



**PESTICIDE REGISTRATION
AND EVALUATION COMMITTEE (PREC)
Meeting Minutes – July 19, 2019**

Committee Members/Alternates in Attendance:

Amalia Neidhardt – Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) – via webcast
Bryan Eya – Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)
Karen Morrison – Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR)
Kevi Mace-Hill – California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA)
Lynn Baker – California Air Resources Board (CARB)
Scott Couch – State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)
Stella McMillin – Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)
Valerie Hanley – Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) – via webcast

Visitors in Attendance:

Anne Katten – California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
Arthur Lawyer - Exponent
Dave Lawson – Western Plant Health Association (WPHA)
Emily Saad – Exponent
Jean-Mari Peltier – Environmental Solutions Group (ESG)
Justine Weinberg – California Department of Public Health (CDPH)
Lori Apodaca - California Citrus Mutual

DPR Staff in Attendance:

Aron Lindgren - Pesticide Registration Branch
Brenna McNabb – Pesticide Registration Branch
Brittanie Clendenin – Pesticide Registration Branch
Brittany Boerstra - Pesticide Programs Division
Charlotte Fadipe – Director’s Office
Chris Collins – Environmental Monitoring Branch
Denise Alder – Pesticide Registration Branch
Edgar Vidrio – Environmental Monitoring Branch
Eric Kwok – Human Health Assessment Branch
Eric Lauritzen – Pesticide Programs Division
Jazmin Gonzalez – Environmental Monitoring Branch
Jesse Cuevas – Pesticide Programs Division
Kara James - Pesticide Registration Branch
Kelly Heal – Environmental Monitoring Branch
Ken D. King – Environmental Monitoring Branch
Minh Pham – Environmental Monitoring Branch
Pam Wofford – Environmental Monitoring Branch

DPR Staff in Attendance continued:

Peggy Bylerly – Enforcement Branch
Regina Sarracino – Enforcement Branch
Val Dolcini – Director’s Office

1. Introductions and Committee Business – Karen Morrison, Chair, DPR

- a. Approximately thirty-five (35) people attended the meeting.
- b. The groundwater protection area regulation will be effective January 1, 2020.
- c. The notice for public health exemption for notification is available for comment. The comment period ends July 23.
- d. The notice for field fumigation posting is available for comment. The comment period ends August 21.
- e. New rulemaking proposes expand restricted materials to include the active ingredient carbaryl. The comment period will open July 26 and will close in September.
- f. California's System for Pesticide Incident Reporting (CASPIR) mobile app is live. This is a platform to report pesticide incidents for response by commissioners and DPR.

2. Ambient Air Monitoring Results for 2018 - Kenneth D. King, Jazmin Gonzalez, and Minh Pham, DPR

There are three reports referenced in this presentation, which include the 2018 Air Monitoring Network (AMN), the Toxic Air Contaminant (TAC) program, and Study 309: Air Monitoring of 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-D) in Merced and Fresno Counties. The AMN took place from January 1 to December 31, 2018, with eight permanent sampling sites monitoring for 31 pesticides with five breakdown products. The TAC program took place from January 1 to August 14, 2018, with one site monitoring for methyl bromide (MeBr) and 1,3-D. This site has since transitioned to an AMN site. Study 309 took place from January 1 to December 31, 2018 with two permanent sites monitoring for 1,3-D. In 2018, the AMN used ten long-term sites to collect data and monitor various pesticides. These sites range throughout the central valley and coast areas, including Watsonville, Delhi, Chualar, San Joaquin, Parlier, Lindsay, Shafter, Cuyama, Santa Maria, and Oxnard. DPR uses mass based units as well as parts per billion (ppb) for fumigants in reports, sampling, and measurements. For consistency, this presentation uses ppb for all results. However, all of the referenced reports include values in both nanograms per meter cubed (ng/m^3) and ppb.

Because no state or federal agency has established health standards for pesticides in ambient air, DPR and OEHHA have developed health-screening levels. DPR estimates the potential for adverse health effects by comparing air concentrations to health screening levels or regulatory targets. Screening levels are based on preliminary assessments of possible health effects and are

not associated with a formal risk assessment. If air concentrations approach this threshold, it may mean that DPR may need to conduct further investigation and research. Regulatory targets supersede screening levels and originate from a formal risk assessment of a chemical's toxicity and potential exposures. If concentrations approach or surpass the regulatory target, DPR will investigate. There are currently four pesticides in the AMN: chloropicrin, MeBr, methyl isothiocyanate (MITC), and 1,3-D that have regulatory targets for one or more exposure period.

The AMN began in 2011 with three sampling locations. DPR collects weekly 24-hour samples and analyzes the data for 31 pesticides and five breakdown products. In 2016, an approved budget change allowed for the expansion of the AMN from three to eight total sampling locations for a period of two years in collaboration with the CARB. DPR operated sites in Chualar, Santa Maria, and Watsonville. CARB operated sites in Cuyama, Lindsay, Oxnard, and San Joaquin. Due to some procurement delays, DPR monitored the site in Shafter until CARB was able to take over in April 2018.

There were 12,058 possible detections analyzed over the year, unevenly distributed across sites due to the varying start dates. Six percent of these resulted in detection of any kind, which include quantifiable and trace detections, while one percent resulted in quantifiable detections. For clarification, trace detections are those between the method detection limit and the reporting limit established by lab. Quantifiable detections are those with assigned numeric concentrations. Of the 31 pesticides and five breakdown products, eight were not present at any of the monitoring sites, 17 registered at trace levels, and 11 registered at quantifiable concentrations.

Monitoring locations were selected based on use patterns of fumigants or organophosphates in their vicinity. MITC was present at each of the AMN monitoring sites. Three of the four sites selected based on fumigant use (Oxnard, Santa Maria, and Watsonville) produced quantifiable detections of chloropicrin and 1,3-D. Three of the four sites selected for organophosphate use (Lindsay, San Joaquin, and Shafter) produced quantifiable detections for chlorpyrifos. The highest measured air concentrations from each site are compared to their respective acute, sub-chronic and chronic screening levels. Among the pesticides discussed here, none exceeded their acute, sub-chronic, or chronic screening levels or regulatory targets. The highest 24-hour chloropicrin concentration observed was from Oxnard at 0.8 ppb. The highest 24-hour MITC concentration observed was from Shafter at 1.2 ppb. Results for chloropicrin use 13-week rolling average concentrations, with the highest registered concentration in Santa Maria at 0.11 ppb. The highest four-week rolling average concentrations are for MITC in Shafter at 0.5 ppb. The highest annual average concentration of chloropicrin registered in Santa Maria at 0.04 ppb and the highest annual average concentration of MITC registered in Shafter at 0.06 ppb.

Cumulative exposure rates for the 14 organophosphate pesticides include acephate, bensulide, chlorpyrifos + oxygen analog (OA), 2,2-dichlorovinyl dimethyl phosphate (DDVP), tribufos (DEF), diazinon + OA, dimethoate + OA, malathion + OA, oxydemeton methyl, and phosmet. Cumulative exposure calculations use a hazard quotient and hazard index approach that relies on the ratio between the detected air concentration and the screening level. Shafter rated

the highest acute, sub-chronic, and chronic hazard indices for all years of AMN monitoring, though no year reached a value of one, which would suggest the need for further evaluation.

The equation for estimating cancer risk multiplies a potency factor in humans (mg/kg/day)⁻¹ by the mean lifetime (70-year) air concentration (mg m⁻³) and the normalized breathing rate of a human adult (0.28 m³ kg⁻¹ day⁻¹). In the absence of 70-year monitoring data, the value of lifetime air concentration assumes continuous exposure at the mean annual concentration for all available monitoring years. Of the seven carcinogenic pesticides included in the AMN, only 1,3-D and chlorothalonil measured at quantifiable concentrations in at least one of the sampling locations in 2018. There are no established cancer risk regulatory targets for chlorothalonil, however, an estimated risk in the range of 1.0E-05 to 1.0E-06 or less is effectively negligible.

In summary, eight of the 31 pesticides and five breakdown products monitored were not present at any monitoring location and 17 were present only at trace levels. The pesticides registered at quantifiable levels, include 1,3-D, chloropicrin, chlorothalonil, chlorpyrifos and its oxon, chlorthal-dimethyl, dimethoate oxon, malathion, methyl bromide, MITC, and trifluralin. The chemicals with the highest number of detections from all monitoring locations were MITC (21.7%), 1,3-D (11%), and chloropicrin (4%). None of the Hazard Indices for a hypothetical combined 14 organophosphate compound exceeded 1.0 at any of the sampling locations during 2018.

As part of the TAC program, CARB conducted monitoring of 1,3-D and MeBr at DPR's request in Oxnard, Watsonville, and Santa Maria. Watsonville and Santa Maria transitioned into AMN sites in 2017 while Oxnard transitioned into AMN on August 14, 2018. The reporting limit for this study was the same as AMN at 0.1 ppb; however, the sampling collection methods varied between the two studies. The TAC collected one 24-hour sample every six days, while the AMN study sampled on a random day, once a week.

Study 309 monitored 1,3-D in high-use areas in the Central Valley and evaluated the effectiveness of 1,3-D mitigation measures. A ranking of historical pesticide use data within Merced and Fresno counties determined the monitoring locations for the study. Delhi ranked sixteenth statewide and first in Merced County while Parlier ranked thirty-sixth statewide and sixth in Fresno County. Monitoring began on December 1, 2016 at both sampling locations. Study 309 used the same collection frequency as AMN, collecting one 24-hour air sample per site on a randomly selected day each week. One notable difference for this study is the lower detection limit of 0.01 ppb as compared to the 0.1 ppb limit of AMN. Delhi and Parlier had very high detection rates, though it is worth noting the lower detection limit used for Study 309 in these areas. The maximum acute, sub-chronic, and chronic concentrations vary by sampling location. Current acute, sub-chronic, and chronic screening levels for 1,3-D are 110 ppb, 3 ppb, and 2 ppb respectively. Air concentrations at Parlier ranked the highest of the measured locations and exceeded the screening levels for all of the exposure periods. The maximum acute, sub-chronic, and chronic concentrations reached 101%, 351%, 147% of the screening levels, respectively. DPR has investigated the extremely high concentrations found in Parlier, and the

results are available on the air program website. Additionally, Shafter observed a maximum sub-chronic concentration of 5.6 ppb, which exceeded the screening level of 3 ppb.

1,3-D is recognized as a human carcinogen by the State of California. DPR has determined a regulatory target for lifetime exposure, in addition to the acute, sub-chronic and chronic exposures. Using the same cancer risk formula as above, DPR calculated a regulatory target of 0.56 ppb for mean lifetime air concentration, as described in the 2016 Risk Management Directive for 1,3-D. Parlier had an annual concentration of 2.9 ppb in 2018 and an overall average concentration of 1.71 ppb. At this rate over 70 years, Parlier would exceed DPR's regulatory target of 0.56 ppb for mitigation of lifetime cancer risk.

In summary, DPR monitored 1,3-D air concentrations in 10 communities in 2018. Air concentrations at eight sampling sites did not exceed human health screening levels for acute, sub-chronic, and chronic exposures. Sub-chronic concentrations at the Shafter site measured above the screening level. Concentrations measured at the Parlier site exceeded human health levels for acute, sub-chronic, and chronic exposures. The annual concentration of 2.94 ppb, measured at the Parlier sampling site, far exceeds DPR's regulatory target.

There have been a few general updates in the AMN. Management of the Shafter site transitioned from DPR to CARB staff. DPR continues to operate the sites in Chualar, Santa Maria, and Watsonville while CARB operates the sites in Cuyama, Lindsay, San Joaquin, and Oxnard. Nearing the two-year completion of the monitoring, DPR and CARB are discussing the next steps for the project. The Shafter site relocated from Shafter High School to Sequoia Elementary School in late February, at the request of the city and the school, due to planned construction. The Oxnard site at Rio Mesa High School transitioned from a TAC site into a full AMN site under CARB jurisdiction. CARB and DPR are looking for a potential replacement site in the Santa Maria area, as the current site may be closing down.

CARB has completed all six seasonal studies, with all data available through the Ambient Air Database. At the end of the month, the database will contain all current data values through April. The seasonal studies took place in Fresno, Tulare, Kern, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara and Imperial counties. The finalized 2018 TAC report and the Study 309 Annual Report are accessible on the DPR website for the public to view. The 2018 AMN Report is in draft form and DPR is currently accepting comments. The comment period will end August 31.

3. Updates on DPR's Cannabis Program - Eric Lauritzen, DPR

There have been many acts and propositions signed into law in California over the past two decades.

- 1996: Proposition 215 (Compassionate Use Act)
- 2003: Senate Bill 420 (Medical Marijuana Program Act)
- 2015: Assembly Bill 243, Assembly Bill 266, and Senate Bill 643 (Medical Marijuana Regulation and Safety Act)
- 2016: Senate Bill 837 (Medical Cannabis Regulation and Safety Act) and Proposition 64 (Adult Use Marijuana Act)
- 2017: Senate Bill 94 (Medicinal and Adult Use Cannabis Regulation and Safety Act)

The three licensing agencies for cannabis in California are Department of Consumer Affairs - Bureau of Cannabis Control, CDPH, and CDFA. DPR is not a licensing agency for cannabis, but is involved with cannabis related research and other decisions in the state. DPR is fulfilling the legal mandates of providing guidance to the Bureau of Cannabis Control and cannabis cultivators through partnerships between the Enforcement Branch and local county agricultural commissioners. DPR is maintaining compliance with the California Food and Agricultural Code related to pesticide use, but is not drafting any cannabis-specific regulations. Ultimately, the department is interested in protecting both the environment and the health of those that use or consume cannabis.

DPR is required to provide pesticide residue guidelines to the Bureau of Cannabis Control. The department's interest is to protect human health when it comes to pesticide use for these products. A licensed, third party lab must test each product before it goes to a dispensary. The drying process qualifies all of the cannabis materials as processed products, which is unusual as the labs typically perform testing on unprocessed products.

A major focus of the department has been to determine what can and cannot be used in California. Products must contain an active ingredient exempt from federal tolerance and have labeling broad enough for use on cannabis or be exempt from registration (Federal Insecticide Fungicide and Rodenticide Act section 25b). DPR evaluates products on a case-by-case basis and focuses solely on label specific determinations on currently registered materials, where the use on cannabis is in question. The department does not publish a list of pesticide products that meet these criteria and does not intend to do so in the future. Stakeholders can refer questions about specific products to the local county agricultural commissioner's office.

CDFA is working on regulations for the 2018 Farm Bill, authorizing the production of industrial hemp. There are challenges that come with this related to registration, specific uses, and potential conflicts. In addition, there are concerns for the impact of cannabis on conventional growers, including cultivation, odor, and land use decisions. DPR has been paying attention to products used in illegal grow sites and has been working with other agencies to gather more data on these

areas. Sacramento State will lead a comprehensive consumption study to help guide DPR policy decisions, focusing on human health risks from a consumption standpoint.

4. Update on Citrus Bee Regulation - Peggy Byerly and Regina Sarracino, DPR

There will be several updates in a rulemaking proposal later this year to the Title 3 of the California Code of Regulations (3 CCR) regarding the protection of bees. These citrus bee regulations have not been revised since 2001. The proposed changes will modernize the regulations and make them more aligned with new changes to the California Food and Agricultural (FAC) Division 13 laws. A major change to 3 CCR section 6650 includes the removal of the modifying terms “highly” or “moderately” to clarify that these regulations apply to all pesticides labeled “toxic to bees”. To modernize this section, the code will indicate the availability of temperature information online, accessible anytime, rather than only via the local newspaper. 3 CCR sections 6652, 6654, and 6656 will substitute the term “apiary operator” in lieu of “beekeeper” to use the same language as the CDFA Division 13 laws. Under 3 CCR section 6652, when an apiary operator notifies the county agricultural commissioner that they are bringing bees into the county, they may also request a notification of nearby pesticide applications that are toxic to bees. Updates to 3 CCR section 6652 will allow for modernized communication and notification methods between the pesticide applicators and apiary operators. Additionally, 3 CCR section 6656 applies only to “citrus/bee protection areas” in Fresno, Tulare, and Kern counties for the period between mid-March and the end of May. The updates to this section will modernize the notification methods available between pesticide applicators and apiary operators as well as update the language around limited exemptions for CDFA declared quarantine pests.

DPR anticipates a public comment period during October 2019. The DPR homepage will have a link to the proposed changes.

5. Committee Comment

Lynn Baker asked about the significance behind the naming of Study 309. Jazmin Gonzalez replied that 309 was the next chronological number in the study naming system.

Lynn Baker then asked for clarification on the selection criteria for Parlier, when it ranked thirty-sixth statewide and sixth in the county. Jazmin Gonzalez explained the different requirements for site selection, such as permission to access, security, and access to power. Minh Pham replied that the selection also considered availability. For this study, DPR compared high-use and high concentration. DPR did not find a direct correlation. Parlier was within a high-use area and therefore met the criteria for the study.

Kevi Mace-Hill asked for a status update on the weather station upgrades mentioned at a previous meeting. Minh Pham replied that DPR installed a 10-meter tower at the Shafter school site, which has the ability to detect meteorological data at multiple levels. DPR installed a shorter

monitor in Watsonville, which can give data for general monitoring, but does not have access to the higher atmosphere level. Edgar Vidrio added that the Air Program is in the process of upgrading most sites, but cited delays due to resource issues. When the program fully transitions the current setup, there will be a full weather tower with sensors at both 10 meters and 2 meters for air dispersion modeling purposes. In addition, the program is collecting some weather data in Watsonville and Chualar, to add to data gathered in Shafter. DPR also plans to deploy a temporary weather station in Parlier to ensure the collection of weather data during the typically high detection months from September to November. DPR would also like to transition Santa Maria and other sites as more resources become available.

Stella McMillin commented that there has been a lack of good mechanisms for testing pesticides found so it would be helpful to have more collaboration between agencies. Eric Lauritzen replied that he agreed and that Rachel Kubiak has worked a lot with other agencies in order to do this work. There is also a dedicated effort on the enforcement side to look at illegal distributors and sites.

Bryan Eya asked if there are currently registered pesticides specifically designated for use on cannabis. Eric Lauritzen replied that there are not any pesticides currently registered for specific use on cannabis. Because cannabis is illegal at the federal level, DPR cannot register any pesticides for use on cannabis.

Bryan Eya asked how farms gain permission from the state to use pesticides on cannabis. Eric Lauritzen replied that if the materials used are federally exempt from tolerance and have broad enough use, then growers could use these products on cannabis. These products are for general use on a variety of crops, and are not cannabis specific. Karen Morrison added that in the case of carbofuran, it is an illegal application at an illegal grow site.

Bryan Eya asked if the general use pesticides are a concern. Karen Morrison replied that it depends on the properties of the pesticide, whether or not it is exempt from tolerance, and if the labeling allows for use on a range of different sites that are broad enough to include cannabis. Eric Lauritzen added that these are typically biological pesticides and some 25B materials that are exempt from federal registration.

Scott Couch asked for clarification on the number of pesticides currently registered for industrial hemp. Eric Lauritzen replied that there are about 30 products registered federally. DPR will continue to monitor hemp.

Scott Couch commented that illegal cannabis grow sites are not going away and that inspectors are still seeing the use of carbofuran.

6. Public Comment

Anne Katten mentioned a follow-up cancer study for both chloropicrin and with results expected in about a year. Anne also commented that there is some evidence of the carcinogenicity of chloropicrin and asked about potential federal carcinogen studies for the parent fumigants of MITC. Karen Morrison did not have any additional information on the status of such studies.

Anne Katten added that these compounds have not been fully evaluated for carcinogenicity. Anne expressed concern about the high levels of 1,3-D detected, noting that most of the sites referenced surpassed the prior regulatory level set by OEHHA. Anne asked if there has been an evaluation to explore any connection between higher rates and application methods and timing. Minh Pham replied that they have done some spot-checking and looked at the data in order to run models, but have not conducted a specific evaluation.

Anne Katten asked if DPR has any preliminary results for the mitigation efforts and studies for 1,3-D or when that information would be available. Karen Morrison replied that there are no results to share at this time but DPR will follow-up. Karen Morrison added that the department is also concerned and is looking into additional acute mitigation and has initiated consultation with partner agencies. DPR is also looking at the entire process of applications with a holistic view of applied products and resulting concentrations.

Dave Lawson showed appreciation for this and previous presentations involving 1,3-D studies, but expressed concern about the lack of consistency and lack of explanation for such high levels detected. Dave suggested further mitigation for 1,3-D and requested DPR consider various factors that can affect the data. Karen Morrison stated that it is challenging to replicate results from the field using models. Karen stated the importance of having confidence in the model values and commented that DPR considers outlier data as well as various agricultural management techniques in looking toward next steps.

Justine Weinberg asked if DPR has made an effort to tie the air monitoring results to the timing of the actual applications. Karen Morrison replied that DPR has looked at the data for some specific applications to see if there was a direct correlation, but in general, DPR takes a more holistic approach.

Arthur Lawyer asked about the meaning for line breaks in some of the graphs showing 1,3-D air monitoring results. Jazmin Gonzalez replied that the breaks along the x-axis in Parlier and Delhi are due to invalid samples for reasons such as field equipment failure or lack of adequate pressure in the canisters for the lab to analyze. Lynn Baker added that there were also breaks along the y-axis, which Jazmin clarified were due to the data exceeding the different scales.

Anne Katten commented that the use data shows that the peak ppb level at the Shafter site occurred when there was an application the day before that was very close to the site. The other significant detections occurred when applications were more than a day before and much further

away. Anne noted the relevancy that applications must be at least a quarter-mile away from a school, but can be much closer to residences or where people are working in the field, meaning these levels could be occurring at other sites where there is no monitoring.

Emily Saad asked if there is a correlation between high use and high concentration. Minh Pham replied that there is not a correlation. Saad followed up to ask what percent quantifiable detections for Parlier were above the 0.1 ppb level, as the presented data used a detection limit of 0.01 ppb. Jazmin Gonzalez replied that, using a 0.1 detection limit, Delhi had a detection rate of 36% and Parlier had a detection rate of 51%. Kevi Mace-Hill commented that it was confusing to compare data and results using different detection limits on the same slide.

Jean-Marie Peltier commented that it might be helpful for the committee to understand how a single high detection instance in Parlier affects the overall numbers, adding that some may consider the data point to be acute exposure instead of chronic. Karen Morrison replied that the committee discussed that process during the March meeting.

Dave Lawson asked which group within the department actually contracts with Sacramento State for the cannabis consumption study. Eric Lauritzen replied that the Human Health Assessment Branch does that contracting.

Dave Lawson asked where to send samples for an enforcement action and how they are actually processed. Eric Lauritzen replied that the CDFA lab, which is the normal mechanism for sampling, is not set up to deal with such samples. DPR can sample other materials on site to show drift. There are also third party labs that test samples for higher-level investigations. DPR is more interested in proactively preventing drift instances with the different types of grow sites.

Arthur Lawyer asked about the timeline for the results of the consumption report. Brittany Boerstra replied that the pilot study with Sacramento State is complete. DPR expects to have the results within the next couple of weeks. The public might be able to see this work next year.

Arthur Lawyer asked if state legalization of cannabis has led to a reduction in illegal grow sites. Eric Lauritzen replied that this program is not particularly involved in that kind of enforcement. Stella McMillin replied that there is no quantitative information, but there are still ongoing carbofuran incidents.

Jean-Marie Peltier asked if USDA or CDFA is taking a comprehensive look at the types of pests that hemp may harbor, with particular concern for protecting other crops near commercial hemp operations. Kevi Mace-Hill replied that staff at University of California Agriculture and Natural Resources (UCANR) been looking at the pests that threaten both hemp and cannabis.

Dave Lawson asked if it is voluntary or mandatory for beekeepers to register with the county agricultural commissioner and map out their specific hive locations. Peggy Byerly replied that it is mandatory for apiary operators to inform county agricultural commissioners when and where

they are moving their bees, but voluntary to request the notification of pesticide applications that are toxic to bees. DPR is hoping that the modernized communication methods (such as the new online BeeWhere site) will encourage more beekeepers to register for notification about these pesticide applications.

Dave Lawson asked if the BeeWhere site is up and running. Peggy Byerly replied yes, the BeeWhere beekeeper registration site launched in the spring and the pesticide applicator access capability recently launched in mid-July. Karen Morrison confirmed that the system was fully functioning as of Friday, July 12, 2019.

Emily Saad asked about the motivation behind the removal of the modifiers “highly” and “moderately” in regards to pesticides that are toxic to bees in the new regulations. Peggy Byerly clarified that the pesticide labels may still contain these modifiers, but there is no longer a need for the distinction within the state regulations because they will apply to all pesticides that are toxic to bees at any level.

7. Agenda Items for Next Meeting

Lynn Baker mentioned that it has been several years since DPR has listed sulfuryl fluoride as a toxic air contaminant and suggested an update on mitigation measures. Karen Morrison replied that DPR has added an addendum to the risk assessment for sulfuryl fluoride relative to the mechanism of action. This went out for peer review through the UC system and DPR is currently reviewing the comments to finalize the addendum. The department can take steps toward mitigation once the addendum is complete.

Arthur Lawyer mentioned that the new accessibility laws have limited the materials available on the website. Those who are trying to be compliant with the department are having difficulty finding the necessary documents. Therefore, the committee should consider alternatives for making the documents available again. Karen Morrison replied that all of the documents are still available, even if they are not on the website. The department prioritized the most frequently used documents in working towards compliance with the new Americans with Disabilities Act regulations. Staff are currently working on making the other documents accessible, but it is a lengthy process.

Jean-Marie Peltier commented that it would be interesting to compare the previous and newly updated Management Agency Agreements between DPR and the State Water Resources Control Board.

The next meeting is scheduled for September 20, 2019 at 10:00 a.m. in the Sierra Hearing Room on the second floor of the CalEPA building, located at 1001 I Street, Sacramento, California.

8. Adjourn