

## **Pest Control Applicator Licensing and Wildland Weed Control**

Topic leader: David Chang, Santa Barbara County Agriculture Commissioner's Office

Facilitator: Joel Trumbo, California Department of Fish and Game

Note taker: Mark Heath, Shelterbelt Builders

### **Attendees**

Joel Trumbo, Dept. of Fish and Game (Facilitator)  
David Chang, Santa Barbara County Ag (Topic Leader)  
Mark Heath, Shelterbelt Builders (Notes)  
Stan Hooper MPR  
Matt Takaeda, DPR  
Eliza Maher, Center for Natural Lands Management  
Dale Schmidt, LA County Water/Power  
Anna Huber, Wildlands Restoration  
Jake Bentley, CA State Parks  
John Ekhooff, CDFG  
Bryan Vander Max, Mission Resource Conservation District  
Bill Neill, Riparian Rop

Joel – introduction to pesticide application licensing requirements, currently no category for wildland weeds and the quals do not necessarily reflect the needs for wildland weeds. Is there a need for specialized categories for wildland weeds?

Current Pest Control Advisor license requires pest control/production agriculture college coursework that doesn't necessarily reflect what's available at Universities/community colleges today.

ACTION ITEM: Create a dialogue.

### **Discussion**

*Stan:* Wildland category important to deal with issues relating to wildland sensitivities, endangered species and lack of specification of current tests

*Bill:* Changes in requirements would require UC to write a new test, new test prep materials, IPM manual etc requiring much work on their part which may be another issue.

*Bill:* Right of Way category and work closely matches the real work done in wildland pest control but it doesn't necessarily ever occur along a right of way. Written recommendations not necessary for much of wildland weed control. Writing multiple recommendations may be unnecessary or redundant for multiple parks with the same invasive plants/vegetation.

*Dale:* Uses right-of-way category for pest control in LA Water/Power but often sprays in a helicopter, large expanses of land, in and around homes

*Joel:* Public applicators don't need all categories because they don't actually need the QAC to spray own land with non-restricted materials. A much greater risk for private applicators who are legally required to operate in the correct category. This becomes a big issue when each county interprets categories differently and the regulations defining categories define wildland weed control unclearly.

*Mac:* DPR realigned State categories to be mirror Federal classifications. That is where the categories come from. Very cumbersome to break out detailed categories and so unlikely to happen soon. Each category takes ~\$80-\$100K funding plus legislation. Subcategories can be developed by regulation with much less expense/effort.

*Joel:* Cal-IPC could possibly write DPR study guides for wildland weeds to help facilitate a wildland weeds subcategory

\_\_\_\_\_: Legislation could be an option as there is likely to be little opposition

*Joel:* Some regulatory benefit for wildland weeders who work directly in endangered species habitat other specialized needs.

\_\_\_\_\_: More credibility from regulators in developing and implementing projects in sensitive wildlands.

*Mac:* How are other States dealing with this issue? Potentially Florida already has an example?

*David:* North American Weed Management Association has a professional weed management certification that ~ 20 people in the US hold currently.

Options: Can we modify the definition for categories with DPR to include wildland category definitions to be more inline with current practices instead of creating a whole new category.

*Mark:* How does this affect private operators such as a Land Trust implementing pest control on their own lands?

*Joel:* Separate issues for ag use of private and public lands.

*Mac:* To justify a new subcategory, DPR needs the current number of people needing the new subcategory; a clear definition of why other categories do not apply and new study materials to support the exam.

*Stan:* PPE compliance difficult in wildlands as well such as eye washing stations in the backcountry.

*David:* What about Invasive Species Control category? Could build a constituency with other invasive species organizations to justify the number of people needed for the new category.

*Mark:* What about a Cal-IPC private certification for wildland weed workers?

*Joel:* Does not solve any legal issues. In summary new subcategory is the easiest mechanism to solve this issue. Plus study materials would have to be identified or created to support such a classification.

\_\_\_\_\_: Pesticide manufacturers have already done a cost-benefit analysis for habitat restoration sections of their labels therefore there should be a good impetus to justify a new category.

*Mac:* We need a number of people who want to take this test to have this subcategory. ~1000 people would need to want to take this test.

*Joel:* No lawsuits have occurred to justify better definitions.

*Mark:* Should we ask DPR for a list of compliance actions for working out of category in wildlands?

*Joel:* Probably little info would be available from DPR

*Anna:* A Statewide interpretation from DPR could clarify how enforcement actions resolve wildland category compliance.

\_\_\_\_\_: The categories must truly represent the actions so truly qualified people are doing the work

**ACTION ITEM: ASK CAL-IPC TO REQUEST A NEW SUBCATAGORY FROM DPR AND ATTEMPT TO JUSTIFY THE NEED.**

*Bill:* What is the action item?

*Mac:* Justification of numbers of people who will take that test PLUS justification of uniqueness of the category.

*Joel:* Definition of PCA issue

*Mac:* Proposed packet of regulation changes to PCA education requirements. Expansion will now include Pest Management experience and higher degrees in natural sciences supplement current educational requirements for the pest control advisors license.

Under "Pending Regulations" for Pest Control Advisory Licensing Requirements - March 2008 – Lead for comments Linda Iriqanda