



Mary-Ann  
Warmerdam  
Director

# Department of Pesticide Regulation

## AGRICULTURAL PEST CONTROL ADVISORY COMMITTEE



Arnold Schwarzenegger  
Governor

Wednesday, 4 November 2009

9:30-12:00

CalEPA Building, First Floor Training Rooms, East/West

### MEETING MINUTES

**Members Present:** (5) Mary Louise Flint-UCIPM, Ronald Berg- Pest Control Dealers, Ken Nichols- Pest Control Businesses, Richard Stoltz- Pest Control Aircraft Pilots, Tim Stone – Commercial applicators

**Department Staff:** (7) David Duncan- Chair of Committee (Ch), Margie Read, Laurie Brajkovich, Mac Takeda, Rayven Jenkins, Cynthia Ray, and Linda O'Connell.

**Guests:** (4) Joyce Basan-CAPCA, Judy Letterman – PAPA, Terry Stark – CAPCA, Doug Okumura – Lawson & Associate, and Stan Van Vleck – DeMare, Van Vleck & Brown

**Members Absent:** (7) Jean La Duc- General Public, Kenneth Oneto- FAC section 56115 Producers, Scott Hudson- County Agricultural Commissioner Association, Linda LaVanne- Agricultural Pest Control Advisers, Matt Scally- Maintenance Gardener Pest Control Business, Wayne Steele-Registrants, and Jim Farrar-California State University System

**Member Vacancies:** *Board of Governors of the California Community College system*

#### I. Introduction and Administrative Topics

David Duncan reminded attendees of safe evacuation procedures. The 15 July 2009 meeting minutes were approved without comment and the 2010 APCAC meeting schedule was discussed. The 2010 meeting schedule is also posted on the DPR website.

#### II. DPR Licensing Updates

##### A. Renewals

Mac Takeda distributed handouts summarizing the 2009 renewal status to-date. Terry Stark asked about turn around time of the individual license renewals. Mac explained that there is a standard 30-day turn around time, although furloughs and any problems associated with a specific license renewal cause more of a delay. It is important to recognize that the applications must go through accounting first in order to process payment. DPR sends pre-printed renewal applications to licensees with a special envelope in order to expedite processing. When applicants use that, it generally helps expedite the process. Additional delays in processing can be caused by failure to include payment, or incomplete continuing education hours, for example.

Judy letterman inquired about DPR's process when a renewal applicant does not send in his/her continuing education hours. Mac responded that the technician tries to contact the licensee by phone, and if they are not reachable, the applicant will be sent a problem letter. Mac said that DPR could also accept faxes from the applicant with the required information. Judy also asked what the renewal applicants should do if they lost or did not receive their renewal document. The response was that the applicant may go to the DPR website and download the appropriate renewal form. Cynthia Ray stressed the importance of submitting the individual

license/certificate renewal application, as this is a legal document and is required for renewal. She also stressed that applicants that submit verification of CE attendance with the renewal form are more likely to be processed more quickly.

#### **B. Flat cards Update**

Mac reported that the Licensing and Certification unit will be changing from embossed cards for license and certificate holders to a 'flat card' system. There are quite a few flat card printing advantages with respect to cost and design, as listed below:

- The cost of the Flat Plastic Card printing equipment as well as the maintenance contract agreement for the equipment is less than the card embosser equipment.
- Flat Card printing equipment has fewer moving parts and a higher production rate per hour versus the card embosser equipment.
- Flat card printing equipment would laminate the card to seal and protect the card.
- No need for imprinting equipment at the Commissioner's Office, however they would have to make a copy of the information on the plastic card, or buy a reader to read the information from the magnetic information strip on the back of the card. The cost for the reader would be minimal.
- We would not need to go to an outside vendor to get the design information put onto the card.
- Flat card imprinting equipment can put our design and information on a blank plastic card front and back.
- The information on the cards can be printed in black.

### **III. Continuing Education**

#### **A. Guidance Document (draft)**

Margie Read introduced Laurie Brajkovich who was recently promoted to supervising senior scientist for the IPM and Policy Unit. Her responsibilities include supervising School IPM, Licensing study guides and examinations and also the Continuing Education (CE) approval and processing.

Laurie discussed the draft guidance document for CE sponsors, which has already been shared for comment with APCAC, CECPM, PAPA and CAPCA, and has also been posted on the CE Lystserve. Some comments have been received, although additional comments would be welcomed. The draft manual discusses DPR's requirements for classes that can be awarded CE hours, and identifies topics that can and cannot be approved. Submit any additional comments or ideas to Laurie by 15 November. The final document will be posted to the DPR website soon after the 15<sup>th</sup>. It is also noted that guidance is a living document and as other improvements, such as those that could be recommended by the Performance Indicator Subcommittee, come to light, the document can be changed.

#### **B. CE Applications**

Judy Letterman spoke about the difficulties that arise when a sponsor is given approval for less credit than what they requested. If a sponsor is denied a class, or if approved hours are less than what was requested, it is important to let sponsor know immediately what course denied (hrs). Margie Read reminded the committee that information about approval, denial, or approval for fewer hours is sent to sponsors immediately on the approval request form. This form is faxed right after the review committee makes a decision. It does seem, however, that sponsors do not necessarily look closely at the form when they receive it and that perhaps it could be made clearer. She offered the idea of including a cover letter describing the rationale for denial or for reduction in approved hours. A number of the participants at the meeting indicated that this was a good idea, and Margie indicated that the procedure that could begin immediately.

Doug Okumura wanted to know why 30 days are needed for approval of CE applications. Margie Read explained the process, and the steps that are required for approval, which include mail delivery to Accounting, processing of payments where applicable, and evaluation of the applications by the DPR committee. Often times it is necessary to get in touch with the applying sponsors as well, because the information provided is incomplete or unclear. This makes additional time necessary so that the back and forth communications can occur.

Judy Letterman speculated that UPS and FedEx tends to sit in the mailroom, it doesn't arrive in a timely manner, which makes sponsors and applicants upset. Terry Stark stated that the mailroom is an issue and the Director of DPR should make a priority to fix. He also believes that the APCAC committee should take into consideration a change from the 30 days required time to less. Margie Read reminded Mr. Stark and the group that there are valid reasons for the 30 day turn around, and simply making a recommendation for it to be less would only intensify the problem. She also noted that when an application is submitted with a good agenda and defensible agenda descriptions it often does not take the full 30 days to approve and process. Furthermore, applications are never denied simply on the basis that they are not submitted 30 days ahead of time, but only if they are received after the course took place, or if they are submitted with insufficient information combined with insufficient time for staff to communicate with them and solicit additional information. If the committee would like to make a suggestion, It would be better to analyze what could be done to streamline the process and leave the turn around time alone. Mary Louis Flint motioned that the APCAC make an official recommendation regarding CE renewal process, and she would draft something up for consideration.

### **III. MITC mitigation**

Linda O'Connell presented information regarding a draft Methyl isothiocyanate (MITC) mitigation proposal was presented at public meetings in May 2007, and received many comments. The proposal was revised based on the comments received, and another draft version of the mitigation was sent out to all stakeholders in December 2007. At this time, based on a request from management, DPR is waiting until the VOC regulations become final before finalizing the MITC mitigation. During this time, the scope of the mitigation has been expanded to include all application methods, and to also include dazomet. In July 2009, DPR sent out a draft proposal for the expanded MITC mitigation to all stakeholders. The mitigation proposal was submitted to management in late 2009. We hope to have the mitigation in place by spring 2010. In the meantime, we are working with USEPA to coordinate our mitigation with what they have finalized.

### **IV. Maintenance Gardener subcommittee updates**

Margie Read reported that the first Maintenance Gardener Pilot Project Workshop in San Luis Obispo County (SLO) will take place on 21 November. By utilizing pass-through money from USEPA, DPR has been working with the SLO Agricultural Commissioners Office to develop the training workshops. The first classes during November and December will be held in English, and will be followed with classes in Spanish, probably in January. Guadalupe Sandoval was hired as the trainer for both English and Spanish workshops. SLO has also developed performance indicators for the workshops which include the final goal of 100% compliance with everyone certified.

### **V. Performance Indicator subcommittee updates**

Margie Read handed out a meeting summary of the APCAC Performance Indicator (PI) Subcommittee. The group participated in a telephone discussion of the following topics:

- The Draft the CE Sponsor Guidance Document

- Performance Indicator Topics
- PI Discussion for Licensing Exams
- PI Discussion for Continuing Education.

Of particular interest to the subcommittee was the topic of Online CE courses and performance indicators/acceptance criteria for them. The committee would like another meeting before APCAC meeting in February. At some point this year it is anticipated that the subcommittee will develop recommendations for approval of online courses. These recommendations will be brought to the APCAC. Comments and ideas are welcome.

#### **VI. UC IPM update**

Joyce Strand announced that after three years, UC IPM is pleased to have a new director, Kasime Alkatob. He is expected to arrive on 19 January 2010 from Kansas. Although UC Davis has experienced 20% in budget cuts, and did lose its research program, the IPM advisor programs are funded.

The fumigation study guide for Category O that UC has been working on is finally on UC website. The study guide has been edited and is in color. For the Category Q, UC IPM has developed a training program, with an illustrated 6-chapter workbook, to help prepare for exams, and Mary Louise Flint developed a power point presentation of these training procedures. The power point is also posted on the UCIPM website. The Maintenance Gardener study guide is also available on hard copy and answers the knowledge expectation questions, and other issues. Some copies will be provided to the County Agricultural Commissioners

#### **VI. Next agenda and closing announcements**

David Duncan announced that due to Jean La Duc's retirement, a replacement in the APCAC General Public position is needed. Cynthia Ray reminded the committee that other positions are expiring, including those of Scott Hudson, Tim Stone, Richard Stoltz, Ronald Berg, and Wayne Steele will be emailed to see who wants to continue on committee. The Board of Governors of the California Community College system is also lacking a representative.

The next meeting will be held on 17 February 2010. Ideas about the agenda should be directed to David Duncan at (916) 445-3870 or [dduncan@cdpr.ca.gov](mailto:dduncan@cdpr.ca.gov).