

**IRRIGATED LANDS REGULATORY PROGRAM
Pesticide Evaluation Advisory Workgroup Meeting #4**

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

MEETING DATE: 16 October 2014

LOCATION: Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
11020 Sun Center Drive, #200
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

ATTENDEES: See Attachment 1

Action Items

- Staff will draft meeting notes and post presentations given at the meeting.
- Mike, Tessa, and Kelly will follow-up to make sure the pesticide list used to “group” pesticides is complete. Mike will download the information from DPR. Tessa and Kelly will review the list. There were some pesticides that were not included on the original “groupings” list, which should have been on the list.
- Kelly, Debra, Tessa, and Patti Tenbrook will refine the list of degradates.
- Elissa will develop a list of reference values for drinking water.
- Homework for the workgroup: For the pesticides that have criteria (such as US EPA criteria), workgroup members should compare the criteria with the aquatic life benchmark. If a criterion is higher than a benchmark and a member thinks that the higher number should be used, the workgroup member should plan to discuss it at the next meeting.

Areas of Agreement

- The Workgroup agreed that pesticides in the PUR database that include the “other related” designation should be excluded from the analysis.
- The list of degradates will need to be refined periodically. Focus will be on degradates with benchmarks. The group discussed how degradate reference values could be used. For parent compounds that quickly (and totally) degrade to a stable degradate, the degradate reference value can be used. The group discussed, but did not come to any conclusions, on how to address parent compounds that might degrade into multiple degradates.
- The group discussed how models, such as that presented by Debra and Rich, could be used in the methodology. The group agreed that such models can be helpful, if needed to refine the list of pesticides to monitor at a watershed scale, when to monitor, or to provide insight on source analysis. However, requiring broad use of such models may be too costly. Therefore, use of models should be an optional tool, not a requirement.
- The group discussed whether using the lowest of the acute or chronic aquatic life benchmark (established by US EPA-Office of Pesticide Programs or DPR) is appropriate. However, agreement was not reached. The group discussed, but did not reach any conclusions, on the reference value to use, if a criterion (e.g., US EPA criteria) is lower than a benchmark.

**IRRIGATED LANDS REGULATORY PROGRAM
Pesticide Evaluation Advisory Workgroup Meeting #4**

ATTACHMENT 1 – LIST OF ATTENDEES

Workgroup members present

Callman, Elissa	Clark, Stephen	Denton, Debra	Firoved, Roberta
Fojut, Tessa	Huntsinger, Josh	Johnson, Michael	Markle, Jim
Moran, Kelly	Orlando, James	Suverkropp, Claus	Tadesse, Dawit

Workgroup members absent

Deng, Xin			
-----------	--	--	--

Staff present

Karkoski, Joe	Susan Fregien		

Others present

Patrick Barnes	Rich Breuer	Monica Van Natta	

Complete list of attendees with affiliations (alphabetical, by last name)

- Elissa Callman, City of Sacramento
- Stephen Clark, Pacific EcoRisk
- Debra Denton, US EPA
- Roberta Firoved, California Rice Commission
- Tessa Fojut, Central Valley Water Board – Sacramento
- Susan Fregien, Central Valley Water Board - Sacramento
- Josh Huntsinger, Placer County Agricultural Commissioner
- Michael Johnson, MLJ-LLC / East San Joaquin Water Quality Coalition – San Joaquin County & Delta Water Quality Coalition
- Joe Karkoski, Central Valley Water Board – Sacramento
- Jim Markle, Coalition For Urban/RUral Environmental Stewardship (CURES)
- Kelly D. Moran, TDC Environmental
- James Orlando, US Geological Survey
- Claus Suverkropp, Larry Walker Associates
- Dawit Tadesse, State Water Resources Control Board
- Patrick Barnes, Central Valley Water Board, Fresno
- Rich Breuer, State Water Resources Control Board
- Monica Van Natta, Eurofins Eaton Analytical, Inc.