DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION
PESTICIDE REGISTRATION AND EVALUATION COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes – January 18, 2013

Committee Members/Alternates in Attendance:

Lynn Baker, Air Resources Board (ARB)
Steve Fagundes, State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)
Brian Larimore, CalRecycle
David Luscher, Department of Food and Agriculture
Stella McMillin, Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW)
Ann Prichard, Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR)
Charles Salooks, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)
Dave Whitmer, California Agriculture Commissioners and Sealers Association (CACASA)

Visitors in Attendance:

Denise Alder, DPR
Brian Bret, Dow AgroSciences
Murray Clayton, DPR
Bahman Ghashghoe, Pest Control Advisor
Greg Gorder, Technology Sciences Group
Matt Hengel, UC Davis
Allan Hirsh, OEHHA
Holly Jessop, DPR
Afiqur Khan, Western Plant Health Association
Artie Lawyer, Technology Sciences Group
Eileen Mahoney, DPR
Jeanne Martin, DPR
Pat Matteson, DPR

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

   a. About 13 people attended the meeting.
   b. No corrections to the minutes of the previous meeting, held on November 16, 2012, were identified.

2. **California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnvironScreen) – Allan Hirsch, OEHHA**

   Allan Hirsch, Chief Deputy Director of the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), gave a presentation on the CalEnviroScreen tool, which OEHHA is developing for Cal/EPA. The draft tool uses environmental, public health and socioeconomic data to identify California communities with the highest pollution burdens

and vulnerabilities. The tool is part of Cal/EPA's Environmental Justice program and has its origins in the agency's statutorily mandated 2004 Environmental Justice Action Plan, which called for the development of guidance on assessing the cumulative impacts of multiple pollution sources. The latest (January 2013) draft version of the tool relies on 17 indicators of environmental and socioeconomic conditions in California's 1,800 zip codes. These indicators include ozone, PM2.5 and diesel PM levels, pesticide use, traffic levels, impaired water bodies solid- and hazardous-waste facilities, asthma emergency-room visits, percentage of children and the elderly in the population, poverty rates, and linguistic isolation. Each zip code receives a numerical score based on how the indicators compare with other zip codes. The latest draft identifies the 10 percent of zip codes with the highest scores. OEHHA expects to finalize the tool in March 2013. Cal/EPA is considering using the tool to award Environmental Justice grants, prioritize cleanup and abatement activities, and assist with outreach. The tool does not measure actual pollution levels or risk from pollution, and should not be the sole factor in decision-making.

3. <u>DPR's Ground Water Protection Program</u> – Murray Clayton, DPR

The Ground Water Protection Program presentation covered 1) the Pesticide Contamination Protection Act (PCPA) of 1985, 2) identification of California's vulnerable areas to impact from pesticides, 3) regulation of these vulnerable areas, 4) evaluation of new pesticides submitted for California registration, and 5) development of the Program's domestic well network.

The PCPA was enacted in 1985 following wide-spread detections of several soil fumigants in California drinking water wells and a report to the legislature on the vulnerability of California ground water to pesticide contamination. The purpose of this law was to prevent the pollution of ground water due to agricultural use of pesticides. The statute required DPR to collect environmental fate data for agricultural use pesticides, identify pesticides that have a potential to contaminate ground water, sample well water to determine if pesticides are migrating to ground water, maintain a database of pesticide monitoring and provide an annual report of sampling results, and formally review pesticides found in ground water to determine if use can continue, and if so, under what conditions.

Areas in California susceptible to leaching by pesticides were originally termed pesticide management zones (PMZs). These are areas where pesticides had been found in ground water as a result of the agricultural use of pesticides. The regulations were specific to the pesticide found and required applicators to use a management practice to mitigate the pesticide's potential movement to ground water. In 2004 DPR established ground water protection areas (GWPAs). These encompassed PMZs but also other areas identified by DPR's CALVUL model to be potentially vulnerable to impact by pesticides. In GWPAs, the regulations are not specific to any particular pesticide. Applicators planning to use any of the regulated pesticides are required to obtain and follow permit measures that mitigate potential movement to ground water.

Groundwater Protection Program staff also evaluate new pesticides containing new active ingredients or expanded uses of existing registrations where there is a perceived potential for offsite movement to ground water. Ground water advisory warnings from U.S. EPA and existing nationwide ground water detections are considered. Physical/chemical properties are evaluated along with field-based fate studies to assess their persistence and mobility in the environment. A pesticide fate and transport model is used to simulate their potential movement to ground water that outputs predicted ground water concentrations of the pesticide. The model encompasses both mechanistic and empirical components, and is run in either a deterministic or probabilistic mode depending on the level of threat the pesticide presents to ground water. Registration recommendations are then typically based on the collective assessment of these evaluations.

In 2000, DPR's domestic well network was established to gauge the effectiveness of the management practices adopted into regulation to mitigate movement of pesticide to ground water. The wells are located in GWPAs and had previously been impacted by pesticides. Continuous monitoring over the years has shown an overall decline in pesticide residue concentrations in these wells. The impact of the regulations and changes in pesticide use in the study area on this decline is under evaluation.

4. Public Comment

None received.

5. Agenda Items for Next Meeting

No agenda items were suggested.

The next meeting will be held on Friday, March 15, 2013, in the Sierra Hearing Room on the second floor of the Cal/EPA building, located at 1001 I Street, Sacramento, California.

6. Adjourn