THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

Department of Agricultural Resources
225 Turnpike Road, 3rd Floor, Southborough, MA 01772
www.mass.gov/agr

MDAR
MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Maura T. Healey	Kimberley Driscoll	Rebecca L. Tepper	Ashley E. Randle
GOVERNOR	LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR	SECRETARY	COMMISSIONER

PESTICIDE BOARD SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

March 18, 2025

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTTENDANCE

Michael Moore, DPH, Food Protection Program, (Chair)	Present
Taryn LaScola, MDAR, Designee for Commissioner Randle	Present
Meg Blanchet, DPH, Designee for Commissioner Goldstein	Present
Nicole Keleher, DCR, Designee for Commissioner Arrigo	Absent
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 February 18, 2025
Motion: R. Berman
Second: T. LaScola
Discussion: None
In Favor: R. Berman, M. Moore, T. LaScola, M. Blanchet
Opposed: None
Abstained: None

B. REMOTE PARTICIPATION MEETING

Jessica Burgess, Deputy General Counsel of the Massachusetts Department of Agricultural Resources, provided an update related to the meeting remote participation policy about to expire at the state level at the end of March 2025. As of March 17, 2025, the House passed an extension of meeting remote participation, tentatively through June 2027. Passage by Senate and signing into law by the Governor were considered likely. However, Burgess noted that this public body has never adopted, as required, the remote public participation provisions that would be necessary to continue remote meetings if they were not extended at the state level. Burgess presented the procedural adoption of remote participation by this body as an option if the Subcommittee wants to ensure use of this meeting format. Absent a remote participation extension or committee policy, a physical quorum would be required at all meetings.

Moore opened discussion and LaScola and Berman recommended voting today. Berman mentioned active public interest and attendance at meetings that is supported by the remote format. Burgess noted that future legislation may make remote participation permanent in some form, but adopting a separate Subcommittee provision would preserve access to this meeting

format. Moore asked Blanchet if DPH has discussed this. She was unaware of such discussions. Blanchet asked if there is urgency to vote today as opposed to the April meeting. Burgess replied likely not, given the strong likelihood of an extension being enacted. Berman asked if remote participation in the legislation is a standalone item or if other provisions might delay passage. Burgess replied that this is expected to move promptly.

Motion: That in the event that the current legislation is not extended, continued remote participation be allowed for the public body and that the Pesticide Board Subcommittee adopts the remote participation requirements as set forth in 940 CMR 29.10 and applicable law.

Moved: R. Berman
Second: T. LaScola
Discussion: None
In Favor: M. Moore, R. Berman, T. LaScola, M. Blanchet
Opposed: None
Abstained: None

B. **PRODUCT REGISTRATIONS**

Motion: That the Pesticide Board Subcommittee registers the pesticide products listed on the EIPAS PR March 18, 2025, Subcommittee cover sheet with the exception of the following products:

- Omni Brand Bentazon 4 (EPA Reg. No. 5905-658)
- Actylis Metribuzin Herbicide (EPA Reg. No. 2749-660)
- Floxcor M5 (EPA Reg. No. 70506-495-62719)
- Axios 20 SC (EPA Reg. No. 8033-139-70506)
- Masterline MaxxDual Insecticide (EPA Reg. No. 101563-201-73748)

Moved: R. Berman
Second: T. LaScola
Discussion: None
In Favor: M. Blanchet, R. Berman, T. LaScola, M. Moore
Opposed: None
Abstained: None

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

- Masterline MaxxDual Insecticide, EPA Reg. No. 101563-201-73748, 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
Opposed: None
Abstained: None

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

- Omni Brand Bentazon 4 (EPA Reg. No. 5905-658), containing bentazon
- Actylis Metribuzin Herbicide (EPA Reg. No. 2749-660), containing metribuzin
- Floxcor M5 (EPA Reg. No. 70506-495-62719), containing chlorothalonil,

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 substance 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 **bentazon, metribuzin, and chlorothalonil** 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
Opposed: None
Abstained: None

D. NEW ACTIVE INGREDIENT MOTION

Miller presented information on the new active ingredient (AI) *ipflufenoquin*, formulated in the product Axios 20 SC Fungicide, EPA Reg. No. 8033-139-70506, for broad spectrum control of a variety of fungal diseases including Botrytis, Sclerotinia, Colletotrichum, scab, blast, and powdery mildew on pome fruits and almonds. Ipflufenoquin is 18.4% of the suspension concentrate formulation.

Ipflufenoquin is classified as a Group 52 fungicide and is thought to inhibit production of an enzyme involved in fungal de novo pyrimidine synthesis. It is absorbed into plant tissue and is locally systemic, with translaminar activity after a foliar application.

Label: The Axios 20 SC label signal word is 'Caution'. Baseline PPE is required (long-sleeved shirt, long pants, shoes, socks) and chemical-resistant gloves made of barrier laminate or butyl rubber. The restricted entry interval is 4 hours. The product is only labeled for agricultural use: almond and pome fruit trees, which include apples, crabapples, and pears. Allowed application methods are chemigation, ground spray, and aerial spray.

The Axios label contains several environmental hazard statements: standard prohibitions against direct surface water applications or contamination by wash or rinsate waters, and groundwater advisories.

It has medium potential for reaching surface water by runoff for several months or more after application. The label suggests maintaining a level, well-maintained vegetative buffer strip and avoiding applications when rainfall or irrigation is expected to occur within 48 hours of application.

The label also has drift language to minimize off-site exposures. Aerial spray release cannot be higher than 10 feet above the vegetative canopy except when needed for pilot safety, ground release must be within 3 feet of the ground or crop canopy, applications when wind speeds exceed 10 miles per hour or a temperature inversion is present are prohibited, and a medium droplet size must be used. Applications are restricted to no more than 3/year at 3 oz/acre product per application for pome fruit trees. The pre-harvest interval is 7 days for pome crops.

Human Health: Based on rat toxicity studies, EPA has categorized ipflufenoquin as Toxicity Category III, or low level of concern, for acute oral and dermal exposures. Acute inhalation, eye irritation, and skin irritation are all Category IV, or lowest level of concern. It is not a dermal sensitizer.

In rodents, the primary target areas of the body are teeth, liver, thyroid, hematological system, and intestines. The chronic dietary No Observed Adverse Effect Level (NOAEL) in mice is 30 mg/kg/day. The toxicology database showed no adverse effects observed in dogs.

Evidence of neurotoxicity was only observed at very high doses (2000 mg/kg) that EPA found not relevant for risk assessment. No treatment-related reproductive effects were reported in the reproductive toxicity study in rats, with decreased pup body weight observed at the same doses as parental toxicity. Over 90% of ipflufenoquin is excreted after 96 hours, predominantly in feces.

Ipflufenoquin is classified as “Not Likely to Be Carcinogenic to Humans”; therefore, a cancer dietary exposure assessment was not required.

Human exposure is possible via food and drinking water, but no residential exposure is anticipated due to the agricultural use pattern. As a result, a residential risk assessment was not required. The chronic dietary exposure and risk assessments for ipflufenoquin were less than 1% of the cPAD for the general US population and all population subgroups. Estimated occupational post-application exposure in orchards is anticipated to be mainly inhalation. Applicator inhalation margins of exposure (MOE) range from 150,000 to 40 million, meaning a large margin of exposure (safety buffer) for this active ingredient. No dermal point of departure was identified, and dermal exposure is therefore not considered a quantifiable risk.

Environmental Risks: Environmental ecotoxicity data show ipflufenoquin to be practically non-toxic to birds on an acute and subacute basis, based on oral gavage dosing that produced no mortality or sublethal effects. Birds are considered surrogates for terrestrial phase amphibians and reptiles. The rat and mouse studies indicate low toxicity to terrestrial mammals. Insects also demonstrated little toxicity, with the LD50 for honeybees exceeding the highest dose tested of 100 micrograms/bee. Chronic exposure studies indicate an adult oral No Effect level of 11 µg/bee/day and 3.38 µg/bee/day for larvae, based on decreased emergence.

Ipflufenoquin is moderately toxic to both freshwater and estuarine/marine fish and invertebrates on an acute exposure base. A study of Eastern oysters showed it to be practically non-toxic (no shell growth inhibition). It has low toxicity to both vascular and nonvascular plants, with risk quotients

(RQ) less than 0.01, well below the acute RQ value threshold of concern (1.0). No effects were observed for sediment-dwelling test organisms at the highest doses tested.

EPA's endangered species impact assessment determined that No Effect determinations could be made for all listed species that are fish, aquatic invertebrates, aquatic plants, birds, amphibians, reptiles, mammals, and terrestrial invertebrates. In 2022 EPA further concluded that No Effects determinations can also be made for listed terrestrial plant species and any listed species that have an obligate relationship with listed terrestrial plant species, as well as their designated critical habitats.

Chemical Properties/Fate: Ipflufenoquin is soluble in water at neutral pH, has a low vapor pressure, and is not expected to substantially volatilize from soil or water. It does not readily transform or degrade via common pathways. Ipflufenoquin degraded via aqueous photolysis in a laboratory setting (environmental adjusted half-lives ranging from 8.7 to 12.3 days), which is its fastest route of degradation.
It is persistent in soils, with estimated half-lives of 542-3570 days in aerobic soils and 271-573 days in aerobic aquatic environments. EPA notes that if unextracted analytical residues from samples of these systems are actually the parent compound, half-lives could exceed 25,000 and 1500 days, respectively.

Ipflufenoquin is classified as slightly to moderately mobile. The octanol-water partition coefficient indicates that it has potential to bioaccumulate in aquatic food chains. However, the bioconcentration factor study submitted suggests low potential for bioaccumulation in fish.

EPA's Environmental Fate and Effects Division compiled a table comparing ipflufenoquin ecotoxicity data with those of other fungicides currently in use. Overall, it has a lower toxicity profile than many currently registered active ingredients.

Groundwater Protection: Ipflufenoquin 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 Axios 20 SC, EPA Reg. No. 8033-139-70506, containing the new active ingredient ipflufenoquin, 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
Opposed: None
Abstained: None

E. PESTICIDE PROGRAM UPDATES

Rodenticide Review: LaScola provided an update on the rodenticide review. The bid was awarded to ERG (Eastern Research Group). They are currently working on Phase I, which will describe the approach to reviewing available scientific literature/research and identifying stakeholders from whom to solicit input. Once the Phase I report is complete and presented to the Board, ERG would

like a public comment period specific to information sources and stakeholders. The report would be available on the website and the comment period would have a duration of several weeks, with e-mail/mailing addresses provided for the public to send Phase I comments. MDAR would collect comments and send them to ERG. After the Phase II report is complete, LaScola suggested a more general public comment period regarding rodenticides. Berman asked when the Phase I report will be available. LaScola replied likely in April, but with the caveat that this process may require additional Subcommittee meetings in May and June. Berman expressed concern about the compressed timeline necessitated by the funding constraints. Moore asked if the Subcommittee would see the Phase I report prior to public posting; LaScola said it would be presented to the Subcommittee first. Moore asked if this was to remain in the Subcommittee or would be presented to the full Pesticide Board. LaScola replied that it falls more squarely within the charge of the Subcommittee, which also meets more frequently.

Glyphosate Review: Wijnja provided an update on the Glyphosate Individual Review. After the February meeting, Subcommittee members requested a reminder prompt to request any additional information needs for the Glyphosate Individual Review. MDAR received several responses, so staff will now move forward with putting together an information package to share with the Subcommittee. Ample time will be provided for review of the information and then the glyphosate review would be put on one or more future meeting agenda(s) for discussion. Berman noted that the executive summary of ERG's Glyphosate Scientific Review Phase II Report mentioned upcoming EPA Biological Opinion and European Food Safety Authority final assessment documents, which might now be available and could be included. Blanchet screenshared information request recommendations from DPH pertaining to 1) more robust review of several conflicting epidemiological study meta-analyses with respect to cancer, 2) whether certain reproductive studies would meet EPA standards for determining its glyphosate chronic reference dose (cRfD), and 3) whether the current cRfD is sufficiently health protective in light of more recent neurological studies indicating lower NOAELs than on which the current cRfD is based. This DPH information request has also been submitted to MDAR staff.

E. PLANNING UPCOMING SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS

Moore asked for clarification on potential projected meeting needs. LaScola proposed third Tuesday May/June meeting placeholders be added to Subcommittee member schedules. This would preserve availability to address ongoing Subcommittee business, particularly the rodenticide review, throughout the late spring. Berman supported this approach. LaScola asked for flexibility in case more frequent meetings are needed during this period. No members objected.

G. ADJOURN

Motion: To adjourn the March 18, 2025, Subcommittee Meeting.

Moved: R. Berman
Second: M. Blanchet
Discussion: None
In Favor: M. Blanchet, R. Berman, T. LaScola, M. Moore
Opposed: None
Abstained: None