PESTICIDE REGISTRATION AND EVALUATION COMMITTEE (PREC)
Meeting Minutes – May 16, 2014

Committee Members/Alternates in Attendance:
Ann Prichard, Department of Pesticide Registration (DPR)
David Luscher, Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA)
James Seiber, University of California (UC), Department of Toxicology
Lynn Baker, Air Resources Board (ARB)
Rebecca Sisco, University of California (UC), IR-4 Program
Rich Breuer, State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)
Stella McMillin, Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW)
Valerie Mitchell, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) –via webcast

Visitors in Attendance:
Aimee Brooks, CA Cotton Ginners and Growers Assoc./Western Agricultural Processers Assoc.
Andi Cameron, DPR –Pesticide Registration
Anne Katten, California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
Artie Lawyer, Technology Sciences Group
Bernice Yeung, Center for Investigation Reporting
Calvin Yang, SWRCB
Charlotte Fadipe, DPR –Director's Office
Debra Denton, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9
Donna Marciano, DPR –Product Compliance
Denise Alder, DPR –Pesticide Registration
Jeanne Martin, DPR –Enforcement Headquarters
Jennifer Salisbury, SWRCB
Jill Townzen, DPR –Pesticide Registration
Kendell Taggart, Center for Investigation Reporting
Kyle Lawson, Lawson and Associates
Leslie Crowl, DPR –Worker, Health, and Safety
Mike Zeiss, DPR –Enforcement
Roberta Firoved, California Rice Commission
Shelley Lopez, DPR –Pesticide Registration

1. **Introductions and Committee Business –Ann Prichard, Chair, DPR**
   a. About twenty-four (24) people attended the meeting.
   b. No corrections to the previous meeting minutes, held on March 21, 2014, identified.
   c. Welcome new committee member Dr. James Seiber with the University of California's Department of Toxicology. Dr. Barry Wilson, long standing committee member, passed away on March 27, 2014.

2. <u>Co-Occurrence Pesticide/Species Tool (CoPST)</u> –Rich Breuer, SWRCB

The original objective of the CoPST was to identify the potential spatial and temporal co-occurrence of forty pesticides with twelve threatened and endangered species to guide future risk assessments. The *Pesticide Regulation and the Endangered Species Act* (American Chemical Society Symposium Series) has published the work. The National Academy of Sciences program also cites the work addressing co-occurrence of pesticides and threatened and endangered species. The current analysis objective is to understand the spatial and temporal distribution of forty pesticides and their potential to cause toxicity, while enabling state and federal agencies to identify and prioritize areas for refined assessments, monitoring, or mitigation.

The study area includes the Sacramento River, the Bay-Delta Estuary, and the San Joaquin River. The model combines pesticide loadings, species of interest, watershed characteristics, and water quality monitoring to create a spatial and temporal co-occurrence model. The outcome reports species distributions, pesticide loadings, hotspots, and areas of concern; including visualization of species distributions, pesticide loadings, and hotspots. The goal is to estimate potential pesticide edge-of-field loadings into nearby water bodies. Important chemical fate and transport factors considered by the model include agricultural modeling, rice modeling, urban modeling, and drift estimates. The tool also incorporates pesticide properties, field specific characteristics, and dissipation processes; but does not include hydrologic transport from edge of field to other water bodies. This leads to an uncertainty regarding the model's ability to predict toxicity in adjacent streams and rivers. Therefore, edge of field prediction does not necessarily indicate adverse effects to water bodies. The historical field monitoring may validate the model.

The initial findings indicated a need for monitoring the pesticides abamectin, copper, mancozeb, maneb, pyraclostrobin, and tralomethrin. The model and field monitoring data displayed some discrepancies that may be due to a number of reasons. For example, monitoring data for May is not included the historical records or the parameters monitored may not match the forty pesticides modeled (i.e., fungicides), and the analytical method resolution may not be at the environmentally relevant concentration or best management practices may be in place, which may cause further discrepancies. Finally, the edge of field pesticide concentration may not have access to receiving water (i.e., natural barriers and chemical or physical degradation occurrences).

The tool helps temporarily and spatially identify priority sections, areas, and watersheds for further investigation. It examines current water quality monitoring sites, frequency, and parameters for relevancy. Additionally, the tool identifies areas as priority for best management practice (BMP) development, BMP funding, and aids in developing plans to improve ecosystem quality and water quality. SWRCB plans to use the tool for outreach with the National Resource Conservation Service and local water boards throughout California while adding more pesticides to the model and updating to reflect the most recent pesticide use reporting data provided by DPR.

To view the report and see an overview of the project, please visit < http://www.waterborne-env.com/projects_featured.asp>. For more information regarding this tool or the program, please contact Rich Breuer at <Rich.Breuer@waterboards.ca.gov>, Debra Denton at

<Denton.Debra@epa.gov>, Gerco Hoogeweg at <Hoogewegg@waterborne-env.com>, or Marty Williams at <Williamsm@waterborne-env.com>.

3. **Product Compliance Branch (PCB) Update –Donna Marciano, DPR**
DPR's Product Compliance Branch (PCB) is responsible for mill assessment collection, audits, inspections, enforcement actions, and pesticide container recycling. Recently, DPR's Web site has been updated to include the recycling rate that has been established based on a three year rolling average, a container-recycling slide show, and a graph showing the annual pounds of plastic collected in California.

A mill is equivalent to $0.001 or 1/10 of one cent and the current rate is $0.021 or 21 mills. Mill assessment is levied on each dollar on the "first" sale of pesticide products into or within California. This amount applies to registrants, brokers, and dealers and is a self-assessment reporting system.

PCB mails quarterly requests for payment to 1,300 registrants, 740 licensed pest control dealers, and 125 licensed pesticide brokers. Fluctuations in mill assessment revenue are due to a number of factors including, but not limited to, change in company ownership, availability of water throughout California, pest pressures, economy, and weather conditions.

Starting January 2015, PCB anticipates starting a pilot project to allow a limited number of registrants, dealers and brokers to test its online reporting of mill assessment and electronic payments. PCB anticipates launching "Mill Pay" in 2016, which will allow for secure, convenient, timesaving, and allow online reporting and payment collection for registrants, brokers, and dealers of pesticide products.

For more information regarding the Product Compliance Branch or to sign up for future communications on Mill Pay, please visit <www.cdpr.ca.gov> or contact <millassessment@cdpr.ca.gov>.

4. **Pesticide Registration Data Management System (PRDMS) Project –Denise Alder, DPR**
The Pesticide Registration Branch (PRB) currently maintains registrations for approximately 13,000 pesticide products containing 1,000 different active ingredients. PRB receives and processes approximately 5,000 registration submissions each year and manages pesticide product license renewals and data storage manually with some technology support. In March 2013, PRB initiated the Registration Program Reengineering Project to conduct a detailed business process analyses and process reengineering of its core business processes. Through this effort, the team identified and documented elements needed in a new pesticide registration system. It is envisioned that this new system will provide comprehensive data capture, analysis and management capability to support pesticide registrations, amendments, renewals, and other critical activities. The detailed business process analysis report is titled, "Business Process Assessment and Design" which was completed in June 2013 and approved by government oversight agency. The next document developed by the PRDMS team was the Feasibility Study Report (FSR), which describes the requirements for the new pesticide registration system. The FSR will be submitted to the oversight agency July 1.

If the FSR is approved, the team will develop the final document, a Request for Proposal (RFP). The RFP will be the system solicitation document for bid by software vendors. The PRDMS team anticipates completing this document in 2015. PRB plans to seek industry input in the development of new solutions, processes, and technologies. PRB anticipates procurement of the new system in 2016 to 2019.

In preparation for the new system, PRB implemented several changes and started streamlining processes to include electronic submission of studies, centralized California Only registration number issuance, a conditional registration tracking coordinator, quick renewal processing, and continuous training for regulatory scientists and their supervisors.

For more information regarding the PRDMS project, please contact Denise Alder at 916-324-3522 or email her at <Denise.Alder@cdpr.ca.gov>.

5. <u>Public Comment and Questions</u>

Stella McMillin inquired whether parameters used throughout May and June in the CoPST tool were the same and Rich Breuer responded that the parameters used where the same.

James Seiber questioned how frequently samples are taken for the CoPST tool. The tool was compiled throughout ten years of data and the frequency of data is not consistent. Ideally, the tool would gather data on a monthly basis.

Stella McMillin asked what the SWRCB envisions the utility of the CoPST modeling tool to accomplish. Debra Denton responded that program would like to feed the data from the CoPST tool back to the regulatory agencies to help prioritize activities.

Artie Lawyer verified the CoPST tool data for 2000-2009 and questioned how easy the tool would be to update with recent data. Debra Denton and Rich Breuer responded that the tool is easily updated; however, the main factor in determining if the CoPST tool will be updated is available funding.

James Seiber commented that the CoPST tool would be valuable to view pesticide ecological footprints.

Lynn Baker inquired whether the PCB has an ideal rate for recycling pesticide containers. Currently, PCB does not have a recycling target.

Rebecca Sisco inquired how the current recycling rate was calculated. Donna Marciano responded that the weight of the product being sold into California is divided by the weight of the recycled container.

James Seiber asked how much money the PCB collects and how DPR allocates the money. The PCB collected 61 million dollars last year. DPR funds the County Agricultural Commissioner's enforcement activities as well as providing funds to operate DPR's regulatory program.

Stella McMillin asked what PCB is doing to prepare for the new Second Generation Anticoagulant Rodenticide regulations to be implemented July 1, 2014. PCB created a frequently asked questions (FAQ) questionnaire for inspectors take with them into the field. Furthermore, DPR has taken proactive measures, informing impacted stakeholders early, and with as much information possible. PCB has also worked with a few associations (e.g., grocers) to help with providing outreach.

Artie Lawyer asked how much mill assessment contribution is from brokers and if the mill assessment compliance is increasing. Mill Assessment compliance has been steadily increasing. Many brokers do not realize internet sales coming into California for the first time are expected to comply with DPR's mill assessment.

Artie Lawyer also inquired when PCB will be initiating its pilot program and if the Branch has an idea of the companies to be included. PCB is going to look at each sector (registrants, brokers, and dealers) and include companies that have had a good history of reporting while also including companies that have had challenges reporting their mill assessment previously.

Denise Alder inquired how the public could be updated with PCB's Mill Pay project. The Product Compliance Branch is in the process of updating its Web pages and developing an interested person's subscriber list.

Rebecca Sisco expressed her concern that the PRDMS project is "reinventing the wheel." With vendor assistance, PRB looked at what existing technologies are available, contacted other pesticide regulatory states to inquire what electronic tools they are using, and is engaging in monthly conference calls with U.S. EPA for future streamlining off electronic efforts. The PRDMS project is in the process of creating a stakeholder advisory group to suggest approaches to implement changes to DPR's pesticide registration process and systems and promote participation in the use of new systems, formats and technologies.

Artie Lawyer inquired if there was an ability to make pesticide product labels available electronically before the PRDMS project is anticipated to be implemented. At this point in time, electronic labels are part of the PRDMS project and will not be a separate project.

6. Agenda Items for Next Meeting

The next meeting will be on July 18, 2014, in the Sierra Hearing Room on the second floor of the Cal/EPA building, located at 1001 I Street, Sacramento, California.

7. Adjourn