

**IRRIGATED LANDS REGULATORY PROGRAM
Pesticide Evaluation Advisory Workgroup Meeting #1**

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

MEETING DATE: Wednesday 9 July 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.
- By 29 July, Dr. Michael Johnson will pull together the core/common parts of the different approaches to produce a straw proposal and where decisions are needed on how various factors are applied for the Workgroup to review and react at the next meeting.
- Staff will notify the Workgroup of any changes in schedule as soon as possible.

Welcome, Introductions and Operating Rules

- Staff welcomed Workgroup members and all attendees.
- Workgroup members, staff and interested persons in presence introduced themselves.
- Staff reviewed the operating procedures for the Workgroup and for the public input: there will be no alternates for meeting attendance, Workgroup members should notify staff ahead of time if unable to attend, public comments should be communicated to staff outside the Workgroup meetings and staff will convey questions and ideas to the Workgroup. Staff will circulate brief meeting notes to Workgroup members for review and input before releasing final notes to the public.

Background, Workgroup Objectives and Scope

- Staff summarized the history of the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program, and described relevant Waste Discharge Requirements Order elements related to monitoring pesticides in surface water. A question about the lack of trigger limits for some of the pesticides listed in the Individual Discharger General Order generated a brief discussion. The development of trigger limits is outside the scope of the Workgroup.
- After the staff's overview of the Workgroup objectives, and dialogue among the participants, the primary charge of the Workgroup was determined to include both identifying evaluation factors and the protocol for assessment based on the factors. Additional tasks could be selected after the completion of the primary charge if the Workgroup members express interest and are available.
- While the definitive role and separation between the EO list and the third-party list of pesticides are pending further clarification, proceeding with developing the list of evaluation factors and process for selection of pesticides should be the focus of the Workgroup. Fleshing out the difference between the two lists could come at a later time.

Existing approaches for pesticide evaluation

- Invited expert remarks – Xin Deng

Dr. Xin Deng gave a presentation and briefed the Workgroup members on the Department of Pesticide Regulation's Phase 1 methodology for pesticide prioritization, which is used for DPR's urban and agricultural monitoring programs. In addition to the two parameters the Phase 1 methodology relies on, the Phase 2 incorporates additional factors and refines the approach. Dr. Deng answered clarifying questions for the Workgroup members. Workgroup members discussed water quality criteria and benchmarks.

- Invited expert remarks – Claus Suverkropp
Mr. Claus Suverkropp described the approach used for pesticide selection for the Sacramento Valley Water Quality Coalition's monitoring program, and provided updates on the method that were developed in recent years. He noted that some pesticides are not monitored due to lack of available analytical methods. Workgroup members made additional comments on the selection of toxicity values.
- Invited expert remarks – Roberta Firoved
Ms. Roberta Firoved gave a presentation on monitoring rice pesticides, and described the decision matrix used in pesticide evaluations. In addition to a historical overview, Ms. Firoved explained how rice pesticide registration process worked, and provided context for rice monitoring program under the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program.
- Expert remarks – Dr. Kelly Moran
Dr. Kelly Moran provided a conceptual overview of elements and critical steps in pesticide prioritization, as well as the importance of the sequence of steps, and known issues and limitations of data. Dr. Moran answered clarifying questions, and Workgroup members discussed pesticide degradates.

Workgroup process and schedule

- Workgroup members noted that the available approaches reviewed previously had many similar properties and had consistent elements to build off of.
- Questions for further consideration included topics such as details of how any one of the evaluation factors will actually be assessed and treated, applicability of the process developed by the Workgroup to all Orders, differentiating between the effect of farming practices and pesticide properties on exceedances in subwatersheds, the application of quantitative elements versus application of a more subjective qualitative assessment within a detailed subwatershed evaluation.
- One recommendation was to have a list of existing factors and priorities for evaluation drafted for the next meeting for the Workgroup members to react to. Elements of a "strawman" draft may be an effective way to provide feedback, identify areas of consensus about the factors and the approach, areas that may need refinement, and to define pros and cons of the proposed elements.
- Staff stated it was up to the Workgroup to determine what may be the preferred way to move forward. Yet, a straw proposal developed by members of the Workgroup rather than staff preparing the draft for comments might be a more efficient way of tapping into the expertise of the qualified scientists in the Workgroup.
- Mike Johnson volunteered to develop a straw man proposal and flesh out options for review and input. Some Workgroup members offered to provide input on specific topics; a subgroup offered to be involved with the initial compilation work.

Wrap-up/ next Steps

- Staff thanked the Workgroup members and other present for attending.
- The next meeting is scheduled for 5 August.

**IRRIGATED LANDS REGULATORY PROGRAM
Pesticide Evaluation Advisory Workgroup Meeting #1**

ATTACHMENT 1 – LIST OF ATTENDEES

Workgroup members present

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

Workgroup members absent

Clark, Stephen			
----------------	--	--	--

Staff present

Barnes, Patrick	Fregien, Susan	Hartman, Jelena	Karkoski, Joe
McClure, Danny			

Others present

Allen, Matthew	Blegen, Kelsey	Brooks, Aimee	Houdesheldt, Bruce
Kubiak, Rachel	Miller, Jeff		

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

- Matthew Allen, Western Grower Association
- Patrick Barnes, Central Valley Water Board – Fresno
- Kelsey Blegen, Best Best & Krieger
- Aimee Brooks, California Cotton Ginners and Growers Association / Western Agricultural Processors Association
- Elissa Callman, City of Sacramento
- Xin Deng, California Department of Pesticide Regulation
- Debra Denton, US Environmental Protection Agency
- Roberta Firoved, California Rice Commission
- Tessa Fojut, Central Valley Water Board – Sacramento
- Susan Fregien, Central Valley Water Board – Sacramento
- Jelena Hartman, Central Valley Water Board – Sacramento
- Bruce Houdesheldt, Sacramento Valley Water Quality Coalition
- 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
- Rachel Kubiak, Western Plant Health Association
- Jim Markle, Coalition For Urban/RUral Environmental Stewardship (CURES)
- Jeff Miller, AQUA-Science
- Kelly D. Moran, TDC Environmental
- James Orlando, US Geological Survey
- Claus Suverkropp, Larry Walker Associates
- Dawit Tadesse, State Water Resources Control Board