

DRAFT

DRAFT

MINUTES OF THE
WATER QUALITY COMMITTEE MEETING
STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL BOARD

The meeting was held on Tuesday, June 26, 2007, at the Structural Pest Control Board, 1418 Howe Avenue, Sacramento, California, commencing at 10:14 AM with the following members constituting a quorum:

Leonard Fromer, M.D., Chair
Jerry Farris
Tom Mumley
Eric Paulson

Board staff present:

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

I. ROLL CALL

Dr. Fromer read the roll call.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE APRIL 4, 2007, MEETING

The minutes were approved by unanimous consent.

III. DISCUSSION REGARDING POSSIBLE STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL BOARD DEVELOPMENT OR ENDORSEMENT OF A STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL IPM CERTIFICATION

Ms. Saylor distributed a packet of information to the committee members concerning Integrated Pest Management (IPM) and EcoWise, a developing IPM certification program.

Dr. Fromer asked for information that came out of the April Board meeting in San Diego.

Ms. Okuma responded that the Board appointed a task force to define IPM and another task force to examine California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 1999.5 to determine if there is a need for amendments to allow for certain truthful claims in advertising. The two task forces met in May and will meet again in June. The issue of certification was brought up out of the task force meetings and it has not been

determined if the Structural Pest Control Board (Board) will provide the actual certification. As a board under the Department of Consumer Affairs, the Board is not in the business of endorsing services. The question before the committee is should the Board be working towards an endorsement program whether it be internal or through an outside entity.

Mr. Mumley understood that the two task forces were formed in response to the Water Quality Committee's recommendations. The committee's suggestion of certification through continuing education would have to wait until the definition of IPM is developed.

Mr. Paulson reported that he has been working with the Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) as well as with EcoWise who will have a representative speak before the committee. The industry has been working closely with the EcoWise program. The program's goal is to be able to certify individuals and sights that practice IPM. Once the program is up and running, the EcoWise program would ask the Board to be approved to certify those who practice IPM. A similar situation occurred when the Africanized Honey Bee Committee petitioned and succeeded to be included in the Board's statutes.

Mr. Farris thought that the committee had decided to certify through continuing education. The discussion had been tabled until a definition of IPM had been developed.

Mark Rentz, DPR, presented issues that his department is struggling with. DPR has a Pest Management Advisory Committee, which makes recommendations on issues that could arise in the coming years. One of the topics that the committee has devoted its resources to is Urban Pest Management (UPM). The agricultural setting is advanced when it comes to IPM but the urban setting is not. DPR would prefer to adopt a certification program from the private sector that would provide the guidelines for IPM certification. One issue that the committee will have to discuss is the difference in certification if an individual gained certification through an outside program or through continuing education.

Dr. Fromer stated that in the field of health care providers, the state government recognizes that it is impossible to certify individuals other than a license. There is a minimum set of requirements to gain a license but specific types of care are not licensed. There are agencies and programs that recognize excellence in particular fields. This method of certification could be used as a model for the Board.

Mr. Farris stated the he does not see the Board as having the staff or resources available to have its own certification program. He suggested that the Board raise the bar on the minimum requirements for a license through both pre-licensing and post-licensing education requirements. The prospective field representatives could be required to complete courses prior to taking the exam similar to the pre-operator course requirement for prospective operators. The continuing education requirements for renewal could include the IPM specific courses.

Ms. Okuma agreed that the Board does not have the necessary resources to develop a certification program.

Mr. Paulson commented that since neither the Board nor DPR will be in the business of certifying those that practice IPM, the two agencies should be open to accepting the program that EcoWise is developing. The EcoWise program should have the certification guidelines finalized in 18 to 24 months to present to the Board.

Dr. Lewis stated that the University of California would like to be more involved with the proceedings concerning UPM and IPM. Mary Louise Flint of UC Davis will be in contact with the Board.

Ted Shapas, EcoWise, introduced himself and provided information about the EcoWise program. The EcoWise program may be the only set of IPM certification standards in the country. The program's stakeholders have a diverse membership and the standards have been updated every three to four months. The program has been funded by state grants and was just renewed for two additional years. The long-term status is in question but if the industry and agencies adopt the program, EcoWise will have life.

Mr. Paulson suggested following the National Organic Program from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) in which fixed standards were set and then private industry programs met the fixed standards and provided certification.

Dr. Fromer stated his concern that California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 1999.5 would have to be amended to allow for industry members to state that they are certified to practice IPM.

Mr. Patzer stated that if there was a certification body, there would not be a problem under the Board's current laws and regulations for individuals to advertise that they are certified. Current examples in the industry are those that advertise membership in PCOC, National Pest Management Association (NPMA), or the Better Business Bureau. CCR Section 1999.5 prohibits against making claims about services provided.

Mr. Farris recommended that once a set of IPM standards is developed, the Board as well as DPR should develop a seal or logo to signify IPM certification. There could be multiple certification programs in the marketplace that would certify individuals and sites as long as they meet the minimum set of IPM standards recognized by the Board.

Mr. Rentz suggested that when EcoWise is ready to present their program, the Board and DPR hold a joint hearing. Before that point, which would be eighteen months at the earliest, both the Board and DPR would need to examine if the agencies have legal authority under current law to allow for claims of certification.

Mr. Rentz suggested that the committee make a motion to direct Board and DPR staff to meet with their Legal Counsel to examine if there are existing authorities and mandates in terms of adopting criteria for IPM certification standards.

Dr. Fromer stated that making a specific motion would prevent background information from being included. He suggested that the committee members correspond through email to formulate a detailed motion.

IV. AGENDA ITEMS FOR FUTURE MEETINGS

The committee discussed conducting the next meeting in September.

Mr. Mumley stated that he would like the committee to review its role and purpose.

Mr. Paulsen recollected that previous discussion included education for IPM issues and also water quality issues not aside from IPM. This education would concern the branch 2 and 3 licenses. There had been discussion to include the branch 1 licenses through air quality education.

Mr. Patzer suggested formulating a pamphlet that would provide information for consumers concerning IPM and water quality issues.

Mr. Rentz stated that if it is determined that the Board does have authority, the committee should assess what role government has in terms of compliance.

Mr. Farris suggested that the committee members examine and critique the EcoWise and IPM Star programs for the next meeting.

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Dr. Lewis stated that he would like the University of California campuses involved with the discussion. The UPM programs have been a lower priority to agricultural programs so he would like higher-level university types present so that programs could get developed.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Dr. Fromer adjourned the meeting at 12:24 PM.

LEONARD FROMER, Chair

KELLI OKUMA, Registrar

DATE