

PESTICIDE REVIEW COUNCIL MEETING

MINUTES

May 25, 2006

Florida Department of Agriculture & Consumer Services

Division of Plant Industry, Conner Building

1911 SW 34th Street

Gainesville, Florida 32608

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Dr. Joe Sekerke, (rep. Dr. David Johnson) Florida Department of Health (FDoH)

Mr. Ed Irby, Environmental Groups

Dr. Dennis Howard, Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (FDACS)

Dr. Christopher Saranko, Toxicologist

Dr. Mark McLellan, Institute of Food & Agricultural Sciences (IFAS)

Mr. Richard Pfeuffer, South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD)

Dr. Mel Kyle, Ag Chemical Industry

Mr. Rick Hicks, (rep. Jerry Brooks) Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP)

Dr. Wendy Graham, Hydrologist

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT

Mr. Dave Eggeman, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FFWCC)

Mr. Jerry Brooks, Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP)

Mr. Bobby W. Newsome, Grower Representative

Dr. David Johnson, Department of Health (DoH)

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. Andy Rackley, FDACS

Dr. Davis Daiker, FDACS

Mr. Mike Page, FDACS

Dr. Richard Lewis, HSA

Ms. Patty Lucas, FDACS

Mr. Dale Dubberly, FDACS

Mr. Thomas Eberhart, FDACS

Dr. Ashok Shahane, FDACS

Ms. Marie Lopez, FDACS

Mr. Paul Rygiel, FDACS

Mr. James Dodson, FDEP

Ms. Mary Hartney, FFAA

Ms. Marie Lopez, FDACS

Ms. Marlene Czerniak, FDACS

Ms. Hina Patel, FDACS

Mr. Roger Jackson, KMG-Bernuth

Mr. Fred McCormack

Mr. Marian Burndt, USGS

Mr. Mike Aerts, FFVA

Mr. Scott Chumar, FFBF

Dr. Fred Fishel, IFAS

Ms. Joan Flocks, UF

Opening Remarks:

Dr. Dennis Howard, Chair, called the Pesticide Review Council (PRC) meeting to order at 9:03am. Dr. Howard began by informing the audience that this is a public meeting and the council welcomes input; however, comments should be held to 5 minutes per speaker during the public input session before the close of the meeting. Dr. Howard informed the council that Mr. Steve Rutz, former chair of the PRC, resigned from the Department of Agriculture & Consumer services (FDACS) in January. This led to the chair position being open and as stated in the guidelines, the vice-chair would assume the chair role. However, as Dr. McLellan, the new vice-chair, had not yet served on the council, the decision was made to keep a FDACS employee as the chair and Dr. Dennis Howard was asked to fill that vacancy. The current officer positions are set to run through June, 2007.

The chair introduced Mr. Andy Rackley to the PRC. Mr. Rackley, Director of the Division of Agricultural Environmental Services (AES), recognized that the Pesticide Review Council is very important to the Department of Agriculture and his division. He stated that he is delighted to be director of AES; his background includes chemicals, pesticides, farming organization, and trade organizations. It is extremely important that the use of pesticides in Florida be judicious, safe and environmentally sound. In the director's position, it is Mr. Rackley's responsibility to look at all the issues that relate to pesticides and to serve as a conduit for information and make sound decisions based on good science without regard for personal opinions. Mr. Rackley noted the advantage of the PRC, whose scientists and professionals have a broad range of expertise, are able to provide sound advice on pesticide-related issues. The advice that comes from this group is valued and appreciated and an invitation was extended for any PRC member to meet on an individual basis to discuss any issue.

Mr. Rackley recognizes the great responsibility the Department of Agriculture has in regulating pesticides in Florida. As the state's rapidly growing population expands into agricultural areas, conflicts can arise that need to be addressed by facts and good science.

Agenda Review and Modification:

Dr. Howard outlined the agenda and asked if any revisions were needed. No amendments were suggested and a motion was introduced by Dr. Mel Kyle and seconded by Mr. Ed Irby. The motion passed unanimously and the agenda was adopted.

Review of Draft Minutes from, January 19, 2005, Meeting:

A motion was made to accept the minutes of the October 5 meeting by Dr. Chris Saranko and seconded by Dr. Mel Kyle. The minutes were approved unanimously, without changes.

Old/New Business:

There was no old business. Dr. Howard stated that it was his first PRC meeting as Chairman and it was a privilege to serve in this capacity.

Agency Status Reports:

DACS, Bureau of Compliance Monitoring, Mr. Dale Dubberly:

Operation Cleansweep 2005-06

Mr. Dale Dubberly explained that the Bureau of Compliance Monitoring (BCM) operates the Cleansweep Program for the FDACS. The council has been advised of the program in the past and was given a progress update. Operation Cleansweep is a program for the collection and

proper disposal of cancelled, suspended and unusable pesticides, all at no charge to the participants. Items accepted are: cancelled pesticides, suspended pesticides, unusable pesticides, restricted-use pesticides, unknowns, custom blends, experimental use pesticides, and pesticides in aerosol cans. Items that are not accepted in the program but are dealt with in other programs are: pesticides in pressurized cylinders, fertilizers, spreaders, stickers, adjuvants, nutritionals, dyes, household chemicals, etc.

Industries that have taken advantage of this program are: farms, golf courses, pest control, citrus, landscape, nurseries, veterinary, forestry, parks/cemeteries, private applicators, greenhouses, and dealers/manufacturers. These participants have accounted for the following yearly totals:

Year	Participants – lbs.
2000-2001	374 - 236,000 lbs.
2001-2002	357 - 225,000 lbs.
2002-2003	145 - 126,000 lbs.
2003-2004	211 - 251,000 lbs.
2004-2005	57 - 73,785 lbs.
2005-2006	104 - 89,000 lbs.

After funds were expended this year, 14 counties were still awaiting service. This demonstrates that continuation of the operation is needed.

2006 WPS Legislative Update

Mr. Dale Dubberly gave a report on the 2006 legislative year pertaining to the Worker Protection Standard Report. The Governor’s Office has re-established a joint commission of migrant worker affairs. This is composed of members of the House and Senate who examine all issues involving migratory workers. Pesticides were the number one issue on the agendas of those meetings. The Department requested ten new positions and 730,000 dollars to assist in

compliance regulation of the worker protection act. As with a past request for more personnel and funding, this was granted. Eight of the ten positions will be for field inspectors; the others will be for a case processor and for clerical support.

WPS Compliance Report

There are about 300,000 farm workers in the state of Florida. After analysis, we have determined where to geographically locate the eight new inspectors to best address compliance issues. For the period between 1995 and 2001, we have compiled a list of total inspections vs. violations which shows that nurseries are a major source of worker safety issues, accounting for 40 percent of the total violations. We are going to focus on the horticulture industry to reduce their violations of central posting of information and other requirements. Training will be an important path to solving most of the compliance issues in Florida. Worker Protection Standards will be a continuing issue and will be on the forefront of rule-making by EPA and Florida.

WPS "Road Show" Accomplishment Report

The Worker Protection Safety Road Show is a cooperative effort with the University of Florida to help growers understand and comply with the standards of worker safety. The Road show was held in various cities and counties in the state: Homestead – March 6, Belle Glade – March 7, Palm Beach – March 7, Immokalee – March 8, Palmetto – March 8, Bartow – March 9, St. Augustine – March 9, Plant City – May 8, Quincy – May 9. The major Goals of the program are to improve compliance with the standard, ensure a healthy workforce and to provide a better understanding of recordkeeping, posting (central and field), the new HTC manual and training.

DACS, Bureau of Pesticides, Dr. Davis Daiker

Arsenical Herbicides Update

Dr. Davis Daiker, Administrator of the Scientific Evaluation Section in the Bureau of Pesticides, gave an update to the council on arsenical herbicides. Dr. Daiker talked on the progress of the prospective groundwater study since the last PRC meeting on October 20th, and also provided an update on the EPA draft risk assessments on organic arsenical herbicides.

On October 19th, 2005, staff of the Methane Arsenic Acid Research Task Force (MAARTF), their consultant (HAS Engineering), FDACS, and FDEP met to discuss changes to the MSMA and DSMA master labels and the design of the prospective ground water. A proposed label revision of note was the insertion of “spot treatment only” language on the labels of Monosodium Methanearsenic (MSMA) and Disodium Methanearsenic (DSMA) products intended for use on turf in Florida. In addition, stakeholders also discussed details of the study design relating to (1) the study plot size- ¼ acre vs. one acre, (2) the number of soil borings/samples, (3) the sampling frequency- monthly vs. quarterly, (4) the analytical requirements- i.e., when to speciate arsenic, and (5) the duration of the study.

Since the October meeting, stakeholders worked to finalize the minutes from the October meeting and again discussed study details related to plot size and sampling frequency. In April 2006, HSA submitted a site selection status report and described efforts to identify a site for the study. Participants are continuing to move forward with site selection activities.

On Apr. 5, 2006, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) released its initial draft risk assessments on the organic arsenical herbicides: MSMA, DSMA, Dimethyl Arsenate (DMA), and Calcium Methyl Arsenic (CAMA). These assessments were conducted as part of EPA’s Re-registration process which is conducted on “older” active ingredients to ensure that

they meet current scientific and regulatory standards, and to consider new research on the toxicity and carcinogenicity of arsenical herbicides and their degradation products in the environment. EPA is seeking stakeholder/public input which is due by June 5, 2006.

The risk assessments evaluated multiple exposure routes (food, soil, and drinking water), chronic and acute exposure scenarios, and cancer and non-cancer endpoints. The risk assessment was complex, reflecting the complex nature of arsenical chemicals and their behavior in the environment. Questions critical to the risk assessments included: Do organic forms of arsenic persist in the environment? Do organic forms of arsenic convert, with time, to inorganic arsenic forms?

The complexity of these risk assessments was attributed, in part, to the following factors:

- Arsenic can occur in various forms in the environment (organic vs. inorganic).
- Various forms of arsenic may have varying toxicities (moderate vs. low)
- Various forms of arsenic may have carcinogenic and non-carcinogenic effects.
- The environmental fate of arsenic is dynamic and impacted by environmental conditions (e.g., methylation vs. demethylation, bound vs. unbound, soil chemistry)

In conducting their risk assessments, EPA considered the following questions:

1. Could the application of organic arsenical herbicides lead to accumulation of total arsenic in soil? If so, could this accumulation be mitigated and what effect might mitigation have on use practices?
2. Could application of arsenical pesticides increase total arsenic in water (surface and ground)? If so, could this be mitigated and what effect on use practices would mitigation have? Mitigation measures could include reducing application rates and frequencies, requiring buffers from wells or water supplies, etc.

3. Would use of the organic arsenical herbicides expose homeowners to unacceptable risks from total arsenic in the residential setting?
4. Would use lead to risk excessive exposures for non-target organisms?

In their risk assessments, the EPA assumed that arsenic from pesticides is not lost but redistributed and transformed throughout the environment; the agency based the risk assessment of MSMA, DSMA, and CAMA on the toxicity of Monomethyl Arsenate (MMA). EPA made no evaluation of cancer risks for the organic forms of arsenic, since no cancer endpoint was selected for these forms.

EPA evaluated the risks to humans and non-target organisms and considered dietary exposure, drinking water exposure, occupational (handler) exposure, residential incidental soil ingestion, and residential dermal exposure. Where appropriate, EPA considered the role of inorganic and organic arsenic in the risks associated with the arsenical herbicides.

EPA concluded that the Margin of Exposure for occupational exposures (mixers, loaders, applicators, etc.) all exceeded 100 for CAMA, MSMA, DSMA and DMA, suggesting no unacceptable risk. With the exception of DMA use in turf renovation (MOE 75), all post-application, occupational exposures, were not associated with any unacceptable risks. In addition, on the day following application, the risk associated with DMA use in turf renovation was acceptable. Residential mixer, loader, applicator exposures had no unacceptable risks.

Regarding residential, post-application exposure, acute incidental oral exposure to DMA was found to be unacceptable, as was the aggregate residential post-application risks for DMA (MOE 3) and CAMA (MOE 85). No unacceptable acute risks were associated with post-application, residential exposure to MSMA or DSMA. A further conclusion of note by EPA was, "...risks to toddlers [or adults] incidentally ingesting soil from an area that had been treated

with compounds that transformed to inorganic arsenic for several years might be a concern.”

Therefore, FDACS suggests that this pathway should be evaluated.

EPA’s estimates of surface water arsenic concentrations (ppb) were made for both turf and cotton uses using PRZM-EXAMS, and reported concentrations in exceedance of the MCL of 10 ppb. The risk assessment, however, made no assessment of the potential effect on ground water, but stated that, “Based on the environmental fate properties of organic arsenicals, leaching to groundwater is not expected to contribute significantly to the already existing burden of arsenic in groundwater except in highly vulnerable situations.”

Although there are minimal food uses for these herbicides, EPA conducted a dietary risk assessment based on the FQPA’s statement that, “acute and chronic dietary risk estimates cannot be limited to residues of DMA and MMA and their salts on cottonseed but must include all sources of dietary exposure.” Therefore, background levels and other sources of arsenic have been included in these assessments. The EPA risk assessment found that all acute risks were below levels of concern and chronic risks were acceptable when assuming 100% organic residues.

FDACS, believes that the EPA risk assessments have several limitations. First, EPA did not evaluate the risks associated with a site that had received multiple years of applications (i.e., residential, golf course, or athletic turf). EPA did suggest that a single application would result in soil levels greater than EPA’s soil screening level of 0.4 mg/kg and also stated in its assessment that “..., arsenic in its inorganic form does not metabolize and evidence indicates that it may build up in soil over time as applications are repeated.” Second, EPA conducted no assessment of the long-term (i.e., chronic) risks from arsenic species in post-application, residential exposure scenario. If organic species are persistent or can be converted to inorganic

species in the environment, should this scenario be evaluated? Third, the drinking water assessment only focused on surface water, although EPA states, “In most situations, organic arsenical pesticides should not contribute significantly to the already existing burden of arsenic in groundwater from all sources, natural and anthropogenic. In certain vulnerable circumstances in areas with low background arsenic, application of organic arsenicals may lead to an increase in groundwater total arsenic.” Florida soils typically have a shallow depth to ground water, sandy soils with low clay and organic matter, >50 inches of rainfall per year, and a background arsenic concentration of 0-4 ppb, all of which result in Florida’s groundwater being particularly vulnerable to leaching compounds.

EPA is seeking input to refine these assessments. Proposed methods of refinement include actual use and exposure information with rates, timing and kinds of practices performed. In addition, EPA will incorporate additional data on the long-term fate and persistence of organic arsenic herbicides and consider input from stakeholders.

MAA Research Task Force, Dr. Richard Lewis

Selection Site

In collaboration with the FDACS, the Methane Arsenic Acid (MAA) Research Task force is evaluating sites for a prospective groundwater (PGW) study with Monosodium Methane Arsenate (MSMA). Dr. Richard Lewis, the study director, gave a report to the council on the progress of this endeavor. This PGW study is being undertaken to determine whether the application of the monosodium methane arsenate (MSMA) herbicide in Florida soils, under reasonable “worst case conditions,” can lead to unacceptable concentrations of arsenic in groundwater.

Site selection criteria were determined to be: “Worst-case” soil type – Entisol Quartzipsamments; depth to groundwater - 10 to 30 ft below land surface; no known land-applied arsenicals; organic content below 2%; absence of flow-restrictive layers; site grade - less than 2%; adequate distance from production wells; undisturbed geology; mature Bermuda grass turf; two-acre minimum site, which is available for 2 years.

The Florida Department of Agriculture & Consumer Services (FDACS) and the Task Force agreed to the Central Ridge area as a representative area for location of the “worst-case” soil type, outside of South Florida. A database from Environmental & Turf Services, Inc. and internet resources were used to locate golf courses and sod farms in the Central Ridge area. Topographical maps were used to determine the approximate depth to groundwater on each site by comparing adjacent lake elevation to ground surface elevations. A National Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) database was used to confirm the soil types and their approximate extent. Aerial photographs were employed to find areas on the golf courses and sod farms that could be used for the study. More specific site data were gathered during initial site visits. Several sites were selected for additional visits and soil sampling.

In total, HSA engineering investigated nearly 100 golf courses and approximately 30 sod farms. None of these sites met the protocol requirements due to: lack of sufficient area for study, presence of seams of clay or improper soil type, prior arsenical usage or detection of arsenic in soil, inappropriate depth to groundwater, and/or lack of participation by site owner. Most of the sites did not meet the requirements due to multiple issues. Realizing that golf courses and sod farms are too restrictive, the search was expanded to include vacant land, which is more abundant and easily located via aerial photographs.

To consider vacant land, the Bermuda grass criterion has to be omitted from the list of requirements for suitability of the site. However, Bermuda grass sod can be transplanted, and, at the same time, vacant land has the advantages of undisturbed geology: no prior arsenical applications, availability of larger areas and fewer limitations (bunkers, etc.), as well as study security (the area can be fenced to prevent trespassers).

The search covered 100 square miles of aerial photographs south-southeast of Haines City, FL and more than 50 potential sites were identified. Sites that did not suit the required criteria were ruled out. A suitable area was located south of Haines City on H.L. Smith Road. The land in that area is clear and undisturbed, depth to groundwater is about 24 ft below land surface, soil meets protocol criteria, sufficient acreage is available to conduct the study, the land is available for the duration of the study, and the owner is very cooperative. The site is generally flat with minimal vegetation. City water and electric service are available. There is no known prior arsenical usage on the site. The soil classification was confirmed by an NRCS soil scientist to be Candler sand – uncoated Typic Quartzipsamments (Entisol).

Additionally, local sources of Bermuda grass have been located. Vendors of weather stations and irrigation systems have been contacted. Subcontractors to install the irrigation system and turf and to maintain the area (mowing, etc.) have been contacted. FDACS was invited by the MAA Research Task Force to visit the site. Upon approval, a site-specific protocol will be developed, and the study will proceed.

DACS, Bureau of Entomology & Pest Control, Mr. Mike Page

BEPC Legislative Update

Mr. Mike Page is the Chief of the Bureau of Entomology & Pest Control (BEPC) in the Florida Department of Agriculture & Consumer Services (FDACS). As the legislative session has closed, there have been some proposed changes to the statutes and rules that pertain to pest control. Florida Statutes, Chapter 482, address wood destroying organism inspections. The BEPC is charged with the enforcement of these laws.

The number one complaint about pest control services involves wood destroying organism inspections (WDOI). Complaints usually come in two forms: 1) misunderstandings by customers and 2) the quality of the WDOI. This affects licensee liability because these complaints are often litigated and place great demand on the regulatory agency's resources. To address these issues, the Bureau requested the industry consider three areas which need to be addressed to improve WDOIs, including statutory changes designed to clarify licensee-employee relationships, new requirements for training and certification specific to WDOI and standardization of procedures under which WDOI are conducted. The industry agreed to statutory changes and the development of WDO inspection standards.

In addition to the issues discussed above a number of pest control licensees were issuing pest control identification cards to individuals who technically meet the definition of "employee"; but, behave as "independent contractors". These companies have been found to lack proper training and supervision, further exacerbating the poor performance record of WDOI in the industry. Changes in the statutes were made to make language more enforceable. For example, Chapter 482.091(2), F.S. removed the word "may" and replaced it with "shall". Further changes were also made to F.S. 482.021(7) and (12) where the definitions were revised to make them clearer.

Other statutory changes included a change to the rules section of Chapter 482.051, F.S., to provide authority allowing licensees to perform secondary treatments for new construction following a complete primary treatment, to enhance the protection of a structure. F.S. Chapter 482.156 proposed changes include: clearly defining certification to mean “an individual”; expanding the types of chemical tools to include fungicides (already includes herbicides, and insecticides); eliminating the 3-year experience requirement to cut grass prior to taking the training for the limited certification and; reducing from 8 hours to 6 hours the training needed prior to examination. Proposed changes to F.S. Chapter 482.211(7) exempted “Mosquito control” but did not specifically define the term. The changes to the statute now include a clarification for the exemption to include activities conducted by a local government or district established under chapter 388 or by special act or by a contractor of the local government or district.

Rules were also affected in this legislative session. 5E-14.105 F.A.C. – Contractual agreements in the public’s interest now requires licensees to issue contracts within 30 days of the initial or final treatment and must be for no less than 1 year from the date specified, must specify wood destroying organisms covered in the contract, have a spot treatment disclosure and must comply with terms of each contract it issues. Also, an entire new section was added which includes time to retreat limitations. Once notified in writing, a licensee must inspect within 30 days and retreat an infestation within 90 days of discovery or 180 days if; access is restricted, treatment is waved or postponed in writing or property is commercial/multiunit. The licensee cannot use limitations, exclusions or conditions clauses to deny treatment or repair to a contract holder unless: the infestation or damage was primarily caused by the limitation, exclusion or condition in the contract. If the licensee was aware of a condition, exclusion or limitation, they

must provide written notification to the consumer to allow time to correct the condition. If the consumer has not corrected the condition within 60 days of written notification then licensee may use the condition to deny repair or re-treatment.

The final workshop was held in March 2006 for Rule 5E-14.149. The Enforcement Response Guideline was amended to promulgate FDACS procedures for enforcement into rule. It lists penalties ranging from a warning letter to revocation of credentials and criminal prosecution. Further, a quarterly list will be published identifying individuals or companies that operated illegally and providing a description of actions taken.

Borate Update

Borates continue to rise in popularity in Florida as a barrier method termiticide which is applied directly to the wood. The rise in popularity comes primarily because of cost and convenience to the builder but also from the ability to be more flexible with the timing of the applications. In March, we performed a special enforcement operation targeting pretreatments. Over 60 inspections were carried out over a three day period, 75% of which involved borates. Enforcement operations can inspect borate applicators after the application is completed.

Some potential problems were noted during the inspections. The majority of homes built in the central and south Florida areas are now constructed with concrete block. This creates a problem with Borate product label language which specifies that at least 60% of the linear footage of interior and perimeter base plate must be made of cellulose materials. Many block homes do not meet this rule and therefore should not be treated with borates. A secondary product can be used in conjunction with borates; however, inspections have not seen applicators performing secondary treatments to enhance the protection of structures. Also, a debris issue is

apparent: Any debris must be removed prior to the borate solution being applied. A proper barrier cannot be produced when debris or obstructions interfere or prevent the establishment of a barrier and this is a clear violation of the label and the rule.

Other noted problems are: potential mixing problems; lack of proper training; label statements being unclear; and efficacy on metal studs. Currently the SOP for the pesticide lab is the development of a field test kit to determine the specific gravity of a tank mix. A spray is applied to the wood and a color test is given to determine compliance. We are determining if a new test is necessary for enforcement purposes.

A new product is on the market called Perfect Barrier DOT Wood or "Bluewood". It is a wood preservative (registered on April 15, 2005) labeled for use against wood decay, fungi and wood destroying insects. This product is applied to the entire stud before installation. Since the product it is not approved for termite protection, some other approved form of termite treatment is necessary while using this type of product.

Asulox (label interpretation)

The Bureau of Entomology & Pest Control received information that some licensees in the state were using Asulam on residential lawns. Upon further investigation we found that the applicators were interpreting the label differently than the state. This product is limited to use in agriculture and commercial turf due to toxicity concerns. Use is allowed on rights-of-way, and this statement was being interpreted by applicators to indicate that it could be used on portions of residential lawns. The label specifically states that this product is for agricultural use only, not for use by homeowners. Inspections also revealed that there were possibly violations of mixing and applications to lawns.

Africanized honey Bees (treatment strategies)

A video was shown that dramatized the nature and ferocity of the Africanized Honey Bees. The program included a recreation of actual events following an Emergency Medical Services (EMS) call from the victim and showed that responders put themselves at risk without adequate training and equipment. Programs are available to train emergency personnel to combat the aggressive bees.

SFWMD, Mr. Richard Pfeuffer

Caloosahatchee River Monitoring project Update

Richard Pfeuffer presented a summary of the cooperative monitoring program for the Caloosahatchee River. Participating agencies include Ft. Myers Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP), Florida Department of Agriculture & Consumer Services (FDACS), and South Florida Water Management District (SFWMD). The program concept and design was presented at the last Pesticide Review Council (PRC) meeting. The data summary covered samples collected and analyzed for the first and second quarter of 2006.

With the exception of aldicarb, the detected concentrations were similar to the historical SFWMD data collected. Aldicarb (carbamate) analysis is not part of the District's current monitoring program, since the previous analytical protocol involved a significantly higher minimum detection limit. The next scheduled sampling will be performed in July.

Council Discussion

A question was raised by Dr. Wendy Graham on what the Governor's Office or the Department expected of the Pesticide Review Council. She stated that she learned a lot about what is going on currently in the pesticide arena; however, wanted clarification on how best to assist, given this information.

Dr. Dennis Howard stated that the council has undergone some evolution since its inception. Originally the Council was mandated due to groundwater contaminations and the need to improve interagency cooperation and reduce overlap in pesticide regulation. Dr. Howard also stated that the Council serves to review and make recommendations to the Commissioner on pesticide matters. The Council members have latitude in determining how the Council should proceed. Mr. Andy Rackley mentioned that when we have issues, the Council should act and provide that needed scientific input to assist the department in the decision making process. This input will be assessed and used to answer to the citizen's of the state and to determine how best to serve them. Further he would like to see any issues that any Council member feels is relevant brought forward and considered.

Dr. Graham further described her take on presentations given the day of the meeting but subsequently, forgotten about after adjournment. She proposed that if there are issues that are pertinent, to provide that information and then request Council's advice on how to approach the issue. As things are presented now, the council is more of a listening audience than advisory committee. She feels that the council can be more useful if it is structured in a way that allows for better feedback.

Comments from Audience

None

Adjournment:

The Council determined that the next meeting of the PRC would be in late October, November 2006 in Tallahassee, Florida. An agenda would be forthcoming when the next date is set.

Upon agreement, the meeting adjourned at 12:10pm.