

MEETING SUMMARY
PEST MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Thursday, March 8, 2001

The fortieth meeting of the Pest Management Advisory Committee (PMAC) was held on March 8, 2001, at the California Department of Pesticide Regulation, 1001 I Street, 1st Floor Training Room, Sacramento, California.

MEMBERS/ALTERNATES PRESENT (Based on Sign-In Sheets):

Paul E Helliker, Department of Pesticide Regulation
Charles Goodman, California Department of Food and Agriculture
Frank Zalom, University of California - Davis, Statewide IPM Program
Karen Heisler, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 9
Mark Shelton, CA State Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo
Mark Tognazzini, California Agricultural Commissioners and Sealers Association
Robert Bugg, University of California – Davis, SAREP
Rick Melnicoe, University of California – Davis, Dept. of Environmental Toxicology
Maxwell Norton, UC Cooperative Extension Merced County
Barry Wilson, University of California - Davis, Dept. of Environmental Toxicology
Andy Kennedy for Robert Curtis, California League of Food Processors
Joel Nelson, California Citrus Mutual
Mel Androus, California Commodity Committee
Tess Dennis, California Farm Bureau Federation
William Thomas, Livingston and Mattesich
Dawit Zeleke, Nature Conservancy Program for Strategic Pest Management
Terri Olle, Californians for Pesticide Reform
Pete Price, Price Consulting
Mark Cady, Community Alliance for Family Farmers
Anne Katten, California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
Christine Bruhn, University of California - Davis, Director, Center for Consumer Research
Cliff Ohmart, Lodi Woodbridge Wine Grape Commission
Robert Ehn, California Plant Health Association
Jennifer Ryder Fox, AgraQuest
Laurie Nelson, Chemical Specialties Manufacturers Association
Matt Billings, Association of Natural Bio-control Producers

ABSENT MEMBERS (Based on Sign-In Sheets):

Steve Pavich, Pavich Farms
Kim Crum, Calif Agricultural Production Consultants Association (Schedule conflict)
Robert Baker, Pest Control Operators of California
Margaret Reiff, Western Region IR-4 Program, UC – Davis (Interim Replacement)
(1 vacancy)

INTERESTED PARTIES PRESENT (Based on Sign-In Sheets):

Artie Lawyer, Technology Sciences Group
Jan Sharp, Calif Strawberry Commission
Lori Berger, Calif Minor Crops
Terry Cage, Calif Aerial Applicators Association
John Pearson, Compliance Service
Dennis Patzer, DCA-SPCB
Jim Wells & Ann Downs, JSC California
Linda Mazur, OEHHA
Brian Brett, DowAgro Science
Syed M. Ali, SWRCB
Jasper Hempel, WGA
Barbara Todd, CDFA

DPR Staff present:
Paul Gosselin
Ron Oshima
David Duncan
Nan Gorder
Bob Elliott
Naomi Fualau
Fred Bundock
Angelica Welsh
Nita Davidson
Belinda Messenger
Mac Takeda

AGENDA ITEMS

1. INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBERS AND OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE AND AMENDMENT TO MEETING SUMMARY.

Paul Helliker opened the meeting, and everyone introduced themselves. Three new members to the PMAC are Mr. Pete Price of Price Consulting, Mr. Rick Melnicoe, UC Davis - Department of Environmental Toxicology, and Mr. Matt Billings, Association of Natural Bio-control Producers.

2. ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS.

Carmen Milanes, M.P.H., of the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment presented an overview of environmental protection indicators for California (EPIC). As part of the implementation of the California Environmental Protection Agency's (Cal/EPA) Strategic Vision, OEHHA is leading a collaborative effort to develop environmental indicators under the EPIC Project. These environmental indicators will provide a means of assessing trends associated with Cal/EPA's mission. Milanes' overview covered the makeup of an environmental indicator. Carmen's presentation included how Cal/EPA is using EPIC as a tool for strategic planning and the first year goals of the EPIC project.

The committee asked if there was any collaboration between DPR and the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) to develop indicators. Paul Helliker informed the committee that there was no formal collaboration between DPR and SWRCB in developing environmental indicators at this point, because the criteria to develop indicators needed to be laid out first. Helliker suggested a comprehensive environmental monitoring network as the optimal solution, but such a scheme could become pretty expensive. DPR has currently developed a draft set of indicators, which Helliker presented. Joel Nelson asked, "if DPR used environmental indicators 2, 3, and 4; what would the Department do differently than is being done now?" Helliker responded that the data collected may well be the same, but that the analysis and reporting might be more targeted to the Department's planning documents. Christine Bruhn commented that environmental indicator #6, "switching from conventional pesticide use practices" implies that such practices pose the highest

risk, which may not necessarily be true. Bruhn recommended that the verbiage be changed. There are positive uses of pesticides as well. Bruhn suggested that we also indicate trends in data. She suggested that a decrease in use of toxic chemicals indicates a decrease in health risks. Laurie Nelson suggested that if we are going to look at health, let's also focus on the positive aspects. Referencing indicator #1 (number of fish kills and bird kills due to pesticide use), Barry Wilson commented that studies have shown that dead birds are rapidly eaten by predators. Because of significant losses within a few days of spraying, it is not a reliable way of getting body counts. Wilson also commented that we do not know about the long-term effects of continual exposure of wildlife to chemical mixtures, endocrine disrupters and the like on reproduction, which not so much kill outright, but reduce the number of young in the next generation. Wilson also suggested that we should have true biomarkers to show the impacts pesticides are having on various creatures. Wilson suggested that we should not just focus on single use; we should also focus on multiple chemical exposures.

3. FUMIGANTS.

Ron Oshima, Assistant Director of Scientific Affairs, DPR, provided an update on the status of fumigant pesticides. Oshima specifically addressed the status of a projected new data requirement for fumigant pesticides. The status report referred to a draft working document that identified the different studies being discussed and the use of existing authorities to require submission. The submission of this information would expedite review of methyl bromide alternatives, a priority since methyl bromide is being phased out because of being an ozone depleter. Oshima also addressed the prioritization of this issue due to the phasing out of methyl bromide and the need for data. The committee asked how *acute exposure* was defined in regulations. *Acute exposure* was defined as short-term exposures (up to 24 hours). The committee questioned the actions that would trigger a review of buffer zones. A *review of buffer zones* is usually triggered by exposures high enough to reduce the margin of exposure to a level below the goal of 100. The committee queried whether or not DPR has a summary of methyl bromide research going on right now. DPR has a summary of methyl bromide alternatives that is available on our web site: <http://www.cdpr.ca.gov/docs/dprdocs/methbrom/altrsums.htm>. The committee asked how much money DPR is putting into the research for alternatives to methyl bromide. Helliker responded that its funding is fairly minimal compared to that of U.S. Department of Agriculture and U.S. EPA. The committee asked how other fumigants not commonly used, such as *nitrogen*, fit into the fumigant data call-in and whether or not DPR has a different review process for them. Oshima indicated all fumigants would be reviewed but that their uses would identify whether the additional studies would be required.

4. INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT (IPM) IN SCHOOLS PROGRAM

Nan Gorder, Senior Environmental Research Scientist in DPR's Environmental Monitoring and Pest Management Branch, provided an overview of the IPM in Schools Program. DPR's efforts to improve and expand on the program include collecting data via a survey to the school districts. The survey will be sent to all the school districts under a contract with California State University (CSUS). School districts are not required to identify themselves, and the surveys will be returned to the CSUS. The CSUS Program will compile the data and forward to DPR. DPR will use the data as baseline information to assess changes. The survey results will be posted on the web site as well.

Nan was asked whether DPR will provide technical training to smaller type schools where any type of pesticide use (i.e., ant spraying) is done by the same person driving the bus. Nan explained that DPR would provide training for anyone who will be identified by the schools as the person who will be doing this job. Not only that, DPR's web site provides information and templates to assist this person or the school in implementing a program. The Food and Agriculture Code (FAC) requires licensed pest control businesses to report pesticide use on a school grounds directly to DPR. Starting in 2002. Pesticide use on school grounds is currently reported to the county agricultural commissioners (CACs) in a monthly summary report where school applications are not separated from other applications. Mark Tognazzini commented that there is no enforcement authority for provisions of the law concerning notification of parents and school staff, posting of applications, and record keeping, and it is up to the school districts to enforce themselves. The CACs are working with the California Department of Education to identify where to refer complaints set to the CAC's office regarding the Education Code provisions. Pete Price asked Mark Tognazzini if it is the belief of the CACs that they should have the authority to enforce the law. Mark Tognazzini indicated that such authority would make things a lot smoother. Bill Thomas wanted to know if the issue was that the CACs attempted to use their existing authority or was it a jurisdictional dispute. Mark said that the existing FAC statutes do explicitly apply to this situation.

5. PMAC 2001 AGENDA ITEMS

- 1) Organic Farming Research Foundation: Evaluation of an organic farm
- 2) Bioeducation/Bio-Indicator: Use of a few organisms
- 3) NewPoint Consultation: A report from this group
- 4) PMAC Contribution to Focus Groups
- 5) Environmental Indicators: Look at each individual indicator and its relationship to DPR programs
- 6) Chesapeake Bay Program "Environmental Outcome-Based Management: Using Environmental Goals and Measures in the Chesapeake Bay Program": Summary of the approach taken by the EPA Chesapeake Bay Program to establish measurable restoration goals and to use environmental and other outcome measures to inform the public about the state of the Bay and restoration efforts. <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/pubs/indpub/indpub.htm>
- 7) Historic perspective in order to understand original goals
- 8) Look at how different types of projects (Alliance grants/PMAC grants) have caught on; not just for justification of using money, but as guidance to future programs. Look at how to measure success/progress and strategically address issues

6. OTHER BUSINESS, AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING AND ADJOURN.

Paul Helliker announced that the next PMAC meeting is scheduled for June 14, 2001, in the Sierra Hearing Room on Second Floor.

Requests for copies of the PMAC meeting summary or reports distributed at the PMAC meeting should be directed to Naomi Fualau at (916) 327-4424, via facsimile at (916) 327-9688 or e-mail at nfualau@cdpr.ca.gov or may be mailed to:

Naomi Fualau
Executive Office
Department of Pesticide Regulation
1001 I Street, P.O. Box 4015
Sacramento, California 95812-4015

For information about the PMAC, please contact either:

Bob Elliott, Pest Management Grants and Alliance (916) 324-4156; or
Naomi Fualau, for all other issues (916) 327-4424