



**PESTICIDE REGISTRATION
AND EVALUATION COMMITTEE (PREC)
Meeting Minutes – May 21, 2021**

Committee Members/Alternates in Attendance:

Dave Tamayo – Structural Pest Control Board (SPCB)
Heather Williams – Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle)
Jaime Rudd – Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW)
James Seiber – University of California (UC), Davis, Department of Environmental Toxicology
Katherine Sutherland-Ashley – Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)
Kevi Mace – California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA)
Lynn Baker – Air Resources Board (ARB)
Matt Hengel – University of California (UC), Davis, IR-4 Program
Patti TenBrook – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 9
Rich Breuer – State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)
Ruben Arroyo – CA Agricultural Commissioners and Sealers Association (CACASA)
Tulio Macedo – Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR)
Valerie Hanley – Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC)

Visitors in Attendance:

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

Anne Katten – California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
Emily Saad – Exponent
Eric Stein – Western Plant Health
James Nakashima – Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)
Michael Zeiss
Thomas Ineichen

DPR Staff in Attendance:

Ashley Fitzwater – Enforcement Branch
Brandon Brown – Human Health Assessment Branch
Brenna McNabb – Pesticide Registration Branch
Brittanie Clendenin – Pesticide Registration Branch
Byron Tam – Integrated Pest Management Branch
Carissa Ganapathy – Environmental Monitoring Branch
Joshua Ogawa – Enforcement Branch
Joy Dias – Environmental Monitoring Branch
Kara James – Pesticide Registration Branch
Laura Benn – Pesticide Registration Branch
Nan Singhasemanon – Pesticide Programs Division
Val Dolcini – Director’s Office

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

- a. Approximately thirty-one (31) people attended the meeting.
- b. Tulio Macedo is taking over from Karen Morrison as the PREC chair and will be leading PREC meetings from now on.

2. Annual Well Sampling Report – Joy Dias, DPR

The Annual Well Sampling report summarizes the sampling data by public agencies for pesticide residues in California well water, as required by the Pesticide Contamination Prevention Act (PCPA) (Food and Agricultural Code Sections 13141-13152). The PCPA was enacted in 1985 to prevent further contamination of groundwater from the agricultural use of pesticides, and it drives much of the work of DPR's groundwater protection program.

Some, but not all, of the steps that DPR takes to implement the PCPA are to identify potential groundwater contaminants that are registered for use as pesticides in California, and add them by regulation to the groundwater protection list (California Code of Regulation Sections 6800(a) and (b)). DPR then monitors for potential and known pesticide contaminants in areas where they are applied, to determine if the pesticides are migrating to California's groundwater from legal agricultural use. DPR also collects statewide groundwater monitoring data for pesticides and enters that data into its Well Inventory Database. DPR then evaluates and responds to all reported detections in groundwater for registered pesticides. Finally, DPR prepares the annual well sampling report to summarize the monitoring results, as well as actions taken in response to detections. The background section of the report provides details about these and other steps that DPR takes to implement the PCPA. [The 35th Annual Well Sampling Report \(2020 update\)](https://cdpr.ca.gov/docs/emon/pubs/ehapreps/report_wir20.pdf) is available on the DPR website at <cdpr.ca.gov/docs/emon/pubs/ehapreps/report_wir20.pdf>

The summary section of the report provides an overview of the data collected by the three agencies that have reported pesticide monitoring results. The three agencies included in this report are DPR, State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), and United States Geological Survey (USGS). The Well Sampling Summary table from the report lists the number of pesticides that each agency has sampled for and detected, the number of wells that were sampled, the number of wells with detections, the number of counties sampled, and the number of counties with detections.

Each agency's unique regulatory responsibilities determine study parameters, such as which pesticides are monitored for and the types of wells that are sampled. For example, DPR monitors for actively registered pesticides that have the potential to contaminate groundwater, whereas SWRCB and USGS include data for legacy pesticides that are no longer registered for use. DPR primarily samples shallow domestic wells, while the SWRCB's drinking water program regulates public water systems. Depending on the study parameters, USGS sampling data may include monitoring wells. During the timeframe covered in the report, almost 4,900 wells were sampled for 327 pesticides throughout California, and 30 of the pesticides or their degradates had reported detections.

The 2020 update includes a sampling results section with a table that has an alphabetical summary of the well sampling results. This table includes the number of samples taken, wells sampled, and counties sampled over the number of positive samples in wells and counties. It also includes the reporting limit range, the sampling agencies, and whether the parent pesticide is actively registered for use in California.

The next section of the 2020 update includes DPR's responses to the 30 reported detections of pesticides and degradates. It also includes drinking water quality standards where they are available, the status of detected pesticides on the Groundwater Protection List (GWPL), and whether or not the pesticides are regulated under California Code of Regulations section 6800(a) (CCR 6800a). These are known contaminants that require mitigation within Ground Water Protection Areas (GWPA's).

Out of the 30 pesticides with reported detections, 24 of these required no further action. Seven of the pesticides are no longer registered for use in California. Three were previously detected in groundwater from legal agricultural use. These three detected pesticides went through the formal review process as specified in the PCPA, and they were determined not to pollute at the levels detected. DPR continues to monitor their concentrations in groundwater for changes. Seven of the pesticides went through the formal review process, and it was determined that their use needed to be mitigated. Mitigation for CCR 6800(a) pesticides includes restricting their use in GWPA's. Since these seven pesticides were only detected within these areas, no further action is required at this time. Three of the pesticides detected in wells were investigated by DPR, and there were no further detections upon follow-up sampling. Four of the detected pesticides were below DPR's screening level of 0.04 parts per billion.

Out of the six pesticides detected that required further action, two of them are deethyl-simazine (ACET) and diaminochlorotriazine (DACT), both degradates of simazine, detected outside of GWPA's in eight and thirteen wells respectively. DPR will evaluate these detections further to determine if follow-up sampling is needed and if these sections should become GWPA's. There were two detections of chloropicrin in wells with no other pesticide detections, and these detections are being evaluated to determine the need for further sampling. There was one detection of thiobencarb in a well with no other pesticide detections and no reported thiobencarb use in the surrounding area. This detection is being evaluated to determine whether further action is needed. There was one detection of fludioxonil in a well within DPR's Well Network in which the pesticide was detected previously, and DPR has initiated Study 328 to determine if there are other fludioxonil detections in nearby wells. There were two detections of imidacloprid in the Well Network where the pesticide had been detected previously, and DPR previously initiated studies GW17/17A for further sampling statewide.

The 2020 update has four appendices. Appendix A gives additional background and information on GWPA's. There are currently 3,840 GWPA's in California, 122 of which were added in 2020 based on pesticide detections. This encompasses almost 2.5 million acres of land in California. Appendix B provides additional information about the principle sampling agencies, particularly the SWRCB and USGS. Appendix C provides more information about the Well Inventory

Database, which has been in place since 1983. It houses 2.6 million records of pesticide monitoring data and includes over 29,000 public and private wells that have been sampled for over 470 pesticides and degradates. Any data received from other agencies is added to the database and is noted to indicate additional sampling data or reporting errors. Appendix D includes additional county-level data that was included in the sampling section.

The [Groundwater Protection Program's website](http://cdpr.ca.gov/docs/emon/grndwtr/index.htm) is available at <cdpr.ca.gov/docs/emon/grndwtr/index.htm>

The [Annual Well Sampling Reports page](http://cdpr.ca.gov/docs/emon/grndwtr/wellinv/wirmain.htm) can be found at <cdpr.ca.gov/docs/emon/grndwtr/wellinv/wirmain.htm>

Committee Comment

Kevi Mace asked when the imidacloprid GW17/17A studies are expected to be completed. Joy Dias replied that the documents are in internal review and will be made available to the public once they are finalized and approved for posting. Kevi also asked for clarification on how DPR chose to respond to imidacloprid detection. Joy replied that if pesticide detections are found to have come from legal agricultural use, DPR begins the formal review process outlined in the PCPA, and from that point, after a public hearing process, a subcommittee of the PREC recommends what kind of response is needed and DPR's Director makes the final determination.

Rich Breuer asked for an explanation of the discrepancy between the number of wells sampled by DPR (189 wells) compared to the much higher amount sampled by SWRCB (4,557 wells). Joy Dias explained that these numbers reflect the different regulatory responsibilities and data collection processes of the agencies. Joy added that DPR focuses monitoring on agricultural use areas and shallow domestic wells within those agricultural use areas, because they seek to determine whether pesticides are entering groundwater from legal agricultural use, while SWRCB seeks to determine if water is safe for drinking. Rich also asked if the different sampling agencies had different detection limits due to their respective regulatory requirements. Joy answered yes and pointed out the differences in reporting limit ranges and detected concentration ranges on the well sampling results table, contrasting USGS's lowest detection concentration (as low as 0.001 parts per billion) against SWRCB's highest reporting limit concentration (10 parts per billion).

Dave Tamayo asked if DPR's monitoring covers urban wells. Joy Dias replied that it typically does not as DPR is instead focused on agricultural use, and although DPR will sometimes sample municipal wells, it generally does not sample in urban areas where agricultural activity no longer takes place. Dave also asked Rich Breuer if SWRCB is monitoring in urban areas where there is increased infiltration of stormwater, which is starting to carry traces of imidacloprid. Rich responded that SWRCB has not done so to his knowledge, and that it would be looked into. Dave suggested that due to the interaction between surface water oriented agencies and agencies using groundwater, DPR should consider working more closely with SWRCB and local agencies on the issue of reusing stormwater to recharge basins. Though not currently an official SWRCB

position of concern, Rich stated that this practice has been a growing concern of his for some time now, as ideally basin recharging should be done to maintain the protective barrier of soil between surface water and potential drinking water.

Public Comment

James Nakashima asked if there is notification for those who are using wells that have been contaminated with legacy pesticides that are no longer registered for use. Joy Dias replied that DPR does not sample wells for legacy pesticides, and that such data comes from SWRCB or USGS. Joy added that those agencies would determine how contamination would be reported to well users.

Mike Zeiss noted that the data presented in the report was through 2019. Mike then asked why the data becomes available as late as it does and whether such data may be released sooner in the future. Joy Dias replied that gathering data from other agencies and processing it for DPR's database is a very time consuming process, and that the pandemic has been a factor in slowing down the reporting process, as staff has had less time to access the databases directly from the office. Joy added that DPR is hoping to release data sooner this year as work becomes less impacted by the pandemic. Joy also noted that the USGS data used by DPR was from 2018, as newer USGS data was still marked as preliminary and was not finalized at the time. Mike also implored DPR to consider making its groundwater data available to PUR Web GIS, which is a web application developed by UC Davis' AGIS lab that allows the public to view data obtained from DPR's Pesticide Use Report (PUR) and Surface Water (SURF) databases. The [PUR Web GIS website](http://purwebgis.ucdavis.edu/PURwebGIS.html) is available at <purwebgis.ucdavis.edu/PURwebGIS.html>

Anne Katten asked how many wells were sampled for chloropicrin and 1,3-dichloropropene (1,3-D) and in which counties. Anne also asked how many wells will be sampled this year. Joy Dias stated that 145 wells were sampled for chloropicrin in 25 counties. Joy added that this data came from SWRCB and USGS, and it is unclear how many wells they will sample for this year, nor does DPR plan on sampling for chloropicrin. Joy stated that there were 2,288 wells sampled for 1,3-D in 46 counties, and that there were no detections in these samples.

Emily Saad stated that a recent GWPP announcement went out requesting volunteers with domestic wells. Emily then asked how these wells are anticipated to fit into GWPP's current well sampling program. Joy Dias responded that this announcement was for a pilot study being done to test new analytical and sampling methods. Joy added that the initial screening for the study will include taking grab samples from wells and analyzing them through the standard analytical processes, entering them into the Well Inventory Database, and responding to detections from these as would be done with any other detections. Joy added that data from the grab samples will help determine which wells will be chosen for passive sampler deployment. Data from the passive samplers will help inform analytical methods going forward.

After the presentation, Anne Katten submitted the following question via email:

Will DPR be doing any groundwater sampling for 1,3-D this year given increased use of application methods that use more water? It would be a good idea since you sample shallower rural wells.

Joy Dias sent the following response via email:

We do not plan to conduct groundwater sampling for 1,3-D. For a pesticide to migrate to groundwater, it needs to be both long-lived and mobile with water. Based on its physical-chemical properties, 1,3-D has not been identified as a potential groundwater contaminant (it has a short half-life). This has also been confirmed by worst-case modeling for 1,3-D under high irrigation rates and previous groundwater monitoring studies that have not resulted in detections.

3. Overview of the California Pesticide Residue Monitoring Program – Ashley Fitzwater, 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. DPR works within the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) and partners with California's county agricultural commissioners who are largely responsible for carrying out enforcement actions in the field. DPR regulates all aspects of pesticides, including registration, sales and use, and the Residue Monitoring Program (CPRMP). DPR has two complimentary food safety programs: The Pesticide Data Program (PDP) which evaluates tolerances, and the Pesticide Residue Monitoring Program which enforces tolerances.

The main goal of the residue program is to keep produce with illegal residues out of the marketplace. The program monitors pesticide residues in fresh produce throughout the California food supply, with emphasis on fruits and vegetables highly consumed by children, and it samples fruits and vegetables that have higher instances of illegal residues. The program selects commodities and sampling sites reflective of differences in consumption patterns among ethnic and socioeconomic groups, and it selects commodities treated with pesticides listed as carcinogens and reproductive toxicants.

Samples are collected by the program's Food Safety Team from three regional offices, located in Sacramento, Clovis, and Santa Ana. Sampling takes place at a wide variety of vendors, including wholesale/retail outlets, distribution centers, and farmer's markets. The collected samples are passed to the California Department of Food and Agriculture's Center for Analytical Chemistry in either their Sacramento or Anaheim locations. The collected samples are extracted and analyzed to detect over 400 different pesticides.

There are two key terms from the results section: tolerance and residue. Tolerance is the maximum amount of residue allowed in foodstuffs, while residue refers to the amount of pesticide detected. U.S. EPA sets tolerances using factors such as combined exposure through

diet, drinking water and home use, and whether the pesticide is known to cause birth defects, cancer, or developmental disorders.

The program staff collected 3,274 produce samples from approximately 500 different businesses in 2019. The collected samples originated from 28 different countries, representing 124 different types of vegetables. From the 3,274 samples, 1,272 of them had no residues, 1,866 had legal amounts, and 137 had illegal residues. Examples of those 137 foods included apples from China, dragon fruit from Ecuador, longan from Vietnam, and lemons from Chile. In each year including 2019, the program found that 96% of produce tested had either no residues or contained legal amounts within tolerance levels. In 2019, the largest number of samples originated from the United States, of which two percent contained illegal residues. Mexico had the second highest number of samples, six percent of which contained illegal residues. The highest percentage of illegal residues came from produce originating from Vietnam, primarily dragon fruit and longan.

Illegal residues fall into one of two categories. The first is when the amount of residue detected exceeds the tolerance limit, which is referred to as Over Tolerance (OT). The second is when there is no established tolerance limit from U.S. EPA for the detected residue, which is referred to as No Tolerance Established (NTE). After illegal residues are detected and categorized, DPR receives lab results from the CDFA Center for Analytical Chemistry and the Enforcement Branch requests a dietary risk assessment from the Human Health Assessment Branch. Enforcement then proceeds with the appropriate response. When an illegal residue is detected, a quarantine is issued for any remaining samples from the same lot, as well as a stop sale. Enforcement then traces back through the supply chain to the grower, and DPR quarantines the potentially contaminated produce at each vendor along the supply chain. Vendors are given the option to either recondition the produce or to dispose of them, ensuring that it will not be consumed by humans or animals. During the traceback process, warning letters are issued to U.S.-based suppliers within the supply chain. For potential health risk cases, DPR also notifies the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, as well as the California Department of Public Health. Fines are potentially levied against repeat California-based offenders who are the first to pack, ship and sell in California. Finally, food safety results are published on DPR's website. The results can be found on the [Pesticide Residue Monitoring Program page](http://cdpr.ca.gov/docs/enforce/residue/rsmonmnu.htm) <cdpr.ca.gov/docs/enforce/residue/rsmonmnu.htm>

Committee Comment

Dave Tamayo asked if there were further actions that vendors are expected to take after receiving warning letters from DPR. Ashley Fitzwater responded that DPR only advises offending vendors, but the vendors themselves make their own decisions on how to proceed. Dave followed up by asking for detail on the types of practices and tools available to vendors to improve their results. Joshua Ogawa, who works under DPR's Enforcement Branch, responded that DPR does meet with these vendors to offer guidance. Joshua added that vendors can either test their own produce or talk with their suppliers up the chain to inform them of the contamination and analyze their pesticide use practices.

Matt Hengel asked whether CDFA would start getting involved with registrations on hemp and hemp-related products. Kevi Mace responded that CDFA's cannabis operations are in the process of being moved into their own department/division, which would be likely to take up involvement with hemp products.

James Seiber asked how DPR carries out samplings at farmers' markets, as well as what kinds of findings DPR sees regularly at these markets. Joshua Ogawa replied that these samplings are carried out similarly to any other type of vendor, and that samples collected in 2019 from farmers' markets did not have residues that exceeded conventional tolerances. James followed up by asking if advanced notice is given to vendors before inspection. Joshua replied that, like with other vendors, farmers' markets are not given advanced notice before sampling begins.

Rich Breuer asked for an explanation on how DPR defines an "illegal" residue, and how it relates to definitions set in the country of origin for the produce. Ashley Fitzwater explained that DPR uses tolerance standards set by the U.S. EPA, and that DPR may still determine illegal residues on products from countries where those residues fell within local regulatory standards.

Lynn Baker asked if DPR interacts or works with any of its counterpart regulatory agencies in Mexico regarding large numbers of imports which are above tolerance levels. Joshua Ogawa replied that DPR has given presentations on their findings to agencies in Mexico in the past.

Patti TenBrook asked if lab sample turnaround times are fast enough to allow DPR to halt all sales of affected produce. Ashley Fitzwater replied that DPR can bring samples to the lab on the same day they were collected, and that the lab typically processes these samples in one to two days, handing them back to DPR on same day they were processed. Ashley continued that DPR will reach out to the vendors about the residues on either the same day or the day after they've been processed. Ruben Arroyo added that when residues are found in the field, the California Agricultural Commissioners and Sealers Association (CACASA) works with DPR to temporarily shut down packaging and shipping of the affected product until residues come up clean or products have been reconditioned, and that this process happens relatively quickly.

Public Comment

Mike Zeiss asked if DPR still samples certified organic produce to find residues that are over tolerance levels for organic produce, and if DPR refers these cases to CDFA. Ashley Fitzwater replied that DPR does sample organic produce, and that these samplings are included in the annual report along with the rest of the data for 2019. Mike also asked if there have been chlorpyrifos detections in California-grown produce for 2020. Ashley replied that there were chlorpyrifos detections, but it was unclear whether those products came from California. Mike followed up by asking if DPR would investigate any hypothetical chlorpyrifos detections in 2020 California produce as possible violations, as the substance is banned outright since 2020. Joshua Ogawa replied that there are still federal tolerance levels in place for chlorpyrifos, and that detections within these tolerances are still considered illegal. Joshua added that DPR would take a closer look at any chlorpyrifos detections because of the legal changes around the substance.

4. 2018 School Pesticide Use and Outreach Summary – Byron Tam, DPR

The California Healthy Schools Act (HSA), enacted in 2000, has two main goals. The first is that it's the policy of the state that effective least toxic pest management practices should be the preferred method of managing pests, and the second is that the state facilitates the adoption of effective least toxic pest management practices at schoolsites. This is done through a combination of outreach, education and trainings.

There are a variety of requirements for schoolsites to follow under the HSA. Before a pesticide application can be made, the schoolsites must identify an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) coordinator, post an IPM plan, and take HSA IPM training, provided by DPR. When the application is made, the schoolsite must send a notification as well as post warning signs in the area of application. After the application is done, schoolsites must keep record of the applications as well as send an annual report of most of the applications made in that year to DPR. DPR is the lead state agency in providing HSA compliance support to California schoolsites, and offers assistance in fulfilling all of the requirements for pesticide application. DPR also engages in outreach and education to promote IPM in the form of conferences, trainings, and workshops.

The HSA also allows DPR to collect pesticide use reporting data from schoolsites. Two different forms are available for either school staff or pest control businesses to fill out, the first of which is for applications made by school/childcare employees, and the other for applications made by separate businesses hired to apply pesticides. These forms both allow DPR to collect data on all pesticide applications made within California schoolsites. It's important to note that employee application forms have only been collected since 2015, and prior to this date, the majority of pesticide use data were from businesses. Forms for employee applications now enable DPR to obtain a more comprehensive view of all pesticide applications on schoolsites.

The 2018 School and Child Care Pesticide Use Report showed that reports were received from 7,103 schools and 1,521 child care centers, and key patterns remained consistent with previous years. There were 887 pesticide products used on schoolsites in 785 school districts. There were 728 organizations, which includes businesses or school districts using school employees to apply pesticides, that reported pesticide use, along with 301 business licenses that reported applications. There were 258 active ingredients reported across all applications. DPR also monitors where applications are occurring across California, and how frequently they are occurring in any given area. In the 2018 report, DPR received pesticide use reports from 1,258 ZIP codes in 57 counties out of the 58 counties in the state. Typically, there are one to two counties that don't report pesticide use in a given year, and when these counties don't report, DPR reaches out to all the districts within these counties to ensure that they do not have anything to report. Primary and secondary schools made up 92 percent of applications reported, with the remaining 8 percent coming from child care centers. Mapping out these use reports shows that, across California, the amount of pesticide applications generally will become denser moving south, as the population and number of school districts tend to increase.

Regarding California's child care centers, the 2018 report found that 95 percent of pesticide applications at child care centers were made by pest control businesses, compared with about 65 percent of applications at school districts that are made by such businesses. In 2010, a DPR funded study done with various organizations found that, out of the three pesticide categories - insecticide, rodenticide and herbicide - insecticides made up the majority of pesticide applications made by businesses. The study found that herbicide was the only category in which the majority of applications were made by employees.

In 2018, a total of 97,629 pesticide applications were reported at California schoolsites. Five out of the top ten active ingredients were insecticides, four were rodenticides, and one was an herbicide. This particular herbicide, glyphosate, made up approximately two thirds of all herbicide applications.

The HSA also allows DPR to collect data on training numbers. Teachers, staff and volunteers who use pesticides at schoolsites must take annual trainings either online, through group training kits, or at in-person workshops. According to a 2019 public survey conducted by DPR, the HSA training requirement was viewed as having the most positive impact on pest management at schoolsites. There has been a consistent increase in the number of trainings from 2016 to 2018, marking a total 166 percent rise since DPR started collecting training data. This trend also coincides with an approximate 15 percent increase in the number of school districts reporting pesticide applications over the same time period.

There are multiple examples of targeted outreach and training that highlight the importance of the School & Child Care IPM programs in relation to the HSA goals of compliance with requirements and reduction of children's exposure to toxic chemicals. One recent example of DPR's direct outreach involved a complaint about pesticide applications occurring near children at a school near Sacramento. Staff immediately reached out to provide compliance resources and took the opportunity to build a positive relationship with the school district. Within a month, DPR staff were on campus to address the complaint, provide HSA training to school employees and provide suggestions for IPM practices based on the school's pesticide use data.

In summary, 2018 pesticide use patterns remained consistent with previous years, but DPR anticipates changes in the coming years regarding use of glyphosate and other herbicides. The pandemic may also prove to play a big role in shifting 2020 pesticide use patterns as most schools were closed for the year. Moving forward, DPR will continue focusing on using pesticide use reporting data to provide further direct outreach to schoolsites, as well as support for their IPM goals.

Committee Comment

James Seiber asked if DPR has been working to scale back glyphosate usage and encourage the use of other herbicides in its place, given the controversy surrounding the ingredient in recent years. Byron Tam replied that DPR began hosting presentations and trainings at various California schools in 2019 to promote the use of glyphosate alternatives along with more direct, physical methods of herb removal that do not involve pesticide usage. Byron added that DPR received many inquiries from schools in 2019 regarding glyphosate, and that much of DPR's actions here were in response to these inquiries. Byron added that 2019 reporting data is expected to shift away from glyphosate as a result of these actions.

Lynn Baker asked Byron Tam to confirm whether or not rodenticides are allowed for use while children are present on schoolsites or child care centers. Byron replied that rodenticide use policies vary from product to product. Lynn also asked if DPR's training and outreach was targeted at teachers. Byron replied that these trainings are directed at teachers as they may often apply disinfectants in classrooms. Byron clarified that the trainings are targeted towards anyone who may potentially be applying pesticides on schoolsites such as staff, parents, and volunteers.

Dave Tamayo asked if DPR was still monitoring schoolsites for recurring, calendar-based applications. Byron Tam replied that DPR does still monitor for these applications and will reach out accordingly to schools utilizing the calendar approach in order to provide suggestions on incorporating IPM into their pest management practices. Dave also asked if DPR is aware of which organisms are the primary targets for pesticides that are being applied on schoolsites and child care centers. Byron replied that it's difficult for DPR to determine specific target organisms due to the fact that many products have broad-spectrum use and can be applied against a wide variety of pests. Finally, Dave asked if DPR incorporates reduction of conducive conditions into training and outreach. Byron replied that DPR will ask schools about cleaning practices and tolerance for waste such as crumbs, and will inform schools if poor cleaning practices may be creating conditions that could lead to infestations.

Ruben Arroyo asked if the HSA program collects exposure data from schoolsites in relation to pesticide use, and if such data could be included in future reports and presentations on pesticide use reporting. Byron Tam replied that the program doesn't directly collect exposure data beyond reported illnesses or other incidents on schoolsites, and instead focuses on reducing the number of applications as that indirectly limits the risk of exposure. Ruben suggested that the HSA program should contact divisions that collect exposure data in order to correlate the data with application data acquired through HSA.

Patti TenBrook asked if disinfectants are a part of the HSA program. Byron Tam replied that there are program members focused specifically on disinfectant usage, and that DPR now has various infographics and other resources on the [California School & Child Care IPM home page](http://cdpr.ca.gov/docs/schoolipm/) <cdpr.ca.gov/docs/schoolipm/>. Byron added that this has been largely directed at schools that have encouraged children to use disinfectants to wipe down surfaces, despite product labels warning to keep them away from children.

Public Comment

Ouahiba Laribi asked if DPR checks to see if the products used by schools and childcares are really what is reported, and if DPR has any idea of the level of compliance. Byron Tam replied that there are various elements of the pesticide use reports that DPR checks to ensure accuracy, but that DPR will only reach out to schools to confirm results if something seems ambiguous or incorrect.

5. Agenda Items for Next Meeting

Dave Tamayo suggested that PREC add a new member who is a representative of a local water quality agency, such as a stormwater agency or publically owned treatment works (POTW), due to the levels and types of toxicity that has been driven by pesticides. Dave noted that the PREC charter allows for a representative of any other public agency that the Director deems appropriate after consultation with the PREC.

The next meeting is scheduled for July 16, 2021 at 10:00 a.m. This meeting will be held virtually on the Zoom platform and broadcast live on the [CalEPA webcast page](https://video.calepa.ca.gov/). <video.calepa.ca.gov/>

6. Adjourn