# Use Information and Air Monitoring Recommendation for the Active Ingredient Chloropicrin in California.

**October 2016**

By

Edgar Vidrio, Pam Wofford, and Fabio Sartori

Air Program
Environmental Monitoring Branch
Department of Pesticide Regulation
1001 I Street
Sacramento, CA, 95814

## INTRODUCTION

The California Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) provides this recommendation to assist the California Air Resources Board (CARB) with the selection of appropriate locations to perform seasonal ambient air monitoring in Santa Barbara County for the pesticide active ingredient chloropicrin as part of the proposed monitoring included in the 2016 Budget Act. This recommendation also includes general information regarding the physical and chemical properties of chloropicrin as well as its reported use in the state.

Chloropicrin is a clear, colorless, and nonflammable liquid with a moderate vapor pressure and boiling point (Ajwa et al. 2010). Following a field fumigation, chloropicrin rapidly diffuses through the soil in all directions and dissipates following a first-order kinetics decay function, with estimated half-lives ranging from 1.5–5.8 days (Wang et al. 2000). Volatilization is the major pathway through which chloropicrin dissipates from soil, although tarps can significantly reduce volatilization (Gao et al. 2008). Table 1 lists selected physical and chemical properties of chloropicrin.

Chloropicrin was first registered in the U.S. in 1975 and is used as a broad spectrum, non-selective fumigant to primarily eliminate the soil fauna, acting as antimicrobial, fungicide, herbicide, insecticide, and nematicide. It is used for (1) pre-plant soil fumigations, (2) residential uses (warning agent for sulfuryl fluoride in structural fumigations), and (3) other specialized fumigations, such as spot tree replant sites and remedial wood treatments. Because of its high volatility, chloropicrin is not expected to be found as a residue in/or any agricultural commodities that are subject to its application (USEPA 2008). It is often used in combination with 1,3-D as a fungicide to achieve a broad spectrum control (Ajwa et al. 2010).

Major exposure risks are primarily for handlers, bystanders, and workers, because of the possible movement off-site following chloropicrin use as a fumigant. In December 2010, DPR issued a Risk Management Directive (RMD) on pesticide products containing the active ingredient chloropicrin to mitigate unacceptable acute exposures to residents and bystanders. Improved risk reduction was achieved primarily by focusing on calculating buffer zones for site-specific meteorological conditions and specific tarp types, as well as focusing on selecting appropriate time intervals prior to tarp cutting (CDPR 2015).

Since methyl bromide is being phased out as a fumigant in most recent years, growers have been using alternative fumigants, particularly 1,3-dichloropropene (1,3-D) and chloropicrin (Ware and Whitacre 2004 ). The latter is sufficiently reactive that it may contribute to the formation of tropospheric ozone, a major component of photochemical smog in urban and rural areas (Carter et al. 1997; Gan et al. 2000; Ajwa et al. 2013).

## CHLOROPICRIN USE IN CALIFORNIA

Pesticide use information was obtained for the calendar years 2012–2014 from the Pesticide Use Report (PUR) database maintained by DPR (CDPR 2011). The most commonly used products containing chloropicrin were Pic-Clor 60 (32 %), Tricon50/50 (18 %), Tri-Clor (9 %), Tri-Clor Ec (8 %), Terr-O-Gas (7 %), Inline (6 %), and Pic-Brom 25 (5 %) (Table 2). These were used in 86 % of all agricultural chloropicrin applications or 6,103 applications.

**Table 1.** Selected physical and chemical properties of chloropicrin.

| Property | Value | Description | Reference |
|---|---|---|---|
| Common name | Chloropicrin | | |
| Chemical names | trichloro(nitro)methane, nitrochloroform | | Kidd and James 1991; Ware and Whitacre 2004 |
| CAS registry number | 76-06-2 | | |
| Molecular formula | $Cl_3CNO_2$ | | |
| Molecular weight (g/mol) | 164.4 | | Kidd and James 1991 |
| Boiling point (°C) | 112.4 (at 757 mm Hg) | | Kidd and James 1991 |
| Density (g/mL) | 1.66 (20 °C) | | Kidd and James 1991 |
| Water solubility (g/L) | 1.62 (25 °C) | Limited solubility in water. Miscible with most organic solvents, such as acetone, benzene, ethanol, and methanol. | Kidd and James 1991;Wilhelm et al. 1996 |
| Vapor pressure (kPa) | 3.2 (25 °C) | Moderate vapor pressure | Kidd and James 1991 |
| $K_d$[a] | 1.2–5.9 | Freundlich equation as $Q = K_d \cdot C_w^{1/n}$, where Q (µg/g) is adsorbed amount per gram of soil, $K_d$ adsorption constant per gram of soil, and $C_w$ the equilibrium concentrations in water (µg/g). | Kawamoto and Urano 1989 |
| $K_{oc}$ (L/kg)[b] | 36.05 | Low soil adsorption | USEPA 2008 |
| $\log(K_{ow})$[c] | 1.8–4.7 | | Kawamoto and Urano 1989 |
| $K_H$ (atm $m^3$/mole) | $2.51 \cdot 10^{-3}$ | High Henry's Law Constant | CDFA 1989 |
| $t_{1/2}$[d] | 4.5 days | Based on laboratory incubations of sandy loam soils at 25 °C | Wilhelm et al. 1996 |
| | 1.3 hr | Flooded soils (treated at 500 lbs/ac) incubated at 25 °C under dark conditions. | Wilhelm et al. 1996 |
| | 1.5, 4.3, and 0.2 days for Arlington, Carsitas, and Waukegen soil, respectively | Investigation on the effects of soil temperature and moisture on chloropicrin degradation in Arlington sandy loam (coarse loamy, mixed, thermic Haplic Durixeralf; Riverside, CA), Casitas loamy sand (mixed, hyperthermic Typic Torripsament; Coachella Valley, CA), and a Waukegen silt loam (fine silty over sandy or sandy-skelatal, mixed, mesic Typic Hapludoll; Rosemont, MN). | Gan et al. 2000 |
| | 6.3, 13.9, and 2.7 days (same as previous soils) | Same as previous but for the corresponding sterilized soils. | Gan et al. 2000 |

a$K_d$, soil-water partition coefficient; b$K_{oc}$, soil-water partition coefficient normalized for soil organic carbon; c$K_{ow}$, octanol-water partition coefficient; d$t_{1/2}$, half-life value estimated using a first-order kinetics regression model.

**Table 2.** Summary of commercial products containing chloropicrin used in California for agricultural applications during 2012–2014.

| Product name | % as active ingredient[1] | Number of applications[2] | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | n | % |
| Pic-Clor 60 | 56.6, 59.6 | 2628 | 32.4 |
| Tri-Con 50/50 | 49.7, 50 | 1431 | 17.7 |
| Tri-Clor | 99 | 770 | 9.5 |
| Tri-Clor Ec | 94 | 672 | 8.3 |
| Terr-O-Gas | 20, 25, 33, 41.5, 50 | 602 | 7.4 |
| Inline | 33.3 | 477 | 5.9 |
| Pic-Brom 25 | 24.9, 25 | 383 | 4.7 |
| Tri-Con 57/ | 42.7, 43 | 271 | 3.3 |
| Telone C-35 | 34.7, 35 | 268 | 3.3 |
| 98-2 Contai | 2 | 155 | 1.9 |
| Mbc-33 Soil | 33 | 127 | 1.6 |
| Mbc-33 | 32.8 | 122 | 1.5 |
| Chloropicri | 99 | 109 | 1.3 |
| Brom-O-Gas | 2 | 51 | 0.6 |
| Tri-Con 45/ | 54.7 | 10 | 0.1 |
| Pic Plus Fu | 85.5 | 3 | 0.0 |
| Metapicrin | 100 | 2 | 0.0 |
| Brom-76 | 1 | 1 | 0.0 |
| Methyl Brom | 2 | 1 | 0.0 |
| Telone C-17 | 16.5 | 1 | 0.0 |

[1] "n" = number of applications; "%" = number of applications as percentage of total number (8107).
[2] Percentage of chloropicrin on a mass basis contained in a product. Certain products under the same name were reported in the PUR with different percentages.

**Top counties and sites/crops**

The cumulative use of chloropicrin in California in the top three counties during 2012–2014 was highest in 2012 (6,297,400 lbs or 75 % of statewide total applied mass during the same period) and lowest in 2013 (5,464,600 lbs or 71 % of the total yearly mass applied in the California) (CDPR 2016, Table 3). The overall highest uses (2012–2014) were in Ventura (28% of total statewide use), Monterey (25 %), and Santa Barbara Counties (16 %). The other counties with lower uses over the same period were Santa Cruz (8 %), Siskiyou (6 %), and San Luis Obispo Counties (5 %) (Table 3). These data indicate that the use of chloropicrin is greatest in coastal areas in the southern coastal regions of Ventura and Santa Barbara counties and in the northern coastal regions of Monterey and Santa Cruz counties where berry-type crops are typically cultivated.

Chloropicrin use was highest on strawberry and raspberry in Ventura County representing 24 % and 3 %, respectively, of total chloropicrin mass applied during 2012–2014 in California (Table 4). Similarly, in Monterey County, use on these two crops represented 23 % and 1 %, respectively, of total chloropicrin mass applied during 2012–2014 in California (Table 4).

**Table 3.** Number of applications (n) and reported use of chloropicrin by year in the top ten California counties (ordered from top to bottom) during 2012–2014[1] (CDPR 2016).

| County/Year | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2012-2014 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | ——— n ——— | | | ——— lbs ——— | | | Total number of applications | CA[2] (%) | Total pounds applied | CA[1] (%) |
| Ventura | 536 | 389 | 407 | 2,742,600 | 2,174,500 | 2,283,200 | 1332 | 16 | 7,200,300 | 28 |
| Monterey | 717 | 605 | 717 | 2,157,000 | 2,015,000 | 2,263,300 | 2039 | 25 | 6,435,300 | 25 |
| Santa Barbara | 287 | 216 | 207 | 1,397,800 | 1,275,100 | 1,416,700 | 710 | 9 | 4,089,600 | 16 |
| Santa Cruz | 267 | 251 | 268 | 655,300 | 659,000 | 784,500 | 786 | 10 | 2,098,800 | 8 |
| Siskiyou | 181 | 195 | 177 | 592,600 | 508,000 | 452,000 | 553 | 7 | 1,552,600 | 6 |
| San Luis Obispo | 147 | 141 | 139 | 417,600 | 446,800 | 480,700 | 427 | 5 | 1,345,100 | 5 |
| San Joaquin | 123 | 189 | 140 | 166,700 | 184,800 | 227,200 | 452 | 6 | 578,700 | 2 |
| Merced | 115 | 141 | 104 | 95,200 | 198,200 | 192,400 | 360 | 4 | 485,800 | 2 |
| Fresno | 92 | 119 | 119 | 92,600 | 105,100 | 150,600 | 330 | 4 | 348,300 | 1 |
| San Diego | 29 | 38 | 76 | 56,600 | 114,700 | 124,800 | 143 | 2 | 296,100 | 1 |
| Combined Total | 2,494 | 2,284 | 2,354 | 8,374,200 | 7,681,300 | 8,375,300 | 7,132 | | 24,430,800 | |
| % of CA Total | 87 | 88 | 89 | 94 | 94 | 93 | 88 | | 94 | |

[1]Numbers are rounded to hundreds.

[2]Percentage of total chloropicrin mass applied in California during 2012-2014.

**Table 4.** Reported chloropicrin use by crop/site in the top five California counties (from left to right) based on total use during 2012–2014[1].

| Ventura | | Monterey | | Santa Barbara | | Santa Cruz | | Siskiyou | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Crop/Site | Total Pounds | Crop/Site | Total Pounds | Crop/Site | Total Pounds | Crop/Site | Total Pounds | Crop/Site | Total Pounds |
| Strawberry | 6,209,400 | Strawberry | 6,013,400 | Strawberry | 3,838,500 | Strawberry | 1,330,600 | Soil application | 1,547,400 |
| Raspberry | 701,400 | Raspberry | 248,300 | Raspberry | 189,300 | Raspberry | 696,000 | Barley | 2,900 |
| Tomato | 142,500 | Lettuce | 61,800 | NOCFG[a] | 33,200 | Blackberry | 49,000 | Strawberry | 2,400 |
| Peppers | 79,800 | Spinach | 42,300 | Blackberry | 28,500 | NOCFGP[b] | 7,000 | | |
| NOCFG | 48,300 | Blackberry | 30,100 | NGCFG[d] | 150 | NOCFG | 5,800 | | |
| NOCFGP | 8,500 | NOCFG | 24,300 | | | NOGTPM[c] | 4,600 | | |
| Blueberry | 5,600 | Lettuce | 9,400 | | | Soil Application | 4,100 | | |
| Peppers | 2,600 | Asparagus | 4,000 | | | Research commodity | 900 | | |
| Lemon | 1,300 | Peppers | 1,700 | | | Blueberry | 800 | | |
| Blackberry | 1,100 | | | | | | | | |

[1]Numbers are rounded to hundreds

[a]NOCFG, Nursery, Outdoor Cut Flowers or Greens; [b]NOCFGP, Nursery, Outdoor Container/Fld Grown Plants; [c]NOGTPM, Nursery, Outdoor Grown Trnsplnt/Prpgtv Mtrl; [d]NGCFG, Nursery, Greenhouse Cut Flowers or Greens.

**Top townships and sections**

The PUR database provides location information as a one mile square section defined by the Public Land Survey System (PLSS). The top two use sections during 2012–2014 in California were located in Ventura County and Santa Barbara Counties, with chloropicrin use totals of 352,000 lbs (1 % of the total chloropicrin mass) and 315,000 lbs (1 % of statewide total mass), respectively (data not shown). The third (S10N34W25), fourth (S10N34W5), and fifth (S10N33W18) overall highest sections were all located in Santa Barbara County near the city of Santa Maria and highway 101 and each corresponded to roughly 1 % of the 2012–2014 statewide total mass applied in California.

Use information can also be summarized on a township level (6x6 mile area or 36 square miles). The top three townships were located in Ventura and Santa Barbara counties (Table 5): the chloropicrin mass applied during 2012–2014 in the two Ventura County townships corresponds to 7 % (S01N21W) and 5 % (S02N22W) of the total chloropicrin mass applied in California during the same period, whereas that applied in Santa Barbara County corresponds to 7 % (S10N34W).

The mass applied in township S10N34W, which includes the city of Santa Maria, was ranked the highest overall for 2014 (Table 6). Additionally, CARB at the request of DPR has conducted seasonal air monitoring in both Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties (S01N21W and S10N34W) in 2014 and 2015 during times of high chloropicrin use. Although 2012-2014 use was higher in township S01N21W, 2014 and 2015 monitoring results indicate that chloropicrin air concentrations were higher in the S10N34W township located in Santa Barbara County.

**Table 5.** Reported chloropicrin use in the top 10 townships in the state of California during 2012–2014[1].

| County | Township | Sum (lbs) | CA[2] (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ventura | S01N21W | 1,925,400 | 7 |
| Santa Barba | S10N34W | 1,876,500 | 7 |
| Ventura | S02N22W | 1,415,800 | 5 |
| Monterey | M14S03E | 1,368,300 | 5 |
| Ventura | S01N22W | 1,256,600 | 5 |
| Monterey | M12S02E | 1,230,500 | 5 |
| Monterey | M14S02E | 1,166,500 | 5 |
| Ventura | S02N21W | 1,129,900 | 4 |
| Santa Barba | S10N33W | 1,086,100 | 4 |
| San Luis Obispo | S11N35W | 933,400 | 4 |

[1]Numbers are rounded to hundreds

[2]Percentage of total chloropicrin mass applied in California during 2012-2014.

**Table 6.** Chloropicrin mass applied in the top 10 townships based on use (from top to bottom) by year in the state of California during 2012–2014[1].

| 2012 | | | | 2013 | | | | 2014 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| County | Township | Sum (lbs) | CA[2] (%) | County | Township | Sum (lbs) | CA[2] (%) | County | Township | Sum (lbs) | CA[2] (%) |
| Ventura | S01N21W | 783,500 | 8.8 | Ventura | S01N21W | 602,600 | 7.3 | Santa Barbara | S10N34W | 641,400 | 7.1 |
| Santa Barbara | S10N34W | 663,700 | 7.4 | Santa Barbara | S10N34W | 571,400 | 7.0 | Monterey | M14S03E | 550,800 | 6.1 |
| Ventura | S02N22W | 525,700 | 5.9 | Ventura | S02N22W | 423,100 | 5.2 | Ventura | S01N21W | 539,300 | 6.0 |
| Ventura | S01N22W | 475,500 | 5.3 | Monterey | M14S03E | 415,400 | 5.1 | Ventura | S02N22W | 467,000 | 5.2 |
| Ventura | S02N21W | 447,000 | 5.0 | Santa Barbara | S10N33W | 407,500 | 5.0 | Monterey | M12S02E | 458,100 | 5.1 |
| Monterey | M14S03E | 402,100 | 4.5 | Monterey | M12S02E | 399,300 | 4.9 | Monterey | M14S02E | 422,300 | 4.7 |
| Monterey | M12S02E | 373,100 | 4.2 | Ventura | S01N22W | 375,300 | 4.6 | Ventura | S01N22W | 405,800 | 4.5 |
| Monterey | M14S02E | 372,000 | 4.2 | Monterey | M14S02E | 372,100 | 4.5 | Ventura | S02N21W | 369,200 | 4.1 |
| Santa Barbara | S10N33W | 354,900 | 4.0 | Ventura | S02N21W | 313,600 | 3.8 | San Luis Ob | S11N35W | 335,000 | 3.7 |
| San Luis Obispo | S11N35W | 294,500 | 3.3 | San Luis Obispo | S11N35W | 303,900 | 3.7 | Santa Barbara | S10N33W | 323,700 | 3.6 |

[1]Numbers are rounded to hundreds

[1]Percentage of total chloropicrin mass applied in California during 2012-2014.

**Seasonal patterns**

When considering the time series of the most recent years (2012–2014), maximum monthly use within a calendar year for the combined top five counties occurred always in September (Figure 1). Similarly, when considering the same time series but split by county, the month of highest use was September in Monterey County (2,743,000 lbs), Santa Barbara County (1,740,000 lbs), and Ventura County (2,062,000 lbs).

When considering the temporal series for the 2014 overall highest use township (S10N34W, Santa Barbara County), the 12-week period with overall highest use (for the cumulative use during 2012–2014) was during weeks 33–44, i.e., the 12-week period starting the last two weeks of August (Figure 2, top plot). This trend remained approximately the same when considering the use split by years (Figure 2, bottom plot). In 2012, 2013, and 2014, the first application of week 33 occurred on August 12, August 18, and August 17, respectively. Instead the last application of week 44 in 2012, 2013, and 2014 occurred on November 12, November 13, and November 8, respectively.

**Figure 1.** Total chloropicrin mass applied in a specific month in the top five California counties (based on use) during 2012–2014.



**Figure 2.** Weekly chloropicrin mass applied in the top township (2014 6 mile x 6 mile area) of Santa Barbara County (top plot) during 2012–2014 and split by year (bottom plot).



## C. RECOMMENDATION

### Ambient Air Monitoring

Township S10N34W, which is located in Santa Barbara County and makes up most of the Santa Maria City area, was the California township with the highest mass of chloropicrin applied in 2014 (641,400 lbs; 7.1% of total state chloropicrin use). At the request of DPR, CARB conducted ambient air monitoring for chloropicrin in 2014 and 2015 in high use areas located in Ventura, Monterey and Santa Barbara Counties as part of DPR's Toxic Air Contaminant Program (Vidrio et al., 2015). The Santa Barbara County sampling location was inside of the S10N34W township. The highest chloropicrin air concentrations detected in both 2014 and 2015 were measured in township S10N34W. Additionally, due to an increase in chloropicrin use in the S10N34W township from 2012-2014, this region currently ranks as the highest use 36-square-mile area in the state. Therefore, DPR requests that CARB conduct seasonal ambient air monitoring for chloropicrin in 6-8 locations in the Santa Maria City region near areas of high chloropicrin use (S10N34W, S11N34W, S09N34W, S10N35W, S11N35W, S10N33W, and S09N33W) in addition to one background site located away from areas of use.

Monitoring sites should be located on schools or other public properties, near the edge of the community, and downwind of high use areas (Figure 3). Monitoring should be conducted over a 12-week period corresponding to the high-use chloropicrin season in this region, which occurs during the months of August, September, and October (weeks 33-44). At each sampling site, four 24-hour samples per week should be collected in sequence during each week of the 12-week sampling period. Each week, the four-day sampling period should begin on randomly chosen days over the full seven-day week, including weekends. In addition to the primary samples, replicate (co-located) samples are needed for at least 10% of the total number of samples collected during the 12-week period. Field spike samples should be collected under the same environmental conditions (e.g., temperature, humidity, exposure to sunlight) and monitoring study conditions (e.g., air flow rates, sample transportation and storage) as those occurring at the time of ambient air sampling. DPR recommends target 24-hour quantitation limits of at least 0.003 ppb for chloropicrin.

DPR requests that CARB provide the following in its ambient air monitoring report submitted to DPR:

1. Location of each sampler (if at a school, location of sampler within school grounds);
2. Sampling height and any information relevant to the study (presence of trees, buildings, particular industrial or commercial facilities and activities);
3. Proximity of the sampler to treated or potentially treated fields, including distance and direction;
4. Latitude and longitude coordinates for sampling sites, including the Datum used (e.g., NAD 27 or NAD 83); and
5. A map of the monitoring site locations and photographs of sample locations.

**Figure 3.** Total chloropicrin mass applied by township in California and in the Santa Maria Region during 2012–2014.




**Suggested Communities for Air Monitoring**

DPR evaluated 1,267 communities for chloropicrin use. The communities included all cities and census designated places (CDPs) in California, except those within the urban counties of Los Angeles, Orange, San Diego, and San Francisco (Andrews and Verder-Carlos, 2014).

DPR evaluated and rated each of the 1,267 California communities using the following criteria:

a) Regional use density (lbs of active ingredient used) during 2012-2014 (between 1 and 5 miles outside community boundary)
b) Local use density during 2012-2014 (within 1 mile outside community boundary)
c) Community use density during 2012-2014 (within the community boundary)

Ratings were given to the communities within the Santa Maria City region of Santa Barbara County according to the statewide rankings of the 1,267 communities evaluated. Table 7 summarizes the results of the evaluation of pesticide use and the Office of Environmental Health Hazards Assessment's (OEHHA) CalEnviroScreen 2.0 (CES 2.0) Population Characteristics percentile for those communities. For any California census tract, the CES 2.0 Population Characteristics percentile factors the following parameters: percent of children and elderly in the population, percent of low birth-weight births, and

the rates of asthma emergency department visits, educational attainment, linguistic isolation, poverty, and unemployment (OEHHA, 2014).

The highest use of chloropicrin from 2012 to 2014 occurred in the cities of Santa Maria and Guadalupe, followed by the Woodlands, Orcutt, and Nipomo Census Designated Places (CDPs). Santa Maria and Guadalupe Cities also had the highest CES 2.0 Population Characteristics percentile ratings among the communities in Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo Counties.

DPR recommends CARB select communities where high use of chloropicrin occurs, guided by the community rating from Table 7, and where the CES 2.0 Population Characteristics percentiles are the highest. DPR suggests that CARB consider the communities of Santa Maria, Guadalupe, Orcutt, and Nipomo as these communities are ranked highly for both use and environmental justice factors. Multiple sampling locations can be placed within a single community.

**Table 7.** Pesticide use and environmental justice factor ratings for communities in Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo Counties during 2012-2014.

| Community Name | County | Chloropicrin Use | | CES 2.0 Population Characteristics | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Statewide Rank[1] | County Rank[2] | Percentile | Rank[3] |
| **Santa Maria city** | Santa Barbara | 13 | 1 | 74 | 1 |
| **Guadalupe city** | Santa Barbara | 13 | 2 | 73 | 2 |
| **Woodlands CDP** | San Luis Obispo | 18 | 3 | 30 | 4 |
| **Orcutt CDP** | Santa Barbara | 21 | 4 | 18 | 9 |
| **Nipomo CDP** | San Luis Obispo | 22 | 5 | 40 | 3 |
| **Callender CDP** | San Luis Obispo | 23 | 6 | 30 | 4 |
| **Garey CDP** | Santa Barbara | 28 | 7 | 23 | 7 |
| **Sisquoc CDP** | Santa Barbara | 35 | 8 | 23 | 7 |
| **Blacklake CDP** | San Luis Obispo | 49 | 9 | 30 | 4 |

[1] Community pesticide reported use ranking is out of possible 1,267 California communities evaluated.
[2] Community rankings based on reported use in San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara Counties, with lower numbers indicate higher nearby pesticide use.
[3] Rankings for the top chloropicrin reported use communities in San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara Counties, with lower numbers indicating higher environmental justice priority.

## D. REFERENCES

Ajwa H, Ntow WJ, Qin R and Gao S (2010) Properties of Soil Fumigants and Their Fate in the Environment. In: (ed) Hayes' Handbook of Pesticide Toxicology. Vol., pp. 315-330

Ajwa H, Stanghellini MS, Gao S, Sullivan DA, Khan A, Ntow W and Qin R (2013) Fumigant emission reductions with TIF warrant regulatory changes. California Agriculture 67(3): 147-152.

Andrews, C.and Verder-Carlos, M. (2014). Recommended Air Monitoring for 2014. Memorandum dated February 18, 2014 to Chris Reardon. California Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Pesticide Regulation, Sacramento, CA. http://www.cdpr.ca.gov/docs/emon/airinit/amn_plan2014.pdf.

CARB. (2010). Sampling Protocol for 1, 3-Dichloropropene, Methyl Bromide, Chloropicrin and Methyl Iodide Application Monitoring. California Environmental Protection Agency, California Air Resources Board, Sacramento, CA. http://www.cdpr.ca.gov/docs/emon/pubs/tac/tacpdfs/2010_ambient_protocol_final.pdf.

Carter WPL, Luo D and Malkina IL (1997) Investigation of the atmospheric reactions of chloropicrin. Atmospheric Environment 31(10): 1425-1439.

CDFA (1989) Evaluation Summary, Ground Water Protection Data, Record No. 63408 California Department of Food and Agriculture, Pesticide Registration Branch, Sacramento, California

CDPR (2015). Control of Resident and Bystander Acute Exposure from Soil Fumigation Applications. C. D. o. P. Regulation. Sacramento, California, California Department of Pesticide Regulation.

CDPR (2016) Pesticide use report system. California Department of Pesticide Regulation, Sacramento, California. http://www.cdpr.ca.gov/docs/pur/purmain.htm Accessed June 29, 2016

Gan J, Yates SR, Ernst FF and Jury WA (2000) Degradation and volatilization of the fumigant chloropicrin after soil treatment. Journal of Environmental Quality 29(5): 1391-1397.

Gao S, Trout TJ and Schneider S (2008) Evaluation of Fumigation and Surface Seal Methods on Fumigant Emissions in an Orchard Replant Field. Journal of Environmental Quality 37(2): 369-377.

Kawamoto K and Urano K (1989) Parameters for predicting fate of organochlorine pesticides in the environment (I) Octanol-water and air-water partition coefficients. Chemosphere 18(9): 1987-1996.

Kidd H and James DR (1991) The Agrochemicals Handbook, 3rd ed. Royal Society of Chemistry Information Services, Cambridge, U.K.

Neal R. R. Segawa, and P Wofford. (2010). Pesticide Air Monitoring Network Monitoring Plan. Department of Pesticide Regulation, May 2010. Sacramento, CA.

OEHHA (2014). California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool, Version 2.0 (CalEnviroScreen 2.0). Guidence and Screening Tool. California Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, Sacramento California. http://oehha.ca.gov/media/CES20FinalReportUpdateOct2014.pdf

Vidrio, E., Wofford, P., and Segawa, R. (2015). Methyl bromide, 1,3-Dichloropropene, and Chloropicrin Air Monitoring Results for 2010-2014. Memorandum dated May 22, 2015 to Marylou Verder-Carlos. California Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Pesticide Regulation, Sacramento, CA. http://www.cdpr.ca.gov/docs/emon/airinit/1,3-D_methylbromide_results_2014.pdf.

USEPA (2008) Reregistration Eligibility Decision (RED) for Chloropicrin Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Pesticide Programs, Washington, D.C.,

Wang Q, Gan J, Papiernik SK and Yates SR (2000) Transformation and detoxification of halogenated fumigants by ammonium thiosulfate. Environmental Science and Technology 34(17): 3717-3721.

Ware GW and Whitacre DM (2004) The pesticide book. 6th edition MeisterPro Information Resources, Willoughby, OH, pp. 488.

Wilhelm SN, Shepler K, Lawrence LJ and Lee H (1996) Environmental Fate of Chloropicrin. In: (ed) Fumigants. Vol. 652. American Chemical Society, pp. 79-93