

LAWN CARE INDUSTRY

White Paper to result from pesticide summit

A day-and-a-half of talk finds industry and critics agreeing on some of the broader aspects of pesticide use.

■ It would be hard to assemble 27 people with more disparate viewpoints on lawn care chemicals. But the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency did in a two-day, mid-May talkfest in Annapolis, Md.

Represented in the group were industry (applicators, golf course and suppliers), trade organizations, government officials, anti-chemical activists and regulators.

It's called the Lawn Care Pesticide Advisory Committee (LCPAC), and the weight of its opinion is the heart of a "White Paper" which should be ready sometime this month. The paper will be distributed to LCPAC members. Then, apparently, it will be given to state regulators who, if they elect, can use it as a baseline of sorts for future lawn care regulation. The White Paper will also contain views of those who disagree with majority opinions.

This was the LCPAC's first chartered meeting. (It first met by invitation only this past February.)

The May meeting dealt with posting/notification, registries, lawn care advertising, and education and training.

Members agreed on some of the broader lawn care issues, disagreed on most others.

Posting and Notification—Some LCPAC members, including several pro-lawn, leaned toward a strong national standard, negating the need for local regulations. Others favored state primacy, while Jay Feldman, National Coalition Against the Misuse of Pesticides, argued vehemently against denying local jurisdictions the ability to make their own pesticide laws.

Most at the meeting seemed to feel that homeowners should post too.

Registries—Almost to the person the LCPAC felt that registries should be open and not require medical certification of those who claim to be chemically sensitive. But when the pre-application notification was discussed, the group fragmented on specifics.

Advertising—Pro-industry members of the LCPAC found themselves on the defensive through much of this discussion, particularly when one committee member read aloud a letter from a prominent lawn care company to a customer. The LCPAC member described the letter as an example of an industry member trying to mislead a customer on pesticide safety. This demonstration created some discussion, but little heat.

LCPAC then learned that the Professional Lawn Care Association of America (PLCAA) had prepared a new pub-

lication (see related story) outlining the statements and claims application companies can make in support of their services.

Training/Education—Shiela Daar, Bio-Integral Resource Center, directed much of this discussion toward the need for more training of Integrated Pest Management techniques. Others agreed that more training opportunities are needed, but nothing solid arose from the discussion.

A third LCPAC meeting is set for the fall when many of the same members will sit down to talk about pesticide labeling issues, exposure methodologies and the benefits of lawn care.

PREVAILING ATTITUDES OF THE LAWN CARE PESTICIDE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

	YES	NO	DIVIDED
Local regulation			✓
Homeowner posting			✓
Medical cert. for registries		✓	
Pre-notification			✓
Advertising legislation			✓
More training	✓		

EPA's Kim promised an industry grade card (a spectator's wry observation, not Kim's) at the fall meeting. Kim said he should have data from the unannounced inspections of lawn care companies being undertaken this summer—10 surprise inspections in each state.

—Ron Hall

ELSEWHERE

**The 'safest' words
to say to clients,
p. 46**

**Best materials
for composting,
p. 48**

**Ways to reduce
deer tick habitat
p. 48**