

PESTICIDE REVIEW COUNCIL

EFFECTIVENESS ASSESSMENT SURVEY RESULTS 2010

Survey Respondents for 2010 (10 of 11 members):

Joe Gaudino, Rick Hicks (secretary), Dennis Howard, Brian Katz (vice-chair), David Krause, Mel Kyle, Mark R. McLellan, Richard Pfeuffer, Gary Reeder, J. Keith Tolson (chair).

Members were asked to pick the number that best describes how the Council functions in seven (7) key topical areas: Scale Range 10 - 1 (10 highest rating to 1 lowest rating)

Ranking Scale Criteria									
10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Excellent Superior	Very Good	Good	Acceptable	Fair	Average	Mediocre Sub-Par	Poor	Very Poor	Extremely Poor

Decision Making Process

Average: 8.7

Council uses process to effectively build a broad-based consensus.

Council uses process to make a majority decision without a consensus of members.

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
2	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

Comments:

- In my time on the PRC, I cannot recall any significant issues that required difficult decisions by the council members. The council is not asked to do very much.
- Adequate opportunity for discussion and dialog. However few contentious issues have come before the Council in last two years.
- Meeting atmosphere and format encourage open communication among members. During decision-making, the Council routinely reaches a consensus, however, there is not currently a process in place to establish consensus as a goal.
- Since my appointment by Governor Jeb Bush on December 2, 2004 we have not been faced with that many issues requiring Council consensus of members. However, when necessary we have done quite well with the decision making process.

Participation and Communication

Average: 8.9

Communications are respectful, balanced and points are clearly understood.

Some members dominate. Limited listening and understanding.

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
3	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

Comments:

- Council members actively and effectively participate in discussions.

- Communication is open, participatory, professional and cordial. Current members clearly communicate their positions. Breaks provide a good opportunity to form relationships.
- Respect among the Council membership is quite good.

Council Relationship to Agency (DACs) Average: 9.1

Council has developed effective working relationship and communication with Agency.

Council has not developed effective working relationship and communication with Agency.

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Comments:

- Dennis Howard has been the focal point for the Agency. We know to communicate with Dennis and he has always been very diligent in getting information on topics of interest to the Council members.
- Role of Council has changed over last 10 years from a almost oversight role to an interagency venue. In this capacity DACs has been more involved in fostering the interagency interaction that fits the mission of the Council.
- The Council provides helpful input to FDACS, but effectiveness might be improved through a more formal process of workplan development and follow through for accountability. I sense that both FDACS and Council members are open to exploring ways to increase effectiveness.
- Communication and working relationship with DACs is excellent, working well both ways.

Council Relationship to Staff Average: 9.0

Average: 9.0

Council has developed effective working relationship and communication with staff.

Council has not developed effective working relationship and communication with staff.

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
4	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0

Comments:

- By "staff", I assume you mean the person who coordinates the meeting schedules and venues, handouts, presentation materials, etc. These people have always been very professional.
- Little interaction between broader staff and Council.
- FDACS staff strive to prepare Council members with meeting agendas and minutes and assist with travel logistics. There has not been much contact between Council members and staff outside of meetings.
- Excellent communication and relationship, working well both ways.

Time for Consideration

Average: 7.8

Adequate time for presentation, generating options, analysis and decision making.

Snap decisions are made or decisions are deferred because of lack of time.

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
0	4	2	3	0	1	0	0	0	0

Comments:

- Issues are discussed in detail and there is ample time for analysis and making effective decisions.
- There has rarely been the need for Council members to make any important decisions.
- Most materials are provided at the meeting rather than before hand. Earlier distribution of materials and longer meetings could assist the Council in making more informed decisions.
- Time for presentations and consideration by Council is good. Time has been allowed for consideration, discussion and adequate decision making process. If necessary, with consent of Council, we will run over-time.

Information and Analysis

Average: 8.2

Critical background and assessment of options yield politically and practically feasible decisions.

Too little or too much, or hard to use information on the situation, options & impacts yield hard to implement decisions.

10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
1	4	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0

Comments:

- There has rarely been the need for Council members to make any important decisions.
- When the Council makes decisions, the results are typically well reasoned and practical.
- We have not lacked for quality and quantity of information, when a decision is required of the Council.

List Key Topical Issues/Tasks (Workplan Tasks) the Council should include as part of a Workplan (tasks for Council consideration/evaluation).

Council Functionality—Communication, Planning, Participation, Representation, Process, Decision-Making, and Implementation

- Is the Department's budget sufficient to enable adequate pesticide testing, public education, and enforcement? Or are funding issues hampering Departments ability to protect public.
- We need to decide what the Council is supposed to do. Previously it was decided that the Council would continue to exist as a forum for topics of interest to be presented and discussed.
- Consideration of: budgetary, legislative (including proposed statutory changes) & rulemaking issues.
- Remaining unresolved issues from past PRC deliberations.

Scientific Studies and Funding Priorities and Strategies

- Environmental fate of pesticide degradates.
- Spray drift.
- Formulations adjuvants - particularly nanotoxicological concerns.
- Antimicrobials.
- T&E issues.
- Emerging diseases (e.g., laurel wilt).
- Forecasts and recommendations to prep for future pesticide regulatory issues.

Advise and Recommend on Pesticide Use Responsibilities—Communication and Cooperation Between and Among Responsible Agencies and Affected Interests

- Pesticide applicator health and safety issues.
- Emerging concerns for pesticide impacts (e.g., bee decline).
- Key pesticide registration and compliance issues/actions.
- Strengthening partnerships among agencies and SUS re: pesticide safety and regulation.
- Unfunded and underfunded mandates and expectations by USEPA for pesticide registrations related to programs the USEPA had delegated to FDACS. i.e. Federal soil fumigation application requirements and NPDES permitting.
- Implementation of the Soil Fumigation RED documents.
- USEPA's proposed general permit for pesticide use under the NPDES program.
- Endangered Species Act implementation for FIFRA regulated products.

Enhancing Communication Between and Among the Agency, Industry and Public

- It has been many years since a substantial issue has occurred. The regulatory processes in place, especially at state level (e.g. Pesticide Registration Evaluation Committee) have mitigated most concerns.
- Current high visibility pesticide related issues.
- Commissioner Award for Pesticide Stewardship program.

Biological and Alternate Controls to Replace or Reduce Pesticide Use

- Updates on research regarding biological and alternate controls to reduce pesticide usage.

What are the key tasks and/or unresolved Substantive Issues that need to be addressed by the Council during 2011?

- Updates on usage of restricted pesticides.
- Continued monitoring regarding well setbacks in aldicarb application areas.
- Monitoring for pesticide degradate compounds in environmentally sensitive areas.
- Implementation of new EPA standards required by recent court rulings.
- Review and recommendations regarding NPDES permitting implementation.
- Issues of interest to me include monitoring of water quality and biological effects of pesticide application.
- Better define role of the PRC in interagency interaction, regulatory process, and legislative agenda.
- Genetically modified crops.
- Creating more of a coordination role in environmental impact of pesticides: a forum for research/monitoring efforts statewide Promotion of U.S. agriculture.
- Implementation of revised fumigant labels (training, compliance issues).
- Pesticide usage surveys for Florida.
- Implementation of new federal restrictions for arsenical herbicides.
- Pesticide resistance: current trends, how to best manage it.
- Ad hoc public forum for pesticide high visibility issues that arise.
- Follow-up on council recommendation and endorsement for FDACS to submit FDACS/FDEP summary to USEPA on problems relating to ground water advisory statements on Federal Pesticide Labels.
- Council involvement in review and recommendations on submissions for the annual Commissioner Award for Pesticide Stewardship.

What would you like the Council to have accomplished within the next five (5) to ten (10) years?

- Recommendations for reductions in pesticide applications and usage with alternative methods.
- Ensure that adequate studies are being conducted to monitor the movement and fate of pesticides of concern.
- Evaluate potential human health impacts on pesticide applicators and residents that consume groundwater near areas where pesticides are applied.
- Try to assist the policy makers in realizing that more regulation stifles productivity and economically viable operations. Work towards less regulations rather than more.
- Increase Council's role in promoting public education regarding pesticide use, safety, and risks.
- In the next 1 year I hope the PRC will either become more relevant or disband.
- Workplan that includes yearly plan with flexibility for emerging issues, a process for yearly updates and feedback from Council, and a longer range strategic plan for pesticide use and regulation endorsed by Council.
- Transitioning the PRC from an advisory council on pesticides to one for Emerging Substances of Concern (or environmental pollutants of concern or pharmaceutical and personal care products as pollutants).
- Established an annual priority list of the most important pesticide-related issues and recommendations to address them.

- Prepare a report on the five-year future of pesticide regulatory issues with recommendations to agencies to address upcoming issues.
- Improved communication with Florida Coordinating Council on Mosquito Control (FCCMC) & Pest Control Enforcement Advisory Council (PCEAC).
- Enforcement Advisory Council Recommended key changes in legislation to improve the effectiveness of pesticide regulatory programs in Florida.
- To accomplish a track record of value-added advice to the commissioner of Agriculture regarding the sale, use and registration of pesticides.
- To have provided good advice and assistance to FDACS on relevant issues, within the authority of the Council.

PESTICIDE REVIEW COUNCIL

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
AND CONSUMER SERVICES

Division of Agricultural Environmental Services



ORGANIZATIONAL AND
PROCEDURAL POLICIES AND
GUIDELINES

PROPOSED COUNCIL PROCEDURAL
POLICIES

(Proposed for Adoption September 16, 2010)

PESTICIDE REVIEW COUNCIL

PROCESS OVERVIEW

CONSENSUS

Defining Consensus

Consensus is a deliberative process where a group seeks a shared understanding of a problem considers and evaluates all options and strives to achieve a practical agreement that all can live with.

Consensus means that, to the extent possible, each member commits to work toward agreements that meet their own and other members needs so that all can support the outcome.

Consensus is a **process, an attitude and an outcome**. Consensus processes have the potential of producing better quality, more informed and better-supported outcomes.

As a **process**, consensus is a problem solving approach in which all members:

1. Jointly share, clarify and distinguish their concerns;
2. Educate each other on substantive issues;
3. Jointly develop alternatives to address concerns; and then;
4. Seek to adopt recommendations everyone can embrace or at least live with.

In a consensus process, members should be able to honestly say:

- I believe that other members understand my point of view;
- I believe I understand other members' points of view; and
- Whether or not I prefer this decision, I support it because it was arrived at openly and fairly and because it is the best solution we can achieve at this time.

Consensus as an **attitude** means that each member commits to work toward agreements that meet their own and other member needs and interests so that all can support the outcome.

Consensus as an **outcome** means that agreement on decisions is reached by all members or by a significant majority of members after a process of active problem solving. In a consensus outcome, the level of enthusiasm for the agreement may not be the same among all members on any issue, but on balance all should be able to live with the overall package. Levels of consensus on a committee outcome can include a mix of:

- Participants who strongly support the solution;
- Participants who can “live with” the solution; and,
- Some participants who do not support the solution but agree not to vote against it.

SUCCESSFUL MEETINGS

Successful Meetings Overview

A successful meeting is a collaboration between members, staff, chair, facilitator, consultants (if relevant) and affected stakeholder interest groups. Consensus-based processes and decisions, developed working with diverse stakeholder interests affected by the issue(s), takes time to educate members' on the range of issues and possible solutions. Members have different levels of expertise and knowledge on the issues and require different levels of preparation and education ("getting up to speed") before they are prepared to evaluate options and make decisions. This is especially relevant to consensus-based decisions that strive for unanimity, or at a minimum a 75% level of support. In consensus-based processes one is not dealing with a simple majority decision requirement, instead the full range of issues and options are evaluated with the goal of ensuring stakeholder interests are addressed to the extent possible, and at a minimum are fairly considered. The reality is that consensus decisions, once reached, are durable, efficacious, long-lasting, and will have achieved the support of most if not all of the stakeholder interests affected by the issue(s).

A meeting will be successful to the extent that staff, chair, facilitator(s) and project consultants plan meetings and meeting objectives, ensure members receive relevant materials, and design and prepare agenda packets, worksheets, surveys, and summary reports sufficiently in advance of meetings.

A meeting will be successful to the extent that members' review materials, study the issues, consult with constituent stakeholders between meetings, complete pre and between meeting assignments, and prepare prior to the meetings. If there are documents and/or information members believe should be evaluated they should let chair/staff/facilitator know. Similarly, if there are meeting objectives and/or agenda items member's think should be added to the agenda, they should identify them during "Agenda Review" and during the "Next Steps" phase of each meeting where next meeting agenda items are requested.

In summary, meeting success is a group effort requiring collaboration, cooperation, planning, commitment, time and resources. It is the responsibility of staff, chairs, facilitators, consultants, members, stakeholder groups, and the public to ensure meetings are productive and successful. In short, it is "our" responsibility.

PESTICIDE REVIEW COUNCIL

ESTABLISHMENT, MEMBERSHIP, ORGANIZATION, AND RESPONSIBILITIES

PESTICIDE REGULATION AND SAFETY

487.0615 Pesticide Review Council. —(The 2009 Florida Statutes)

(1)(a) There is created within the department the Pesticide Review Council. The purpose of the council is to advise the Commissioner of Agriculture regarding the sale, use, and registration of pesticides and to advise government agencies, including the State University System, with respect to those activities related to their responsibilities regarding pesticides. The council shall serve as the statewide forum for the coordination of pesticide-related activities to eliminate duplication of effort and maximize protection of the environment of the state and the health of the public.

(b) The council shall consist of 11 scientific members as follows: a scientific representative from the Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, a scientific representative from the Department of Environmental Protection, a scientific representative from the Department of Health, and a scientific representative from the Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, each to be appointed by the respective agency; the dean of research of the Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences of the University of Florida; and six members to be appointed by the Governor. The six members to be appointed by the Governor must be a pesticide industry representative, a representative of an environmental group, a hydrologist, a toxicologist, a scientific representative from one of the five water management districts rotated among the five districts, and a grower representative from a list of three persons nominated by the statewide grower associations. Each member shall be appointed for a term of 4 years and shall serve until a successor is appointed. A vacancy shall be filled for the remainder of the unexpired term.

(c) In conducting its meetings, the council shall use accepted rules of procedure. A majority of the members of the council constitutes a quorum for all purposes, and an act by a majority of such quorum at any meeting constitutes an official act of the council. The secretary shall keep a complete record of each meeting which must show the names of members present and the actions taken. These records must be kept on file with the department, and these records and other documents about matters within the jurisdiction of the council are subject to inspection by members of the council.

(d) The members of the council shall meet and organize by electing a chair, a vice chair, and a secretary whose terms shall be for 1 year each. Council officers may not serve consecutive terms.

(e) The council shall meet at the call of its chair, at the request of a majority of its members, at the request of the department, or at such time as a public health or environmental emergency arises.

(2) The council shall have the power and duty to:

(a) Recommend, based upon review of state pesticide program needs, appropriate scientific studies on any registered pesticide when substantive preliminary data indicate that the pesticide could pose an unreasonably adverse effect on the environment or human health. The recommendations may include using available services of state agencies or of the State University System to conduct such scientific studies or may recommend that these agencies seek funding for this purpose. When the council recommends a study, it must support legislative budget requests for funding needed to conduct the study. The council may also conduct scientific studies if specific funding is provided to the department or other governmental agency by the Legislature.

(b) Make recommendations, subject to a majority vote, directly to the Commissioner of Agriculture for actions to be taken with respect to the sale or use of a pesticide which the council has reviewed. When such review is performed in conjunction with the registration of a pesticide, the council shall comply with the time framework of the registration process pursuant to chapter 120 and as implemented by department rules.

(c) Provide advice or information to appropriate governmental agencies, including the State University System, with respect to those activities related to their responsibilities regarding pesticides. However, confidential data received from the United States Environmental Protection Agency or the registrant shall be confidential and exempt from the provisions of s. 119.07(1); and it is unlawful for any member of the council to use the data for his or her own advantage or to reveal the data to the general public.

(d) Review biological and alternate controls to replace or reduce the use of pesticides.

(e) Consider, at the request of any member, the development of appropriate advice or recommendations on a pesticide when substantive preliminary data indicate that the pesticide could pose an unreasonably adverse effect on the environment or human health.

(f) Assist the department in the review of registered pesticides which are selected for special review based upon potential environmental or human health effects. The department shall consult with the council in the special review process. This process must include, but need not be limited to, selecting pesticides for special review, providing periodic updates to the council on preliminary findings as a special review progresses, and formulating final recommendations on any pesticide on which a special review has been conducted.

(3) The council shall submit an annual report, no later than November 1 of each year, to the Commissioner of Agriculture, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the President of the Senate, containing a record of the council's activities, recommendations regarding any pesticide reviewed by the council, and recommendations related to any other duty of the council and its purpose.

(4) The council is defined as a "substantially interested person" and has standing under chapter 120 in any proceeding conducted by the department relating to the registration of a pesticide under this part. The standing of the council shall in no way prevent individual members of the council from exercising standing in these matters.

(5) Members of the council shall receive no compensation for their services, but are entitled to be reimbursed for per diem and travel expenses as provided in s. 112.061.

History.--ss. 9, 11, ch. 83-310; s. 18, ch. 84-338; s. 1, ch. 86-116; ss. 4, 6, 7, ch. 88-304; s. 3, ch. 91-20; s. 5, ch. 91-429; ss. 17, 37, 38, ch. 92-115; s. 14, ch. 94-233; s. 14, ch. 94-356; s. 324, ch. 96-406; s. 1124, ch. 97-103; s. 232, ch. 99-8; s. 222, ch. 99-245; s. 21, ch. 2000-154; s. 33, ch. 2004-64.

PESTICIDE REVIEW COUNCIL

ORGANIZATIONAL AND PROCEDURAL POLICIES & GUIDELINES

CONSENSUS-BUILDING AND DECISION-MAKING PROCEDURES

The Pesticide Review Council (PRC) will seek consensus decisions on particular issues and their package of recommendations to be submitted on a regular basis to the DACS Division of Agricultural Environmental Services.

The Council's Consensus building and decision making process is a participatory one whereby on matters of substance, the members jointly strive for agreements which all of the members can accept, support or at least agree not to oppose. In instances where, after vigorously exploring possible ways to enhance the members' support for the final decision on an issue or package of recommendations, and where 100% acceptance or support is not achievable, final decisions of the Council will require at least a 75% favorable vote of all members present and voting. This super majority decision rule underscores the Council's view of the importance of seeking and developing agreements with the participation of all members and with which all can live with and support. In the event the Council can not reach consensus (75% in favor) on a decision, a minority report may be requested immediately following the vote, requesting the rationales and preferences of those dissenting, and shall be included in the meeting summary reports.

The Council will make decisions only when a quorum is present. A quorum shall be constituted by at least 51% of the appointed members being present (simple majority). The Council will utilize Robert's Rules of Order, as modified by the Council's adopted procedural guidelines, to make and approve motions; however, the 75% supermajority voting requirement will supercede the normal voting requirements used in Robert's Rules of Order for decision making on substantive motions and amendments to motions. In addition, the Council will utilize their adopted meeting guidelines for conduct during meetings. The Council will make substantive recommendations using their adopted facilitated consensus-building procedures, and will use Robert's Rules of Order only for formal motions once a facilitated discussion is completed.

The presiding Chair and/or Facilitator of the Pesticide Review Council, in general, should use parliamentary procedures set forth in Robert's Rules of Order, as modified by Council's adopted procedural guidelines.

Any voting member may make a motion when a quorum is present.

A second is required to discuss the motion.

If a motion is seconded, the Chair/Facilitator opens the floor for discussion. The Chair/Facilitator will recognize members wishing to speak on the motion. The Chair/Facilitator will, if time permits, recognize other participants wishing to speak on the motion.

The Chair/Facilitator may elect or be requested by the member making the motion to take a "straw poll" on the motion. Based on the result, the Chair/Facilitator may table the motion with the agreement of the member moving it, pending further discussion. The member making the motion may accept friendly amendments to the motion.

After completing discussion, the Chair/Facilitator will call the discussion to a close and restate the motion, with any friendly amendments, and call for a vote.

If the motion receives a 75% favorable vote of the members present and voting it will be approved.

MEETING GUIDELINES

COUNCIL MEMBER'S ROLE

- Keep to the agenda and meeting procedural guidelines.
- The meetings are an opportunity to explore possibilities. Offering or exploring an idea does not necessarily imply support for it.
- Listen to understand. Seek a shared understanding even if you don't agree.
- Be focused and concise—Balance participation & minimize repetition. Share the airtime.
- Look to the facilitator to be recognized. Please raise your hand to speak.
- Speak one person at a time. Please don't interrupt each other.
- Raise hand to be called on by facilitator, and only speak when called upon.
- Focus on issues, not personalities. Avoid stereotyping or personal attacks.
- To the extent possible, offer options to address other's concerns, as well as your own.
- Represent and communicate with member's constituent group.
- Turn in completed evaluation forms.

THE CHAIR'S ROLE

- Open and adjourn meetings.
- Offer public comment opportunity at the scheduled public comment agenda time.
- Work with the facilitator and assume role of the facilitator if the facilitator is not present.

THE FACILITATOR'S ROLE

- Design and facilitate a participatory Council meeting process—guide the meeting process.
- Assist participants to stay focused and on task.
- Assure that members follow guidelines and time limits.
- Prepare agenda packets and provide meeting summary reports.

MEMBER'S OF THE PUBLIC ROLE

- Respect meeting process and guidelines.
- Provide input during provided comment opportunities.
- Consult and provide input to their representative stakeholder members to enhance the efficacy of the process.

GUIDELINES FOR BRAINSTORMING

- Speak when recognized by the Facilitator.
- Offer one idea per person without explanation.
- No comments, criticism, or discussion of other's ideas.
- Listen respectfully to other's ideas and opinions.
- Seek understanding and not agreement at this point (brainstorming) in the discussion.

THE NAME STACKING PROCESS

- Determines the speaking order.
- Members raises hand to speak. Facilitator will call on members in turn.
- Facilitator may interrupt the stack (change the speaking order) in order to promote discussion on a specific issue or, to balance participation and allow those who have not spoken on a issue an opportunity to do so before others on the list who have already spoken on the issue.

GUIDELINES FOR REPORTS AND PRESENTATIONS

- Chair/Facilitator introduces presenter.
- Hold all questions until report or presentation is complete.
- Facilitator stacks names.
- Facilitator calls on speakers.
- Clarifying questions only.
- No discussion or comments.

GUIDELINES FOR DISCUSSIONS AND PROPOSALS

- Facilitator guides process.
- Meeting guidelines remain in effect.
- Facilitator stacks names.
- Proposal is presented (no comments or discussion).
- Clarifying questions are taken (no comments or discussion).
- Discussion of proposal (focus on issues, refine proposal, and consensus building).
- Consensus/Acceptability ranking as needed.
- Test for consensus with a motion to approve and a vote.

ACCEPTABILITY RANKING SCALE

During the meetings, members may be asked to develop and rank options, and following discussions and refinements, may be asked to do additional rankings of the options if requested by a member. Members should be prepared to offer specific refinements to address their reservations.

The following scale will be utilized for the ranking exercises:

4. **Acceptable**—I support proposal as is. ★★★★★
3. **Minor Reservations**—I can live with this; but would like to see changes as follows. ★★★
Be prepared to offer specific refinements or changes to address your concerns.
2. **Major Reservations**—I can't support this unless following changes are addressed to meet my serious concerns. ★★
Be prepared to offer specific refinements or changes to address your concerns.
1. **Not Acceptable**—I can't support this. ★
Be prepared to offer alternatives and options that would address your own as well as other's concerns.

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
--	---------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------

PRIORITIZATION RANKING SCALE

- 5 Highest Level of Priority; Urgent
- 4 High Priority
- 3 Moderate Level of Priority
- 2 Low Level of Priority
- 1 Lowest Possible Priority; Council Should not Pursue

Topic	Rank	5	4	3	2	1	Raw Score
-------	------	---	---	---	---	---	-----------

AGENDA SUBMITTAL AND CONSIDERATION PROTOCOLS

All agenda items must be submitted by close of business forty-five (45) days prior to the next scheduled Pesticide Review Council meeting.

The Division of Agricultural Environmental Services will review a proposed agenda item for a determination of whether or not the issue falls under the purview and statutory authority of the Pesticide Review Council. The agency will notify the proponent of any negative determination relative to issue being placed on next agenda.

Proposed agenda items meeting the submittal criteria will be noticed in the Florida Administrative Weekly (FAW) in accordance with the noticing requirements of F.S., Chapter 120.

Pesticide Review Council members will receive all proposed agenda items and supporting documentation at least fourteen days prior to the next scheduled Pesticide Review Council meeting.

No new agenda items will be considered at the Council meeting with the exception of those issues raised by the Division of Agricultural Environmental Services that have been determined to require immediate Council action, or by the unanimous (100%) approval of a quorum of the Council through the Chair.

Agenda items that meet submittal criteria and arrive after the established deadline will be placed on the next regularly scheduled Council meeting agenda.

Based on number of agenda items the Chair/Facilitator may allocate a specific amount of time for each agenda item.

Council will not consider action on proposals that have requested other actions such as an administrative hearing or declaratory statement, unless specifically requested by the Division of Agricultural Environmental Services.

The Council by a 75% favorable vote may discuss requested agenda items not meeting submittal criteria requirements but may not take any formal action on the issue until the next Council meeting.

Special meetings may be called by the Division based on urgency and necessity for immediate action.

AGENDA ITEM SUBMITTAL CRITERIA

Agenda item must be submitted 45 days prior to regularly scheduled Council meetings.

Proposed agenda item must clearly state the action requested of the Council.

The proposed request must not discriminate against products by requiring the use of a specific product in order to comply with the provisions of the request (e.g., the proposal must address a specific problem and not require the use of a specific product in order to comply).

If applicable, proponent should provide exact rule or statutory references that the proposal addresses.

Proponent should provide all necessary supporting documentation required for Council and Agency to determine the merits of the request (i.e., relevant fiscal impact information; documentation that the proposal is critical to the health, safety, and welfare of the public; documentation that the proposal is not requesting an action that would require a specific product to meet the requirements of the proposed action).

Proponent must indicate that they have not requested any additional actions on the proposed agenda items such as an administrative hearing or declaratory statement.

Proponent must provide the following contact and agenda information:

CONTACT INFORMATION	
Name:	
Organization/Representation:	
Address:	
Phone and Fax Numbers:	
E-Mail Address:	
Date Submitted:	

AGENDA ITEM INFORMATION	
Date of Council Meeting:	
Name of Presenter:	
Representation of Presenter:	
Agenda Item Title:	
Amount of Time Requested:	
Rationale for Agenda Item:	
Specific Action Requested:	
Background Documentation:	

MEETING PROCESS—AGENDA CONSIDERATION PROTOCOLS

Facilitator* introduces the agenda item/proposal.

Proponent states the action requested and provides rationale for proposal.

Facilitator asks Council members only for clarifying questions (a clarifying question addresses a specific point that is not understood, and should not indicate support or opposition to the proposal).

After questions, the facilitator opens the issue up for discussion. All Council members and Agency Staff wishing to speak must raise their hand and be acknowledged by the Facilitator prior to speaking. Council approved meeting guidelines are in effect at all times.

For Proposals (issues requiring Council action): Following Council member's preliminary discussion, the facilitator asks if any members of the public wish to address the Council on the current issue under Council consideration. The facilitator serves as a moderator for public input. The facilitator asks for those who wish to speak in favor of the proposal or topic under discussion to offer brief comments, others who wish to speak in favor will be asked to offer new points or simply state agreement with previous speakers. The same opportunity and requirements will be offered for those who wish to speak in opposition to the proposal or topic under discussion. The facilitator ensures that all views are expressed and similar views are not repeated. Members may, through the facilitator, ask clarifying questions to members of the public offering comments. The facilitator may limit comment to three (3) minutes per person. This process is used for substantive issues and not for procedural matters before the Council.

For Discussion Issues (no formal action required): Following Council member's preliminary discussion, the facilitator asks if any members of the public wish to address the Council on the current issue under Council consideration. The facilitator serves as a moderator for public input. Members of the public will be provided one opportunity to comment per discussion agenda item, and may be limited to three (3) minutes. Members may, through the facilitator, ask clarifying questions to members of the public offering comments. This process is used for substantive issues and not for procedural matters before the Council.

For Proposals and Discussion Issues (Substantive Agenda Items): After discussion and public comment, a council member may make a motion for an action on the issue. If there is a second to the motion the facilitator will call for discussion. Once a motion is made and seconded the discussion will be restricted to only Council members unless the facilitator requests specific clarification from a member of the public. Members may request specific clarification from a member of the public through the facilitator. A member may wish to second a motion for the purpose of Council discussion and not necessarily as a show of support for the motion. If the motion involves an option that the public has already commented on, then the vote is taken, if the proposed action (motion) is materially different from what was discussed, an additional opportunity is provided for public comment, and then the Council votes on the motion.

Only motions to approve will be considered (no motions to disapprove). If there is no motion after discussion the requested action is not approved, and "dies" for a lack of a second.

*If there is not a facilitator, chair will perform the same function.

MEETING PROCESS FORMAT GUIDELINES

- ◆ Facilitator introduces each agenda item.
- ◆ Proponent/Presenter provides overview, rationale for proposal, and any requested action.
- ◆ Clarifying questions from members (something you don't understand). Names stacked.
- ◆ Council begins discussion only after all questions are answered.
- ◆ General discussion by Council members.
- ◆ Facilitator asks if any members of the public wishes to address the Council on the current issue under board/committee consideration
- ◆ Facilitator asks for those who wish to speak in favor of the proposal or topic under discussion to offer brief comments, others who wish to speak in favor will be asked to offer new points or simply state agreement with previous speakers.
- ◆ The same opportunity and requirements will be offered for those who wish to speak in opposition to the proposal or topic under discussion.
- ◆ Facilitator ensures that all views are expressed and similar views are not repeated.
- ◆ Facilitator may instruct public to avoid repeating points, and to summarize key points and to submit lengthy prepared statements into the record (instead of reading them).
- ◆ Members of the public will be provided one opportunity to comment per discussion agenda item, and may be limited to three (3) minutes.
- ◆ Members may, through the chair, ask clarifying questions to members of the public offering comments.
- ◆ After public comment, facilitator calls for members discussion and stacks names of members wishing to speak.
- ◆ Members explore all options (pros and cons) prior to making a formal motion.
- ◆ Any voting member may make a motion when a quorum is present. Requires a second.
- ◆ If a motion is seconded, the facilitator opens the floor for discussion. The Facilitator will recognize members wishing to speak on the motion.
- ◆ If the motion involves an option that the public has already commented on, then no additional public comment is taken, if the proposed action (motion) is materially different from what was previously discussed, an additional opportunity is provided for public comment, and then the Council votes on the motion.
- ◆ Once a motion is on the floor discussion is restricted to Council members except as allowed by the chair for purposes of clarification.
- ◆ Council member offers a second (may be seconded for purposes of discussion, and not necessarily due to agreement with the motion).
- ◆ Council members may offer friendly amendments and if accepted by maker of the motion, friendly amendment becomes a part of the motion currently under discussion.
- ◆ In order to get a "read" on a motion, the Facilitator may elect or be requested by the member making the motion to take a "straw poll" on the motion. Based on the result, the Facilitator may withdraw or table the motion with the agreement of the member moving it, pending further discussion.
- ◆ Council members may offer an amendment to the motion: second required, discussion, vote on the amendment only.
- ◆ The motion on the table is now the motion as amended (if amendment was approved).
- ◆ After completing discussion, the Facilitator will call the discussion to a close and restate the motion, with any friendly amendments or approved amendments, and call for a vote.
- ◆ If the motion receives a 75% or greater favorable vote of the Council members it will be deemed approved.

PRC MEETING ATTENDANCE POLICY

Any members of the Pesticide Review Council who fails to attend two consecutive regularly scheduled meetings will be contacted by the Department to determine why the member was not able to attend and if the member still wishes to serve on the Council. If the member cannot demonstrate his or her absence was for good cause, which includes but is not limited to personal or family illness or military service, or no longer wishes to serve on the Council, the Department will request the member submit a written resignation from the Council to the Commissioner of Agriculture. If the member refuses to resign, the Council will recommend to the Commissioner of Agriculture the member's appointment be terminated and a new member be appointed as a replacement.

PRC DRAFT GUIDING PRINCIPLES

- Principle 1: The overall purpose of the PRC is to serve as an advisory body to the Division of Agricultural Environmental Services.
- Principle 2: The PRC shall adhere to their Statutory authorities and charge.
- Principle 3: The PRC shall strive to achieve consensus on substantive recommendations made to DACS, other agencies and state universities.
- Principle 4: The PRC shall operate under clear, concise, consistent, and fair procedural protocols.
- Principle 5: The PRC shall serve as an accessible liaison between the Division of Agricultural Environmental Services, the regulated industry, and consumers thereby protecting the interests of the public.

PRC DRAFT MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Pesticide Review Council is to advise the Commissioner of Agriculture regarding the sale, use, and registration of pesticides and to advise government agencies, including the State University System, with respect to those activities related to their responsibilities regarding pesticides. Duties include recommending appropriate scientific studies on any registered pesticide and for actions to be taken with respect to the sale or use of a pesticide reviewed by the Council relative to protecting the environment and/or human health from unreasonably adverse effects, and reviewing biological and alternate controls to replace or reduce the use of pesticides. The council shall serve as the statewide forum for the coordination of pesticide-related activities to eliminate duplication of effort and maximize protection of the environment of the state and the health of the public.

MEETING FREQUENCY POLICY

The PRC shall meet three times per year starting with January of each year. Regularly scheduled meetings will be held in January, May, and September of each year. Additional meetings may be called by the Agency or Council Chair as required.

ABSENTEE COUNCIL MEMBER COMMENT POLICY

Any member of the Council who wishes to have their comments/opinions read into the record at a meeting they will not be able to attend, may send their written comments by e-mail or fax to the Facilitator and the Department of Agriculture. The member should identify the agenda item(s) that the comment(s) pertain to. The Facilitator will read the absentee member's comments into the record during the discussion portion of the specific agenda item the member is commenting on, and the member's comments will be included in the Facilitator's meeting summary report. The Council member may only make one comment per agenda item, and each comment will be limited to a maximum of five-hundred (500) words.

ALTERNATE MEMBER POLICY

- In the event Council members can not attend a meeting, they may send an alternate to attend meetings in their absence.
- Council members shall notify DACS and the facilitator by e-mail when they will not be able to attend a meeting, and if an alternate will attend in their place.
- Council members shall provide the name and contact information for their alternates.
- Alternates shall be of the same stakeholder/constituent groups as the appointed members and knowledgeable on the issues.
- Council members shall provide alternates with a copy of the upcoming meeting's agenda and consult with alternates on the substantive discussion issues before the Council.
- Alternates will sit at the table and participate in all substantive discussions.
- Alternates should represent member's views on substantive discussion issues, to the extent possible.
- Alternates shall agree to follow all Council procedures as stipulated in the PRC's "Organizational and Procedural Guidelines". The Guidelines may be viewed at the following link: <http://consensus.fsu.edu/PRC/index.html>
- Alternates shall not participate in the discussion of procedural matters such as the yearly assessment survey and workplan prioritization exercise.

OFFICER ELECTION POLICY

The Council will elect three officers from within the existing membership, whom will serve in that position for a one-year term. The positions are chair, vice-chair, and secretary. Initially, three officers will be elected, and subsequently a new secretary will be elected at each September meeting, and the previous secretary will ascend to the vice-chair position, and the vice-chair will ascend to the chair position. An elections committee, comprised of 3 members from different interests will recommend nominations to the Council prior to the election of new officers.

SUBCOMMITTEE ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURES POLICY

- The Council Chair shall convene subcommittees following a consensus vote of the Council.
- Subcommittees are advisory to the Council and shall report at each Council meeting.
- Subcommittees shall follow Council Organizational and Procedural Guidelines for operating meetings and decision making. The Guidelines may be viewed at the following link:
<http://consensus.fsu.edu/PRC/legislation.html>
- Subcommittee members are appointed by the Council Chair.
- Subcommittee chairs are appointed by the Council Chair.
- Subcommittees shall have a minimum of one (1) Council members.
- Subcommittee chairs shall recommend members to the Council Chair for appointment.
- Subcommittee chairs shall maintain an updated list of members and provide them to the Council Chair and DACS.
- Subcommittees shall be comprised of a sufficient number of members to ensure representation by relevant affected stakeholder interests.
- Subcommittees require a quorum to conduct business. A majority of members shall constitute a quorum.
- Subcommittee members may designate an alternate to participate in meetings and vote in their absence. The subcommittee chair must be notified and approve alternate selections.

TELECONFERENCE PARTICIPATION PROCESS

ATTENDANCE

- Facilitator will ask committee members to identify themselves.
- Members will offer their names one at a time. To avoid confusion and to ensure accuracy, please wait until facilitator repeats and confirms a name before offering another.
- Once attendance is complete, the agenda will be reviewed and approved by the committee.
- Committee members should announce if they have to sign-off before the teleconference meeting is complete, to ensure a quorum and an accurate count of votes.

PARTICIPANT ETIQUETTE

- Background noise from participants is picked-up and amplified on the conference leader's phone, especially if you are on a speaker-phone. Please refrain from sidebar conversations.
- Please place your phone on mute, unless you are speaking, to cut down on ambient background noise. Ensure your phone is muted if you leave the phone for any reason. Use the mute function on your personal phone, or the conference muting function per instructions.
- If your line creates a disturbance or has technical difficulties, the teleconference operator may be required to manually mute your line until the problem is resolved.
- Do NOT place your phone on hold (your system's background sound/music will play).

DISCUSSION PROCESS

- Facilitator will introduce discussion item or presenter.
- Presenter will provide overview of issue and recommendation(s) for committee action.
- Hold questions until presentation is complete.
- Once presentation is complete, Facilitator will ask if committee members have clarifying questions on the issue, create a speaker's list*, and call on members in-turn for clarification.
- Members participating via the internet shall indicate their desire to speak by using the "Raise Hand" function on the web screen.
- Facilitator will ask if anyone from the public wishes to discuss the issue or propose alternative options, create a speaker's list*, and call on participants in-turn for discussion.
- Members of the public participating via the internet shall indicate their desire to speak by using the "Raise Hand" function on the web screen.
- Facilitator will ask if any committee member wishes to discuss the issue or propose alternative options, create a speaker's list, and call on members in-turn for discussion.
- Once clarification and discussion is complete, Facilitator will ask if a voting committee member wishes to make a motion on the issue.
- Following a second for the motion, Facilitator will ask if there is any additional discussion.
- If the motion involves an option the public has already provided input on, then the vote is taken following any additional committee discussion; if the proposed action (motion) is materially different from what was previously discussed, an additional opportunity is provided for public comment, and then the committee votes on the motion.

**"Speaker's List" will be compiled from those in attendance, on the web, and participating solely by phone.*

PESTICIDE REVIEW COUNCIL

WORKPLAN DEVELOPMENT SURVEY RESULTS 2010

Survey Respondents for 2010 (10 of 11 members):

Bill Caton, Joe Gaudino, Rick Hicks (secretary), Dennis Howard, Brian Katz (vice-chair), David Krause, Mel Kyle, Mark R. McLellan, Richard Pfeuffer, J. Keith Tolson (chair).

Members were asked to provide input from their individual perspectives on an initial set of key issues and questions that need to be addressed by the Council.

1. MEMBERS' PERSPECTIVE ON KEY ISSUES THE PRC HAS BEEN CHARGED WITH ADDRESSING.

- Public health and safety related to the use of pesticides in Florida.
- To provide information and advice regarding the use and registration of pesticides; to evaluate ways to protect the environment and the public health regarding the use of pesticides.
- Public Safety, appropriate use of pesticides, public education, liaison with Department and legislature.
- In my tenure on the PRC, we have not been asked to make any significant recommendations to DACS or other agencies. We are typically updated by DACS and other presenters on the status of DACS pesticide program activities, legislative issues, high profile pesticide issues that are being addressed by DACS, and interesting topics, studies, etc. We have never been asked to look in any detail at any upcoming or ongoing pesticide registration or use issues and come up with recommendations. The current mix of PRC members may not have the time or inclination to work beyond these regularly scheduled meetings so I am not sure how much we could get done effectively.
- Sale, use, and registration of pesticides in the State of Florida with focus on interagency cooperation. A minor component is the recommendation of studies to address concerns.
- Recommendations to reduce overlap, increase efficiency and resolve conflicts in Florida pesticide regulation.
- Recommendations for addressing perceived high risk/visibility pesticides.
- Recommendations to plan for future approaches to meet emerging and evolving pesticide issues.
- Registered pesticides that have been found to potentially or overtly pose a human health or environmental risk when used according to the approved label.
- Questions relating to the sale and/or use of pesticides that may have an impact on the environmental and human health safety.
- Promoting and recognizing good stewardship programs and practices relating to pesticide labeling and use.
- USEPA registration/labeling and pesticide use mandates, NPDES permitting, and implementation of the Soil Fumigant RED requirements.
- Appropriate discussion and guidance related to pesticide use and impact.
- Ensuring pesticides that are approved for use in the State of Florida, if used properly, will not result in unreasonable adverse effects to human health, safety and the environment.

MEMBER FEEDBACK ON COUNCIL WORKPLAN TASKS/ISSUES (TASKS/ISSUES UNDER COUNCIL PURVIEW) BY TOPIC.

2. MEMBERS WERE ASKED TO IDENTIFY, FROM THEIR PERSPECTIVES, THE KEY ISSUE(S)/QUESTIONS THEY BELIEVE NEED TO BE ADDRESSED BY THE COUNCIL IN KEY TOPICAL CATEGORIES.

A. COUNCIL FUNCTIONALITY—COMMUNICATION, PLANNING, PARTICIPATION, REPRESENTATION, PROCESS, DECISION-MAKING, AND IMPLEMENTATION.

Key issues/sub-tasks the Council should address:

- Identifying the needs for Council evaluation and input.
- How Council recommendations and findings are reported to DACS management and/or the legislature.
- Feedback from DACS management or the legislature to the Council on these recommendations.
- How is the Council fulfilling its obligation to review biological and alternate controls to replace or reduce the use of pesticides?
- The PRC is created to advise the Commissioner of Agriculture on pesticide related issues.
- We need some top-down (from the Commissioner's office) advice/input on the value and significance of the PRC operations, recommendations and suggestions.
- What have we accomplished in the eyes of the Commissioner's office. Also, input on the expectations of the Commissioner's office for the service of the PRC and any proposed projects or issues to be addressed. This would be most helpful and critical, in my opinion, for any definitive outline of the Council functionality to be developed.
- How can we increase the level of focus and consideration being given to alternative control methods?
- If we are to literally focus on the legislative charge, we need to discuss specifically what that workload would amount to and decide whether we have the proper mix on the Council and whether existing council members have the interest or time to commit to doing work outside of the meeting.
- Clear plan for issues that the Council will address.
- Better participation by under-represented stakeholders in the process.
- How can the Council become more actively involved in providing recommendations to FDACS and other agencies involved with pesticide regulatory issues?
- Membership/representation is good.
- FDACS staff serves the Council well.
- Communication - the council needs to facilitate a discussion of key issues including an airing of public opinion on matters before the Council.
- Ensuring there is a consistent decision-making process that is based on scientific fact and that recommendations are effectively communicated to the appropriate target audience.
- Planning: the Council needs to review key issues and plan for periodic updates.
- Decision-Making: the Council needs to review data and scope of appropriate matters and encourage well thought out decision making.

B. SCIENTIFIC STUDIES AND FUNDING PRIORITIES AND STRATEGIES.

Key issues/sub-tasks the Council should address:

- Studies to determine the movement and fate of pesticides and their degradate compounds in groundwater and surface water.
- Studies to determine any health effects to pesticide applicators and people living near fields where pesticides are applied.
- Perhaps the Council could be more actively focused on suggesting studies that should be funded. I am not aware of any direct involvement of the council on this subject since I have been a member.
- The lack of data to truly evaluate pesticide impacts on human health and the environment.
- Priority pesticides for monitoring.
- Roles and funding for obtaining this type of data.
- The Council has no grant funding mechanism to empower an active research mission directed at the needs of the State. Should those funds be made available then the ability to meet this objective could be achievable.
- When issues arise like assessment of potential environmental impacts of arsenical herbicides, can the Council move from being a sounding board to serving in more of an advisory capacity?
- Can the Council help the Department identify and develop more robust/refined risk assessment and management tools for pesticide studies?
- List of potential funding sources or mechanisms.
- There are no specific pesticides at issue that pose an unreasonable adverse effect on the environment or human health before the Council that need to be addressed at this time.
- Provide advice on an as needed basis.
- Have a process/mechanism in place that is timely and effective in getting information that is need through research.
- I am not aware of any pending issues.

C. ADVICE AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON PESTICIDE USE RESPONSIBILITIES— COMMUNICATION AND COOPERATION BETWEEN AND AMONG RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES AND AFFECTED INTERESTS.

Key issues/sub-tasks the Council should address:

- More updates on research regarding alternatives to pesticides.
- updates on studies regarding the movement and fate of pesticides and their degradate compounds.
- It seems the Council is being kept informed of SUS activity. I am not sure we are influencing or providing significant input to the SUS.
- Identify agencies that need assistance or information on pesticide use (assuming that these agencies use pesticides or make important decisions about pesticide use/misuse).
- Better communication from each agency representative on current issues related to pesticide regulation along with more involvement from the Council in the pesticide related activities of the agencies.
- Greater participation by FFWS will be helpful.
- Provide advice to FDACS, DEP and FWC in coordinating NPDES permitting for pesticides. Identify areas in which the SUS and agencies can partner to improve pesticide safety.
- Developing communication protocols.

- I am not sure the Council (at least speaking for myself) understands and appreciates this category of responsibility. I certainly don't have enough confidence in my understanding and appreciation of this category to propose any key issues to be addressed. I yield to the other Council members for input on this one.
- Establish a system that is comprehensive and user friendly for governmental agencies to find or request pesticide related information.
- Provide advice on an as needed basis.
- I am not aware of any pending issues.

D. ENHANCING COMMUNICATION BETWEEN AND AMONG THE AGENCY, INDUSTRY AND PUBLIC.

Key issues/sub-tasks the Council should address:

- Provide more outreach type programs to educate the public on pesticide application safety, possible health effects, and ways that the PRC is protecting Florida's environment and public health related to pesticide usage.
- How to increase communication, particularly with the public on issues that are periodically in the media.
- A clear need is to include the Farm Workers in the loop. I suggest that a place on the Council be made for a Farm Worker representative since so many of the pesticide issues are related to worker exposure/safety.
- Greater participation by industry and public.
- Serve as a public forum when pesticide controversies arise.
- Help the parties identify and prioritize and resolve pesticide issues of mutual concern.
- Developing communication protocols.
- I suggest we develop a clear work-plan and agenda for 2011 and then discuss communication between and among the Agency, Industry and Public. Have something to communicate and then discuss the content and vehicle.
- Utilize technology to the maximum extent feasible to improve communication between DACS and their stakeholders.
- Encourage discussions among agency representatives that are members of the Council and encourage out-side agency advice as needed.
- I am not aware of any pending issues.

E. MITIGATION MEASURES TO MANAGE PESTICIDES—ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

Key issues/sub-tasks the Council should address:

- Soil fumigation procedures and recently required re-labeling.
- Obtain the most current information on environmental studies of pesticides, particularly those involving health effects on humans and aquatic biota.
- The key issue at this time is the use of fumigants. The council has been kept informed of this issue.
- My agency is also a participant in the Pesticide Registration Evaluation Committee. These items listed above are just what we do on the PRC. Does the PRC need to have a redundant role?
- A clearer mechanism to bring forward a potential issue and how the Council would approach it

might help.

- Is "special review" a relevant process? What are the implications of targeting a pesticide for special review?
- At this time we have no particular products to address in either of these categories. At issue is implementation of the Soil Fumigation RED.
- Endangered Species Act implementation for FIFRA regulated products.
- USEPA's proposed general permit for pesticide use under the NPDES program.
- Pesticide registrations in Florida with questionable (i.e. contaminate) wording relating to ground water advisory statements on Federal Pesticide Labels.
- I am unable to answer this part. I don't understand the connection between "mitigation measures to manage pesticides" and the statutory citations listed.

F. BIOLOGICAL AND ALTERNATE CONTROLS TO REPLACE OR REDUCE PESTICIDE USE.

Key issues/sub-tasks the Council should address:

- Get updates on research involving biological and alternate controls to reduce pesticide use.
- I don't think this issue has been on the agenda in the short time I have been a member of the Council.
- Tendency of farmers to stick with pesticides they know to be effective and not try alternative controls.
- Identifying alternative controls that are equally viable and also have other benefits.
- Identifying incentives for farmers to switch over.
- Continue including these topics in series of talks in the coming year.
- Genetically modified organisms, trends in usage, regulatory considerations.
- Promotion of BMPs and IPM.
- Not discussed sufficiently.
- I know of no particular biological or alternate controls to replace or significantly reduce pesticide use before the Council at this time.
- Does DACS have the necessary authority to require the use of biological or alternate controls?
- I am not aware of any pending issues.

G. OTHER ISSUES/TASKS.

Key issues/sub-tasks the Council should address:

- The issue of public funding is important to ensure the Department and SUS can continue to adequately perform their role in protecting the public, promoting science, and working with industry. Perhaps we should compare how Florida generates revenues for funding purposes to other large states such as California.
- How can we offset or minimize the impact of budget cuts that are expected over the next several years?
- We don't have the expertise in this group to do much of anything with this but we can invite researchers to discuss viable alternatives they have developed and potentially support those in recommendations to the Agency and industry reps.
- Pesticide resistance: prevalence and mechanisms to counter it.
- Risk-based compliance inspection programs.
- None that I am aware of.

- I am a new member so I am unaware of any "other issues/tasks".
- I am not aware of any pending issues.

3. The Council has a clear vision and strategy for achieving their statutory mission.

Average: 3.5				
<i>Strongly Agree</i>	⇒	⇒	⇒	<i>Disagree</i>
5	4	3	2	1
2	1	4	1	0

4. The Council has a well established Workplan to address tasks.

Average: 2.9				
<i>Strongly Agree</i>	⇒	⇒	⇒	<i>Disagree</i>
5	4	3	2	1
1	1	4	2	1

5. I am satisfied with how the Council is functioning and meeting their statutory mission.

Average: 3.4				
<i>Strongly Agree</i>	⇒	⇒	⇒	<i>Disagree</i>
5	4	3	2	1
2	1	5	1	0

6. Background information (documents, reports, etc.) members felt would be helpful.

- Regular updates on pesticide studies by IFAS, UF, and other universities in the state.

PRC 2010 WORKPLAN PRIORITIZATION EXERCISE

Please Complete by: _____
 Complete On-Line or Return to: jblair@fsu.edu

RANKING SCALE

- 5 Highest Level of Priority; Urgent
- 4 High Priority
- 3 Moderate Level of Priority
- 2 Low Level of Priority
- 1 Lowest Possible Priority; Group Should not Pursue
- 0 Task is Complete

TOPIC	RANK	5	4	3	2	1	(0) TASK IS COMPLETE	RAW SCORE
TASK B ISSUES								
Council Functionality								
Workplan development/prioritization (3)								
Strategic plan development (4)								
TASK C ISSUES								
Scientific Studies/Funding								
Pesticide/degradates movement/fate (1)								
Applicator health effects (2)								
Pesticide impacts: human/enviro. (3)								
Spray drift (4)								
Formulations and adjuvants (5)								
Antimicrobials (6)								
Emerging pests and diseases (7)								
Restricted pesticides usage/surveys (8)								
Pesticide resistance (9)								
Strategy to secure a funding source (10)								
Biological/alternate controls to reduce pesticide use (11)								

TOPIC	RANK	5	4	3	2	1	(0) TASK IS COMPLETE	RAW SCORE
TASK D ISSUES								
Agency Communication								
NPDES Permitting (1)								
Coordination with other councils (2)								
Information system (3)								
Applicator health/safety issues (4)								
Pesticide registration/compliance (5)								
Soil fumigation RED documents (6)								
FIFRA endangered species (7)								
Aldicarb application well setbacks (8)								
Genetically modified crops (9)								
Revised fumigant labels (10)								
Arsenical herbicides restrictions (11)								
TASK E ISSUES								
Industry/Public Communication								
Public education (1)								
Coordination/Forum (2)								
Pesticide stewardship award (3)								
Strategy for stakeholders (4)								
TASK F ISSUES								
Mitigation Measures								
Pesticide degradates monitoring (1)								
Impacts on applicators (2)								
Soil fumigation procedures (3)								
TASK G ISSUES								
Biological Alternatives								
Pesticide Resistance (1)								
Research pesticide reduction (2)								
Rec's. reduction pesticide use (3)								
Incentives alternative controls (4)								