

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

PESTICIDE BOARD SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

July 21, 2026

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Michael Moore, DPH, Food Protection Program, (Chair)	Present
Taryn LaScola, MDAR, Designee for Commissioner Randle	Present
Meg Blanchet, DPH, Designee for Commissioner Goldstein	Present
Eric Seaborn, DCR, Designee for Commissioner LaChapelle	Present
Richard Berman, Commercial Applicator	Present

The Board did meet or exceed the minimum number (3) of members present to form a quorum and conduct business.

A. REVIEW OF MINUTES FOR July 21, 2026

Motion: R. Berman

Second: M. Blanchet

Discussion: None

In Favor: E. Seaborn, M. Moore, T. LaScola, M. Blanchet, R. Berman

Opposed: None

Abstained: None

B. PRODUCT REGISTRATIONS

Motion That the Pesticide Board Subcommittee registers the pesticide products listed on the EIPAS PR July 21, 2026, Subcommittee cover sheet with the exception of the following products:

- Maxunitech Carfentrazone +Sulfentrazone SE, EPA Reg. No. 95009-3,
- Pestie Home Barrier B2 Spray, EPA Reg. No. 91234-296-100947,
- Overlay NXT, EPA Reg. No. 279-3468-55467,
- Harrell's ProtectMAX Sulfentrazone, EPA Reg. No. 101563-284-52287,
- Phenatic, EPA Reg. No. 66222-312,
- Palouse M, EPA Reg. No. 66222-299,
- Enfield Herbicide, EPA Reg. No. 62719-756-55467, and
- Bronte, EPA Reg. No. 84059-34

Moved: R. Berman

Second: T. LaScola

Discussion: None

In Favor: M. Blanchet, R. Berman, T. LaScola, M. Moore, E. Seaborn

Opposed: None

Abstained: None

Motion: That the Pesticide Board Subcommittee has determined the use of the following products,

- Maxunitech Carfentrazone +Sulfentrazone SE, EPA Reg. No. 95009-3, containing sulfentrazone,
- Overlay NXT, EPA Reg. No. 279-3468-55467, containing fluthiacet-methyl,
- Harrell's ProtectMAX Sulfentrazone, EPA Reg. No. 101563-284-52287, containing sulfentrazone,
- Phenatic, EPA Reg. No. 66222-312, containing MCPA,
- Palouse M, EPA Reg. No. 66222-299, containing MCPA, and
- Enfield Herbicide, EPA Reg. No. 62719-756-55467, containing acetochlor,

may cause an unreasonable risk to man or the environment, when taking into account the economic, social, and environmental costs and benefits of their use. This determination is based upon the leaching potential and toxicological concern of these substances as defined in the "Protection of Groundwater Supplies from Non-Point Source Pesticide Contamination" Regulations. Therefore, the Subcommittee hereby modifies the registration classification of agricultural/commercial pesticide products containing **sulfentrazone**, **fluthiacet-methyl**, **MCPA**, and **acetochlor** from general to restricted use for groundwater concerns.

Moved: R. Berman

Second: T. LaScola

Discussion: None

In Favor: M. Blanchet, R. Berman, T. LaScola, M. Moore, E. Seaborn

Opposed: None

Abstained: None

Neonicotinoid Motion:

Move: That the Pesticide Board Subcommittee has determined that the use of the following product:

- Pestie Home Barrier B2 Spray, EPA Reg. No. 91234-296-100947, containing imidacloprid,

may pose unreasonable adverse effects to the environment as well as to pollinators, when taking into account the economic, social, and environmental costs and benefits of their use in the Commonwealth and are thereby restricted. This is pursuant to the Subcommittee's decision on March 1, 2021, to modify the registration classification of products containing neonicotinoids, including **imidacloprid**, that have outdoor non-structural uses or outdoor non-agricultural uses on the label from general to state restricted use.

Moved: R. Berman

Second: T. LaScola

Discussion: None

In Favor: M. Blanchet, R. Berman, T. LaScola, M. Moore, E. Seaborn

Opposed: None

Abstained: None

C. NEW ACTIVE INGREDIENT MOTION

Miller presented information on the new active ingredient (a. i.) *inactivated Burkholderia rinojensis strain A396 cells and spent fermentation media*), which is formulated in Bronte, EPA Reg. No. 84059-34, for control or suppression of foliar insects, mites, soil insects, and nematodes in various agricultural, greenhouse and indoor crops.

Bronte is an insecticide and nematocide in suspension concentrate form in which the active ingredient (a.i.) material is ~ 95% of the product. *B. rinojensis* strain A396 is an inactivated gram-negative bacterium isolated from soil beneath an evergreen tree in Japan. Bronte has a minimum concentration of 330 micrograms per milliliter of romidepsin, which is a secondary metabolite and natural peptide proherbicide and insecticide. EPA notes that a heat-inactivated version of this active ingredient is already federally registered, but this differs in its manufacturing process because it is chemically inactivated and therefore is a new a.i. The mode of action is that the enzymes and secondary metabolites produced by this strain are toxic to various insects and nematodes.

Handling precautions: Bronte has 'Caution' as its signal word. Handlers are required to wear baseline PPE as well as waterproof gloves and protective eyewear and a specified NIOSH-approved particulate or air-purifying respirator. The restricted entry interval for agricultural workers is 4 hours. The environmental hazard statement specifies that Bronte is for terrestrial use only, with the standard prohibition against direct applications to water, areas where surface water is present, or to intertidal areas below the mean high-water mark. Drift is not permitted to contact people or sensitive areas, and if wind is blowing, it must be in the opposite direction of sensitive areas.

Uses: Bronte is for use on a wide range of agricultural and greenhouse crops, including leafy and fruiting vegetables, brassicas, roots and tubers, celery, tomato, peppers, cucurbits, strawberries, blueberries, cane berries, hops, apples, stone fruits, cherries, cereals, and corn. Both foliar and in-furrow sprays are allowed, as is transplant water treatment. Applicators may use ground spray, chemigation, aerial spraying, and greenhouse foggers. Spray drift management requirements are listed in the label and specify height release limits, droplet size, wind speed ranges for applications, avoiding temperature inversion conditions, and buffers. For all crops, the preharvest interval is zero days.

The maximum application rate is 20 fluid ounces of product per acre. There is not maximum frequency of applications besides adhering to treatment intervals according to the particular crop.

Human Health: Technical grade strain A396 is rated as Toxicity Category IV, or lowest risk, for all acute exposure pathways. No hypersensitivity effects were reported and cell culturing was not required. No adverse effects were seen at the highest doses studied or in the bacterial reverse mutation assay. Scientific rationales rather than testing were submitted for the end product. These were based on the low toxicity exhibited in the technical grade a.i. studies and the fact that the inactive ingredients are exempt from tolerance requirements and only comprise 5% of the formulation. These were accepted by EPA but the end product was classified as Toxicity Category III for all exposures. The safety data sheet lists 1-hexanol and propylene glycol as right-to-know ingredient disclosures for certain states.

An acute pulmonary toxicity/pathogenicity study is usually required for microorganisms, but the registrant submitted the rationale that because the a.i. is inactivated and therefore non-viable, it is neither infective nor pathogenic. The secondary metabolite romidepsin is an FDA-approved cancer treatment for certain T-cell lymphomas.

There are no dietary exposure concerns since *B. rinojensis* is naturally found in soil, is not expected to remain at high levels on plant surfaces or readily reach ground water, and it has negligible toxicity. Romidepsin has low bioavailability and is not well-absorbed into the body, for example, through skin or gastro-intestinal tissues. When it is used as a cancer therapy, it has to be injected. For these reasons, a quantitative aggregate exposure and risk assessment was not required. This product has no residential uses and residential exposure is expected to be minimal. Drift from ground and aerial sprays is possible but exposures would not present a human health concern. Occupational handlers and occupational post-application exposures are anticipated in the short- and intermediate-term. However, these do not pose risks of concern due to PPE requirements on the label and the negligible toxicity of the a.i. Overall, EPA anticipates no unreasonable adverse effects to humans.

EPA finds that an exemption from the requirement of a tolerance for residues in or on all food and feed commodities is justified when used in accordance with label directions and good agricultural practices. This exemption was established in February of 2025.

Ecological risk: The EPA assessment considers the most likely exposure to terrestrial organisms to be either via contact during application or with treated surfaces or orally, through ingestion of treated surfaces. However, no risks of significance to mammals or birds are anticipated.

There were no observed adverse effects in rats at the highest dose of active ingredient tested. In testing on bobwhite quails, the only sublethal effects observed were minimal, temporary, and at the highest dose studied, which vastly exceeded estimated environmental concentrations. The registrant submitted toxicity data for three species of non-target insects besides honey bees. The most sensitive of these was ladybird beetles, though its risk quotient was significantly less than the EPA threshold of concern. Both adult and larval honey bees exceeded the risk quotient threshold, resulting in label mitigation language requiring a prohibition on spraying where bees are foraging and buffers to reduce spray drift during foliar applications. Required buffers are listed in a table and are a function of application type and droplet size. For aerial applications, this can be up to 66 feet but most ground applications have a buffer requirement of 4 feet. Effects on terrestrial plants were studied using ten different field crops and no adverse effects were observed at roughly 5x the label rate, with the exception of a 5% reduction in soybean shoot length. There was also minor phytotoxicity observed across species tested, but this was at least partially attributed to normal low-level external stressors. Overall, adverse effects in nontarget plants are not anticipated from label applications. For aquatic organisms, the most likely exposure would be via spray drift or a mistaken direct application, which would be the worst-case scenario. However, this a.i. has been shown to have very low toxicity to fish and invertebrates. No mortality or sublethal effects were reported at the tested concentrations for rainbow trout or water fleas. Toxicity studies on three aquatic plants indicated the no observed effect concentrations were 10 to 1000 times higher than the worst-case estimated environmental concentrations.

ESA: EPA did not explicitly report effect determinations for Endangered Species Act listed species in the docket for this a.i. Instead, its ecological risk assessment contains an endangered species mitigation section that cites the existence of label mitigation measures deemed necessary to reduce risk to nontarget organisms. It also stipulates that if, at any time in the future, EPA finds that additional measures are needed to protect listed species and designated critical habitats, the registrant will be required to either meet those requirements within 30 days of notice or cancel the product registration.

Fate/transport: A brief summary of romidepsin's chemical properties and degradation was included in the dietary risk section of the human health risk assessment. It is not volatile and has low water solubility. It is not expected to be taken up by plants. It biodegrades rapidly and little to no residues are expected on plants and soil. If residue were to wash off, EPA expects that it would return to background concentrations by the time runoff reached waterbodies.

Groundwater Protection: inactivated *Burkholderia rinojensis* does not meet the criteria for being classified as a potential groundwater contaminant in Massachusetts.

Move: That the Pesticide Board Subcommittee approve the product registration for Bronte, EPA Reg. No. 84059-34, containing the new active ingredient 'inactivated *Burkholderia rinojensis* strain A396 cells and spent fermentation media', which has never before been registered in Massachusetts.

Moved: R. Berman

Second: T. LaScola

Discussion: None

In Favor: M. Blanchet, R. Berman, T. LaScola, M. Moore, E. Seaborn

Opposed: None

Abstained: None

D. Glyphosate Individual Review: The Pesticide Board Subcommittee will review and deliberate on the classification of glyphosate through the Individual Review process. Materials for consideration include the Massachusetts Glyphosate Commission Final Phase Two Report and additional scientific information provided to the Subcommittee.

Following the summary presentation by Wijnja, MDAR staff, of the Glyphosate Scientific Review and additional data provided by the Department, the Subcommittee discussed procedural aspects related to bringing forward a motion for action on the Glyphosate Individual Review. Berman noted that the Roundup brand name is currently associated with multiple products, some containing glyphosate and other active ingredients and some not containing glyphosate, and suggested that this may be relevant when considering the scope of the registration review.

Berman proposed a motion stating that, “that based on the ERG Scientific Report and additional data provided by the Department the Subcommittee makes no changes to the current general registration status of current glyphosate-containing products “. The Subcommittee discussed the proposed motion and the process for allowing members additional time to review and discuss the proposed action with their respective appointing commissioners and agencies.

The motion was subsequently laid on the table to allow Subcommittee members additional time for internal review and consultation. The Subcommittee agreed that members would receive copies of the proposed motion and the Department's presentation. The motion may be brought back for consideration at a subsequent meeting, at which time Subcommittee members may further discuss or amend the proposed language before taking action.

E. Anticoagulant Rodenticides Individual Review Timeline. Discussion regarding the timeline for initiating the Subcommittee's deliberations on the classification of anticoagulant rodenticides through the Individual Review process.

The Subcommittee initiated discussion of the Rodenticide Individual Review and reviewed the proposed timeline and materials compiled by Department staff. Staff provided the Subcommittee with access to the materials compiled for the review so that members could begin reviewing the information and identify any questions or requests for additional information or clarification.

The Subcommittee discussed continuing the review at its next meeting and requested a summary presentation of the materials for the Anticoagulant Rodenticide Individual Review. Department staff indicated that they could prepare a summary presentation for the next meeting. The Subcommittee expressed interest in moving forward with the review efficiently, noting the significant public interest in rodenticide issues as well as interest from industry.

The Subcommittee also discussed the potential value of incorporating a public health perspective into the review, given the relationship between rodenticide use and rodent populations. Members expressed interest in hearing from Subcommittee members with public health expertise regarding relevant public health considerations. Department staff indicated that this perspective would be considered as the review proceeds.

The Subcommittee agreed that Department staff would work together to prepare a summary presentation for consideration at the next meeting.

F. New Business

No new business was brought before the Subcommittee.

G. ADJOURN

Motion: To adjourn July 21, 2026, Subcommittee Meeting.

Moved: M. Moore

Second: T. LaScola

Discussion: None

In Favor: M. Blanchet, R. Berman, T. LaScola, M. Moore, E. Seaborn

Opposed: None

Abstained: None

“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](#).”