

Karen Cowan

Please see attached comments from the California Stormwater Quality Association.



California Stormwater Quality Association®

Dedicated to the Advancement of Stormwater Quality Management, Science and Regulation

May 7, 2025

Jennifer T. Teerlink, Deputy Director and Science Advisor

California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Via DPR Public Comment Portal: <https://cdpr.commentinput.com/?id=c6HgahZY7>

Subject: Comments on Department of Pesticide Regulation Pesticide Prioritization Process Workshop

Dear Ms. Teerlink:

The California Stormwater Quality Association (CASQA)¹ appreciates the opportunity to provide input on the Department of Pesticide Regulation's (DPR) proposed Pesticide Prioritization Process as presented in the April 8, 2025 Workshop (Workshop).

For decades, the uses of certain pesticides in urban areas – even when applied in compliance with pesticide regulations – have adversely impacted urban water bodies. Currently, several pesticides are present in California urban water bodies at concentrations above aquatic toxicity thresholds.² Our member agencies face substantial costs to comply with pesticides-related Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs), California State Water Board Toxicity Provisions, and additional permit requirements. However, while local agencies in California have authority over their own use of pesticides, they are pre-empted by state law from regulating pesticide use by consumers and businesses to address these sources of pollution in stormwater.

Consistent with CASQA's [Vision for Sustainable Stormwater Management](#) (Vision),³ we strongly support efforts to reduce pesticide pollution, at the source. Minimizing pesticide pollution before it can occur, as opposed to attempting to remove pesticides from the environment, is essential to sustainable stormwater management. True source control (the elimination of a pollutant at its source) and the use of alternative products offers the most effective and economical approach to eliminating pesticides that impair the beneficial uses of California's waterways.

From a true source control perspective, CASQA supports DPR's plan for a robust and coordinated prioritization process for pesticides subject to reevaluation. Through DPR's Pesticide Prioritization Workshop, DPR has requested comments on the prioritization process, structure for submission of potential priorities, and Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) areas of expertise. CASQA offers the following comments to help support DPR in developing its pesticide prioritization process.

¹ CASQA is a nonprofit corporation that advances sustainable stormwater management protective of California water resources. With approximately 2,000 members, our membership is comprised of a diverse range of stormwater quality management organizations and individuals, including cities, counties, special districts, federal agencies, state agencies, ports, universities and school districts, wastewater agencies, water suppliers, industries, and consulting firms throughout the state. Collectively, CASQA represents over 34 million people in California.

² California Integrated Report (Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List and 305(b) Report)
https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/water_quality_assessment/2020_2022_integrated_report.html

³ CASQA's Vision for Sustainable Stormwater Management, October 2020. Available at:
https://www.casqa.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/final_-_vision_for_sustainable_stormwater_management_-_10-07-2020.pdf

COMMENT #1: PRIORITIZATION PROCESS – CASQA SUPPORTS THE INCORPORATION OF APPLICATION-SPECIFIC POTENTIAL PRIORITIES

The initial step of the proposed pesticide prioritization process is obtaining potential priorities. These potential priorities would then be prioritized for review by the SAC. The identification of potential priorities would come from DPR staff, the SAC, and the public. It is recognized that the potential priorities sourced from DPR staff would come from active ingredient ranked lists and application-specific methods. CASQA supports the inclusion of application-specific methods to ensure problematic pesticides are not simply replaced with another problematic pesticide. Focusing solely on active ingredients may overlook application methods involving multiple ingredients.

COMMENT #2: PRIORITIZATION PROCESS –ESTABLISH A PUBLIC PROCESS FOR SETTING POTENTIAL PRIORITIES

The proposed pesticide prioritization process establishes a SAC responsible for evaluating whether the potential risks associated with potential priorities have been identified with sufficient data and quality scientific assessment. DPR is planning to identify up to eight potential priorities per year, four of which would be proposed by DPR staff, two by the SAC itself, and two by the public. However, the proposed pesticide prioritization process does not describe how submitted potential priorities would be selected by DPR for SAC review. To allow for both supportive and non-duplicative potential priority submissions, submitted potential priorities vetted and approved by DPR for consideration should be made available to the public through a dedicated web portal.

Additionally, adopting a structured public process for selecting the annual potential priorities for SAC review would provide another opportunity for incorporating public and stakeholder engagement. The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) uses a structured public process to prioritize products under its Safer Consumer Products Program, including a multi-year Priority Product Work Plan that is subject to public review and comment. Adopting a similar work plan approach, with opportunities for public input, would help address the current gap in transparency around how submitted potential priorities advance to SAC review.

CASQA Recommendation:

- Develop a dedicated web portal clearly listing potential priorities proposed by DPR, SAC, and the public, including all submitted and supporting documentation.
- Develop an annual work plan with public review and comment periods for setting the SAC's review of potential priorities; consider the DTSC Safe Consumer Products Program process as a model.
- Clarify the SAC's process for selecting two of the eight annual priorities for its own review and assess whether the SAC selecting annual priorities is appropriate given its objective evaluation role.

COMMENT #3: SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE AREAS OF EXPERTISE – INCLUDE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT EXPERT

CASQA supports DPR's efforts to develop a Scientific Advisory Committee (SAC) with comprehensive expertise to address the various nuances associated with evaluating the scientific merits of pesticide registration and reevaluations. CASQA acknowledges that DPR has already included expertise in public drinking water and wastewater utilities. However, given the breadth of water resource considerations and stormwater's significant role as a transport mechanism for pesticides affecting surface and ground waters, the inclusion of stormwater management expertise would effectively address a critical gap in the committee's current scope.

CASQA Recommendation:

- Include stormwater management as an additional SAC area of expertise.

CASQA Comments on DPR's Pesticide Prioritization Process Workshop

CASQA appreciates DPR's efforts to create a robust pesticide prioritization process and we look forward to continued engagement.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments. If you have any questions, please contact me (karen.cowan@casqa.org) or Joseph Draper (joseph.draper@casqa.org).

Sincerely,



Karen Cowan, Executive Director
California Stormwater Quality Association

cc: Karen Morrison, Director, DPR
Sapna Thottathil, Deputy Director and Special Advisor, DPR
Aimee Norman, Chief, Integrated Pest Management Branch, DPR
Anson Main, DPR
Karen Mogus, Chief Deputy Director, California State Water Resources Control Board
Philip Crader, Deputy Director, California State Water Resources Control Board
Rebecca Nordenholt, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region
Amanda Magee, California State Water Resources Control Board
Laural Warddrip, California State Water Resources Control Board
Jessica Radar, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region
Peter Meertens, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Coast Region
Jenny Newman, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region
CASQA Board of Directors, Executive Program Committee, Policy and Permitting Subcommittee, True Source Control Subcommittee