Glassy-Winged Sharpshooter
Environmental Protection Task Force
November 7, 2000

Meeting Summary

Task Force Attendees: Ron Oshima/CDPR, Dr. Rick Kreutzer/CDHS, Dr. Les Ehler/UC Davis, Linda McElver/Central Coast Canaries, Brian Finlayson/CDFG, Mike Reid/SWRCB, Jessica Hamburger/Pesticide Action Network, Richard Greek/CACASA/SLO Ag Commission, Ann Maurice/Ad Hoc Committee for Clean Water, Hank Giclas/Western Growers Association, Tess Dunham/California Farm Bureau, John McCaull/Audubon Society-California

CDFA and Facilitation Support Team: Gerry Miller/CDFA, Aurelio Posadas/CDFA, Dr. Peter Kurtz/CDFA, Bob Dowell/CDFA, Dale Flowers/Facilitation Team, Tanya Matson/Facilitation Team

Other Attendees: James Stratton/OEHHA, Lorianne Fought/Bayer Corporation, Percy Schmeiser/Farmer and Federal and Provincial Agriculture Committee, Sean Feder/California Certified Organic Farmers

Welcome, Introductions and Review of Agenda: Dale Flowers/Facilitation Team

Dale Flowers welcomed the task force to the third of four meetings. He commended them on their efforts thus far and asked them to begin considering the framework of their report. He asked that they consider questions such as: Where are we? How will recommendations be delivered? How can we combine different objectives and perspectives into central themes?

Environmental Health Concerns of the "Acceptable Risk" Populations: Linda McElver/Central Coast Canaries

Linda McElver stated the Central Coast Canaries is an advocacy group that represents the chemically-sensitive population. Linda stated that for the chemically-sensitive population, the use of pesticides can be very dangerous, even life-threatening. Linda explained that pesticides are registered based upon risk assessment studies that leave the chemically-sensitive population in the "acceptable risk" category. She noted that in 1990, the Senate Office of Research, in the publication *Regulation vs. Practice – A Review of the California Department of Food and Agriculture's Pesticide Registration Process*, indicated that it cannot vouch for the safety of specific pesticide products currently registered for use in California. In addition, the report noted "Numerous pesticide products have been registered for sale in California lacking adequate warning for consumers." She indicated the report states further, "The Department has adopted policies and practices circumventing regulatory requirements that require full testing for acute health effects of pesticides." Linda stated the known and unknown hazards of pesticide use are not properly communicated to citizens. She indicated that the GWSS program could potentially bring the use of pesticides to every Californian's neighborhood for the sake of agriculture. These actions could leave the chemically-sensitive population unable to find safe locations to live or cause them needless suffering. Linda pointed out that the pesticides currently being utilized may not meet the requirements of the Food Quality Protection Act of 1996. In 1992, it was found that pesticide residue on some foods could make a child ill, despite

legal applications and residues. Linda stated it is her contention that the 1996 standards of the Food Quality Protection Act should be adopted in California; requiring pesticides to undergo the testing requirements of those standards before being used in California.

Linda explained that recent studies may prove that after application, exposure to pesticides is longer than risk assessments estimate due to lingering pesticide residue. Linda noted that a California Department of Health Services pilot project suggests the potential for pesticide exposure that exceeds Environmental Protection Agency chronic oral reference dose. In this pilot project, dust samples were obtained from the homes within one-quarter mile of agricultural fields. The residues found in the homes of farm workers were found to be dangerous for toddlers. Other studies have indicated that pesticide residues in the soil can be tracked indoors where they can accumulate and remain much longer than outdoors. EPA studies have found pesticides throughout the home environment: indoor air, carpet dust, and outdoor soil. Highest concentrations were found in carpet dust. Linda indicated that drift is also a problem that is not adequately addressed. The book *Designer Poisons* by Dr. Marion Moses reports that "80 to 90 percent of the sprays drift off target, at high concentrations for a mile or more and up to 50 miles." As a result, methods used to apply the pesticides use 99 percent more than needed to kill a pest. Linda explained that label instructions on pesticides indicate that the spray area can be entered after it has dried. This label instruction is not truly protective. In fact, the EPA has no information on the period of time that lawn chemicals persist in the soil.

Linda further explained how there are many diseases that have possible links to pesticide use. A significantly higher risk of Parkinson's Disease may be linked to home and garden use of pesticides. In addition, several cancer studies (breast, ovarian, lung, liver, testicular, brain, pancreatic) are linked to pesticide exposure. Linda noted that home pesticide products are generally exempt from Proposition 65, California's mechanism for alerting the public to potential exposures. Linda also noted that a major portion of the ingredients of a pesticide (the inert ingredients), are not subjected to the same testing as the active ingredients. Active ingredients are defined as an ingredient that will "prevent, destroy, repel or mitigate any pest." Inert ingredients are defined as "one that is not active." Linda indicated that there are four categories of inert ingredients that are available for use in California. The largest of those categories is List 3, which is classified as "unknown toxicity." Linda stated that in 1995, there were over 2,500 inert chemicals being used that had no known toxicology data. Linda further explained that while active ingredients are subjected to a battery of tests to determine environmental fate, toxicity, and effects on wildlife and non-target organisms, the mixture of active and inert ingredients is not assessed for the same effects.

Linda stated that her son developed asthma due to exposure to fields sprayed with Round-Up, a commonly used household product, but would not develop asthma at home when playing in his organic yard. Linda discussed the matter with EPA Round-Up specialist, Jim Tompkins. Linda stated that Mr. Tompkins indicated in a letter of May 5, 2000 that "…involving the relationship between glyphosphate exposure and asthma. …people are normally sensitive to some other ingredient in a pesticide besides the active ingredient. Petroleum distillates which are a common pesticidal ingredient can cause adverse effects in a sensitive person at levels less than one part per billion (1 ppb). The Agency does not currently require any testing that could be used to assess the risk of asthma in an exposed population." Linda indicated that the CDFA's current GWSS program fails to consider pre-existing medical conditions prior to implementing its spray program. Nor does it include any follow-up monitoring on the health or environmental effects.

Linda stated that there are no studies to determine if the benefits to the wine industry justify the public health risk. Currently, 6 percent of Californian's suffer from multiple-chemical sensitivity. Linda noted that multiple-chemical sensitivity is difficult to diagnose; however, California has recognized MCS as a disability. Linda informed the group of her own experience with pesticide exposure. She indicated that she was poisoned with pesticides 10 years ago when accidentally sprayed in the face with Dursban. Subsequent symptoms have ranged from a documented drop in I.Q., memory and attention loss to persistent headaches, blurred vision, and rashes on exposed skin. Linda explained that a pesticide exposure in Florida left her lying in her bedroom with nearly no pulse. She was subsequently placed on Florida's pesticide sensitive list and received ½mile warnings of pesticide spraying. Linda indicated that this was not sufficient prevention of exposure, so she moved to San Luis Obispo, where pesticides are not used as frequently and ocean breezes keep the air fresh. Linda indicated that people with chemical sensitivities would have to leave their homes until they could be assured that 5 half lives of the chemical have passed; the point at which approximately 97 % of the chemical is gone.

Linda concluded that the lack of protocol to address the chemically-sensitive population was distressing and that in light of the facts discussed, the emergency should be lifted and CDFA should stop all actions involving pesticide use.

Questions/Comments:

- Are there any practical approaches that could be recommended to CDFA that would reduce the exposure and associated risk? *Non-pesticide alternatives could be considered, such as wrapping vines with netting that would eliminate GWSS contact with vines.*
- There are two lawsuits that have been filed in San Joaquin and Tulare Counties, respectively, as a result of pesticide use. *The actions surrounding these lawsuits were taken prior to the inception of the State's program.*
- What measures can the state take to best address the needs of those with MCS while balancing all interests, beliefs and positions?

Organic Alternative to Pesticides and Pierce's Disease: Jessica Hamburger/Pesticide Action Network

Jessica indicated that the heart of the mission of the GWSS Environmental Protection Task Force was to explore alternative possibilities that would result in the least harm to public health and the environment. Jessica stated that while it is not acceptable to harm the public health or environment, each potential alternative for addressing the GWSS and Pierce's disease issue may have an effect. Jessica stated that most decisions are based upon risk assessment, which may generate huge amounts of data, yet miss important points by not asking the right questions. Jessica indicated that her discussion, with the mission of the task force in mind, would be focused on framing recommendations.

Recommendation No. 1. The Pierce's Disease Advisory Task Force and the Scientific Advisory Panel shall be expanded to include health, environmental and organic agriculture experts.

Jessica suggested that the group turn to organic farming for examples of how this pest may be combated while reducing any potential damage to public health or the environment. She explained that organic farming deals with pests in an integrated fashion. In fact, she stated, organic farmers will assert a greater concern with the overall GWSS program than with GWSS.

The expansion of the SAP to include environmental and health representatives could encourage the exploration of options that address environmental and health issues.

Recommendation No. 2: CDFA shall develop a plan for developing, deploying and monitoring alternatives to synthetic pesticides that pose the least possible harm to human health and the environment in sensitive areas. This will also reduce CDFA's legal liability and help preserve existing biological control of pests.

Jessica noted that ultimately, more and more lawsuits will be filed as a result of the program. At this stage, a move toward organic alternatives would circumvent the need for litigation while implementing measures that are protective of public health and the environment. Jessica indicated that there are several organic options such as bug vacuuming, yellow sticky traps, and kaolinite clay that could successfully be combined with a parasitic wasp release. These alternatives would be more protective of sensitive areas including areas where residents have health problems, wetland and riparian zones, backyard organic gardens, nature preserves, and organic farms. A plan for GWSS control on organic farms should be developed in concert with organic agriculture experts.

Recommendation No. 3: CDFA shall consult with UC scientists to develop a definition of when a "new infestation" of GWSS becomes an "established population" and is therefore no longer subject to treatment under CDFA's Rapid Response Plan and the County Work Plans.

Jessica stated that CDFA should consult with UC scientists to define when GWSS has become an established population; dissolving the need to control infestations.

Recommendation No. 4: CDFA shall use means to control the spread of the GWSS that pose the least possible harm to human health and the environment.

Jessica stated that this should include a true quarantine of nursery shipments; contingent upon the wine industry compensating them for their economic losses.

Recommendation No. 5: CDFA shall conduct research aimed at developing Pierce's Disease and GWSS control measures that pose the least possible harm to human health and the environment.

For long-term consideration, CDFA should conduct research that aims at GWSS control measures with the least possible harm to the environment. In the short term, data could be collected regarding the health and environmental effects for annual review. In addition, Jessica stated that other factors of Pierce's disease should be addressed through research. For example, Pierce's disease may be more common in certain soil types or on vines that are planted on slopes.

Recommendation No. 6: CDFA shall end the state of emergency and apply the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and other relevant laws to its Emergency Regulations and its Rapid Response Plan. CEQA provides a framework for analysis of alternatives, including their health and environmental impacts. It also provides a process for public involvement in the decision-making process.

Sean Feder of California Certified Organic Farmers provided the group with some insight from an organic grower's perspective. Sean stated that CCOF is the oldest and largest organization of certified organic growers in the state of California. CCOF membership includes approximately 800 farmers in various agricultural regions growing a variety of crops. CCOF is an advocacy organization that supports education regarding organic farming. Organic farming is holistic approach that focuses on sustainable, ecological solutions to problems. Sean indicated that it is encouraging to see CDFA take a long-term approach to control of GWSS through biological control measures such as the parasitic wasp. However, Sean indicated that CCOF opposes mandatory treatment of organic farms with synthetic pesticides. This would result in a number of impacts to organic farmers, including their crop rendered non-compliant with the California Organic Farmers Foods Act. Sean noted that a disqualification of eligibility to sell a crop as organic could potentially result in severe economic impacts. Sean explained that the use of highly-residual pesticides disrupts the complex natural communities of beneficial insects that an organic farmer relies upon heavily to control pests. Therefore, Sean stated that the CCOF would specifically recommend the measures of the Rapid Response Plan be minimized. Sean suggested that CDFA and county officials consult with organic farmers to devise methods of control specific to organic farming operations.

Sean discussed methods of control that would be feasible to an organic farming operation. These would include oils and soaps, which have been determined to be efficacious on leafhoppers, although repeated applications would be necessary. In addition, Sean suggested kaolinite clay, which has demonstrated efficacy on GWSS. Sean noted that barriers, bug vacuuming, and biological control methods would also be feasible. Botanical insecticides are just as efficacious as synthetics, but tend not to be as long-lasting. Sean mentioned that Premium Pyganic 175 is an insecticide that is currently approved for use by the Organic Materials Review Institute; however, it is not approved by CDFA or DPR. This product is a pyrethron-based botanical that could serve as a short-term solution, which would result in less disruption to the existing insect community, yet still enable the crop to be sold as organic. Sean requested that the approval of this insecticide be fast-tracked to make it available for the GWSS program.

In conclusion, Sean indicated that CCOF opposes any mandatory spraying of private property in urban areas without their consent. Sean said that carbaryl may be efficacious in the short-term, however, CCOF would question its efficacy in the long-term due to the resultant killing of beneficial insects. Sean stated that eradication would not be a feasible goal due to the fact that GWSS may have already established permanent populations. Therefore, long-term, broad-range research measures should include factors such as building resistance into plants.

Questions/Comments:

- Could Premium Pyganic 175 get a Section 18 exemption? *If it is designated as a reduced-risk material, it is possible.*
- Pyrethrons may have less effect on mammals and humans, but could have more of an effect on fish due to toxicity.
- To date, have any organic growers been forced to have their property sprayed? *No.*
- Perhaps the group should consider where the battle should be staged: in the urban and suburban areas? On farmland? The level of action could be staged at increasing levels as GWSS gets closer and closer to vineyards.
- Insecticidal soaps can have unsafe inert ingredients at low levels.
- Pierce's disease occurs in the north state; however, there are no GWSS.

- Does CDFA have any protocols to address organic farming operations? *No.*
- The Sonoma County GWSS Plan does not have any elements to address the chemically-sensitive population or organic farms.

To provide clarification on some questions about the program, Aurelio Posadas, CDFA, noted that the GWSS Program is not an eradication program for GWSS or Pierce's disease. CDFA is currently trying to eradicate new infestations. It is possible that if GWSS occupies a large area, CDFA would not try to eradicate the infestation due to its size.

- Is there an established size that would be determined as too large to take action? *There is no established threshold. Each site is addressed based upon its specific circumstances. A threshold is something the program could consider incorporating.*
- It is positive to hear that the program is not focusing on complete eradication.

GWSS Rapid Response Plan: The Emergency, Risks, Disclosure and Unintended Consequences: Ann Maurice/Ad Hoc Committee for Clean Water

Ann began by stating that this type of group was a good forum to release creative energy and generate practical policy-solutions. Ann stated that in her review of the issue, she decided to look at the origination of the problem. The legislature declared that *Xylella fastidiosa*, Pierce's disease, and the GWSS were clear and present threats to the grape industry. The legislature declared the situation an emergency and created a fund for money to come from federal, state, industry and "other sources." The rationale behind the emergency was the devastation that occurred in Temecula. Ann explained that in their testimony before the legislature, wine industry officials indicated that approximately 300 acres were lost in Temecula in 1999, and projected losses for 2000 would be approximately $6.5 million. These projected losses factored in the assumption of continuing similar loss in the following years. Subsequently, the focus of the CDFA program was on GWSS control and/or eradication. To control or eradicate GWSS, three measures were chosen: pesticides, exotic insects, and the release of bio-engineered bacteria. Ann stated that with these measures, the public has to consider the risks and/or unintended consequences. Bio-engineered bacteria can also affect humans. Exotic insects can disrupt natural species populations. Ann noted that the risks associated with the implementation of the GWSS program have to be balanced with the severity of the problem. Are the adverse risks to public health and the environment balanced with the threat of devastation to the wine industry? To have a better understanding of the threat, Ann stated that she reviewed the facts of the Temecula situation. Through discussion with agricultural and other governmental officials, Ann indicated that sharpshooters have been found to swarm in citrus groves. Yet, photos of vineyards in Temecula note young grape plantings right next to citrus groves. Ann explained that interviews with some growers indicated that there was not as great of a problem as originally speculated. Ann said that in light of the fact that knowledgeable growers are investing in new plantings adjacent to citrus groves (which have been seen to be swarming with GWSS), GWSS could not be the sole determining factor behind the viticulture devastation due to Pierce's disease. These facts lead to alternative explanations which may include that the bacteria is necessary, but not sufficient, for Pierce's disease to develop, vines may have been infected prior to planting, immune system suppression, nutritional deficiency, poor soils, or defective vines. So, Ann explained that devastation may be directly correlated with land management practices rather than GWSS transmitting Pierce's disease. An alternative explanation may include the fact that the vines already have Pierce's disease when they are planted, but they do not exhibit the signs of Pierce's disease until they experience

some kind of stress such as water depravation. Ann indicated the group should consider some questionable industry practices such as: no mandatory certification program to inspect for *Xylella fastidiosa*, planting and re-planting in known Pierce's disease prone areas, and planting highly-susceptible Pierce's disease varietals and rootstocks.

With no concrete answers to some of these questions, Ann asked whether putting the public at risk could be justified. Ann noted that Callaway, the company that presented information to the legislature regarding potential losses, actually reported that production was up from the previous year. In fact, Kern County has the highest production of grape and citrus in the state. Ann said the group must ask itself, "Why is there no devastation in Kern Country?"

Ann stated that many of the questions posed could have been answered through the CEQA process. The public and environmental health should have a priority. Ann concluded that no new funds should be allocated for the program until the CEQA process has outlined the full extent of the problem and assessed the potential environmental and public health effects.

Percy Schmeiser, a farmer and Canadian Provincial Agriculture Commission member, informed the group of his experience in controlling pests in Canada. Canada has had infestations of worms, aphids and wheat midges that have destroyed wheat crops. Any application of pesticides is meant to kill and may result in environmental damage including killing beneficial insects. In controlling wheat midges in Canada, it was determined that the farmer who sprayed pesticides for the wheat midge one year, had a larger problem with wheat midges in the following years. Farmers who decided to forego spraying the first year, did not experience as much difficulty in following years.

Questions/Comments:

- There are two options to consider based upon the information presented: either a limited sample skews the view of the overall data or, the notion of an emergency is not well-grounded.
- When examining the decision-making process, we must consider whether the magnitude of the problem justifies the program approach. If grape production is up, maybe GWSS and Pierce's disease do not pose a threat of financial disaster to the grape industry.
- Pierce's disease may be spread by other means. Are there any situations where Pierce's disease is present and GWSS is not? *Approximately 5,000 acres in the Napa Valley have Pierce's disease where GWSS is not present. There are blue-green sharpshooters in the Napa Valley which can carry Pierce's disease, but they do not move through vineyards as quickly as GWSS.*
- This group should discuss the genetic engineering research projects that are being considered.

Pesticide Selection and/or Alternatives: Bob Dowell/CDFA

Bob Dowell gave a short overview of the decision-making process behind the selection of a non-pesticidal alternative. Bob explained that the criteria for selecting a non-pesticidal alternative included its efficacy in replicated tests with appropriate controls, its registration for use in California, whether or not it meets the goals of the program either directly or indirectly, and if it is approved for use by the SAP. To begin the process, CDFA staff consulted available literature, the SAP, and other knowledgeable individuals about potential options. CDFA operational staff reviewed the potential options and determined whether the option was feasible and would meet

the needs of the program. Subsequently, CDFA management reviewed the resultant recommendations of staff. Bob noted that CDFA staff considered several potential options including: biological control, mass trapping, "soft insecticides," trap crops, physical barriers, GWSS pathogens, GWSS predators, and repellents. Bob stated that research conducted to date has led to the identification of a GWSS egg parasite. Currently, CDFA staff is working very hard to rear the parasites, host plants and GWSS in large numbers to continue to study the efficacy of the egg parasite. Bob explained that mass trapping efforts with yellow sticky tape conducted had not been very successful due to the fact that yellow sticky tape does not work well in low population density situation. Although trapping works well in high density situations, it has been determined that overall, visual surveys are more effective. Bob indicated that additional research needs to be conducted to develop a better trapping system for GWSS, but in the short-term, it is unlikely that it would be successful in lowering GWSS numbers. The soft insecticides considered by CDFA include soaps, botanicals, and insect or growth regulators. Efficacy data on these methods are lacking and testing is underway. If these are determined to be efficacious, CDFA will evaluate their usefulness in the overall program. Bob indicated that the use of trap crops can be very effective in certain situations. Trap crops lead the insect away from cash crops to crops that are treated to kill the insect. However, there is currently no research on an effective trap crop for GWSS. Moreover, GWSS has a wide range of host plants which would make the trap crop method difficult. Bob stated that physical barriers are also an option. For the purposes of the CDFA program, barriers would not result in the control of the GWSS spread, but could be an effective mechanism for individual growers. There are no data to support the efficacy of physical barriers. Bob noted that pathogens can be a very effective control measure that could greatly lower GWSS numbers. Currently, research is underway to determine if a GWSS pathogen is available. Bob noted that there are a number of generalist predators in California that could eat GWSS; however, no specific GWSS predator is known. Generalist predators have not been successful at controlling leafhopper numbers overall and GWSS control may be similarly unsuccessful. Repellents have also been considered. Repellents do not reduce or prevent the spread of GWSS. Since there is no available data on the efficacy of repellents against GWSS, testing is currently underway. If repellents are found to be efficacious, they could protect grapes against transmission of Pierce's disease.

Questions/Comments:

- What about blue traps? *Blue traps were tested and it was determined that yellow were more effective.*
- Have some of the alternatives been determined to be useless to the program because they do not result in a reduction of GWSS numbers? *The goal of the program is to contain and reduce the spread of GWSS. If the pest is repelled, it results in the control zone becoming larger.*
- Repellents could be used to drive GWSS out of vineyards or out of neighborhoods where chemically-sensitive persons reside.
- Imidacloprid, one of the pesticides being used in the program has received a Section 18 exemption for use in the emergency situation. That means that it is not federally-registered. *A Section 18 is an exemption from the normal federal registration requirements. It is a form of registration itself. The exemption was obtained for use on citrus. However, imidacloprid is fully registered for use on landscape plants, etc., for which it is currently being applied as part of the program.*
- The pesticide products being used as part of the program are very controversial. The section 18 for use on citrus is only valid for a short period of time.

- Some of the pesticides being used for the program have not undergone the full EPA registration process? *Some exemptions were requested, such as the use of imidacloprid (or Merit) on citrus and in nurseries.*

Dale Flowers introduced William Hearns from the Legislative Analysts Office. Dale explained that many questions had been posed with respect to the scope of this group and William may be able to answer some of those questions.

William indicated that it is not the role of the Legislative Analysts Office to define the role of this task force. William reminded the group of the opening remarks of Secretary Lyons wherein he indicated that the discussions of this group should be open and inclusive. William stated that the group had been open and inclusive thus far. With respect to the report, William said that it could be as inclusive as the group desired. It will be valuable for the legislature to receive a report that includes areas of consensus; however, other views, where there is no consensus, could still be presented in the report.

Questions/Comments:

- What is the intent of the legislature? Was it their intent that we look at a broad scope (i.e. overall program, research allocations, pesticide registration process, etc.) or have a more narrow focus? *The legislature does not want to constrain the discussions of this task force. The task force can discuss a broad range of issues if it feels it is necessary. Bear in mind the time constraints and the need to produce a report.*
- There has been a problem with getting information in a timely manner such as what amount of money is being allocated for specific kinds of research. How can we prepare a report if we don't have all the information necessary? *The timeframe to prepare this report is very short. If required information that should reasonably be delivered to you has not been, you can request the presence of the appropriate person to present that information at a meeting. There is some information that cannot reasonably be expected to be delivered in time or is simply incomplete or unavailable.*
- This task force should keep in mind that these discussions are the first round process that is opening up the dialogue for discussion in future task forces and hearings.

Overview of GWSS Program in California: Bob Dowell/CDFA

Bob described the current situation regarding GWSS in southern California. Currently, is it widespread over several hundred square miles of Kern County centered around the city of Bakersfield. There have also been isolated finds of GWSS in Tulare, Sacramento, Butte, Fresno and Contra Costa counties. The SAP determined that the infestation in Kern County is too widespread to be dealt with and that GWSS had become permanently established. However, the SAP felt that it was possible to control isolated infestations in Tulare and Fresno counties through the Rapid Response Plan. Bob stated that the SAP also recommended monitoring activities be conducted in order to determine whether or not Rapid Response Plan activities were effective at lowering GWSS numbers. To date, the SAP has found that the treatment program in Tulare County has markedly reduced the numbers of GWSS. The SAP requested that monitoring continue in the spring to determine if treatment resulted in lowering of dispersal numbers. The goal of the CDFA program is to contain GWSS infestations in southern California and prevent the continued spread of the pest in northern California until a solution to

the Pierce's disease problem can be developed. To that end, there are two paths that could be taken: protect the crops or take treatment action against GWSS where it is found. Bob noted that while protection of crops could be effective, it does not meet the goal of reducing GWSS numbers outside that crop and, there are no data to indicate crop protection methods would be efficacious for the target crop. Bob stated that treatment where GWSS is found may lead to reduced numbers overall and may eliminate small infestations.

Questions/Comments:

- Has any research been conducted in Tulare County on the impacts to beneficial insects? *No.*
- Perhaps the goal should be to slow the spread of GWSS into northern California, not prevent the spread. Slowing the spread into northern California leaves time for research to develop some methods to prevent the spread of Pierce's disease once the pest arrives.

Public Involvement in Decision-Making and Water Concerns: Bob Dowell/CDFA

Bob stated that he had outlined some details regarding public involvement and water quality concerns to provide answers to some questions previously asked by the task force. Bob indicated that there were opportunities for public input into the program. Prior to implementation of a treatment program, public meetings are held to hear comment and answer any questions. In addition, a 30-day posting and public comment period is provided for all registration of pesticides and/or Section 18 exemptions. The SAP public sessions also provide an opportunity for input. CDFA has also received telephone calls and written comments from the public stating their concerns regarding the GWSS program. All concerns are reviewed by CDFA staff and reported to the current head of the Department, Bob Wynn.

Questions/Comments:

- The SAP determined not to address the several hundred square miles of GWSS occupation in Kern County. Instead, it chose to address smaller infestations where there is a chance to control or eradicate. Is there an established threshold that is defined as too large to control? *There are no established thresholds. Each case is examined based upon site-specific circumstances.*
- What is CDFA doing in Kern County regarding GWSS on citrus? *CDFA has stopped all movement of fruit out of the infested area. Packing plants with crop have been closed temporarily and owners are setting off insecticide bombs. The program will be expanded to look at the movement of fruits. Shipments of table grapes have been inspected all year and no problems have been found to date. Table grape inspection will continue through the remainder of the year.*
- Are there any other pesticides that have been determined to be efficacious on GWSS? *Carbaryl and malathion were determined to be efficacious. The SAP chose carbaryl.*
- The public should understand the information reviewed and the comparisons made by the SAP that led to the recommendation of carbaryl.

Recommendations Framework: Dale Flowers/Facilitation Team

Dale indicated that he had spoken to most of the members of the task force regarding the framework of the recommendations. He asked that the group discuss how to frame their recommendations and begin to consider the transition into a report to the legislature. The following comments were made:

- Some of the group's discussions have been questioning the judgments of CDFA and the DPR. If the group is going to present those discussions in the report, we should ensure that the facts are accurate.
- It would be impossible to evaluate all the variables that go into the decision-making process. The group has to proceed with the understanding that decisions have been made on firm ground.
- There may still be some scientific questions that are unanswered. The group should bear in mind that there will be further review of this program by the legislature.
- The report could indicate that in certain cases, there was not sufficient information on which to base recommendations. This group is providing recommendations with the best available knowledge and information. With that in mind, the report could outline that some SAP recommendations seem legitimate; other decisions may have some unresolved issues.
- There are some fundamental questions that may arise as a result of the presentations heard today. The data to answer those questions may not be available at all.
- This group could outline the points where there seems to be data gaps, or insufficient data to come to concrete conclusions. A recommendation could be to address the broad range public issues that this group has discussed. However, we should move forward with recommendations on the more specific issues where there is consensus. Without forward momentum, the work accomplished to date would be discredited. Recommendations can include areas where further research should focus.
- This group can integrate its concerns with the GWSS program along with broader concerns regarding pesticide registration and use by proposing alternatives that will result in less harm to public health and the environment. It is not necessary to question the registration process of pesticides to arrive at those recommendations. The group could agree to disagree on the issues surrounding the pesticide registration process; however, whatever the position on that issue, the focus still remains on alternatives to pesticide use.

Dale Flowers then presented the group with a list of general areas of concerns developed from the previous meetings. The General Areas of Concern were as follows:

1. Emergency conditions
2. Pesticide selection and application
3. Consideration of alternatives
4. Public information – disclosure/involvement
5. Public health and safety
6. Effects on all pollinators
7. Effects on species and endangered species
8. Environmental considerations (effects on water quality, air, land)
9. Research

Dale suggested a couple of different approaches to addressing these General Areas of Concern. First, he suggested that the task force break into working subgroups and each subgroup would return with two or three of the most important recommendations on each of those areas of concern. Second, Dale indicated that each task force member could write down their own recommendations and submit them to be attached to the overall report. Dale indicated that if consensus can be found on some of the issues, those issues could make up the body of the report. For those who have differing views on the remaining issues, a minority report could be drafted.

Questions/Comments:

- This task force was created by the legislature, making it a state body. Subdividing the group may not be an option.
- There are some areas where this group disagrees; however, there are some powerful areas of agreement. Those areas of agreement should be identified up front in the report. If the work of this group results in a compilation of several individual reports, the strength of the agreement is lost, and four weeks of work becomes fruitless.
- A binder of 15 different opinions will not be helpful to the legislature and it is unlikely that those opinions would be read.
- The report could outline the findings of this task force based upon the information presented and available. Based upon the findings, recommendations could be made.
- The legislature asked this group to identify its issues with respect to public health and the environment. The report should concisely present those issues.

Dale concluded the discussion by asking each member of the group to identify the three most important recommendations for each general area of concern. He requested that these recommendations to be e-mailed to Gerry Miller/CDFA for presentation and review at the next meeting. Dale also asked the group to consider the framework of the report.