

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs



Department of Agricultural Resources

225 Turnpike Road, Southborough, MA 01772

www.mass.gov/agr



Maura T. Healey
Governor

Kimberley Driscoll
Lieutenant Governor

Rebecca L. Tepper
Secretary

Ashley E. Randle
Commissioner

CONSERVATIONIST PESTICIDE ADVISORY COUNCIL **MEETING MINUTES**

Date: March 13, 2026

A. ROLL CALL

Kimberly Pearson, Brewster Natural Resources Advisory Commission	Present
Clint Richmond, Sierra Club	Present
Regina LaRocque, MGH Center for Environment and Health	Present
Emma Wick, USDA Natural Resources Conservation Services	Present
Kristin Andres, Association of Preserve Cape Cod	Absent

The Conservationist Pesticide Advisory Council ("Council") did meet or exceed the minimum number three (3) of members present to form a quorum and conduct business.

DOCUMENT(S) PRESENTED:

Minutes from the February 13, 2026 meeting

B. REVIEW OF MINUTES FROM FEBRUARY 13, 2026:

Motion to Accept the Minutes: K. Pearson

Second: R. LaRocque

In favor: All

Abstention: None

C. PESTICIDE ENFORCEMENT UPDATES, T. LASCOLA

Rodenticide Scientific Review: T. LaScola informed the Council that the hearing for the rodenticide individual review was going to be held on March 18th from 1pm-3pm. She indicated that if people wanted to provide verbal comments they needed to sign up to speak. She noted that if people wanted to attend the hearing but not provide comments, they did not need to sign up.

D. GROUNDWATER PROTECTION REGULATIONS, HOTZE WIJNJA AND T. LASCOLA

T. LaScola provided a summary and presentation of the groundwater protection regulations ([333 CMR 12.00](#)). She explained what a Zone II and Interim Wellhead Protection Area (IWPA) are. She also explained that if an individual is using a pesticide on the groundwater protection list and the property is located in a Zone II or IWPA, has to follow certain rules such as having a Pest Management Plan and providing notification to MDAR.

H. Wijnja provided a summary and presentation on how a product is placed on the groundwater protection list. He explained that a product is placed on the groundwater protection list when it contains a potential groundwater containment (as defined by the regulations), and which has been registered by EPA or the Massachusetts Pesticide Board Subcommittee as a restricted use pesticide due to groundwater concerns. He then summarized the historic additions that were made to the list and more recent additions to the list. He also noted that during EPA's registration review process, they conduct a comprehensive drinking water assessment as part of the review. He referenced USGS and MDAR's monitoring effort that showed certain pesticides were found in drinking water, but they were below the levels of concern.

Council Discussion: R. LaRocque noted that Massachusetts relies heavily on information provided by the federal government and wanted to know if cuts have affected the regulatory environment. T. LaScola stated that while they may see delays in things coming out of the federal government, they have not seen a reduction in quality of the work that is taking place.

R. LaRocque then noted that inert ingredients might include PFAS and wanted to know if MDAR was thinking about that issue. H. Wijnja indicated that the PFAS compounds, which are often referred to as the "classic" compounds, are currently regulated and that these compounds are not in registered pesticide formulations. He recognized that there are different definitions of PFAS used by organizations, which include other programs within EPA. If using those definitions, there are a few pesticide products that contain PFAS, but noted that if a product is registered, it has met the specific criteria that EPA has set forth. He stated EPA also reviews inert ingredients and any inert ingredients that fell under the EPA Pesticide Program definition, were removed from the list as they were no longer being used in products.

K. Pearson asked if MDAR has looked at the products that were found in the monitoring studies to determine if there are concerns with bioaccumulation. H. Wijnja responded that EPA assesses bioaccumulation as part of their human health assessments. States use EPA's benchmark values when evaluating results which are lower than the MCL's. She also asked if non-human end points/impacts were looked at. He stated that EPA has aquatic life benchmarks which can be referenced.

C. Richmond asked if a product has to meet all the criteria or just one of the criteria set forth in the regulations to be of toxicological concern. It was explained that the regulations stated that the products need to meet or exceed the MCL, or the proposed MCL, or DEP guideline value or Health Advisory level less than or equal to a certain value or EPA classification know or probable human carcinogen category A, B1 or B2.

K. Pearson stated that EPA relies heavily on information provided by the registrant. H. Wijnja stated that EPA does look at that information but also looks at open literature as well, but it must meet its criteria. EPA also has certain criteria the registrant must adhere to when conducting research and providing data. EPA reviews the data to determine if it is of sufficient quality and if not they will have the registrants go back and provide new or additional data. K. Pearson noted that this is not unique to EPA but happens in other spaces and wondered if it would be a good idea for either EPA or the state to conduct monitoring of new active ingredients.

E. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business

F. ADJOURN

Motion to Adjourn: K. Pearson

Second: E. Wick

In Favor: All

Any documents referenced in these minutes may be obtained through a Public Records Request. To make a request, please go to [AGR Public Records Requests | Mass.gov](#).