and Report overall. A vote for final Report approval will take place at the December meeting. Some Committee members must discuss the Recommendations with their organizations or constituencies before final approval.

Any Recommendation requesting funding for 2020 must be included in the current Recommendations Report, but some Recommendations that merit more time to be developed were selected to be added to the 2020 Workplan, to be refined throughout the next calendar year with the potential to be included in the 2020 Recommendations Report. A description of the 2020 Workplan will be included in the 2019 Recommendations Report.

Conduct a LiDAR survey of the entire Clear Lake watershed

The following comments were recorded:

- If a new LiDAR survey is not needed for the watershed model, that lowers this Recommendation's immediate level of priority
- LiDAR data might be useful in the future if a specific need for it is identified, and the further in the future a new survey is done, the more defined the erosion will be
- This may be low-hanging fruit that would provide generally valuable information, but a more specific cost estimate is needed for a cost-benefit analysis
- A new survey at higher resolution will still be comparable to the low resolution 2016 survey
- LiDAR eventually will be needed to compare before- and after- effects of the Middle Creek Restoration Project
- LiDAR could inform where to place stream gauges, but the collective knowledge of those familiar with the Lake is more likely to determine good locations

The Committee agreed to continue gathering information on the costs and benefits of a LiDAR survey of the entire Clear Lake watershed before the next iteration of the Report is approved.

Conduct a bathymetric survey of Clear Lake

Bathymetry of Clear Lake would be taken by sonar from a boat over 3-6 months. The current bathymetric data is from 2003 and TERC previously stated that using this out of date data could potentially offset the accuracy of the internal lake model by 10-15%. The US Geological Survey (USGS) volcanic risk group, USEPA, and Lake County are interested in partnering in this effort. Dr. Schladow provided a draft letter from USGS endorsing and offering to contribute a yet-to-be-determined amount of funding towards the bathymetric survey.

The following comments were recorded:

- The accuracy of the internal lake model TERC is developing will rely on this data
- The bathymetric data can be put into the Lake model after the model has been developed
- The shared costs with other entities increase the priority of this action

The Committee conditionally approved this Recommendation for further refinement. Ms. LaBay and Ms. Coppinger noted their intent to seek feedback from their organizations before the next iteration of the Report is approved. The Facilitation team will follow up with Ms. LaBay and Ms. Coppinger for additional input (see Action Item #11).

Maintain and improve consistent monitoring of the upper watershed and urban sources

The following comments were recorded:

- This Recommendation could include ensuring that required monitoring is taking place
- The Subcommittee should identify locations around the Lake to be monitored and what kind of monitoring is needed:
    - Specific locations
    - Specific land uses
    - Locations where sanitation overflows with winter flooding
- The barriers to monitoring should be established as quickly as possible
    - Previous barriers must be resolved to move forward: lack of funds, lack of expertise, and lack of an integrated monitoring plan for the Lake
- An integrated monitoring plan should be developed
    - Clearlake, Lakeport, and the County will be doing more monitoring related to pyrethroids over the next year
    - Monitoring should be watershed-wide, not limited to the Lake
    - A monitoring plan must communicate with the development of the watershed model
    - The model requires approximately 10 sets of readings at one site over a winter season (3-4 per year are currently taken)
    - Lake Tahoe had at most 10 gauging stations for 63 subbasins
- Who will conduct this monitoring (existing parties or a consultant) will determine a cost estimate
- Who will be in charge of the monitoring needs to be determined
    - It must be an institution with a long-term investment in the County
    - It should be an integrated program with two lead partners on the Lake, to ensure follow through

The Committee asked for the Subcommittee to develop a short list of monitoring sites to move this Recommendation forward, approving it for further refinement.

<u>Analyze satellite imagery of nutrients and algal blooms throughout the watershed</u>

The following comments were recorded:

- The Committee needs to determine the purpose and type of satellite imagery and telemetry. In conversations with Dr. Dodd, Susan Ustin, UC Davis mentioned three relevant systems:
    - Geo satellite
    - Imagery
    - High resolution spectral analysis
- A telemetry expert such as Dr. Ustin should present to the Technical Subcommittee
- The cost estimate needs include validation of the satellite results with in-situ measurements
- The Committee should hire a consultant to determine what data would be most useful to them
- Satellite could provide meteorological data for the watershed model, but other sources could, as well

The Committee agreed to have the Subcommittee request a presentation about satellite options and refine their data needs. This Recommendation will be added to the 2020 Workplan.

Develop a model of the upper watershed

The following comments were recorded:

- The model will take 2-3 years to see results
- The equation sets from the Tahoe watershed model can be used so the project doesn't have to start from nothing

The Committee agreed to refine the recommendation and supports the development of an upper watershed model. This is a high priority recommendation for the Report.

Analyze existing Clear Lake data and compile it in an accessible unified database, with database management staff

The following comments were recorded:

- This Recommendation should be split into two: Database compiling and data analysis
- Regarding the location and management of a database:
    - Some data is required to be stored in a certain place based on jurisdictional or funding requirements
    - AB 1755 creates the Open and Transparent Water Data portal, but this is just for State data
    - It needs to be determined what relationship this database will have with the Open and Transparent Water Data portal created by AB 1755
    - The database should stay on Big Valley's website to build on an already substantial and trusted foundation
    - The Tribe might not have the budget or resources to maintain such a large database
    - The watershed model will create a home for the watershed data, but that is not all of the data
    - The State sometimes outsources large dataset management. UC Davis, for example, manages a State cancer registry, which costs $50 million per year. There are potentially resources there to manage large datasets
    - Department of Information Technology (DIT) could be a resource to advise on this
    - Big Valley is updating their database to be more workable, with the help of a consultant. It will be publicly accessible before the December meeting
- Regarding data analysis and formatting:
    - Putting the data into formats where they can be compared would be useful
    - Converting data to a different format can be a lot of work
    - All comparable future monitoring data should be in the same format
    - Resources should not be spent to analyze the data unless there is a purpose to analyzing it, since data can be analyzed in different ways
- The data outputs from the Lake model and the potential watershed model will be massive and should be publicly accessible

- Health data could be incorporated into the database and correlated with water quality data, this would be valuable but a huge challenge
- The 2020 Recommendation could be to fund a data management workgroup made up of Clear Lake stakeholders and staff from certain agencies to refine the database needs
- Simply creating an inventory of all Clear Lake data might be enough rather than creating an entire database

Mr. Gibson advised this Recommendation to be added to the 2020 Work Plan. The State Finance Department may be able to provide assistance developing the recommendation. Committee members agreed to move this item to the 2020 calendar. Mr. Gibson will circulate the AB 1755 Legislative Progress report to the Committee (see Action Item #12).

<u>Assess the public's perceptions, attitudes, and knowledge gaps towards water quality in order to improve education and ultimately human impacts on Clear Lake</u>

The following comments were recorded:

- Responses to the current proposal:
  - This is a relatively inexpensive proposal
  - Lake County has to do this survey anyway and the Committee could add their financial support to make the assessment more ambitious
  - The people reached by the survey are not the people who need to be reached by the survey. Reaching out to people with most impacts can be challenging.
  - Positive unified messaging from the County, the Tribes, and other stakeholders might go further than an assessment
  - Supporting WRD to reach their goals may be a good use of Committee resources
  - It needs to be clarified if the project would reside with WRD or with the Committee
  - This information about public knowledge gaps would help drive many of our next steps and be a cornerstone of movement forward with the public in general
  - Public support is critical and will help drive a lot of projects to success
  - Unless it's done really well over long period of time, over and over and over again public outreach backfires and creates mistrust
  - This is not just low hanging fruit; an improper survey can give very skewed results
- Suggestions to refine the current proposal:
  - The public assessment could be followed by targeted outreach and education.
  - An assessment could be used to gauge interest in potential projects, a combination of asking what the public knows and how they think the $5 million for capital projects should be spent
  - The CRC Strategic Doing workshops could provide an opportunity to pose targeted questions that could provide specific input back to this process
  - A consultant can be hired to design and conduct the Assessment

Committee members conditionally approved the recommendation as refined above (one member abstained from participating). Ms. Logsdon said she is not opposed to the data gathering and

educational goals but expressed concerns about the dangers of a poorly conducted survey and the detrimental impacts she has witnessed in the past. The Facilitator acknowledged that this Recommendation needs to be refined before the Committee can approve it.

Review the implementation and efficacy of existing Tribal, local, State, and federal programs, BMPs, and other management requirements in the Clear Lake Basin

Jennifer LaBay, CVRWQCB, explained to the Committee CVRWQCB's current process for determining if the goals and mandates of the nutrient TMDL are being met by the responsible parties. The TMDL was adopted in 2006 and updated in 2012. It recognizes seven responsible parties for phosphorous loading in the Lake: California Department of Transportation (CalTrans), irrigated agriculture, US Forest Service (USFS), US Bureau of Land Management (BLM), City of Lakeport, City of Clear Lake, and Lake County for some unincorporated lands. Each of these responsible parties was assigned a load allocation in 2006, indicating that they must reduce their phosphorous loading to the Lake. This is usually achieved through implementation of BMPs. The TMDL requires compliance with the load allocations, which can be demonstrated through monitoring or modeling. It does not require that compliance be demonstrated with strict monitoring data.

During the 2012 TMDL update, it was unclear if the load requirements had been met by the responsible parties. In 2016 CVRWQCB issued all responsible parties a 13267 Order, a formal enforcement action requiring further information or studies be submitted. The amount of the loading reductions still was not clear. In 2018 CVRWQCB hosted a workshop in Lake County with five CVRWQCB members and the responsible parties that was also attended by the Tribes. At that meeting CVRWQCB committed to determining if the goals of the TMDL are being met.

CVRWQCB staff are currently drafting and issuing new 13267 Orders to responsible parties that have not demonstrated compliance with the TMDL nutrient allocation. This process is meant to address data gaps and estimate the current status of load reductions. The responsible parties have six months to respond to the Orders, except for Lake County who requested more time. If CVRWQCB finds that the responsible parties are not meeting their load allocations, they will ask for a plan of additional practices the party will implement, and to update their 13267 report to show that they are meeting the TMDL.

CVRWQCB recognizes that there have been steps made on the part of the responsible parties, and also that there are issues and a lot of work to be done to ensure the goals of the TMDL are met and to determine what a revised TMDL may look like. The responses to the 2019 13267 Orders can be found on the CVRWQCB website.

The following comments were recorded:

- A consultant should be hired to conduct this review
- This should be added to the 2020 Workplan to work out more details
- Regulations at the local, state, and federal level should be reviewed, including the TMDL.
- When the results of this recommendation are released, a review should be held with all of the land managers from every relevant jurisdiction

Committee members approved this Recommendation.

Expedite the Middle Creek Restoration Project

Harry Lyons, Lake County Resource Conservation District (RCD), presented on the current progress of the Middle Creek Restoration Project. He described the status of the budget and the roles of the myriad agencies and individuals involved in the planning and implementation of the project. The Recommendation developed by the Technical Subcommittee was to expedite portions of the Restoration Project and conduct pilot projects. Dr. Lyons clarified that the Restoration Project is a large, slow, incredibly expensive, and packaged plan already set in motion with many different entities involved and could not be expedited in portions. He said that the most helpful action from the Committee would be to lend political support to the project and to help educate the public.

The Committee agreed to develop a letter of support to the California Legislature and U.S. House of Representatives for the Middle Creek Restoration Project. Ms. Logsdon said she will need to speak with the Scotts Valley Tribal Council, but expects there to not be a problem (see Action Item #13).

Public Comment

Because of the length of the meeting, Public Comment was taken twice. Comments from both periods are compiled here:

- A Lake County resident encouraged participants to go to the local library and learn about cyanotoxins and methylmercury, and about what work has already happened on Clear Lake, in order to not "reinvent the wheel." She stated that the people in Lake County can solve their own problems and need to be treated with respect. She expressed distaste with the County being known as a welfare county, and ridiculed for having a small budget. She expressed hope that the Committee find a way to reach out to the people of Lake County to network. She thanked the Committee for its time.

- A member of the public asked Dr. Schladow about the Tahoe improvement project that the Committee is modeled after, and if, once all of the data was gathered and the research was done, there was an organizational structure in place that "took the bull by the horns" and effectively moved the ideas forward.

  Dr. Schladow: It took the Tahoe agencies 10 or 15 years to build trust amongst themselves. Now the Tahoe Interagency Executive Committee is a group of about 40 people that meets every one to two months where they exchange information and make decision on a series of plans. Their workplan is constantly being modified. That structure may be where this group is headed, but it took a long time and lots of resources. Relatively speaking, this group is still in an embryonic stage.

- Dr. Schladow commented that if the Committee could invest in a high quality phone and camera system it would be of great benefit to those who occasionally need to participate in the meetings remotely.

Closing Comments

Ms. Ryan thanked the Committee members for staying engaged in the technical discussion for the entire day. The input will help the Technical Subcommittee to move forward. The Facilitator committed to sending an updated version of the Report out for the Committee's review in two weeks (see Action Item #14). This document will be the basis for the next Technical Subcommittee discussion.

Mr. Gibson thanked the facilitation team and everyone else in attendance. He expressed appreciation for the volunteerism of the Committee members, their knowledge of the Lake and its history, and all of the work they have put into the Committee thus far.

ADJOURN

Committee Members Present			
First	Last	Organization	Title
Thomas	Gibson	California Natural Resources Agency	Deputy Secretary and Special Counsel for Water
Janet	Coppinger	Lake County	Special Districts Administrator
Eddie	Crandall	Lake County Board of Supervisors	Supervisor
Paul	Dodd	UC Davis	Associate Vice Chancellor
Karola	Kennedy	Koi Nation of Northern California	Committee Designee
Jennifer	LaBay	Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board	Nonpoint Source Program Manager
Terre	Logsdon	Scotts Valley Band of Pomo Indians	Environmental Director
Harry	Lyons	Lake County Resources Conservation District	President
Christina	Harrison (Alternate)	Habematolel Pomo of Upper Lake	Assistant to the Environmental Director
Sarah	Ryan	Big Valley Band of Pomo Indians	Environmental Director
Mike	Shaver	Middletown Rancheria of Pomo Indians	Environmental Director
Wilda	Shock	Lake County Economic Development Corporation	Committee Designee
Brenna	Sullivan	Lake County Farm Bureau	Executive Director
Alix	Tyler	Elem Indian Colony	Environmental Director

Committee Members Absent			
First	Last	Organization	Title
M. Youngblood	Konkle	Robinson Rancheria	Environmental Director
Linda	Rosas-Bill	Habematolel Pomo of Upper Lake	Environmental Director

Public Attendants and Staff	
Name	**Organization**
George Spurr	City of Lakeport
Angela DePalma-Dow	County Water Resources
Bernadette Austin	CRC, UC Davis
Jonathan London	CRC, UC Davis
Sara Watterson	CRC, UC Davis
Jim Steele	Resident
Joan Moss	Resident
Katherine Schrade	Resident
Alicia Cortes	TERC, UC Davis
Geoff Schladow	TERC, UC Davis
Rick Orwig	The Lake County Bloom / LakeKonoctiLife.com/BARC
Sam Magill	CSUS Consensus and Collaboration Program
Sophie Carrillo-Mandel	CSUS Consensus and Collaboration Program