

California Walnut Board

101 Parkshore Drive, Suite 250
Folsom, CA 95630-4726
(916) 932-7070
(916) 932-7071 Fax
info@walnuts.org
An Equal Opportunity Employer and Provider



GRADES & STANDARDS COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

May 2, 2013

The California Walnut Board Grades & Standards Committee held a teleconference meeting on Thursday, May 2, 2013, at the CWB Office in Folsom, CA. Committee Chairperson Bill Carriere called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m. Ms. Dana Steindorf called the roll and established a quorum. The following Committee members were present via telephone:

Bill Carriere, Chairperson
Steve Lindsay, Vice-Chairperson
Chuck Crain
Sam Keiper (non-voting)
Frank Guerra
Gus Mariani
Pete Turner

Others attending via telephone were Jeremiah Szabo of DFA; Andrea Ricci of USDA/AMS; Bob Van Steenwyk; and CWB staff members Dennis Balint, Carl Eidsath, Abhi Kulkarni and Dana Steindorf.

The first order of business was the approval of the minutes from the February 14, 2013, Grades & Standards meeting. Mr. Guerra made a motion to approve the minutes, Mr. Crain seconded the motion and it carried unanimously by roll call vote.

Chairperson Carriere asked Mr. Eidsath to present the next agenda item, Review EPA draft risk assessment for Chlorpyrifos. Mr. Eidsath discussed EPA's ongoing review of chlorpyrifos (Lorsban, dursban, etc.). He stated that the model that EPA used for the risk assessment is the same model that is used for fumigants, called a PERFUM model. In the 70 page proposed rule that EPA has put out, there was a significant change to the by-stander risk from using Lorsban (which currently does not have a buffer zone) between 2,000 to 4,700 feet using the PERFUM risk analysis. He indicated that our industry has 70,000+ acres treated with Lorsban each year; 250,000 pounds of Lorsban were used in 2010.

Mr. Eidsath asked Mr. Van Steenwyk to attend this teleconference meeting as an expert and to confirm what replacement we have available as a drop in or if there is no drop in, what the risk for the codling moth and husk fly infestations are if we were unable to use Lorsban. Mr. Eidsath stated that a 2,000 foot buffer zone would completely eliminate the use of Lorsban in our industry. Mr. Van Steenwyk commented that he has worked on Lorsban for many years and it has many advantages and disadvantages. There are replacements that follow the course that are more expensive and some are more environmentally disruptive than Lorsban and some are

less. The major advantage to Lorsban is that it has been proven to be negatively correlated with insect cross resistency. As pure substitutes, there are a number of compounds that can be used; but there are draw backs to each of the substitutes.

Mr. Balint stated that the buffer zones are really the key – he asked Mr. Van Steenwyk and the Committee if any of the orchards they are familiar with would be affected. Mr. Van Steenwyk stated that just about every orchard he knows of would be affected. If there was a 2,000 foot buffer zone to any residence or any potential bystander, it would affect the majority of the orchards in the state.

Mr. Balint commented that when the Commission provides comments to EPA, one of the arguments that can be used is economic impact. He would need Mr. Eidsath and Mr. Kulkarni to determine an estimate of the acreage lost and economic impact if this buffer zone were instituted. Mr. Van Steenwyk suggested that staff contact Karen Klonsky at UC Davis who has done some economic analysis already.

Mr. Eidsath stated that May 7, 2013 at midnight Eastern time is the deadline for comments to EPA on the proposed rule. The Commission will submit a letter for the public comment period. The Committee discussed options for getting the information out to growers and handlers in order for them to submit comments in time as well. Mr. Guerra mentioned that the Handler Coalition is meeting on May 7th and maybe we could have several people sign a letter. Mr. Eidsath stated that he has a draft letter that he will complete and have submitted by May 7th on behalf of the Commission. Mr. Turner suggested that each person signing the group letter at the Handler Coalition meeting could indicate the tonnage they represent in the industry. Mr. Crain stated that it will probably be 98% of the tonnage represented at that meeting; he would like to see handlers submit individual letters as well as signing the group letter. Mr. Eidsath commented that Dow is also going to submit comments to EPA that include an extensive rebuttal to the PERFUM method.

Ms. Ricci stated that she had shared with Mr. Eidsath yesterday that the USDA's policy and guidance has changed to allow marketing order Boards and Committees to comment on other agency legislation, but they can only provide factual information and cannot take a position. Also, the materials must be presented to USDA for review before they are submitted. The timeframe on this issue is prohibitive to having the Board submit the comment letter; therefore, the Commission will submit the letter to EPA.

The time and place of the next meeting will be at the discretion of the chair. There was no need for an Executive Session. Hearing no further business, Chairperson Carriere adjourned the meeting at 4:05 p.m.