

Alicia Williams

The enforcement branch has refused to act for the past 18 months on severe adverse impacts from restricted pesticides used in Easter Lily crop in Smith River. My adverse impact review per Food and AG code 14009 has not been processed by Del Norte county ag commissioner Justin Riggs, he is purposefully not giving an official determination and defacto affirming the permits. Director Morrison denied my appeal because she claims she cannot do anything without an official determination by CAC Riggs. This looohole is being used to continue death and destruction to very sensitive habitat- the estuary. Our salmonids are going extinct as well as insects birds and mammals including humans and dogs. Ethoprop, Metam Sodium, Copper, 1,3D all are unmitigated and have destroyed ecoligy and our local economy. Please do something, please honor the law now!

Dr. Karen Morrison, Director
California Department of Pesticide Regulation
1001 I Street, P.O. Box 4015
Sacramento, California 95814

January 27, 2026

RE: Ch 12 Section 12.2 Appeal to the Director by Others per FAC 14009(b) implemented by 3 CCR 6442.

Director Morrison,

I am representing the Smith River locals affected - that are still living – as well as countless animals affected that have no voice and for the future people and animals that will rely upon the quality of our local ecology to live. Personally, I am not able to live with any sense of security to survive if we have another natural disaster such as Smith River Complex Fire or Tsunami/Earthquake that eliminates access for food delivery. This area has had abundant salmon that provided security to all life forms from prehistory, up until these highly toxic pesticides used annually by lily growers began wreaking havoc on them. The emotional toll of working to get the authorities to uphold the law in order to protect this community from irreversible and devastating harm has been enormous, and my ability to leave the house has greatly diminished. I have battled depression and have suffered physically from stomach issues and frequent headaches from the excessive stress. This work was supposed to be done by countless government officials and non-profit groups, over three to four decades, but they refuse to do this very hard work – even though they are funded and staffed!

- Because of the dire circumstances and irreversible grave damages, I am asking the Director to **Stay the Operation of these permits** until your review is complete and the matter is finally decided - as allowed under Timeframes of 12.2. **This involves significant health and environmental hazards.**
- Because this matter has adversely affected many in this community, I am asking for the Director to **conduct a Public Review** - as allowed under Public Review of 12.2.

I lived in Smith River at the Oceanview RV Park in 2022 and moved to Crescent City once my husband and I found the house we wanted to purchase. This pesticide poisoning and grave harms from the lily grower operations has been raised by many locals over the years but they have always been ignored. I am submitting a separate 29-page pdf “Declarations 1 -11” with this appeal that contains eleven declarations of affected locals still alive, given under penalty of perjury. Please read them so that you can better understand the scope of this matter. And please watch and carefully listen to the public outcry recorded on 10/21/2024 at SR Methodist church <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zWRMVMDQDw4> , and 10/22/2024 at Board of Supervisors on YouTube <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ehM1YvM7CDQ>.

I am writing this appeal to request that you please immediately override our Del Norte CAC Justin Riggs', abuse of discretion and de facto affirmation of the RMPs issued to the Smith River Easter Lily growers (Millers, Crocketts, and Westbrooks), and for you to please revoke the existing permits that were issued on or about July 2025, and also **deny and prohibit any future issuing of these restricted pesticides in our county due to local weather conditions which make safe application impossible, as well as multiple severely adverse impacts.**

Additionally, I am requesting that you modify Copper Hydroxide, Copper Oxychloride, and Copper Diammonium Diacetate Complex to Restricted Status in Del Norte County. And institute a ban to **prohibit all Copper use in our county whenever there is any chance of mobility to our waterways - this is urgently needed in order to avoid extinction of coho salmon and threatened chinook salmon.**

As you will see from the evidence in this appeal, there is no safe application of these materials due to long established local weather conditions which have been wrongly ignored by CAC and CDPR. And there is no alternative that can be adopted which would result in mitigation of adverse effects fast enough to prevent keystone species loss and prevent the irreversible ecological damages. This is largely due to the persist negligence of our CAC to monitor and respond appropriately to these ongoing and significant adverse impacts. CAC Riggs has also shown malice in his abuse of discretion and refusal to uphold his duty to protect from pesticide harm - he has been given ample evidence by me starting on 11/24/2024 and he heard the public outcry in-person on 10/22/2024. He has acted in bad-faith.

Additionally, Del Norte County has suffered enormous economic harm from the ongoing permitting of these restricted materials and of copper in the cultivation of Easter Lily bulbs in Smith River. Our salmon fishery has been closed for seasons after steady population declines over the past 40 plus years. Our food security and self-reliance are gone because of the deadly effects of these restricted materials:

Thimet 20-G = Phorate: 0, 0-diethyl S-[(ethylthio)methyl] phosphorodithioate 20%, Telone II = 1,3 D (dichloropropene) 97.5%, Vapam HL = sodium methyldithiocarbamate, Mocap EC Nematicide-Insecticide = ethoprop (o- ethyl s, s – dipropyl phosphorodithioate 69.6%, and these non-restricted materials; Nu-COP HB = copper hydroxide 77%, Copper Oxychloride, and Copper Diammonium Diacetate Complex.

Despite the clear directive to CACs to continually monitor for adverse impacts of pesticides, Justin Riggs has never done so. The protocol is clear that every time an application for RMP is received the CAC must consider adverse impacts and alternatives before issuing any permit. CAC Riggs has not collected data to see the implications of the multiple incident reports and complaints that have been received by his office over the years. He has blatantly disregarded the approved protocol for logging, investigating and documenting pesticide incidents and complaints.

AS per **FAC 14009(d)**, CAC Justin Riggs has not properly considered **Sec 14006.5** and **he abused his discretion** in issuing the permits to the three Easter lily growers of Smith River CA.

(2) Whether the commissioner properly considered Section 14006.5.

(3) Whether the commissioner abused their discretion in issuing, refusing, revoking, or conditioning the permit.

Justin Riggs also violated his duty and 14009(d) with knowledge of repeated label violations by lily growers. For example, violation by Dhalstrom Watt that occurred 8/15/24 during which the applicator was spraying in windy conditions and sprayed neighboring property owner, Marilyn Gray, in the face while she was gardening in her backyard.

- **Timeline and Summary:**

After witnessing the public outcry in-person on **10/22/2024** at our DNC Board Supervisors chamber, CAC Riggs did not mitigate these harms. He did not address the public at that meeting nor any subsequent board meeting. I have been to several meetings to address the supervisors and ask them to intervene and help prevent further harm.

And even after being explicitly asked to revoke the RMPs by myself by phone in late October 2024, and in person on **11/5/2024**, and via email on **11/27/2024** officially citing Compendium CH 5 - 3 CCR 6414(b), FAC 14006.6, and CH 9 - 9.1 steps for immediate suspension without prior notice, CAC Riggs still did not protect the public and environment from further harm from permitted pesticides.

After my requests for CAC Riggs to use his authority and state law to end the RMPs were ignored and my attempts to get action by CDPR Enforcement Dept. staff were also ignored, I emailed a request on **6/13/2025** to address the multiple harms caused by these RMs and included sources of evidence and data that proved the harms. In the months that followed my initial requests I located the FAC 14009 providing "any interested party" to call for an adverse impact review by their CAC.

CAC Riggs emailed letter **6/20/2025** stating that in order for him to conduct a permit review I needed to include some specific grower and permit location data per FAC 14009(c) to my adverse impact request, which I provided via email on **6/22/2025** and I included attachment of the 5-page letter written by NMFS (NOAA Fisheries) in **November 2018**, warning Easter Lily growers of their violations of ESA Section 9 for illegal take of Coho Salmon.

CAC Riggs acknowledged receipt of my review request on **6/23/2025**. I reply to clarify that the review is currently in progress and ask him to provide the information requested by Board Supervisor Starkey back on **10/22/2024** at the special meeting after hearing the public outcry over these pesticide harms. I summarize that the locals expressed having suffered multiple health ailments and dying from cancer at a disproportional rate in Smith River. I remind him that it has been eight months since that meeting and we have not seen or heard him bring back any report to the board or the public and that is why I'm following up with him. I explained that I needed his response in order to include it in my report to the Board in order to enlist their support for him in honoring the laws and properly regulating pesticide use in our county. I also explained to him that I am working to bring about necessary collaboration of the multiple entities that also have mandates to protect and recover from the harms caused as a result of unsustainable and damaging AG practices. And I end by stating that my report will be made tomorrow

and I would like to address the reason why he has not come back to the Board or the public in these subsequent eight months.

I received no response.

On **6/27/2025**, I email additional data for review, and attach photos of stormwater pouring off lily fields and attach the full presentation by NMFS in 2018 and I point out that this report goes with the illegal take warning letter already provided to him **6/22/2025**. I paste the quote off of Cdpr.Ca.gov which states, "at DPR we protect people and the environment through our regulation of pesticides and by fostering sustainable pest management. Our vision is pest management that is safe, effective, and sustainable for all Californians and our environment." And I reiterate that the use of restricted materials in Smith River is not safe nor sustainable, therefore no further permits should be issued. I also ask for next steps for the safe removal of those restricted materials that are being stored in our county.

I received no acknowledgment to this email.

Then on **7/1/2025**, CAC Riggs emails a short letter refusing to conduct the permit review based on a statute of limitation stated in Title 14 Sec 15112.

On **7/5/2025**, I reply via email to both CAC Riggs and Chelsea Gronchowski that called out the fact that CAC Riggs has not been doing proper evaluations of restricted material use in our county and if he would he would deny these permits. I Included a summary of his responsibilities not being accomplished and that my records requests have shown huge failures in a majority of these functions. I am pointing out the fact that this shows he does not care to conduct a long overdue review to prevent continued grave harms to humans in our environment and instead chooses to delay the inevitable on a technicality. And that this shows his lack of compassion and lack of comprehension of the urgency of the situation and a denial to look at the evidence by conducting the adverse impact review now. I end by stating that this delay will cause more unnecessary suffering.

I received no response to this email.

My email on **7/9/2025** requesting to be notified of RMPs and NOIs was also ignored.

I email again on **7/21/2025** and state that Title 14 section 15112 is not a valid reason to refuse to review adverse impacts and I reminded him that my request for this review began on **11/5/2024**.

No response was given.

In a separate email **7/21/2025**, I provide CAC Riggs with feasible alternatives to pesticides and specifically to address nematodes.

On **7/24/2025**, I request the status of review and include Daniel Rubin legal dept. at CDPR, Celia Pazos Tribal Liaison at CDPR, and the CDPR Enforcement team incl. Donna Marciano. And I cite that **FAC 14009** states, "if CAC is unable to complete the review in 10 days the CAC may notify the person in writing and include the estimated timeline for completion".

No response was given by anyone.

On **12/3/2025**, I email CDPR Environmental Justice dept. to provide the environmental justice guidelines that CAC are required to follow and asked for assistance in getting the determination from CAC Riggs.

I never received any response.

On **12/20/2025**, I emailed CAC Riggs and Enforcement Branch head Donna Maricano another RMP review request per **FAC 14009** as a consultant for CA Against Toxins, a non-profit only involved as funding source for my work. In addition to emailing Riggs and Marciano on 12/20/2025, I mailed hard copies with my home address in Crescent City as the return address on the envelope.

In response, CAC Riggs never acknowledges my email and never mails me a copy of his reply letter **12/30/2025**. Instead, CAC Riggs only mails his response to the Arcata address for CATs, addressed to Patricia Clary – who only cosigned the letter and has had no involvement or experience with this matter or ongoing request for permit review. In his letter Riggs States that the request is valid and the review is in progress but that he cannot provide a “specific date estimate” (which is nonsense because it is an estimate - the opposite of a specific date - which is required of CACs in **FAC 14009**), and he claims to be working with DPR on his three year evaluation and claims no applications of the restricted materials in question are not currently happening.

CAC Riggs is knowingly violating **FAC 14009** criteria:

*14009. (a) (1) An interested person may request the commissioner to review their action in issuing, refusing, revoking, suspending, or conditioning a permit to use or possess a restricted material. The request for review of the commissioner’s action shall be limited to the issues described in subdivision (d). The commissioner shall review the request and **issue a written decision in response to the request to review within 10 days of receipt of the request.** If the commissioner is unable to complete the review within 10 days, the commissioner shall notify the person requesting a review in writing, including an estimated timeline for completion. The commissioner may affirm, modify, or cancel the permit action reviewed.*

Note that on **July 2, 2024**, Governor Newsom signed Assembly Bill (AB) 2113 (Chapter 60, Statutes of 2024). AB 2113 amended FAC section 14009 to create a new annual reporting requirement for CAC permit action reviews. CACs must now annually report to the Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) the number of permit action reviews completed in the previous calendar year, pursuant to FAC section 14009(a)(1), that **were not completed within 10 days**, the average number of days required for review, and the number of permits that were affirmed, modified, or cancelled.

The reason for these requirements is that **these permit review requests are intended to be promptly completed, within 10 days, as the norm**. And if CACs are found not to be adhering to this upon review of their annual reports in accordance with AB 2113, further action by the state would be called for.

These permit reviews are about significant adverse impacts of restricted materials. Adverse means, “causing harm” “more than moderate negative impact(s), or a negative or harmful result”. Therefore, the standard timeline for completion of these reviews by CACs is 10 days and if there is valid reason that the CAC cannot complete their determination in that time, FAC 14009 is clear that the CAC must make

requester aware of the delayed determination within the first 10 days and provide the estimated date to receive their determination.

This requirement is known by CAC Riggs since **June 2025**.

CAC Riggs has been aware of the specific multiple and significant adverse impacts since **10/22/2024**. He has had specific data to review for seven months because I personally have provided him with extensive resources, facts and evidence of harmful impacts since **June 2025**. I have also provided detailed alternatives to pesticides to assist him in his determination. Riggs has been aware of the ongoing water exceedances from his involvement with the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board Technical Advisory Group since at least **November 2024**.

Additionally, DPR has a MAA with waterboard since **2019 – MANAGEMENT AGENCY AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD AND THE DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION**, which has allowed additional sharing of records and evidence of the ongoing pesticide contamination from Easter lily cultivation practices in the Smith River watershed with DPR.

There is no valid reason for CAC Riggs to delay his determination in this matter. He has also not provided determinations per FAC 14009 for adverse impact reviews presented to him **6/22/2025** by me, and **9/2/2025** by SCS Save CA Salmon.

CAC Riggs is purposefully playing games and treating this grave and time sensitive matter with gross negligence to his duty to the public and has breached public trust and is failing to protect from multiple pesticide harm as he is required in position of CAC of Dept of Pesticide regulation.

Justin Riggs is violating county and state law.

Once I was aware of his deceptive communication tactics of excluding me from receiving his 12/30/2025 letter, I called CAC Riggs on **1/22/2026**. After speaking very briefly via phone to request that he email me copy of his written response dated 12/30/2025 by noon that day. He emailed the 12/30/2025 letter (which is invalid since it provides no date for determination) – and he also provided his corrected response letter dated **1/20/2026** – which gives expected date of March 19 for review determination. This is a 14-week timeline with unreasonable excuses listed to attempt justification of further delay in preventing from continued adverse impacts.

Justin Riggs has a full staff, and CDPR Enforcement was made aware of this urgent concern by me in our meeting on 12/18/2024, which included Donna Maricano, Fidel Perez, Paul Ryan and Carlos Gutierrez. There is no valid reason that CDPR can disregard the clear criteria in FAC 14009.

This delay to March 19th is unreasonable and unacceptable in light of the fact that CAC Riggs has had everything necessary to complete this RMP review for over seven months. And these adverse impact reviews are intended to be done promptly per Food and Ag Code.

I replied later on **1/22/2026**, with a demand for his determination immediately and that if he did not, he was de facto affirming the permits. Note that I did ask him to respond with date and time he was available to discuss this overdue determination but he never replied.

Justin Riggs has acted in bad faith and this matter is very long overdue, involves species loss, ecosystem collapse and grave harms to human health and safety.

- Actions requested to be taken by Director Morrison:

It is now Tuesday **1/27/2026**, and I have not received any acknowledgement from him. So, in order to meet the 30-day deadline for appeal to Director by Others per **Chapter 12 section 12.2**, I am writing this appeal requesting CDPR Director Morrison to swiftly review this matter and to:

1. Revoke the existing RMPs for all three Easter Lily growers in Smith River and to refuse any further issuance of RMPs.
2. Direct staff to expediently conduct the process of changing the non-restricted status of Copper pesticides/fungicides for use in Del Norte County to Restricted Status per **FAC 14006.6**.
3. Make the determination that Copper use is to be prohibited in DNC if there is any possibility for movement through the environment via wind or rainfall, etc. to enter any waterbodies or storm drains. This requirement is vital and must be made immediately to prevent extinction of endangered coho, and threatened chinook.
4. Lastly, due to ongoing blatant disregard of public health and the law, I implore you to take immediate disciplinary action against CAC Riggs and revoke his authority to work as a county ag commissioner.

3 CCR 6444 Generalized Effects states, *"If at any time pesticide residues, symptoms, or health hazards appear generally throughout any area, the director or commissioner may cause a field inspection to be made. If it appears that substantial loss, damage or injury is likely to result from continued application of a specific pesticide within such area, the director or commissioner may cause all permits for applications of that pesticide within such area canceled and specify that no additional permits shall be issued therein".*

There is ample existing evidence without conducting a new field inspection that this generalized effect exists in Smith River where lily bulbs are being cultivated.

- RM involved and their warnings from product labels, which are evident in our county:

Restricted pesticides requiring permit used by Easter Lily growers in Smith River are;

- 1. Thimet 20-G = Phorate: 0, 0-diethyl S-[(ethylthio)methyl] phosphorodithioate 20%**
made by AMVAC Los Angeles 888-462-6822 EPA reg no. 5481-530-2A
Environ. Hazards: **very highly toxic to fish and wildlife**. Do not apply directly to **water**, or to areas where **surface water** is present or to intertidal areas below the mean high **water mark**. Runoff may be **hazardous to aquatic organisms** in neighboring areas. Do not contaminate water when disposing of equipment wastewater or rinsate. **Birds & mammals may be killed** if granules are not properly covered with soil in all areas of the treated field and in loading areas.
- 2. Telone II = 1,3 D (dichloropropene) 97.5%**
H1A. Hazardous liquid in Vapor acute inhalation toxicity and carcinogenicity.
FIFRA Federal insecticide Fungicide and Rodenticide Act As amended for the pesticide registered under EPA reg no. 95290-1

3. Vapam HL = sodium methyldithiocarbamate , contains metam sodium 4.26lbs/gallon

EPA reg no. 5481-468 AMVAC Los Angeles

Environ. Hazards: **Toxic to mammals, birds, aquatic invertebrates and fish.** Do not apply directly to **water**, or to areas where **surface water is** present or to intertidal areas below the mean high **watermark**. Do not contaminate **water** when disposing of equipment wash **waters** or rinsafe. Metam sodium has certain properties and characteristics in common with chemicals that **have been detected in groundwater** (**Highly soluble in water** and has low absorption in soil). For untarped applications, leaching and runoff may occur if there is **heavy rainfall** after soil fumigation.

4. Mocap EC Nematicide-Insecticide = ethoprop (o- ethyl s, s – dipropyl phosphorodithioate 69.6%

EPA reg no. 5481-9041-AA AMVAC Los Angeles

Acute oral, dermal, inhalation and primary dermal and eye toxicity.

Hazard to humans and domestic animals.

Unrestricted but must be restricted and prohibited – any COPPER:

Nu-COP HB = copper hydroxide 77% , metallic Copper equivalent 50%

EPA reg no. 42750-132 Agri Star by Albaugh Inc Ankeny IA

Label states NOT FOR USE IN CALIFORNIA

Environ hazards: **Toxic to aquatic organisms fish and invertebrates and wildlife and extremely toxic to birds.** **Birds** in treated areas may be killed. Do not apply directly to **water**, or to areas where **surface water** is present or to intertidal areas below the mean high **watermark**. Runoff from treated areas may be hazardous to **aquatic organisms** in neighboring areas. Do not contaminate **water** when disposing of equipment wash **waters**. This product is **toxic to bees** exposed to direct treatment. Do not apply this product while **bees** are actively visiting the treatment area. Do not apply by air. **Do not allow drift.** Do not apply more than **one application per crop season**. Must incorporate application into soil. **Do not apply within 140 feet of inland fresh water habitats.** **Do not allow spray to drift.** **Applicator also must use all other measures necessary to control drift.**

Director Morrison, upon reviewing the detailed adverse impact review requests attached to this appeal, and the many sources of evidence and facts provided for you, you will see that these label warnings are not being adhered to and that due to weather factors out of human control, they will never be able to be adhered to. Therefore, these RM must be permanently prohibited from use in Del Norte County as it is a temperate rainforest with storms involving copious rainfall and heavy winds and the Smith River area are wetlands. Please urgently prioritize this appeal considering the already 12 months plus of delay and the irreversible nature of these harms.

Sincerely,

Alicia Williams, Activist and Del Norte County Resident

- List of resources provided for review in this appeal.

Note that the links are provided for you to access and review and are not provided by me in print form.

1. 3-page word doc "County Ag Immediate Suspension" – provided to CAC on 11/24/2024.
2. <https://www.cdpr.ca.gov/cac-letter/restricted-materials-permitting-program-changes/> provided to CAC on 6/13/2025.
3. <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/species/pacific-salmon-and-steelhead/esa-protected-species> provided to CAC on 6/13/2025.
4. <https://regulations.justia.com/states/california/title-14/division-1/subdivision-3/chapter-3/section-670-5/> provided to CAC on 6/13/2025.
5. <https://fgc.ca.gov/About/Policies/Miscellaneous#Wetlands> provided to CAC on 6/13/2025.
6. CDPR has had a MAA with Waterboard since 2019, and is well aware of the ongoing exceedances of copper and pesticides in water samples. I informed CAC of this fact on 6/13/2025.
7. 2016 Smith River Community Health Assessment 57-page report by Siskiyou Land Conservancy - provided to CAC on 6/13/2025.
8. 2018 NMFS ESA section 9 warning letter to lily growers – provided to CAC on 6/22/2025.
9. <https://nativephilanthropy.candid.org> – provided to CAC on 6/22/2025.
10. <https://delnortehistory.org/del-nortes-economic-history> – provided to CAC on 6/22/2025.
11. <https://wildrivers.lostcoastoutpost.com/2022/jul/14/reservation-ranch-owner-agrees-restoring-smith-river> – provided to CAC on 6/22/2025.
12. Endangered Species Status of Coho Salmon plus other adversely affected animals of CA declared to be Endangered or Threatened listed in CCR – CA Code of Regulations – Title 14, Division 1, Subdivision 3, Chapter 3, Section 670.5. (Tidewater Gobi, Chinook, Western Frog, smelt, multiple birds). - provided to CAC on 6/22/2025.
13. [12825 (a) 1, 2] (1) The pesticide has significant adverse environmental effects for which there is no feasible mitigation available. (2) The use of the pesticide is of less public value or greater detriment to the environment than the benefit received by its use. - provided to CAC on 6/22/2025.
14. 14006.5(b), (4) meteorological conditions for use – provided to CAC on 6/22/2025.
15. USDA has the CRP program that will pay growers to establish long-term, resource- conserving plant species; develop wildlife habitat. Contracts by FSA Farm Service Agency's CRP conservation reserve program pay rent and offer cost-share assistance. See <https://www.fsa.usda.gov> for details – provided to CAC on 6/22/2025.
16. See <https://www.fgc.ca.gov> Wetlands Resources and <https://wildlife.ca.gov> Lake and Streambed Alteration Program as well, there are plentiful Grant opportunities and assistance available to lily growers — provided to CAC on 6/22/2025.
17. See Natural Resources Conservation Service Conservation Practice Standard – Cover Crops Code 340, as well as their Conservation Practice Standard Wetland Enhancement Code 659 — provided to CAC on 6/22/2025.
18. Crop Rotation – see article by Charlie c Nicholson & Neal M Williams 2021 'Cropland heterogeneity drives frequency and intensity of pesticide use' — provided to CAC on 6/22/2025.
19. Conservation Drainage Practices – see www.epa.gov/soakuptherain – provided to CAC on 6/22/2025.
20. Article by Matthew J Helmers Iowa State Univ, 'Buffers and Vegetative Filter Strips' summary of benefits from this broadly accepted practice is on page 12 – provided to CAC on 6/22/2025.

21. Educational institution (UC Ext. NCPI, Northwest Center for Alternatives to Pesticides) – provided to CAC on 6/22/2025.
22. Despite growers “claiming to be participating” in Waterboard monitoring & management processes aimed at improving water quality lily growers have failed to implement corrective efforts. 1. SWAMP process resulted in the 2013 Surface Water & Sediment Report. The Stewardship Team after several years resulted in the 2. 2018 Basin Plan – provided to CAC on 6/22/2025.
23. 8/15/24 study by Matt Hurst chemist Cal Poly Humboldt, “Effects of Vegetative Barriers on Copper Runoff from lily bulb fields” – provided to CAC on 6/22/2025.
24. State Water Resources Control Board was petitioned to direct the North coast Regional waterboard staff to abandon the Stewardship Team process and develop a permit WDR water discharge requirements, see this SWRCB Petition for Review re: Smith River Estuary filed by Environmental Law Foundation 11/2/2018. Devastation to our local commercial salmon fishery on page 8. Page 12 references NMFS 10/25/2018 report concluding that lily bulb farming has contributed significant dissolved copper to the tributaries of Smith River Plain & cites violations of water quality standards. – provided to CAC on 6/22/2025.
25. The recent public outcry was video recorded at the Del Norte County Board of Supervisor meeting 10/22/24. The public outcry the evening prior 10/21/24 in Smith River Methodist church was audio recorded by Redwood Voice and **both are available on YouTube** for your review. Justin Riggs was in attendance at the BOS 10/22/24 meeting – I saw him there, and I give comment on both. – provided to CAC on 6/22/2025.
Because of grave harms to humans/mammals - 1,3-D is banned in over 30 countries See <http://pan-international.org> PAN Pesticide Action Network Consolidated List of Banned Pesticides Dec 2024 - provided to CAC on 6/22/2025.
26. https://www.montereycountynow.com/news/local_news/community-orgs-push-back-against-lax-regulations-about-the-fumigant-1-3-d/article. 11/21/2024 report by Katie Rodriguez detailing the locals in Monterey County CA calling for 1, 3-D to be banned - provided to CAC on 6/22/2025.
27. 12825(a), (4) criteria is met, “the pesticide, when properly used, is detrimental to vegetation, except weeds, to domestic animals, or to the public health and safety –because of extreme toxicity of 1,3-D and the huge quantities applied by lily growers, its use must be prohibited. provided to CAC on 6/22/2025.
28. Full slide deck w/ photos of the stormwater flowing off of the Easter Lily Fields included in NMFS/NOAA Fisheries 4/19/2018 presentation “Smith River Dissolved Copper Monitoring “ – provided to CAC on 6/27/2025.
29. Summary of his CAC responsibilities not being accomplished by Riggs.
<https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/exec/county/Commissioner.html>
30. "Pesticide Use Enforcement program was developed to provide for the proper, safe, and effective use of pesticides essential for production of food and fiber and for protection of the public health and safety. It also protects the environment from potentially harmful pesticides by prohibiting, regulating or ensuring proper stewardship of pesticides. An important component of the program focuses on agricultural and pest control workers, ensuring safe working conditions, use of proper protective equipment and training for employees who work with or around pesticides. Other components of the program include pesticide use reporting, incident investigations, outreach activities promoting best management practices, and monitoring applications in the field." - Provided to CAC on 7/5/2025.
31. Cultural Practices for Root-Knot and Root-Lesion Nematode Suppression in Vegetable Crop Rotations by Sustainable Agriculture Research & Education

32. <https://www.sare.org/resources/cultural-practices-for-root-knot-and-root-lesion-nematode-suppression-in-vegetable-crop-rotations/> - provided to CAC on 7/8/2025.
33. Nematicidal Amendments and Soil Remediation
<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7238745/> - provided to CAC on 7/18/2025.
34. Soil Health and Arthropods: From Complex System to Worthwhile Investigation
35. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7022451/> - provided to CAC on 7/18/2025.
36. Del Norte County being a migratory bird essential habitat area, this unsustainable practice has contributed to bird species decline COUNTRY WIDE not only in CA. – provided to CAC on 7/18/2025.
37. Proven effective approach for water runoff using two stage ditches in conjunction with cover crops. <https://www.snexplores.org/article/ditching-farm-pollution-literally> - provided to CAC on 7/21/2025.
38. 2022 USDA 12 pg Guide "Biochar Basics: An A-to-Z Guide to Biochar Production, Use, and Benefits" <https://research.fs.usda.gov/treeseearch/64794> - provided to CAC on 10/6/2025
39. <https://blog.entomologost.net/will-crackerjack-marigolds-deter-pests.html>. The country of India has used marigolds successfully to suppress plant-parasitic nematodes for hundreds of years (Khan 1971), and “marigold can suppress 14 genera of plant-parasitic nematodes, with lesion (Pratylenchus spp.) and root-knot (Meloidogyne spp.) the most affected (Suatmadji 1969). Even with variation, marigolds have an overall suppressive effect on nematodes.
<https://edis.ifas.ufl.edu/publication/NG045>. – provided to CAC on 12/20/2025
40. Biochar can be delivered from Pacific Biochar – Humboldt Sawmill. Or equipment can be purchased to make biochar onsite. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7238745/> – provided to CAC on 12/20/2025.
41. Toxin filtering plants such as bell gable, and golden-eye grass for contaminated water.
<https://renovables.blog/en/botany/which-plants-best-filter-contaminants-from-water%3F> and <https://ucanr.edu/site/uc-master-gardener-program-sonoma-county/native-grasses> - provided to CAC on 12/20/2025.
42. Additional resources to support growers to transition are: Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Conservation Practice Standard – Cover Crops Code 340, a 7-page document. As well as their Conservation Practice Standard Wetland Enhancement Code 659, a 6-page document. - provided to CAC on 12/20/2025.
43. Coho Recovery plans have been completed by both NOAA/NMFS and Smith River Alliance SRA and are ready to use. <https://www.fisheries.noaa.gov/resource/document/final-recovery-plan-southern-oregon-nothern-california-coast-evolutionarily> and Smith River Plain Stream Restoration Plan Final Report to CA Coastal Conservancy October 2018.
www.smithriveralliance.org . - provided to CAC on 12/20/2025.
44. Growers are directly violating the direction given by NCRWB exec. officer Matthias St. John on page 3 of the October 2, 2018 letter addressed to growers requesting “Information about Lily Bulb Operations in Smith River Plain”, “While the plan is being developed, growers are expected to implement management practices sufficient to control discharges to surface waters and groundwater in order to protect water quality.” The latest results from NCRWB staff water samples presented at the October 8, 2025 (7 years later) public hearing held at DNC Board of Supervisors chambers, still had exceedances at levels harmful to aquatic life. - provided to CAC on 12/20/2025.

45. Phorate is banned In Brazil, China, European Union, India, Switzerland the United Kingdom and Turkey among others. Ethoprop is banned in China the United Kingdom and the European Union. <https://personalinjurylawcal.com/blog/banned-pesticides-herbicides/>. Therefore, (4) The pesticide, when properly used, is detrimental to vegetation, except weeds, to domestic animals, or to the public health and safety – 12825(a), (4) criteria is met because of extreme toxicity of 1,3-D, Phorate & Ethoprop & their huge quantities applied by lily growers which has caused ongoing health complaints which vary from flu-like to respiratory, to cancer. These harms are listed on their labels. - provided to CAC on 12/20/2025.

- Additionally, I am reporting violation of 12825.5. (a) by registrant of 1,3-D. and asking DPR of EPA to act now to ban 1, 3-D in California and all states of America.

12825.5 states, “If, during the registration process or at any time after the registration of a pesticide, the registrant has factual or scientific evidence of any adverse effect or risk of the pesticide to human health, livestock, crops, or the environment that has not been previously submitted to the department, the registrant shall submit the evidence to the director in a timely manner. All such information, including, but not limited to, that information required under **Section 6 (a) (2) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. Sec. 136d (a) (2))**, shall be submitted to the director.

(b) The director may adopt regulations that are reasonably necessary to carry out this section. Section 6 (a) (2) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act requires pesticide registrants to report information concerning unreasonable adverse effects of their products to EPA (62 FR 49370). And the above articles as well as the multiple public outcries of the peoples of Del Norte and Monterey counties – prove **the registrant of 1, 3-D is well aware of these effects and has not provided information to EPA.**