

MEETING SUMMARY  
**PEST MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**Thursday, September 13, 2001**

The fortieth meeting of the Pest Management Advisory Committee (PMAC) was held on September 13, 2001, at the California Department of Pesticide Regulation, 1001 "T" Street, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor – Training Rooms East and West, Sacramento, California.

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

Paul E Helliker, Department of Pesticide Regulation  
Steve Shaffer, California Department of Food and Agriculture  
Karen Heisler, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 9  
Mark Tognazzini, California Agricultural Commissioners and Sealers Association  
Robert Bugg, University of California – Davis, SAREP  
Barry Wilson, University of California - Davis, Dept. of Environmental Toxicology  
Robert Curtis, California League of Food Processors  
Joel Nelson, California Citrus Mutual  
William Thomas, Livingston and Mattesich  
Mark Cady, Community Alliance for Family Farmers  
Anne Katten, California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation  
Maxwell Norton, UC Cooperative Extension Merced County  
Christine Bruhn, University of California - Davis, Director, Center for Consumer Research  
Cliff Ohmart, Lodi Woodbridge Wine Grape Commission  
Cynthia Cory replacing Tess Dennis, California Farm Bureau Federation  
Kevin Keefer for Robert Ehn, California Plant Health Association  
Kim Crum, Calif Agricultural Production Consultants Association

**ABSENT MEMBERS (Based on Sign-In Sheets):**

Dawit Zeleke, Nature Conservancy Program for Strategic Pest Management  
Frank Zalom, Statewide IPM Program  
Jennifer Ryder Fox, AgraQuest  
Laurie Nelson, Chemical Specialties Manufacturers Association  
Mark Shelton, CA State Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo  
Matt Billings, Association of Natural Bio-control Producers  
Mel Androus, California Commodity Committee  
Pete Price, Price Consulting  
Rebecca Sisco (replacing Ron Hampton), Western Region IR-4 Program, UC – Davis  
Rick Melnicoe, University of California – Davis, Dept. of Environmental Toxicology  
Robert Baker, Pest Control Operators of California  
Steve Pavich, Pavich Farms  
Terri Olle, Californians for Pesticide Reform

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

Artie Lawyer, TSG  
Richard Stoltz, CAAA  
Gary Van Suple, CTFA  
John Pearson, Compliance Services  
Barbara Todd, CDFA  
Kati Buehler, Calif. Rice  
Ralph Riggs, AgraQuest, Inc.  
Jasper Hempel, KSC  
Les Grober, RWQCB  
Jim Wells, Norigen Sciences Inc.  
Ed Kaempf, NewPoint  
Mike Reed, Walt Shannon,  
Syed M. Ali, SWRCB

DPR Staff (continued):

John Sanders	Barry Cortez
David Duncan	Lisa Ross
Lisa Quagliaroli	Bob Rollins
Kathy Brunetti	Pat Dunn
Nan Gorder	Ron Oshima
Angelica Welsh	Mac Takeda
David Supkoff	Bob Elliott
David McCarty	Nick Surjan
Marshall Lee	

**AGENDA ITEMS**

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

Paul Helliker opened the meeting with introductions.

**2. AB 780 – PESTICIDE MILL ASSESSMENT.**

Adrienne Alvord, DPR's Legislative Director, gave an overview of AB 780. The overview included a summary of what AB 780 would do and how it would impact DPR. Adrienne summarized three things that AB 780 would do. (1) AB 780 would provide clarification that fee collection for selling pesticides in California can be made online. (It is not known how much pesticide was sold in this manner.) (2) AB 780 would provide for the extension of mill assessment at 17.5 mils from January 2003 to June 2004, and effective July 1, 2004 and thereafter, the mil will drop down to 9 mils. (3) Finally, AB 780 would provide that DPR submit to the Legislature by 2003, a recommendation on the long term funding of DPR.

Paul Helliker then informed the committee that he will be asking a subcommittee of PMAC to help advise DPR on completing this report. Paul indicated that the role of the PMAC subcommittee would be to help DPR decide current and future funding levels, decide an equitable and fair split in levels of funding from State funds and special funds (industry), and finally, to decide on a mechanism of funding. Paul asked the committee to contact him if anyone (1) was interested in volunteering to be a subcommittee participant and (2), could provide feedback to him on what the committee thinks should be the proper use of the committee, which would include but not limited to its current function. Adrienne was asked to expand on the where the 7 mils, requested in AB 780, was going. Per Adrienne, the 7 mil was figured to best reflect the backfill of DPR for one or two years. In closing, Adrienne stated that should a subcommittee of PMAC be established to advice DPR on their report to the Legislature, it is likely that she will chair such a group.

### **3. OVERVIEW OF GRANT REVIEW PROCESS**

Bob Elliott, Associate Environmental Research Scientist at DPR, provided an overview of the grant review process. Bob informed the PMAC that this year, DPR will prepare packages for subcommittee groups containing complete copies of proposals for that subcommittee's topical area only. Each package will also contain the summaries of the proposals from other topical areas. The chairperson for each subcommittee will be responsible for contacting each member of his/her subcommittee.

Barry Wilson asked Bob if there was any thought to normalizing the scores. Bob responded that they have not considered the thought, but it could be done at the meetings. Bob said that they intend to lower the score from 90 to 85. The reason being that it would give opportunity for more proposals to be considered. Barry Wilson recommended that lowering the bar should be done experimentally for at least two years. Norman Maxwell suggested that lowering the bar should be tried for one season. Many of the committee felt that lowering the bar would provide more leverage and provide more authenticity on the 15 percent stretch. Joel Nelson asked if by lowering the bar meant that PMAC will be considering for funding those proposals that are below the 90 percent score. (Answer to that was "yes"). Kim Crum felt that the committee is already burdened with looking for funds for those proposals above the 90 percent score. To lower the bar to 85-89 percent would just add on to that burden.

Paul Helliker pointed out that lowering the bar does not mean lowering the criteria or standards. It merely provides for a broader selection. The issue was put to a vote to confirm the lowering of the bar from 90 percent to 85 percent. The majority voted to lower the bar.

### **4. FUMIGATION WORKPLAN**

Ron Oshima, DPR, provided a status update on the fumigant work plan. Ron informed the committee that the information in the handouts are also available on the web site. Bill Thomas asked Ron that "...after promulgating reform in soil fumigation, there was talk about going into the next regulatory phase. When does DPR think that will be on the schedule?" Ron indicated that DPR's number one focus right now is subchronic data, although DPR is working on putting together a schedule. Barry Wilson asked the committee if they had any concerns about the kind of trucks that carry MITC. Bill Thomas stated that the issue falls under the jurisdiction of the Department of Transportation.

Steve Shaffer of CDFA expressed his appreciation to DPR for keeping them informed on the status of the fumigation. He made special note of thanking Ron Oshima for keeping them informed.

### **5. WATER QUALITY POLICY**

John Sanders, DPR, gave an overview of DPR's draft workplan of a process describing how DPR will respond to the presence of pesticides in surface water. Several questions were asked during the meeting. Representatives from the State Water Resources Board wanted to know when they can sit down with DPR to provide them with feedback of the document; at what point does DPR

have an exceedence point; how long is the process; what data does DPR have in getting their workplan done; what concerns does DPR have for industry input; and does DPR not anticipate submitting the technical document to the board for approval. Barry Wilson asked what, if any, is DPR's concern on difficulty of analysis of chemicals. Steve Shaffer wanted to know what the impetus was for creating the workplan. Does it fit with the existing MAA, and how does it fit with the MAA? What is the process with the other agencies...Karen Heisler wanted to know if there were any time parameters attached to the workplan or will they be built into the workplan. The draft workplan was distributed to members at the meeting, however, the document has since been revised. Copies of the revised workplan may be obtained by contacting Naomi Fualau via e-mail, [nfualau@cdpr.ca.gov](mailto:nfualau@cdpr.ca.gov), or by phone at (916) 327-4424.

## **6. BUSINESS PROCESS IMPROVEMENT UPDATE.**

DPR managers from the Pesticide Registration Branch, Pesticide Enforcement Branch, and Pest Management and Licensing Branch provided their individual plans on addressing the recommendations given by the NewPoint Group. David Supkoff highlighted the Pesticide Registration Branch's improvement list, including their P2 recommendation (working with U.S. EPA to eliminate duplicate registration). Paul Helliker suggested that anyone interested in participating in the Pesticide Registration Branch's P2 recommendation should contact David Supkoff at (916) 324-4185, or via e-mail [dsupkoff@cdpr.ca.gov](mailto:dsupkoff@cdpr.ca.gov). Artie Lawyer wanted to know when the recommendations will take place.

David Duncan, Pesticide Management and Licensing Branch, briefly highlighted their plan. Their plan is to gather general stakeholder input as well as input from the pest control licensing community. David indicated that stakeholders want timely information and response, as well as accessibility to staff and program information. Some areas where licensing and certification will focus efforts include staff assignment changes, training to improve customer service, evaluating staggering renewals, and extending licensing period. Cliff Ohmart asked if electronic transactions, as well as business practices, were considered in the NewPoint evaluation. David responded that the evaluation included e-Government recommendations but that we are focusing first on business processes. For the Pesticide Use Report (PUR), the Branch will look at establishing performance objectives for processing the PUR data and producing the annual report, and evaluate the Restricted Materials Management Program now a pilot program for revising the county level permit issuance and tracking process. A feasibility study will emerge from the pilot program. The program will be established, and relationships with IPM will be strengthened. The Branch is looking to the new Cal/PIP system to help make the PUR information more available to all interested.

Nick Surjan, Pesticide Enforcement Branch, briefly highlighted their plan to address recommendations from the NewPoint Group. Handouts were provided for the committee and others attending the meeting.

## **7. OTHER BUSINESS AND MEETING ADJOURN.**

Bob Bugg - I'm seeing a lot of paperwork and information during the last three meetings, but there doesn't seem to be much feedback from the committee.

Helliker - Is it the feeling of the committee that we should go ahead and lay out an agenda for 2002? We will schedule those items that we really need to discuss and give more time to those issues.

- Kim Crum - This has been very valuable to CAPCA. My understanding is each member takes this information to this/her constituents for feedback and keep them informed of such issues. If issues rise from them, then I send a note off to the person in charge, which happens to be Paul. I'm assuming that all of us have that option.
- Helliker - I'd like to have a committee on regulatory issues and a committee on how to sustain pest management.
- Steve Shaffer- I appreciate the incredible use of PMAC. I suggest that we have material available to committee a week or two before meeting so we can provide worthwhile feedback.
- Karen Heisler - Provide committee with link to why we are discussing it at the meeting.
- Bob Bugg - I'd like to have a primer and brief technical presentations to be helpful in contextualizing detail.
- Helliker - Before the next meeting, we need to make a list of those things that we will need to discuss next year.

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](mailto: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