



Mary-Ann Warmerdam
Director

Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor

Parlier Technical Advisory Group Meeting Minutes – January 6, 2006

In Attendance:

Randy Segawa – Department of Pesticide Regulation, Environmental Monitoring
Jay Schreider – Department of Pesticide Regulation, Medical Toxicology
Pat Matteson – Department of Pesticide Regulation, Pest Management
Ian Reeve – Department of Pesticide Regulation, Worker Health and Safety
Lynn Baker – Air Resources Board
Webster Tasat – Air Resources Board
Helene Margolis – Department of Health Services
Bob Schlag – Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
Dave Rice – Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
John Faust – Office Environmental Health Hazards Assessment
Gary Van Sickle – California Tree Fruit Agreement
Charlie Goodman – California Department of Food and Agriculture
Karen Francone – Fresno County Agricultural Commissioner's Office
Lori Berger – California Minor Crops Council

Absent:

Tobi Jones – Department of Pesticide Regulation
Pam Wofford – Department of Pesticide Regulation
Tim Tyner – UC San Francisco VAPHER
Rey Leon – Latino Issues Forum
David Grantz – UC Kearney
Dmitri Smith – Integrated Waste Management Board
Evan Shipp – San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District
Kent Pinkerton – UC Davis Center for Health and Environment

Randy started the meeting with the introductions and a note of some changes of personnel on the TAG. Ian Reeve is DPR's Worker Health and Safety representative for exposure assessment.

Monitoring status:

DPR began monitoring on Jan 3 at all three schools. DPR is collecting both its multi-residue samples and its MITC samples. There's a problem installing electricity at Benavidez School, so ARB has not been able to set up their monitoring trailer. ARB hopes to be operational by Jan 17. If the trailer is not operational, ARB will begin sampling for VOCs with canisters at DPR's sampling location at Benavidez.

Pat asked about possible tampering of the samplers. Tampering has not been a problem in the past and is unlikely for this project. DPR's samplers are on roofs and ARB's trailer will have a fence surrounding it.



The lab analysis will take about 4 weeks to analyze each batch of samples. DPR plans to issue the first progress report in April 2006. The TAG will review drafts of the progress reports prior to release.

Protocol changes:

The pesticides included in the monitoring are still uncertain. It looks like chlorothalonil and oryzalin may be added back in. DPR had dropped these earlier due to lab problems, but the problems may have been resolved. Only qualitative data may be available for some pesticides. The lab may only be able to determine presence or absence, but not concentration. Lori Berger has concerns about reporting qualitative results. The TAG will discuss in detail if and when this occurs.

After discussing with Parlier officials, DPR decided to add water monitoring to the protocol. DPR will collect samples from Parlier's 5 municipal water wells once or twice during the year and analyze them for selected pesticides.

Comments received on protocol:

As requested at the last LAG meeting, DPR asked ARB's technical review committee for the Central California Ozone Study and the California Regional Particulate Air Quality Study to review the protocol. DPR received comments from two committee members. The comments dealt with minor technical issues. DPR has a more stringent quality assurance program than the EPA QA suggested by the commenter. The lab is also using a more stringent calibration procedure than the one suggested by the commenter.

Community forum:

The community forum is scheduled for Jan 28 at the Parlier Community Center, 10:00 – 3:00. DPR's director and Randy will make short presentations, but the forum will focus on the information tables and availability of staff to answer individual questions.

Screening levels:

Jay led the discussion on screening levels. Since DPR sent out the draft screening levels, Jay has revised the descriptions and developed a table. These will be sent to the group. The same methods as the Lompoc project were used. For the most part, Jay used existing levels described in risk assessments by DPR, OEHHA, or EPA. Sulfur is the one pesticide for which data was not available. There may be some occupational data that we can use. TAG members should try to get any comments on the screening levels to Jay by the end of the month.

Other issues:

There was a discussion about evaluating cumulative exposures. DPR will be working with OEHHA on this evaluation. Neither agency has a method to do this yet.

There was a discussion about modeling air concentrations. The model that DPR will probably use has been validated. However, the data generated from this project may or may not be amenable to the model. DPR will prepare a protocol for review by ARB and the San Joaquin Valley APCD before conducting any air dispersion modeling for Parlier.

Next meeting:

Unless there is a need to discuss the screening levels some more, the next meeting probably won't be until we have some monitoring data to discuss. The next TAG meeting will be in March or April to discuss preliminary monitoring results.