MINUTES OF THE
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL BOARD
JANUARY 21, 2010

The board meeting was held on Thursday, January 21, 2010, at the Structural Pest Control Board, 2005 Evergreen Street, Hearing Room, Sacramento, California, commencing at 8:06 A.M. with the following members constituting a quorum:

Cris Arzate, President
Jean Melton, Vice President
Luis Agurto
Bill Morris
Cliff Utley

Board member Terrel Ferreira was not present.

Board staff present:

Kelli Okuma, Executive Officer
Susan Saylor, Assistant Executive Officer
Dennis Patzer, Administration Analyst

Departmental staff present:

Kurt Heppler, Legal Counsel

## I. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Ms. Saylor read the roll call.

## II. FLAG SALUTE

Mr. Arzate lead the flag salute

## III. PUBLIC HEARING: REGULATIONS: AMEND SECTIONS 1974 AND 1996.1 OF TITLE 16 OF THE CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS RELATING TO FUMIGATION WARNING SIGNS AND INSPECTION AND COMPLETION TAGS

Mr. Heppler announced for the record that the hearing was to consider the proposed amendments of sections 1974 and 1996.1 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations as outlined in the public notice. The hearing is being held under the authority of section 8525 of the Business and

Professions Code sections 11456 and 11502 of the Food and Agriculture Code and provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act commencing with section 11300 of the Government Code. The hearing was open to take oral testimony and/or documentary evidence by any person interested in these regulations. For the record, which was being made by tape recorder, all oral testimony and documentary evidence will be considered by the Board pursuant to the requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act before the Board formally adopts the proposed amendments to the regulations or recommends changes that may evolve as a result of the hearing.

Mr. Heppler stated that if any interested person desired to provide oral testimony, he or she should stand or come forward, giving his or her name and address, and if he or she represented an organization, the name of such organization, so that there would be a record of all those who provided testimony. He stated that it is the desire of the Board that record of the hearing be clear, intelligible, and that the hearing itself be orderly, thus providing all parties with a fair and ample opportunity to be heard. He stated that after all interested parties, if any, had been heard, the issue would stand as submitted.

Mr. Heppler asked the audience if there were any questions concerning the nature of the proceedings or the procedures to be followed in the public hearing. As there were none, he stated they would proceed in chronological order to consider the Board's proposed amendments to the regulations.

Mr. Heppler stated that the proposed amendment to section 1974 (Fumigation Warning Signs), which would add a subdivision "c" to the existing regulation, read as follows: (c) All warning signs must contain the trade name of the fumigant used and its active ingredient.

There was no oral testimony in support or opposition of the proposed amendment to section 1974.

Mr. Heppler asked Ms. Okuma if any written comments in regards to section 1974 had been received. Ms. Okuma stated that no written comments in regards to section 1974 had been received.

Mr. Heppler stated that the proposed amendment to section 1996.1 to amend subsection "b" would read as follows: (b) If the registered company completes any work with respect to wood-destroying pests or organisms, it shall post a completion tag next to the inspection tag. The completion tag shall not be less than 3" by 5" and shall contain the firm's name, date of completion, and trade name of any pesticide used, active ingredient or method(s) of treatment.

There was no oral testimony in support or opposition of the proposed amendment to section 1996.1.

Mr. Heppler asked Ms. Okuma if any written comments in regards to section 1996.1 had been received. Ms. Okuma stated that no written comments in regards to section 1996.1 had been received.

Mr. Heppler suggested to Mr. Arzate that having received no testimony or documentation in support or opposition to the proposed amendment of section(s) 1974 and 1996.1, the matter stand as submitted.

Mr. Arzate asked if there was a motion before the Board to proceed with rulemaking and to delegate the Executive Officer to move forward.

> Mr. Morris moved and Mr. Utley seconded to adopt the proposed amendments to sections 1974 and 1996.1, to proceed with the rulemaking file and to delegate the Executive Officer to complete the final statement of reasons and submit it to the Office of Administrative Law for approval. Passed unanimously.

## IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE MAY 28, OCTOBER 21 AND 22, AND DECEMBER 28, 2009, BOARD MEETINGS

Mr. Utley moved and Mr. Morris seconded to approve the minutes of the May 28, October 21 and 22, and December 28, 2009, board meetings. Passed unanimously.

## V. RESEARCH UPDATE

Ms. Okuma stated that due to illness, Dr. Rust was not able to present his research at the meeting.

Dr. Lewis, U.C. Berkeley, made a presentation on "Field evaluations of localized treatments for control of drywood termite infestations in California."."

Dr. Lewis made a presentation on "Assessment of devices and techniques for improving inspection and evaluation of treatments for inaccessible drywood termite infestations."

## III. PUBLIC HEARING - CONTINUED

Mr. Heppler stated that questions had arisen after the public hearing regarding the verbiage of rule and regulations section 1996.1. He asked the board members if there were any objections to returning back to the agenda item.

Mr. Arzate stated that there were no objections to returning back to the agenda item.

Mr. Agurto asked if it was possible to make a word change at the end of section 1996.1 from verbiage "or" to "and/or" as "or" was confusing.

> Mr. Utley moved and Ms. Melton seconded that the language adopted for section 1996.1 at the regulatory hearing be left as proposed and to reaffirm the board's action to adopt it. Passed unanimously.

## VI. EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT

Ms. Okuma introduced the Board's new Chief Enforcement Officer, Bill Douglas who will begin work at the Board on February 1, 2010. Mr. Douglas is currently the Assistant Executive Officer of the Athletic Commission under the Department of Consumer Affairs.

Ms. Okuma also introduced board staff in the audience, Tom Ineichen, Structural Pest Control Board Specialist for the Northern California area, Melissa Roberts, Licensing Unit and Viki Whitaker, Administration Unit.

Ms. Okuma reported:

- The Pest Control Operators of California (PCOC) is sponsoring legislation to extend the sunset provision for the fumigation enforcement program. Assemblywoman Fiona Ma from San Francisco has agreed to carry the legislation. Martyn Hopper, PCOC, asked for the Board's support for the bill.

  Ms. Okuma asked how a sunset of the Structural Pest Control Board would affect the extension of only the enforcement program.

  Mr. Heppler stated that, in his opinion, the sunset extension provision for the Fumigation Enforcement Program would not be affected as the participating counties would continue to administer the program.

  Mr. Hopper stated that it was his impression from conversations with the Director and Assistant Deputy Director of the Department of Pesticide Regulation that they would seek legislation to keep the Structural Pest Control Board from being sunsetted.

Mr. Utley moved and Mr. Agurto seconded that the staff be directed to prepare a letter in support of the legislation to extend the sunset provision for the Fumigation Enforcement Program. Passed unanimously.

- Staff has been attempting to organize a meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee, however, it has been delayed with the transference of the Board to the Department of Pesticide Regulation and staff changes at the Board.

- The Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) is administering the Structural Pest Control Board Specialist civil service examination. There is currently one vacancy for a Board Specialist. Recruitment notice was mailed to licensees of the Board, and approximately 200 applications were received. Human resources staff will review and evaluate the applications.

- Dennis Patzer is continuing with a project, in which the previous Administrative Analyst was working on last year, to post actual accusation documents and administrative decisions to the Board's website links.

- The Board voted at a previous meeting to remove cancelled licenses from the website. The action came from the industry's frustration of licensees not reporting to the board changes of address and employment. Part of the industry's frustration was that individuals with cancelled licenses were still being associated as employees of companies because those companies were the listed company of record when the license was cancelled. There is now a statement on the website that if a consumer wants information regarding an individual whose license has been cancelled, they should contact the board. Staff was to report to the Board any feedback based on the changes. The board has been contacted by an attorney who feels that it may not be in the consumers best interest to remove cancelled licenses from the website. The attorney and Mr. Heppler have been working on the issue and will keep the Board advised.

- She has attended numerous meetings with the Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) since the last Board meeting. The majority of the meetings have been staff meetings. DPR has been very open in terms of inviting Board staff to meetings and incorporating Board staff into the DPR family.

- The board is asked to provide information to various control agencies on a regular basis. The transfer of jurisdiction is creating double duty in some instances, by staff responding to two departments. In some instances, there is confliction regarding what the board is required to do between the two agencies/departments.

- Staff is working on transferring the Board's fleet of vehicles to the Department of Pesticide Regulation, as well as credit cards that enable

Board Specialists to make purchases related to operation of the vehicles.

- The Department of Pesticide Regulation has stated it views the Structural Pest Control Board as a branch, and the Board has more authority than the Department extends to its branches. The Department stated it would be working with the Board to take over various functions currently performed by the Board. One of the functions currently under review is the cashiering function performed by the Board and the Department of Consumer Affairs. She expressed concern that if the Department were to take over the cashiering function, it could slow up processes at the Board. Mr. Arzate asked Ms. Okuma in what ways could consumers be affected by the problems she described. Ms. Okuma said that the industry would most likely feel the impact, not consumers.

- She reviewed with Chris Reardon and Chuck Andrews, Department of Pesticide Regulation, the board members, terms that expire and discussed consequences of not having a quorum. Consequences could be every administrative case being required to go to a hearing (no stipulated agreements could be approved) and that enforcement costs could skyrocket. Mr. Reardon informed her he will be talking to the Governor's Office regarding new appointments to the Board.

- The Governor's Office issued an Executive Order directing all departments to develop a plan to reduce salaries and wages by 5%.

  Mr. Morris commended Ms. Okuma and her executive staff for the incredible job that has been done keeping a positive attitude with Board staff during these difficult times.

Ms. Saylor reported:

- Licensing statistics were reviewed with the Board members.

  Mr. Morris stated that applicator license cancellations seemed to be very high and asked Ms. Saylor if there were any concerns regarding the high number of cancellations. Ms. Saylor stated that some applicators become field representatives and many others do not renew.

- New staff has been hired by the board. Janet Hogg replaced Mekki Northon who retired in December. Ila Kopp replaced Patti Jensen, who retired in November. Complaint Unit positions have been filled by Kristel Flores and Salvador Navarro. The office supervisor position will be filled on February 1, 2010 by Peggie Gibbs.

- The first quarterly audit for continuing education for applicator licensees has been completed. Fifteen percent of the renewals were audited which equated to 19 applicators. Fifteen applicators were in compliance, one surrendered the license, and three were issued a citation and fine.

- The second quarterly audit for continuing education for applicator licenses was completed. Twenty-seven individuals were audited. Twenty-three individuals were in compliance, one surrendered the license and three have yet to respond.

- Continuing education audit notices for field representatives and operators were sent in early December 2009. Four hundred field representatives were audited and one hundred and seventy-five operators were audited. The audits process has not yet been completed.

- Regulatory Action Status report was reviewed with the Board members.

## VII. DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION UPDATE

Kathy Boyle, Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR), reported that DPR and Structural Pest Control Board staff will be assisting this year in providing structural enforcement training to county agricultural commissioners. Training has been tentatively scheduled for Southern California in April and in Northern California in May.

Ms. Boyle stated that there are three registered labels for sulfuryl fluoride in California. All of the labels state that the applicator's manual is part of the label. She stated that the specimen label and the applicator's manual must be in possession of the licensee onsite at the time of the application. Only labels with their corresponding applicator's manual are acceptable as there are differences in the labels and the applicator's manual for each registered pesticide.

Ms. Boyle reported that surface water workshops have been scheduled by DPR to seek input on the development of regulations to prevent pesticide contamination of surface water. Information regarding the workshops is available on the Department of Pesticide Regulation's website. The workshops would be held at the Cal EPA building in Sacramento at 1001 I Street, on February 11, March 26, April 28, and May 11, 2010. She stated that all meetings would be from 10:00 AM to 12:00 PM. She highly recommended that board members and licensees attend the meetings.

Ms. Boyle reported that U.S. EPA is seeking to disclose inert ingredient information. The U.S. EPA website contains further information about the agency's proposed actions.

## VIII. PEST CONTROL OPERATORS OF CALIFORNIA UPDATE ON THE STATUS OF ITS CALIFORNIA AERATION PLAN (CAP)

Mike Watkins, Cardinal Professional Products, gave a PowerPoint presentation regarding the California Aeration Plan.

## IX. REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF COMMENT(S) RECEIVED DURING THE FIFTEEN (15) DAY COMMENT PERIOD REGARDING THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 1997 OF TITLE 16 OF THE CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS TO INCREASE THE WOOD DESTROYING ORGANISMS (WDO) FILING FEE FROM $2.00 PER ACTIVITY TO $2.50 PER ACTIVITY EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2010.

Ms. Okuma stated that the Board had previously met in July 2009, to increase the WDO filing fee from $1.50 per activity to $2.00. She stated that at the time of the meeting, the Board considered different options regarding the fee. The Board elected to increase the fee to $2.00, recognizing that if the industry did not experience an increase in work, there was the possibility of having to revisit the issue and increase the fee to $2.50. The rulemaking file with a fee increase to $2.00 was submitted to the Department of Consumer Affairs. By the time that the Department of Consumer Affairs submitted the package to the State and Consumer Services Agency for approval, the Structural Pest Control Board had fallen under the jurisdiction of the Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR). DPR submitted the rulemaking file to the California Environmental Protection Agency (Agency). The Board was informed it needed to amend the rulemaking package to increase the activity fee to $2.50, because $2.00 was not going to be sufficient. The Board was also informed that if the fee in the rulemaking package was not increased to $2.50, agency would not sign off on the increase at all, thereby leaving the fee at $1.50 and potentially putting the board in a very precarious position in terms of overall revenue. The board noticed for public hearing a telephone conference meeting to increase the fee to $2.50. The Board voted to increase the fee to $2.50 at the meeting and granted authority to the Executive Officer to move forward with the rulemaking file in the absence of any adverse comment. The Pest Control Operators of California did provide a written response in that comment period which is before the Board today for consideration.

Mr. Heppler stated that Ms. Okuma had summarized the situation accurately. He stated that because adverse comments were received preventing the Executive Officer to move forward with the rulemaking package, the Board

must make a decision whether it wants to proceed with the rulemaking package setting the fee at $2.50.

Bill Gaither stated that the Pest Control Operators of California was in opposition to the fee increase to $2.50 due to the current state of the economy.

Mr. Arzate asked if there were any comments from the public.

Darrell Ennes, Terminix, asked Ms. Okuma how many inspections were being done annually.

Ms. Okuma stated that the number was around 1.2 million.

Mr. Ennes stated that the proposed increase would raise an additional 1.2 million dollars. Expenses incurred by government traditionally get passed on to the consumer. He stated that Terminix did almost 170,000 inspections last year and that means that there would be an additional cost of $170,000 to Terminix in fiscal year 2010/2011. He stated that the additional fee would be passed on to consumers.

Mr. Utley stated that when the fee increase was originally discussed, Ms. Saylor told the Board that the fee should be $2.50, and the industry wanted to try it at $2.00. At the special telephone conference meeting, he requested the Board members be provided with a quarterly revenue update so the Board could adjust the fee when report filings increase, but for now the fee increase is needed because inspection reports filings are down. He said he was in favor of the fee being set at $2.50.

Mr. Arzate stated that for the public's awareness, Mr. Utley's recommendation, which was a sound one, was adopted in a positive manner by Ms. Okuma and her staff to provide the quarterly reports so that when filings increase, a determination could be made to reduce fees.

Mr. Heppler asked Ms. Okuma if it was her understanding that a raise in the filing fee to $2.50 is needed to sustain board operations.

Ms. Okuma stated that the fee increase to $2.50 was needed according to the fund condition.

Mr. Morris moved and Mr. Utley seconded to adopt the amendment to increase the fee to $2.50, and request that the Executive Officer prepare the rulemaking file accordingly and submit it to the Office of Administrative Law. Passed unanimously.

## X. CONSIDERATION OF A REVISION TO THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 1996.3 OF TITLE 16 OF THE CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS SUCH THAT THE WDO INSPECTION & COMPLETION REPORT FORM REFLECT THE ESTABLISHED WDO FEE

Mr. Heppler stated this revision is a house keeping and oversight issue to assure that the WDO fee that is adopted is reflected on the WDO Inspection and Completion Report Form so that all parties are accurately informed of the fee.

Mr. Heppler stated the purpose was to adopt the proposed changes to reflect $2.50 on the form and to circulate the language for 15 days and in the absence of adverse comments, direct the executive officer to prepare the rulemaking file and transmit it to the Office of Administrative Law.

Mr. Utley moved and Ms. Melton seconded to adopt the proposed changes to reflect $2.50 on the WDO form, circulate the language for 15 days, and in the absence of adverse comments, direct the Executive Officer to prepare the rulemaking file and transmit it to the Office of Administrative Law. Passed unanimously.

## XI. DISCUSSION AND CONSIDERATION TO RELEASE A REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL RESEARCH TO BE FUNDED FROM THE STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL RESEARCH FUND

Ms. Okuma stated that Martyn Hopper, Pest Control Operators of California, requested the Board consider releasing a Request for Proposals. A fund condition for the Research Fund was provided to the Board Members.

Ms. Saylor stated the fund condition document gives information regarding research fund expenditures for 2006/2007, 2007/2008, and 2008/2009. She stated that current expenditures for 2009/2010 were $110,000 and the Governor's budget projections for revenue for 2010/2011 is $404,000.

Mr. Arzate asked how the board's transition to the Department of Pesticide Regulation relates to the research funding.

Ms. Okuma stated that she had conversed with the Department of Pesticide Regulation about the uniqueness of this particular fund and DPR was versed on the limitations on expenditures. She stated that a representative from the DPR's Contracts Unit was present to listen to the dialogue to get a better understanding of this matter.

Mr. Arzate asked if the composition of the research advisory panel would change with the transition of the Board to the Department of Pesticide Regulation.

Ms. Okuma stated that law sets the composition of the research advisory panel and it would take a legislative amendment to change the composition.

Martyn Hopper, Pest Control Operators of California, stated that the major issue the Association has identified is bedbugs. He asked Gail Getty, University of California, Berkeley, to address the Board.

Ms. Getty stated there was a large bedbug summit in New York which received a lot of press. Bedbugs have not been addressed on the West Coast at the same level. She stated that the University has contacted officials in San Francisco in regards to holding a summit. The bedbug phenomenon primarily started on the East Coast . There is no information for the public on the West Coast regarding integrated pest management approaches or pesticide approaches to the control of bedbug populations.

Mr. Arzate asked Ms. Getty if bedbug problems were a regional issue with a prediction that it will become a statewide issue.

Ms. Getty stated that it was becoming a statewide issue and education of the public and the industry is essential.

Mr. Heppler cautioned against favoritism for any single bidder and asked the Board to keep this in mind when releasing a research fund proposal so it will be wide in scope, wide in geographical area, and promote competitive bidding to enforce itself as provided by law. He stated that the solicitation and evaluation process should be fair-square, with equal footing for everyone.

Ms. Okuma stated that in the past, the Board has released proposals nationwide, and also has limited them to California researchers. She stated proposal releases have been wide in scope and also very narrow and specific.

Mr. Utley stated that he was in favor of moving forward with a research fund proposal for bedbugs.

Mr. Agurto stated that he would like to see many types of bedbug control addressed in the research fund proposal, not just those dealing with pesticides or chemicals.

Mr. Heppler stated that the Board could consider a research fund proposal to study methods of treatment for bedbugs including alternative methods and

integrated pest management (IPM) by research facilities domiciled in California for a maximum allocated value.

Terry Harrison, Contract Analyst with the Department of Pesticide Regulation, stated that he will be working directly with the Structural Pest Control Board through this proposal and recommended that a dollar cap be placed on the research fund proposal.

> Mr. Agurto, moved and Mr. Utley seconded that the board release a request for proposals with an allocation for a maximum of $250,000, to be made available for one or more qualified vendors for the study of and treatment, including alternative treatments and integrated pest management (IPM), for bedbugs by any research facility domiciled in California. Passed unanimously.

## XII. DISCUSSION REGARDING THE RECOMMENDATION AND USE OF THERMAL INSULATION LABELED FOR STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL

Ms. Okuma stated that the board has received inquiries from the industry regarding the use of thermal insulation labeled for structural pest control. The label for the insulation includes control of termites and cockroaches, Branch 2 and 3 operations. One of the questions posed was, can this insulation be installed under a Branch 2 or 3 license or is the installation of the insulation stepping into the role of a licensed contractor.

Harvey Logan, Western Exterminators, stated that he felt the matter should be referred to the Technical Advisory Committee.

Mr. Utley stated that he agreed with Mr. Logan.

Mr. Arzate directed the board to refer the matter to the Technical Advisory Committee.

## XIII. DISCUSSION AND CONSIDERATION OF POTENTIAL LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL TO INCREASE THE COMPANY REGISTRATION BOND FROM THE $4000 REQUIREMENT

Ms. Okuma stated at the December 28, 2009 Board meeting, during public comments, John Van Hooser asked that the matter be put on the agenda for the Board to discuss whether legislation should be considered to increase the company registration bond from its current $4000 requirement.

Mr. Van Hooser stated that he was opposed to increasing the bond beyond its current $4000 limit. He stated that it would be a burden on the industry to do it at this time considering the state of the economy. He stated that he did not

see a consumer benefit in increasing the bond, but rather, a benefit to the industry as in the case of a Branch 1 company trying to collect a debt from a Branch 3 company for services rendered. He stated that this is a contract matter and should not be addressed through bond attachment.

Harvey Logan, Western Exterminator, spoke in favor of increasing the bond to $10,000 and stated that legislation should state that one company could not use the bond to collect from another company.

Mr. Arzate asked Mr. Logan if the increase of the bond from $4000 to $10,000 would further protect the consumer.

Mr. Logan stated that he believed that $4000 was not adequate to cover damage sustained by a consumer. He stated that it had been 25 years since the bond amount had been increased.

Mr. Agurto asked if the board saw a need to increase the bond amount.

Ms. Okuma stated that the board does not receive information regarding bond pay-outs to accurately ascertain the necessity to increase the bond.

Mr. Van Hooser stated that bond issues usually arise from Branch 3 situations and that Branch 2 companies do not usually have bond collection issues. He stated that he felt increasing the bond amount could be a significant burden to a small company and not as much to a large company.

Lee Whitmore stated that the Board could consider tabling the issue as the Pest Control Operators of California (PCOC) will be addressing the issue at its March 2010 meeting. If PCOC were in favor of increasing the bond, the matter could be addressed at a future Board meeting.

Mr. Arzate tabled the issue.

## XIV. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Utley inquired regarding the appointment of new board members to replace a vacant board member position and to fill vacancies that will occur when two current board members term out. He had concerns if appointments are not made, there will not be a quorum after July 2010.

Ms. Okuma responded that she had a conversation with Chris Reardon and Chuck Andrews at the Department of Pesticide Regulation regarding Board member appointments. She stated that their response was that the department would be talking to the Governor's Office about board appointments.

Mr. Morris stated that the Board members could take the initiative to speak to their representatives.

Mr. Arzate suggested that the Board address the language of its mission statement. He stated there should be a meeting of interested parties to discuss what the Structural Pest Control Board recommends to the Department of Pesticide Regulation before, if and when the Board is dissolved in regards to environmental protection, and consumer protection. He scheduled the strategic planning meeting for March 24, 2010, in Pasadena.

Ms. Okuma stated she would facilitate Mr. Arzate's direction.

## XV. BOARD MEETING CALENDAR

The next meeting of the Structural Pest Control Board will be scheduled in Sacramento on April 21 and 22, 2010.

The meeting adjourned at 1:25 P.M.

## XIV. REVIEW OF ACTIONS TAKEN AT MEETING

- Adopted the proposed amendments to sections 1974 and 1996.1, to proceed with the rulemaking file and to delegate to the Executive Officer authority to complete the final statement of reasons and submit it to the Office of Administrative Law for approval.

- Approved the minutes of the May 28, October 21 and 22, and December 28, 2009, board meetings.

- Directed staff to prepare a letter in support of the legislation to extend the sunset provision for the Fumigation Enforcement Program.

- Adopted amendment of section 1997 to increase the WDO filing fee to $2.50, and request that the Executive Officer to prepare the rulemaking file and transmit it to the Office of Administrative Law.

- Adopted proposed changes in section 1996.3 to reflect $2.50 on the WDO activity filing form, to circulate the language for 15 days and in the absence of adverse comments, direct the Executive Officer to prepare the rulemaking file and transmit it to the Office of Administrative Law.

- Directed the release of a request for research proposals with an allocation for a maximum of $250,000 to be made available for one or

more qualified vendors for the study of and treatment, including alternative treatments and integrated pest management (IPM) for bedbugs, by any research facility domiciled in California.

- Directed the board to refer the matter of thermal insulation to the Technical Advisory Committee.

- Tabled discussion regarding increasing the current $4000 bond requirement.

- Strategic Planning Board meeting will be scheduled in Pasadena on March 24, 2010.

- Next meeting of the Structural Pest Control Board will be scheduled in Sacramento on April 21 and 22, 2010.

## XVII. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

There were no public comments.

## XVIII. CLOSED SESSION

The Board went into closed session pursuant to subdivision (c)(3) of Section 11126 of the Government Code, the Board met in closed session to consider proposed disciplinary actions and stipulated settlements.

## XIV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:10 P.M.

CRIS ARZATE, President

Kelli Okuma

KELLI OKUMA, Executive Officer

4/22/10
DATE