Notice of Proposed and Final Decisions and Public Reports

Volume 2024-06
February 9, 2024

Department of Pesticide Regulation
Pesticide Registration Branch

NOTICE OF FINAL DECISIONS TO REGISTER PESTICIDE PRODUCTS AND WRITTEN EVALUATION

Pursuant to Title 3, California Code of Regulations section 6255, the Director of the Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR), files this Notice of Final Decisions to Register Pesticide Products with the Secretary of the Resources Agency for posting. This notice must remain posted for a period of 30 days for public inspection. Between the time DPR posts a proposed registration decision for public comment and DPR makes a final decision regarding the product, non-significant changes may be made to the product label (e.g., revising the product name, changing a master label to an end-use marketing label, correcting typographical errors). If the changes are not significant, DPR will not re-notice the product for public review and comment. However, if significant changes are made to the product label that substantially affect DPR's analysis on direct or indirect significant adverse environmental or human health impacts that can reasonably be expected to occur from the proposed decision, DPR will re-notice the product label for public review and comment.

In addition, for any product that is posted proposed to register as a conditional registration, the registrant may address the conditions of registration by providing the appropriate data or modifying the product label (e.g., remove use site, add "not for use in California" to a use site) during the posting period. If the registrant adequately addresses the conditions of registration during the posting period and the resulting change to the product label is not significant such that DPR must re-post the product label for review and public comment, DPR will post the product below, but will no longer have a "conditional" designation by the registration type.

For information about submitting a request for any documents related to this notice, please visit https://www.cdpr.ca.gov/public_r.htm.

To view the public report that was issued when the product was proposed for registration, click on the hyperlinked Tracking Number for the product.

Tracking Number with hyperlink to public report – (EPA Registration Number)
Applicant / Brand Name

292743 - (71711 - 63)
NICHINO AMERICA, INC.
ZEMBU HERBICIDE
USE: HERBICIDE - FOR THE CONTROL OF WEEDS SUCH AS LATE WATERGRASS, RICEFIELD BULRUSH, AND SMALLFLOWER UMBRELLA SEDGE ON WATER-SEEDED RICE
TYPE: SECTION 3 REGISTRATION - CONDITIONAL
ACTIVE INGREDIENT(S):
PYRACLONIL
CAS NUMBER(S): 158353-15-2

Written Evaluation

Pursuant to Title 3, California Code of Regulations section 6254, this notice includes a written evaluation of significant environmental points raised in comments submitted during the review and comment period required by Title 3, California Code of Regulations section 6253. DPR received comments raising human health and/or environmental concerns from Jonathan Evans, Environmental Health Legal Director, and Jess Tyler, Staff Scientist, of the Center for Biological Diversity in response to DPR's November 3, 2023, Notice of Proposed and Final Decisions and Public Reports, Vol. 2023-44; Track ID 292743. A summary of the points raised and DPR's response are provided below.

Comments: The Center for Biological Diversity (CBD) expresses concerns related to the proposed registration of Zembu Herbicide, containing the new active ingredient pyraclonil, for use on water-seeded rice grown only in California. CBD states DPR has not fully complied with the substantive requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and its procedural requirements as a certified functionally equivalent CEQA program under Title 3 California Code of Regulations section 6254. CBD raises concerns that DPR's analysis has not fully disclosed and analyzed potentially significant direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the project and does not accurately inform the public of the potentially significant adverse environmental effects from the proposed use of pyraclonil on water-seeded rice. The commenter raises concerns about pyraclonil's toxicity to aquatic plants, aquatic vertebrates, and aquatic invertebrates as well as its potential to further contaminate the Sacramento and San Joaquin watersheds in California's Central Valley and impact aquatic ecosystems. In addition, CBD states DPR must fully ensure there are binding and enforceable mitigations and alternatives to minimize any significant adverse effect of the activity on the environment. CBD cites 13 studies (addressed in DPR's responses), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (U.S. EPA's) 2023 draft and final ecological risk assessments for pyraclonil, and California Department of Fish and Game's (CDFG's) 2008 "Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area Land Management Plan" to support their comments.

DPR Response: DPR has complied with the substantive requirements under CEQA, and DPR's conclusions are supported by substantial evidence that this product is not expected to result in any significant direct, indirect, or cumulative environmental impacts.

Pesticides must be registered with DPR prior to sale and use in California. As stated in the public report, before a substance is registered as a pesticide for the first time in California, DPR is required to perform a comprehensive review of all required scientific data submitted for pyraclonil and the end-use product, Zembu Herbicide. In reaching a proposed decision to register a pesticide product, DPR evaluates the proposed registration action, all applicable supporting scientific data, and the product label for the project's potential to cause a significant adverse impact on human health and the environment. If DPR's review and evaluation of the proposed pesticide labeling and data supports a conclusion that a significant adverse impact may occur

which cannot be avoided or adequately mitigated, DPR cannot register the product unless the Director makes a written statement of overriding conditions.

DPR's public report in support of its proposed decision issued on November 3, 2023, https://www.cdpr.ca.gov/docs/registration/nod/2023-44.pdf, provides a description of the project (the proposed label), describes DPR's analysis of the required data to support the project, and discusses the required mitigation measures contained on the proposed label to avoid or reduce any significant effects that the project might have on the environment.

Due to the specific irrigation practices associated with rice cultivation and the potential for these practices to create pathways for pesticides to enter surface water, DPR thoroughly evaluates rice pesticides for potential adverse impacts to surface water quality. For Zembu Herbicide, DPR analyzed the required data submitted to support the proposed label. Based on the evaluated data and mitigation measures contained on the proposed label, DPR did not identify any significant adverse effects to the environment from the proposed use of Zembu Herbicide. Therefore, no alternatives or further mitigation measures are necessary to avoid or reduce any significant effects on the environment. As stated in the public report, data indicate pyraclonil has a short half-life in water. Based on the aquatic field dissipation studies submitted for pyraclonil, the aquatic field dissipation half-life of pyraclonil ranges from 1.5-3.1 days (sediment and water systems combined) and, therefore, it is not considered to be persistent in aquatic environments. Since complete degradation of pyraclonil occurs after seven half-lives, pyraclonil will be completely degraded within 10.5-21.7 days following a single application of Zembu Herbicide. This is supported by the California aquatic field dissipation study which finds that pyraclonil concentrations in rice paddy water are undetectable within 2-3 days following application of Zembu Herbicide. The 30-day water holding period and subsequent seven-day slow release period (not more than two inches of water over a drain box weir) required by the label ensures nontarget aquatic organisms outside of treated rice paddies will not be exposed to the fully formulated product or levels of pyraclonil that would result in adverse effects. Therefore, based on DPR's evaluation of the project, there were no significant adverse effects identified to the environment and DPR does not expect this product to further contaminate watersheds or impact aquatic ecosystems. The scope of DPR's decision is on the proposed label, which contains legally enforceable mitigation measures and use requirements to address potential concerns related to the proposed use found on the label. Based on DPR's evaluation of the submitted data and its own analysis of the project, the label contains adequate use restrictions and mitigation measures to conclude there are no identified potentially significant direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts of the project. DPR's responses to CBD's statements about the potential for pyraclonil to contaminate watersheds and its toxicity to aquatic vertebrates and impacts to aquatic ecosystems are discussed in more detail below.

Impacts to Fish Behavior and Reproduction

CBD states DPR did not fully analyze the impacts, including sublethal impacts, of pyraclonil to fish behavior, reproduction, or other aspects of biology that could result in potentially significant impacts. CBD references the aquatic toxicity endpoints used in U.S. EPA's April 2023 Draft Ecological Risk Assessment for pyraclonil. CBD states pyraclonil is a light-dependent

peroxidizing herbicide that makes it more toxic to fish and that DPR has not fully analyzed the impacts to fish from low levels of pyraclonil remaining in the environment. Additionally, the commentor states DPR did not disclose or consider the impacts of the inert ingredients of the formulation and how they factor into chronic toxicity to aquatic organisms. CBD is also concerned about impacts to species protected under the Endangered Species Act, specifically two Chinook salmon species.

DPR Response: As stated in the public report, DPR evaluated acute and chronic risks to fish by assessing toxicity data, environmental fate and transport data, and label use restrictions, and by using a risk model designed with conservative assumptions to provide high-end estimates on aquatic risk. In this case, the toxicity endpoints used in the risk model accounted for lethal, reproduction, and other sublethal effects of pyraclonil. DPR disclosed in the public report that the end-use product is more acutely toxic than the technical grade active ingredient, and therefore, DPR calculated acute risk quotients using toxicity studies with the end-use product. With the 30-day water holding period requirement, the public report states the acute risk quotients do not exceed DPR's level of concern. As a result, the formulated end-use product is not expected to pose acute risks to aquatic organisms, which would account for any endangered or threatened species. Based on U.S. EPA's Endangered Species Act biological evaluation, with these label mitigation measures in place, U.S. EPA predicts that "the use of pyraclonil will not result in unreasonable adverse effects to non-target organisms or present a likelihood of jeopardy to these [two listed Chinook salmon] species." In addition, the label requires users to obtain any applicable Endangered Species Protection Bulletins within six months prior to or on the day of application. Users must follow all directions and restrictions contained in any applicable bulletins for the area of application.

U.S. EPA and DPR agree with CBD that fish may be more sensitive to pyraclonil under enhanced ultraviolet (UV) lighting on a chronic exposure basis. DPR's public report disclosed pyraclonil is a light-dependent peroxidizing herbicide that has enhanced toxicity to fish in the presence of UV light. As a result, the public report states DPR used U.S. EPA's enhanced UV chronic toxicity adjustment when estimating chronic risk. As stated in its 2023 draft ecological risk assessment for pyraclonil, U.S. EPA used an adjusted (lower) no observed effects concentration (NOEC) of 0.6 ppb to model chronic risk. This adjusted NOEC is sufficiently protective because it is the concentration at which no lethal or sublethal effects are anticipated, even under enhanced light conditions.

DPR's evaluation of Zembu Herbicide included a review of the end-use formulation (including composition of inert ingredients). Due to confidential business information requirements, DPR is unable to disclose to the public any inert ingredients in the product formulation. (7 U.S.C. § 136h; Gov. Code § 7924.330.) U.S. EPA approves all inert ingredients for use in pesticide formulations applied to food commodities and exempts them from dietary tolerance requirements. DPR verifies this information, however U.S. EPA has authority over the petition process for an inert ingredient to be approved for tolerance exemption and the process involves the submission and evaluation of physical/chemical properties, toxicity, human/animal metabolism, exposure, environmental fate and effects, and ecotoxicity to ensure the proposed use

of a chemical is considered safe for human health and the environment. Moreover, the adjusted NOEC (0.6 ppb) is three orders of magnitude lower than 100 ppb, the lowest aquatic NOEC derived from formulated product toxicity studies. Therefore, the adjusted NOEC is sufficiently protective of any aquatic risks associated with inert ingredients in the formulation.

The label prohibits users from making more than one application of Zembu Herbicide per year. As stated in the public report, pyraclonil has a rapid aquatic field dissipation half-life. Pyraclonil is expected to fully degrade within 10.5-21.7 days and the label requires a 30-day water holding time and subsequent 7-day slow water release to ensure the degradation of any pyraclonil and inert ingredient concentrations entering aquatic habitats of treated rice paddy water. Therefore, as stated in the public report, DPR expects these factors to adequately mitigate any chronic risks to aquatic organisms exposed to the end-use formulation outside of treated rice paddies. The points raised and the U.S. EPA's draft and final ecological risk assessments of pyraclonil cited in CBD's letter do not change DPR's original evaluation conclusion that the product label adequately mitigates risks to fish outside of treated rice paddies. As a result, DPR does not expect the use of this product to pose an unacceptable acute or chronic risk to surface waters and aquatic organisms, including any endangered or threatened species.

Pollinator Impacts

CBD challenges DPR's statement that pollinators are not attracted to rice fields and would, therefore, not be impacted by pyraclonil in nectar or pollen. CBD states U.S. EPA's risk assessment discloses pyraclonil has the ability to function as a systemic insecticide, which can transport the pesticide throughout the plant, including pollen. CBD cites studies that pollinators have been documented to forage for rice pollen. CBD states DPR must disclose that pyraclonil is harmful to pollinators because it is presumed present in rice pollen and is collected by pollinating insects.

DPR Response: DPR reviewed the studies provided by CBD and still concurs with its original evaluation conclusion that a single application of Zembu Herbicide before or at rice seeding (in accordance with the use directions on the label) is not expected to pose risks to insect pollinators. CBD cites U.S. EPA's 2023 final ecological risk assessment for pyraclonil to support the claim that pyraclonil is systemic. However, this document discloses that U.S. EPA does not have data on whether the compound is transported in plants via phloem and/or xylem tissues. Similarly, CBD did not submit data directly showing that pyraclonil is systemic. Even if it were systemic in nature, Zembu Herbicide is labeled for a single application prior to or at rice seeding. Since Zembu Herbicide is applied at or before seeding, due to its short half-life, pyraclonil would start degrading well before the rice germinates and would not be available for plant uptake. Thus, pyraclonil is unlikely to still be present in plant tissues several months post-application when the rice blooms. Based on the anecdotal nature of the literature provided by CBD, DPR concludes that incidental foraging on rice flowers is not expected to pose a significant risk to insect pollinators.

One study submitted by CBD (Gealy et al. [2003]) states anecdotally that "rice breeders have observed a small increase in outcrossing when honeybees are present," and another study (Pu et

al. [2014]) has empirical evidence of the presence of honey bees and other insect pollinators in rice. However, neither study provides substantial evidence to suggest that rice flowers are highly attractive, provide significant resources, or are a major pesticide exposure pathway to pollinators. While certain species of bees and hoverflies can carry an average of 100 to 400 rice pollen grains on their bodies (Pu et al., 2014), this is a small fraction of the hundreds of thousands of pollen grains that a single insect can collect. Another study (Terrell and Batra [1984]) reports observations of insects collecting pollen from wild rice, however this is not germane to an evaluation of Zembu Herbicide which explicitly prohibits use on wild rice. Wild rice, belonging to the *Zizania* genus, is different from rice listed on this product label (*Oryza sativa*).

DPR reviewed all the citations CBD provided to support its claims that pollinators are exposed to a number of agricultural pesticides (Botías et al., 2017; Pisa et al., 2021), and that pollen is an essential source of protein and nutrients for insect pollinators and is a well-documented route of pesticide exposure (Krupke et al., 2012; Fisher and Moriarty, 2014). While the cited references support these general tenants, the references do not provide information specific to pyraclonil or rice pollen. Therefore, DPR maintains its scientific analysis and findings in the public report that the proposed use of pyraclonil is not expected to result in unmitigated risks to insect pollinators.

Ecosystem Impacts to Aquatic and Terrestrial Plants

CBD claims DPR did not fully analyze the impacts of pyraclonil to aquatic plants and ecosystems, such as Central Valley freshwater ecosystems, downstream of rice fields. Specifically, the commenter states U.S. EPA's analysis shows that even after dilution, the amount of pyraclonil released into the Sacramento River can produce risk quotients that exceed the level of concern for vascular and aquatic plants. As a result, CBD asserts this exposure can destroy aquatic plant communities downstream of rice paddies and "have ripple effects up the food chain." The commenter also expresses concerns that pyraclonil may damage aquatic and terrestrial vegetation in other undisclosed areas not covered by the label mitigation measures requiring users to abide by a 30-day holding period and a seven-day slow release of pyraclonil treated water.

DPR Response: U.S. EPA evaluated risk to aquatic plants using estimated environmental concentrations (EECs) in water released from the rice paddy seven days after the application. However, as the commenter acknowledges, the Zembu Herbicide label requires a 30-day water holding period and a seven-day slow release of pyraclonil-treated rice paddy water (not more than two inches of water over a drain box weir). Because of its short half-life in water, pyraclonil is expected to completely degrade within 10.5-21.7 days prior to release of treated rice paddy water, adequately mitigating risks to non-target aquatic and terrestrial plants outside of treated rice paddies. As stated in the public report, the phytotoxicity data reviewed by DPR to support the registration of this proposed label indicate Zembu Herbicide is not expected to result in significant adverse effects to the evaluated aquatic and terrestrial plants. As a result, DPR does not expect use of this product in accordance with its label directions to pose a significant adverse effect on flora.

Runoff and Flooding

The commenter also expresses concerns about impacts of runoff from treated fields during flood events. CBD cites CDFG's 2008 Yolo Bypass Wildlife Area Land Management Plan and states that due to the engineering of the Sacramento River to mitigate flooding, pyraclonil residues from rice fields could get diverted into areas such as canals that eventually rejoin important waterways for wildlife. In addition, uncontrolled runoff from fields during flood events could overflow surrounding levees and end up on land intended for agriculture or wildlife conservation. CBD also expresses concerns about the release of excess accumulated water in rice paddies from spring storms coinciding with annual flooding of Central Valley rivers.

DPR Response: Courts have held that environmental analysis under CEQA is not required to engage in speculation in order to analyze a "worst case scenario." (See *Napa Citizens for Honest Government v. Napa County Bd. of Supervisors* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 342, 373.) Given the rapid degradation of pyraclonil in aquatic environments and the rarity of spring storms in California capable of flooding rice fields, this scenario is highly unlikely. Most of the rice produced in California is grown within the Sacramento Valley in late April and May (typical rice seeding time and when this product is intended for use), when precipitation is modest and does not align with severe flooding events. According to the National Weather Service data for the Sacramento Area from 2000-2023, the mean precipitation for April and May was 1.30 inches and 0.60 inches, respectively. Based on this historic data, the risk of a flood event causing uncontrolled runoff from rice fields during April or May has a low probability of occurring. In addition, as stated in the public report, the best management practices and restrictions for levee management on the label are expected to serve as additional mitigation measures to protect aquatic habitats from water seepage. Specifically, the label prohibits users from applying pyraclonil to rice fields exhibiting visible water seepage that moves offsite into drains that are considered state waters during the water holding period. Users must also ensure the borders surrounding each rice field be compacted before water is allowed to fill the field. Non-compliance with seepage requirements is considered a water-holding violation and subject to county agricultural commissioner (CAC) enforcement action. Furthermore, the label for Zembu Herbicide also prohibits users from applying the product where runoff is likely to occur. Users are prohibited from applying the product where runoff or irrigation water may flow directly onto agricultural land other than rice fields. California's rice industry works closely with the Central Valley Regional Water Board, DPR, and CACs to meet water quality requirements and identify necessary enforcement actions. In fact, in a September 2022 letter to DPR, the City of Sacramento Department of Utilities Sacramento River Source Water Protection Program acknowledged that due to diligent implementation of mitigation in the form of management practices by California rice growers, the frequency and levels of detection of rice pesticides in surface water have significantly reduced in recent years.

Analysis of Synergistic Effects and Cumulative Impacts

CBD states DPR must ensure the cumulative, additive, and synergistic impacts of pyraclonil are fully analyzed and potentially significant impacts are mitigated. The commenter cites several studies (described below) to support the statement that "pesticide mixtures in the environment

are ubiquitous" and relays specific concerns related to the toxic impacts of pesticide mixtures on water quality, wildlife, and the environment.

DPR Response: CBD cites studies (Belden et al. [2007] and Nowell et al. [2018]) to support the statement that "pesticide mixtures in the environment are ubiquitous." These studies are scientifically sound and show that pesticide mixtures are found in drainage basin sites in Midwestern states overlapping soy/corn-growing regions and in streams in the Corn Belt region. However, neither study included pyraclonil, rice-growing regions, or California watersheds in the research scope. CBD cites studies (Covert et al. [2020], Kepner [2004], and Laetz et al. [2009]) to support the comment that pesticide mixtures are in waterways and present increased toxicity to aquatic life, including salmon species. The study by Covert et al. (2020) does not fully support CBD's comment as the study found that pesticide mixtures did not consistently pose higher toxicity to aquatic animals, and those that did were driven primarily by a single pesticide. The study by Laetz et al. (2009) provides an example of additive and synergistic toxicity to salmon specifically from organophosphate and carbamate pesticides but does not support a general statement about the toxic effects of all pesticide mixtures. Kepner (2004) is not a peer-reviewed article or scientific study and does not support CBD's comment. CBD cites Luo and Zhang (2010) to support their comment "in 2007 alone, about 60 million kg of pesticide active ingredient were applied to farmland in the Central Valley and pesticides are among the reasons why the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers are designated as impaired waterways under the Clean Water Act." Although Luo and Zhang (2010) describe the same facts in their introduction, their study presents a method to model pesticide transport and is not relevant to CBD's primary comment regarding analysis of cumulative impacts of pyraclonil. In sum, none of CBD's comments or references provide evidence of potential synergistic or cumulative impacts of pyraclonil in aquatic environments.

In addition, as stated in U.S. EPA's August 2023 Response to Public Comments on EPA's Registration of the New Active Ingredient, Pyraclonil, "EPA requested that the applicants submit toxicity data for patent claims on mixtures that were provided to the U.S. USPTO [U.S. Patent and Trademark Office]…. In response to EPA's request, the applicant searched U.S. patents to identify any claims of synergy, or greater than additive (GTA) effects, with other currently registered pesticides and submitted these data to EPA. EPA's review of these patents did not identify any that met the established criteria described in EPA's approaches for GTA review. Therefore, EPA does not have evidence to support concerns about environmental effects relating to GTA effects of pesticides coapplied with pyraclonil at this time."

Before DPR will register a pesticide, DPR conducts a thorough scientific evaluation of the pesticide, including reviewing the toxicology and other scientific studies, to evaluate whether use of the pesticide may cause a significant adverse effect to human health or the environment when used according to the product label and other applicable statutes and regulations. This evaluation includes assessing any reasonably foreseeable cumulative impacts and reasonable alternatives to registering the pesticide product that would reduce any significant environmental impact. Pyraclonil is not persistent in aquatic environments and the 30-day water holding period and the additional seven-day slow water release requirements on the label ensure that pyraclonil will be

completely degraded prior to release of treated rice paddy water. These factors limit pyraclonil from entering aquatic areas outside of treated rice paddies and prevent cumulative, additive, and synergistic impacts with other pesticide compounds. As a result, DPR concludes the cumulative impacts and risks to wildlife and nontarget plants from Zembu Herbicide are sufficiently mitigated.

As stated in the public report, after a pesticide is registered, DPR continues to monitor the pesticide to assess whether its use is having any unforeseen adverse environmental or human health impact. Based on DPR's evaluation of the pesticide and submitted data, DPR maintains its conclusion that there are no direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts which would result from use of Zembu Herbicide as outlined on the proposed label. However, through DPR's program of continuous evaluation, DPR is able to address any effects on human health and the environment that were unforeseen at the time of initial registration and adopt appropriate measures to address these effects, up to and including cancellation of the pesticide registration. DPR continuously evaluates pesticides in several different ways. First, pesticide registrants are required to immediately self-report to DPR any additional information on an adverse effect or risk of the pesticide to human health or the environment. This reporting requirement provides an after the fact check on registration decisions. DPR also monitors air quality, surface water, and ground water for evidence that pesticide use may be having an unanticipated adverse environmental impact. If, at any time, DPR finds through its continuous evaluation that a significant adverse environmental impact has occurred or is likely to occur, DPR will reevaluate the pesticide and determine whether additional mitigation measures are necessary, including to address potential significant cumulative impacts.

DPR Conclusion: Overall, after thoroughly evaluating CBD's comments and citations, DPR finds the submitted information does not change the conclusions of DPR's previous scientific evaluations and public report that use of this product is not expected to pose an unacceptable risk to aquatic organisms or surface waters. As stated in the public report, after evaluating the project and scientific data supporting this registration action, DPR has not identified direct or indirect significant adverse environmental impacts from the use of this pesticide product in a manner consistent with its label and any applicable use restrictions in regulation. Pyraclonil is not persistent in aquatic environments and the 30-day water holding period and the additional seven-day slow water release requirements on the label ensure that pyraclonil will be completely degraded prior to release of treated rice paddy water. These factors limit pyraclonil from entering aquatic areas outside of treated rice paddies and prevent impacts to nontarget aquatic organisms as well as cumulative, additive, and synergistic impacts with other pesticide compounds. Based on DPR's extensive analysis, DPR has determined that the acceptance of this proposed pesticide product containing a new active ingredient is not expected to have any significant adverse effect that can reasonably be expected to occur, directly or indirectly, to the environment. Furthermore, cumulative impacts are sufficiently mitigated. Therefore, DPR is proceeding with the decision to accept the proposed label submitted by Nichino America, Inc. for its product, Zembu Herbicide, EPA Reg. No. 71711-63, containing the new active ingredient, pyraclonil.

Original signed by _____ *02/08/2024*

Tulio Macedo, Chief
Pesticide Registration Branch

Dated

NOTICE OF FINAL DECISIONS TO DENY PESTICIDE PRODUCTS

Pursuant to Title 3, California Code of Regulations section 6255, the Director of the Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) files this Notice of Final Decisions to Deny Pesticide Products with the Secretary of the Resources Agency for posting. Unless specified, the reason for denial is that the required data was not submitted, was determined to be inadequate, or there was a likelihood of a significant adverse environmental effect anticipated from the use of these products in a manner consistent with its label. This action will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment. This notice must remain posted for a period of 30 days for public inspection. For information about submitting a request for any documents related to this notice, please visit https://www.cdpr.ca.gov/public_r.htm.

Tracking Number – (EPA Registration Number)
Applicant
Brand Name

None to report.

Original signed by
Tulio Macedo, Chief
Pesticide Registration Branch

02/08/2024
Dated