**DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION**
**PESTICIDE REGISTRATION AND EVALUATION COMMITTEE**
**Meeting Minutes – May 20, 2011**

**Committee Members/Alternates in Attendance:**

Syed Ali, State Water Resources Control Board
Lynn Baker, Air Resources Board (ARB)
David Luscher, Department of Food and Agriculture
Stella McMillin, Department of Fish and Game (DFG)
Jodi Pontureri, State Water Resources Control Board
Ann Prichard, Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR)
Rebecca Sisco, University of California, IR-4 Program
David Ting, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)
Gabrielle Windgasse, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)
Elena Yates, CalRecycle

**Visitors in Attendance:**

Denise Alder, DPR
Henry Buckwalter, Western Plant Health Association
Amy Duran, DPR
Billy Gaither, Pest Control Operators of California
Artie Lawyer, Technology Sciences Group
Marshall Lee, DPR
Eileen Mahoney, DPR
Jeanne Martin, DPR
Pat Matteson, DPR
Eric Paulsen, Clark Pest Control
Richard Spas, DPR
Jim Wells, Environmental Solutions Group
Pat Willenbrock, Pyrethroid Working Group

**1. Introductions and Committee Business – Ann Prichard, Acting Chairperson, DPR**

a. About 13 people attended the meeting.
b. No corrections to the minutes of the previous meeting, held on March 18, 2011, were identified.

**2. <u>The California 2009 Urban Pesticide Use Pattern Survey</u> – Pat Willenbrock, Chair Pyrethroid Working Group Communications Committee**

**Introduction**

An on-line survey was conducted in 2010 to collect information about pyrethroid use patterns to ensure that decisions about the future of these products by the California Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) are based on actual market usage data and not on default assumptions. The survey was sponsored by the Pyrethroid Working Group (PWG), an industry task force whose members are AMVAC, Bayer, Cheminova, DuPont, FMC Corporation, Syngenta and Valent. Data collection was conducted by Meta Research, Inc., an independent market research firm.

**History**

DPR asked PWG to conduct a survey among professional pest management companies. The primary objective was to understand use patterns; that is, how a Pest Management Professional (PMP) uses and applies chemicals. The survey included questions designed to identify:

1. The specific use patterns in which pyrethroids are applied
2. The percentage of pyrethroid use associated with each use pattern
3. The pyrethroid active ingredients and product formulations associated with each use pattern
4. The percentage of pyrethroids applied to residential properties versus commercial properties
5. Seasonal (winter, spring, summer, and fall) timing of applications for each use pattern
6. Application equipment used
7. Identification of targeted pests for each use pattern

In September 2009, PWG partnered with Meta Research, Inc. to begin planning for the Use Pattern Survey. Because PWG was trying to document the critical use patterns and treatments made by PMPs, the survey was not limited to pyrethroids. Therefore, whereas pyrethroids make up the bulk of the responses in the findings, the survey asked PMPs to report **any** product used for general pest control.

**Summary of Key Findings Highlighted In Report**

- Overall, the final respondent sample was very representative. Key demographics such as size of operation, type of operation, service interval etc. all tied to figures reported in

other large national surveys. Geographically, counties serviced correlated with the major metropolitan areas.

- More **pounds** of permethrin were reported than any other single active ingredient. The most frequently mentioned/commonly applied **products** contained fipronil or bifenthrin. hree-quarters (75%) of respondents mentioned a product containing bifenthrin and 73% mentioned Termidor (fipronil) as one of their top 5 (in terms of pounds used) products for 2009.
- Liquid formulations applied via power spray is the use pattern that distributes most pounds of pyrethroids. This is true for all products other than fipronil and lamba-cyhalothrin for which most pounds were applied via hand-held sprayer. Bifenthrin also had 22% of pounds applied in the form of granules.
- Liquid products which generate 95% of total outdoor pounds are typically used as **perimeter or spot** treatment. While granules generate fewer total pounds (3%) than liquids, when they are used, they are typically applied in a **broadcast** treatment.
- Driveways/concrete walkways often treated with perimeter applications. These uses are allowed by the labels on most products currently available in the channels of trade. The latest EPA restrictions[1] to these uses were not physically on commercial product in 2009 and for the most part are only now beginning to work their way into commercial inventories.

**Conclusions**

- Few use patterns are chemical specific
- Size and type of organization generates greatest differences in product choice and use pattern
- The single use pattern delivering the largest number of pounds is outdoor, residential perimeter treatments made via power spray equipment
- Few perimeter applications are limited to spot treatments; most include use of continuous band applications
- Perimeter treatments typically include application to hard surfaces such as driveways and walkways
- PMPs openly reported on current use practices and many are likely not aware that some currently labeled use patterns may be significant contributors to the residues detected in urban waterways.

- New Federal labels are just beginning to cycle into production and make their way onto commercially available products. It may take some time before any environmental impact can be seen from these changes.

[1]Federal EPA label changes, such as "Other than applications to building foundations, all outdoor applications to impervious surfaces such as sidewalks, driveways patios, porches and structural surfaces (such as windows, doors and eaves) are limited to spot and crack-and crevice applications, only."

**3. <u>Status of Copper Antifoulant Reevaluation</u> – Richard Spas, DPR**

Mr. Richard Spas presented an update on DPR's current copper based antifoulant paint reevaluation. He discussed DPR's initiation of a Copper Based Antifouling Boat Paint Reevaluation on June 3, 2010. After a brief discussion about the history and the reason for the reevaluation, Richard stated that 12 manufacturers and 190 currently registered copper based waterway products are included in the reevaluation. DPR's initial contact letter provided:

- An outline of the re-evaluation process
- Data requirements
- Time frames for the required information and company responses

The majority of currently registered copper antifoulants fall into two paint categories. These two paint types make up over 84% of the copper paints being used today in California waterways. The two types appear to be:

- Ablative copolymer - made up of up to 58% copper. Continuously sheds the outer layer of paint for over one year.
- Conventional Epoxy Ester - a hard paint that is manufactured with up to 76% copper, which lasts up to 2 years

After initially establishing leach rate data requirements, DPR was made aware of a more accurate way of calculating leach rate data, the ISO Method. On March 23, 2011, DPR issued a letter to registrants stating that DPR would accept leach rate data from the ASTM Method or the ISO Method. However, DPR would prefer, that registrants use the ISO method for the following reasons:

1. It reflects a more accurate leach rate.
2. It will be easier to compare leach data from each company's product, if all the products are tested using the same method.

In addition on March 23, 2011, DPR expanded the scope of the reevaluation to include an investigation into underwater hull cleaning materials and procedures. DPR is requiring

registrants to present a scientifically valid study protocol to determine the impact of underwater hull cleaning on the environment.

**4. Public Comment**

None received.

**5. Agenda Items for Next Meeting**

Ms. Elena Yates from CalRecycle suggest an agenda item to discuss CalRecycle's concerns regarding the potential for residues of certain new pesticide active ingredients intended for use on lawns or rangeland/pastures which in turn may be used as a feedstock (e.g., lawn clippings, manure) for compost and mulch production. Chemicals of concern include clopyralid, aminopyralid, and most recently eighteen new products currently under review that contain the new active ingredient, aminocyclopyrachlor.

The next meeting will be held on Friday, July 15, 2011, in the Sierra Hearing Room on the second floor of the Cal/EPA building, located at 1001 I Street, Sacramento, California.

**6. Adjourn**