



Mary-Ann Warmerdam
Director

Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor

Minutes Parlier Local Advisory Group Meeting September 15, 2005

Local Advisory Group (LAG) members present:

Doug Edwards/Karen Francone, Dr. Rogelio Fernandez, Raúl Gaona, Teresa DeAnda, Harold McClarty, Carolina Simunovic, Vernon Peterson, Jennifer Ambacher (alt), Lou Martinez, and Israel Lara (*Absent*: Ben Benavidez, Weldon Byram, Juana Espino, Chris Haga, Rey Leon, Martin Macareno (LUPE translator), Richard Milton, Jose Renteria, Matthew Towers, and Richard Velasco).

Facilitator: Lydia Martinez

Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) staff: Veda Federighi, Randy Segawa, Braulia Sapien, Pat Matteson, and Leonard Herrera

Audience sign-in sheet: Caroline Farrell, Kevin Keefer, Gary Van Sickle, Lynn Baker, Karri Hammerstrom, Nancy Martin, Renee Pinel, Suzanne Noble, Manuel Cunha, and Tim Tyner

1. Introductions and review: Lydia Martinez opened the meeting with introductions from the LAG and the audience. She recapped the group's norms, noted the documents available, and reminded members of the public that they are invited to speak and to fill out a speaker's card. She reviewed the agenda, noting a change to the order of the items and adding another item about membership on the LAG. Veda Federighi, Environmental Justice Coordinator and Assistant Director of the Department of Pesticide Regulation, said that she would like to begin with the items listed later on the agenda in order to resolve some important and necessary housekeeping issues.

2. Changes to Future Meeting Schedule: Some members have asked if the meetings could start at 6 p.m. because of the long drives they face. However, Lou Martinez cannot meet at 6 p.m. on the third Thursday, as currently scheduled. Veda asked if the meetings could be changed to the second Wednesday or Thursday of the month. Because one member would have a conflict on Wednesdays, the meetings will be changed to the second Thursday at 6 p.m.

3. Membership on the LAG: Veda explained that a number of things have changed regarding membership. Staff had hoped that LAG would include a representative from the Parlier Unified School District. Lucy Domenica was originally that member but she has retired, and for a number of reasons, now is not a good time to burden the district by asking it to appoint another member. DPR will, of course, continue to maintain a working relationship with the district, since sampling will be occurring on several school sites. The second change regarding membership is that in July, Martin Macareno from LUPE suggested that two Spanish-speaking members who live in Parlier should represent LUPE on LAG and he would translate for them; that arrangement occurred at the August meeting and should have been explained. Furthermore, Doug Edwards



from the County Ag Commissioners Office is leaving not only that office but also California and Karen Francone will replace him on LAG. The more difficult issue regarding membership, however, is that four members, who represent the local business community, have not attended any LAG meetings, although they have received all agendas and minutes. Lou Martinez will talk to them about serving as alternates and if they have recommendations about their replacements. Veda will send an updated membership list to LAG and the website. *[Note: Lou and Veda conversed on this subject after the meeting. Weldon Byram, Chris Haga and Richard Velasco cannot participate in the LAG. Parlier Businessman and Local Chamber of Commerce President Israel Lara will continue to be a LAG member.]*

4. Community Briefing and Open House: Veda stated that Martin Macareno had suggested informing the community about what was happening not only at the end of the pilot project but also at the beginning. Referring to a handout detailing elements of and preparation for a successful event, she suggested that LAG form an ad hoc subcommittee that could assist in the planning via conference calls and emails, rather than taking time from the LAG meeting itself. (Lydia interrupted the discussion to introduce LAG member Israel Lara who was welcomed by the group. Lou Martinez also arrived.) Veda then reviewed several staff suggestions about such an event. Saturday might be the easiest day for people from the community to attend a function, as Sundays may be more of a family day. The event could be held from 3:00 to 6:00 p.m. on one of the last two Saturdays in January to avoid the holidays, and include one or two briefings about the pilot project itself with tables around the room staffed by representatives from DPR, the County Ag Commissioner's Office, the County Health Office, and others. Table staff could share information about DPR's air monitoring, the Air Resources Board (ARB) project, the pest management study, pesticide enforcement, worker safety, health screening levels, and similar topics. Teresa DeAnda asked if there would be time set aside for people to ask questions. Veda responded that questions could be raised at the general briefings, perhaps with one session scheduled at 3:30 p.m. and another at 5:00 p.m. and then people could ask specific questions at the tables that particularly interested them. Randy Segawa, Project Leader and Senior Environmental Research Scientist at DPR, could do a visual demonstration of the pilot project, and DPR Director Mary-Ann Warmerdam has offered to make introductory remarks. Lou Martinez has suggested using the Parlier Community Center, which has sufficient space and parking and meets other facility requirements. Translators would be available and all handouts would be provided in both English and Spanish. Harold McClarty asked if the event was to inform the public about the pilot project or so the public could learn about pesticides. Veda responded that the event's purpose was to explain what DPR was doing in Parlier but that her experience with such events was that people generally wanted to know about related topics as well. Dr. Fernandez said that the event sounded well thought out and that he liked having both briefings and the individual tables. Although a subcommittee was not immediately formed, Veda said she would send details to the LAG with a toll-free number that they could call with comments and suggestions about the event.

5. Recap/Pesticides, Sampling Locations and Frequency: Randy returned to the *Draft Protocol* that had been discussed at the August meeting and recapped the pesticides to be monitored and the locations and frequency of monitoring. [The draft protocol is available at www.cdpr.ca.gov/docs/envjust/pilot_proj/lag/meetings/2005_mtg/081805mtg/protocol_draft.pdf.]

Referring to Table 1 on page 21, Randy noted that the pesticide iprodione could not be done by the laboratory using current methods and oryzalin would probably have to be dropped as well. He also called people's attention to Table 7 on page 27 that includes the top 25 pesticides used within five miles of Parlier in 2003. The pesticides listed in blue will be monitored. Of those pesticides remaining, chloropicrin has the highest rating based on use, volume, and toxicity and could be added to the pilot project if the LAG decided to decrease sampling sites or frequency of monitoring. The current plan is to take two samples (multi-residue and MITC) at each of three locations; there would be 24 hour sampling for three consecutive days for 52 weeks. If sampling were done only at two sites, Randy believes there would be enough money to add another chemical (chloropicrin or another). The Technical Advisory Group (TAG) recommends the existing proposal, and Veda said that more testing days would provide better data. Randy asked the LAG members to think about the choice.

Randy then turned to page 41 showing the DPR monitoring sites currently proposed for Chavez, Benavidez and Martinez Elementary Schools. He pointed out that the Air Resources Board proposes to monitor once every six days at Benavidez Elementary and during the peak month of use for sulfur and 1,3-dichloropropene every three days. Randy asked what LAG members thought of moving the Chavez monitoring site to the United Health Center which is right on the edge of town. Carolina Simunovic thought it should be moved to the UHC, whereas Harold McClarty wanted the sampling to be done where the children were, given the purpose of the project. The TAG has registered no preference. Braulia Sapien explained structural problems with the roof of the health center. With that information, the LAG members decided to keep the three elementary schools as sampling sites. Randy commented that the three consecutive days of sampling was a more complicated issue than he had originally thought and that he would be consulting with TAG on the matter. Harold McClarty stated that the sampling locations and frequency should be decided "where we can get the best data" and be informed by the technical expertise of the TAG, rather than the LAG. Everyone agreed. Randy asked one final time if the LAG needed additional time to decide about any changes; with no concerns raised, the project will proceed as proposed.

6. Pest Management Study: Lydia then introduced Pat Matteson, Associate Environmental Research Scientist in the DPR Pest Management Analysis and Planning Program. Pat described the Parlier area pest management assessment that she will oversee. She first explained that DPR's mission is to protect human health and the environment not only by regulating pesticide sales and use but also by fostering reduced-risk pest management. DPR does the latter through what is called a "precautionary approach." In the context of this pilot project, DPR is especially interested in proactive measures to protect children's health.

The pilot project will focus on fact-finding and analysis to generate proposals for promoting the adoption of environmentally friendly pest management practices by Parlier area growers. The specific objectives of the study are to identify least-toxic pest management approaches that can be expected to reduce pesticide use and risk; to gather information that can help growers improve their farming operations and get out in front of regulations and restrictions by taking advantage of new techniques and information; and to identify future project collaborators and funding sources. The study will focus, at least initially, on grapes, stone fruits, and preplant fumigant use; major pests that growers have to cope with; and current pest management practices and

environmentally friendly alternatives. Pat listed those groups to whom she would be turning for information. A preliminary draft report should be available in late October 2006, subject to revision based on the air monitoring findings.

Pat then asked for questions and comments. Teresa DeAnda asked if the study would be limited to Parlier. Pat responded that the Parlier area pest management assessment could link to DPR integrated pest management initiatives with a larger geographic scope. The Deputy Agriculture Commissioner and an audience member recommended adding pest control operators and organizations like the Farm Bureau to the list of collaborators and information sources. Veda suggested that next spring or summer, the LAG should have a field day to learn about this study's findings.

Manuel Cunha asked what would be done to control the sale and use of pesticides by homeowners. Veda responded that the funding for this study applies only to agriculture, which accounts for about 30 percent of pesticide used in the State. (Chlorine-based products, used primarily for municipal water treatment, account for 40 to 45 percent. The remaining pesticide products are used in institutional, public health, home-and-garden and other settings.) Veda added, however, that the Master Gardeners and Poison Control would be invited to the community briefing and open house in January to answer questions on pest control and poison prevention.

The questions then moved back to the pesticide air monitoring project. An audience member asked if the Lompoc monitoring methods would be used in Parlier. Randy responded that those methods were being revised but were included in the draft protocol that could be accessed on DPR's website. She also asked about the three monitoring sites, health screening levels, and the health and hazard index. Veda noted that these were also in the protocol and had been discussed by Dr. Jay Schreider, Primary State Toxicologist at DPR, at the last meeting. Veda shared the flow chart on screening levels that she had developed and confirmed that this part of the project was separate from the data collection but would be developed and discussed further as the project progresses. Veda also responded to the question about peer review raised by Manuel Cunha at the last meeting, noting that the pilot project staff was working with the Air Resources Board to access a group that the ARB uses for external peer review process, for which Manuel thanked her.

7. Future Meeting Schedule: Veda and Randy suggested that the next meeting occur in January when LAG can visit ARB's monitoring trailer and wrap up last minute details on the community briefing and open house to be held at the end of the month. In the interim, planning about the open house will occur by email and conference calls. Health screening levels can be discussed at the March meeting. DPR plans to issue an interim report on project findings in April, which can be discussed at the May meeting. Starting in January, meetings will begin at 6:00 p.m. on the second Thursday.

The next meeting will begin at 6 p.m., January 12, in the same place (Nectarine Room, Kearney Agricultural Center, Parlier).