

**Environmental Justice Planning Advisory Workgroup Meeting Minutes  
November 15, 2006**

---

**Members Present:** Jim Wells, Marilyn Dolan, Mily Trevino-Sauceda, Tracey Brieger, Veda Federighi, Jena Ambacher, Teresa DeAnda, Claudia Soria, Karen Heisler, Erin Field, Terry Stark, Gary Kunkel

**Members Absent:** Laurie Nelson, Renee Pinel, Carolina Simunovic, Martha Arguello, Brenda Washington Davis, Carl Winter, Robert Baca, Shankar Prasad

**Facilitators:** Joseph McIntyre, Sara Tickler, Kara Vernor

**Next Meeting:** December 12, 2006, 10:00-2:00  
**Location:** TBD  
Sacramento, CA

**Housekeeping:**

- Version 2 of the meeting minutes from last month are approved for posting as final.

**Meeting Agenda:**

- Welcome and brief introductions
- Measuring Public Participation – Goal 1
- Implementing Goal 2
- Implementing Goal 3 – Research
- Recap of day and process evaluation to date
- Meeting dates and locations for next meetings
- Closing and Thanks

**Meeting Ground Rules:**

- Listen
- Respect
- Hold Judgment
- Share Fully
- Courtesy:
  - Silent cells/pagers
  - Be concise
  - Be on time
  - Be prepared

**I. Implementing Goal 1**

**Draft Goal 1:** Ensure meaningful public participation and promote community capacity-building to allow communities to effectively participate in environmental decision-making processes.

The group brainstormed the following ideas for measuring “ensuring public participation:”

- Create a report card for EJ task accomplishments –
- Conduct public participation pilot projects
- At public meetings, ask participants to do meeting evaluations

- Distinguish between “technical” (completing EJ tasks) and “substantive” (changes in impacts) outcomes
- Create a baseline measure regarding how DPR is perceived by the public in its participation efforts
- Do people know who to call in the counties and at DPR
- Track numbers and demographics of attendees and in particular first-time attendees
- Attendees at forums should reflect the diversity of the community in which it’s held
- People should know their rights; how to participate; know policies and procedures
- DPR should plan for public participation before embarking on new projects, programs or activities, determine what level of participation is appropriate and be transparent about why you choose the level
- We need to be able to interpret evaluations that are not skewed because someone didn’t like the outcome vs. the process.

The group brainstormed the following ideas for measuring “promoting community capacity:”

- Partner (for example, with the Board of Supervisors) to build capacity.
- Begin with a pilot project that looks at capacity building and measure its success.
- Learn from the Parlier project to inform the pilot project, generate a report and evaluate, etc.
- The level of funding for this goal is important – the process of identifying needs and requesting them. Pursue resources.
- Leveraging resources at the county and regional levels.
- Promoting community capacity should become intrinsic, not be an “add on.”

## ***II. Implementing Goal 2***

**Draft Goal 2:** Integrate environmental justice into the development, adoption, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies.

The group was asked to divide into two sub-groups to:

- Discuss objectives
- Add measures of success
  - How many
  - How long
  - How often
  - By when
  - Degree of impact
- Determine the top 5 objectives for the group
- Ask someone to take notes and report to the whole group

The objectives included:

1. Minimize logistical barriers to local participation. It needs to be convenient, affordable and in multiple languages.
2. Develop a culture of EJ within DPR, which might include guidance for staff and training at the local level [EJ best management practices].
3. Investigation system has to be inclusive of all the interested parties.
4. Complaint system that is accessible, easy-to-use, and gives feedback.
5. These systems are created through a state process that includes multiple stakeholders. It starts with first contact and continues through to resolution.
6. Create an ongoing state multi-stakeholder advisory group to provide input to and feedback on regulations, policies.

7. Create local/county/regional stakeholder advisory groups to provide input to implementation strategies [county-level may create too many for the state to deal with in a meaningful, timely manner; regional may have some benefits for issues that cross county lines; county-level could make sense since each has a Board of Supervisors].
8. Create a DPR [handbook] with credible community partners for the public that is based on a needs assessment that educates on the mechanics of navigating DPR effectively.
9. Require CACs to develop EJ outreach programs with credible community partners and includes information on the laws of pesticide use and drift.
10. DPR's decision-making process is transparent including how public participation was used and what the outcome was and why.
11. Review and improve existing risk assessment policies including enforcement practices, product registration and permit conditions, etc. [This group needs to include members who are diverse and technically proficient to determine the adequacy. We need to determine which processes, who, how. Placeholder: is dial-in data working?]
12. Integrating notification and the right-to-know about pesticides.

**Homework:**

**All:** Email us anything that needs to be included in these objectives but isn't.

**Karen:** Please integrate concerns you have heard into objective #11 above and bring it our next meeting.

### ***III. Implementing Goal 3 – Research***

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

The workgroup members were asked by the facilitator to divide themselves into three groups: Industry, EJ Advocates and Regulators. Each group took a turn sitting in a small “focus group” circle while the other members stood or sat quietly within hearing range.

#### ***EJ Focus Group***

What would you hope would come out of an improved research, data collection, and evaluation process?

- Less exposure to pesticides is our primary goal.
- It would measure the real numbers/impacts.
- There isn't any information that captures breast and ovarian cancer numbers of women in the farm areas.
- There are higher incidents of asthma in children and no doctors will confirm that it is from living in the farm areas.
- This is difficult because we have enough data to know that many of these things aren't good for us and we shouldn't be using them. We only need the political will to stop.
- This goal can get at the combined and cumulative effects for a child who is exposed to one or two or twenty pesticides at a time.
- Want to look at endocrine disrupters. There are eighth graders that are really short, really tall. Second grade boys with breasts, facial hair and body odor. These are all potentially tied to endocrine system impacts of pesticides.
- Let's look at a location where a permit is up for renewal and do some qualitative research to adequately document the impacts.
- Go to an area when there is heavy spraying going on for three months and ask people every day how they feel, what's going on for them, what have they noticed?

- Do a study over several years to collect information and include people in the community over time.
- Use a precautionary principle/approach.

### ***Regulator Focus Group***

What would you hope would come out of an improved research, data collection, and evaluation process?

- Making science we have today accessible.
- Getting answers to questions that we don't have answers to.
- Get exposure levels better defined.
- We need boatloads of resources going to agricultural methods that allow for and encourage lower risk strategies and include an economic analysis that is clear.
- Alternative research with more broadly defined pesticide management should be a priority again.
- DPR could expand the type of exposure research that it does, for example, do more research into the impact of ambient pesticides on communities near agricultural areas, like the Parlier study.
- We need more research to quantify impacts of VOCs, particulate matter, etc.
- Need non-traditional data sources for decision-making. Need to look more broadly at what kind of data we use.
- If companies found ways to minimize risk - what if there was huge success stories to encourage that type of development? It would widely disseminate "the word."
- More structured collaborative research between DPR and other agencies or go with them in terms of collecting research.

### ***Industry Focus Group***

What would you hope would come out of an improved research, data collection, and evaluation process?

- The precautionary principle comes at a cost. "Just in case of a risk, here is what we're going to do." We allow people to continue doing what they're doing, if we're reducing risk.
- We don't know all the factors in the exposed areas, what about diet? What about comparing urban settings to rural settings with similar demographics?
- We're just looking at pesticides and only looking at agriculture pesticides as if we are looking for the problem to be there. It isn't good for anyone. It isn't realistic.
- What about personal choice factors like smoking, obesity, etc? Let's look at cumulative effects completely.
- Health care has to be a factor as well.
- What about growers' families who often live in the middle of the field. The study needs to be broad enough to include all these issues.
- All of us, especially farmers, would love to use less pesticide.
- Exposure studies of workers that are more thorough.
- It's bad to just look at pesticide exposure, like what we're doing in Parlier. We're chasing for an answer.
- There is value in looking at the socio-factors. Wouldn't want to see traditional scientific rigor being replaced by methods less so e.g., the precautionary principle: we don't want to go from "is" to "might."
- Looking at the risk factors is good for everyone, the community, the farmer, etc.
- Nutrition outreach and knowledge is helpful.

***What did you notice across the three groups?***

- We agree that we should look at all factors in a community.
- A lot of areas of agreement and overlap:
  - Research into reduced-risk pest management.
  - More thorough assessment of potential causal factors.
  - The desire to study workers and community members in a study
- There seems to be disagreement or different starting points re: precautionary principle

#### ***IV. Future Meeting Dates:***

December 12, Sacramento Public Library East Meeting Room, 828 I Street

January 16 – First floor training rooms, Cal/EPA building

February 13 – First floor training rooms, Cal/EPA building

#### ***V. Assignments:***

**All:** Email us anything that needs to be included in these objectives that aren't here.

**Karen:** Please integrate concerns you have heard into objective #11 above and bring it our next meeting.

**All:** What are those specific things that DPR could do with the research and data collection that would have impact?

**Facilitators:** Check with the group members to see who can make the December meeting and draft an agenda of outstanding items that we will button up.

**All:** Suggest alternatives to an EJ tour so that we can all agree to the problem that we are working on [i.e., panel presentation, speakers, etc.].