DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION
PESTICIDE REGISTRATION AND EVALUATION COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes – April 17, 2009

Committee Members/Alternates in Attendance:

Lynn Baker, Air Resources Board (ARB)
Melenee Emanuel, State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)
Fabiola Estrada, US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
Anna Fan, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)
Martha Harnly, Department of Public Health (DPH)
Stella McMillin, Department of Fish and Game (DFG)
Ann Prichard, Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR)
Barry Wilson, University of California Department of Environmental Toxicology

Visitors in Attendance:

Tom Babb, DPR
Brian Bret, DowAgro Sciences
Lea Brooks, DPR
Frank Carl, California Agricultural Commissioners and Sealers Association
Laura Crendall, UC Davis
Angela Csondes, ARB
Nasser Dean, Western Plant Health Association (WPHA)
Susan Edmiston, DPR
Shifang Fan, DPR
George Farnsworth, DPR
Roberta Firoved, California Rice Commission
Billy Gaither, Pest Control Operators of California
Amy Her, DPR
Bruce Johnson, DPR
Anne Katten, California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
Artie Lawyer, Technology Services Group
Eileen Mahoney, DPR
Jeanne Martin, DPR
Pat Matteson, DPR
Renee Pinel, WPHA
Sue Peoples, DPR
John Sanders, DPR
Jay Schreider, DPR
Mike Stanghellini, Tri-Cal
Jiig Tao, DPR
Stan Van Vleck of Dimare, Van Vleck & Brown LLC
MaryLou Verder-Carlos, DPR
Denise Webster, DPR
Jim Wells, Environmental Solutions Group, LLC

Pam Wofford, DPR

1. <u>Introductions and Committee Business</u> – Ann Prichard, Chairperson, DPR

a. About 30 people attended the meeting.
b. No corrections to the minutes of the previous meeting held on March 5, 2009, were identified.

2. <u>Air Monitoring Network</u> – Randy Segawa, DPR

DPR plans to set up a network to sample ambient air for multiple pesticides in several communities on a regular schedule, over the next five years. DPR will use data gathered to evaluate and improve protective measures against pesticide exposure. The project is expected to begin later this year. Additional information is available on DPR's Web site at: <http://www.cdpr.ca.gov/docs/emon/airinit/air_network.htm>.

3. <u>Public Comment</u>

The following were suggestions for the Air Monitoring Network:

Objectives:

A. DPR should include medical assessments for individuals to relate exposures to health outcomes.

Pesticides monitored:

A. Include KOW, as a surrogate for persistence, when selecting pesticides to monitor.
B. Use average of most recent 3 years when ranking pesticide use for site selection.
C. It can be limited to 1 sample media, but may look at MITC or chloropicrin use once site is determined and add to site sampling.

Sampling plans:

A. Look at Parlier data and the maximums at each site to see if data will be lost by using only 1 site/community.
B. It is preferable to have more communities monitored rather than more sites/community.
C. One sample every 6 days (similar to ARB's VOC monitoring) is acceptable.
D. Change objectives to reflect monitoring of chronic and subchronic exposure rather than acute. The toxic air contaminant program looks for acute.
E. Sample more frequently during high pesticide use periods.

F. Once communities are selected, pesticide use of top 10 pesticides of concern may suggest more frequent sampling during peak use.

Sampling intervals:

A. Some discussion about a 48-hour sample period, rather than 24-hour. Would have to consider breakthrough problems.

Sampling each week:

A. We should sample each week rather than every other week.

Sample alternate years:

A. Stick with the same communities for at least 2 – 3 years.

Other types of monitoring:

A. Dust was suggested, but not if fewer air samples will be collected.
B. Studies in Imperial County and Monterey County were suggested for consideration in site selection.

Community suggestions:

A. Salinas area
B. Imperial County
C. San Joaquin Valley
D. Sacramento Valley

General comments:

A. Pesticide use should have most impact on community selection.
B. Use same criteria for site selection that was used in Parlier study.
C. The sites should be spread out over a large geographical area.

Should Parlier be used as a site:

A. It should be used as a reference site unless only one site is located in the San Joaquin Valley, then move to another.

Background site:

A. No urban sites.

4. <u>Agenda items for next meeting</u> - Ann Prichard, DPR

Stella McMillin requested that John Sanders provide the committee with and update on DPR's surfacewater protection regulations.

The next meeting will be held on Friday, May 15, 2009, in the Sierra Room on the second floor of the Cal/EPA building, located at 1001 I Street, Sacramento, California.

5. **Adjourn**