Recommendations of the California Department of Pesticide Regulation Environmental Justice Planning Advisory Workgroup on

Implementing Environmental Justice Practices

Report prepared by The Results Group and approved by Workgroup members

June 2007

ADVISORY PLANNING WORKGROUP MEMBERS

Jena Ambacher	California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
Martha Arguello	Physicians for Social Responsibility
Tracey Brieger	Californians for Pesticide Reform
Teresa DeAnda	El Comite Para el Bienestar de Earlimart
Marilyn Dolan	Alliance for Food and Farming
Erin Field	Western Growers Association
Karen Heisler	US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
Gary Kunkel	Tulare County Agricultural Commissioner
Laurie Nelson	Consumer Specialty Products Association
Renee Pinel	Western Plant Health Association
Carolina Simunovic	Fresno Metro Ministry
Claudia Soria	LUPE (La Unión del Pueblo Entero)
Terry Stark	California Association of Pest Control Advisors
Hermila Treviño-Sauceda	Lideres Campesinas
Brenda Washington Davis	California Farm Bureau Federation
Jim Wells	Environmental Solutions Group
Carl Winter	University of California, Davis

Department of Pesticide Regulation Sponsor/Workgroup Chairperson

Veda Federighi, Assistant Director, External Affairs
Department of Pesticide Regulation

Facilitators

Joseph McIntyre	Ag Innovations Network, (joseph@aginnovations.net)
Sara Tickler	The Results Group, (sara@theresultsgroup.com)
Kara Vernor	The Results Group, (kara@theresultsgroup.com)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	WORKGROUP PROCESS	1
III.	POLICY CONTEXT	3
IV.	RECOMMENDATIONS	3
	Goal 1	4
	Goal 2	6
	Goal 3	8
	Goal 4	10
	Proposed Goal 5	12
V.	APPENDIX A	16
VI.	APPENDIX B	18

Recommendations of the
CA DPR Environmental Justice Planning Advisory Workgroup
to the
California Department of Pesticide Regulation
on
Implementing Environmental Justice Practices

June 2007

I. INTRODUCTION

This document contains the recommendations of the Environmental Justice Planning Advisory Workgroup convened by the California Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR). The Workgroup was charged with developing a set of advisory recommendations to the Department to guide the development of an Environmental Justice (EJ) strategy and implementation plan in accordance with legislative mandate and directives from the California Environmental Protection Agency.

In 2003 DPR released its first draft EJ implementation plan, which was amended as result of public comment. The amended draft was the subject of a series of "listening sessions" held throughout the state in 2004. DPR received feedback that that the first plan had been drafted without sufficient public input. As a result, in November 2004, DPR put aside the draft and committed to developing an implementation plan that included public participation from the start.

In late 2005, DPR formed an EJ Workgroup that included the members who created these recommendations (and several other members who did not participate in the effort) and began the process of securing professional facilitation for the workgroup. By June of 2006, work had begun on formally convening the group and beginning the process of developing recommendations.

The Workgroup held its first meeting in July 2006. It held ten meetings between July 2006 and April 2007. Nine of these meetings were held in Sacramento; one meeting was held in Fresno. Over the ten meetings, the workgroup conducted 40 hours of dialogue and deliberation to develop its recommendations.

After the April 2007 meeting, the consulting firm engaged by DPR to manage and facilitate the meetings integrated the Workgroup findings and collaborative outcomes into a draft summary report of recommendations. This draft was shared with the workgroup for their comments, revised, and finalized as this document. It will be posted on DPR's Web site for public review and comment.

II. WORKGROUP PROCESS

In seeking the support of professional facilitation for the Workgroup, DPR hoped to build on the lessons learned by the Cal/EPA Environmental Justice Advisory Committee (CEJAC) in developing their report to Cal/EPA on EJ strategy. In particular DPR hoped to create a more effective collaboration between all the stakeholders involved in the Workgroup.

The facilitators for this project, Ag Innovations Network (Joseph McIntytre) and The Results Group (Sara Tickler and Kara Vernor), had extensive experience in multi-stakeholder collaboration. In the case of Ag Innovations Network this experience was primarily in the area of agricultural and rural policy. The facilitators developed a plan for the Workgroup that emphasized respectful dialogue, sharing of interests, and consensus solution seeking.

Prior to the first meeting of the Workgroup, the facilitators called all Workgroup members to introduce themselves and begin the process of identifying concerns and issues. These calls were used to help design the structure of the Workgroup meetings.

At the first meeting of the Workgroup, members established ground rules that were observed throughout the process. These ground rules included:

- Listen: Listen carefully to other members with the goal of understanding
- Respect: Respect the experience of other group members
- Hold Judgment: Consider the possibility that alternative views and solutions may be valid
- Share Fully: Bring all information relevant for the group decision process
- Courtesy: Silent cells/pagers, be concise, be on time, be prepared

The Workgroup used a consensus decision-making method. Members agreed to operate with these guidelines:

- To identify points in common and prioritize them
- To sustain strong consensus by avoiding a formal minority report
- To seek recommendations that would work in the real world
- To work through to agreement and use second level recommendations with pros and cons as a last resort

In practice the group employed a weak consensus method, meaning the recommendations forwarded to DPR were not objected to by any member.

Over the course of its ten meetings, the Workgroup used a variety of communication methods to arrive at their conclusions. These included:

- Stakeholder focus groups, where stakeholders with common interests discussed those interests amongst themselves while the other members "listened in."
- Large group dialogues, where every member was asked to participate in deliberations on a specific topic.

- Small group working sessions, where members were divided up to work on specific topics and report back to the whole group.
- The Workgroup also collaborated between meetings to develop proposals, refine language, and prepare materials for upcoming meetings.

Representatives of DPR participated in all meetings of the Workgroup and provided data about the Department, its operations, legislative mandate, and budget, and other relevant information. Detailed meeting records were prepared by the facilitators and were reviewed by Workgroup prior to each meeting. These records are publicly available on the DPR website and form the basis of this report. All meetings of the Workgroup were open to the public and noticed on the DPR website and listservers. The public was invited to listen and observe, but not participate. Public comments were accepted by DPR via email (and further comments will be solicited in public listening sessions to be held by DPR throughout the State on the Final Draft EJ Implementation Plan).

At the conclusion of the ten-meeting process, many members indicated that they did not feel the recommendations were complete and expressed a desire to continue to work with DPR to better implement EJ. They agreed to continue to participate in the formation of the final DPR plan through the public workshop process that DPR plans in late 2007.

Of particular note, the workgroup did not achieve consensus on Goal 5 pertaining to health and exposure of communities of color and low-income populations. Despite two collectively agreed upon extensions of workgroup time, they did not begin work in earnest on this goal until the next to final meeting, and simply did not have time to reach consensus, despite significant progress. Workgroup members noted that addressing exposure and impact to communities is fundamental to EJ. The state of development of this goal, the potential to achieve consensus or to clarify key definitions such as "harm" with more time allotted, and DPR's commitment to such outcomes should be highlighted in the public workshops.

III. POLICY CONTEXT

In developing its recommendations the Workgroup was asked to consider the California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA) IntraAgency EJ Strategy and the CEJAC report as resources and guidance for its discussions. The EJ strategy and implementation plan recommended also needed to integrate with DPR's operational goals and priorities, which were also provided to the group.

The first decision that faced the group was determining the focus of its work. Two options were considered:

1. To develop its own implementation strategy and objectives without reference to previous work.
2. To use the California EPA IntraAgency EJ Strategy as the DPR strategy and focus more on implementation planning.

At its third meeting, the Workgroup opted to use the framework of the California EPA IntraAgency EJ Strategy as its starting point. The group accepted *with modifications* the four goals of the IntraAgency Strategy. Over the remaining six meetings of the Workgroup, members developed implementation plans for the four consensus goals.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

This section contains the consensus recommendations of the Workgroup. It has been organized by goals and objectives of an EJ implementation plan. Goal 5 is reviewed as well, though it is not a consensus recommendation.

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

Ensure Meaningful Public Participation
DPR should:

1. Require County Agricultural Commissioners (CACs) to have a public outreach component.
2. Plan for public participation before embarking on new projects, programs or activities. Determine what level of participation is appropriate and be transparent about why the level was chosen.
3. Help the public know how DPR works, their rights, how to participate, how to understand policies and procedures and who to call in the Counties and at DPR. DPR should make data more accessible and usable by providing a public participation handbook and education, especially around the misuse of products, as well as technical translation and assistance in these matters.
4. Develop innovative ways to conduct language-accessible community outreach within the cultural context of the community that facilitates the sharing of differing viewpoints and includes community-driven forums.
5. Establish hiring practices that increase staff diversity.

6. Evaluate all public participation activities by first creating a baseline measure regarding how DPR is perceived by the public in its participation efforts, tracking numbers and demographics of attendees and in particular first-time attendees and, at public meetings, asking participants to do meeting evaluations.
7. Assure that interpretations of evaluations are not skewed because someone did not like the outcome vs. the process.
8. Seek to have attendees at forums reflect the diversity of the community in which it's held.
9. Conduct pilot projects on public participation and one that looks at capacity building and measure its success. Learn from the Parlier project to inform the pilot project, generate a report and evaluate results.
10. Create a report card for EJ task accomplishments and distinguish between "technical" (completing EJ tasks) and "substantive" (changes in impacts) outcomes.
11. Conduct a community capacity analysis to ascertain what skills and support are needed.

Promote Community Capacity Building and Education

DPR should:

1. Build professional and community relationships between DPR, community groups, and the CACs.
2. Assure the level of funding for this goal is adequate. Pursue and leverage resources at the county and regional levels.
3. Develop EJ training for staff, CAC, and DPR (also a part of Goal 4).
4. Partner (for example, with the Board of Supervisors) to build community capacity.
5. Coordinate and interact with UC cooperative extension to conduct local education.
6. Make promoting community capacity become intrinsic and not just an "add on."
7. Create an EJ ombudsman to help people navigate the system.
8. Publicize and reward EJ success stories.

Effectively Participate in Environmental Decision Making Processes

DPR should:

1. Move away from "decide, announce and defend" decision-making by giving adequate notice in various languages in appropriate media while considering the cultural context.
2. Make it easier for people to contact DPR:
   a. Expand number of hours they are open
   b. Have multiple language capability
3. Acknowledge and respond to the inequities by proactively creating equitable processes.
4. Create a better relationship between DPR and Boards of Supervisors.
5. Develop more advisory committees and include communities in existing ones so that communities' and farming preferences are included in DPR policies.

Goal 1 Development Summary

After adopting Goal 1 from the California EPA IntraAgency EJ Strategy with the caveat that technical translation and assistance should be incorporated into the objectives of this goal, the group developed objectives over the course of the next three meetings through the following steps:

1. Reviewed objectives from the California EPA IntraAgency EJ Strategy in order to stimulate thinking about objectives for Goal 1.
2. Within the large group each member took turns brainstorming potential objectives while occasionally discussing the merits of and objections to the ideas that were emerging.
3. Completed an assignment to consider how Goal 1 objectives could be made more measurable.
4. Returned to the next meeting with suggestions on how to refine the objectives, which also led to the development of more objectives.
5. Returned again and ranked the proposed objectives according to both their importance and urgency.
6. Half of the group then used the rankings as a guide and consolidated the objectives even further. (The other half of the group was involved with the same process for Goal 2.)
7. Between meetings, a subgroup completed suggestions for implementing Goal 1. These suggestions did not go to the group for consensus endorsement. (See Appendix A for Goal 1 Implementation Suggestions.)

8. Goal 1 and its objectives as listed above were adopted by consensus at the final Workgroup meeting, though the following two gaps were noted:
   - "Capacity building" and "cultural context" need more definition.
   - The implementation mechanism is unclear, as is the measure of success.

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

DPR should develop methods to work with CACs to be more responsive to incidence reports. It should create standards for responding to violations, including farmer notification of adverse incidents, and incorporate them into CAC negotiations and evaluations. DPR should:

1. Develop a complaint/incident reporting mechanism that guides impacted parties to deliver all relevant information to CACs and/or DPR and assures feedback on initial response, progress of investigation and resolution. Initial response should include anticipated timelines and explanation of process.
   a. This should be coordinated by DPR working with CACs and other interested parties so that reporting mechanisms (both to CACs and response to complainants) is consistent statewide.
2. Develop complaint-reporting forms that allow for copies to be retained by CACs, DPR, complainants, and individuals/entities being investigated. Form would contain a case number, information related to complaint, and all appropriate information related for individuals or groups to contact CACs & DPR for follow-up information.
   a. Reporting form should include timelines for complainants to anticipate follow-up information from CACs.
3. Work with CACs and other interested groups or parties to conduct outreach/educational training on how individuals can access system correctly.

DPR should develop mechanisms to provide the public with timely information concerning the progress, processes, outcomes, and responses to complaints and investigations. The mechanisms include:

1. Working with CACs and other interested groups to conduct outreach/educational training on how individuals can access the system correctly.
2. A review of reporting mechanisms to assure that the system allows parties all information relevant to their complaint that is currently allowable by law.

3. As part of its annual review process with CACs, an evaluation of the timeliness of their communications with all impacted parties and the consistency of CACs in meeting their responses timelines.
4. Methods developed on a statewide basis to assure consistency between counties in the reporting/response process.

Goal 2 Development Summary

The development process for Goal 2 was very similar to that of Goal 1. After adopting Goal 2 from the California EPA IntraAgency EJ Strategy with no significant concerns or objections, the group developed objectives over the course of two meetings by completing the following steps:

1. Reviewed objectives from the California EPA IntraAgency EJ Strategy in order to stimulate thinking about objectives for Goal 2.
2. Divided into two subgroups and discussed potential objectives, added measures of success, and agreed on the top five objectives. Both groups shared their top objectives and, after more discussion, created a list of twelve objectives in all.
3. Ranked the proposed objectives according to both their importance and urgency.
4. Half of the group then used the rankings as a guide and consolidated the objectives into two main areas. (The other half of the group was involved with the same process for Goal 1.)
5. Between meetings, a subgroup refined the language, and this version was endorsed by consensus as Goal 2 in the final Workgroup meeting.
6. The following two gaps in Goal 2 were noted:
   - Most of the objectives address enforcement, but the goal is broader than enforcement.
   - There is no mechanism or grievance process in place to appeal a CAC's finding on a reported violation other than the legal system.

<u>Goal 3:</u>

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.

DPR should:

1. Support, participate in and rely on an integrated, cross-disciplinary, comprehensive research approach to community health, inclusive of pest management alternatives and impacts.
2. Develop a team approach with healthcare providers to improve incident reporting that does not just depend on illness reports. Collect information from local health care providers to identify routes of exposure.
3. Identify all the inputs that need to be monitored (such as air, water and diet), develop a standard metric through which to report that data, and collect data for those inputs where data is not already being collected.
4. Make all information accessible to the public, not just policy specialists and consultants.

Goal 3 Development Summary

Goal 3 was also adopted from the California EPA IntraAgency EJ Strategy, but in this instance the group first revised the language. Goal 3 of the California EPA IntraAgency EJ Strategy stated: *Improve research and data collection to promote and address environmental justice related to the health and environment of communities of color and low-income populations.* Concerns arose about both language that was contained in the goal, and language that was missing. The following is a summary of some of the key comments regarding these issues:

- Add "and/or" to "communities of color and low-income populations."
- Remove the end of the sentence ("communities of color and low-income populations") because that language is already inherent in the EJ definition. It is the only goal that includes a subset like this. We should be consistent. That goal should be applicable to the entire state.
- Leave it in, not all redundancies are bad. It is sometimes important to call out or reinforce what we mean. Particularly when you discuss research and data, some populations are not studied as much. We want to redress these inequities.
- It needs to tie back into the community through action taken based on the research and data collection.
- Suggested revision: "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 research results to improve health in these communities."

The suggested revision was later endorsed by consensus. After revising Goal 3, the group completed the following steps to create the objectives:

1. Workgroup members divided themselves into three groups; Industry, EJ Advocates and Regulators; and each took turns answering the question, "What would you hope would come out of an improved research, data collection, and evaluation process?", while the other two groups watched and listened. The group noticed that across the three groups:
    a. We agree that we should look at all factors in a community.
    b. There are a lot of areas of agreement and overlap:
        i. Research into reduced-risk pest management.
        ii. More thorough assessment of potential causal factors.
        iii. The desire to study workers and community members in a study
    c. There seems to be disagreement or different starting points re: the precautionary principle.
2. Between meetings Workgroup members emailed their top two Goal 3 objectives to the facilitators and those objectives were compiled for discussion at the next meeting.
3. At the next meeting the Workgroup read aloud and discussed each Goal 3 objective and developed additional objectives. These objectives were divided into two categories: "Data Collection" and "Data Access."
4. The Workgroup agreed 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.
5. The Workgroup worked through approximately half of the objectives and tested for consensus. Only one objective was endorsed.
6. Objectives were consolidated and discussed again, resulting in more endorsements and a final recommendation as is found above.

Proposed objectives that did not receive consensus endorsement are listed below with accompanying comments that signal places of disagreement:

1. Compile data and provide an analysis of gaps in determining practices that lead to the non-agricultural exposure of concern and use findings to direct educational programs. *(The term "non-agricultural" was not acceptable to all members, reflecting the difficulty the Workgroup experienced in developing recommendations that were applicable in both urban and agricultural settings.)*
2. Encourage/support comprehensive research **(including, but not limited to, efficacy and economic viability)** into alternatives to pesticide use and application methods that minimize or eliminate volatilization of materials. Publicize successes. *(The bolded phrase was in contention, reflecting the ongoing*

tension within the Workgroup between DPR's protective mission and the needs of the agricultural community for effective pest control measures.)

3. More **[valid]** multi-media, geo-specific monitoring, and community surveys to assess the situation at the ground level. *(The term "valid" was in contention, reflecting concerns about the reliability of this type of data.)*
4. Develop an IPM education program for consumers. *(Needs further definition and to be moved to Goal 1)*
5. DPR should take into consideration the current requirements to test, approve and register low or reduced-risk pesticides that are currently having a great deal of difficulty being approved for use in California. *(The Workgroup ran out of time before addressing this objective, but this theme was important to agricultural members.)*

Goal 4:
Ensure DPR is accountable for effective collaboration, coordination and communication within DPR, with CACs, and with other government agencies in addressing Environmental Justice.

DPR should:

1. Create a system for communicating with school superintendents (State and County) to encourage that all school district officials, employees and contractors know what to do in the event of a pesticide incident and to work with the school districts to evaluate the exposure risk.
2. Convene a cross-agency workgroup to coordinate agency actions, especially to provide information and education that identifies IPM opportunities, and to encourage the use of IPM to effectively protect public health.
   a. This workgroup should consist of a broad spectrum of agencies, including DPR, Public Health Departments, UC Extension, DHS, and Federal and State housing agencies.
3. Create a public information tool that describes the various agencies, their responsibilities regarding pesticide use, and their contact information, and make available in various languages.
4. Facilitate an annual input process from a wide range of stakeholders to identify regulatory gaps and inconsistencies, prioritize them for action in a public process and recommend DPR either resolve or advocate for resolution.
5. Join with the CACs to be involved in County Area Plans to specify responsibilities in the case of an incident.
6. Review and update MOUs regularly and make them available to interested parties.

7. Conduct an education program for employees with regard to their responsibilities and other agency responsibilities.
8. Coordinate with OEHHA to ensure that medical staff recognize, report, and respond to pesticide related illnesses appropriately.

Goal 4 Development Summary

Like the others, Goal 4 was adopted from the California EPA IntraAgency EJ Strategy, but like Goal 3, the Workgroup chose to revise some of its language. Goal 4 of the California EPA IntraAgency EJ Strategy states: *Ensure effective cross-media coordination and accountability in addressing environmental justice issues.* Again, concerns arose about both the language that was contained in the goal, and language that was missing. The following is a summary of some of the key comments regarding the need for a revision to Goal 4:

- It should read, "Improve the collaboration of…" instead of "cross-media." We don't know what that means.
- Regardless of where the impact occurs, air, water, soil, that there is an effective collaboration.
- Every goal should include this. To specify that it is across media does not make a separate goal.
- It is useful to call out separately so we can develop objectives for it.
- The question of accountability is what brought us to this goal. For example, how is DPR going to work with others to determine where schools should be built in the central valley.
- EJ is particularly vulnerable within the gaps of air, water, etc.
- It would be better to integrate it as an implementation strategy under the other goals.
- Accountability is extremely important for implementation.
- Suggested revision: Ensure DPR is accountable for effective collaboration, coordination and communication within DPR, with CACs, and with other government agencies in addressing Environmental Justice.

The suggested revision was later endorsed by consensus. After revising Goal 4, the Workgroup took the following steps to create the objectives:

1. Members responded to the question, "Where are the gaps/opportunities for improvement here?"
2. Based on the answers to the above question, objectives were first proposed objectives and then prioritized.

3. A subgroup worked outside of the meeting to refine and consolidate the objectives.
4. The objectives were endorsed by consensus at the final meeting of the Workgroup.

<u>Proposed Goal 5:</u>
Protect public health among communities of color, low-income populations, or both by reducing and preventing exposure to pesticides. (First version)

Prevent and reduce exposure to pesticides in communities of color, low-income populations, or both by preventing use of the most harmful pesticides, reducing the use of the rest, and supporting lower-risk alternatives. (Second version; see below for the revised version of this goal.)

Proposed Goal 5 Development Summary
Goal 5 was proposed early in the process and was proposed, in part, because at least a portion of Workgroup members felt there should be a goal that "directly addresses why we are here." Some initial comments on the first two versions of the goal are as follows:

- Not all exposure is harmful.
- This might best fit in the objectives or implementation plan. This is already addressed in DPR's mission, vision already. It also is included in Goal 2.
- It should not be a stated goal. It begs the dialogue about whether all pesticides are bad, good, etc.
- Keep in mind that pesticides include household products, like anti-bacterial soap. This language would imply reducing use of these health-enhancing products.
- There are two elements: one is reducing the overall exposure of pesticides and the other is preventing the most dangerous pesticides.
- Doesn't address the concern of risk.
- The risk of not taking action needs to be included.
- I would oppose statements that consciously blanket asking for reduction.
- Of all the goals, this is the one that gets us to pollution prevention.
- Reducing use doesn't always equate with reducing risk.
- There are three areas of disagreements:
    1. How do you protect public health? Do we use less or more pesticides?
    2. How do you reduce risk?
    3. Whether or not people are using the lowest risk alternative?

- Risk assessment needs to include what gets used, who gets harmed, and who makes the decision about what gets used.
- The words in the definition create a visceral rather than rational reaction because they are so horrible. None of those get at what we want DPR to do.
- The words were not chosen as a scare tactic or to get a reaction. They are scientifically proven categories. How can you be scientific and specific without listing these?
- Reducing and preventing pesticides does not show up in any of the other goals. We need to state it explicitly.
- "Prevention" is the trigger word.
- What we are encouraging in this goal is a process where alternatives are considered, prioritized and decisions are thoughtful. How can we get that language in there?
- Risk assessment is very politically vulnerable. There is little trust in it. So we can't separate use from exposure.
- If we don't trust risk assessment we can't know what the probable carcinogens are. That is a fundamental problem.
- We disagree as to how "controllable" the exposure piece is. Drift demonstrates that it isn't to some of us. So then we end up back at preventing.
- EJ is not just about building better processes for accountability and transparency (the focus of the first four goals). The fundamental point is to reduce pesticide use/exposure to protect the health of affected communities. I strongly feel that it's impossible to consider any EJ plan complete without a commitment to that goal.

Because the group was not close to agreement on this goal, the facilitator asked the EJ Advocates to draft a version of Goal 5 from the perspective of Industry, the Industry Advocates to draft a revised Goal 5 from the perspective of EJ Advocates, and Regulators to draft a revised Goal 5 that would balance the concerns of Industry and EJ Advocates. This resulted in a revised version of Goal 5.

<u>Proposed Goal 5 Revised:</u>
Prevent harmful exposure in communities of color and/or low-income populations through an integrated approach, including:

- **Encouraging less harmful alternatives, including non-chemical;**
- **Reducing use of the most harmful chemicals; and**
- **Reducing risk through mitigation strategies and reduced-exposure technologies.**

The group felt this version was more agreeable, but was not ready to endorse it. Before moving forward with potential Goal 5 objectives, the group re-focused by discussing their reasons for proposing the goal in the first place. Some of those reasons are as follows:

- Personal experience with being poisoned and not knowing what to do about it. Also watching someone die. I still see people going through the same thing.
- How do I grow a crop and protect it without endangering people?
- Protecting humans.
- Minimizing risk: for growers (eliminating the pest), and for people (exposure). It's about risk management both ways.
- To acknowledge the disproportionality inherent in the EJ definition, that people are disproportionately affected. And it's about reducing exposure.
- There is constantly changing information; we are always in the role of failing. Working really hard to do the best you can now means taking responsibility for a system where people are getting the short end of the stick.

From here a discussion of the terms within Goal 5 ensued. The following terms and issues surfaced:

1. *Definition of EJ community*: The current legal definition versus a definition that guides implementation
2. *Use vs. Exposure*: The members are not ready to correlate these.
3. *Use vs. Misuse*: Misuse is clearly covered under DPR's mandate; the question arises when legal use may cause unintended harm.
4. We can't move very far forward if we can't define "harmful."
5. The group agrees to reducing impacts, but doesn't agree that reducing use would reduce exposure and therefore reduce impacts.

Objectives related to "encourage less harmful alternatives" were proposed, but not agreed upon:

1. Incentives and disincentives for less harmful/harmful pesticides
2. Training programs for those who want to switch methods, work less harmfully
    a. Working with growers and asking them what they need
3. Grants to measure efficacy of alternatives
4. Include EJ as a factor in granting programs

5. Affirmatively solicit community input for grant programs
6. Check to see if feedback loop is present in Objective 3

The Workgroup could not reach consensus on Goal 5 or its objectives within the time allotted for the process.

APPENDIX A:
GOAL 1 IMPLEMENTATION SUGGESTIONS

What
DPR will develop a public education program about how pesticides are regulated in California, the public's opportunities to influence these processes and the public's rights regarding pesticide use and exposure. This program will be conducted in a manner that is accessible to and consistent with the cultural contexts of diverse communities across the state.

Core information
Specifically, the program will at least include information on:

1. How DPR works – who does what
2. Policies/procedures (e.g. complaints, certification process for PCAs etc.)
3. Who to call if you've been exposed to pesticides
4. What to contact & how regarding pesticide regulation in CA
5. What's legal/illegal regarding pesticide use
6. More?

How
The program must be comprehensive in terms of the communities it reaches and the manner in which information is provided. In addition to using more traditional educational techniques such as pamphlets (see below), new and innovative techniques must be used to ensure that communities without significant (or any) experience dealing with DPR and the CACs know how to navigate the world of pesticide regulation.

Establishing meaningful public participation requires both that communities understand better how pesticide regulation works and that regulatory bodies (DPR & CACs) understand the needs and concerns of communities. Building greater trust and understanding between communities and regulatory bodies will result in more effective regulation.

Interactive Workshops:
An important pillar of the public education program is multi-stakeholder workshops or series' of collaborative meetings at the county level that bring together regulatory bodies and low income communities, communities of color or both. These workshops will provide an in-person opportunity for regulatory bodies to explain the core information, above, to communities and allow communities to raise questions and explain their concerns and/or needs to regulatory bodies. Including other county agencies, such as First Responders, or local health clinics in these workshops could be

very useful. Such workshops could help to identify important components of public education programs in each county.

Other media:
In addition to workshops, the public education program will produce multi-media materials covering the core information stated above. Deciding how information is made available must be selected recognizing that certain media are more effective at reaching specific target audiences than others (e.g. Spanish radio is a better way to reach farmworker communities than a printed handbook).

Options for methods to convey the core information include, but are not limited to:
1. Written material: handbook, fact sheets
2. Visual print material, such as fotonovelas, etc.
3. Radio: public service announcements
4. TV

Basic principles of accessibility:
When organizing meetings or providing print or other materials, DPR staff must make them accessible to target communities. This includes taking into account at least:
1. Language
2. Meeting times convenient for target communities (e.g. perhaps evenings or weekends)
3. Convenient locations
4. Without presence of management/supervisors
5. Child care

Who
As the only body with the mandate to implement such a program, DPR is the lead agency and will provide budget for the program. Implementation of the program will take place in collaboration with CACs. DPR will incorporate program elements into the annual negotiated workplans with the CACs.

DPR will encourage local county agencies to share (some degree of) financial responsibility for the program to encourage local buy-in and cooperation.

Role of DPR regional offices?

Next Steps for DPR:
1. Identify target audiences for the public education program
2. Identify resource people/organizations in these communities to determine communication methods most effective at reaching this target community
3. Prioritize certain counties for this work? Establish a pilot program in one or two counties first?

APPENDIX B:
DEFINITIONS OF KEY TERMS

Before the process of adopting and creating goals began, the Workgroup decided to clarify the terms "enforcement" and "accountability" to help ensure that members would have a clear understanding each other's ideas. A subgroup defined the terms which were subsequently accepted by the whole group.

Defined Terms:

Enforcement is a tool for effective deterrence; it should be educational, include evaluations and measures of success and be consistent. The actions should be based on common sense and be transparent.

Accountability: The Department's actions have to be transparent. It requires follow up and follow through, and measures of success. The actions need to correspond to the mission and the vision of the DPR.