



November 18, 2022

Mary Jane Coombs
Branch Chief, Industrial Strategies Division
California Air Resources Board (CARB)
1001 I St.
Sacramento, CA 95814
maryjane.coombs@arb.ca.gov

Re: Petition for CARB to Regulate the Use of Sulfuryl Fluoride

Dear Ms. Coombs,

On behalf of the Western Plant Health Association (WPH), I am submitting these comments in opposition to the Center for Biological Diversity's petition to eliminate the use of sulfuryl fluoride and asks that CARB deny the petition. WPH represents the interests of pesticide and fertilizer manufacturers, agricultural biotechnology providers, and agricultural retailers in California, Arizona, and Hawaii.

Petitioners have claimed that CARB has an obligation to "phase out" sulfuryl fluoride. WPH opposes this action as CARB is not mandated by law to act on sulfuryl fluoride. We also believe that CARB's intervention is not warranted given the extensive federal and state regulatory framework that already governs the use of sulfuryl fluoride in the state. Sulfuryl fluoride is extensively regulated by US-EPA and the California Department of Pesticide Regulation, whose express missions are to assess and regulate pesticides in order to protect human health and the environment.

The petitioner's claims about sulfuryl fluoride's contributions to climate change are misleading. Sulfuryl fluoride's contribution is negligible compared to other greenhouse gases. When comparing concentrations, carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere are significantly greater with a concentration comparison of carbon dioxide to sulfuryl fluoride of 164 million to one and compared to methane or nitrous oxide - a comparison of 740,000 and 130,000 to one respectively. There are more effective ways to regulate greenhouse gases to meaningfully impact climate change. CARB recently proposed a Draft 2022 Scoping Plan Update which has increased

greenhouse gas reduction goals by an additional 40% reduction by 2030 - without any regulation of sulfuryl fluoride. This demonstrates that CARB has already recognized that sulfuryl fluoride is not a significant contributor to climate change.

Sulfuryl fluoride is an important tool to protect public health, the environment, and economic sustainability in the state. Sulfuryl fluoride use advances the state's affordable housing policies and assists the state in achieving its ambitious climate change goals. It is critical to comply with federal food safety laws and international export requirements to eradicate pests from high-value agricultural commodities, such as fruits and nuts, among other benefits. Without the guarantee that pests have been eliminated from these commodities prior to export, foreign governments will not allow commodities to be imported, which will devastate California's agricultural economy. It is also an important component for farmers to incorporate in their Integrated Pest Management plans. Banning sulfuryl fluoride use in the state will compromise public health, the environment, and our economy.

The claim that there are "viable alternatives" to sulfuryl fluoride fumigation is false. The petitioners themselves acknowledge that more research regarding treatment alternatives is needed. More than 45 years of research has failed to identify new alternatives that are equally as effective as sulfuryl fluoride. With these considerations in mind, WPH asks that CARB deny the petition that would eliminate the use of sulfuryl fluoride in California. Allegations used by the petitioners have already been proven to be false and disregard the benefits and safeguards to public health, the environment, and our economy that the availability of sulfuryl fluoride provides. We thank you for your consideration of our comments. Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Pinel', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Renee Pinel
President/CEO