

**IRRIGATED LANDS REGULATORY PROGRAM  
Pesticide Evaluation Advisory Workgroup Meeting #5**

**DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY**

MEETING DATE: 16 December 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/materials from the meeting.
- Staff will edit and re-post the Meeting #4 Summary notes, based on Workgroup members' comments.
- Workgroup Members (Mike, Tessa, and Kelly?) will review Pesticide Groupings for completeness.
- Follow-up on Step 3 Strawman discussion: Mike and Kelly will review the draft Step 3 strawman process and develop suggestions/ideas to share with the Workgroup before the next meeting.
- Meeting #6 will be held on 27 January 2015.

**Topics of Discussion/Areas of Agreement**

- Workgroup members briefly discussed the draft *Degradates and Impurities List* development and *Reference Table* documents. In-depth discussion was postponed to allow enough time for presentation and discussion of other agenda topics during this meeting.
- Workgroup members have not reached consensus regarding use of a) the acute and/or chronic aquatic life benchmarks as reference values, and b) the reference value to use, if a criterion (e.g., US EPA criteria) is lower than a benchmark.
- Elissa Callman presented a Recommendation for Use of Enforceable Drinking Water Standards and Drinking Water Guidance Values in ILRP Pesticides Prioritization for Monitoring. The Workgroup members agreed that if an identified aquatic life reference value is lower than the drinking water standard for a given pesticide, that pesticide does not need further consideration under drinking water reference values. But if it is subsequently removed from the potential monitoring list for aquatic life protection, it would be included in the drinking water prioritization process.
- The Workgroup discussed the recommendation to omit pesticides with enforceable drinking water standards from the Step 2 preliminary ranking calculation and take them directly to Step 3. It was suggested that Step 2 should not be omitted, but maybe additional evaluation could be developed within Step 3 to recognize those pesticides with federal and/or state adopted primary and secondary MCLs, NLs, or AALs.
- Mike Johnson distributed tables and described the process and results of two test runs he conducted applying the Preliminary Methodology for a small watershed in the ESJWQC. His examples provided relative rankings of pesticides by month and a decision as to whether or not a pesticide should be monitored, based on fate characteristics and previous monitoring results. The first example was based on his understanding of the draft Steps 1-3 process and the second example was a modified process proposed for the ESJWQC.

**IRRIGATED LANDS REGULATORY PROGRAM**  
**Pesticide Evaluation Advisory Workgroup Meeting #5**

- The example results were distinctly different, with many more pesticides selected for monitoring in the first example compared to the ESJWQC proposed process. As a result, the Workgroup members recommended that modification and clarification is needed for the draft Step 3 process.
- Some Workgroup members commented that pesticide monitoring exclusions should not be based solely on the Koc value. For example, the USGS regularly finds pendimethalin in water samples, even though the Koc is relatively high.
- Workgroup members suggested that watershed size should also be considered when determining whether a pesticide should be monitored.
- Workgroup members discussed the draft Strawman for Discussion – Step 3, presented by Kelly Moran. The following topics were discussed (but no specific changes were recommended):
  - A question was raised under Step 3A(3) as to why measured values  $\geq 10\%$  of the reference value go directly to Sept 3D. This step was proposed as a safety factor. Consensus was not reached on whether this is needed.
  - In a discussion of Step 3B, members suggested that maybe this step should be optional or that it be removed. Consensus was not reached. Members also commented that low-risk use patterns and application methods are hard to characterize.
  - In a discussion of Step 3C, members suggested this step could be applied first to eliminate pesticides from further evaluation, with the exception that degradates shouldn't be eliminated at this stage. Consensus was not reached.

**IRRIGATED LANDS REGULATORY PROGRAM  
Pesticide Evaluation Advisory Workgroup Meeting #5**

**ATTACHMENT 1 – LIST OF ATTENDEES**

**Workgroup members present**

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

**Workgroup members absent**

Denton, Debra			
---------------	--	--	--

**Staff present**

Karkoski, Joe	Susan Fregien	Yared Kebede	

**Others present**


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

- Elissa Callman, City of Sacramento
- Stephen Clark, Pacific EcoRisk
- Xin Deng, Department of Pesticide Regulation
- 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
- Yared Kebede, 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