

**Environmental Justice Planning Advisory Workgroup Meeting Minutes
January 16, 2007**

Members Present: Jim Wells, Tracey Brieger, Veda Federighi, Karen Heisler, Terry Stark, Laurie Nelson, Renee Pinel, Brenda Washington Davis, Carolina Simunovic, Jena Ambacher, Marilyn Dolan, Teresa DeAnda (via phone)

Members Absent: Martha Arguello, Shankar Prasad, Mily Trevino-Sauceda, Claudia Soria, Erin Field, Gary Kunkel, Carl Winter

Facilitators: Joseph McIntyre, Kara Vernor

Next Meeting: *January 29, 10:00-2:00*

Location: *First floor training rooms, Cal/EPA building
Sacramento, CA*

Housekeeping:

- Meeting minutes from last month are approved for posting as final.

Meeting Objectives:

1. Create and prioritize implementation objectives for Goal 3 (Research).
2. Complete suggested recommendations for implementing Goal 1 (Public Participation) and Goal 2 (Integration of EJ).

Meeting Agenda:

- Welcome and introductions, approve minutes of September meeting
- Goal 3 information sharing:
 - What is being done today by DPR, Veda Federighi
 - What is being done in academia, Carl Winters
 - Proposals from advisory group members
- Development of consensus suggestions for Goal 3
- Completion of suggestions for Goal 1
 - Review of small group work
 - Finalizing recommendations
- Completion of suggestions for Goal 2
 - Review of small group work
 - Finalizing recommendations
- Recap of day, next agenda, review of member preparation

Meeting Ground Rules:

- Listen
- Respect
- Hold Judgment

- Share Fully
- Courtesy:
 - Silent cells/pagers
 - Be concise
 - Be on time
 - Be prepared

I. Paul Goslin spoke to the group about DPR's relation to research.

- DPR is fundamentally a regulatory agency.
- Regulatory agencies don't spend a lot of time in exploratory research.
- Exploratory research doesn't produce findings that are well accepted. Sometimes the scientific community gets ahead of what has been well established. The findings also do not tend to lead to things that we can easily bring into the regulatory world.
- We take a broad spectrum of research that guides us in developing scientific standards. Everyone wants us to rely on consistency. If an area is not well developed, it is not appropriate for a regulatory structure.
- If we are going to base any regulation on science, it has to have gone through a peer-review process, or external scientific rigor.
- The science hasn't caught up to how to link to regulatory functions.
- Our level of funding determines whether or not we can do surveillance.
- We need to work with other agencies to develop test methods that are directly related to how we regulate. Collaboration with other agencies is a definite in figuring out how to apply other regulations.
- Health officials say you can't narrow things down based on the health assessments of individuals. They suggest we prioritize based upon health data and other indicators, but pushed us back to doing traditional risk assessment and really focusing on setting exposure standards.
- In the future, we are looking for what can help us regulate, rather than more global community assessments.
- Does DPR to protect public health? In our mission we have a small area that signifies a need for pest management, but we're not going in to do the research to, for example, combat West Nile. We play an advisory role, but not a participant role.

II. The group read aloud and discussed objectives for Goal 3.

Goal 3: Improve research and data collection to promote and address Environmental Justice related to the health and environment of communities of color, low-income populations, or both. Use research results to improve health in these communities.

The group agreed that the language in Goal 3 did not exclude urban environments and could include the use of pesticides to "improve health" when deemed appropriate by research. The group agreed to leave the language of the goal as it stands, and to delineate specific issues through the objectives.

The group then added more objectives, categorized all of them into "Data Collection" (DC) and "Data Access" (DA), and discussed their level of acceptance of the first seven (as is noted in parentheses at the end of each objective):

- [DC] Simultaneous Air, Water & Biomonitoring: Collect data simultaneously in a given "EJ community" on levels of pesticides in the air, water and in people's bodies to examine if there is a correlation or not. The study should document how many pesticides are detected in a given area and address cumulative impacts. Should action be needed, determine appropriate remedies with community members. (not at agreement until there is clarification of "Biomonitoring" and correlation to exposure and in comparison with existing standards.)
- [DC] Compile data and provide an analysis of gaps concerning collecting air monitoring data along a [true] gradient to measure concentrations of pesticides in the air as a function of distance from application sites. (not at agreement)
- [DC] Compile data and provide an analysis of gaps concerning DPR's monitoring of use of household products in "pilot project" communities. (not at agreement)
- [DC] Encourage/support research into alternatives to pesticide use, application methods that minimize or eliminate volatilization of materials, etc. and publicize successes. (at agreement)
- [DC] Partner with other subject matter experts/agencies to examine all factors (ie. ag chemical exposure, access to health care, smoking, alcohol use, diet, etc) that influence the health of communities of color, low-income or both with the goal of identifying those factors which have the greatest adverse impact. (this objective will be collapsed into the following objective)
- [DC] Partner with other subject matter experts/agencies to conduct comprehensive research, data collection and evaluation that looks at impacts of all environmental inputs, not just pesticides, and should also involve health evaluations of residents including diet, heredity and other health factors. (Clarify collaboration. Do we want to make DPR responsible for the "partnering"?) (not at agreement)

The group did not determine consensus or lack of consensus on these objectives:

- [DC] Develop a team approach with healthcare providers to improve incident reporting, not depend just on illness reports. Collect information from local health care providers to identify routes of exposure. (Language tweak needed, and possibly add "communicate findings to community healthcare clinics".)
- [DC] What was applied (pesticides) and reported (illnesses), a community survey (Geo.-based).
- [DC] Identify all the inputs that we need to monitor (such as air, water and food) develop a standard metric through which to report that data, and collect data for those inputs where data is not already being collected.
- [DC] Do research where there is an opportunity to collaborate and share the data with others.
- [DC] DPR to collect data on misuse practices in the home to direct educational programs.

- [DC] More multi-media, geo-specific monitoring, representing what is going on at the ground level.
- [DA] DPR to structure research so that it can be built on.
- [DA] IPM education program for consumers.
- [DA] Implement a peer reviewed, science-based program along the lines of that described in the federal Data Quality Act, also referred to as the Information Quality Act (44 U.S.C. § 3516 note), its implementing guidelines (67 Fed.Reg. 8452 (Feb. 22, 2002) and the Office of Management & Budget's Final Information Quality Bulletin (70 Fed.Reg. 2664 (Jan. 14, 2205)).
- [DA] Make all information accessible to the regular citizen, not just policy specialists and consultants.
- [DA] DPR should take into consideration the current requirements to test, approve and register low or reduced-risk pesticides which are currently having a great deal of difficulty being approved for use in California.

After the lunch break the group decided it would be most productive to continue its work on Goal 3, consequently it did not address the agenda items related to Goals 1 and 2.

III. Assignments:

1. DPR will email a document that describes what it does in relation to research to help clarify to the group what is already being done.
2. Prepare recommended objections for Goal 4: Ensure effective collaboration, coordination, communication and accountability within DPR and other government agencies in addressing EJ
3. Brenda Davis will provide reference material about the Data Quality Act.

Parking Lot

Discuss DPR regional structure

IV. Future Meeting Dates:

January 29 – First floor training room, 10-2, Cal/EPA building
 March 12 – First floor training room, 10-2, Cal/EPA building