

A. Grant number: 009607-UCB

Title: Pest Prevention by Design: Guidelines and Training Center

Type: Special Issues

Lead investigator: Vernard Lewis, Extension Specialist, ESPM,
Richmond Field Station, University of California, 1301

South 46th Street, Richmond, CA 94804, office phone 510-665-6724, FAX 510-665-3427, Vernard Lewis <vlewis@nature.berkeley.edu>

Team members: Chris Geiger, Manager, Department of the Environment, San Francisco, CA; Ted Shapas, Manager, EcoWise Certified Program, Oakland, CA

State(s) involved: California and Washington

Funding Year: 2007

Funding amount: \$5,000

B. Summary

A meeting of 23 stakeholders from the Western Region was convened in Oakland, CA on May 8, 2007 to discuss the potential for a structural pest center in California. In attendance were representatives from four universities, two state pesticide regulatory agencies, state water board, several environmental non-profit groups, state public health, several pest control companies, and one municipality. Since California does not officially have a structural pest center, we also invited a representative from Washington State University to discuss the process that led to the creation of their center. While meeting participants were primarily from CA, we felt that issues discussed were representative of those effecting urban areas in all the Western Region.

The meeting kicked off with short presentations on issues, challenges, and opportunities for a structural pest center from representatives of the Department of Pesticide Regulations (DPR), San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board, Pest Control Operators of California, and San Francisco Department of the Environment. Each speaker focused their presentation on problems and opportunities as it pertained to structural pest management and their particular discipline and or area of expertise. Overall, all speakers agreed that changes in population demographics and federal regulations regarding water quality will force changes in strategies and practices used to manage/control structural pests.

Two large group discussions involving all participants were held during the day-long workshop. The morning session asked participants to discuss opportunities a UC structural pest management center could create for them. The afternoon session asked participants to prioritize their lists made during the morning session. The outcomes of both sessions found participants setting their priorities highest for a demonstration center (11), followed by a training center (8) with public education and outreach (6) and coordination and liaison with agencies/industry (5) sharing equal ranking at fourth. When asked to prioritize audience groups, architects/designers (15) were ranked highest, closely followed by pest management professionals (14) with public regulators/policy makers (8) and real estate professional/building manager (8) ranking fourth.

The last activity of the day was to discuss potential barriers and possible funding mechanisms for the center designed during the day. The group articulated many obstacles to funding a structural pest center. Most of the barriers/obstacles revolved around the University of California,

especially its high overhead rate, inter-campus rivalry, and tendency toward being too academic. Other obstacles included lack of talent to support the center and lack of urban advisors at the county level. The group also provided ideas to overcome the obstacles. The resounding feeling from the participants was to start small at first, and identify a high-ranking University champion to push the center creation and agendas. More details on the meeting activities and two sets of notes taken during the workshop are presented in the sections that follow and in Appendices.

C. Objectives:

The original grant proposal objective read, “Once assembled, the charge of this group will be to brainstorm the critical components leading to the creation of guideline and reference standards for pest-preventative building designs and means for concentrating and disseminating this information and talents, including via demonstration and training centers.” However, during the participant invite phase, participants told us they wanted to discuss the larger view pertaining to the potential of creating a structural pest center. Pest-prevention designs and standards as well as training could be folded into the larger matrix of needs and creation of a center. During the daylong event, there was considerable discussion on the need for pest prevention designs and standards, and the potential for integration with green building certifications; see notes in the Appendices.

D. Working Group Membership: Our organization and planning team for the Western IPM Center-funded project consisted of Dr. Vernard Lewis, UC Berkeley; Dr. Chris Geiger, San Francisco Department of the Environment; and Ted Shapas, EcoWise Certified in Oakland. Facilitator for the daylong meeting was Dr. Susan Laughlin, former Vice-President, University of California, Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources. A list of center meeting participants and their affiliations includes the following:

Bonilla, Denise, California Department of Health Services
Burgoyne, Dan, State of California, Dept. General Services
Clark, Patrick, Clark Pest Control, Bakersfield
Clark, Terry, Clark Pest Control, Lodi
Davidson, Nita, California Department of Pesticide Regulation
Foss, Carrie, Washington State University
Gatto, Joseph, Clark Pest Control and President Pest Control Operators of California
Getty, Gail, University of California, Berkeley
Haverty, Michael, USDA Forest Service
Love, Jen, Build It Green (NGO)
Mumley, Tom, CA Regional Water Quality Control Board, SF Bay Region
Okuma, Kelli, California Structural Pest Control Board
Reierson, Donald, University of California, Riverside
Rentz, Mark, California Department of Pesticide Regulation
Slater, Arthur, Slater Pest Control and Consulting
Simon, Deanna, San Francisco Department of the Environment
Speare, Laura, San Francisco Estuary Project/ABAG
Wilen, Cheryl, UC Statewide IPM Program, UC Davis
Taylor, Robin, University of California, Berkeley

E. Progress: The daylong meeting was held May 8, 2007 in Oakland, California. Initially, thirty-three individuals representing 15 separate agencies and companies were invited to the center meeting. The final count of those agreeing to attend and in final attendance was twenty-three representing eleven different stakeholder groups. The format we chose for the opening session of the meeting was to provide background on how the meeting came to be, followed by brief reviews of pertinent issues related to structural pest management from the perspectives of regulatory, industry, water board, and municipality representatives.

Mark Rentz, representing DPR, led off the panel discussions. He outlined what he thought the greatest challenge was facing the state and region pertaining to urban pest management, that is, the State's rapidly changing demographics, with more people moving into cities. Traditionally, pesticide issues pertained more to agriculture, but that has and will continue to change. Other issues include DPR grappling with a large influx of staff retirements and increased competition for resources and budgets. Mark was optimistic that opportunities did exist and revolved around partnerships and strong communication as the State strives to improve water and air quality.

Tom Mumley with the Water Quality Board gave his perspective next. Tom mentioned that federal mandates must be followed pertaining to preventing pesticides emanating from municipalities from entering waterways. This regulatory mandate will be very difficult to achieve since cities do not have any regulatory control over most pesticide users, especially homeowners. He also mentioned that it may be inappropriate to increase regulation of the pest control industry in the State. A more sustainable solution is needed with the focus at the homeowner level to curtail their perceptions and needs for pesticides, especially when the products they use may eventually end up in waterways. These solutions are still being formulated but may include limits on over-the-counter products and modifying homeowner perceptions on pests and need for their management/control.

Joe Gatto spoke on behalf of the pest control industry in the State. Joe stressed that the industry is doing what it can to comply with water quality mandates, but without the cooperation of their customers' facilities, the industry is limited in what it can do. He also mentioned the problems with over-the-counter products and difficulty in providing any enforcement of homeowner pest control practices. The industry has and will continue to do its part in being a steward of the environment.

Chris Geiger represented San Francisco Department of the Environment, and gave the perspective of a City that has adopted an IPM philosophy. San Francisco and other cities often face pest problems in sensitive facilities, such as in hospitals and schools. Due to the complexities of the problems, buy-in from facility managers and on-the-ground staff is key to the success of an urban IPM program. Alternatives to pesticides or least toxic pesticides are being used whenever possible, but more options are needed. From Chris's perspective, a certification system for both pest management providers and sites is needed, along with more urban IPM research and extension resources. The burgeoning green building movement represents an opportunity for UC to integrated pest prevention measures into building design and maintenance, and perhaps the center could help serve this need.

The following questions were raised after the four presentations:

- 1) Question: Availability of pesticide use reports, how can we get better and faster information? Answer: System is antiquated and we need to look at what systems are needed to take us into the 21st century.
- 2) Question: Can we use pesticide use data to explain how pesticides move in the environment? Answer: Don't know.
- 3) Question: How do we get information out to 5 million people? Answer: No good answer, but behavioral modification and changes in public perception are needed. However, in San Francisco pesticide use is down 70%.
- 4) Other comments included pesticide usage has gone from pounds to grams, zero tolerance for pests by public, give pest management professionals a "tool box" for IPM, and need for preventative pest designs.

Then followed two participatory activities where participants were asked to discuss the opportunities for creating a structural pest center, including prioritizing and ranking important themes/features and services offered. For the discussion that followed a facilitator was used, Dr. Susan Laughlin, retired associate vice-president from the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources, University of California. No audio or visual recordings of the meeting were taken; the meeting planners wanted transcribed comments from participants to be frank and candid, and reasonably anonymous.

In the first session, group participants were subdivided into three small groups and asked the questions "What could a UC structural pest control center do for you? Not surprising all three groups had a common vision for the center, training, demonstration, and outreach (see notes in appendices for detailed listing by small group). However, there was considerable variance in achieving this center vision - hands-on versus collaboration versus web sites. When participants were later asked to prioritize center themes (using colored dots along side of individual listings cast as votes of interest), a demonstration structure ranked highest (11). Training center was next in ranking (8), followed by public education & outreach (6) and coordination & liaison (5). It is interesting to note that research as a center theme received little group support (4), while themes on policy guidance and best management practice guidelines received no votes.

The participants were also asked to prioritize audience groups the center might serve. Once again colored dots cast as votes were used by participants to designate interest. Architects/designers received the greatest numbers of votes (15), closely followed by pest management professionals (14). Public regulators/policy makers (8) and real estate professional/building managers (8) were tied at third in the rankings. Other audience groups receiving votes included residents (7), kids (5), retail store personnel (3), IPM coordinators (2) and research community (1).

A second discussion question was presented participants, "What are the barriers to effective operation of the center and how can we avoid them? An additional wrinkle was that along with voicing concerns participants had to propose a solution to overcome the concern. The format

used for this discussion was small group, later re-convening as a large group with Susan Laughlin facilitating the ebb and flow of comments. Many concerns were voiced as barriers by the participants concerning creating a university based structural pest center and are listed below along with possible solutions noted in parenthesis “()”. For a complete listing of comments see Appendix I.

- ❖ High University overhead costs (off campus center may have lower rate),
- ❖ Difficulty in centralizing control over the center within UC system (draft clear center by-laws and charter),
- ❖ Overlap with other University or non-university programs (good communication and collaboration),
- ❖ Inter-campus rivalry (good communication and collaboration),
- ❖ Shortage of technical talent (use of graduate students or interns),
- ❖ University run structural pest center may be too academic (advisory board needs to be multifaceted),
- ❖ No filter in counties or UC advisor level to disseminate center generated information (need to create structural/urban advisor positions),
- ❖ Sustainability in funding/budget (create partnership and write grants),
- ❖ Geographical location of center (multiple campus involvement),
- ❖ Over ambitious in services or activities provided (start small),
- ❖ Too many target audiences (limit audiences served),
- ❖ Client base to support center may be too limited (work at developing clientele/market for support), and
- ❖ Difficulties in setting priorities and focus (rely on advice from advisory board).

The next activity for the day was a presentation given by Carrie Foss of Washington State University. Ms. Foss is the Urban IPM coordinator and provided leadership leading to the creation of the Structural Pest IPM Training facility based in Puyallup, Washington. She gave the participants a brief summary on the Center recently opened in April 2007. The facility primarily provides training and education only for structural pest inspectors and pest managers. Several training sessions with hands-on activities have been conducted. More are being planned. Funding was provided from at least five stakeholder groups in the State. Start up costs for the center was modest, approximately \$20,000, much of building materials and labor were donated or volunteered.

The last group activity of the day was to have participants discuss, “What resources are available to create and fund a center?” Susan Laughlin was the facilitator for a lively large group discussion on possible funding strategies. Basically the overall conscience of participants was to keep the initial focus of center small, and rely on seed money from industry and small grants. Once the center has developed itself, sustainable funding should be sought after from larger funding institutions. Major funding will require the writing and communicating of clear objectives and an individual or small group of individuals that can champion the center through the development and growth phases. See Appendix I for notes for this activity.

The final actions of the day were Vernard Lewis giving and overall summary, and thank you to all participants by the meeting planning group.

F. Results:

It has been three months since the center stakeholders meeting in Oakland. At least one in-person meeting and three conference calls have been convened from the planners of the meeting to discuss future courses of action. This final report is one course of action. The meeting and conference calls all showed interest in moving the center vision forward and seeking out potential funding agencies; although, the themes and services produced by the center or audiences served have yet to be decided. One of the meeting planners, Vernard Lewis, has sent out letters to the pest control industry in California, seeking out donations to create a center that is very limited in scope; basically a demonstration and training center for the structural pest control industry. San Francisco is also pressing forward with a project to create a list of preventive pest building designs. However, the final form and funding sources for a center described on paper that day on May 8 by 23 stakeholder participants still lies some distance in the future.

G. Appendices: Appendix I, note-taker, Gail Getty, University of California, and Appendix II, note-taker, Deanna Simon, San Francisco Department of the Environment.

APPENDIX I

(Note taker, Gail Getty, University of California)



A STRUCTURAL PEST MANAGEMENT CENTER FOR CALIFORNIA?

May 8, 2007

9:00-4:00

Elihu Harris State Building, Conference Room 6, Second Floor
1515 Clay Street
Oakland

Agenda

9:00 Gathering and Refreshments

Introduction of Conveners and Participants..... Vernard Lewis
Purpose and Desired Outcomes.....Susan Laughlin

The **Major Challenges** Facing Us Now and in the Future in
Urban Structural Pest Management and How We Can Address Them
.....Panel

- Mark Rentz Department of Pesticide Regulation
- Tom Mumley San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Joe Gatto Clark Pest Control
- Chris Geiger San Francisco Department of the Environment

NOTES:

Mark Rentz: Handout: Issues with DRP grappling with. Biggest challenges rapidly changing demographics. Reassessing our mission, goals and objectives, and strategic plan. A lot of resources go here. Resources and non-agriculture issues are a big question. DPR facing a serious attrition challenge, i.e. loss of staff (~50%) and retirement. Issues include competition and knowledge level. Water Quality, Air Quality, ES. Increasing public expectation in regard to pest issues and alternative approaches. Limited resources is also a challenge. Invasive species and imports are a significant issue. What will be climate change and what will that mean to pest management issues.

Collaborative partnerships, i.e. business, academia, government. Proactive approach at DPR: looking for opportunities for solutions, well trained workforce in pest management, Increase

population growth and pest management, research and technology programs for alternate solutions and testing before use by public. Strong communication strategy is an issue. Most people are concerned with their problem and a solution for THEM. Many times public not as concerned with overall result

Tom Mumley: Water quality perspective. Point 1. Did studies of urban pests in creeks, amount of pesticides used in urban settings, i.e. tests done in Contra Costa county. Good news is 99% of chemicals used in watershed not found in creeks. (XXXask for second stat later). Another challenge: regulation of pollutants in streams..required to take action. Urban pest conveyence, i.e. storm drains and municipalities. Problem, we can regulate things they need to control. But municipalities cannot control pesticide used. Water quality controls cannot be solved via current rules, etc. Access to various chemicals and replacements and how they are used in pest management are important. Other challenges: outrageous that some of the chemicals available to the public. Anyone can buy them, even a small child. Drugs are behind the counter in drug stores, but pesticides readily available to public. Cannot expect public to be competent in use of pesticides. Asking too much of public. Most of market is residential. Too much use and the problem is making customer happy. Effective pesticide use includes IPM, IPM certification. Why is it so hard, because people are lazy. Pesticides readily available. A lot of products are meant to be used in a way that causes water quality issues. How products are used, i.e. broadcast spraying and subsurface issues. Need to bring pest management to the consumer, i.e. homeowner and businesses to use pesticides well.

Joe Gatto: Water quality a huge issue. At PCOC developing programs that are site specific. Cannot do without cooperation of the site. Some concerns are measurements of products iin the water, and how is it getting in the water. Majority of products are produced over the counter and we have no control over this. PCO's see a lot of this, and it is more encompassing. Technicians need at least 30d training, while the homeowner can buy what they want and use as much or little as they want. A lot of water quality measurements is nano level, and homeowner uses whatever they want. So, homeowner education is most important and will protect the waterways. Easy enough to be able to control the professionals because we have to answer to laws and regs to stay in business, but hard to regulator HO without taking stuff off the shelf. I also think that what we need to do at PCO's is be more vocal and get message out to the consumers. We have been protectors of the environment forever. We are very concerned by the environment and we get a bad rap from the media. We are the solution and not the problem. A lot of hurdles, not the least is how are pesticides getting into the water. Getting away from treating impervious surfaces is a goal being approached by PCOC. PCOC continues to work on that. We can be stewards of the environment.

Chris Geiger. I'm here as a major consumer of pest services SF is a large area to treat. Sensitive sites are the norm. Big pest challenges and the usual budget issues and politically charged agendas and issues. When you try to solve pest problems in the least hazardous way in Sf, a lot of people are talking to each other. Only way to deal with problems is to talk a lot with a lot of people. Open to the public. Feels SF has a model IPM program. Successful because we all talk to each other. Pesticide use lowered 10% as a result. Challenges: first is the need for a facility manager and for them to reali8zed they have an active role in IPM even with budget restraints. Instituting behavioral changes is very difficult. Further professionalizing the pest management

industry is needed. Rodenticides are an issue in the state and will soon not be available to the public. We need a certification system to know better what kind of quality service we are getting, and that the least amount of pesticide is being utilized. Big need is better way to contract with structural pest control. Having certifications would be helpful. I agree with the idea that we need certification for providers, but also for the sites. You want to know that making sure the job was done right is important. More training is needed for the industry. Statewide IPM training is sometimes out of date, sometimes doesn't address needs. Here's a pattern of meeting comments: when it comes right down to it, there is a deficiency in building pest management. How buildings are built is contributing to pest problems. Questions include pre-treat on construction slabs. No place for definitive guidance and answers. If we talk about a Center maybe it can a center that serves many issues, i.e. whole systems design, IPM, architects, Pest industry, Water Quality, etc. END

Questions and comments from audience.

Q1. 2006 usage pesticide use report questioned and how to get that information out better/faster. A1: antiquated system now and a lot of challenges. We need to ask ourselves if the system in place can move us into the 21st century. We gather mainly sales data and correlate with use data. But people are extrapolating what the data says. Our question is how does product A get to point B. I don't know how we can expedite the report now. There is misuse of sales data. First, we need to define the question. Q1 cont. how do we get message out to the public.

Q2 cont. How do you get info out to 5 million people, with various backgrounds, language, behavior. I feel the solution is behavior modification, change the public's perspective what constitutes pest management. Q2: Pesticide use in SF decreased 7%.

Comment on what you are using and reduction. A2: no definitive answer because it is divided into many departments and cannot quantify. Difficult to answer that.

Comment: We've gone from pounds to grams of materials now. In order to get the public more mainstream, you need to educate the public.

Comment: zero tolerance level by public for any pest problem.

Comment: One approach may be to have smaller quantities available to the public.

Comment: Broadening the role of the PMP. Give the professional the training and "tool box", and the PMP went through a educated thought process: i.e. deal with immediate problem, but also have the component of preventing future problems.

10:45 Break

Opportunities: What Could a UC Structural Pest Control Center Do For You?..... All

NOTES AND CHARTS DEVELOPED BY GROUPS:

Coleoptera Group:

A Center at UC brings objectivity and cross disciplinary

-Best Management Practices

Authoritative guidelines

Curricula

-Coordination/Strategic Planning

Extension personnel

-Outreach/Communication

Behavior modification

-Training

Industry, PMP's, Architects, Builders

-Demonstration Structure

DIPTERA GROUP

- Training
 - County regulators
 - Design and Construction
 - PMP's
 - Public
- Outreach
 - Collaboration
 - Off Site training
- Demonstration
 - Construction/landscape
 - Prevention
 - New Technologies

ISOPTERA GROUP

-TRAINING

Web Site

Handson

Research

Inform other agencies & programs

Coordination and Liaison

Clearing house

Public education and Outreach

Website

Communication

Website

Demonstration

Hands on

Guidance/Policy papers

Inform other agencies and programs

Physical Center and Director

Location, eg. Richmond Field Station

Training could move anywhere

Multiple audiences

PMP's

IPM coordinators

Architects, engineers

Public

Landscape designers

Building and real estate professionals

Retail store employees

Review and Prioritize Possible Contributions of a Center..... All

NOTES OF MAJOR THEMES AND VOTES:

Major Themes (PRIORITY NUMBERS)

- Training (8)
 - Website and hands on

- Demonstration (11)
 - (having a building)
 - construction & landscape practices
 - Prevention
 - New Technologies

- Public Education and outreach (6)

- Coordination and Liaison (5)
 - Agency/Industry

- Research (4)
 - Grants
 - Trials
 - Priorities

- Policy Guidance

- Best Management Practice Guidelines

WHO ARE THE AUDIENCE GROUPS

- PMP's (14)
- Residents (7)
- Retail Store Personnel (3)
- Kids (5)
- Architects/Designers (15)
 - Structural
 - Landscape
 - Builders/Construction
- Public Regulators/Policy Makers (8)
- IPM Coordinators (2)
- Real Estate Professionals/Building Managers (8)
- Research Community (1)
- NGO's – Non-governmental organizations (0)

PRIORITY ORDER

Audience Groups

- Architects/Designers (15)**
- PMP's (14)**
- Public Regulators/Policy Makers (8)**
- Real Estate Professionals/Building Managers (8)**
- Residents (7)
- Kids (5)
- Retail Store Personnel (3)
- IPM Coordinators (2)
- Research Community (1)
- NGO's – Non-governmental organizations (0)

Major Themes

- Demonstration (11)**
- Training (8)**
- Best management Practices Guidelines (8)**
- Public Education and Outreach (6)
- Coordination and Liaison (5)
- Research (4)
- Policy Guidance (0)

12:20 Lunch

Obstacles: What Are the Barriers To Effective Operation?
How Can We Avoid Them?..... All

NOTES:

Beetle group:

UC Center vs. Non-UC Center

-Problems

Centralized control by UC could be problematic

Review of overhead costs UC might charge (49% cost)

-Solutions

By-laws and charter must be clear in beginning

-Overhead and costs
Off campus center may be lower rate?

Isoptera Group:

UC Center vs. Non-UC Center

-would there be overlap with other non-UC and UC programs

-inter-campus rivalry

-Competition for resources

-Solution may be good communication and collaboration

Diptera Group:

Shortage of technical talent, turnover of talent, i.e. retirement, and organization talent.

Relying on grad students for support may be a solution.

Beetle Group:

Second concern:

UC emphasis may be too academic and not practical enough

Advisory board needs to be multifaceted.

Termite Group:

Second concern:

Technology transfer problems in publishing to the end-users.

i.e. endorsements

If you can't endorse how do you get information out?

No filter such as advisor groups to disseminate information

Diptera Group:

Second Concern:

Funding

Solutions: bring in partnerships, grants, or/and have it as a program and not a center. Instead of having a facility, it can be a program via electronic medium or other non-physical building/place.

Sustainability. Funding long term. Solutions might be a campus program vs. a full blown Center.

Beetle Group:

Another concern:

Geographical location of Center. Service the entire state, Northern vs. Southern California vs. Central....

One solution may be multiple campus involvement.

Possible solution may be how Board is comprised.

Termite Group:

Another concern:

Selling Urban Pest Management. Funding, public relations/interest, selling idea to the University.

Solution: lower carbon footprint, green building, etc.

Diptera Group:
Another concern:
Over ambitious project.

Beetle Group:
Another Concern:
Credibility of a non-University center
Solution may be a non-profit group as a Center or running the center.

Termite Group:
Another Concern:
Communicating with different audiences. Target different audiences and can we communicate with any one of them. Solution may be to involve them in multi-disciplined groups.

Diptera Group:
Another Concern:
Lack of a champion.

Other concerns:
Does the client base exist for longevity of a Center.
Work on developing market.

Problems may include setting priorities, staying current, available real estate for physical structure(s).

U.C. approval of Center could be difficult.

Conclusions (sobering elements of thoughts from group):

Funding
Inter-campus rivalry
Focusing efforts
Technology Transfer
Lack of a champion

An Example of a University-based Urban Pest Management Center
Carrie Foss, Washington State University

NOTES:

2:30 Break

What **Form** Might the Center Take? What **Resources** Are Available?..... All

NOTES:

Site vs. Program

Demonstration structure as a part of program.

Difficult to state what “form” means. Leads us back to “don’t get over-ambitious”.

Couple of programs/centers “center for the built environment” use campus buildings and professors and grad students to hold meetings, give classes, etc. So, no building, use campus resources, academia.

We do on-site training. We rent space. Field exams may be at construction sites. We have an office, but people don’t come to us.

Education and outreach to general public is challenging if don’t have a facility they can come to.

Consumer outreach takes a different form than industry. Demonstrations are smaller. Programs developed over time. Planning on a larger facility later.

Davis Center that is new, has larger classroom that can hold 30 people with demonstrations and living laboratory. Have enough funding background and UC backing.

Another idea was the need for a strong director. A cheerleader, very focused, good communicator, collaborator, fund raiser.

FUNDING:

Question: where should funding be sought from?

First understand goals and objectives.

Est. entities and collaborators from various groups.

Example: PCOC may be a group.

Partnerships are important. We are always at the mercy of year to year funding. We are all experiencing

Some for of this.

2 sets of funding: seed and sustaining

Will training alone provide enough income.

Service center funded by different source.

Some experiences are that the training pays for itself.

Membership may provide funds from various groups.

What is the incentive of membership?

Support research that helps industry and funder?

Exposure to cutting edge research that may give funder edge on competitors.

State mandates may be serviced/addressed. Includes objectives of various new mandates.

How you craft program to meet criteria of grants.

Could be a slow track. Vernard et.al write smaller grants. Get grants from EPA to meet their goals.

These grants may result in larger grants later.

Curious as to what has been out there, other examples, i.e. non-profit organizations, single centers run by organizations. Does anyone know of one?

One membership organization gets funding from various organizations whose goals match their’s.

Good to know who is doing what out there and how they are getting funding. You may be competing with others, especially if many people go to source. You may wish to piggy back with other fund seekers.

Private foundations.

Champion role will include strong fund raising skills.

PRESSING PIECES OF ADVICE TO Vernard Lewis

Question to the group: Did we miss any stakeholders coming to this meeting.
Industry, HUD, building managers, organizations i.e BOMA,

Wrap-up and Next Steps.....Vernard Lewis, Chris Geiger, Ted Shapas

NOTES:

4:00 Adjourn



APPENDIX II

(Note taker, Deanna Simon, San Francisco Depart. Of the Environment)

Terry Clark – Clark pest control

Don Reirson - UCR

Mark Rentz – DPR policy coordination

Jen – build it green

Robin – UCB w Vernard, used to be with forest service

Gail Getty – w Vernard

Pat Clark – Clark pest control in Bakersfield

Michael Haverty – emeritus scientist for forest service, now visiting scholar in Vernard’s lab

Tom Mumley – water board tmdls

Joe Gatto – Clark pest control, rep of PCOC

Kelli Okuma – structural pest control board

Carrie Foss – wash state univ, wash state pest control center

Dan Burgoyne – dept of gen services pest management

Susan Laughlin – facilitator

Advice

Recommendations

Emerging issues:

- Need to start small, focused?
- Need high-level champions
- There is a need/opportunity to collaborate with and provide resources to other industries – architects, designers, facility managers.
- Need for credible conveners – Univ? NGO?
- There is a need to change consumer paradigm of what pest management means (ie: prevent instead of treatment, going beyond zero tolerance). What role can this center play? Can influence policy & design
- Gap exists in framework for communicating prevention, treatment, and emerging technologies for urban pest management
- Research/ideas are out there – we just need a venue to communicate them
- PMP training lacking, needed – could be a source of ongoing funding
- Prevention BMPs & training don’t exist and are needed
- Could collaborators help fund: DPR, PCOC,

Lingering Big Questions:

- Who are the champions/supporters?
- How to attract the necessary talent?
- Audience: Which audience focus will produce the greatest impact? Can we / do we want to target consumers AND professionals?
- Marketing: How to generate support and visibility?
- Sustained funding
- Challenges with University sponsored program: Will univ program be practical enough? Will overhead taken by Univ be too much for funders? Will there be turf competition between campuses?

Ideas:

- If univ sponsor doesn’t pan out, look to NGOs or consider scaling down to a program w/out a center
- Have Struct pest control board/ PCOC require X hours of water quality education to renew a license – source of ongoing funding for trainings.
- Encourage consumers to hire professional pest control
- North and Southern Cal centers
- Membership-based
- Look to potential funders, see who else they are funding, and consider piggy-backing/collaborating

Thoughts

Summary:

Vernard Lewis

- Major audiences: Architects/designers, PMPs, PolicyMakers, Facility Managers
- Major themes are: Demo site, trainings, BMPs
- Will be doing PCO trainings, and will work with Kids
- He can champion his lab, but he can't champion this large idea

Chris Geiger

- May begin by proceeding on small parts (ie: prevention BMPs)

Mark Rentz -

DPRs staff attrition = loss of a resource – gap needs to be filled

As state demographics change resources available need to keep pace. Need to fill

data/resource gap as more of the state moves from rural to urban.

Invasive pressure increasing

Public expecting us to come up w alternative approaches

DPR supports collaborative partnerships. Esp in light of diverse urban pest stakeholders

- **As state demographics change resources available need to keep pace.**
- **Need to fill data/resource gap as more of the state moves from rural to urban.**
- Do the data collection systems we have now meet our needs?
- Need a way to change consumer attitude and behavior

Tom Mumley –

Regional/state water board legally obligated to take action to reduce P pollution of waterbodies. B/c municipalitie can't regulate the use of pesticides (only regulate discharges) we need to approach it from a different direction. The have a challenge here, so a pest management center could be a way for them to increase their impact.

Big opportunity to educate – since pyrethroids are legal and increasing, we are just replacing diaz and chlorpy w/ diazinon. In light of the fact that we can't regulate how homeowners use P's, we need to do something else.

His focus is more on the homeowner and changing the way pests are controlled on-site b/c products are available and if used properly still have water quality concerns. "Need to bring pest management awareness to the consumer"

- **Regional/state water board legally obligated to take action to reduce P pollution of waterbodies.**
- **Focus on the homeowner and changing the way pests are controlled on-site b/c available products still have water quality concerns even if used properly. "Need to bring pest management awareness to the consumer"**

Joe Gatto –

water quality issues pop up weekly. Also concerned about the availability of products to the homeowner. Impossible to see where pollution is coming from, but he thinks the industry is doing it right.

- **Need to convince homeowners to get over bad image of the pest control industry and to use professional service more b/c then we can be sure products are used properly.**

Chris Geiger –

- Education of facility managers and their role in IPM is a new paradigm that needs to be embraced.
- Moving products from consumer market to the professionals “where it belongs” – ie: further restrict consumer products
- **Need to provide a way for people to assess the quality of the service they receive, a way to discern. Ie: Ecowise, Greenshield, etc...**
- Municipalities need tools to effectively contract for pest management services
- Tools needed: certified providers AND certified sites
- **Also needed is a framework in which to insert pest prevention into the design process.**
- Could be a multipurpose facility, including demonstration center, maybe a place to do pilot projects.
- This could be an opportunity for UC to really take the lead

Outcome of group exercise #1

1. Place for objective, credible information
2. Coordination/liason - w other disciplines/industries (building, architects, designers, etc...)
3. Demo site – construction & landscape practices, prevention, new technologies
4. Training - Off site and on-site, web
5. Research – grant program/research prioritization/on-site trials
6. Public education and outreach
7. Guidelines and BMPs
8. Policy Guidance

Potential Audiences:

PMPs

Residents – via county ext agents?

Retail store personnel

Building Professionals - Architects/designers – structural and landscape – preconstruction and construction

Policy makers

IPM coordinators

Real estate professionals – post construction

Facility managers

Research community