DEPARTMENT OF PESTICIDE REGULATION
PESTICIDE REGISTRATION AND EVALUATION COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes – August 16, 2013

Committee Members/Alternates in Attendance:

Lynn Baker, Air Resources Board
Rich Breuer, State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)
Jeff Fowles, Department of Public Health
Brian Larimore, CalRecycle
Valerie Mitchell, Department of Toxic Substances Control
Ann Prichard, Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR)
Charles Salocks, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
Rebecca Sisco, University of California, IR-4 Program
Dave Whitmer, California Agriculture Commissioners and Sealers Association

Visitors in Attendance:

Denise Alder, DPR
Anne Katten, California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
Jeanne Martin, DPR
Pam Wofford, DPR
Aimee Brooks, California Cotton Ginners and Growers Associations/
Western Agricultural Processers Association
Randy Segawa, DPR
Darren Van Steenwyk, Clark Pest Control
Rosemary Neal, DPR
Stephen Siegel, California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA)
Elaine Wong, CDFA
Jay Schreider, DPR
Bahman Ghashghaei
Najme Minhaj, DPR
Josifan Obosurn, DPR
Kristin Prado, DPR

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

a. About 26 people attended the meeting.
b. A correction to the minutes of the previous meeting, held on July 19, 2013, to denote Jodi Pontureri, alternate for Rich Breuer - SWRCB, was in attendance.

2. Update on Air Monitoring Network

Air Monitoring Network Results for 2012 – Pam Wofford, DPR

Pam Wofford discussed the draft monitoring results for 2012. DPR has been monitoring in three communities since 2011: Ripon, Salinas, and Shafter. DPR collects one set of 24-hr samples at each site one day each week. Each set consists of four samples: multi-residue, VOC, MITC, and chloropicrin. For 2012, 156 sample sets were collected for 6002 analyses, with at least one pesticide detected in 88% of sets and 5.5% of the analyses. Of the 38 pesticides and breakdown products monitored, 14 were not detected, 13 were detected at trace levels, and 11 were detected at quantifiable levels. All concentrations were less than DPR's health screening levels, indicating a low risk. The cumulative exposure to all organophosphates combined was also less than screening levels. Nine of the 11 pesticides detected in quantifiable concentrations were fumigants or organophosphates. DPR has begun comparing the measured concentrations with pesticide use near the monitoring sites. Preliminary analysis shows that some detections coincided with pesticide applications within 5 miles of the monitoring site, but others did not. DPR is accepting comments on the draft report until September 20, 2013.

Pesticide Air Monitoring Network: Monitoring Plan Changes for 2014 – Randy Segawa, DPR

Randy Segawa discussed options for changes to the air network beginning in 2014 and requested comments on some key issues. By the end of 2013, DPR will have 3 years of data, and most, but not all, objectives will likely be achieved. If DPR continues the air network, it will consider changes to the sampling plan of one set of samples for each community, for each week. DPR will also consider changes to the pesticides included in the monitoring. While concentrations are less than screening levels, fumigants and organophosphates have higher risk than the other pesticides. Should monitoring be discontinued for the other pesticides? Should other pesticides be added? DPR will consider moving the monitoring sites to other communities. DPR selected Ripon, Salinas, and Shafter because they were among the communities with the highest use of the monitored pesticides during 2006-2008 in three regions: North Central Coast, San Joaquin Valley, and Ventura. DPR has updated its pesticide use analysis with 2011 data and evaluated all communities in the state, except urban counties such as Los Angeles. The analysis shows that Ripon, Salinas, and Shafter still have high use, but a few communities have slightly higher use. Should DPR move the monitoring sites to other communities?

Mr. Lynn Baker of ARB inquired about the rationale for not including a monitoring station in Tulare County. According to Mr. Baker, Tulare ranks third in pesticides use for 2011. Randy agreed that Tulare might have high pesticide use. However, DPR's calculation for Tulare is 2.76, which is below Camarillo and Oxnard. The ranking accounts for pesticide use in the analytical screen (32 total pesticides) and does not include sulfur and oil. Should DPR continue to select communities based primarily on pesticide use? Mr. Baker stated the Air Monitoring Network should continue. DPR's investigations look at cumulative and annual

exposure to pesticides in the study communities. Mr. Baker requested DPR revisit the suggestion made a few years ago of evaluating existing ARB monitoring conducted in high use areas. He recommended taking six weeks of high use in the highest areas, look at the average concentration over those six weeks, to determine the study communities. Mr. Baker stated that there will be higher concentrations of detections for several pesticides than seen in the proposed towns – Ripon, Shafter, and Salinas. Mr. Baker felt that this type of community determination would be more health protective of an exposure. Mr. Baker recommended that this type of exercise should be performed when making a determination whether to continue monitoring in the same towns or other towns.

An additional comment was raised Ms. Katten regarding the communities selected by DPR. She felt the actual locations for the monitoring sites did not adequately represent pesticide use in those communities. There are subdivisions located next to agricultural fields and wind patterns should also be considered. She suggested that more monitoring sites should be considered targeted to the seasonal use of pesticides. Ms. Mitchell raised questions regarding how the screening levels and cancer risks are developed to estimate exposure. Mr. Segawa stated DPR is estimating exposure based only on the monitoring data. In the past, DPR has used modeling to estimate exposure and anticipate using it on this project. In order to perform modeling, DPR will need very detailed pesticide use data. The main objective of this study is to estimate seasonal and long term pesticide exposure. Several individual 24 hour samples are averaged to determine estimates of long term exposure.

DPR executive staff will make the final determination as to whether the air monitoring network will continue. DPR scientists will meet with management and provide them with the various options such as describing what will be gained by continuing the air network and what will be lost or gained if different air monitoring is conducted. One objective of the air monitoring network was to gather sufficient data to be able to estimate air concentrations based upon pesticide use and weather patterns. DPR has not been successful in making this connection yet. If successful, a powerful tool will be developed to model air concentrations based on pesticide use. This model could be used to estimate concentrations during different time periods and for other communities not included in the air monitoring network.

Mr. Whitmer believes this is very important work to continue. He encouraged DPR to continue to use the most up to date information with respect to the population demographics, changing cropping patterns, and different weather patterns. This information will be critical in determining whether or not the air monitoring network should continue and identifying those communities that will be monitored. Mr. Breuer mentioned looking into the temporal geographic spread of pesticide use. If fumigation occurs during a certain part of the year, place the sampling apparatus next to fumigated field during that time period. Then move it to the row crops in a later part of the year for the organophosphate monitoring. The total amount of samples stays the same but the sampling is more temporal geographical focus.

DPR will solicit comments on the air network plan for 2014 at the next PREC meeting on September 20, 2013 and is accepting comments until then.

3. Public Comment

None were received by email.

4. Agenda Items for Next Meeting

Ann Prichard noted that the Air Monitoring Network will be an agenda item for the next PREC meeting.

Jay Schreider of DPR's Medical Toxicology suggested a potential agenda topic could be the risk assessment prioritization scheme.

The next meeting will be held on Friday, September 20, 2013, in the Sierra Hearing Room on the second floor of the Cal/EPA building, located at 1001 I Street, Sacramento, California.

5. Adjourn