MINUTES OF THE
PRETREATMENT COMMITTEE
STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL BOARD
February 22, 2005

The meeting was held on February 22, 2005, at the Structural Pest Control Board, 1418 Howe Avenue, Suite 18, Sacramento, California, commencing at 10:00 AM with the following members constituting a quorum:

Ron Moss, Chair
Ray Carrier
Kevin Ethridge
Rick Walsh

Board staff present:

Carl Smitley, Enforcement Coordinator

Committee member Randy Zopf was not present.

When the meeting opened, Kevin Ethridge stated he would like to go on record as being opposed to the committee's progress on the requirement for prior notification of pretreatments. Ethridge said he originally did not like the idea and has since returned to his position of opposition. He feels a pre-notification requirement would not help in the enforcement of existing regulation and would be an unnecessary encumbrance and expense to his company and the industry. He said the companies that under bid/under apply chemical would not comply with any new regulation.

Kevin Ethridge introduced Carl John Martin, an "Independent Consultant" from Arizona. Martin stated his opposition to pre-notification as an additional regulation regarding pretreatments. He feels existing regulations are not enforced and additional regulations would be useless.

Rick Walsh stated a pre-notification for pretreatments would be a useful enforcement tool, much like the Notice of Intent for fumigations. This additional tool would provide a practical means of monitoring pre treatments for compliance.

Kevin Ethridge was concerned nothing would be done if companies do not notify. Walsh said if it is found a company is not notifying then it would be considered a "serious" violation and a NOPA would be issued, just as is currently being done with fumigation notifications.

The Committee asked PCOC President Harvey Logan for his thoughts on the proposal. In summary, Logan felt there was a need for pre-notification; however, he felt the industry would never support any additional fees associated with such notification.

After much discussion by both Committee members and the public audience, it was decided to proceed with the proposed pre-notification requirement.

The Committee's slightly modified its tentative form, voted and adopted it by a 4 to 1 margin.

The Committee discussed and modified its tentative version for the definition of a preconstruction liquid soil treatment. The definition was voted on and adopted in a unanimous 4 to 0 vote.

The Committee discussed and prepared a tag to be placed on the property or lot pretreated. The tag contents was voted on and adopted in a unanimous 4 to 0 vote.

The meeting adjourned with our recommendations to be presented for consideration at the next Board Meeting.