

Subject: minutes of August meeting
Date: Monday, September 19, 2016 12:35:38 PM

RE: Curtis Bohlen's comments on pesticide sales data

What I heard Bohlen say is that sales data are public information, and the board should not claim to have the best way to analyze them.

Perhaps Bohlen should be asked if this represents what he actually expressed, as opposed to the rather confusing "sales data need to be democratized; the board should not tell the public when they can see the data." The minutes also record his having said that people are really interested in this information, and the board should provide it [but only if data is verifiably accurate].

I ask for the clarification because what I heard from Bohlen is consonant with the general sentiment of board members and staff at the last meeting as reflected in my own notes: that analysis of sales data would be too labor intensive and in fact would require another staff member (Jennings); that comprehensive sales records -- from internet as well as retail stores -- cannot be collected (Bohlen); that they are not reliably accurate (Tomlinson); that BPC has a large audience of people with no specific interest in pesticides (Eckert); that it's not worth the time and money to undertake such analysis (Granger).

Notwithstanding the legislature's having repealed the sentence requiring BPC to publish reports tracking pesticide use, as Jennings states in response to JoAnn Myers's letter, there are increasing pressures for the board to disclose what information it is able to amass, especially on lawn and golf-course applications. Paul Schlein makes a compelling case that resources are available to the board to provide the statistics backing up the 700% increase, and I support that argument.

Jody Spear