

Environmental and Consumer Protection Division  
Office of Environmental Services  
*mailing:* 1802 W. Jackson St. #78, Phoenix, AZ 85007  
*physical:* 1110 W. Washington St. #450, Phoenix, AZ 85007  
P: 602-542-3575

### Region 9 Pre-SFIREG meeting summary

Region 9 met on May 1 in Portland Oregon at the end of the Western Region Pesticide Meeting (WRPM). Represented were Ak-Chin Indian Community, American Samoa University + EPA, Arizona + PSEP, California + PSEP, EPA Region 9, Gila River Indian Community, Guam, Hawaii, ITCA and Nevada.

The notice regarding EJ projects came out this day. Budgets for 2026 are an unknown at this point, but likely there will be a reduction. People were to talk with their POs if there were questions about the EJ issues. Workplans are to be developed as usual, however, not knowing the funding levels kind of throws a wrench in that, especially when the funding covers personnel.

There was a lot of discussion at the WRPM relating to collaboration and this discussion continued, especially as it came to C&T updates. Likely most plans will have some sort of changes that will be required, just based on timelines, how language in law and rules may have changed through the process. With the loss of PERC funding this will have an impact on some states that were looking for manuals to come out from PERC. The website on line reference materials are used by everyone and there needs to be some way to ensure all this information is not lost.

In reviewing the feed through flow chart everyone thought it would be useful. There were questions about the loss of labeling which was confusing, until it was brought out to think about feed being like treated seed, in which the application is to the feed. This helped understand the flow better.

After some discussion on the GUP to RUP there was hope that there would be some clarity provide by the EPA on how this is going to work.

Mosquito blowers has not been an enforcement issue for those present, but it was easy to see how this could be a problem. Getting information on the labels would be very helpful in avoiding problems. (prohibited use)

ESA was a major part of the overall conference. The frustration is how things can change from day to day and week to week. For the regulated public this makes it difficult to understand and follow the requirements. Ultimately, we believe things will

start to level out which will allow states better opportunities to provide clear information.

Pesticide registration issues was an area we thought we could potentially collaborate on. Sulfuryl Fluoride is a current issue for CA as they found the product being trapped in drinking and storage containers. CA is developing BMP's with Douglas, which may lead to label changes. We will work to keep the communication open regarding the registration issue moving forward as if it is important to one western state there is the possibility it is to others.

American Samoa is working on getting their health services agency and agriculture department cooperating with each other as they deal with pesticide misuse issues on food commodities that are then being sold directly to consumers. They were working on an MOU, but even without that they had 3 farms shut down based on this cooperation. This is a big deal as there were little to no consequences previously. They are really working on trying to get training to farmers. Very little if any RUPs are used so this is an additional exercise they are trying to work through to help with better public health and safety.

Guam is dealing with some bio-security issues as they bring in boxes for fumigation – historically this has relied on methyl-bromide.

Closing out there was discussion on PZP, which is birth control for horses. The issues is it is an RUP pesticide. There is little understanding as to how this came about being regulated under FIFRA versus FDA. In addition, there was discussion around what training and category is appropriate for this use. After some of the participants did a little online research, it was determined that not all of it is applied via a dart gun. The label makes it sound like the manufacturer provides training. Is it like firearm safety? The use is limited in that it is not just available to the general public, but it can be for those working under management contracts for various land agencies, BLM, DOI etc.

A follow-up question relating to the USDA eliminating record-keeping requirements for private applicators shows that California, Hawaii and Nevada all have requirements for this. Arizona, although having adopted rules, are limited by statute stating recordkeeping can be equivalent to, but not more stringent than federal. A substantive policy was approved stating these rules would not be enforced until such time as these rules are modified.

Summary provided by Jack Peterson, AZDA