PESTICIDE REGISTRATION
AND EVALUATION COMMITTEE (PREC)
Meeting Minutes –May 15, 2015

Committee Members/Alternates in Attendance:
Amalia Neidhardt, Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) –via webcast
Charles Salocks, Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)
Crystal Reul-Chen, Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle)
Eric Lauritzen, CA Agricultural Commissioners and Sealers Association (CACASA)
Lynn Baker, Air Resources Board (ARB)
Margaret Reiff, Department of Pesticide Registration (DPR)
Patti TenBrook, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA), Region 9 –via webcast
Rebecca Sisco, University of California, IR-4 Program
Rich Breuer, State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)
Valerie Mitchell, Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)

Visitors in Attendance:
Anne Katten, California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
Darren Van Steenwyk, Clark Pest Control –via webcast
James Nakashima, OEHHA
Jennifer Fearing, Center for Food Safety
Justine Weinberg, California Department of Public Health –via webcast
Natalie McCorkle, California Prison Industry Authority
Paul Towers, Pesticide Action Network North America
Rachel Kubiak, Western Plant Health Association –via webcast
Ray Meek, California Prison Industry Authority

DPR Staff in Attendance:
Andi Cameron, Pesticide Registration Branch
Denise Alder, Pesticide Registration Branch
Doug Downie, Pest Management and Licensing Branch
Jeanne Martin, Enforcement Branch
Jennifer Teerlink, Environmental Monitoring Branch
Jolynn Mahmoudi-Haeri, Pesticide Registration Branch
Marta Barlow, Office of Legal Affairs
Polly Frenkel, Office of Legal Affairs
Richard Spas, Pesticide Registration Branch
Stephanie Duncan, Product Compliance Branch

1. Introductions and Committee Business –Margaret Reiff, Acting Chair, DPR

About twenty-four (24) people attended the meeting and thirty-three (33) viewers on the webcast.

2. Product Compliance Overview –Stephanie Duncan, DPR

The DPR's Product Compliance Branch (PCB) is comprised of three entities: product compliance (internally known as inspections), audits, and mill assessment. The goals of product compliance are marketplace equity and consumer protection. Marketplace equity ensures products offered for sale are registered in California. This includes Marketplace Surveillance Inspections (MSI), Producing Establishment Inspections (PEI), and collecting pesticide samples for analysis. The California Department of Food and Agriculture's Center for Analytical Chemistry performs the analysis to confirm the pesticide composition. Additionally, the consumer protection aspect investigates complaints from California Agricultural Commissioners, DPR staff, pesticide registrant competitors, and the public.

Inspectors visit pesticide manufacturing, packaging, or labeling establishments to perform a PEI. The inspectors examine records and inspect the facility for compliance issues. A typical year consists of fifty PEIs. Furthermore, inspectors will inspect any location that may sell pesticide products including retail establishments, wholesale establishments, and agricultural dealers. This is known as an MSI. The inspectors will review pesticide labels and label claims at these establishments. A typical year consists of 130-200 MSIs.

PCB also conducts audits on entities to ensure compliance with mill assessment and registration requirements. PCB performs these audits on pesticide registrants, licensed dealers and brokers, and any entity that sells pesticide products into or within the state. Audits are initiated by inspections and investigations, audit and compliance history, analysis of sales trends, non-reporting on mill assessment forms, pesticide use report data comparisons, and random selection (location, newer pesticide products, never been audited). The auditors will analyze the establishment's sales data, current market labels, licenses, recycling certificates, and pesticide sellers. Establishments are required to keep record of sales data for up to four years. Current market labels must have be the same the label on file with DPR.

Mill Assessment is a self-assessment system with quarterly requests for payment from 1440 registrants, 388 pest control dealers, and 178 pesticide brokers. A mill is equivalent to $0.001 or 1/10 of one cent. Currently, the mill assessment is at 21 mills or .021 per dollar of each pesticide sale. Mill is due on the "first" sale of pesticide into or within California by registrants, brokers, and dealers. DPR collected $64,812,217 in fiscal year 2013-2014. Two-thirds of the collection is used to fund DPR's activities such as enforcement activities at the state level and California Agriculture Commissioners at the local level. MillPay is an online pesticide product reporting system that will allow automatic calculations, spreadsheet upload of amount of product sold and quantity, online payment options, and the ability to view previous reports. A pilot program is currently in progress and DPR anticipates launching MillPay in 2016.

In conclusion, PCB conducts inspections, ensures marketplace equity, protects consumers, and collects mill assessment fees. PCB also works closely with the Pesticide Registration Branch, Pest Management and Licensing Branch, Office of Legal Affairs, Enforcement Branch, and other entities to achieve compliance. For further information regarding PCB, please visit <http://cdpr.ca.gov/docs/mill/masesmnu.htm> or e-mail <productcompliance@cdpr.ca.gov>.

3. Update on Neonicotinoid Reevaluation –Denise Alder, DPR

The last update on neonicotinoid reevaluation was provided at the July 20, 2012, Pesticide Registration and Evaluation Committee Meeting. At the January 17, 2014 PREC meeting, an update on U.S. EPA's pollinator protection labeling initiative was provided.

DPR initiated the reevaluation of certain pesticide products containing the neonicotinoids on February 26, 2009. The reevaluation included pesticide products containing the active ingredients imidacloprid, clothianidin, dinotefuran and thiamethoxam. The reevaluation was based on adverse effects data submitted by Bayer CropScience for imidacloprid. The adverse effects data included residue studies of imidacloprid use on ornamental plants. Honey and bumble bee studies were additionally submitted. DPR's evaluation of the adverse effects data noted two critical findings: (1) high levels of imidacloprid in leaves and blossoms of treated plants; and (2) increases in residue levels over time.

The nitroguanidine insecticide class of neonicotinoids includes imidacloprid, clothianidin, dinotefuran, and thiamethoxam. Clothianidin, dinotefuran and thiamethoxam were included in the reevaluation because they are in the same chemical family as imidacloprid. Based on available data, DPR scientists believed these active ingredients would have the same potential residue concerns as imidacloprid. Data also indicated that these active ingredients were similar to imidacloprid in toxicity to honey bees.

Currently, the reevaluation includes 274 products and 82 registrants. On an annual basis, DPR "rolls-in" additional products registered since the reevaluation was initiated. Excluded from the reevaluation were certain products such as those formulated as a gel or impregnated in a strip, termiticide, flea control products combined with rodenticide, pet spot applications, ant and roach baits, premise application for control of nuisance pests, and manufacturing use only products. These types of products are unlikely to move into plants that bloom or be a source of forage for honey bee or pollinators, and consequently, were excluded. The list of products included in the reevaluation is available on DPR's Neonicotinoid Reevaluation Web page located at <http://cdpr.ca.gov/docs/registration/reevaluation/chemicals/neonicotinoids.htm>.

DPR's data requirements can be broken into field-based studies and acute toxicity studies. DPR requires field-based residue analysis in pollen, nectar, and leaves from specific agricultural orchard and row crops grown in specific soil types for each of the four active ingredients. DPR's initial residue study strategy included locating existing treated fields to conduct trials. Later, DPR began requiring prescriptive two-year residue studies.

For products containing imidacloprid, DPR is requiring residue data on citrus, cotton, cucurbits, fruiting vegetables, pome fruits, strawberries, and stone fruits. Almonds were initially a data requirement. However, in 2010, the registrant informed DPR that use on almonds was minimal and voluntarily removed use on almonds from product labels. During the course of the reevaluation, DPR added a requirement for residue studies in stone fruits. This requirement added another tree crop to the study matrix in the same family as almonds.

For products containing thiamethoxam, DPR is requiring residue data on citrus, cotton, cucurbits, fruiting vegetables, strawberries, and stone fruits. In December 2012, DPR granted a waiver from conducting trials in pome fruit due to its minimal use in California. When almonds were added to the thiamethoxam labels, DPR added residue studies in almonds as a data requirement. However, in 2013, the registrant informed DPR they would also remove almonds from its thiamethoxam labels.

For products containing clothianidin, DPR is requiring residue data on almonds, cotton, cucurbits, fruiting vegetables, pome and stone fruits. DPR's Enforcement Branch made a determination that based upon the bee hazard statement on clothianidin product labels, such products cannot be used on blooming cotton in California. In May 2013, DPR granted a waiver from conducting residues trials in pome fruit due to its minimal use in California.

For products containing dinotefuran, DPR is requiring residue data on cotton, cucurbits, fruiting vegetables, and stone fruits. DPR required registrants of all four active ingredients to conduct and submit the results of acute toxicity studies (LC_{50} study) on honey bee brood starting with the larval stage through emergence.

DPR is collaborating with U.S. EPA's Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) Division and Pest Management Regulatory Agency (PMRA) Health Canada on this reevaluation. Concerns about the effects of neonicotinoid pesticides are not unique to California and DPR, OPP and PMRA are working together to investigate potential affects pesticides may have to honey bees. Through this partnership, DPR is able to share in the evaluations of all data provided to the agencies and public literature. U.S. EPA and PMRA have committed to completing an interim risk assessment on imidacloprid and progress reports on the other three active ingredients. DPR plans to reach a determination on its neonicotinoid reevaluation by 2018.

May 2011, DPR received the imidacloprid final reports for cotton and fruiting vegetable (tomato) residues. The data collected did not include the highest labeled rate of application. In March 2012, DPR required new, more prescriptive residue studies. These studies will be conducted at the maximum allowable label rate and follow the field for two years. New cotton and fruiting vegetable residue study final reports are anticipated at the end of June 2015. The University of California, Riverside in partnership with Bayer CropScience, conducted residue studies on citrus. DPR received the final reports from these studies in May 2011 and April 2012. The results of imidacloprid reside studies in cucurbits and strawberries were received in December 2012. The imidacloprid larval acute toxicity study was received in March 2012. DPR anticipates receiving final reports for imidacloprid residue studies in pome and stone fruit final at the end of January 2016.

Additionally, based on input from DPR and PMRA, U.S. EPA required imidacloprid registrants to conduct higher tier honey bee studies. Tier II studies, or feeding studies, examine effects on colonies following exposures to known concentrations of a pesticide in a food source fed to a bee colony. DPR received the final report on the colony feeding study in December 2014. Tier III studies, or full field studies, are a field-level study that looks at long-term effects under

environmentally realistic exposure conditions. Imidacloprid registrants are conducting two such studies: one in pumpkins to simulate exposure scenarios in Northern US and Canada, and a second one in California cotton. Since the cotton study is being conducted in California, DPR provided input on the study parameters and evaluated the study protocol. This study is in progress with summary information anticipated December 2015.

DPR received the final report of a fruiting vegetable (tomato) residue study in thiamethoxam in January 2012. Cucurbit studies will be similar to the prescriptive sampling performed with imidacloprid in that these will be prescriptive year zero studies. DPR received the results of thiamethoxam residue studies in January 2013. A thiamethoxam cotton residue study final report is anticipated for June 2015. DPR anticipates receiving the results of the thiamethoxam citrus, strawberry and stone fruit residue studies by December 2015. DPR received the thiamethoxam larval acute toxicity study in January 2012. The thiamethoxam colony feeding study was also conducted with summary information submitted and a final report anticipated September 2015. U.S. EPA required thiamethoxam registrants to conduct a Tier II colony feeding study. DPR expects to receive the final report on the colony feeding study in September 2015.

DPR anticipates receiving the results of clothianidin stone fruit residue studies in August 2015 and the clothianidin almond residue studies in December 2015. A three-year study investigating clothianidin residue in cucurbits (pumpkin) was received in April 2015. Currently, there is a label amendment pending at U.S. EPA to remove use in the fruiting vegetable crop group and low-growing berry for clothianidin products. DPR received the clothianidin larval acute toxicity study in February 2012. At U.S. EPA request, a clothianidin colony feeding study was conducted. A final report of the study is anticipated to be submitted December 2015.

In March 2012, DPR received a cotton residues study on dinotefuran. The registrants submitted existing data on cucurbits and fruiting vegetables in January 2010. The registrants requested DPR consider this data before conducting new studies. DPR needs to evaluate the submitted information and respond to the registrant. DPR prioritized the receipt and analysis of imidacloprid data due to high use relative to other neonicotinoid products. Additional residue studies are being conducted for U.S. EPA in 2015 and 2016 that will add to DPR's understanding of how dinotefuran is expressed in the pollen and nectar of representative orchard and row crops including the crops required for DPR's reevaluation. The registrants provided a report on the effects of dinotefuran to hives on March 2012. In January 2014, the registrant submitted a protocol to conduct an acute larval toxicity study with the final report anticipated November 2015. A colony feeding study, required by U.S. EPA, is underway with a final report anticipated for November 2016.

In August 2013, U.S. EPA announced its pollinator protection labeling initiative, which required all outdoor foliar applied neonicotinoid products to add new label statements to protect pollinators. These label statements apply to all outdoor foliar use products, containing the active ingredients imidacloprid, thiamethoxam, clothianidin, or dinotefuran, and included all pesticide formulation types (except granule formulations). The new labeling requirements include a bee advisory box and a bee hazard icon in the directions for use for each application site to identify additional restrictions to protect bees and other insect pollinators. The advisory box did not

replace existing bee protection language, but made neonicotinoid product labels uniform. These restrictions apply to application directions for crops with contracted pollinator services or for food/feed and commercially grown ornamentals that are attractive to pollinators. U.S. EPA required products that enter the marketplace after February 28, 2014, to bear the pollinator protection language. As an early mitigation measure, DPR centralized and expedited the processing of these amended labels. DPR continues to ensure that every neonicotinoid submission for new product or label amendment meets the stringent label standards.

For more information regarding DPR's reevaluation program, please visit DPR's Web Site at <http://cdpr.ca.gov/docs/registration/reevaluation/reevals.htm> or contact the Reevaluation Coordinator, Denise Alder by e-mail at <Denise.Alder@cdpr.ca.gov>.

4. <u>DPR's Pesticide Registration Process</u> –Richard Spas, DPR

DPR's mission is to protect human health and the environment by regulating pesticide sales and use and by fostering reduced-risk pest management. A pesticide is any substance intended to control, destroy, repel, or attract a pest. DPR currently has seven branches including, Pesticide Registration, Human Health Assessment, Worker Health and Safety, Environmental Monitoring, Enforcement, Product Compliance, and Pest Management and Licensing. The branches work together to evaluate and register pesticide products before sale or use in California, evaluate health impacts of pesticides through risk assessment and illness surveillance, ensure a safe workplace for those working with pesticides, and monitor potential health and environmental impacts of currently registered pesticides. Furthermore, the branches work together to license commercial applicators and other pesticide professionals to ensure they are adequately trained to use pesticides safely, support development and adopting of pest management practices designed to reduce pesticide use, and test for pesticide residues on fresh fruit and vegetables.

DPR receives 6000 to 7000 submissions in a typical year, out of which 4000 to 5000 are pesticide product registration submissions (e.g., new products or amendments to currently registered products). The average timeframe for evaluation of a new pesticide that is substantially similar to a currently registered pesticide product is 60 to 90 days. The time period is longer if the products contains and active ingredients or uses new to California. Currently, DPR registers a total of 13, 254 pesticide products containing 1,026 different active ingredients to 1,497 companies. DPR offers a variety of registrations and exemptions from registration, including full registration (i.e., basic, supplemental, and alternative brand names), California only registration (adjuvants), FIFRA section 24(c) special local needs registrations, FIFRA section 5 experimental use permit registrations. DPR also offers FIFRA section 18 emergency exemptions from registration. DPR will review products for compliance with FIFRA section 25(b) (minimal risk pesticides) and grant research authorizations.

An applicant's registration submission includes an Application for Pesticide Registration, an application fee, copy of the U.S. EPA stamped accepted pesticide label, any corresponding U.S. EPA documentation (e.g., notification form, letters, and e-mail), six copies of the printer's proof or final printed pesticide label, and scientific studies (e.g. product chemistry, environmental fate, toxicology, phytotoxicity, ecotoxicology and efficacy). Most products must be registered with

U.S. EPA before the applicant can submit an application for registration in California. For more information regarding registering a pesticide product, please visit DPR's Web Site at <http://cdpr.ca.gov/docs/registration/regprocess.htm>.

All registration submissions start in the mail/intake station for log in, if the submission contains scientific studies then the submission moves to indexing. The submission is then routed to the regulatory scientist assigned to the company making the submission. The regulatory scientists will check the submission for completeness and verify label compliance. If additional scientific evaluation of submitted data is needed, then the submission enters formal evaluation. Each evaluation station evaluates the data related to its area of expertise and then the submission is returned to the regulatory scientist to address any concerns or deficiencies to the applicant. Upon a determination that the submission is complete and use of the product poses no significant unmitigated adverse effects, the regulatory scientist sends the submission to licensing. Pesticide Registration Process Flowcharts can be found online at <http://cdpr.ca.gov/docs/registration/change/trkprocess.pdf>.

The types of pesticide products submitted to DPR range from standard chemicals to biopesticides (microbials and biochemicals). Biopesticides are derived from natural materials such as animals, plants, bacteria, and certain minerals. Microbials are living or killed entities including bacteria, fungi, viruses, and protozoans. Examples of biochemical pesticides include pheromones extracted from insects or plants, plant growth regulators, and insect growth regulators. Under certain criteria, DPR accepts applications to register new pesticide products and amendments to currently registered products prior to federal registration. The following may be submitted concurrently to DPR and U.S. EPA: 1) new pesticide products containing new active ingredients; 2) Experimental Use Permits; 3) new and currently registered antimicrobial pesticides that are intended to control pests that pose a threat to human health; 4) new "public health pesticides;" and 5) with prior approval from the Pesticide Registration Branch Chief. For more information regarding concurrent submission, please visit <http://cdpr.ca.gov/docs/registration/canot/2015/ca2015-03.pdf>.

DPR posts information regarding all pesticide products entering the formal scientific evaluation process in its weekly "Materials Entering Evaluation Notice." This notice includes the product's U.S. EPA Registration Number, name of the applicant, the product brand name, use, type of registration action, and active ingredient(s). Copies of Materials Entering Evaluation Notices are available on DPR's Web Site at <http://cdpr.ca.gov/docs/registration/mee/meemenu.htm>. The chemistry, pest and disease protection, plant physiology, microbiology, and ecotoxicology (formerly fish and wildlife) evaluation stations reside within the Pesticide Registration Branch. Other DPR branches also evaluate registration submissions, including Human Health Assessment (formerly Medical Toxicology), Worker Health and Safety, and Environmental Monitoring (Air Program, Ground Water Protection Program, and Surface Water Protection Program).

The Pest and Disease Protection station evaluates data to support the efficacy of insecticides, miticides, plant fungicides, post-harvest applications, nematicides, and some fungicidal washes. The Plant Physiology station evaluates herbicides, plant growth regulators, agriculture related

algaecides for efficacy and phytotoxicity and issues research authorization permits. The Chemistry station evaluates product chemistry and environmental fate data, and verifies tolerances (the maximum residue limit, which is the amount of pesticide residue allowed to remain in or on each treated food/commodity) and exemption from tolerances. It is important to note that DPR does not set tolerances. Food and feed tolerances can only be set by U.S. EPA. For more information regarding tolerances, please visit <http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/factsheets/stprf.htm>.

The Microbiology station evaluated efficacy data to support the registration of disinfectants, sanitizers, surface fungicides (e.g., wood preservatives), antimicrobial washes for fruits and vegetables, and algaecides for industrial and residential uses. The Ecotoxicology station evaluated efficacy and ecological effects in rodenticides, antifouling boat paint or coatings, fish control agents, aquatic amphibian control agents, terrestrial amphibian agents, reptilian control agents, avian toxicants, and vertebrate repellents and the ecological effects of all outdoor use pesticides.

DPR may register a pesticide product, conditionally register a pesticide product, or refuse to register a pesticide product. A product is conditionally registered, when more data needed to support the efficacy of the product. The applicant will be required to submit the data in a specific timeframe. Once a decision is made on submissions that enter formal scientific evaluation, DPR posts the products weekly in its Notices of Proposed and Final Decisions. If a product is posted proposed for registration then there is a thirty-day public comment period. If comments are received, DPR must respond to the comments for making a final registration decision. This notice provides the same information about each product as the Materials Entering Evaluation Notice. Notices of Proposed and Final Decisions are available on DPR's Web Site at <http://cdpr.ca.gov/docs/registration/nod/nodmenu.htm>.

For more information regarding DPR's Pesticide Registration Process, please visit <http://cdpr.ca.gov/docs/registration/regmenu.htm> or contact Ombudsman, Ms. Jolynn Mahmoudi-Haeri by e-mail at <Jolynn.Mahmoudi-Haeri@cdpr.ca.gov>.

5. Committee Comment

Rebecca Sisco requested the number of producing establishments in California, the percentage of the establishments being inspected per year, and the number of producing establishments in Northern California versus Southern California. The inspections of producing establishments are conducted under federal authority. Each year, U.S. EPA contracts with the Product Compliance Branch through a cooperative agreement to perform approximately 50 inspections, the locations of which are selected by U.S. EPA. There are approximately 500 pesticide-producing establishments in California. All product compliance branch inspectors carry federal inspection credentials to perform the producing establishment inspections.

Rebecca Sisco further inquired where the product compliance inspectors are located. Stephanie Duncan replied there are five inspectors in Sacramento and one inspector based in Los Angeles.

If needed, the Northern California inspectors will travel to Southern California or other states for inspections.

Rebecca Sisco inquired on the residues required for the neonicotinoid reevaluation. Denise Alder replied the reevaluation is requiring residue studies on leaves, pollen, and nectar. Residue levels in plant leaves confirm that a systemic pesticide was applied to the crop. Rebecca Sisco asked about the fields for the clothianidin cucurbit trials, as they are an annual crop. Denise Alder responded by stating there were not any rotation crops and the study was primarily only pumpkin. The fields were planted one crop per year and the fields were left fallow.

Rich Breuer inquired if the studies only revolved around bees or if there were toxicity studies on other species as well. Denise Alder responded that currently the reevaluation is focused on honey bees and DPR is looking into adding bumble bees. DPR is relying on open literature to address bumble bees, blue orchard bees, and leaf cutter bees. DPR is using honey bees to represent the bee species.

Rich Breuer commented one of the concerns is UC Granite Canyon is finding that the traditional toxicity test species and with emerging pesticides, the standard EPA test species are not sensitive. Mr. Breuer expressed concern as to whether registrants are testing the right species.

Rich Breuer questioned how the neonicotinoid reevaluation is addressing the urban component. Denise Alder stated registrants are conducting urban studies on a voluntary basis. The nursery industry is funding additional research on applications made to containerized ornamentals and vegetable crops. Based on the reevaluation timeframe, the neonicotinoid reevaluation is concentrating on agricultural orchard and row crops. However, DPR is looking at the available research that is currently being conducted by registrants and researchers as well as the nursery industry.

Crystal Reul-Chen inquired if all the field studies are available online. Denise Alder stated the all the studies are available through the public records act. For more information regarding Public Records, please visit <http://cdpr.ca.gov/docs/registration/PRbrochure.pdf>.

Crystal Reul-Chen asked when the neonicotinoid reevaluation analysis would be completed. Denise Alder stated certain residue studies have final reports submitted and evaluation completed on them. U.S. EPA and PMRA Health Canada anticipate issuing progress reports on all four chemicals by the end of the year. Crystal Reul-Chen further inquired if a progress report will be presented to the committee. Denise Alder said that a progress report could be given to the committee.

Lynn Baker inquired how often DPR decides not to register a product that U.S. EPA has registered. On average, DPR denies 8-10% of products that have been registered with U.S. EPA.

Eric Lauritzen asked what triggered a reevaluation. Denise Alder stated there are a certain set of criteria that can trigger for reevaluation including data showing an adverse effect or potential for an adverse effect, the labels are incorrect, etc. Reevaluation can be for a specific active

ingredient or a whole class of active ingredients such as the neonicotinoids. Timeframes are set by statute. Registrants have up to two years to generate required data. Once there is sufficient data to show a significant adverse effect then DPR can restrict the pesticide or make it a restricted material. If there is data indicating a significant adverse effect that cannot be mitigated, DPR can proceed with cancellation.

Rebecca Sisco inquired if a new Ombudsman has been named. Richard Spas stated Jolynn Mahmoudi-Haeri has been named the new Ombudsman.

6. Public Comment

Paul Towers asked what potential next steps DPR will take after the agencies publish the progress report. Denise Alder stated the progress report would not include mitigation and will provide information on the available data received by the agencies. Mitigation strategies will be considered after the conclusion of the full risk assessment. However, if there is something the agencies can address quickly (e.g., thru label amendment), the agencies will discuss this option.

Paul Towers stated U.S. EPA is limiting the future registration of neonicotinoid products and inquired how that will affect California. Denise Alder stated DPR does have some label amendments in-house that would fall under the U.S. EPA hold. However, DPR has not yet made a decision on whether to allow these applications to proceed. DPR is working closely with U.S. EPA and the products in-house are currently registered with U.S. EPA. DPR is taking this opportunity to reassess the information.

Paul Towers inquired how an announcement from the White House Task Force would affect DPR. Denise Alder stated DPR would take actions as necessary to address the outputs of the task. Paul Towers further inquired if DPR had any information on the potential output. Denise Alder stated DPR does not currently have any information.

Paul Towers asked how DPR is handling the active ingredients that have similar chemistry, but are not in the same class as neonicotinoids e.g., sulfoxaflor and flupyradifurone. DPR is reviewing the submitted bee toxicity data in order to base its registration decisions on the best available science.

Paul Towers inquired what the trigger is for a formal reevaluation. Denise Alder stated DPR has received an application to register a sulfoxaflor containing product. DPR will not make a final decision until DPR ecotoxicologists have reviewed the data.

Doug Downie inquired what the difference is between conditional and interim registrations. Denise Alder stated interim registrations are missing the California field dissipation studies. Interim Registrations currently cost $5,000 and the Pest Management and Licensing Branch will conduct an analysis on the benefits and risks specifically for the groundwater environmental fate studies.

Paul Towers asked what portion of current registered products are registered conditionally. Denise Alder stated there are about 200 conditionally registered products out of the 13,000 products currently registered for use in California. The proportion is quite small. Paul Towers inquired as to the average length of time it takes to get information back from the registrant and process a conditional evaluation. Richard Spas stated DPR sets a specific reasonable timeframe for the applicant to conduct the study. For example on a storage and stability issue, DPR may give the company six months to a year.

Paul Towers further inquired if the conditional product can remain on the market while conducting the necessary studies. Richard Spas stated yes.

7. Agenda Items for Next Meeting

No agenda items identified for the next meeting.

The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, July 17, 2015 at 10:00 a.m. in the Sierra Hearing Room on the second floor of the Cal/EPA building, located at 1001 I Street, Sacramento, California.

8. Adjourn