

**Summary of the notes taken by Mark Rentz
Regarding the
PEST MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PMAC) Meeting
February 14, 2008**

1. Attendance

PMAC Members (signed in)

Bob Blakely	David Bakke
Mark Cady	Stacy Carlson
Cynthia Cory	Nasser Dean
Robert Ehn	Jennifer Ryder Fox
Brian Hill	Karen Heisler
Anne Katten	Pam Marrone
Laurie Nelson	Maxwell Norton
Cliff Ohmart	Pete Price
Mark Rentz	Renee Rianda
Mark Shelton	Rebecca Sisco
Dave Tamayo	Darren Van Steenwyk (sitting in for Robert Baker)
Mary-Ann Warmerdam	

Interested Parties (signed in)

Kathleen Haley	Inside CalEPA
Martyn Hopper	PCOC
Larry Coltharp	Scotts MiracleGro
Bill Chase	MGK Co.
Daniel Baldwin	Syngenta
Barbara Todd	CDFA
Joyce Basan	CAPCA
Jim Wells	ESG
Pari Pachamutha	Western Exterminators/PCOC
Tobi Jones	DPR
Kendra Daijog	TGG, Inc./CAPCA
Renee Pinel	WPHA
Syed Ali	SWRCB
Billy Gaither	PCOC

2. Introductions and Opening Comments

- ◆ Opening comments by DPR Director Warmerdam regarding critical agenda items:
 - Urban Pest Management Working Group report and recommendations (possible action by PMAC).
 - Update on DPR Alliance Grant Program and DRAFT Small Grant Program process.
 - PMAC membership composition – Discussion regarding possible modifications.

3. DPR Strategic Plan (Deputy Director Rentz)

- ◆ Copies of final DPR strategic plan provided to PMAC members and interested public.
- ◆ Available online at http://www.cdpr.ca.gov/docs/dept/planning/strg_pln/2008plan/strtplan.pdf
- ◆ Deputy Director Rentz discussed how public input, including that from the PMAC members, was considered during the development of the final plan.
- ◆ Deputy Director Rentz discussed how the DPR Executive Office would use during the development of the DPR Branches' annual operating plans, and during the review of those plans the strategic plan.
- ◆ Focus will be on aligning Branches' operational goals, objectives and targets in support of the DPR strategic goals and objectives

4. Urban Pest Management Working Group (UPMWG) Report and Recommendations

- ◆ UPMWG presented its final report and recommendations to the full PMAC.
- ◆ Director introduced the agenda item with her observations and comments.
 - Recognized that this was a very complicated task and that working group was assisting DPR in exploring areas that DPR had limited past involvement, i.e. urban pest management issues, challenges and opportunities.
 - Recognized that the UPMWG members represented a very diverse group of expertise, perspectives and responsibilities.
 - This diversity contributed to some very robust discussions; discussions that are to be expected when you explore new policy areas that involve complex issues.
 - The UPMWG developed a very comprehensive set of recommendations for the PMAC's consideration. As the PMAC deliberates it needs to recognize that DPR resources (people and \$\$) will limit what can be realistically accomplished.
 - It is the responsibility of the PMAC to recommend to the Director what course of action DPR should take with regards to the working group's recommendations.
- ◆ UPMWG presentation to the PMAC facilitated Phil Bobel, UPMWG member. The UPMWG report and Bobel's powerpoint presentation can be downloaded at <http://www.cdpr.ca.gov/docs/dept/pmac/reports>
 - Overview of the process for identifying pesticide challenges and opportunities, and possible recommended actions.
 - Open and transparent process – Interested parties (i.e. non-working group individuals) were given a seat at the table and allowed to provide input throughout the discussions.
 - Eleven general pesticide use challenges and opportunities were identified and refined by the working group. See UPMWG report for more details.
 - Recommendations were developed for each. See UPMWG report for more details.
 - Some recommendations had the full support of the UPMWG.
 - Others had less than full support.
 - Some recommendations were dropped from further consideration.
- ◆ **PMAC Action**
 - Possible courses of action considered:
 - **Defer action** until the Spring PMAC meeting (May 15) to allow PMAC members more time to review the report and recommendations.

- **Forward the entire report**, including all the recommendations (fully supported and not fully supported) to the Director for DPR review and report back to the PMAC on DPR likely actions.
- Forward to the Director only the recommendations **fully supported** by the UPMWG.
- Forward to the Director a **subset** of the recommendations identified by the PMAC as priority actions.
- Notify the Director that the PMAC **could not agree** to a course of action on the UPMWG recommendations.
- **The PMAC agreed to forward the entire report to the Director with the recommendation that DPR management identify and prioritize those recommendations that are feasible, in terms of proactive results and given DPR's current priorities.** Though there was not full agreement, the majority of the PMAC members recognized that it was probably best for DPR to initially focus on the recommendations fully supported by the UPMWG. It was requested that the Director report back to the PMAC at its spring meeting.

5. DPR Grant Programs

1. DPR Alliance Grant Program (Thomas Babb)

- Grants awarded in 2007
 - Almond Pest Management Alliance II: \$217,860. Program designed to promote pest management practices that are less reliant on the use of organophosphates, carbamates and pyrethroids in almonds. Further advance successful efforts developed under the Almond Pest Management Alliance I, a grant program funded by DPR for five consecutive years.
 - Urban Pest Ant Management Work Plan: \$183,488. Promote implementation and adoption of least toxic IPM strategies to manage ants in urban environments, reduce the amount of insecticide used to manage ants, and develop strategies to prevent or significantly reduce insecticide runoff into waterways associated with managing ant populations.
 - California Grape Alliance Work Plan: \$183,640. Apply the Sustainable Winegrowing Program's "cycle of continuous improvement" to winegrapes, raisins and table grapes. Increase the adoption of economically viable IPM practices that decrease pesticide risks to air and water.
- PMAC members requested that DPR, and/or project managers provide an annual progress report on approved grant proposals.
- DPR staff requested volunteers from the PMAC to participate on the 2008 Alliance Grant Review Subcommittee. Volunteers included:
 - Becky Sisco
 - Bob Blakely
 - Dave Tamayo
 - Karen Heisler (Chair)
 - Nassar Dean
 - Mark Cady
 - Renee Rianda
 - Brian Hill
 - Cliff Ohmart

2. Small Grant Program - Draft Proposal (Dave Duncan)

- Being developed by DPR staff in the hope of funding in 2008-09.
- Expedited proposal and award process for small grants.
- Small grant = not to exceed \$50,000 per year or up to 150,000 for the grant term.
- Proposals could be submitted at any time.
- Review and recommendations by PMAC to Director (could utilize Alliance Grant Subcommittee - depending on work load).
- Priority areas for grants:
 - Pest management in urban environments.
 - Pest management in agricultural settings.
 - Projects to improve protection of surface and ground water.
 - Projects to reduce volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions.
 - Projects that address new or exotic pests.
 - Projects to reduce worker pesticide exposure.
- PMAC suggestions:
 - Keep running list of interested parties (project proponents) for when money becomes available.
 - Consider research projects as well as on-the-ground practices.
 - Priority grant areas should reflect DPR policy priorities.

6. PMAC Membership – Possible revisions

- Director's comments:
 - PMAC recommendations germane to discussion:
 - DPR should give greater attention to non-agricultural (urban) pest management challenges.
 - DPR should consider revising PMAC membership to ensure expertise available to provide input for non-agricultural issues.
 - Currently PMAC lacks the expertise to fully address non-agricultural pest management issues.
 - Have a large number of representatives from various academia (UC, CSU) programs.
 - One option might be to utilize the academic expertise as the PMAC subcommittee responsible for reviewing grant proposals.
 - PMAC members feedback:
 - Local agencies with programs that could be affected by DPR policy decisions should have a permanent PMAC seat (e.g. stormwater agencies, POTWs).
 - Need more urban representation – urban pest management professionals, urban agencies, human health experts.
 - Look at expertise provided by various academic representatives as a measure of representation. May be opportunities to consolidate representation.
 - Need greater representation from public interests.
 - Representative for landscape professionals.
 - Don't increase urban representation at the cost of agricultural presence.
 - Explore ways to better utilize individual organizations to represent a conglomeration of similar interests.
- **PMAC Recommendation: DPR bring back a proposal(s) to the PMAC at its May meeting.**

7. DPR's VOC Regulations – Update (Jerry Campbell)

- Federal District Court ruled that current DPR VOC policies and regulations violates State Implementation Plan (SIP). Decision under appeal by DPR and agriculture industry.
- DPR ordered to adopt regulations to ensure compliance with SIP.
- DPR regulations went into effect in late January 2008.
- Anticipate possible litigation in response to regulations.
- Regulations will have significant constraints on use of fumigants in non-attainment areas, most notably Ventura County.
- DPR is exploring alternative application practices and technology to reduce VOC emissions.