



1/10/2010

*Utilizing Reduced Risk Pesticides and IPM Strategies to
Mitigate Golfer Exposure and Hazard*

**Massachusetts Pesticide Analysis Laboratory, Department of Veterinary &
Animal Science, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA 01003**

Dr. J. Marshall Clark (Principal Investigator),
Jeffery Doherty, Ph.D. Candidate

Third Year Progress Report

January 2009 - December 2009

Funding/Support

USGA- Green Section
New England Regional Turfgrass Foundation
USDA-NE-187

RESEARCH SUMMARY

This ongoing study seeks best management practices for reduced golfer exposure to “**reduced risk**” turfgrass pesticides. We have previously evaluated exposure in over 150 rounds of golf following the application of standard turfgrass insecticides (chlorpyrifos, cyfluthrin, carbaryl, imidacloprid), herbicides (2,4-D, mecoprop-p, dicamba) and a fungicide (chlorothalonil). Exposure estimates made using biomonitoring and dosimetry data are significantly less (up to 15-fold) than estimates made using volatile and dislodgeable foliar residues. This type of information is absolutely critical to reduce individual contributions of pesticides to the USEPA/FQPA “Risk Cup” evaluation of agrochemicals, including turfgrass pesticides. While many standard pesticides have been removed from use, new “reduced risk” pesticides are being added to the IPM practitioner’s toolbox. To date, there is no similar data on “reduced risk” pesticides, which elicit low mammalian and environmental toxicity, low potential for groundwater contamination, low pest resistance potential, and are compatible with IPM, due to their novel physical and chemical properties. In the first growing season (Summer 2007) we evaluated pesticide exposure following two applications of carfentrazone-ethyl. Last season (Summer 2008) we evaluated exposure following three applications of azoxystrobin. This season (Summer 2009) we evaluated exposure following two applications of halofenozide.

Accurate assessment of golfer exposure to pesticides requires knowledge of the availability of pesticide residues following application, transfer and absorption kinetics of these residues, and major routes of entry into the body. Determination of the actual transfer of available environmental residues (dislodgeable foliar residues, DFRs) to golfers during a round of golf and the subsequent penetration of the transferred residues was achieved by measuring the exposure of volunteers using dosimetry (pesticide residues on full body cotton suits and personal air samplers) and biomonitoring (measuring urinary metabolites), respectively.

Dosimetry and biomonitoring, together with concurrently collected dislodgeable and volatile residue data, provides a unique and complete database on golfer exposure and has allowed us to develop two *golfer exposure models*. Using the total pesticide dose derived from dosimetry or biomonitoring data, these models accurately predict golfer exposure based solely on DFRs. With this information, a simple wipe sample from the turfgrass surface is sufficient to realistically predict exposure in most situations.

The central predictor of exposure in our model is the transfer factor (TF), which is the ratio between the amounts collected on the dosimeter suits versus environmental residues (DFR). By combining information determined for halofenozide (with post-application irrigation) along with our previous research on chlorpyrifos, cyfluthrin, carbaryl, imidacloprid (with post-application irrigation), 2,4-D, mecoprop-p, cyfluthrin, chlorothalonil, carfentrazone-ethyl and azoxystrobin (without post-application irrigation), we will validate our golfer exposure model and amend it for use with pesticides that vary widely in their physical and chemical properties. Regulators and health professionals now consider biomonitoring data the “gold standard” for measuring pesticide exposure, and we have validated our TF model using this approach for carfentrazone-ethyl. New data generated will be completely novel and will establish the potential benefits to golf of using “reduced risk” pesticide approaches.

With our empirically derived TF model, pesticide dose can be predicted using environmental residues (airborne and DFR). This pesticide dose can then be used to calculate a Hazard Quotient (HQ) using the US EPA’s established reference dose (RfD). HQs less than or equal to one indicate that exposure resulted in a pesticide dose at which adverse effects are

unlikely, even if that dose is received every day over an individual's lifetime. A HQ greater than 1.0 does not necessarily infer the exposure will cause adverse effects, but rather that the absence of adverse effects is less certain.

Last season (2009) we evaluated exposure in 16 rounds of golf following the application halofenozide with post-application irrigation. Analysis of these dosimetry samples is in progress.

Experimentally-derived TFs from our previous research range from a low of 570 (2,4-D) to a high of 6300 cm²/hr (chlorpyrifos). Using our established experimental design based on concurrently collected dosimetry, biomonitoring and environmental samples we have calculated a preliminary transfer factor of **1600** for azoxystrobin and a preliminary dermal absorbed dose of **0.70** µg/kg, resulting in a dermal HQ of **0.0039**. It is important to note that this is the dermal HQ only, and that the air samplers need to be analyzed to determine the inhalation HQ. These results validate our original assumption that the use of reduced risk pesticides will result in lower HQs.

To date, HQs determined for azoxystrobin as well as the previously studied pesticides chlorpyrifos, carbaryl, and cyfluthrin with post-application irrigation, and 2,4-D, MCP, cyfluthrin, carfentrazone-ethyl, and chlorothalonil without post-application irrigation have all been below 1.0, indicating safe exposure levels.

By choosing "reduced risk" pesticides with novel physical and chemical properties, our models will be expanded to provide golf course managers and regulators a range of exposure factors to accurately predict exposure (dose) following a variety of application scenarios. It is imperative to test "reduced risk" pesticides in IPM programs to document their impacts. First, our data will establish the benefits (e.g., protection of the health of workers, golfers, and wildlife, decreased potential for resistance, etc) of reduced risk materials. Second, EPA offers an expedited registration review for these compounds. Third, there is a critical need for this type of regulatory information, and our accurate estimates of exposure will allow appropriate risk assessments to be made for the vast majority of commercial pesticides for which there is no suitable urinary metabolite (i.e., not amenable to biomonitoring studies). Lastly, we have established that estimates of golfer exposure are significantly lower when dose is determined directly (biomonitoring) and indirectly (dosimetry) compared to previous estimates made using volatile and dislodgeable foliar residues. Hazard assessment of "reduced risk" pesticides should result in even lower HQs as evidenced by carfentrazone-ethyl.

I: OBJECTIVES:

Objective 1: Determination of the level and hazard of volatile and foliar dislodgeable residues of the reduced risk pesticides, halofenozide, carfentrazone-ethyl and azoxystrobin, following full course-full rate applications.

Objective 2: Effect of partial course application strategies (e.g., tees and greens) and post-application irrigation on volatile and foliar dislodgeable pesticide residues following full-rate applications of halofenozide, carfentrazone-ethyl and azoxystrobin.

Objective 3: Concurrent determination of dosimetry and urinary biological monitoring of researchers simulating an 18-hole round of golf following application of halofenozide, carfentrazone-ethyl and azoxystrobin to turfgrass. **NOTE:** This aspect of the proposal will be funded and carried out under separate agreements with the New England Regional Turfgrass Foundation.

Objective 4: Model the relationship between volatile and dislodgeable foliar residues vs. actual golfer exposure using urinary biological monitoring techniques (*Biomonitoring Exposure Model*) or, for pesticides that are not amenable to biomonitoring, using dosimetry techniques (*Dosimetry Exposure Model*) for a wide range of pesticides and application scenarios.

II: WORK COMPLETED:

We are continuing to determine dislodgeable foliar residues (DFRs) with the EPA recommended *California Roller* method. The use of this validated method consistently results in approximately 50% less pesticide residues available for transfer to golfers than the previous cheesecloth wipe method, reducing total exposure estimates.

Two separate applications of halofenozide without post-application irrigation have been completed (2009). Two groups of research subjects played a simulated round of golf (4 hrs) following each application. A dosimetry group (n=4) wore cotton overalls, gloves, a veil, and personal air samplers containing XAD-2 resin. A biomonitoring group (n=4) collected urine over a three day (24 hrs) period post-exposure. Samples representing a total of 16 rounds of golf were collected. We have collected 166 samples, the analysis of which is in progress (Table 1).

Table 1. Samples collected and analyzed over the course of the project.

Pesticide	2007		2008		2009	
	collected	analyzed	collected	analyzed	collected	analyzed
Carfentrazone-ethyl						
DFR	30	30				
Dosimeters	112	112				
Airborne	8	0				
Urine	16	0				
Azoxystrobin						
DFR			45	45		
Dosimeters			144	144		
Airborne			12	0		
Urine			48	0		
Halofenozide						
DFR					30	0
Dosimeters					96	0
Airborne					8	0
Urine					32	0

Environmental Residues: This season (2009), 30 California roller samples were collected following application of halofenozide. Analysis of these samples is in progress.

Whole Body Dosimeters (passive dosimetry): One set of golfers (dosimetry group) wore overalls that consisted of a single layer of white, 100% cotton and cotton gloves. This cotton clothing served as a passive collection medium for DFR from treated turfgrass. Overalls were removed at the end of the golf round and sectioned as follows for analysis: lower arms, upper

arms, torso, lower legs, and upper legs/waist (1-4). Additional dosimetry samples include a veil and upper socks. Another set of golfers (biomonitoring group) wore partial dosimeters consisting of upper arms, torso, and upper legs/waist.

This season (2009), 8 full and 8 partial dosimetry suits were collected following halofenozide application for a total of 96 samples. Analysis of these samples is in progress.

Personal Air Samplers (active dosimetry): Inhalation exposure was measured using personal air sampling pumps containing XAD-2 resin (NIOSH 5602) calibrated to a flow of 1.0 liter of air per minute with special air sampling tubes attached to volunteers' collars of the dosimetry group (5-7). Particles are retained on a glass microfiber and pesticide vapors are absorbed on a two-section sorbent contained within the sampling tubes. Total air concentration is estimated by summing the amount of pesticide collected in the tube divided by the amount of air sampled.

To estimate the total amount of pesticide inhaled during the exposure period, the air concentration will be multiplied by an inhalation rate for light workloads (21 liters/min) and the time over which the exposure occurred (4 hrs).

This season (2009), 8 personal air samplers were collected and will be analyzed for halofenozide in the following manner. Subsequent to sampling, the front sorbent section and the glass microfiber will be combined into an 8 ml vial and the rear sorbent bed into another. Pesticide residues are desorbed for 1 hr with 2.0 ml acetonitrile. Samples will be analyzed by LC/MS.

Urine Samples: To estimate the total absorbed dose following halofenozide exposure, urinary biomonitoring will be conducted for the parent compound, halofenozide. Urine samples were collected 24 hrs before exposure, and then collected for three 24 hr periods following exposure (the estimated time to excrete ½ of the total dose of halofenozide) (8).

This season (2009), 8 urine samples were collected and method development for the above compound is in progress.

III: RESEARCH FINDINGS

Golfer Exposure Models

Multipathway exposures will be evaluated by comparing pesticide residues on dosimetry media and/or 24 hr post-exposure urine (biomonitoring group) to volatile and dislodgeable foliar residues (DFR). The direct and simultaneous determination of dosimetry and biomonitoring data provides a novel and complete database on how much pesticide is transferred from the treated turf to the golfer during the play of a round of golf, and subsequently how much pesticide is actually absorbed. This exposure data, together with dislodgeable and volatile residue data, has allowed us to develop a new golfer exposure model. Using the total pesticide dose derived from dosimetry and/or biomonitoring data, these models can be used to accurately predict golfer exposure based solely on dislodgeable foliar residues (DFR). The transfer factor (TF, Equation 1) is derived from a comparison of the residues determined from the whole body dosimeters with the DFRs. With this information, a simple California Roller wipe sample from the turfgrass surface is sufficient to realistically predict exposure in most situations (Equation. 2).

A) Dermal Hazard Quotient

EQUATION 1:

$$TF(\text{cm}^2/\text{hr}) = \mu\text{g on dosimeter}/\text{DFR}(\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2)/4 \text{ hrs}$$

EQUATION 2:

Dermal Pesticide Dose ($\mu\text{g}/\text{Kg}$ body weight/d) =
DFR ($\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2$) x TF (cm^2/hr) x dermal penetration x 4hr /body weight (70kg)
Where TF = transfer factor and DFR = dislodgeable foliar residues

The DFR, transfer factor and dermal penetration factor are used subsequently to calculate a dermal hazard quotient using the EPA RfD.

EQUATION 3:

DHQ = Dermal Dose ($\mu\text{g}/\text{Kg}$ body weight/d) /EPA RfD ($\mu\text{g}/\text{Kg}$ body weight/d)

Transfer Factors

A transfer factors has now been calculated for carfentrazone-ethyl and azoxystrobin (Table 2)

Table 2. Summary of golfer transfer factors

Pesticide	Transfer Factor (cm^2/hr)
Carfentrazone-ethyl	1800
Azoxystrobin	1600

A dermal hazard quotient has been calculated for carfentrazone-ethyl and azoxystrobin(Table 3).

Table 3: Dermal hazard quotients (DHQ) calculated for carfentrazone-ethyl from DFR and dosimetry.

Pesticide	DFR ($\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2$)	TF(cm^2/hr)	Dermal Penetration	Dermal Dose ($\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}$)	RfD ($\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}/\text{day}$)	HQ
Carfentrazone-ethyl	0.00039	1800	10%	0.004	5000	0.0000008
azoxystrobin	0.126	1600	6.1%	0.70	180	0.0039

Hazard quotients less than or equal to one indicate that exposure resulted in a pesticide dose at which adverse effects are unlikely. A HQ greater than 1.0 does not necessarily infer the exposure will cause adverse effects, but rather that the absence of adverse effects is less certain.

DFR = Dislodgeable Foliar Residues, TF = Transfer Factor from the turf to the dosimeter. RfD = EPA Reference Dose. HQ = Hazard Quotient. carfentrazone-ethyl, mean of two applications, azoxystrobin, mean of three applications

The DHQ for carfentrazone-ethyl is 0.0000008, and that of azoxystrovbin is **0.0039** indicating that the occurrence of adverse effects are unlikely, as determined by the US EPA HQ criteria. These hazard quotient will be combined with that generated from the airborne residue data in the following manner:

B) Inhalation Hazard Quotient

The inhalation dose is calculated by determining pesticide residues collected by a personal air sampler following four hours of simulated golf. Airborne concentrations are calculated by totaling the amount of pesticide collected in the tube divided by the amount of air sampled (2 L/min). To estimate the total inhalation exposure over the four hour exposure (240 min), airborne concentrations ($\mu\text{g/L}$) are multiplied by an inhalation rate for light workloads (21 L/min).

EQUATION 4:

$$\text{Airborne dose } (\mu\text{g}/240 \text{ min}) = \text{collected residues } (\mu\text{g}/240 \text{ min}) \times \frac{21\text{L}/\text{min}/240 \text{ min}}{2\text{L}/\text{min}/240 \text{ min}}$$

EQUATION 5:

$$\text{Inhalation Dose } (\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}) = \text{airborne dose } (\mu\text{g}) \times 100 \% \text{ penetration} / 70 \text{ Kg}$$

EQUATION 6:

$$\text{IHQ} = \text{inhalation dose } (\mu\text{g}/\text{Kg body weight}) / \text{reference dose } (\mu\text{g}/\text{Kg body weight}/\text{d})$$

C) Combined Hazard Quotients

Finally, total dose is calculated by combining the dermal dose ($\mu\text{g}/\text{Kg}$) with the inhalation dose ($\mu\text{g}/\text{Kg}$) for use in the calculation of an overall hazard quotient.

EQUATION 7:

$$\text{Total Dose} = \text{DFR } (\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2) \times \text{TF } (\text{cm}^2/\text{hr}) \times \text{dermal penetration} \times 4\text{hr} + \text{inhaled dose}/\text{body weight } (70\text{kg})$$

OR

EQUATION 8:

$$\text{Total Dose} = \text{dermal dose } (\mu\text{g}/\text{Kg}) + \text{inhalation dose } (\mu\text{g}/\text{Kg})$$

EQUATION 9:

$$\text{Combined HQ} = \text{DHQ} + \text{IHQ}$$

OR

EQUATION 10:

$$\text{Combined HQ} = \text{total dose}/\text{RfD}$$

This transformation provides a method for directly and realistically evaluating exposure levels of golfers in order to *establish safe reentry intervals without involvement of human subjects*. Our experimentally derived exposure ratios (transfer factor and penetration factors) are consistently 2 to 15-fold less than previous estimates using volatile and dislodgeable foliar residue data.

IV. FUTURE RESEARCH PLANS:

1) Expected completion dates for remaining analyses:

azoxystrobin air samplers:	2/27/10
azoxystrobin urine:	3/15/10
halofenozide dosimeters	4/30/10
halofenozide air samplers:	5/30/10
halofenozide urine:	7/30/10

2). Complete final application and analysis of halofenozide - 2010.

V. PUBLICATIONS

Putnam, R.A., Doherty, J.J., and Clark, J.M. 2008. **Golfer Exposure to Chlorpyrifos and Carbaryl Following Application to Turfgrass**. J. Agric. Food Chem. 56 (15), 6616–6622

Putnam, R.A. 2006. **Golfer Exposure to Turfgrass Pesticides**. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA, pg. 1-83.

Putnam, R. A. and Clark, J. M. **Dosimetry and Biomonitoring Following Golfer Exposure to Chlorpyrifos**. ACS Symposium Series 951. Chapter 11 (pg 159-174)

Clark, J.M., Putnam, R.A. and Doherty, J.J. 2007. **Managing Pesticide Exposure From Treated Turf**. University of Massachusetts Turf Research Field Day. UMass Extension. 165-167.

REFERENCES

1. Dow AgroScience Agricultural Re-Entry Task Force Field Re-entry Protocol. Determination of Dermal and Inhalation Exposure to Reentry Workers. 2000.

2. Dow AgroScience Agricultural Re-Entry Task Force Standard Operating Procedure ARTF-8D/1: Whole Body Sampling – Outer Dosimeters. Dow AgroSciences, Global Environmental Chemistry Laboratory, Indianapolis IN. 2000. pp 1-4.
3. Dow AgroScience Agricultural Re-Entry Task Force Standard Operating Procedure ARTF-8B/2: Hand Wash Samples. Dow AgroSciences, Global Environmental Chemistry Laboratory-Indianapolis Lab. 2000. pp 1-3.
4. Dow AgroScience Agricultural Re-Entry Task Force Standard Operating Procedure ARTF-8C/2: Dermal Face and Neck Wipe Samples. Dow AgroSciences, Global Environmental Chemistry Laboratory- Indianapolis Lab. 2000. pp 1-2.
5. Dow AgroScience Agricultural Re-Entry Task Force Standard Operating Procedure ARTF-8A/2: Collection of Air Samples Using OVS Tubes. Dow AgroSciences, Global Environmental Chemistry Laboratory- Indianapolis Lab. 2000. pp 1-3.
6. Gardner, M. et al. 2005. Quantification of 2,4-D on Solid-Phase Exposure Sampling Media by LC-MS-MS J Anal Tox. 29 (3) 188-192.
7. Saunders, D.G., Powers, F.L., and Lardie, T.S. Validation of Methods for Determination of Chlorpyrifos in Inhalation Dosimeters, Dermal Dosimeters, and Hand Wash Solutions from User Exposure Studies with a Sprayable Ready-To-Use Product. Dow AgroSciences, Global Environmental Chemistry Laboratory- Indianapolis Lab. 1998. 1- 56.
8. Federal Register. <http://www.epa.gov/EPA-PEST/1998/August/Day-19/p21747.htm>