

## **DRAFT**

### **Notes**

#### **Parlier Local Advisory Group Meeting**

**June 9, 2005**

Local Advisory Group members in attendance: Ben Benavidez; Rosa Betancourt; Jena Ambacher, Teresa deAnda; Doug Edwards; Dr. Rogelio Fernandez; Raül Gaona; Rey Leon; Harold McClarty; Richard Milton; Vernon Peterson; Martin Macareno; Carolina Simunovic; Matthew Towers. (*Absent:* Weldon Byram, Luci Dominico, Chris Haga, Israel Lara, Lou Martinez and Richard Velasco.)

Facilitator: Lydia Martinez

DPR staff in attendance:

Clarice Ando, Veda Federighi, Leonard Herrera, Tobi Jones, Pat Matteson, Randy Segawa

Audience sign-in sheet:

Andrew Chang, Kevin Keefer, Jim Wells, Elliot Balch, Ofilia Figueroa, Erin Field, Vidal Reyna, Karri Hammerstrom, Malinda Hall, Roger Isom, Renee Pinel, Tim Tyner, Manual Cunha.

### **Welcome**

Veda Federighi welcomed the new LAG members, and thanked them for taking the time to attend these meetings, and provide their input. She went over the purpose of the meeting, and provided a DPR overview. Her notes are attached to these minutes.

### **Introductions**

All those in attendance at meeting introduced themselves.

### **Meeting ground rules and other housekeeping matters**

Led by Lydia Martinez, the LAG developed these ground rules for meetings:

- Don't interrupt others
- Be respectful and positive
- Stay on time (use a timekeeper)
- Stay on target and focused
- No side discussions
- Respect cultural differences
- Keep meetings informal (no votes taken)
- Honest dialogues/agree to disagree
- Stay positive
- Have fun

Veda Federighi explained that there will be a toll-free number available for LAG members who cannot attend personally but want to call in to meetings. However, due to the high cost of these calls, members would be asked about a week before the meeting

whether they plan to call in, so DPR can reserve enough (but not too many) lines. DPR pays for the lines reserved, whether or not they are used.

Veda also explained the committee's role is an advisory one, and DPR considers this role vital to a successful project. The LAG knows the community—DPR does not. DPR will fully evaluate and consider all LAG recommendations, and certainly adopt a good many of them. If DPR decides not to adopt a LAG recommendation, staff will provide an explanation of why the Department did not do so.

DPR believes that listening to recommendations from advisory groups is important. For example, DPR made two important changes in the Parlier project in response to recommendations from the statewide Cal/EPA Environmental Justice Advisory Group, or CEJAC. CEJAC recommended that DPR get input from university and other experts on the scientific aspects of our project, so we formed a Technical Advisory Group. We asked about 20 scientists and other experts from universities, other State agencies, the agricultural industry, and others to serve. Their first meeting was June 6. We will be posting minutes of those meetings on our Web site.

Another important addition to the project, made in response to a CEJAC recommendations to put more emphasis on alternatives analysis, was to have DPR's Pest Management Analysis and Planning (PMAP) unit do a study of pest management practices in the Parlier area, with a focus on least-toxic (integrated pest management) techniques being used. In Lompoc, we leveraged a similar study to get a U.S. EPA grant for the University Cooperative Extension to provide outreach to farmers on IPM.

The next one or two LAG meetings will be primarily devoted to issues DPR needs input on to get the project rolling. However, we will be asking LAG members for their input on agenda items, and for their thoughts on what agenda priorities should be (that is, what project issues should have priority to discuss).

### **Overview of Cal/EPA Environmental Justice Action Plan, EJ pilot project:**

Veda provided this overview:

EJ was defined in 1999 legislation as:

“The fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the development, adoption, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies.” (California Government Code Section 65040.12)

That and other legislation require Cal/EPA and its various boards and departments to develop an EJ strategy and plan, that is, guiding principles to ensure that our programs achieve environmental justice, and specific steps to get there.

However, former Cal/EPA Secretary Terry Tamminen (who is now the Governor's chief of staff) was impatient with the pace of that planning. He wanted some “action action action.” He called environmental justice the “civil rights issue of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.”

So Mr. Tamminen put together an “EJ Action Plan.” Included are six pilot projects, all designed to help us better understand and find ways to reduce environmental health risks, particularly to children. Each pilot project is different (Air Board, Toxics, and Water Board), but after we collect data, we will each develop a Children’s Environmental Risk Reduction Plan (ChERRP), to explore practical ways to reduce children’s environment risk. More about that at a future meeting.

DPR’s project is to do air monitoring in a rural Central Valley community, and DPR picked Parlier for this project. (Randy Segawa will explain more how and why we picked Parlier.)

The project will gather important data about pesticides in air. We will also use the project to help Cal/EPA develop guidelines for public participation, cumulative impact assessment, and precautionary approaches. As for precautionary approaches, we realized we needed to do more on alternatives analysis, which is why we are having our PMAP unit do a pest management and alternatives study. We will talk more about those topics at future meetings.

### **Parlier pilot project overview**

Randy Segawa went over the pilot project. His slides are attached to these minutes. Additional comments, including answers to questions asked by the LAG and audience members:

Randy discussed the number of pesticides that will probably be monitored and the basis for selecting the pesticides. Teresa DeAnda asked if there would be different monitors for different types of pesticides. Response: yes, there will be several types of samplers.

Randy discussed the criteria used to select Parlier as the community for monitoring. One of the criteria was the number of non-occupational pesticide drift illnesses in a community. Carolina Simunovic asked where this data comes from. Response: under state law, all physicians must report suspected pesticide illnesses to DPR. The drift illness data comes from the records of these illnesses. DPR considered communities in Merced, Madera, Fresno, Kings, and Tulare counties. Arvin in Kern County and Grayson in Stanislaus counties were also considered based on specific suggestions from the public. Martin Macareno pointed out that communities outside of the five main counties were not considered unless they were specifically suggested. Rey Leon commented that Huron would be highly rated for monitoring except that it does not have any cumulative impact data to evaluate exposure to other contaminants. Rey asked if there would be monitoring in westside communities. Response: Monitoring in other communities would depend on the availability of resources, once the plan for Parlier is established. Veda commented that this is not the last monitoring project DPR will conduct.

Teresa DeAnda wanted to know if ozone will be evaluated with pesticides. Response: Yes, ozone is monitored in Parlier on a continuous basis. DPR also hopes to get assistance to monitor for particulate matter. Raul Gaona asked what the measured air concentrations will be compared to. Response: Air concentrations will be compared to

“health screening levels.” These are concentrations below which health impacts are not expected. Manuel Cunha commented that particulate monitoring is not necessary because a lot of monitoring has been done in the past and DPR should coordinate with the agencies that have done this work. Tim Tyner (member of Technical Advisory Group) commented that the proposed monitoring will provide data on pesticides as gases. TAG was interested in adding monitoring that would provide information for pesticides in the form of particulates. Rey Leon commented that the cost of particulate monitors has decreased over the last several years.

Discussion of the appropriate format for questions and comment.

Vernon Peterson asked if residential pesticides can be distinguished from agricultural pesticides. Response: It is probably not possible to distinguish between the two sources. Harold McLarty asked if the amount of residential pesticide use can be subtracted from the amount of agricultural use and the corresponding air concentrations. Response: Probably not. Very little data is available on residential use of pesticides.

Jena Ambacher asked if pesticides in water will be monitored. Response: Yes, most drinking water in Parlier comes from wells. The wells are monitored for pesticides on a routine basis.

Raul Gaona asked if we find something harmful when would this be brought to people’s attention. Response: As with other monitoring projects, DPR acts immediately when harmful levels are found. DPR will also provide periodic progress reports for this project.

Rick Milton asked if historical information is available on use of pesticides. Pesticide use may vary from year to year due to pest pressure. Will be able to compare use during monitoring with use in previous years? Is there historical monitoring data available? Response: Yes, DPR has historical use data, but there is not historical monitoring data. The historical monitoring data focuses on individual pesticides in areas and seasons of high use. Very little air monitoring has been done for multiple pesticides in a single community.

### **Discussion of objectives**

DPR proposes the following project objectives:

Are residents of the community exposed to pesticides in air?

Which pesticides are people exposed to and in what amounts?

Do measured air levels exceed levels of concern to human health, particularly children?

As a result of comments from LAG members, DPR expanded the objectives to include (new objectives in italics)

*Inform the community of the project.* This includes having bilingual open forums.

*Reduce pesticide risk.*

*Conduct follow-up actions.* This may include regulatory actions and/or education.

*Evaluate comparative risk.* Compare the pesticide risk to other pollutants.

### **Discussion: pesticide selection**

DPR selected an initial list of pesticides for monitoring based on those that likely have higher health risk. Higher risk pesticides are those that have higher use, higher volatility, and higher toxicity. Randy presented four lists of pesticides: 1) pesticides that DPR can likely monitor, 2) pesticides that DPR might be able to monitor, 3) pesticides that would be very difficult to monitor, and 4) comparison of pesticides with high statewide use to those with high Parlier use. DPR is attempting to add two high-use pesticides in Parlier to the study: phosmet and iprodione. It would be very difficult to add the other Parlier high use pesticides: ziram, formetanate, and captan. There was back and forth discussion about particular pesticides. DPR will provide additional information on trade names of the pesticides, use patterns, and health effects of the pesticides for discussion at the next meeting. LAG members should be prepared to discuss and suggest pesticides for monitoring at the next meeting.

### **Discussion: sampling location**

Randy discussed the criteria DPR will use to select monitoring locations: 6 – 50 ft above ground, unobstructed air flow, site permission and accessible to DPR personnel, electricity, and secure from tampering. DPR also prefers to sample at a school or other “sensitive site” near the edge of town and near ag fields. Randy demonstrated one of the air samplers. Randy also presented maps showing locations of schools and pesticide use in the Parlier area. Dr. Fernandez asked if the samplers could be placed on roofs. Response: Yes, most of the samplers will probably be on roofs. Dr. Fernandez volunteered and suggested that one of the samplers be placed at the United Health Center clinic in Parlier. Teresa DeAnda suggested that samplers be located downwind from most of the pesticide applications. Harold McLarty commented that he thought schools should be monitored. Response: Pesticides are applied all around Parlier. Any location in Parlier will be downwind from pesticide applications. LAG members should be prepared to discuss and suggest locations for monitoring at the next meeting.

### **Feedback on meeting**

Discussion led by Lydia Martinez

LAG members and audience members suggested that the agendas and meetings be a little more formally structured:

- Agenda should be broken out more, so that it would be clearer as the meeting progresses where we are. For example, on June 9 agenda, the different topics under “Open discussion” should have been listed separately.
- Similarly, the agenda should note when the public will provide input, and when the LAG will. There should be an opportunity for both for each agenda discussion item, so members of the audience don’t have to stay to the end of the meeting to provide input. There seemed to be agreement that the LAG should have their discussion of a particular topic first, then audience members.
- Like at CEJAC meetings, audience members should be asked to fill out cards indicating if they want to speak on a topic. (Cards will be available at future

meetings at the sign-in table.) This will help the facilitator better structure the meeting, and also help the notetaker keep an accurate record of who spoke. If someone in the audience decides at the last minute they want to address a topic, they will be asked to fill out a card afterwards.

- If there are LAG members calling in, during LAG discussions, members should try to remember to identify themselves before they say something so that those on the phone know who is speaking.

The next meeting will be at 7 p.m. July 21, in the same place (Nectarine Room, Kearney Agricultural Center, Parlier).

## **Veda Federighi's notes for June 9 LAG meeting, agenda item: Welcome**

### **Purpose of meeting:**

As you know, this is the first meeting of the Parlier Local Advisory Group, known in government-ese as the "LAG." We are very excited about bringing you together to help us on this project.

Parlier, like many California rural communities, may have higher concentrations of pesticides in air compared to urban communities. This makes sense, considering how close you are to agricultural fields.

Both the Department of Pesticide Regulation and the State Air Resources Board have done monitoring in the past. But we would like more data to do better estimates of the risks that may be posed by pesticides in ambient air, that is, the air around us all the time. The data we gather here in Parlier will help us identify ways to reduce environmental health risk, particularly to children.

You can help us do a better job in their effort. We want you to exchange information, concerns, and ideas about the project. Although this group is not a decision-making group, your views will influence how we do our project. I promise that we value your input highly, and if we don't take your advice on something, we will explain why we didn't.

At these first LAG meetings, we will focus on the nitty gritty of air monitoring. As the project proceeds, we will be looking to you more for advice on how to use the information we will be collecting—what the risks are, and what we should do to reduce them.

*--To keep the meeting a reasonable length, and to make sure we get to the important topics, some issues will be discussed only briefly at this meeting. At future meetings, we will go over them in more detail.*

But you should know a little about what we do (and what we can't), what our role is, as you help us evaluate options for the project.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency regulates pesticides at the national level. In California, pesticide sales and use is controlled by the State Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) and by Agricultural Commissioners in County Departments of Agriculture in all 58 of the State's counties.

DPR is one of six departments and boards within the California Environmental Protection Agency. DPR's mission is to protect public health and the environment by regulating pesticide sales and use, and fostering reduced-risk pest management.

Before a pesticide can be sold or used in California, it has to be evaluated and registered by both U.S. EPA and DPR. DPR scientists evaluate data submitted by pesticide

companies. If manufacturers cannot show that their products can be used safely and not harm people who may be exposed, DPR will not allow the pesticide to be used in California.

To ensure compliance with the nation's toughest pesticide laws, California has the largest and best-trained enforcement organization in the nation.

DPR oversees licensing and certification of dealers, pest control advisers, pest control businesses, applicators, and pilots, and we oversee activities of the County Agricultural Commissioners.

The Commissioners and their staffs have primary responsibility for local enforcement activities. Their pesticide enforcement duties include:

- Inspecting the operations and records of growers, pest control businesses, pesticide dealers, and agricultural pest control advisers.
- Registering licensed pest control businesses (both agricultural and structural), pest control aircraft pilots, and agricultural pest control advisers.
- Issuing permits for the use of restricted pesticides.
- Inspecting pesticide applications.
- Conducting pesticide incident and illness investigations.
- Taking enforcement action (including levying fines and penalties) if violations are found.

(Doug Edwards from the Fresno County Ag Commissioner's Office is a member of the LAG.)

Another DPR activity particularly relevant to this project is our environmental monitoring program. DPR studies how pesticides break down in the environment, and their potential to contaminate soil, water and air. This helps answer questions about the impact of these chemicals on human health and the environment and to learn ways to prevent contamination.

DPR scientists also use monitoring and other data to evaluate reduced-risk solutions for pest problems. In fact, that DPR unit will be doing a study in the Parlier area. They will look at cropping patterns, pest pressures, pest control practices, pesticide use, application methods, and alternative pest management techniques, with a focus on integrated pest management. DPR will coordinate its study with ongoing work already being done in the Parlier area: for example, the Almond Pest Management Alliance and Outreach Project; DPR's federally funded project to develop organophosphate alternatives for stone fruit; the Code of Sustainable Winegrowing Practices developed by the California Association of Winegrape Growers and the Wine Institute; and research and extension activities by the world-renowned Kearney Agricultural Center.

## Environmental Justice Pilot Project

### Air Monitoring for Pesticides in a San Joaquin Valley Community

Local Advisory Group Meeting  
June 9, 2005

## DPR EJ Pilot Project

- Ambient air monitoring for pesticides in a rural community of the Central Valley
- DPR conducted similar monitoring for Lompoc
- Held workshops to solicit ideas for
  - Project objectives
  - Pesticides to monitor
  - Community to monitor

2

## Proposed Project Objectives

- DPR proposes the following objectives:
  - Are residents of the community exposed to pesticides in air?
  - Which pesticides are people exposed to and in what amounts?
  - Do measured air levels exceed levels of concern to human health, particularly children?

3

## Proposed Study

- Conduct air monitoring for pesticides at 2 – 4 locations in Parlier
- Collect 24-hour samples 2 – 4 days per week for 52 consecutive weeks
- Compile data for other contaminants in Parlier
- Evaluate individual and cumulative impact of pesticides and other contaminants in Parlier
- Evaluate current and reduced-risk pest management practices for crops in Parlier area
- Scientific review by Technical Advisory Group

4

## Proposed Pesticides for Monitoring

- DPR proposes to monitor 21 – 27 higher risk pesticides
- Higher risk pesticides are those that have higher toxicity and/or higher exposure
- Pesticides rated from 1 – 4 in the following categories:
  - Statewide use
  - Volatility
  - DPR risk assessment priority

5

## Community for Monitoring

- DPR evaluated 83 communities
  - All communities listed in 2000 Census for Merced, Madera, Fresno, Kings, and Tulare, except foothills
  - Grayson (Stanislaus) and Arvin (Kern)
- Each community evaluated for 14 criteria within 3 categories (3 categories equally weighted)
  - 4 criteria for EJ
  - 2 criteria for availability of cumulative impact data
  - 8 criteria for pesticide use

6



## Area Considered for Monitoring



7



## EJ Criteria

- 83 communities rated 1 – 4 (4 representing higher priority for monitoring) in 4 EJ subcategories
  - Child population density (<18 yrs old)
  - Non-white population percentage
  - Median family income
  - Number of non-occupational drift illnesses
- Overall EJ rating is average of 4 subcategories

8



## Highest EJ Ratings

Community	Rating (max of 4)
Earlimart (Tulare County)	4.0
Arvin (Kern County)	3.5
6 communities (including Parlier)	3.0

9



## Cumulative Impact Data Criteria

- 83 communities rated 0 – 4 in 2 subcategories for availability of cumulative impact data
  - Monitoring density for pesticides in municipal wells
  - Number of criteria air pollutants monitored
- Overall cumulative impact rating is average

10



## Highest Cumulative Impact Data Ratings

Community	Rating (max of 4)
Clovis (Fresno County)	3.5
Parlier (Fresno County)	3.5
Visalia (Tulare County)	3.5
Fresno (Fresno County)	3.0
Madera (Madera County)	2.5
23 communities	2.0

11



## Pesticide Use Criteria

- 83 communities rated 0 – 4 in 8 pesticide use density (lbs/sq mi) subcategories
- 2 use distances
  - Regional use (within 5 mi of community)
  - Local use (within 1 mi of community)
- 4 pesticide types (2002)
  - 4 fumigants
  - 14 organophosphates
  - Sulfur and copper
  - 13 other pesticides
- Overall pesticide rating is average

12



## Highest Pesticide Use Ratings

Community	Rating (max of 4)
Kingsburg (Fresno County)	3.9
London (Fresno County)	3.8
Huron (Fresno County)	3.6
6 communities (including Parlier)	3.5

Propose monitoring for 12 months, so seasonal use patterns immaterial

13



## Highest Overall Ratings

Community	Rating (max of 12)
Parlier (Fresno County)	10.0
Arvin (Kern County)	8.4
Visalia (Tulare County)	8.4
Orange Cove (Fresno County)	8.1
London (Fresno County)	8.0

14



## Other Considerations

- Air Sampling Feasibility
- Weather Considerations
- Possible collaboration with other projects
  - UCD health study of migrant farmworkers in Mendota
  - UCSF study of asthma and air toxics in Fresno County
  - Environmental Health Tracking Program study of environmental exposure and health outcomes

15



## Community for Monitoring

- DPR selected Parlier for monitoring
  - Highest rated community
  - UCSF asthma study
  - Several preferred monitoring sites

16



## Issues for Discussion

- Project objectives
- Pesticides for monitoring
- Sampling locations and frequency

17



## Proposed Project Objectives

- DPR proposes the following objectives:
  - Are residents of the community exposed to pesticides in air?
  - Which pesticides are people exposed to and in what amounts?
  - Do measured air levels exceed levels of concern to human health, particularly children?

18



## Pesticide Selection

---

- Pesticides that will likely be included
- Pesticides that may be included
- Pesticides that may be very difficult to include
- Pesticides that are high use in Parlier area

19



## Sampling Locations

---

- Location must meet following:
  - 6-50 ft above ground
  - Unobstructed air flow
  - Site permission and accessible to DPR personnel
  - Electricity
  - Secure from tampering
- Prefer to sample at school or other “sensitive site”
- Prefer to sample at edge of town, near ag fields

20