Prepared by The Akous Group

For

The Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) and
The Pesticide Management Advisory Committee (PMAC)

On

March 23, 2009

This report contains the results of interviews conducted of PMAC members in November 2008 as an inquiry into how the Pesticide Management Advisory Committee (PMAC) can become a more effective advisory committee to the Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR). This report contains an executive summary, project methodology, interview findings, and the abbreviated and summarized interview data.

Executive Summary

The Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) and the Pesticide Management Advisory Committee (PMAC) are obliged to meet the challenge "to develop and implement a course of action that adequately addresses pest management concerns and minimizes negative impacts on human health and the environment while giving sufficient consideration to a diversity of opinions."

In support of the critical role PMAC serves in collaborating with DPR toward these goals, DPR retained The Akous Group to provide a framework and forum to enable PMAC members to "identify opportunities where PMAC could become a more effective advisory body."

The Akous Group interviewed twenty members of PMAC who volunteered to share their perspectives during a twenty-minute telephone interview. The results from all twenty interviews have been summarized in this document. A subcommittee of PMAC member volunteers will review these findings and recommend a course of action to DPR in order to ensure PMAC is most effective. (N.B.: due to budget and time constraints, this committee was never convened. These results were presented directly to the full PMAC in February 2009.)

The top findings expressed by PMAC members are summarized below. A more detailed summary follows in the body of this document.

> A request of DPR to exhibit strong leadership, clearly articulating the roles and objectives of PMAC, develop more transparency and communication between DPR, PMAC and stakeholders, and cultivate a proactive approach to urgent and upcoming issues for pest management in California.
>
> An appeal to DPR to actively develop and promote a respectful and meaningful working environment where PMAC members are asked to balance constituency demands with working together toward the creation of solutions which support the goals and needs of DPR and their stakeholders.
>
> A desire for DPR to maximize and leverage the expertise and value of PMAC members by using meetings to get input prior to decision-making and less time reporting out, as well as balancing and adjusting PMAC membership to include more subject matter expertise in underrepresented stakeholder sectors.

Project Methodology

DPR asked PMAC members to participate in this project by letter on July 18, 2008, and by email on November 9, 2008 (the project was interrupted for three months by the 2008 California budget impasse). PMAC members were invited to schedule their interviews on-line at their convenience. The Akous Group followed up via email and telephone with members who did not schedule online.

In order to maximize stakeholder representation and limit costs, DPR directed The Akous Group to interview only members-at-large. Every effort was made to ensure a balanced representation of each stakeholder group. Alternate members were interviewed as necessary in order to ensure full representation of all stakeholder groups. All stakeholder groups are represented in these findings except for the *Nonagricultural Pesticide User Group*, as those members were not available during the interviewing timeframe.

The Akous Group interviewed twenty members of PMAC from November 10th through November 26, 2008. Four questions were asked during twenty-minute telephone interviews.

- What are two things that are working well at PMAC?
- What are two things that could be improved?
- What are the best opportunities for PMAC to become a more effective advisory body?
- Would you be willing to serve on a sub-committee scheduled to meet January 12 to review the results of these interviews and make recommendations to the Department on how to make the PMAC more effective?

The Akous Group transcribed each interview verbatim and read back the data to each PMAC member for confirmation. The individual interview data has been abbreviated and summarized and can be found in the appendix at the end of this document. The interview data footnoted in the findings use the following convention: a number indicates the interview and a letter the corresponding main point. For example, 5C represents interview number five, main point C.

PMAC Interview Findings

All of the data from the interviews were analyzed and have been summarized into five major points. These findings are presented in order of priority based on the frequency in which members expressed these main points in various forms, as well as information collected from the group as a whole. Please refer to the Appendix at the end of the document for the abbreviated data from individual interviews.

1. **PMAC members would prefer DPR exhibit strong leadership, clearly articulating the roles and objectives of PMAC. (1A, 2B, 3C, 4C and D, 5B, 7A, 8B, 11C, 19C)**

    - Is the role of PMAC to be an Advisory Committee, a Sounding Board, or a Lobbying forum? Until this role is clearly articulated, PMAC members felt that it would be difficult to assess strategies to advance the effectiveness of the committee.

    - Currently PMAC operates as a forum for multiple stakeholders to express their perspectives and provide a broad diversity of opinions, functioning as a sounding board or lobbying function for constituencies.

- If PMAC is to operate as an advisory committee to best support DPR in working toward its mission, the committee should be given specific problems and asked to collaborate and come up with solutions to those problems based on the constituencies they represent.

2. **PMAC members appeal to DPR to actively develop and promote a respectful and meaningful working environment where PMAC members are required to balance constituency demands with working together toward the creation of solutions, which support the goals and needs of DPR and their stakeholders.**

   - PMAC Members are asking DPR to take a strong leadership in both facilitating discussions and in directing PMAC members to participate in ways that will honor all the voices at the table and provide good, workable solutions to move DPR toward their goals. (2C and D, 4E, 5C, 9B, 14B, 16B, 19B).

   - Members experience a mixture of frustration and satisfaction with how PMAC members represent their constituencies and advance individual agendas. Many members request that their fellow members balance constituency demands with a need to create working solutions that most stakeholders can support. These members would prefer to participate in discussions that are more meaningful and contribute solutions to the goals and needs of DPR and the stakeholders of California. Members request that DPR be active in asserting this role of PMAC members. (1C, 2A and B, 3A and C, 7A, 10B and C, 14A and D, 19C, 20B and C)

     - For Example, DPR could say, we are committed to protect urban pesticides from being released into the water and sewage drains. We need to come up with three actions to address this problem. We want PMAC members to work on solutions that everyone can live with.

   - Members want to see more successful collaboration in PMAC similar to the working committee successes for the Pest Alliance Grants, strategic planning, and 21st century sub committee work. (3F, 5A, 6A, 11B, 15F, 17B, 18A, 19A and B)

3. **PMAC members would like DPR to continue to develop transparency and communication between DPR, PMAC and stakeholder groups.**

   - Members would like more transparency in both what is needed of them from DPR and a consistent and timely feedback loop from PMAC recommendations to DPR Management decisions and implementation. (1B, 4A, 6B, 8C, 11C and D, 12B, 14C, and 18B)

   - Members prefer more opportunities to discuss potential DPR responses to PMAC recommendations and implementation plans prior to final decisions so they can have a more meaningful role and impact in the decision-making process. DPR could spend more time soliciting feedback from PMAC on proposed policy options, initiatives, roles etc.

- Members suggested that DPR send update information and other prep materials prior to meetings, possibly in the form of additional webinar/teleconference meetings, so that face to face time is spent on discussion on and impacting issues, not on reporting out and updating functions.

4. **PMAC members ask that DPR maximize and leverage the expertise and value of PMAC members by balancing and adjusting PMAC membership to include more subject matter expertise in underrepresented stakeholder groups.**

   - PMAC Membership overall is widely applauded for its diversity of representation and perspectives, while some industries and influence are more heavily weighted.

   - Members believe that some balance is required in adjusting membership to include more representation in urban pesticide management, public and consumer education, fieldwork and pesticides application perspectives, air and water issues, Southern California agencies, and CA State Universities. (5E, 7B, 9D, 11B, 12A and B, 18D, 20A)

   - Members mentioned that additional expertise is needed and that knowledge can be added to the committee by way of ad hoc committees, as well as continuing the practices of bringing in expert speakers and field trips, without increasing the size of PMAC. (3E, 5D and F, 7B and C, 10D, 11D, G and H, 13B, 15A and B).

   - Several members suggested leveraging stakeholder expertise and cultivating broader communication and knowledge sharing by inviting other stakeholder agencies, legislators, and industry experts to attend field trips or specific meetings of PMAC. (6B and C, 8C, 16E).

5. **PMAC members request that DPR proactively engage PMAC members and broader stakeholders to address urgent and up coming issues for pest management in California. (11D, 13D, 17C, 20E)**

   - Urban pest management (3B and E, 4B, 5E, 6A, 7B, 11E and F 19D)
   - Integrated Pest Management (IPM)
   - Air and water issues
   - Urban encroachment
   - Research of new pest management technologies
   - Invest in and ensure DPR is utilizing the newest pesticide analysis technology
   - Utilizing the private sector for research and technology expertise
   - Supporting and influencing legislators
   - Public marketing/PR and education
   - Moving CA Pest Advisory System through a continuum of ecologically based IPM

PMAC Subcommittee Workgroup

The following PMAC members are available on January 12th and have volunteered to sit on a subcommittee to review these findings and recommend a course of action to DPR in order make PMAC more effective.

Available
Rebecca Sisco - Academia and Public Foundations
Barry Wilson - Academia and Public Foundations
Mark Cady – Agricultural Production
Bill Thomas - Agricultural Production
Cliff Ohmart – Pest Control Advisor
Preeti Ghuman - Public and Consumer Advocacy (New Member)
Dave Tamayo – Public and Consumer Advocacy (Alternate member)
Robert Ehn – Registrants and Trade Associations
Pam Marrone – Registrants and Trade Associations

May be available
Cynthia Cory – Agricultural Production (alternate if another Ag rep doesn't volunteer)
Bob Blakely - Agricultural Production
Brian Hill – Environmental and Public Interest Organizations
Tim Paine – Ex Officio Member
Mark Shelton - Ex Officio Member (available by phone)

Appendix of Interview Data

The following data are abbreviated summaries of the main points from twenty individual interviews of PMAC members.

Interview #1

A. Clear set of objectives, roles, and clients for both the DPR and the PMAC Advisory Group. Clearly articulate the role of DPM and the PMAC advisory group relative to the other pest management groups in state. A clear articulation of the DPR/PMAC's clientele (regulatory agencies, CAL EPA, a state wide group of practitioners, policy makers, farmers, etc). I or We as a group do not understand what we are providing to the clientele or the statewide organizations. Is this advisory group designed to meet the goals of the agency or a legislative oversight? (1A)

B. How is the agency using the info generated from PMAC? (1B)

C. It is important to me that my involvement is effective and is of maximum benefit to the agency and is not just to meet a requirement. (1C)

D. Clearly source research, documents and products that are sent out. Who in the state is responsible for research and dissemination of this info (UC systems, State Universities)? State Agencies are prohibited from doing research. It is critical that clients view each group as adding value and their contribution should be acknowledged. Some documents are produced that the other groups are better suited to put together. Confusion from stakeholder groups about which group has better role or better document. (1D)

Interview #2

A. Some members function solely as conduits of information from their constituency, versus operating as thinking, problem-solvers which include addressing their constituency's point of view in approaching a solution. Some members are afraid to take a stand. They defend their turf. Some members function as preserve the status quo versus tackling issues. This makes it difficult to come to consensus or other meaningful decision-making processes around issues. What we can all agree on results in recommendations that are watered down and meaningless. This is the biggest impediment to getting things done in this group. (2A)

B. I take the info from the PMAC/DPR to my constituents so they know what is happening, so we can then meet about developing an approach to solve the issue. I ask myself, is this the best for all the stakeholders in state and my own stakeholders? I believe that I need to tell my constituency what is happening so we can decide how to deal with this from our perspective as opposed to just rejecting the goals or issue at hand. (2B)

C. DPR is not using us (PMAC members) to the best of our abilities. Our interaction with DPR staff could be more meaningful as opposed to just being a sounding board. Instead of presenting their plans and then asking, "what do you think?" DPR could provide a more meaningful role for members. "Meaningful" defined as getting things done toward a goal like reducing pesticide risk for example. (2C)

D. Perhaps we need more homework or preparation prior to our meetings. Maybe DPR can deliver information or there needs in a more engaging manner. (2D)

E. DPR is constrained based on legislation. PMAC members may want them to do something – but DPR cannot. PMAC members may or may not be aware of constraints – DPR does communicate those restraints when items come up in PMAC. (2F)

Interview #3

A. Recommendations get watered down to a consensus document. (3A)

B. We don't go far enough into an ecologically based, integrated pest management (IPM) approach and are still too dependent on chemical pesticides in the PMAC recommendations to DPR. (3B)

C. There are members whose stakeholders are strong and powerful who are more content with status quo, don't like regulation and are in favoring retaining chemical pesticides, instead of moving DPR, the state of California, and California agriculture along the continuum of ecologically based IPM. Those stakeholders have strong constituencies behind them and we have gone as far as we can go with current PMAC members. (3C)

D. Improve the California pest advisory system. Advisors in this system are employed by chemical pest distributors and this is a conflict of interest. We have tried in the past to include more ecologically based IPM training in the curriculum as a requirement for licensing. There is some, but not enough of it. DPR could tackle reopening this discussion of how to move these advisors up through the ecologically based IPM continuum. (3D)

E. DPR could make meetings more effective by including more presentations from experts on new and innovative ideas in the pest management arena. (3E)

F. More work could be done in additional committees. DPR could identify key issues and then assign PMAC members to work on these issues. (3F)

G. Good high-level strategy input from PMAC to create frameworks to DPR for addressing urban and agriculture pest management, with an increasing emphasis on urban pest management. (3E)

Interview #4

A. The grant program and the pest management alliance grants are working well. The team reviewing grants was good and conscientious about the grants and their assessment of them. Hopefully DPR selected good possible projects to move IPM forward based on PMAC recommendations. I would like to know about the results. (4A)

B. There is a concerted effort from DPR and PMAC to move IPM concerns and to balance urban and agriculture. It is the status quo that IPM operates in agriculture, particularly in California. Urban IPM hasn't had the resources or the focus to have an IPM approach, although there has been marked improvements from 2006 to 2008. The IPM urban

alliance grant proposals in the DPR and PMAC committee saw the need and value of supporting IPM equally in agriculture and to be more inclusive on the urban side. This is not going to happen overnight. There may be some concern that it is not happening fast enough. (4B)

C. PMAC needs a sense of purpose. Not having a clear sense of purpose is a weakness. Three years back it lost it sense of purpose, there was no money for pest management grants. Since money came in, there is a clearer sense of purpose around the grants. When PMAC has that level of focus on grants – it works well. (4C)

D. PMAC would be a stronger advisory committee if members did not come with a lobbying attitude. If you are on the PMAC committee, bring what you know to the table and of course it will influence your problem solving approach. Too often discussions or arguments are based on a group's interests, the representative is not thinking outside their organizational agenda. To be an effective committee, representatives should leave a bit of that behind. Are you serving in advisory or lobbying capacity? Advisors are more open minded and less myopic. Lobbying is being myopic and single minded, people are looking at the gains for their organization – not for the overall goal of a larger purpose. (4D)

E. DPR must provide direction. Please come right out and tell PMAC what they want from us. How can PMAC help DPR? Be direct and explicit. (4E)

<u>Interview #5</u>

A. PMAC works best when members work on funding and grant funding, because people are trying to work better together rather than protecting their interests. (5A)

B. Better define the role of the PMAC. When there is no longer funding for grants, it is not clear what the role of PMAC should be. Is our role as an advisory committee? A sounding board? A place for different groups to protect their interest in the policy arena? My perception is that DPR values the group and doesn't want to lose this interesting group of people who have lots of experience, background and opinions but needs to be clear and transparent about PMAC's role. (5B)

C. DPR asks PMAC for recommendations. These kinds of recommendations involve voting and looking to build consensus around them. The process we use is Robert's rule of order. It feels alien and not appropriate to the kind of advising that many members are accustomed to. I have no background in this legislative style; I think this is true for other participants as well. My recommendation is when we (PMAC) have a clearly defined role – then a process can come out of it that fits that role as well as possible. We need to define a process that we're going to employ depending on the activity. I would like to see DPR move forward on this thoughtfully. (5C)

D. There is a challenge in creating the best linkages between PMAC and communities that are affected by DPR's decision-making and balancing the size of these linkages so that the PMAC committee is not too large and bloated that it is unworkable. (5D)

E. Urban pest management representation. There is an opportunity to really make a big difference in how pesticides are used in urban areas by figuring out how those communities can be represented at PMAC. When we were just dealing with agriculture interests, there was one kind of structure, as DPR moves toward more resources into urban pest control and pesticides uses – we need to find more appropriate representation. It may not be from a group. I don't know what the best structure would be - there is no urban commodity group. Homeowners and other people who are not organized like other groups use large amounts of pesticides. (5E)

F. Expert knowledge. Another linkage that PMAC needs to have is strong expert advice, not necessarily for PMAC to have every field represented on this committee, but there is a lot of knowledge out there that could help PMAC in an advisory role around technical issues. Programs at UC and other State Universities and in private sector (USCA) could help inform the decision-making that goes on. DPR would be well served to tap into and explore that knowledge base better and to fit it into a structure that works. We have an opportunity to replicate the kind of success we had with the 21st century pest management and urban pest management sub-committees. That process helped us make good decisions without having that knowledge be a member on the PMAC and without making the group itself larger. (5F)

Interview #6

A. Consider separating the two main interest groups into agriculture and urban. Use a mechanism for separating the urban from the agriculture agendas in the group. There are two primary divisions of concerns; perhaps a subset of membership could focuses on each. Sometimes when we're all together half the room is not engaged in the topic. (6A)

B. Better process and more timely feedback or response from DPR to PMAC input. Uncertain if discussion or work products lead to any changes. Seems as though things moved on from the PMAC to PDR take a long time to hear back. Timeliness in the response from DPR to PMAC would be good (more than 3-4 months is too long). Sometimes response is 6 months or longer. (6B)

C. Opportunity for discussion about the response to PMAC recommendations. Management needs to come back and tell us what DPR is going to do (or not do) based on PMAC recommendations. We then need to be able to have a dialogue about that decision, even though DPR has the final word on decision-making. (6C)

D. The agenda seems mostly staff (DPR) driven. I would like to see more effort to solicit input from stakeholders on what the agenda should be for the meeting. (6D)

Interview #7

A. PMAC has evolved from an applied research and basic research grant review group to an advisory committee that evaluates info presented by director of DPR. The group is diverse enough to provide a cross section of representatives of the groups we serve. A core group of people have been together long enough to work out issues. People know each other and it's a good size of group that works cohesively. The grant program includes divergent perspectives. We evaluate each proposal as a scientific document

without prejudice. It is very good as a sounding board for the director when DPR needs feedback. (7A)

B. To strengthen the function of PMAC, we need to change the makeup and tweak it slightly. All stakeholders who are affected have to be represented. We are lacking by not having urban pest interface (ex: nursery management pest control operator, landscaper etc) and could be more effective if we did. Opportunities to bring in the constituency of urban pest management. Consumer products and consumer groups need more representation. Use ad hoc committees like academia, or other areas of expertise. Agriculture commissioners are important as well, need to make sure we don't lose them off PMAC. Current size is a statute. 24 at large, (6 ex-officio). 12-15 is best size. I am opposed to making the group too big. People don't share views, don't participate, people get lost. DPR already has an advisory committee (PREC) that handles other issues for DPR. We don't need to have those groups rep on PMAC. (7B)

C. Need to have membership, adhoc committees or utilize academia to be able to deal effectively with developing and upcoming issues. We need to be able to represent the segment of the industry, but don't have the expertise on PMAC. For example: water, air issues, urban encroachment, operating in agriculture and urban development – are the new issues we face. Hot topics – need to include California state university people, not just UC. They are working to support air and water issues in cooperative extension research and education (part of UC) gets shortchanged and is not always utilized or acknowledged as an important function. They are one of the most important interfaces we have because they are involved in rural agriculture and urban pest management. (7C)

<u>Interview #8</u>

A. PMAC might be in need of a renewal its process and objectives. (8A)

B. Sometimes PMAC discussions lacked specific objectives for the group. What specific charge is required to PMAC if we are not reviewing grants for DPR? This group needs a specific purpose to pull them together and to help the state and the growers. (8B)

C. I don't know where the power is – who is making the decisions? Need for transparency in decision-making. PMAC needs to have the ear of people who are making decision, not veiled but up front. Want to get info or feedback. Unclear who made the decision about the grants. Are the grants coming back? (8C)

<u>Interview #9</u>

A. PMAC could be given the opportunity to discuss different policy and dept research in the early stage of development. To be able to give input to DPR that can impact decision-making. Not after the analysis or decision has already been made. (9A)

B. Make sure that the person facilitating the meeting is evenhanded about getting input from different members and not trying to shape the discussion too much. Ensure the facilitator or meeting chair is not too controlling over the discussion or bias toward or against certain members. (9B)

C. Could get selected materials further in advance of the meeting. (9C)

D. Important to maintain the diversity of members on the committee. It's okay, but could be improved. I see this is in process. (9D)

Interview #10

A. PMAC should itself participate in agenda setting. (10A)

B. Complex and contentious issues should be directly tackled by PMAC. We tend to shy away and not have substantive and feisty discussions that one would expect due to mix of stakeholders. When I joined, I thought there would be more of these types of discussion. (10B)

C. Some people may have come into the room with their mind made up – particularly from positions based on representation of their sectors. This creates an atmosphere where we do not have real discussions and are unlikely to make concessions. There are opportunities to find where common values are held among the broad spectrum of stakeholders if we were to have substantive discussions. We might bridge the gulf of assumptions and perceptions (ex: like one group doesn't care about another) that lead to or increases the polarization of certain groups. Out of these discussion might come a better understanding of each other and the possibility of new, creative ideas. (10C)

D. A consistent and concrete update of actionable items from DPR of what is coming up at DPR on a 3-4 month horizon. (Ex announcement that a chemical would be reviewed). Here are the things we're working on in advance that might involve stakeholder input or PMAC recommendation. We should know about these things via PMAC versus the various listeners, which announce things after they happen. (10D)

Interview #11

A. Strategic planning work. A good effort and priority was made to spend time on what DPR should be working on in a progressive manner. It was intensive effort that a lot of people spent time on. Got everyone focused. Various interests and concerns of PMAC members were shared. (11A)

B. Working sub committee structure is a positive thing that should continue. Efforts that take more energy or more time than our quarterly meetings are offered to sub committees to work on these issues. This is a good process. We should always make sure there is a cross section of stakeholders, even if PMAC members don't volunteer. We can also including stakeholders outside of the committee to ensure this cross section. (11B)

C. Help folks realize the challenges and opportunities that DPR is working within. Help PMAC understand what we could realistically accomplish. Help DPR understand the different stakeholder priorities. Help DPR get insight on how to implement pest mange regulations for the state. (11C)

D. Be proactive about current, upcoming and big picture issues. Make sure that as a group, we are addressing and thinking about the most current issues and thinking ahead to upcoming issues. Good preparation and good discussions to prepare ourselves for these upcoming issues. More proactive discussion, bring people in to prepare us for these

upcoming issues. Stay current and don't get caught up in budgetary or everyday work at the DPR. PMAC should focus on big picture and discuss this continually as a group. (11D)

E. Urban Pesticide management. Continue to discuss and think about the entire world of pesticide use and not just production agriculture. We need realize and address how to educate and hold accountable urban and suburban pesticide users. There has been an effort to initiate this issue and we must continue this effort. (11E)

F. New technology in pesticide manufacturing. Make sure we are bringing in pesticide manufacturers to talk about what technologies they are thinking about to make pesticides safer and softer. We need to understand the challenges and opportunities of the improving technology in pesticide manufacturing. We need to have open dialogue and an awareness of the challenges of this. We need to also have awareness that some deterrent is needed to eliminate pests. Elimination of pesticides or watered-down pesticides are not the only ideas or solutions. (11F)

G. Creative ideas beyond just reduction of pesticide use for production agriculture. There is pressure on further reducing pesticide use in production agriculture. We need to also seek alternative ideas. Manufacturers, users, and consumers need to come together, talk about and be aware of how we will solve this. Agriculture needs to have the softest, most high tech tools that are available and not get to a place where we don't have these tools at all. (11G)

H. Opportunity for DPR to use PMAC as forum to focus on assessing if DPR is using the most update to date computer models and scientific analysis techniques for impact of pesticides. (11H)

I. DPR is using old regulatory frameworks and old analysis techniques of pesticide impact. Let's bring in new thinkers and the latest scientists. Let's make sure that DPR scientists have the most current computer models and scientist analysis techniques for Pesticide Analysis. Let's make sure that the analysis is right before making recommendations. Bring in the scientists and outside experts to support this effort. (11I)

<u>Interview #12</u>

A. To include two full membership slots for water agencies. Waste water and storm water issues are separate and neither one is a substitute for each other. DPR could show that it is interested in both perspectives and their importance. Both water reps are in public and consumer advocacy slots. One could be moved to environmental and public interest area. Seems like there would be a goal to balance in northern and southern California representation. Membership seems to be heavy in the central valley based on agriculture members. (12A)

B. A better balance between agriculture and urban issues and membership. Since half of the pesticides used in the state are in urban areas, we need more membership that represent urban areas. It appears that PMAC has two open slots in academic and public foundations and in the environmental and public interest areas, these could be filled with

people from urban pesticide management perspective {ex: water pollution costs by pesticide runoff}. (12B)

C. It is important to have a clear feedback loop. When PMAC makes recommendations, it would be good if PMAC gets advised on how the feedback was received and how, what and when changes will be made by DPR management. This seems like it would be especially important for public agencies and non-profits that need to justify the resources they're putting into PMAC. (12C)

Interview #13

A. Process is really important, but sometimes we get hung up. I know that this is a public body and some processes need to get done. It's the same issue at all government agencies, things move so slowly. I get impatient sometimes and want to hurry up and talk about the issues. Diverse stakeholders get around the table to talk and get into issues, to enhance each other's understanding and create an atmosphere to work toward common solutions. (13A)

B. Need more money for pest management alliance program grants. If we got money back for pest management alliance grants it would create incentives for programs. It is important to stakeholders of PMAC to get innovation in the field of pest management issues. (13B)

C. More frequent meetings. Quarterly meetings make it difficult for momentum and continuity. We spend a lot of time getting caught up on reports, instead of getting into something to create new ideas or momentum for change. It would be more helpful to meet every other month or so, using webinar or phone conference formats. (13C)

D. There are many pressures and different issues that are fast moving and driving change that it difficult to be aware and proactive. We could be looking at how these different issues are driving change through continued public policy, changes in the economy, market changes, and issues driven by court cases, and understanding the connection between these changes and regulations. (13D)

E. The tours/field trips are good effective ways of learning from each stake holder's perspective. If they could be open to other stakeholders, especially legislative staff or staff from other environmental agencies, they could learn from those field trips. (13E)

Interview #14

A. People show up and stake out traditional or entrenched positions around issues. It is not a place where there is a lot of collaboration or interest in finding agreement on an issue. It seems like the opposite is true. I don't find PMAC to be a place where productive conversations happen. If the purpose is just to be a sound boarding to hear the polar opposing views, then it is functioning that way already. (14A)

B. If the purpose of PMAC is to create solutions and get work done, then it is the wrong composition of members or DPR needs to want to push each side to work out issues or

policies. DPR could be more assertive in pushing the group to work something out on a particular issue.

C. If DPR were more assertive about advancing specific initiatives – there would be more interest from the members. If DPR just puts it on the table (what do you think?) – they will get push back. If DPR wants to implement some of the priorities, they have to be assertive and ask us how to make this work or whether or not we are in favor of a particular issue. For example, DPR could say, we are committed to protect urban pesticides from being released into the water and sewage drains. We need to come up with three actions to address this problem. We want everyone to work solutions that everyone can live with. (14B)

D. Use the visioning and strategic planning documents created by PMAC on urban and agriculture issues. Find out if DPR has put any of these ideas on the priority list. Not sure if DPR has tried to implement any of it. (14C)

E. If the members and stakeholders from the environmental and public interest groups are not showing up, that is a problem. Most stakeholders are not going to show up in a forum where there is a stakeout of positions. There is nothing productive that comes out of that way of being. A forum that exists to stakeout positions is less valuable. If PMAC is not a place where decisions are made and solutions are creative – then attending is a lower priority. (14D)

<u>Interview #15</u>

A. At summer field trips, we get a first hand look at pest management phenomena in the field (ex: golf course, hospital, botanical garden). We have an opportunity to hear from people dealing with issues first hand. Provides a different look at pest management than we are familiar. I also take advantage of talking to members of PMAC who I don't normally get a chance to talk. (15A)

B. Outside perspective that most of us may not have. (EX: strawberry commission). We (PMAC) talk a lot about general issues, having people come in to talk about specific issues and bringing in real world experience is valuable. Visitors who present from various disciplines, specialists who bring insight into pest management. (15B)

C. Meetings are organized and run very well. It's a good use of time. Great committees. Marianne is a great leader and we don't waste any time, I appreciate that. (15C)

D. We could have a telephone conference once a year, – if we weren't having visitors or presenters. It's a long distance trip for me (10 hours drive) plus a hotel etc. I spend two days per PMAC meeting. Given the economy and time and that 25 people show up, we could save the state some money. (15D)

E. I would like to see a return of the pest management grants. Restoration of our pest alliance grant program would help us be more effective and influential. (15E)

F. It might be interesting for us to bring in a legislator or two to one of our meetings, since we advise the governor on pest management related issues. Urban legislators have little understanding of agriculture issues and pesticides are a part of that agriculture issues. We could have a legislative day where we invite a legislator or two. If they could come and hear some of the issues we are working in, we might have more influence. They hear from Marianne and the governor, but perhaps legislators could benefit from 10-15 of us – could be enlightening for them. PMAC could issue a periodic newsletter of activity to governor's office or other legislative staff. It might be useful to have an update from PMAC to go out to political influencers. (15F)

Interview #16

A. Mix of organizations represented is working well. Broad spectrum of opinions and input, a diverse expertise to the group. Good background and specialization with an institutional emphasis. The amount of openness and willingness to be candid and frank works well. (16A)

B. Less time getting briefed and listening to presentations. Spending more time discussing policy options. Every meeting should be a discussion on different policy options from DPR for the legislators to consider. DPR could spend more time soliciting feedback from PMAC on proposed policy options, proposed initiatives, and roles etc. (16B)

C. Due to the diversity of group, DPR missing an opportunity to utilize the group for vetting policies, procedures and rules. This is an excellent group to do this with because of the expertise in broad areas. They don't have to be afraid to throw policy options or proposals out there, they won't get an emotional response, they will get well thought-out technical responses. (16C)

D. Important that the DPR director tries and attends as many meetings as possible. The committee appreciates the efforts that past directors have made to participate. (16D)

E. It would be good with some discussions to have representatives from other regulatory agencies or appointed boards (example: air and water quality) attend PMAC meetings. Many issues are cross cutting. Regulatory policies have to be reconciled with other regulatory agencies. Rules may cross over DPR, water and air. These invitations should be agenda driven depending on the discussion. (16E)

Interview #17

A. The way it is being administered is strength. DPR has prioritized and given credit to the group. Gives support to the group. The right people at DPR attend the meetings. (17A)

B. The structure is diverse and brings in a non-controversial format or forum without concentrating on a particular proposal, which then might have people advocating for their position. Diverse set of folks together and the general structure I like. People who have been appointed or are serving are knowledge in the their areas – going right. The group (PMAC) has done well when it has funds to distribute to innovative projects. PMAC takes the role serious and appropriately directs research funds. (17B)

C. Everyone on the committee has bemoaned that less funds have been available to do innovative research. This should be improved to make PMAC more effective. More money to do more thinking with a focus on new thinking and new techniques to pest control. More emphasis on new practices, procedures, new tools in important key areas. Such as, water quality, air quality, volatile organic compounds (voc) and workers' safety. We would do well if we prioritize our efforts with alternate pest control keeping in mind the protections of these environmental issues and always workers' safety. We should concentrate on doing things that bring new innovation in pest control practices. I worry that sometimes we are not using our efforts to encourage new intervention from out in the private entrepreneurial sectors. I think that there is new talent in the entrepreneurial thinking world that we are not maximizing or tapping into. (17C)

D. Find a way to have more involvement from or to do outreach to those who are actually researching pest control would be good (from folks who are doing in their back shop to the actual researchers at Dupont or Dow). If we had some input by people who are in the scientific trade we might be well served to have add'l knowledge where we could encourage or stimulate add'l important pest control strategies or techniques. (17D)

Interview #18

A. Members had reviewed various grant applications in a subcommittee to larger group. It seemed like a good use of an advisory committee. Utilizing people's resources and giving them something real to do. Seems like they have a good balance of folks on the sub committee. Reviewing and making recommendations on grant funding seems like a good use of the time. (18A)

B. Conceptually these types of advisory bodies are positive. Allows stakeholders to engage in the process and increases transparency. (18B)

C. Planning tours is a good thing to do, to see different pest management techniques. (18C)

D. A better balance of representation around the table/committee so the recommendations from the group are more balanced. Industry representatives dominate the committee at large. They control some of the advice or outcomes. Previous representatives provided input and it was not heard. People had predetermined where they wanted to steer the committee. (18D)

E. Regular meetings are important – this should continue. Issue with attendance? A lot of the members were not at the last meeting. Possibility to improve or incentivize attendance in some way. (18E)

Interview #19

A. Effort of the group to develop the strategic plan was a good exercise and able to achieve the objectives that dept (DPR) was looking for, resulting in a document that can taken and used going forward. Alliance grants are very beneficial. (19A)

B. DPR is serving more as a facilitator rather than a participant when they ask the committee to work on certain projects. Allow all sub-committees to function as successful working committees. Based on the final product of the urban pest management working group and

talking to those who were on it – there is frustration that sometimes DPR is trying to direct outcomes rather than seeking input. Sometimes DPR has conclusions they want to achieve and there was more input from staff than there should have been. It was not an open as it could have been. The urban pest management working group was an example of not as successful of a working group as the strategic planning work group. (19B)

C. PMAC has proven to be a good advisory body. It gets bogged down when certain participants go off on an emotional level. Staff leading PMAC needs to be strong enough to keep us on track and keep us on the facts and things that can be scientifically supported. (19C)

D. PMAC has been successful transitioning toward integrated pest management programs. (19D)

E. Helping DPR develop positions where they can address water quality in terms where pesticide management relates to water quality. PMAC can help DPR maintain that responsibility and not the water resource control board who do not have the expertise to deal with those issues. PMAC can help maintain DPR's authority over those areas. (19E)

<u>Interview #20</u>

A. The size of the committee could be cut in half. Shouldn't have more than about 12 members representing all aspects. Not every single area needs to be representative by one or more people. For example: couldn't there be one member who could talk to and represent academia and academic research? More than enough government reps (water, city, others). Membership needs to be spread out across the state (south California has no rep). There is very little representation on the structural pest control side. It should be someone who is in the field on the turf or agriculture side and someone who deals with the regulations in a daily basis, not a paper pusher rep. If you really want to know if your programs are working – you need to have the real work people who deal with it day in and day out (park pest control, agriculture applicators). (20A)

B. Need to rotate members off (every 4-6 years) or less, so we don't have the same agencies or people. We are stagnating with the same folks on the committee. New folks coming on don't have an opportunity to be heard. Established people in there and don't let want to let go of the reins. (20B)

C. Needs to be more or better criteria of how members get appointed or nominated to serve on the board, possible use an application process with criteria. Not using affirmative action criteria like gender, or locality or personality. I got nominated, which I really am honored by, but there were other people who were better qualified and knew more about the industry. (20C)

D. We can still have public comment areas but we need to have a better structure. Let's have folks sign in, go in order, and speak concisely for 2-3 minutes. Now, who ever speaks the loudest gets heard. Every should not be putting in personal opinions as opposed to what is best for the group overall. People will talk and repeat the same thing as others have already said—it appears to hear themselves talk. This stretches out the meeting and does not add new information to the conversation– things get rehashed. It is

disheartening and a waste of time. Could get things done in half the time. Stick to the agenda and keep the focus of the meeting on the agenda not on sidebars. (20D)

E. I hope they listen to what folks say from these interviews. It is frustrating that our time and input is not valued or used. I don't have that kind of time to waste. If it was more productive, it could be a great committee. DPR doesn't use us to their best advantage. If DPR would take the recommendations from PMAC and do something with them. Instead of doing what they want to do anyway. Our voices are not being heard. (20E)

F. We should pass information out and promote better education for the rules and regulations (example: work protection standards). Since we have zero tolerance for exposure, we need to get better promotion out there on safe application of pesticides, instead of always blaming the farmers or applicators. (20F)

G. DPR should talk to each of the regulator agencies and coordinate. There should be better connections with agriculture commissioners and they should be working together instead of against each other. They don't work together and this hurts everybody. DPR cannot talk to their sister agencies (example: water, CDFA, and other sister deptartments who have rules and regulations that cross over). (20G)

The Akous Group
325 Neva Street
Sebastopol, CA 95472

707-480-7165
707-823-6113 (fax)
joseph@akous.com
http://akous.com

Our mission is to support organizations in tapping the wisdom and strength of their members. Through skilled facilitation, collaborative planning, and application of the latest thinking about teams, culture, and change, we support the emergence of organizations that reflect the deepest values of their members.