

# FRAUD AND DECEPTION: THE CDFA LBAM ERADICATION PROGRAM

## *A Detailed Description of Management Strategy Fraud* Prepared For The People by Professor Glen Chase



A.G. Kawmanura, Secretary of the CDFA.

Kawmanura sprays hundreds of thousands of infant children, toddlers, pregnant mothers and adults with untested pesticides. He assures the public that its "Safe," though there is not a single scientific document that concludes that it is safe. When CDFA lies or false information gets exposed, Kawmanura says that he needs to communicate better, implying the lies and fake information were just a misunderstanding.



Steve Lyle, Director of Public Relations.

Steve's quote in the Santa Cruz Sentinel Paper<sup>1</sup> regarding the pesticide sprayed directly on children: "The chemicals have, in fact, been reviewed, and they found the pheromone doesn't kill anything." Unfortunately no natural moth pheromone was used, instead a synthetic chemical pesticide that the State Health Hazard agency found to be toxic.<sup>9, 11</sup> And it was manufactured by Suterra, the company owned by Stewart Resnick, the democrat who contributed \$144,600 to the Republican Governor's reelection campaign.



John Connell, Director of Plant Health & Pest Prevention.

Replaces Kawmanura as CDFA spokesman at the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors meeting after Kawmanura is caught lying on CBS news telling CBS that CDFA only uses EPA registered pesticides (lie) and that Professor James Carey is not an entomologist (lie).<sup>2</sup> Connell follows suit and lies to the Board telling Supervisors that Dr. Dan Harder did not go to the southern island of New Zealand when preparing his LBAM report.<sup>3</sup> Connell also misrepresents Dr. James Carey's work, the entomologist who first determined that LBAM has been in California for at least 30-50 years which denies the CDFA's basis of LBAM emergency.<sup>3</sup>

# CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION .....	3
CDFA METHOD OF FRAUD #1 .....	3
CDFA METHOD OF FRAUD #2 .....	5
CDFA METHOD OF FRAUD #3 .....	7
CDFA METHOD OF FRAUD #4 .....	8
CDFA METHOD OF FRAUD #5 .....	8
BACKGROUND INFORMATION .....	9
CALL FOR AN INVESTIGATION.....	11
SUMMARY .....	11
SOLUTION .....	12
Professor Chase, the author .....	12
References.....	13

## **INTRODUCTION**

The California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) has committed fraud methodically and on a grand scale regarding the Light Brown Apple Moth (LBAM) eradication program. This report details the fraud and deception within the strategies and communications that CDFA Management perpetrated in order to create and sell a bogus emergency eradication program for LBAM in California.

CDFA Motivation: By faking the need for an unnecessary emergency eradication program for LBAM, CDFA attempts to fraudulently access \$100's of millions of dollars of emergency taxpayer funds, which are intended for real emergencies. And because LBAM does no damage to crops, forests, or home gardens, CDFA Management can spend the \$100's of millions for anything they want and to anyone they choose, because CDFA activities are not necessary to actually accomplish anything.<sup>4-1</sup> It is very much like the CDFA taking emergency funds to keep the sky from falling.

Exposing The Fraud: When researchers and scientists checked every country on this earth that has a record of LBAM arriving throughout recorded history, they found that there is not a single example of LBAM ever being a serious pest, ever!<sup>4-2</sup>

### **CDFA METHOD OF FRAUD #1:**

CDFA's main method of fraud is "Fear and Solution." CDFA creates a false fear and then comes to the rescue with a solution. The false fear is the nearly harmless moth that CDFA characterizes as the moth of mass destruction. CDFA falsifies that eradication is necessary and possible, and extorts taxpayer emergency funds for a fake and unnecessary solution.

Fraud Activity #1-1: In Fall 2007, CDFA initiated a propaganda campaign to alarm people of the damage caused by LBAM. Through media and community meetings in Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties, CDFA lead people to believe that damage had been occurring from LBAM and the magnitude of the damage would accelerate until there was no turning back and LBAM would devastate agriculture crops, forests and home gardens. By April 2008, concerned citizens, scientists and superior courts in Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties found that no damage, literally none, had actually occurred.

Fraud Activity #1-2: The theme of fraud that the CDFA is now using is a classic example of the false fear that CDFA creates. Now that the CDFA has been exposed for lying about existing damage from LBAM, CDFA has rebounded with a new slogan: "Once the damage is seen, its too late." CDFA uses this slogan to make us believe that LBAM is like a locust attack on our State or the wall of a dam breaking and that we should have fixed the crack ahead of the devastation. This is all scary stuff. But there is ZERO truth and ZERO relationship of LBAM to the fear scenario that the CDFA has created in their new slogan. It is without precedent in the known history of this earth that LBAM suddenly devastates crops, forests or backyard gardens, as CDFA Management would want us to believe.

Fraud Activity #1-3: CDFA Management is lying to make people believe that LBAM has only been in California for a short time. This deception is an attempt to support the previous deception (in #1-2 above) that LBAM damage is still coming. If people knew the truth that LBAM has been here for many years and caused no damage, even CDFA could not scare them. So CDFA is currently promoting the message that LBAM has recently arrived. If that were true, it would make LBAM the fastest spreading moth in the known history of the earth and CDFA knows that LBAM has no history or pattern of such glory.

Prior to the first two reports of CDFA fraud being released, CDFA Management was not as careful in delivering their lies. CDFA repeatedly implied to the public that February 2007, the month that CDFA had DNA tests completed for LBAM, was also the date that LBAM arrived in California. That date was planted in hundreds of media stories and CDFA never once corrected the misunderstanding that they intentionally created.<sup>5</sup> DNA testing a dinosaur bone in February 2007 does not mean that dinosaurs arrived in California on that date, but CDFA used that date to create the illusion of recent arrival. For others who were more aware, CDFA denied that LBAM was in California for a long time because CDFA ineffectively put out traps in 2005 and didn't catch any. Currently, CDFA is using in-house entomologists to fake a report that LBAM is here for only five or six years. This at least erases the 2007 arrival date that CDFA still implies to unknowing audiences and it confirms that CDFA 2005 trapping data is not relevant to determining an arrival date.

CDFA is now using the movement of nursery stock to falsely rationalize the widespread distribution of LBAM in California.<sup>3</sup> While it is possible that a find of a moth or two could actually be from a plant that was carried to another place, the wide spread locations of LBAM in California and the population densities of LBAM in these locations, can not be explained by plant movement or LBAM hitching rides on trucks. The sciences of Entomology, Statistics, Botany and Invasive Pest Biology indicate that 30-50 years is the minimum time that LBAM has been in California to reach its current spread and population density.<sup>6</sup> It could be even longer as the spread of moths has a history sometimes of simply not expanding for significant periods of time. However, it is likely that CDFA will soon produce an in-house report, that is not peer reviewed, to maintain deception and to serve as CDFA's next generation of fake science for the public.

Fraud Activity #1-4: Pictures that CDFA Management displayed to imply LBAM damage in California were not pictures of LBAM in California. To date, CDFA Management has not responded as to the places and dates these pictures were actually taken. Because of CDFA Management's reluctance to identify the location and dates of those pictures that CDFA showed to misrepresent LBAM damage, it is likely that CDFA forced moth larva into fruit that CDFA had cut open or some other form of photographic deception that is typical of other CDFA Management behavior. None of the pictures appear to be within a natural agriculture setting, and CDFA has gone silent on this issue.

Fraud Activity #1-5: CDFA declared LBAM an emergency avoiding the required legal process of initiating and completing an Environmental Impact Report, per California Environmental Quality Law. From September to November 2007, CDFA sprayed over 400,000 people with toxic chemicals that by April 2008, the courts had declared illegal and in violation of California's Environmental Law. To date, no apology from the CDFA has been given to any of those people. Not a single response by CDFA Management to over 600 people or their doctors who reported illness has ever been made. CDFA Management has not returned a phone call, written a letter or sent an email to the father of a perfectly healthy 11-month-old boy who went into respiratory arrest following the aerial spray. It is estimated that 40,000 to 80,000 people were sickened by the spray and no one yet knows how many of the 400,000 people's lives will suffer long term.

Fraud Activity #1-6: During Fall 2007, there was a natural Oak Moth infestation in Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties. Most of the public does not know the difference between one moth and another. CDFA Management used the visibility and timing of the Oak Moth infestation to declare the LBAM emergency. Many people incorrectly thought the Oak Moth damage was from LBAM because CDFA had falsely publicized LBAM damage. CDFA did not clarify nor publicize that the damage people were seeing was exclusively from Oak Moths, not LBAM.

## **CDFA METHOD OF FRAUD #2:**

The second method of CDFA fraud finds the CDFA supplying other agencies with false information so that the work of other agencies results in conclusions that support the CDFA lies. Other agencies are generally innocent, but under pressure for immediate results with limited budgets and not suspecting CDFA deception, other agencies accept the information and data that CDFA supplies them.

Fraud Activity #2-1: CDFA supplied the Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) and the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) with false information.

In fall 2007, the CDFA sprayed pesticides on a population of approximately 400,000 people in Monterey and Santa Cruz counties. The pesticide was designed to stay in the air for 30-90 days to attract moths, so of course people would continue breathing it for the same 30-90 days. CDFA Management insisted it was safe for humans to breathe.

To prove it was safe, the Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) and the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) created a consensus statement on their opinion of the health effects on people. The CDFA gave these agencies the information regarding the pesticides that were sprayed on the people and these agencies used that information, as given by CDFA, for their evaluation and ultimate opinion.

A key item of information was the particle size of the pesticide sprayed on the people. CDFA told the agencies that the smallest particle was 25 microns.<sup>7</sup> This is critically important since particles 25 microns and larger are generally caught in the nasal and throat passages and ultimately expelled by the body. Particles smaller than 10 microns

can get lodged deep in the lung and are more likely to directly enter the blood stream. This can cause death and a myriad of problems to a human body immediately, in the short term and the long term. The body simply doesn't have the filters or natural preventative systems to effectively handle such minute particles.

The average (median) particle size of the pesticide sprayed in fact was 9.8 microns.<sup>8</sup> That means that over half of the trillions of particles released were smaller than 10 microns. This information was discovered by a private citizen scientist, but he found it in CDFA documents.

CDFA Management did not ask DPR and OEHHA to redo their study using the correct particle size in the pesticide sprayed on people including pregnant women, infants, toddlers, school age children, handicapped and the elderly. Instead, CDFA Management continued to repeat "Perfectly Safe," regardless of the facts.

Fraud Activity #2-2: A.G. Kawmanura, Secretary and head of the CDFA, repeatedly reported to the media and the public that the chemical applied onto the human population was non-toxic. Kawmanura did this despite the fact that even the DPR and OEHHA consensus statement identified the ingredients and the complete pesticide product applied on the people as toxic.<sup>9, 11</sup>

Over 600 people reported illness from the spray. It is estimated that 40,000 to 80,000 people became ill from the spray. Children never experiencing respiratory problems ended up in the hospital. An 11-month-old child with no history of any respiratory problems went into respiratory arrest following the spray.<sup>10</sup> Kawmanura has never apologized or made an attempt to communicate with any individual or doctor that reported illness, but he continues to preach to the press and the public that the CDFA applications of pesticides on children are safe.

Fraud Activity #2-3: In February 2008, CDFA Management hired a public relations firm for \$500,000 to convince the people that the spray was safe, but CDFA Management wouldn't spend one cent to contact any one of the many hundreds of people who reported illness or the thousands that actually got sick from the pesticide applications or their doctors who reported the illnesses. Shortly after CDFA contracted the Porter Novelli Public Relations firm, it was reported that government fair practices contracting rules were violated by CDFA and CDFA immediately terminated the contract. CDFA Management denied any wrongdoing and said that the contract termination was for a different reason.

Porter Novelli is the Public Relations firm that is credited with keeping the public from being aware of global warming problems during the many years that Porter Novelli was contracted by some of the biggest polluting companies in the world. Porter Novelli's founders are also credited with getting Nixon re-elected prior to his impeachment. It is likely that members of Porter Novelli or others who are willing to commit crimes against humanity are still working off the record and out of sight for the CDFA. Since CDFA initially contracted with Porter Novelli, CDFA Management's methods of deception and misinformation delivery and strategies appear to be better coordinated than prior to Porter Novelli's inclusion.

Fraud Activity #2-4: After word got out in the media and generally in the San Francisco Bay area that hundreds of people reported illness and thousands got ill in Santa Cruz and Monterey counties, CDFA requested DPR, OEHHA and the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) to do another study. This April 10, 2008 study was limited so again not a single person or doctor was interviewed or examined. Instead, only the administrative report records were looked at and only about 10% of the total were considered. The results of this limited study were inconclusive. **The report conclusion was unable to deny the link between the pesticides applied on the people and their illnesses,** and it also did not show the link.<sup>12</sup>

With this information, CDFA Management and OEHHA Management again deceived the press and the public by not telling them that the **report could not deny that the pesticide applied on the people had caused their illnesses.** CDFA and OEHHA only told the press and the public that the report didn't show the link. Kawmanura further implied that the report concluded that the pesticides were safe and had not sickened people, which was inaccurate, misrepresenting the report and a dangerous lie.

Fraud Activity #2-5: Kawmanura and other CDFA Management visited cities and counties in the proposed pesticide application areas and delivered the false messages of damage done by the moth, recent arrival of the moth, pesticide applications were safe etc. After private citizens and scientists visited these cities, 29 cities and three counties, representing 2.4 million people, passed resolutions against the CDFA LBAM eradication program.<sup>13</sup> 90 organizations representing unions, school districts, organic farmers, etc also passed resolutions against the CDFA LBAM eradication program.<sup>14</sup> Many of these cities and organizations had been fooled initially only hearing the lies of CDFA Management.

Fraud Activity #2-6: CDFA has also delivered false, biased and inaccurate information to the Technical Working Group (TWG) and the Environmental Task Force (ETF) in order that these groups come to conclusions that support the CDFA eradication program.

### **CDFA METHOD OF FRAUD #3:**

The third method of CDFA fraud is to load the decision making processes with people who have something to gain by the fake eradication program going forward and exclude independent and honest analysis by scientists and others who are not dependent on or under the wing of CDFA.

Fraud Activity #3-1: CDFA loaded the Technical Working Group (TWG) and the Environmental Task Force (ETF) with people that were likely to support the bogus CDFA LBAM eradication program. CDFA Management was intent to keep anyone out of these groups who was known to have a different opinion or willing to consider realistic alternatives. The University of California recently offered a panel of experts to look at the eradication program of LBAM, but CDFA refused.

#### **CDFA METHOD OF FRAUD #4:**

The fourth method is repetition of message: "Safe," "Safe," "Safe," "Safe," "Safe," "Just a Pheromone," "Just a Pheromone," "Just a Pheromone," "Just a Pheromone." It is interesting to learn that there is not a single drop of natural moth pheromone in the entire bogus eradication program, and not a single scientific document that concludes that any method used by CDFA in their program is safe.

It is shocking to learn that the toxic synthetic chemical pesticide, which is produced in a pesticide manufacturing facility, that CDFA calls "Pheromone" is forced into the air in amounts millions of times greater than humans contact from natural pheromones produced by LBAM.<sup>15</sup>

CDFA Management had their staff walk residential neighborhoods in Sonoma County and tell the residents that twist ties placed on their property are safe and of no concern to their health or the health of their children and pets. Anyone who contacts twist tie manufacturers will learn that twist ties were engineered and manufactured to be used only in agricultural fields and orchards, not residential neighborhoods. Since there are no studies regarding the impact of twist ties in residential areas and it is an experiment performed by CDFA Management, assuring the residents of safety for their families including their children is certainly an immoral, if not a criminal act.

#### **CDFA METHOD OF FRAUD #5:**

The fifth method of fraud and deception is damage control. When the CDFA is caught lying, or the false information they deliver is found to be incorrect, A.G. Kawmanura, the secretary of the CDFA, makes the statement that they will need to communicate better, implying that the lies and deception were just a misunderstanding.

The CDFA lost two lawsuits in two different superior courts. Both courts found that NO damage had occurred from LBAM. Both courts ruled that the CDFA emergency eradication was illegal and in violation of California law. Both courts stopped the CDFA from further proceeding with an illegal program. CDFA then insulted both superior court judges and arrogantly claimed they would appeal and would certainly win the appeal on both court decisions. As time passed and the public's memory of CDFA's appeal claim faded, CDFA very quietly decided not to pursue the appeal. The appeal that CDFA boasted shortly and continuously after the decisions of two courts has now been dismissed.

When CDFA Management is forced to stop their eradication program by a court decision, enforcement of an existing law or by political pressure from elected officials, CDFA complies but they attempt to save face and maintain their foundation of lies by announcing that the stoppage is for a different reason. CDFA Management wants us to believe the following lies: (1) the stoppage of their main method of eradication, aerial spray of pesticides on the people, was not due to anything other than a scientific breakthrough in sterile moth release; (2) the canceling of twist ties in Sonoma County was not because the citizens learned their rights and legally stopped CDFA from accessing their properties, (3) the sudden canceling of an illegal contract prior to its completion with Porter Novelli was not done to minimize a potential investigation or protect CDFA Management from prosecution.



## **BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

Much of the lies, deception and CDFA fraud that is so easy to see occurred early on in the program when CDFA was not expecting members of the public and scientists from the Agriculture and University communities to come forward and challenge the fake information and denounce the bogus program that CDFA was promoting. Currently, CDFA Management speaks far less often and only after carefully preparing their words before releasing them to the public. CDFA Management today generally speaks in broad terms such as protecting our agricultural industry with the safest products. Details are rarely revealed today because the details are so easily refuted by legitimate scientists familiar with the bogus CDFA LBAM program.

Background #1: In 2007 and early 2008, Kawmanura claimed that the window of opportunity to eradicate the moth was only months. CDFA eradication couldn't be successful if they waited and that is why CDFA sprayed pesticides on the people of Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties during 2007 and why CDFA planned further monthly applications starting in early 2008. Today, in October 2008, by CDFA's information, we are now well past the window of opportunity to eradicate the moth since the eradication effort never commenced in 2008 due to public and political pressure and the court decisions not allowing the spraying. CDFA has never rationally explained why they are still going for eradication when the window of opportunity that they indicated for eradication is now past. CDFA should now be going into a period of monitoring and controlling LBAM, if necessary, just as hundreds of other insects are monitored and controlled. CDFA Management continues the "Eradication" program not to actually eradicate the moth but to pretend they can in order to access the emergency funds. Appropriate monitoring and controlling if necessary does not qualify for emergency funds. The emergency LBAM funds that CDFA so treasures represent an additional 40% of CDFA's total annual budget.

Background #2: CDFA Management continually said that aerial spraying was the ONLY way to eradicate LBAM. When public and political pressure and the courts stopped the aerial spraying, almost the same day, Steve Lyle, the Director of Public Relations for CDFA, announced that there had been a major and unexpected breakthrough in sterile moth release and that sterile moth release was now the predominant way to eradicate LBAM. When asked by CBS news what the breakthrough was, Steve Lyle, the Director of CDFA Public Relations didn't know, but said that he would look into it.<sup>16</sup>

Sterile moth release was not the new eradication tool that coincidentally had a breakthrough when aerial spray was rejected by the people, elected representatives and the courts. It was simply a substitute method to continue the fraud to pretend eradication, so emergency eradication funds could be grabbed by CDFA.

Sterile insect release works only in a very limited way with a very small number of insects. The basic criteria for success of sterile insect release are: (1) a very small area of infestation; (2) a concentrated location of the insect; (3) the insect locating in and around a single crop; (4) The female mating only once and not being promiscuous; (5) the male

not guarding over female pupae waiting for them to mature as that would give advantage to fertile males rather than sterile males released. With LBAM in California, none of these criteria for success are met. In fact, the opposite is true in each case. The program won't be up to any serious volume until 2011, well past even CDFA's representation of window of opportunity to eradicate. Also, there has been no testing of this method regarding LBAM.

To say that Sterile Moth Release is the main method now and that CDFA is counting on it to be successful is beyond a fairy tale. Sterile moth release has never eradicated any widely dispersed moth, such as LBAM in California, and wide dispersion and not being specific to any one place or crop is the exact nature of LBAM.

CDFA Management continues to use the Pink bollworm moth as an example of eradication that sterile moth release has accomplished. But anyone familiar with the pink bollworm moth knows that this moth lives exclusively in and around cotton fields and that the sterile moth release did not eradicate even this moth. It simply was used in conjunction with massive amounts of other pesticides and other methods to assist control of this moth. Because LBAM does not live in one crop environment, and for the other reasons mentioned above, sterile moth release cannot practically even be used to assist eradication, let alone eradicate, as CDFA Management would want us to believe. That CDFA would want us to believe that sterile moth release is the answer to LBAM eradication when initial tests have not even begun is an insult to the public and absurd in any characterization of science.

Background #3: It is not particularly difficult for any private citizen to contact another country where LBAM arrived previously and find out what is happening in that country today. LBAM came to New Zealand 150 years ago, to Hawaii 100 years ago and more recently to Europe where they don't even bother to monitor or restrict its entry or movement. After dozens and dozens of contacts now, when a vegetable farmer or orchard farmer or grape vineyard farmer is contacted in these countries, typically the farmer cannot understand the interest in LBAM. LBAM simply is not a pest that is of any significance to any of these people in any of these countries. With normal farm techniques, LBAM is controlled while controlling other insects without focusing or singling out LBAM.<sup>17, 18, 19, 20, 21</sup>

The only place in the world that LBAM has been found to be a significant pest of damage to farm crops, forests and backyard gardens is in the virtual world of CDFA press releases, CDFA communications to the public and elected officials and on the CDFA website, nowhere else. The United States places a zero LBAM tolerance on some New Zealand crops so there are extra inspections for the New Zealanders who export to the US, but not a problem of crop loss from LBAM.

What stands out is the bewilderment of these foreign growers trying to understand why California would single out such a benign insect when so many other true pests do exist, and particularly why California would add \$100's of millions of dollars of pesticides of any kind and by any method to its populated non agriculture lands for such an innocuous and unimportant insect.

Background #4: In communications with dozens of entomologists, not a single one thinks that LBAM can be eradicated. The most senior scientists with complete job security speak directly against the CDFA LBAM eradication program.<sup>17</sup> The others agree, yet the vast majority of entomologists are not able to speak out since their career research funding and/or agriculture industry employment is very much linked to their relationship with the CDFA.<sup>22</sup> An open investigation of CDFA Management would allow these entomologists and other scientists to speak out without fear of reprisal or retribution.

### **CALL FOR AN INVESTIGATION:**

An independent investigation into the CDFA LBAM eradication program will quickly demonstrate the erroneous messages delivered and the unnecessary LBAM eradication program perpetrated by CDFA. **An investigation will isolate the real scientists within the CDFA from the Management because the scientists at the CDFA will unlikely commit perjury to support the fraud and deception that has been delivered by CDFA Management to California's agriculture community, elected officials, the press and the general population.**<sup>23</sup>

In daily and routine analysis, CDFA scientists are pressured to get the results that CDFA Management is looking for to access the emergency funding. Even many industry and university entomologists are under direct or indirect pressure from CDFA due to CDFA research funding or CDFA contracts with the companies that entomologists represent. Under investigation, A. G. Kawmanura, Steve Lyle and John Connell will no longer be in the position to conveniently piece together and misrepresent information from CDFA entomologists and other scientists.

The huge majority of entomologists and other scientists within the CDFA are not proud to be associated with an LBAM eradication program that in the words of those who have privately spoken out lacks integrity.

### **SUMMARY:**

CDFA Management, specifically Kawmanura, Lyle, Connell and others have created a hoax to generate a bogus emergency LBAM eradication program in order to access \$100's of millions of dollars of emergency funds. They have methodically lied and delivered false information to create the program and maintain it. The three dominant bogus claims they make are (1) LBAM is currently damaging and a further threat to California crops, forests and backyard gardens, (2) LBAM is a recent arrival to California and (3) CDFA can successfully eradicate LBAM. There is no difference of opinion in the science of these three areas. Rather, there are these three absurd assertions by the CDFA versus legitimate science, common sense and continued observation that denies all three bogus assertions. CDFA has used old USDA information that may have been inaccurate originally, but certainly, with modern farming methods and integrated pest management, is inaccurate and outdated today. LBAM is no more harmful than any of the three hundred other low impact Tortricidae (leaf roller) moths that live in California. CDFA Management disguises their greed for emergency funds as a noble determination to eradicate.<sup>23</sup>

CDFA implements, monitors and reports on the moth, the status of the eradication program and the safety of the program. There is no separation of powers so there are no checks and balances on a dishonest program and the reports from CDFA are always consistent with whatever is necessary to get hold of the emergency funds. It would be consistent with other known CDFA lies and misinformation if CDFA Management is also manipulating "Suspected" LBAM finds to represent actual LBAM finds and to find or not find LBAM larva or eggs whenever it suits their purposes.

### **SOLUTION:**

It would be reasonable to have an investigation so that CDFA Management is not overseeing the program they are implementing. CDFA Management tried to pretend damage from LBAM with misleading comments to the press and the public, with bogus pictures and with pleas to the court. All have been rejected.

It would be reasonable to halt all LBAM eradication activities until such time that LBAM damage can be demonstrated by an independent entity not influenced by CDFA Management. LBAM is simply part of the food chain. LBAM has truly been in California for 30-50 years or more and done no damage. As we wait to see and 30-50 more years pass still without LBAM damage, \$100's of millions of dollars will have been saved and be available for real emergencies. People too will have been spared a variety of toxic chemicals unnecessarily applied to the communities where people work, live and raise families.

### **Professor Chase, the author:**

Glen Chase is a Professor of Systems Management specializing in Environmental Economics and Statistics. Glen served as an Associate Professor teaching graduate level courses in Systems Management at USC for eight years. He has taught at multiple universities in the Central Coast area, including The Naval Post Graduate School, The Monterey Institute of International Studies and Cal State University, Monterey Bay. Glen is also a Management Consultant. Currently, Professor Chase develops management systems to assist organizations that cater to the improvement of life for children with disabilities.

Background Note: the area of Systems Management within Chase's field involves management, communication and integration of complex and often highly specialized sciences. Systems Management was not generally recognized 100 years ago, when a single scientist could be a master of all areas related to his/her work. Today, it is essential.

Professor Chase's first report (<http://www.indybay.org/newsitems/2008/07/15/18516449.php>) revealed the falsehoods CDFA delivered after June 19 when courts and public pressure stopped the CDFA from aerial spraying synthetic pheromone based pesticides directly on cities. Professor Chase's second report (<http://www.indybay.org/newsitems/2008/08/19/18527832.php>) revealed the fraud and misinformation delivered by CDFA from fall 2007 until June 19, 2008.

## References / notes

- 1 Santa Cruz Sentinel, 01/05/2008, Shanna McCord - Sentinel staff writer: "Group alleges hundreds got sick after moth spraying" <http://www.scsextra.com/story.php?sid=64642>
- 2 Anna Werner cbs5.com - CBS 5 Investigates: Is Apple Moth Really A Risk? 4/15/08. <http://cbs5.com/investigates/apple.moth.spraying.2.700753.html>(5:35).
- 3 Sonoma County Board of Supervisors meeting, 7/8/08.
- 4-1 LBAM in California: The True Story: Summary & References, Page 5, #6a "CDFA has asserted potential damage estimates from the LBAM with no scientific basis", Professor Glen Chase <http://www.indybay.org/newsitems/2008/08/19/18527832.php> "The only documented costs of LBAM on this earth were during the previous century when a Southern Hemisphere country widely sprayed an organophosphate pesticide killing the natural predators of LBAM and many other insects. When the spraying stopped, the natural predators returned and LBAM again required no control and did no damage. The costs the CDFa use to project California costs for projected LBAM damage are unsubstantiated. The costs were not from damage by the LBAM, but rather almost entirely from the cost of executing the spraying program, which was creating the problem."
- 4-2 It is not within the biology of LBAM to decimate crops and plants. CDFa is mandating using bad practices as part of their quarantine protocols and possibly setting up a situation where LBAM does get as bad as it can by eliminating the natural controls.
- 5 CA Farm Bureau, 9/3/08, Kate Campbell, Assistant Editor, [next to last paragraph] <http://www.cfbf.com/agalert/AgAlertStory.cfm?ID=1129&ck=69A5B5995110B36A9A347898D97A610E>
- 6 James Carey, Ph.D. " *Invasion Biology of the Light Brown Apple Moth, Presentation to Assembly California Legislature, Committee on Agriculture, March 12, 2008*, <http://www.lbamspray.com/Reports.htm> [See Report #24]
- 7 " *Consensus Statement on Human Health Aspects of the Aerial Application of Microencapsulated Pheromones to Combat the Light Brown Apple Moth* " October 31, 2007, by the Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) & the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)", [page 4, last paragraph, line 1.] [http://www.hopefortruth.com/Consensus\\_Statement\\_on\\_Human\\_Health\\_Aspects.pdf](http://www.hopefortruth.com/Consensus_Statement_on_Human_Health_Aspects.pdf)
- 8 Figure #3 on page 6 of the letter from the CDFa to Drs. Knepp & Hafferman in the following reference: [http://www.hopefortruth.com/KneppHaferman\\_medianparticle.pdf](http://www.hopefortruth.com/KneppHaferman_medianparticle.pdf)
- 9 " *Consensus Statement on Human Health Aspects of the Aerial Application of Microencapsulated Pheromones to Combat the Light Brown Apple Moth* " October 31, 2007, by the Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) & the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)", [page 2, paragraph #3, lines #7-10.] [http://www.hopefortruth.com/Consensus\\_Statement\\_on\\_Human\\_Health\\_Aspects.pdf](http://www.hopefortruth.com/Consensus_Statement_on_Human_Health_Aspects.pdf)
- 10 Air Force Major Tim Wilcox's 11-month-old healthy baby Jack goes into respiratory arrest following the aerial spray. <http://youtube.com/watch?v=YxXFZkVd0To> (14:59)

- 11 *"Consensus Statement on Human Health Aspects of the Aerial Application of Microencapsulated Pheromones to Combat the Light Brown Apple Moth" October 31, 2007, by the Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) & the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)", [page 4, paragraph #4, lines #5-10.]*  
[http://www.hopefortruth.com/Consensus\\_Statement\\_on\\_Human\\_Health\\_Aspects.pdf](http://www.hopefortruth.com/Consensus_Statement_on_Human_Health_Aspects.pdf)
- 12 *"Summary of Symptom Reports in Areas of Aerial Pheromone Application for Management of LBAM in Monterey and Santa Cruz Counties September, October, and November. 2007"* [http://www.hopefortruth.com/OEHHA\\_DPR\\_CDPH\\_report.pdf](http://www.hopefortruth.com/OEHHA_DPR_CDPH_report.pdf)
- 13 A Coalition of California Cities to Stop the Spray.  
<http://ccc.stophespray.org/communities.htm>
- 14 CCCSS. <http://ccc.stophespray.org/organizations.htm>
- 15 April 16, 2008 Knepp / Hafferman letter to EATF, page 6.  
<http://www.hopefortruth.com/KneppHafLettertoEATF.pdf>
- 16 CBS 5 Investigates With Ana Werner: State Drops Plan For Bay Area Moth Spraying  
<http://cbs5.com/investigates/apple.moth.spraying.2.752554.html>(3:01)
- 17 Carey, Zalom, Hammock Letter. A one-page letter from UC Davis Entomology & Agriculture Distinguished Professors to the USDA, May 28, 2008.  
<http://www.hopefortruth.com/UCDavisExpertsLetter.pdf>
- 18 Dan Harder, Ph.D. Executive Director Arboretum, University of California at Santa Cruz, Premier World Botanist regarding LBAM in California: *"Integrated Pest Management Practices for the Light Brown Apple Moth in New Zealand: Implications for California"* March 6, 2008  
<http://www.lbamspray.com/Reports.htm> [See Report #21]
- 19 Dr. Daniel Harder, *"Scientist's Research Showing Apple Moth a Minor Pest in New Zealand Stands Solid in Face of State's Partial Facts. State Efforts to Discredit Report Rely on Partial and Incorrect Information"* April 2, 2008.  
[http://www.hopefortruth.com/Harder\\_response\\_CDFA.pdf](http://www.hopefortruth.com/Harder_response_CDFA.pdf)
- 20 Len Richardson, Editor, California Farmer, *"Exotic moth policy must change"* May 2008.  
[http://www.hopefortruth.com/Cal\\_Farmer\\_Len\\_Richardson.pdf](http://www.hopefortruth.com/Cal_Farmer_Len_Richardson.pdf)
- 21 Jeff Rosendale, Grower, Horticultural Consultant, co author of Dan Harder integrated Pest Management Report above. *"Light Brown Apple Moth (LBAM) 101"*  
[http://www.hopefortruth.com/Jeff\\_Rosendale\\_LBAM.pdf](http://www.hopefortruth.com/Jeff_Rosendale_LBAM.pdf)
- 22 *Presentation to Assembly California Legislature, Committee on Agriculture, Room 4202 State Capital" March 12, 2008.* [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2Zc7I\\_o0M6E](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2Zc7I_o0M6E) (15:27)
- 23 CBS news investigative sight with further references that demonstrate CDFA Management misinformation, etc. <http://cbs5.com/investigates/apple.moth.spraying.2.720511.html>