Department of Pesticide Regulation

Gavin Newsom
Governor

Yana Garcia
*Secretary for
Environmental Protection*

Karen Morrison
Director

PESTICIDE REGISTRATION
AND EVALUATION COMMITTEE (PREC)
Meeting Minutes – October 25, 2024

Committee Members/Alternates in Attendance:

Edgar Vidrio – Department of Public Health (CDPH)
Fabiola Estrada – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 9
Garrett Keating – Department of Industrial Relations (DIR)
Kristen Pidcock – Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle)
Ryan Bourbour – Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW)
Katherine Sutherland-Ashley – Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)
Kari Arnold - University of California (UC), Davis, IR-4 Program
Fatemeh Ganjisaffar – California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA)
Lisa McCann – State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)
Stan Armstrong – Air Resources Board (ARB)
Mai Ngo – Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)
Stephen Scheer – CA Agricultural Commissioners and Sealers Association (CACASA)
Tulio Macedo – Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR)

Visitors in Attendance:
Note: Only attendees who identified themselves using their full name are listed below

Anne Katten – California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
Bianca Lopez – Vally Improvement Project (VIP)
Bill Turechek – Strawberry Commission
Bruce Young
Daniel Hobby
Dillon Gabbert
Emily Saad – Exponent
Francisco Paredes
Graham Hunting
Jacob Villagomez
James Nakashima – Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)
Jane Sellen
Jasmin Ramirez-Strain
Jayne Walz – Helena Agri-Enterprises, LLC
Jing Tao – Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)
Juan Hidalgo
Kaitlyn Preston
Karen Da Silva
Kenneth Allen
Laura Adame
Lei Han

Liyi Monier
Lori Miyasato
Michael Zeiss
Robert Sisson
Ronnie Capili
Sam Michie – Ventura County APCD
Taylor Roschen
Yanju Chen – California Air Resource Board (CARB)

DPR Staff in Attendance:

Aisha Iqbal – Pesticide Registration Branch
Alyssa Knudsen – Pesticide Registration Branch
Andrew Turcotte – Pesticide Registration Branch
Aniela Burant – Environmental Monitoring Branch
Anna Kalashnikova – Human Health Assessment Branch
Aron Lindgren – Pesticide Registration Branch
Atefeh Nik – Human Health Assessment Branch
Brandon Brown – Human Health Assessment Branch
Chunbo Zhang - Human Health Assessment Branch
David Bonnar – Human Health Assessment Branch
Elana Varner – Pesticide Registration Branch
John Adragna – Human Health Assessment Branch
JT Teerlink – Pesticides Programs Division
Maziar Kandelous - Environmental Monitoring Branch
Minh Pham - Environmental Monitoring Branch
Mitra Geier - Human Health Assessment Branch
Nan Singhasemanon - Pesticide Programs Division Monitoring and Mitigation
Nan-Hung Hsieh – Human Health Assessment Branch
Randy Segawa – Environmental Monitoring Branch
Scott Tiscione – Human Health Assessment Branch
Shelley DuTeaux – Human Health Assessment Branch
Stephen Rinkus – Human Health Assessment Branch
Svetlana Koshlukova – Human Health Assessment Branch
Yvan Delgado - Environmental Monitoring Branch

1. **Introductions and Committee Business – Tulio Macedo, Chair, DPR**

a. Approximately sixty-six (66) people attended the meeting.
b. Since the last PREC meeting in July, DPR amended regulations to increase fees relating to license and certificate application, renewal, and exam fees. The new fees became effective on

August 5, 2024. DPR also amended regulations to increase pesticide registration-related fees. The new fees went into effect on October 1, 2024.

c. An upcoming Pesticide Contamination Prevention Act (PCPA) subcommittee consultation meeting is October 28 at 8:00AM in Sacramento and virtually via Zoom. This public meeting for consultation [which is not a hearing] is, in accordance with Food and Agricultural Code section 13145(e), a three-member subcommittee consisting of one member each representing DPR, the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), and the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), who shall be consulted for a revision to the existing method to determine the potential of a pesticide to pollute groundwater. The agenda and scientific support of the revision is available on DPR's website.

2. **Air Monitoring Network Annual Report Update – Dr. Maziar Kandelous and Dr. Yvan Delgado, DPR**

A brief summary of the activities of the Air Program, specifically for the ambient air monitoring results for 2023. Beginning with a discussion of the studies, screening levels and regulatory targets, the results of the studies, and concluding the regulatory and other actions to address results. The Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) monitors ambient air to assess exposures and risks, evaluate long term trends, and inform additional actions or mitigation measures that may be necessary.

The two studies included in this presentation are Air Monitoring Network (AMN) and Study 309. The AMN includes 4 sampling sites where 35 pesticides are monitored and 5 breakdown products. The report timeframe is January 1, 2023 to December 31, 2023. The second study is Study 309: air monitoring of 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-D) in Merced and Fresno Counties. Study 309 includes 2 sampling sites monitoring 1,3-Dichloropropene for the timeframe of January 1, 2023 to December 31, 2023.

To complete the studies there are 6 monitoring sites, 4 of them are air monitoring networks: Oxnard, Santa Maria, Shafter, and Watsonville. The other 2 sites are Delhi and Parlier. The two sites that are 1,3-D specific are Oxnard and Santa Maria, and there is collaboration with the Agricultural Commissioner offices of Ventura and Santa Barbara.

DPR estimates the potential for adverse health effects by comparing the air concentrations to health screening levels (SL) or regulatory targets (RT). Screening levels are based on a risk assessment of possible health effects. The levels are based on reference concentrations, which are air concentrations at which there are no adverse effects are expected to occur in humans with an additional conservative factor included to account for uncertainties. A measured concentration that is above the SL does not necessarily indicate a health concern, but it does indicate the need for a refined evaluation and possible mitigation. Mitigation and regulatory action are informed by monitoring results, along with other data collected by the department. Regulatory targets supersede SL and are associated with legal requirements to mitigate a specific pesticide's health or environmental risks or impacts. DPR puts measures in place based on RT to limit exposures and avoid adverse effects. A measured concentration that is above the RT does not necessarily

indicate an adverse health effect has occurred, but it does indicate that restrictions on the pesticide use may be necessary or modified if already existed. 1.3-D, chloropicrin, methyl bromide, methyl isothiocyanate (MITC) have RT for one or more exposure periods.

There are three terms used to describe detections: quantifiable, trace, and non-detect (ND). Quantifiable detections refer to pesticide concentrations above the limit of quantification. Trace detections refer to pesticide concentrations below the limit of quantification but above the method detection limit. And non-detect is below the method detection limit. To better understand these terms, think about an eye exam. Quantifiable detection would be seeing the eye exam signs. Trace detection is blurry vision; pesticide is detected but not the exact amount because it is a small amount, something is there but not a measurable amount. Non-detect would be seeing nothing at all, no pesticide detected. Another important concept to understand is the difference between quantifiable detections and screening levels. Quantifiable detections refer to pesticide concentrations above the limit of quantification. The screening level indicates the need for a refined evaluation. Continuing with the eye exam example, quantifiable detections would be the seeing the smallest letters at the bottom of the chart, small but visible. The large visible letters at the top would be screening levels.

The Air Monitoring network (AMN) results for 2023 include the ambient air in four communities located in four different California counties. Watsonville, which is between Monterey and Santa Cruz counties, Shafter in Kern County, Santa Maria in Santa Barbara County, and Oxnard in Ventura County. The 2023 report uses many methods to describe data, how it is collected and analyzed and what those results mean. Data from the report show that monitoring found generally low levels of pesticides in the air that were all below screening levels. There were 19 pesticides detected, 207 sample sets which are a collective term for all air samples recovered from one site in one week, 8085 sample analyses which are the detection of an individual chemical in a sample. And there were no air samples with pesticide concentrations above screening levels or regulatory targets. There were 40 chemicals monitored in 2023, eight pesticides were detected at quantifiable concentrations, 11 pesticides were detected at trace levels and 21 pesticides were not detected.

The Table of Pesticide Detections by location as individual samples, first column is community name, second column is number of analyzed samples, third column is quantifiable and trace detections, and the fourth is the quantifiable detections.

The next table and focus of the results in this presentation is Number of Quantifiable Detections and % at each location. The percent of quantifiable detections were calculated out of the detected pesticides. For example, Chloropicrin in Oxnard, 15 detections were quantifiable and represents 29% which means the other 71% of detections were trace amounts.

And the third table shows the highest concentrations detected in 2023 for acute, subchronic, and chronic screening levels and includes all communities. The percent of screening levels is more informative than pure concentration for acute. All pesticide concentrations were 2% or less and the screening levels of regulatory targets set by DPR. For subchronic. the highest concentration

was that of Chloropicrin at 95% and MITC at 67%. The screening level for chronic, the highest concentration was that of MITC at 68% followed by chloropicrin at 39%.

The fourth table shows the acute concentrations by location. Focusing on the percent of screening levels, for all acute pesticide concentrations 2% or less than the screening levels or regulatory targets set by DPR. Subchronic concentrations and percentage by location, all concentrations are in parts per billion (ppb). For chloropicrin concentrations, 95% at screening level in Oxnard, 59% in Santa Maria, and 65% in Watsonville. For MITC concentration 45% at screening level in Santa Maria and 67% in Shafter. For all other pesticides detected at quantifiable concentration, the screening levels were 3% or less. The next table shows the annual chronic concentrations by location. For chloropicrin concentration was 39% at screening level in Oxnard, 31% in Santa Maria, and 23% at once. The MITC concentration was 44% in Watsonville, screening level in Santa Maria and 68% in Shater. For all other pesticides detected at quantifiable concentrations the chronic screening level were 10% or less.

Organophosphate cumulative exposures – Organophosphates are a class of chemical compounds that can cause adverse health effects on humans, such as inhibiting an enzyme in the nervous system called cholinesterase. Cumulative exposures are calculated for 15 organophosphate pesticides included in the AMN. Cumulative exposure was estimated using a hazard quotient (HQ) for each pesticide where the air concentration detected is divided by screening level. All hazard quotients were added to determine a hazard index at each monitoring site. A hazard index greater than 1.0 suggests further evaluation. All acute, subchronic, and chronic hazard indices were 0.06 or less in 2023.

Cancer risk estimates – lifetime exposure cancer risk is the probability of an additional case of cancer over a 70-year period. Cancer risk is the normalized breathing rate (nBR) of a human adult multiplied by the mean lifetime (70 year) air concentration (LAC) and cancer potency factor in humans (CPF_H). AMN program monitors six pesticides that are designated as known or probable carcinogens: 1.3-D, chlorothalonil, dichlorvos (DDVP), diuron, iprodione, and propargite. In 2023, only 1,3-D and DDVP were detected or quantifiable. The default breathing rate (nBR) is $0.28 m^3/kg/day$. In the absence of 70-year monitoring data, LAC is the pesticide's historic average concentration. The CPF_H that are determined by DPR are: 1,3-D 0.014 $(mg/kg/day)^{-1}$ and DDVP 0.350 $(mg/kg/day)^{-1}$. The cancer risk estimate for DDVP was less than 5%, which is the threshold set by DPR across all four communities in California.

Study 309 Ambient Air Monitoring results for 2023, mainly is focused on 1,3-D. Due to high detections in Parlier and Shafter in 2018, DPR proposed new non-occupational (residential) bystander regulations to reduce potential exposure to 1,3-D in 2022. The final regulations went into effect in January 2024. Through a separate process, DPR is working with the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment to develop new regulations specifically focused on protecting occupational (workers) bystanders working near 1,3-D applications. Future mitigation and regulatory actions to protect human health, and the environment will be informed by closely reviewed monitoring results, other data, and research.

1,3-D Monitoring locations were at the following sites: Rio Mesa High School in Oxnard, Bonita Elementary School in Santa Maria, Sequoia Elementary in Shafter, Ohlone Elementary School in Watsonville, Schendel Elementary School in Delhi, and the UC Agricultural Research Center in Parlier. The objective of the 1.3-D study #309 is to monitor the 1,3-D in high use areas of the Central Valley (Fresno and Merced Counties) and evaluate the effectiveness of 1,3-D mitigation measures. Monitoring began in December 2016 at both sampling locations. Monitoring locations were selected by ranking communities within Fresno and Merced counties based on historical use within 5 miles of the community boundary between 2012 and 2014. One 24-hour air sample collected per site per week on a randomly selected day. With 52 weeks in a year, there were generally 52 analyzed samples, except when something went wrong with the sample itself or a malfunction of the monitoring site. In summary of the quantifiable concentrations per sampling location, 10 percent in Oxnard and up to 36 percent in Parlier.

A summary of the maximum or the highest acute, subchronic and chronic air concentrations by monitoring locations DPR compares the highest 24-hour concentrations against the 55 parts per billing concentration (ppb). Screening levels are 55 ppb for acute exposure, 3 ppb for sub-chronic, and 2 ppb for chronic exposure. In regard to acute concentration, all sites were below acute screening levels ranging from 1% to 9%. Subchronic is based on the highest 13 week rolling average of the year, and ranges from 1.9% to 13.5%. The final screening level is chronic which is based on one-year averages which for 2023 and for 1,3-D the percentages are 1% to 7.7%. All sites were below the chronic screening levels.

DPR has established a cancer risk regulatory threshold of 1.00E-05. As mentioned with AMN results, cancer risk is the NBR times the LHC times the CPF. The default breathing is 0.28. In the absence of 70-year monitoring data the pesticide historic average concentration and determined by DPR for 1,3-D this would be 0.014. So, for 1,3-D the cancer risk would be 0.56 ppb. Comparing the average monitor concentrations for 2023 to the lifetime air concentrations regulatory target for cancer risk, Parlier had the highest monitor average concentration of 0.95 and a cancer risk percentage of 169%. The 1,3-D annual concentrations across all years and all sites, out of all the annual averages dating back to 2011, the chronic screening level was exceeded only once in 2018. The chronic screening level for 1,3-D is 2 ppb.

In summary of the AMN (Study 257), 8 pesticides were detected at quantifiable levels, 11 were detected at trace levels and 21 pesticides were not detected. 1,3-D, chloropicrin, DDVP, malathion, methyl bromide, and MITC were detected in all 4 air monitoring sites. Hazard indices for organophosphates were 0.06 or less across all sampling locations. Cancer risk percentage for DDVP were 5% or less in all sampling locations. Acute, subchronic, and chronic SL and RT were not exceeded for any pesticides.

After chloropicrin air concentrations exceeded the 13-week subchronic SL in 2021, DPR exploring the factors that contributed to the elevated directions. DPR is conducting a more detailed evaluation of pesticide use data, historical weather patterns, computer modeling, and more intensive monitoring to better understand potential sources and exposures in the area.

DPR's reevaluation of chloropicrin and California Council on Science and Technology (CCST) Fumigant Alternatives Study will be used to supplement DPR's assessment of the fumigant.

In summary of the 1,3-D study DPR monitored 1,3-D air concentrations in all 6 communities in 2023: Delhi, Parlier, Oxnard, Santa Maria, Shafter, and Watsonville. The measured 2023 air concentrations sites did not exceed human health screening levels for acute, subchronic, or chronic exposures. Long term data trends noted for 1,3-D in Parlier and Shafter. In Parlier long term (7 year) average concentration was above the lifetime (70 year) air concentrations. In the last 3 years, the annual concentration has decreased from 1.55 ppb in 2021 to 0.77 in 2022 and then 0.07 in 2023.

The 7-year average concentration of 1,3-D in Parlier of 0.95 ppb exceeds the 70-year average regulatory target of 0.56 ppb. DPR's regulation to mitigate acute and cancer risks associated with 1,3-D was implemented on January 1, 2024. Its effectiveness will be assessed through continued monitoring of air concentrations. Occupational bystander regulations are in development jointly and mutually with the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA). Independent study is evaluating fumigant use and available alternatives, challenges and research gaps about their adoption in California.

The Sustainable Pest Management Roadmap emphasizes the need for safer, sustainable alternative pest management tools and practices. Sustainable Pest Management Roadmap calls for enhanced monitoring and data collection. DPR has commissioned a fumigant alternatives study to help inform and accelerate sustainable pest management in California.

An update on the Fumigant Alternative Study is that a $525,000 contract with the California Council on Science and Technology (CCST) has a project timeline of December 2023 to November 2025. As of October 2024, authors concluded drafting the Phase 1 report covering 1,3-D and chloropicrin and alternatives to these fumigants. Steering Committee reviewed drafts and reached consensus on the Phase 1 report. The Steering Committee drafted and reached consensus on the Executive Summary. CCST recruited 8 independent experts with a balance of perspective to provide peer review of the report. Phase 1 report will be completed in December.

The DPR Air Monitoring Reports < cdpr.ca.gov/docs/emon/airinit/air_monitoring_reports.htm> can be found on the DPR website. DPR has released Air Monitoring Network Results for 2023 – Volume 13 report and is accepting comments until 5:00pm on November 12, 2024. Comments should be submitted online <cdpr.commentinput.com/?id=dNaJeZ3jF>

Committee Comment

Garrett Keating asked about the cancer risk calculation is based on the air concentrations obtained at the school site locations or sampling locations. Maziar Kandelous confirmed that this was correct. Garrett followed up to confirm that there was one sample site at Parlier, and Maziar confirmed. Garrett followed up to ask about whether there was modeling with the data and noted that this was possibly not part of the scope of the presentation. He was curious if the modeling

showed more exposure points, then the one sample site. Maziar confirmed that some modeling was performed, but the results are based solely on the sampling data. And Garrett had one more question about 1,3-D sampling and would there be more sampling besides the current site sampling to assess. Maziar confirmed that there will be use analysis and census modeling in addition to continue site monitoring.

Stephen Scheer asked about how the initial screening level is determined and what is the safety factor? Maziar prefaced that this might more be better answered by Human Health and Assessment (HHA) branch. But safety factor is determined to take in account the difference between animals and humans, as well as human to human differences. Aniela Burant followed up to include that the safety factor is determined more by the Human Health and Assessment branch and is based on risk assessments and other data. Scientists in HHA look at the no adverse effect levels, where the exposure provides no known effects to animals. And there is also variation between humans with a factor of ten. Stephen followed up with a request for a further explanation in easy terms for the panelists to review about safety factor and screening levels.

Edgar Vidrio asked about the Fumigant Alternative Study and CCST and the steering committee. Maziar responded that the Fumigant Alternative Study is independent of DPR, which is why the CCST is completing the reports and meeting with scientists to discuss the findings. The steering committee reviews data and reaches out to experts. And the 8 experts mentioned that review the report are different then the steering committee.

Public Comment

Anne Katten - California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation asked in the Q&A box "Why haven't you included captan and malathion in the list of carcinogens? These are also proposition 65 listed carcinogens." Minh Pham stepped in to answer that HHA is working on assessing the cancer risk for the listed chemicals as well as other AMN chemicals. The list is actively being assessed and updated.

Anne Katten - California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation followed up with another question: "It is good that the percentage of methyl bromide detections dropped in 2023. Has DPR determined why there were a high percentage of methyl bromide low level detections in other recent years?" Maziar answered that there is a comprehensive evaluation of the detections, and a report is being finalized at this time. The report will explain all possible sources in more detail and will be published early next year.

Anne Katten - California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation followed up with a comment: "We appreciate that you are doing a more detailed evaluation of chloropicrin use, weather patterns and computer modeling. We would recommend this also for MITC especially in Kern County where levels of concern have also been measured in the Arvin area."

Anne Katten – California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation followed up with an additional comment "We are very concerned that the overall average 1,3 D level at every site was well

above the OEHHA cancer No Significant Risk Level (NSRL) of 0.04 ppb. This should be disclosed in presentations and reports."

James Nakashima- OEHHA (affiliation not given but mentioned in response) asked in the Q&A box "Are the ongoing MeBr detects due to commodity fumigations?" Maziar responded that James is a colleague from OEHHA and thanked him for his comment. He went on to say that there is no single source for the Methyl Bromide detects and circled back to the upcoming report that will discuss the multiple possible sources in more detail.

Jane Sellen - Californians for Pesticide Reform (CPR) – submitted the following comment:

> On behalf of CPR we continue to object strenuously to your use of total analytes as your top line finding, as using analytes as a denominator is grossly misleading. Many of the pesticides included in the analysis are not even registered for use in California, others are not used near a given monitor or are used only seasonally and therefore would not be expected to be detected. The relevant finding is the number of samples that included a detection, which DPR surely knows because that is the metric you led with in your media outreach.
>
> Unfortunately, your press release stated that no pesticides were detected in 95% of samples collected, which is false. In fact, almost 80% of samples collected included at least one detection. Although you did revise the headline in response to our complaint, it was too late for the news cycle, and no media outlet issued a correction.
>
> Furthermore, the public comment portal still states that no pesticides were detected in 95% of samples collected. Again, this is a false statement intended to deceive the public.
>
> In addition, we reject your level of concern for 1,3-D and want to emphasize that the chronic levels continue to exceed the legal level set by OEHHA at all 6 monitors.
>
> We believe DPR has a responsibility to accurately inform the public and not to mislead them. My question: can DPR commit to ending the practice of minimizing the gravity of your findings? – Minh thanked Jane for her comment. A response in writing will be issued to be clear but wanted to remind that the focus of the meeting is more on the air monitoring team and the air monitoring network, and the consistent work completed throughout the state. He continued that the team completes work every week and does not minimize any of the risk or what is being done for the residents in California. The team goes out and do due diligence to look at all the analytes that are currently available. The study itself was built to look at ambient air, to not target anything specific but to look at the air quality as a whole. The results that have been in the studies are presented showing trending for the year.

The response to this comment will be outside of the minutes.

Bianca Lopez - Valley Improvement Projects (VIP) asked is the occupational bystander regulation also includes teachers? Specifically asking because the monitors are located at schools, and assuming that occupation is included in the occupational bystander regulations. Bianca added that she was concerned about the way that DPR addressed and released the number of detectable pesticides. Bianca also added that she was also concerned about the chronic levels that exceed OEHHA standards at the school sites, and what the process is to inform the administration and the families that attend the school. Bianca also wondered what Edgar Vidrio of Public Health thinks of that as well. It is concerning that high levels of pesticide use specifically near schools where children attend. If it is being detected by monitors then the children are potentially being exposed to that, what kind of responsibility do you hold? And Bianca followed up with a request to restate what is being done about the exceedances in Parlier, except for additional monitoring. Maziar responded that there are two regulations, one is already in effect, which is the non-occupational bystanders which are for residents including kids in school and teachers. The regulation for occupational bystanders is being worked on, which is for people who are working in the fields around the application sites. This does not include teachers as they were part of the non-occupational bystanders. Maziar continued to address outreach to the schools. The report and findings have been sent to the schools. There are also fact sheets that are shared with the schools. DPR reaches out to the schools and goes over the data and plans to presents to the community as well.

Anne Katten - California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation asked why DPR leads off presentations and press releases with the overall percent of detections of pesticides. Anne commented that it was deceptive and misleading. Minh responded that first and foremost DPR is working on being more mindful about how information is being communicated. Historically the results have been released with a quick overview of the results, and then it is broken down further in the report. Minh continued that he was appreciative of the comment and restated taking due diligence to be better on the release of information.

James Nakashima - OEHHA, in the Q&A box thanked for a very thorough presentation. Regarding 1,3-D concentrations measured in Parlier, James went on the ask about the differences between the 13 week and chronic values. If the 13-week value were simply divided by four, as if there were no other detects, wouldn't the 13-week value 2.1ppb translate to a chronic value of approximately 0.5ppb. Maziar responded with a reminder that there are 3 exposure periods, one is the 24-hour sampling time, and subchronic which is 13 weeks, and chronic which is one year average. The 13 week is a rolling average of the 13 weekly data points, and a detection is conservatively though to be a detection for the entire week. If there is a detection of 2.1ppb, then it is assumed that the value is for the entire week.

Bianca Lopez - Valley Improvement Projects (VIP) followed up with a clarifying question about restating or clarifying what is being done about the exceedances in Parlier. Maziar responded that the detections had triggered the process of evaluation which resulted in 1,3-D rulemaking. Monitoring is continuing to assess the difference from before the regulations to after the regulations. Bianca followed up with a question to Edgar Vidrio of Public Health and what is thoughts and responsibilities about the pesticide exposure of school children to exceedance of

OEHHA's standards near schools. And Bianca continued to ask about occupational workers and whether teachers were considered since the monitors are located near schools. Edgar Vidrio responded that Public Health collaborates with DPR and in studies. Public Health does advise and provide input of results. If DPR sees the need to involve Public Health, involvement will occur. DPR has sole authority to regulate pesticides. Maziar followed up with school sites are not considered occupational, they are structures that are protected through non-occupational. School sites are considered occupied at all times, and a distance of 100 to 500 feet for applications to protect occupied structures. Any applications are also limited if distance requirements for protection are not met, which protects children from exposure. Minh also added that terms used are bystanders, occupational bystanders, and workers and handlers. The most sensitive population would be children, or bystanders. Occupational bystanders are considered farm workers or workers that have the ability to be close to an adjacent field that is receiving an application. Minh added that there will be text from the regulations about the language used for the terms used.

Jane Sellen - Californians for Pesticide Reform (CPR) asked in the Q&A box, can you cite the statute or regulation that says teachers are not occupational bystanders. Tulio Macedo reminded that Minh addressed and will be providing text.

Anne Katten - California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation asked in the Q&A box "What 1,3-D levels in individual AMN samples for 2023 are you considering triggering concern that the new regulation is not adequately controlling 1,3-D emissions?" and clarified that she meant 2024 samples. Minh responded that the occupational bystander regulations are still in development. Once the regulations are finalized, there will be a PREC presentation on all the details of the occupational bystander regulations.

Jane Sellen - Californians for Pesticide Reform (CPR) asked in the Q&A box "If kids are more sensitive, why are they subject to less protective cancer risk than workers." Followed up with "14 times less protective." Maziar responded that they are not.

Bianca Lopez of Valley Improvement Projects (VIP) asked in the Q&A box "Why does DPR have two sets of regulations? Shouldn't we follow OEHHA's standards for ALL?" Maziar responded that follows OEHHA values when DPR completes regulations. And there is an entire branch that provides the screening and regulatory targets that regulation is based on.

Jane Sellen - Californians for Pesticide Reform (CPR) asked a follow up question in the Q&A box "To clarify, why are kids subject to 0.56ppb and workers to 0.04ppb, which is 14 times less" Minh responded that the Air Monitoring team works on the AMN and field support for the study. When regulations are built by the department and produces the risk characteristic document, it is done so mutually with HHA counterparts and partners to assess all appropriate thresholds and using all available research and data.

3. **Agenda Items for Next Meeting**

Ryan Bourbour – Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) requests an update on mitigation strategies for AB 1322 and the anticoagulant rodenticides.

Mai Ngo – Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) suggested via email that DPR could have one of the toxicologists go over the Department's process for developing screening levels and assessing exposure and risk to different people.

The next meeting is scheduled for March 21, 2025 at 10:00 a.m. This meeting will be held virtually on the Zoom platform and broadcast live on the CalEPA webcast page.

4. **Adjourn**