



**PESTICIDE REGISTRATION
AND EVALUATION COMMITTEE (PREC)
Meeting Minutes – November 15, 2019**

Committee Members/Alternates in Attendance:

Amalia Neidhardt – Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) – via webcast
Dave Tamayo – Structural Pest Control Board (SPCB)
James Nakashima – Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)
Kevi Mace-Hill – California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA)
Patti TenBrook – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9 - via webcast
Paulina Kolic – Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle)
Rich Breuer – State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)
Ruben Arroyo – CA Agricultural Commissioners and Sealers Association (CACASA)
Stella McMillin – Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) – via webcast
Tulio Macedo – Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR)

Visitors in Attendance:

Anne Katten – California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
Brian Gress – California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA)
Dave Lawson – Western Plant Health Association (WPHA)
Emily Saad – Exponent
Emily Zakowski – California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA)
Jean-Mari Peltier – Environmental Solutions Group (ESG)
Lori Apodaca – California Citrus Mutual

DPR Staff in Attendance:

Aniela Burant – Environmental Monitoring Branch
Ann Schaffner – Worker Health and Safety Branch
Anna Bellini – Worker Health and Safety Branch
Annette Narzynski – Environmental Monitoring Branch
Aron Lindgren – Pesticide Registration Branch
Brenna McNabb – Pesticide Registration Branch
Brittanie Clendenin – Pesticide Registration Branch
Dan Wang – Environmental Monitoring Branch
Denise Alder – Pesticide Registration Branch
Edgar Vidrio – Environmental Monitoring Branch
Eric Kwok – Human Health Assessment Branch
Jason Carter – Environmental Monitoring Branch
Kara James – Pesticide Registration Branch
Kaylynn Newhart – Environmental Monitoring Branch
Kelly Froman – Pesticide Registration Branch

DPR Staff in Attendance continued:

Kevin Solari – Worker Health and Safety Branch
Laura Benn – Pesticide Registration Branch
Minh Pham – Environmental Monitoring Branch
Nan Singhasemanon – Environmental Monitoring Branch
Robert Budd – Environmental Monitoring Branch
Scott Wagner – Environmental Monitoring Branch
Shelley DuTeaux – Human Health Assessment Branch
Val Dolcini – Director’s Office
Xin Deng – Environmental Monitoring Branch

1. Introductions and Committee Business – Tulio Macedo, Acting Chair, DPR

- a. Approximately forty-one (41) people attended the meeting.
- b. The comment period for the public health exemption regulation ended July 23, 2019.
- c. The comment period for the field fumigation post regulation ended August 21, 2019.
- d. The comment period for the expansion of restricted materials to include the active ingredient carbaryl ended September 10, 2019.
- e. Upcoming chlorpyrifos workgroup workshops will take place on January 14 in Fresno, January 16 in Sacramento, and January 21 in Ventura. More information is available on the DPR website.

2. Surface Water Pyrethroid Analysis - Xin Deng and Robert Budd, DPR

The Surface Water Protection Program (SWPP) monitors agricultural pesticide runoff using a targeted approach. The monitoring project is designed to capture the worst-case scenario, focusing on areas of high pesticide use, high agricultural production, and high potential for runoff during the growing season. As a result of the targeted approach, SWPP detects pesticides in high detection frequencies and concentrations in surface water of agricultural areas. SWPP selected Salinas, Santa Maria, and Imperial as project sites in 2007 and began monitoring pyrethroids in 2012. The program extended monitoring areas to rice fields in the Sacramento Valley in 2017 and to areas with orchards and various crops in the San Joaquin Valley in 2019. Most of the selected waterways collect runoff from adjacent agricultural fields, however, the Salinas River site has a riparian habitat upstream, resulting in cleaner water and no pyrethroid detections in the seven years of monitoring.

Though monitoring provides concentration levels of various pesticides, it does not predict the effects of exposures. In order to evaluate potential risks, concentrations for various pesticides need to be compared to their effect thresholds. Agencies such as U.S. EPA and the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board have established toxicological thresholds for pesticides of major concern, but these databases do not include all of the pesticides SWPP monitors on a regular basis. For this reason, SWPP utilizes the U.S. EPA Aquatic Life Benchmarks, which include values for 635 pesticides and degradates as well as data for various

taxa, such as fish, invertebrates, algae, and vascular plants. These benchmarks are based on the lowest toxicity values in the literature. Acute endpoints include mortality/immobility for invertebrates and fish as well as growth rate for plants, whereas chronic endpoints include reproduction, growth rate, and early development. Essentially, benchmarks are useful for estimating relative risks among pesticides, sites, watersheds, and regions.

SWPP agricultural monitoring project regularly monitors 7 pyrethroids: bifenthrin, permethrin, λ -cyhalothrin, cyfluthrin, cypermethrin, fenpropathrin and esfenvalerate. In the Sacramento Valley, detection frequencies, acute benchmark exceedances, and chronic benchmark exceedances for all monitored pyrethroids are below ten percent. In the Central Coast and Imperial Valley, these values are much higher for bifenthrin, permethrin, and λ -cyhalothrin but for other pyrethroids, these values are all below ten percent. For bifenthrin, detection frequencies and chronic benchmark exceedances increased from 2012 to 2016, but decreased from 2016 to 2018. For permethrin, detection frequencies and chronic benchmark exceedances fluctuated from 2012 to 2017 and decreased from 2017 to 2018. For λ -cyhalothrin, detection frequencies, chronic benchmark exceedances, and acute benchmark exceedances fluctuated from 2012 to 2018. Use amount is one of the biggest factors affecting detection frequencies. There was an 18 percent decrease in use of bifenthrin from 2015 to 2017, a 21 percent decrease in use of permethrin from 2014 to 2017, and a 20 percent increase in use of λ -cyhalothrin from 2015 to 2017. Other factors, such as pest pressure, regulations, or changes in agricultural practices and methods, could affect use and observed concentrations of these chemicals. When comparing detections and benchmark exceedances across regions, the Salinas Valley had high detection frequencies and chronic benchmark exceedances, but moderate to low acute benchmark exceedances. The Imperial Valley had high to moderate detection frequencies and chronic benchmark exceedances, but moderate to low acute benchmark exceedances, and the Santa Maria Valley had moderate to low detection frequencies and benchmark exceedances for all three chemicals.

In addition to monitoring data gathered by DPR, staff are looking at data from other sources, such as the California Environmental Data Exchange Network (CEDEN) and the Water Quality Portal. These data sets can be difficult to utilize due to irregular sampling frequencies, concentrations below the method detection limit or reporting limit, or biased status and trend information. Current statistical models to analyze data require sufficient sampling frequency to project accurate results, which renders much of the monitoring data unworkable. A proposed geospatial modeling framework that does not rely on sampling frequency may provide more accurate information. This framework uses a large array of data records to better understand trends and status, identify sources and important factors for off-site movement, and predict pesticide concentrations for sites with no or limited monitoring data. Preliminary tests of this model identified slope, average flow, and soil erodibility as the most important factors for bifenthrin transport in agricultural settings. This implies that pyrethroids most likely move off-site through sediment-bound transportation from a sloped agricultural field. In the future, DPR will include pesticide use reporting data, weather information, and other time-series data into the

model. Staff are also looking into dynamic/time-series regression models and machine learning models to better understand patterns.

The Surface Water Protection Program collaborates with multiple agencies throughout the state. SWPP worked with the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board to provide data that has been very important to support the development of agricultural orders for the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program. SWPP also collaborates with the Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) on toxicity tests, sampling together and sharing information between programs. SWPP has research collaborations with UC Davis, the UC Extension, and the Resource Conservation District of Santa Cruz. These research collaborations focus on pesticide mitigation via integrated treatment systems and pesticide removal from agricultural runoff in woodchip bioreactors.

In April 2019, DPR hosted the first best management practice symposium. This event created a platform to exchange best management practice ideas and research findings, as well as laid the foundation for more watershed-oriented regional outreach symposia in the future. In 2017 and 2019, SWPP staff visited agricultural fields in Salinas. Staff had the opportunity to see the best management practices implemented by growers, get insight into stakeholder perspectives, and learn about the production of crops from seedling to harvest. Through these field trips, SWPP staff seek to better understand agricultural pest management, integrated pest management, and production systems. These field trips could serve as first-hand experience to guide SWPP in developing future outreach strategies.

SWPP monitors urban surface water through samples gathered from long-term and newer monitoring stations within major urban centers throughout California. For this analysis, SWPP also utilized sediment data gathered from SWRCB's Stream Pollution Trends Monitoring Program (SPOT). Urban sampling is divided by site type and event type. Samples are taken at storm drains, which help staff evaluate source identification, or downstream in receiving waters, which help staff evaluate the potential effects of pesticide concentrations on the aquatic ecosystems. Samples taken during the dry season provide an estimate of base flow concentrations, while samples taken during a rain event aid in the evaluation of precipitation as a contaminant transport mechanism off the landscape.

To provide an overall status of the concentrations, SWPP staff analyzed all DPR monitoring data from 2009 to 2018 and calculated detection and exceedance frequencies on a statewide, regional, site type, and event type basis. Staff also collected sediment and performed toxicity tests at a subset of locations. Bifenthrin, cyfluthrin, and permethrin had the highest detection frequencies and exceedances statewide, compared to the minimum U.S. EPA aquatic benchmarks. When looking at regional differences, bifenthrin had the highest detection frequencies in both Northern and Southern California, followed by cyfluthrin and permethrin. Cyfluthrin and permethrin concentrations were statistically higher in Southern California compared to Northern California monitoring data. When comparing site types, detection frequencies were generally higher at stormdrain collection sites, yet only bifenthrin had statistically higher concentrations. During storm events, detections of bifenthrin, cyfluthrin, permethrin, and deltamethrin were statistically

higher than during the dry season. This highlights the importance of storm water runoff as a major contaminant transport pathway off the landscape. However, pyrethroids are extremely hydrophobic, leading to higher detection frequencies in the sediments than in the water column. Based on toxicity units, bifenthrin has much greater potential contribution to potential toxicity than the other six major pyrethroids examined for this presentation.

In an effort to reduce the amount of pyrethroids in runoff, DPR instituted surface water regulations in June 2012. These regulations apply to all professional applicators, including landscape maintenance workers. The main goals are to reduce the amount of mass applied to hardscape areas, such as the driveway or sidewalk, and to restrict applications made to drains that directly enter the stormdrain system. In 2011, EPA and the registrants signed an MOA to include language on professional use product labels restricting bifenthrin applications to the driveway or garage door, unless protected from rain and sprinklers.

To conduct trend analysis, SWPP staff evaluated sites with associated data prior to and after implementation of the regulations. Staff conducted several non-parametric analysis tests on the data, including Mann-Whitney, Kendall's tau correlation, and the Kaplan-Meier method. These tests were conducted and evaluated on statewide and regional scales and by site type and event type. Results show a statistically significant decrease in bifenthrin concentrations as well as a slight decrease in cypermethrin concentrations in Northern California monitoring locations. Results also show a statistically significant increase in deltamethrin, however the detections for this chemical are still well below 50 percent. In Southern California, the trends are mixed, though there is a potential increase in cyfluthrin concentrations in the storm drains and during storm events. There were no observable trends for esfenvalerate, λ -cyhalothrin, and permethrin. When analyzing trends in sediment concentrations, SWPP staff found statistically significant increases in many of the pyrethroids. This may be due to the long half-life of these chemicals, leading to a build-up of concentrations at the monitoring locations over time.

SWPP conducts outreach with various groups to educate professional communities and the public about surface water regulations, the MOA, and how to apply pesticides responsibly. There are over 4,700 structural license holders in the state, but there are many more applicators who are performing the actual applications of these chemicals to residential and structural areas. In addition to outreach at events, SWPP recently submitted a manuscript entitled An Evaluation of Trends in Pyrethroid Concentrations in California Surface Waters that outlines all of the research discussed in this presentation. Staff have been increasing collaboration with local agencies to collect stormwater runoff for monitoring and hope to continue that framework of collaboration in a more formalized manner going forward. SWPP has been collaborating with the pyrethroid working group on a special study in a watershed with extremely high concentrations of pyrethroids. The goal of this study is to increase monitoring, conduct collaborative outreach with registrants, and evaluate strategies to reach applicators and the public that can be applied statewide. Staff also plan to continue a dialogue with pest control operators to explore practices that could result in reduced runoff.

3. Updated Management Agency Agreement with the State Water Resources Control Board - Scott Wagner, DPR

The Management Agency Agreement (MAA) establishes a unified and cooperative program to protect water quality related to the use of pesticides. It also acknowledges that the mandates of DPR and the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) are distinct - DPR regulates pesticide use and SWRCB regulates discharges of pesticides. For the State and Regional Water Boards, these mandates are derived from the Clean Water Act and the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. For DPR, the mandates are derived from the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and the Food and Agricultural Code.

In 1997, DPR and SWRCB signed the original MAA along with the associated Implementation Plan. The agencies added to the agreement with the Process for Responding to the Presence of Pesticides in Surface Water in 2003 and the Executive Charter in 2012. These two additional documents provided guidance and clarification on the MAA and Implementation Plan. In June 2019, DPR and SWRCB signed an updated MAA. The rewrite of the MAA and Implementation Plan was intended to consolidate the four existing documents, enhance a commitment to collaborate, provide a framework for successful interaction, remove outdated sections, enhance statewide engagement, and more efficiently and effectively prevent and address pesticide pollution.

In addition to staff from DPR and SWRCB, the MAA rewrite workgroup included members from the Central Valley, Central Coast, Los Angeles, and San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Boards; staff from each region were given the opportunity to participate in the workgroup. All regions had the opportunity to review and provide comment on the draft MAA and Implementation Plan in December 2018. The workgroup addressed all comments and each Regional Water Board supported the final updated version of the MAA. The executive director of SWRCB and the director of DPR both signed the updated MAA in June 2019.

The updated MAA reflects the mandates and authorities of DPR and SWRCB and expresses the high-level goals and principles of each agency. It reflects an overall commitment to a coordinated approach between the agencies, with a description of mandates and authorities and a guide for conflict resolution. The revised Implementation Plan describes in detail how the MAA will be implemented. It is a dynamic document that can be amended as necessary as programs change over time. The Implementation Plan also provides a description of authorities and programs, a description of staff and executive level interactions, and outlines the roles of the MAA coordinators from DPR, SWRCB, and each of the Regional Water Boards.

Under the updated MAA, pesticide-related water quality communication may occur between one MAA coordinator and another, between an agency's MAA coordinator and technical staff, or between an agency's MAA coordinator or technical staff and management. The updated Implementation Plan lists the documents that require interagency review, outlines information and data sharing methods, provides a process for responding to water quality issues, and includes an issue resolution procedure. The Implementation Plan also states that SWRCB executive-level

meetings will include an annual MAA update. The MAA promotes a “no surprises approach” to coordination, wherein technical staff and executive management from both agencies practice effective communication and collaboration.

The revised Process for Responding to Pesticides in Surface Water starts with a formal transmittal from the State or Regional Water Boards to DPR, summarizing the waterways known to be impacted and a description of the suspected problem. DPR then prepares a timely response with a determination of whether the issue is likely to trigger agency action, the likely extent of the issue, and DPR’s potential response. The agencies will then meet and evaluate regulatory and non-regulatory action to address the issue.

4. Acephate Mitigation - Anna Bellini, DPR

For the Worker Health and Safety Branch (WHS), mitigation is defined as reducing worker exposure to pesticides, which is typically accomplished through regulations, permit conditions, or label changes. Mitigation for WHS begins after the Human Health Assessment Branch (HHA) publishes their exposure assessment document and risk characterization document. These documents contain information about an active ingredient as well as the associated potential risks to users, workers, and bystanders. Once these documents have been published, WHS begins to write a scoping document. The scoping document summarizes the two documents from HHA, and updates use information or any other pertinent information for the active ingredient. At the same time, DPR management begins writing a risk management directive. The risk management directive defines the scope of the mitigation, including what to mitigate and to what level. For acephate, WHS is working with registrants to mitigate acute occupational scenarios of concern.

Acephate is an organophosphate insecticide/miticide, with major uses on lettuce, cotton, beans, celery, landscape, nurseries, and structural pests. There are currently 25 actively registered acephate products in California, 20 of which are primarily for agricultural use and five primarily for home use. Because workers could potentially use home use products as part of their job, all 25 products are being considered for mitigation. As part of this process, HHA completed a risk characterization document for acephate in October 2008, an exposure assessment document in January 2009, and an addendum risk characterization document in July 2013. While developing mitigation options, WHS asked HHA to update and revise the margins of exposure, resulting in two memos: Recalculating Short-term, Seasonal, and Annual Margin of Exposures of Acephate Based on Updated Policies, Updated Transfer Coefficients, and Updated Pesticide Use Report Data - March 2018; and Review of New Acephate Products Registered after Finalization of the 2013 Addendum to Acephate Risk Characterization Document and any Implication for Additional Changes to Margin of Exposure (MOE) Estimates - May 2019. DPR published a risk management directive in May 2019 outlining the need to mitigate acute occupational exposure concerns, defined as a margin of exposure of less than ten.

Potential mitigation options include reducing the application rate, reducing the maximum daily acreage treated, reformulating/repackaging the product, requiring a closed system, or requiring additional personal protective equipment. In January 2019, WHS and DPR staff met with

acephate registrants to discuss the generalized exposure scenarios identified in the exposure assessment document, risk characterization document, and addendum risk characterization document. These exposure scenarios were representative of multiple crops and/or application types. HHA then reviewed the labels for all affected products and tied each specific exposure scenario to the broader representative scenarios presented in the risk characterization document. WHS sent the label specific scenarios and potential mitigation options to registrants in October 2019.

Going forward, DPR staff will meet with individual registrants to review the label specific exposure scenarios and mitigation options presented in October 2019. Registrants are required to submit mitigation plans by the end of the year.

5. Update on Air Monitoring Network - Minh Pham, DPR

The Air Monitoring Network (AMN) started with three sites in 2011 to assess potential health risks, to develop measures to mitigate risk, and to measure the effectiveness of regulatory requirements currently in place. Through a two-year temporary budget change proposal in 2016, the program expanded to eight sites: Chualar, Cuyama, Lindsay, San Joaquin City, Santa Maria, Shafter, Oxnard, and Watsonville. These sites measure organophosphates and fumigants in ambient air for 24-hour durations each week and were selected based on overall risk and priorities within the department.

DPR conducted seasonal monitoring in Santa Maria until the site was incorporated into the AMN through the expansion in 2017. This site was selected mainly for nearby fumigant use. The original site resided on the rooftop of a building in collaboration with the Air Resources Board (ARB) and the Santa Barbara County Agricultural Commissioner, adjacent to Santa Maria High School. Due to ARB vacating that building, the site was relocated five miles north-west to Bonita Elementary School. The station is at ground level, similar to the other seven sites, and is surrounded by agricultural fields. This site utilizes the standard air monitoring station setup, which includes a sampling platform, a Met One 3-Channel Pesticide Sampler, and a Xontek Model 901 Canister Sampler. This site also includes a meteorological weather monitoring station, allowing DPR to collect real-time data on weather patterns specific to the region. The station is currently fully operational at the new location.

DPR added a mobile meteorological weather monitoring station to the Parlier site as part of Study 309, measuring ambient air for 1,3-Dichloropropene. The tower collects real-time data on wind speed and direction at both two meters and ten meters, as well as temperature, atmospheric pressure, and humidity levels. Though there is a meteorological tower at the California Irrigation Management Information System station adjacent to the site, that tower does not have the multiple air monitoring heights needed for modeling.

On December 3, 2019, Google will no longer support Google Fusion Tables, the platform currently used for the Pesticide Air Monitoring Results database. All of the visualization tools within the software, including maps, charts, tables, and cards, will become unavailable on that

date. DPR is currently working to provide a suitable alternative with similar functionality as the Google Fusion Tables interface. Until such alternative is identified, results from the Pesticide Air Monitoring Results database will continue to be available for download as a .CSV file.

ARB currently conducts monitoring on behalf of DPR at sites in Cuyama, Lindsay, San Joaquin City, Shafter, and Oxnard as part of the approved budget change proposal that expanded the AMN. The limited period of expansion is tentatively set to be completed by the end of 2020, at which time ARB will vacate those five sites. DPR is committed to taking over the operation of the site in Shafter, and is exploring the feasibility of maintaining a portion of the other AMN sites vacated by ARB.

6. Committee Comment

Dave Tamayo asked if Robert Budd had any information from the Enforcement branch about the status of compliance with the surface water regulations. Robert responded that SWPP is working with the enforcement branch and regional offices to evaluate compliance as part of the special study. Robert clarified that, due to resource allocations, each county agricultural office operates differently in terms of the number of inspections each performs, and some are more engaged than others in doing inspections specific to the regulations.

Dave Tamayo asked if the decreases observed in bifenthrin in Northern California were sufficient for water quality purposes. Robert Budd responded that this information was included as part of the study manuscript and that the trend line would cross the benchmark value in 2021 if it continued as is.

Dave Tamayo asked if DPR was in continued communication with the U.S. EPA Office of Pesticide Programs about adding restrictions to product labels, rather than depending only on state restrictions for license holders. Nan Singhasemanon replied that U.S. EPA recently released an ecological risk mitigation proposal for 23 pyrethroids, including those discussed in today's presentation, covering both urban and agricultural uses. Nan clarified that SWPP provided input earlier in the year toward the development of this document, but the final version was released only two days prior to this meeting. Nan added that the proposal may contain suggestions from SWPP as well as other concepts for mitigation that had not yet been considered.

Ruben Arroyo asked if DPR found an increase in other pyrethroids in correlation with the decrease in bifenthrin. Robert Budd replied that there is always a potential for a shift in chemistry, but that there is some evidence that at least one of the major pest control operators has shifted away from using bifenthrin, which could be partially responsible for the decrease in concentrations in Northern California. Robert added that another factor for those decreases could be the large amount of targeted outreach performed in the Sacramento area where many monitoring locations are stationed.

Ruben Arroyo asked if DPR is conducting outreach to homeowners, in addition to the outreach it conducts with licensees. Robert Budd replied that the special study mentioned earlier in the

presentation will address outreach to the public sector, whereas past outreach was primarily focused on professional applicators. Ruben questioned whether homeowners could buy products containing pyrethroids. Robert clarified that many of the products a homeowner might find at home improvement stores contain some level of pyrethroids. Denise Alder added that the pyrethroid working group has sponsored outreach specifically to the urban consumers through the ApplyResponsibly.org campaign.

James Nakashima asked how stable pyrethroids are once they are bound to sediment and how long it would take to see measurable changes based on mitigation efforts. Robert Budd replied that bound pyrethroids remain for quite a while, so changes in sediment detection levels will take some time. Robert clarified that the monitored watersheds in Southern California are all concrete lined, creating very quick movement through the water column, which is of high concern.

Rich Breuer asked if the use rate for efficacy would provide a different result when compared to pounds of active ingredient in the graph depicting use over time. Xin Deng replied that the result would be similar.

Paulina Kolic asked for additional details on the scope of work for the research related to pesticide removal from agricultural runoff in woodchip bioreactors, and when it might be implemented throughout the state. Xin Deng replied that woodchip bioreactors have proved to be effective in removing nitrate. Xin added that the study is ongoing and there are no conclusive results yet.

Dave Tamayo asked to what extent DPR is working with county agricultural commissioners to ensure compliance with surface water regulations and ensuring inspectors are looking for specific information. Robert Budd replied that DPR is increasing efforts to engage agricultural commissioners, but is focusing more heavily on the counties of concern. Robert added that there are several new additions to the inspection forms that need to be relayed to the inspectors. Ruben Arroyo clarified that the agricultural commissioners are licensed through the State and the inspectors have specific licenses to conduct inspections. Ruben added that inspectors are afforded specific structural training through a collaborative effort with DPR and the Structural Pest Control Board, as well as training on how to read labels and how to apply laws and regulations from federal, state, and local entities.

Dave Tamayo expressed compliments to DPR and SWRCB staff for being engaged in the amendment and implementation of the MAA. Dave added that the revised plan was a vast improvement and lays the groundwork for better collaboration between DPR and SWRCB.

Ruben Arroyo asked for clarification on the highest use of the acephate products and location of the exposures. Anna Bellini responded that agriculture has the highest use of these products, specifically in lettuce, cotton, and alfalfa. Anna added that occupational exposure was too high and came mostly from mixing, loading, and applying the pesticide.

Ruben Arroyo asked what prompted the acephate mitigation review, specifically how many exposures were documented and over what time frame. Ann Schaffner offered to look into the pesticide illness reporting data and get back to Ruben with an answer.

James Nakashima asked if the acephate label specific scenarios were in addition to the scenarios presented in the exposure assessment document, risk characterization document, and addendum risk characterization document. Anna Bellini replied that the scenarios presented in those documents were more broad and representative scenarios, whereas the label specific scenarios sent to the registrants contained more specific information in finer detail, so that the registrants would know exactly which scenarios needed mitigation.

Dave Tamayo asked if air monitoring will be terminated at the stations in Cuyama, Lindsay, San Joaquin City, and Oxnard if DPR does not have the funding to continue. Minh Pham replied that there may be a possibility to reallocate resources or limit monitoring to a seasonal basis to target those communities for specific pesticides, but next steps are currently uncertain. Minh stated that DPR may have more information towards the beginning of the year, at which point they will lay out a plan for moving forward.

James Nakashima asked for clarification on whether the timeline for the end of the AMN expansion is based on the fiscal or calendar year. Minh Pham clarified that it is based on the calendar year, with an expected termination of ARB participation in December 2020.

Ruben Arroyo asked if the onset of AB 617 would be an option to continue operations in some of the rural communities that may lose air monitoring. Minh Pham replied that there is an ongoing discussion between DPR and ARB regarding this option. Minh added that DPR is involved in the AB 617 discussion only in an advisory capacity.

Dave Tamayo asked if DPR is anticipating that the new data platform will be usable by the public and agencies outside CalEPA. Minh Pham confirmed that the interface for the new platform should be useful for any person diving into the dataset. Minh added that visualization and mapping are high priorities in a potential replacement platform and that the goal is to find an alternative that is as good as, if not better than, the current Google Fusion Tables software.

7. Public Comment

Shelley DuTeaux asked if the framework in the MAA also coordinates issues concerning legal and illegal cannabis grows between the agencies. Nan Singhasemanon responded that there may not be specific references to cannabis in the MAA, but the language generally describes procedures that govern interactions, which would be relevant in those scenarios. Rich Breuer confirmed that if issues with cannabis affect water rights and water quality, the agencies would use the MAA framework.

Dave Lawson asked if the water programs also use the Google Fusion Tables software and whether they will face the same problem as DPR with the end of product support. Minh replied

that the Google Fusion Tables software is used by all three of the Environmental Monitoring programs - Surface Water, Ground Water, and Air. Minh added that the whole branch is working with IT to find a suitable replacement for all three monitoring programs.

Dave Lawson asked how the AB 1755 data transparency movement will affect access to the data. Nan Singhasemanon replied that the data will be added to the Open Data Portal lead by the Water Quality Council, which is currently being used by the Ground Water Program and will be used by the Surface Water Protection Program starting next year. Nan added that the interface for this platform will be different and may affect the way staff and the public access and interpret the data. Rich Breuer clarified that data sharing currently occurs between DPR and SWRCB as well as between the Ground Water Programs of each agency, ensuring adequate coverage and accessibility for the public. Nan confirmed that, over the last few years, both agencies have been actively working toward synchronizing data between their respective databases.

8. Agenda Items for Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for January 17, 2020 at 10:00 a.m. in the Sierra Hearing Room on the second floor of the CalEPA building, located at 1001 I Street, Sacramento, California.

9. Adjourn