

**Summary of the Notes taken by Nan Gorder and Mark Rentz  
Regarding the  
PEST MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PMAC) Meeting  
MARCH 24, 2006**

**1. Attendance**

PMAC Members

David Bakke	Bob Blakely
Christine Bruhn	Mark Cady
Cynthia Cory	Robert Ehn
Terry Gage	Paul Gosselin
Karen Heisler	Jerry Howard
Anne Katten	Susan Kegley
Bobbi Larson	Pam Marrone
Laurie Nelson	Cliff Ohmart
Pete Price	Rick Roush
Jennifer Ryder Fox	Rebecca Sisco
Terry Stark	Dave Tamayo
Mary-Ann Warmerdam	

Interested Parties

Lori Berger	CA Minor Crops Council
Doug Dobbs	CA League of Food Processors
Roberta Firoved	CA Rice Commission
Dave Lawson	Lawson and Associates
Artie Lawyer	Technology Sciences Group
Bob Lilley	CA Agricultural Commissioner, San Luis Obispo County
Pat McCaa	Del Monte Foods
Bob McClain	CA Pear Advisory Board
Sara Miller	Western Plant Health Association
Renee Rianda	CA League of Food Processors
Barbara Todd	CA Department of Food and Agriculture
Jim Wells	Environmental Solutions Group

DPR Staff

Mark Rentz  
Nan Gorder  
Dave Duncan

## **2. Director's Opening Remarks**

- **NOTE:** The primary purpose of the March 24, 2006 PMAC meeting was to complete review of the Pest Management in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Working Group's (working group) report and recommendations and determine if there were areas of general agreement to forward to the Director.
- The Director extended her appreciation to those who submitted written comments on the Working Group's recommendations.
- The Director acknowledged that there are some key areas of general agreement and some areas where there is wide divergence and disagreement. Both were summarized in a memo to the PMAC from Deputy Director Mark Rentz. See Attachment 1. The Director suggested that the PMAC use the memo to identify recommendations from PMAC to DPR.
- The Director concluded that if there are no recommendations from the PMAC she would consider all working group recommendations and subsequent comments to decide what priorities the Department should move forward.
- The PMAC agreed to take up separately the two general areas in the working group recommendations ("Expanding DPR's Integrated Pest Management Program" and "Enhancing DPR's Compliance, Education and Enforcement Programs").

## **3. PMAC Discussion on Working Group's Report and Recommendations pertaining to "Expanding DPR's Integrated Pest Management Program"**

### **(a) Motion proposed by PMAC member Jerry Howard:**

Based on the recommendations set forth in the "Pest Management in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century" Working Group report, the Pest Management Advisory Committee recommends that the Director:

- Expand the department's efforts to address urban pest management;
- Identify opportunities to further promote integrated pest management (IPM) in both the agricultural and urban settings;
- Reinvigorate the Department's IPM Innovator program and restore the Pest Management Alliance grant program;
- Expand the Department's working relationships with the University of California and California State University systems to increase pest management research, education and training, cooperative extension services and the University of California IPM program; and
- Reconfigure the PMAC membership to provide broader expertise to discuss the evolving pest management challenges identified in the working group report.

Furthermore, the PMAC requests that the Director report back to the Committee at its next meeting (May 11, 2006) the Department's proposed actions on these recommendations.

- (b) **PMAC Action:** The motion was adopted unanimously by the PMAC. The Director will report back to the PMAC at its next meeting (May 11, 2006) as to which portions of the

motion she is prepared to move ahead. Deputy Director Rentz will develop a strategic outline for each of those sections identified by the Director.

(c) Additional Feedback

- Some PMAC members expressed concern that the motion did not address specific working group recommendations.
- The Director agreed that DPR would assess individual recommendations as part of its strategic planning.
- It was agreed that the PMAC membership needed to be reconfigured to ensure adequate expertise was present to address the issues identified in the working group's report, most notably urban pest management.
- DPR needs to improve interagency coordination, especially with regards to water quality. Discussion item for future PMAC meeting.
- DPR should coordinate discussions between representatives from the environmental and agriculture communities to develop a funding strategy for the Pest Management Alliance grant program.
- Need further consideration to adopting specific recommendations on page 4 (lines 92-107) and page 5 of the working group's report.
- DPR should give further consideration to the recommendation on page 10 to "form a working group to explore the feasibility of a statewide voluntary integrated pest management certification program."
- Agreed that DPR would post the working group report and recommendations on its webpage.

**4. PMAC Discussion on Working Group's Report and Recommendations pertaining to "Enhancing DPR's Compliance, Education and Enforcement Programs"**

(a) Report from DPR's Enforcement Branch Chief

- As per the PMAC's request, Enforcement Branch Chief Paulson provided the committee with a comparison of the working group's recommendations and recent changes to DPR's enforcement policies, including the proposed Enforcement Response Policy (ERP).
- Several PMAC members expressed concern that it is premature to take further action with regards to enforcement until final action is taken on the proposed ERP.
- Decision by the Director: The Director agreed that many of the recommendations have been incorporated in recent DPR enforcement policy changes and that DPR is reluctant to take any further action on the compliance, education and enforcement recommendations until the ERP rulemaking process is completed.

(b) Specific comments from PMAC members

- DPR needs to evaluate whether changes in fine structure is adequate to deter violations. Need to strongly reprimand recidivist violators. Consider incentives for long-term compliance.
- Training and equipment:
  - Some PMAC members asserted that some employers failing to provide adequate training and safety equipment for workers.

- Other members queried as to how should employers deal with employees who fail to partake in training when offered, don't behave in a manner consistent with what is taught in the training sessions, or fail to use safety equipment when provided?
- Possible opportunity: Bring together representatives from agri-business, worker groups and agriculture communities to evaluate existing training and education efforts, and identify opportunities to better coordinate and communicate amongst all parties.
- Need program to improve communications between adjacent landowners to minimize exposure.
  - Monitor the Kern County effort and depending on whether it is successful, look at opportunities to expand elsewhere.
- Concern with closure of Fresno testing lab.
  - DPR response: Significant funding shortfall impedes reopening Fresno lab. Coordinating with Anaheim lab, but still insufficient lab operations.

## **5. 2006 PMAC Field Trip (Thursday, July 13, 2006)**

### **(a) Suggestions:**

- Environmental justice project in Parlier
- San Francisco's urban IPM and school IPM
- Citrus IPM; innovative growers
- Coastal veggies; implement IPM and export constraint
- Visit research facility
- Driscoll facility – whole foods organic strawberries
- Orchard Supply Hardware—point of sale info; individual staff explain re pesticides

(b) Director's Input: Since last year's field trip targeted on agricultural pest management and since so many of the PMAC's working group recommendations focus on urban pest management, the Director recommended that this year's field trip focus on urban and structural pest management.

(c) DPR will bring back a recommendation to the PMAC at its May meeting.

## **6. Additional Stakeholder Comments:**

- Lori Berger, CA Minor Crops Council\*
- Renee Rianda, CA League of Food Processors\*
- James P. McCaa, Del Monte Foods\*

\* Written comments by Ms. Berger, Ms. Rianda and Mr. McCaa will be provided to PMAC members as separate "pdf" files.

## ATTACHMENT 1

**TO:** Pest Management Advisory Committee  
**FROM:** Mark Rentz  
**SUBJECT:** Summary of Responses to Pest Management in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century  
Working Group Recommendations  
**DATE:** March 2, 2006

---

### **1. General Thoughts**

- General support for increasing DPR's focus on non-agricultural (urban/residential/structural) pest management challenges.
- Concern that insufficient consideration was given to evolving farming practices (i.e. reduced reliance on pesticides, development and use of reduced-risk pesticides, increased IPM research, development and implementation).
- Excellent examples provided regarding ongoing efforts to further advance reduced-risk pesticide and IPM strategies.
- Some expressed reservation with the proposals that DPR expand its role beyond regulating pesticides.
- There appears to be some general support for voluntary, incentive based approaches.

### **2. Areas of opportunity/mutual support (although to varying degrees)**

- Urban/residential pest management.
- Reconfigure PMAC membership (more urban representation).
- Reinvigorate the IPM Innovator and Pest Management Alliance programs.
- Expand/Improve DPR/UC/Cal. State working relationships:
  - Pest management research, education and training.
  - Cooperative extension.
  - UCD IPM program.
- Increase access to federal \$\$.
- Increase education, training and role of PCAs/PCOs with regards to IPM.
- Accelerate approval process for reduced-risk pesticides.
- Explore opportunities to expand retail point-of-sale information on pest management options. NOTE: Some reservation if not negotiated with retailers/manufacturers.
- Support through incentives and encourage commodity group efforts to develop and implement innovative pest management practices.

### **3. Areas where there was a lack of mutual support**

- Expanding DPR's mission beyond regulating pesticides.
- Further discussion on PCA conflict of interest issue/recommendation.
- Support for a statewide voluntary IPM certification program.
- Environmental impact models to evaluate pesticide risk.
- Restrictions on retail sales of pesticides.
- Marketing (eco-labeling) certain pest management options.
- Additional enforcement measures until adequate opportunity to implement and monitor recent DPR enforcement policies.