

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

PESTICIDE PROGRAM DIALOGUE COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, June 1, 2023

11:00 a.m.

DAY 2

1 PESTICIDE PROGRAM DIALOGUE COMMITTEE ROSTER

2 May 2023

3 NAME

AFFILIATION

4 User/Grower Groups/ Farmer Representatives

5 Amy Asmus

Weed Science Society of
6 America

7 Jim Fredericks

National Pest Management
8 Association

9 Mark Johnson

Golf Course Superintendents
10 Association of America

11 Patrick Johnson

National Cotton Council

12 Dominic LaJoie

National Potato Council

13 Lauren Lurkins

Illinois Farm Bureau

14 Tim Lust

National Sorghum Producers

15 Bob Mann

National Association of
16 Landscape Professionals

17 Gary Prescher

National Corn Growers
18 Association

19 Caleb Ragland

National Soybean Association

20 Damon Reabe

National Agricultural
21 Aviation Association

22 John Wise

IR-4 Project

23

24

25

1	NAME	AFFILIATION
2	Environmental/ Public Interest/ Animal Welfare Groups	
3	Nathan Donley	Center for Biological
4		Diversity
5	Jessica Ponder	Physicians Committee for
6		Responsible Medicine
7	David Shaw	Mississippi State University
8	Alexis Temkin	Environmental Working Group
9		Alternatives to Pesticides
10		
11	Farmworker Representatives	
12	Becca Berkey	Community-Engaged Teaching
13		and Research Program
14		Northeastern University
15	Lauren Dana	Legal Aid Chicago
16	Mayra Reiter	Farmworker Justice
17	Mily Treviño-Sauceda	Alianza Nacional de
18		Campesinas, Inc.
19		
20	Public Health Representatives	
21	Joseph Grzywacz	Department of Family and
22		Child Sciences Florida State
23		University
24	Aaron Lloyd	Lee County Mosquito Control
25		District

1	NAME	AFFILIATION
2	Marc Lame	Indiana University's O'Neill
3		School of Public and
4		Environmental Affairs
5		
6	Chemical and Biopesticides Industry/Trade	
7	Associations	
8	Manojit Basu	CropLife America
9	Steven Bennett	Household and Commercial
10		Products Association
11	Lisa Dreilinger	Reckitt Benckiser
12	Keith Jones	Biological Products Industry
13		Alliance
14	Karen Reardon	RISE, Responsible Industry
15		for a Sound Environment
16	Charlotte Sanson	ADAMA
17	Anastasia Swearingen	American Chemistry Council
18		
19	State/Local/Tribal Government	
20	Jasmine Brown	Tribal Pesticide Program
21		Council
22	Dawn Gouge	Arizona Experiment Station
23		University of Arizona
24		
25		

1	NAME	AFFILIATION
2	Megan Patterson	Maine Department of
3		Agriculture, Conservation
4		and Forestry
5	Dave Tamayo	County of Sacramento
6		Department of Water
7		Resources
8	Wendy Sue Wheeler	Pesticide Resources and
9		Education Program,
10		Washington State University
11		
12	Federal Agencies	
13	Walter Alarcon	National Institute for
14		Occupational Safety and
15		Health Centers for Disease
16		Control and Prevention
17	Cameron Douglass	Office of Pest Management
18		Policy, US Department of
19		Agriculture
20	Charlotte Liang	Division of Plant Products
21		and Beverages, US Food and
22		Drug Administration
23	Ed Messina (Chair)	Office of Pesticide Programs
24		Environmental Protection
25		Agency

1	NAME	AFFILIATION
2	Cathy Tortorici	Endangered Species Act
3		Interagency Cooperation
4		Division
5		National Oceanic and
6		Atmospheric Agency

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 DAY TWO - JUNE 1, 2023

3 ED MESSINA: Welcome, everyone. We're
4 going let folks join, and we'll get started in a --
5 momentarily.

6 (Pause.)

7 ED MESSINA: Welcome, everyone. If you're
8 joining, we're just giving time for folks to enter
9 the session.

10 (Pause.)

11 ED MESSINA: How are we doing on folks
12 joining? Are we at a good spot?

13 DANNY GIDDINGS: You can go ahead.

14 HOUSEKEEPING

15 ED MESSINA: All right. Welcome,
16 everyone, to Day 2. Thanks for joining today.
17 We've got a packed agenda. I'm going to quickly
18 kick it over to Danny for our logistics, and then
19 we're going to get into our session. So thanks for
20 attending.

21 Danny?

22 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Ed. Welcome
23 back to Day 2, everyone, of the Spring PPDC meeting.
24 If you're just joining us, my name is Danny
25 Giddings. I'm your moderator. I'm joined, as you

1 just heard, by Ed Messina, Director of the Office of
2 Pesticide Programs and Chair of the PPDC.

3 A few housekeeping notes at the top.

4 First, I want to draw your attention to the
5 translation button down at the bottom of your Zoom
6 screen. That is to -- you need to choose a language
7 by pressing that button, whether or not you're going
8 to be using English or Spanish. We're providing
9 Spanish interpretation. We anticipate a bilingual
10 meeting, but regardless of whether you're going to
11 use Spanish [connection issue] choose a channel.

12 If you are in the English channel, you
13 need to make sure that the box next to -- the box
14 that says, mute original audio, is unchecked,
15 because you will be hearing -- if you are in the
16 English channel, that's only for the English
17 Channel. You want to be hearing the original
18 audio.

19 For Spanish speakers, you should leave
20 that box checked. Otherwise, you're going to get a
21 soft English feed under your Spanish feed.

22 So I'm now going to turn it over to our
23 interpreter, Jacqueline, who will give those
24 instructions in Spanish.

25 Jacqueline?

1 (Spanish translation.)

2 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Jacqueline.

3 EPA is also providing American Sign
4 Language and live CART transcriptions today. You
5 will access that service by, again, pressing --
6 well, the ASL service anyway, by, again, pressing
7 the translation button at the bottom of your screen
8 and selecting the ASL option.

9 If you're having any issues connecting to
10 Zoom or navigating the Zoom platform, you can email
11 Michelle Arling at Arling.Michelle@EPA.gov.
12 That's A-R-L-I-N-G.M-I-C-H-E-L-L-E@EPA.gov, or call
13 Michelle at (202) 566-1260.

14 ZOOM SUPPORT: Danny, this is -- Danny, my
15 apologies. This is Troy Meese with Zoom Technical
16 Support.

17 We've had a couple of instances where your
18 voice is going -- volume is going up and down and
19 it's making it difficult for our translators. If
20 you can address that --

21 DANNY GIDDINGS: Yeah. I just addressed
22 it on my end. Hopefully, this is better. Sorry.
23 My gallery mics in this conference room were muted.
24 So, hopefully, people are hearing me better. And
25 let me clear any obstructions to the mics on the

1 table.

2 ZOOM SUPPORT: Thank you.

3 DANNY GIDDINGS: And this is a great
4 reminder that we have multiple live translations
5 being provided, as well as a recording for the
6 purpose of having transcripts produced. For that
7 reason, we need to -- if you have any kind of
8 speaking role today, it is important to speak
9 slowly, loudly, and clearly, so that all who want to
10 can participate fully in this meeting.

11 I'll remind all PPDC and workgroup members
12 that you are panelists in today's Zoom webinar,
13 which means that you have the ability to mute and
14 unmute yourselves and turn your webcam on and off.
15 Please remain on mute with your webcam off until you
16 have raised your hand and been recognized to speak.

17 Members of the public are on listen-only
18 mode for the duration of today's meeting, but can
19 request to provide public comment at the end of
20 today's meeting by, again, emailing Michelle Arling
21 or by raising their hand in Zoom.

22 We do have a change in the agenda.
23 Everyone should have received an updated agenda from
24 Michelle this morning, but I do want to just go over
25 that change right now.

1 The Emerging Pathogens Implementation
2 Committee Update, which was in the original agenda
3 before lunch, has now moved after lunch to 1:20 to
4 2:15, and the Formation of Pesticide Label Reform
5 Workgroup, which was after lunch, has now moved
6 before lunch from 11:40 to 12:15.

7 We've also heard overnight that some
8 people who registered for the meeting through
9 EventBrite did not get emails with information on
10 how to join the meeting. Sincere apologies from
11 everyone here at EPA, and we are looking into how to
12 avoid this issue in the future.

13 So with that, I think we can launch into
14 our first workgroup update, which is this morning
15 from the Pesticide Resistance Management Group.
16 This is, I think, two-point -- Pesticide Resistance
17 Management Workgroup 2.0. And for that, we are
18 going to hear from Nikhil Mallampalli from the
19 Biological and Economic Work -- sorry, Economic
20 Analysis Division in OPP, and Cameron Douglass from
21 USDA and the Office of Pest Management Policy.

22 Welcome, you two.

23 PESTICIDE RESISTANCE MANAGEMENT #2 WORKGROUP UPDATE

24 NIKHIL MALLAMPALLI: Thank you. I hope
25 you can hear me okay.

1 My name is Nikhil Mallampalli. I'm an
2 entomologist by training. A little bit about me,
3 I've been in the Biological Economic Analysis
4 Division for many years, worked in all kinds of
5 registration and registration review actions and
6 resistance management matters have been a big part
7 of that work sometimes. I've also worked closely
8 with the former chairs of the first workgroup, Bill
9 Chism and Alan Reynolds, on resistance management
10 issues. And I'll --

11 DANNY GIDDINGS: Nikhil?

12 NIKHIL MALLAMPALLI: Yes?

13 DANNY GIDDINGS: Can I stop you just for a
14 moment? It sounds like there's rolling or a
15 mechanical sound coming through on your mic, just to
16 be aware of it. I can still understand you, but for
17 our viewers, I just want to see if we can address
18 that up-front. If not, then we can go. But I
19 wanted to see if there's anything on your end that
20 you can do.

21 NIKHIL MALLAMPALLI: Okay, I'm not sure
22 what I can do. It might be the fan on my laptop.

23 ELTON: Danny, it could be the closed --
24 it could be the closed captioning from the
25 (inaudible).

1 DANNY GIDDINGS: Oh, okay.

2 ELTON: So we might have to tell her to
3 mute.

4 DANNY GIDDINGS: Okay, sounds good.
5 Whatever you did, Nikhil, just now, you sound
6 better. So I think you must have addressed it.

7 And, Elton, please do work with the closed
8 captioner to mitigate any background noise. Thank
9 you.

10 ZOOM SUPPORT: Conferencing support
11 services one more time.

12 Nikhil and Danny, please do the following:
13 In the upper left corner of your screen is a shield.
14 Left click the shield, each of you. You'll see a
15 gear icon up in the right-hand corner, click that.
16 Select audio in the left-hand tab. You'll see down
17 at the bottom where it says audio profile on the
18 right-hand side, you'll see background noise
19 suppression. I would suggest that Danny put his on
20 low. I would suggest that Nikhil put his on medium.
21 And we should be fine going forward.

22 Thank you.

23 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks.

24 NIKHIL MALLAMPALLI: Is that better?

25 ZOOM SUPPORT: Speak a little more.

1 NIKHIL MALLAMPALLI: Is that better?

2 ZOOM SUPPORT: Yes, thank you.

3 NIKHIL MALLAMPALLI: Thank you.

4 Okay. So moving on, I will jump to the
5 next slide.

6 This slide just provides you a brief
7 outline of what we're going to show you. We're
8 going to begin with a few slides that recap the
9 first resistance management, its major
10 recommendations, and then we'll move on to a
11 description of the new workgroup and the charge
12 questions that evolved out of the first workgroup.
13 We'll move on after that to the initial views of the
14 new workgroup on the charge questions.

15 So I'm going to cover the first item and
16 Cameron's going to cover the rest of the slides.

17 So I should explain that the workgroup has
18 formed only relatively recently and I think, as Ed
19 mentioned yesterday, we could accept a few more
20 members. So it's still very much in its infancy.
21 So just to set that out.

22 Our next slide, please. So in 2021, the
23 first Resistance Management Workgroup, RMWG for
24 short, generally recommended that EPA take a more
25 proactive role in resistance management, and it went

1 into a great deal of detail on that. That was
2 presented back in 2021 and '22. The full PPDC voted
3 to move forward these recommendations to OPP in
4 2021.

5 Next slide, please.

6 And so I'll begin with just a very brief
7 recap of the major recommendations that came out of
8 that first workgroup. I'm not going to say every
9 word in these slides. Hopefully, you can read them
10 at your leisure. And if you were on the PPDC in
11 those years, these are taken straight from previous
12 presentations. So you have already seen them.

13 Among these major recommendations were
14 that EPA should look at changes in pesticide labels
15 to make them more uniform across manufacturers in
16 the context of resistance management information to
17 the end user and that they should be easy to
18 understand by the end user; that EPA should conduct
19 a thorough review of its policies and regulations to
20 make sure it's not inadvertently getting in the way
21 of good resistance management.

22 And the third major point is that EPA
23 should expand its collaboration and outreach
24 efforts with other federal agencies and convene
25 scientific advisory panels to address specific

1 priority issues.

2 So these are the -- this is the -- the
3 first three were -- they're all wishlists from the
4 first Resistance Management Workgroup.

5 Next slide, please.

6 The fourth recommendation was that EPA
7 should explore how it can encourage resistance
8 management through cooperative agreements with
9 perhaps registrants, other entities, and
10 nongovernment organizations. It should focus on
11 helping registrants to update training materials and
12 redirect grant programs to help resistance
13 management adoption in the field.

14 And, finally, the first workgroup said
15 that EPA should explore the creation of incentive
16 programs to assist overcoming hurdles associated
17 with resistance management, hurdles such as grant
18 funding and helping users transition to more
19 resistance management-oriented pest management
20 programs.

21 So the next slide, please.

22 In 2022, OPP provided its initial
23 reactions to those recommendations, and one of the
24 things that was pointed out was the full
25 implementation of all of these recommendations,

1 which are really ambitious, good ideas, would be
2 lengthy and require a lot of agency resources and
3 probably state-level resources as well, because
4 state lead agencies implement a lot of pesticide
5 regulation.

6 Specific challenges, ESA, Endangered
7 Species Act implementation is a huge priority for
8 us, and we have -- as you know, we have talked about
9 this in the other sessions, constrained resources
10 and staffing levels.

11 We know that resistance management
12 measures need to be tailored to a specific pesticide
13 and target pest because target pest biology is a big
14 factor in resistance management. So it can't be a
15 one-size-fits-all. We have to go more or less
16 chemical by chemical, pest by pest.

17 We also thought that we could -- in terms
18 of improving collaboration with other agencies, we
19 could leverage existing organizations, one of which
20 we already participate in -- it's called the Federal
21 IPM Coordinating Committee, FIPMCC for short -- to
22 improve that interagency collaboration. And,
23 actually, we have been doing this in recent years.
24 EPA has issued two pesticide registration notices
25 which are guidance documents aimed at registrants

1 and our own staff on the types of label statements
2 that could go on labels for resistance management
3 and we've been publicizing those through the FIPMCC
4 and its quarterly meetings.

5 FIPMCC, for those of you who don't know,
6 excuse me, is an organization coordinated by the
7 USDA OPMP, which Cameron is a member of.

8 All of these issues and these challenges
9 remain in play and will have to be taken into
10 account by the current Resistance Management
11 Workgroup as it proceeds.

12 I will turn the next slide over to
13 Cameron.

14 CAMERON DOUGLASS: Thank you, Nikhil, and
15 good morning, everyone.

16 So as Nikhil alluded to, the second
17 iteration of this Resistance Management Working
18 Group was approved -- it was voted on and approved
19 by PPDC last year. For a number of reasons, the
20 group has taken a little while to get going. So
21 we've really only been working on this effort for
22 the last six to eight weeks.

23 The charge questions that PPDC did approve
24 for this group to work on, though, were threefold.
25 The first was assisting EPA in developing

1 implementation strategies following on the first
2 group's recommendations. The second was developing
3 a framework to ideally quantify the risks and
4 benefits from resistance for conventional active
5 ingredients, and the third was exploring the
6 leveraging of existing IPM strategies for resistance
7 management.

8 Next slide, please.

9 As Nikhil stated at the beginning of this
10 presentation, this group is in its infancy. We have
11 identified some members, many of whom are PPDC
12 members, but we have a few folks who we've asked to
13 join us who are not PPDC members, and we just wanted
14 to sort of emphasize that we're really proud of the
15 little bit of work we've already done in making sure
16 we have representation from diverse stakeholders on
17 this group and especially a few new growers who have
18 joined us in order to make sure that the views and
19 perspectives represented in this workgroup are broad
20 and diverse and represent the different parts of
21 agriculture.

22 We would -- we are, however, happy to take
23 on new members. So if there are PPDC members who
24 would like to participate in this effort moving
25 forward again, again, please reach out to myself or

1 Nikhil, and we'll follow up on there.

2 The other thing I wanted to mention, and
3 Nikhil alluded to this, we have basically separated
4 the members in this workgroup into the -- to work on
5 the three charge questions, so implementation,
6 risk/benefit framework, and IPM. And we have
7 several of our colleagues in EPA and USDA who are
8 serving as liaisons or leads for those groups.

9 And I just wanted to note that Elyssa
10 Arnold, who is my colleague in USDA/OPMP, is
11 actually the Chair of the Federal IPM Coordinating
12 Committee that Nikhil mentioned, and she's actually
13 leading the IPM charge question group for this
14 workgroup. And so we're -- we feel like that is
15 already sort of a step forward in terms of ensuring
16 coordination and collaboration across some of the
17 existing federal groups working on resentment
18 management in IPM.

19 Next slide.

20 What we wanted to do today -- again, this
21 group is in infancy, but we wanted to present some
22 initial thoughts from, especially the chairs, the
23 leads of the charge question groups and, hopefully,
24 spark a little discussion and get some feedback from
25 the broader PPDC members on the direction that we

1 think these groups might go in over the next year.

2 Related to the first charge question on
3 implementation of the first group strategy, we asked
4 the technical sort of leads of this group, who are
5 Amy Asmus and David Shaw, who were instrumental in
6 the first group's development of their
7 recommendations, to give some thought -- initial
8 thoughts to prioritizing those five recommendations
9 from that first Resistance Management Workgroup.

10 And so what is represented on this slide
11 is primarily sort of their initial thoughts, and
12 those are that the highest priorities in terms of
13 the first group's recommendations are: first,
14 issues related to label changes; secondly, expanding
15 collaboration and outreach efforts; and, thirdly,
16 exploring opportunities for funding and training.

17 I wanted to speak really briefly to these
18 three priorities. Later this morning, I think we'll
19 hear more about separate opportunities within PPDC
20 for work on label reform. So in light of that,
21 we've decided not to independently or separately
22 work on that issue, even though we have deemed it a
23 high priority. But we do hope, moving forward, that
24 there will be a lot of cooperation and collaboration
25 between our workgroup and whatever is formed in

1 other portions of PPDC to work on label reform.

2 So the other two high priorities are
3 expanding collaboration and outreach and exploring
4 opportunities for funding and training. And there's
5 a lot of overlap there in those two issues and the
6 first step towards those issues in our view is
7 really clearly identifying stakeholders and partners
8 in those efforts, and so that's something that that
9 charge question group will be working on quite a bit
10 in the next few months.

11 Next slide, please.

12 The second charge question for this
13 workgroup was trying to develop a quantitative risk-
14 benefit framework that we could put back to EPA and
15 they could potentially try to pilot in some
16 pesticide risk assessments and management -- risk
17 management decisions moving forward. And the views
18 presented on the slide are primarily those of this
19 charge question group's technical lead, who is Dr.
20 George Frisvold with the University of Arizona, who
21 has a lot of experience in this type of analysis and
22 looking at the risks and benefits of agricultural
23 decisions, including resistance management.

24 And one of the thoughts that he brought to
25 the table early on was that there is existing

1 precedent from EPA's Office of Pesticide Programs on
2 incorporating quantitative analyses of risks and
3 benefits. One example of that is some of the early
4 work that the BPPD, the Biopesticides and Pollution
5 Prevention Division, did when they registered BT
6 plant-incorporated protectants, and we think that
7 there could be some extrapolation or generalization
8 of some of the methods and sort of concepts, the
9 framework that they use for the Bt PIP resistance,
10 management quantification that we could apply to
11 conventional pesticides.

12 So this group, moving forward over the
13 next few months, will look at that existing work
14 that EPA has done and see how it can be applied to
15 other pesticides that OPP regulates. Some of the
16 specific thoughts George provided were that, you
17 know, resistance lowers long-run benefits and,
18 therefore, resistance management actions and
19 policies could increase both long-run benefits, but
20 also that proactive resistance management might
21 incur short-term costs.

22 So there are some specific trade-offs
23 involved in resistance management, both in the short
24 run and the long run, that could potentially be
25 quantified, and that there are a lot of existing

1 economic tools and analyses that would provide the
2 framework, sort of the empirical and quantitative
3 framework for doing so.

4 So we're very excited to see where this
5 charge question group's work leads over the next 6
6 to 12 months.

7 Next slide, please.

8 The third charge question group was
9 leveraging IPM to better manage resistance
10 management. This group has met already and very
11 quickly identified a number of what I think are very
12 interesting and exciting opportunities for existing
13 programs that could be better and more
14 comprehensively leveraged, we think, by EPA to
15 further connect IPM to resistance management.

16 Some of these opportunities that have
17 already been identified, these existing structures
18 or groups include pesticide environmental
19 stewardship programs, an existing IPM Center for
20 Excellence in EPA Region VI, continuing ongoing
21 collaboration between the EPA and the regional IPM
22 centers, which are funded through USDA, and
23 continuing existing examples of quantifying the
24 benefits of IPM strategies, which is something that
25 EPA has already done.

1 With that said, though, this charge
2 question group did identify a number of challenges
3 towards the further leveraging IPM to manage
4 resistance. Some of those, of course, include
5 limited resources within the EPA, which is something
6 you'll hear a lot about in PPDC. But there are some
7 other unique challenges that members of this charge
8 question group raised, including challenges that
9 producers are facing. Some of those include labor
10 shortages and challenges of consumer acceptance of
11 sometimes unconventional approaches to pest
12 management that might make sense in an IPM context,
13 but maybe in a business framework or in a production
14 agricultural framework pose some additional
15 challenges.

16 Next slide, please.

17 So we wanted to wrap up with just
18 highlighting a few next steps of this group. Again,
19 as we said, this group is relatively recently formed
20 and operating. We do plan, though, to have a full
21 set of recommendations and report produced for next
22 year's Spring meeting, which would address the three
23 charge questions that this group will be working on.
24 And we'll carefully consider the challenges that we
25 continue to hear from EPA on both the implementation

1 of the first working group's recommendations, but
2 also some of the other challenges that EPA obviously
3 faces in implementing resources and other related
4 challenges.

5 But we really see a lot of opportunities
6 in this group and we're really optimistic and
7 excited to get to work and hope we can come up with
8 some good recommendations for PPDC to consider next
9 year.

10 And with that, that's the end. Hopefully,
11 we have a little bit of time for a discussion.

12 DANNY GIDDINGS: Hi, and thank you. Yes,
13 we -- indeed we do. So let's now turn it over to
14 the PPDC for discussion. If you're a member of the
15 PPDC, please raise your hand to be recognized and I
16 will call on you in the order that you raise your
17 hand.

18 I'm seeing two panelists. Here we go.
19 All right. Marc Lame, go ahead. You have the
20 floor.

21 MARC LAME: Thank you. Good morning. And
22 let me say how gratified and impressed I was with
23 yesterday's presentation and today's presentation.
24 Very good job, folks.

25 So in general, I want to say that, you

1 know, at first they said one of the prior -- one of
2 the priorities actually, at low priority, was a
3 review of policies that would inhibit resistance
4 management. And that's a discussion that I was not
5 entirely part of. Some other folks did that and
6 I understand that.

7 However, if you really want to have
8 resistance management and also have some adoption of
9 IPM, particularly with the groups that you listed,
10 the IPM centers, the Center for Excellence in IMP,
11 Partners Environmental Stewardship Program, you're
12 going to have to review the existing policies. And
13 the reason is that the policies are -- and one
14 would, you know, think this is common sense --
15 they're pesticide-centric. However, the
16 technologies are not.

17 So if we want to, for instance, use crop
18 phonology, planning times based on (inaudible)
19 temperature, that's a whole other thing, and that's
20 -- and we need to get into that and what are the
21 policies that might be inhibiting that.

22 I need to kind of take a step back and
23 basically remind the members that integrated pest
24 management and resistance management are basically
25 twin best management practices born out of the

1 necessities of providing those requiring pest
2 management with effective tools that are going to
3 last and protect human health in the environment
4 from the negative effects of what Vandebosch would
5 call the pesticide treadmill, which means using more
6 and more, over and over again, and that doesn't help
7 the pesticides as far as longevity and it doesn't
8 help the environment.

9 So the problem is that these existing
10 policies are basically in -- in my time of working
11 with the USDA, CDC, and EPA, that they, again, are
12 pesticide-centric and relegate these other
13 technologies to an underfunded or unfunded status.
14 More importantly, those change agents that are
15 necessary to get people to use resistance management
16 technologies and integrated pest management
17 technologies, those change agents are unfunded or
18 underfunded, and many change agents and the managers
19 in the agencies that are managing those projects
20 that the change agents are being funded under don't
21 understand the diffusion of the IPM innovation.

22 Simply doing webinars and doing labels,
23 which are both important and the agency does a very
24 good job at both of those, simply doing that is not
25 going to create the behavior change necessary for

1 resistance management, let alone integrated pest
2 management. So we need to rethink that.

3 My question to the agency, first of all, I
4 want to raise that priority from low to high, as far
5 as reviewing existing policies, and I want to ask
6 the agency where and how pollution prevention
7 funding fits in to resistance management and
8 integrated pest management. Under FIFRA, doing the
9 webinars and the labels, that's all well and good,
10 but it doesn't cut it. And the fact of the matter
11 is that, you know, if we really want to do good
12 pollution prevention, pollution prevention for
13 pesticides is not having pests, whatever technology
14 that is, and more often than not, it's not
15 pesticides.

16 Crop phenology -- and this is -- this is
17 50 years' worth of sound science, folks. This is
18 not a pie in the sky. You know, we've known for
19 decades that planting times can reduce pesticide use
20 by half in many crops, and, yet, it is not widely
21 adopted. And the question is why.

22 So I would like to find out if someone
23 from the agencies knows if we can start using
24 pollution prevention monies to help fund the
25 diffusion of resistance management and integrated

1 pest management. Are those funds available instead
2 of relying just on FIFRA funding?

3 DANNY GIDDINGS: So the question has been
4 posed, and I don't know if -- who wants to take
5 that.

6 Ed, I think you probably are best
7 positioned.

8 ED MESSINA: They tend to be different
9 flavors of money. But I think you raised some great
10 comments, Marc, so I think maybe we can, you know,
11 take that back and explore and I know Nikhil or
12 others -- you know, I would probably ask my folks in
13 BPPD to sort of follow up on that, because I think
14 that could be a good suggestion. And Frank Ellis in
15 my office would be someone to check in with. So
16 we'll take that back and -- I know it hasn't been
17 done, but whether it could be done is a good
18 question and we'll see, you know, depending on the
19 flavor of money, if we can do that.

20 MARC LAME: Well, the change agents are
21 out there. I know that, particularly with NAFA, but
22 -- and I know your folks are well aware of how well
23 it can be done and they've participated in some
24 great programs. So it really would be nice if there
25 was some reprioritization under current conditions

1 and then maybe trying to grab some other funding.

2 Thank you.

3 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Marc.

4 CAMERON DOUGLASS: If you have other
5 questions, Marc, you know, we're excited to have you
6 in the workgroup and look forward to talking about
7 those issues moving forward.

8 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Marc. Thank
9 you, Cameron. Thank you, Ed, and thank you, Nikhil.

10 Let's turn now to Mayra Reiter. You're
11 recognized.

12 MAYRA REITER: I think there were others
13 who had raised their hands before me.

14 I think Nathan was next.

15 DANNY GIDDINGS: Okay, we can go to
16 Nathan.

17 Nathan, go ahead, and then we'll go to
18 Mayra next.

19 NATHAN DONLEY: Great. Well, thanks and
20 thank you to the workgroup for all the work you've
21 been doing so far and will continue to do.

22 My comment is really going to be pretty
23 closely aligned with what Marc said. I think the
24 most important aspect of resistance management,
25 which is rarely discussed, is pesticide reduction.

1 You know, the less pesticide that goes into the
2 environment, the less of the selective pressure for
3 pest resistance to develop. So reducing or
4 eliminating pesticide use is the only preventative
5 strategy for pest resistance. It's just the only
6 one. Everything else is just a delay tactic.

7 But, unfortunately, things like
8 prophylactic uses of pesticides are still quite
9 high, and to most people, pesticide resistance
10 management means, you know, how do I combine as many
11 pesticides as possible? And EPA is really
12 facilitating this in my opinion. I've honestly read
13 through every new active ingredient approval in the
14 last, I don't know, three or so years, because I
15 comment on every one, at least the conventional
16 ones, and the main benefit that is used as
17 justification for the registration is resistance
18 management, things like it adds a new mode of
19 action, or something like that, for a crop.

20 And since approvals are a cost-benefit
21 balancing than resistance management is constantly
22 tipping the scale to the benefit side. Then you
23 start getting into this, you know, circle of
24 ridiculousness, for lack of a better word -- sorry
25 to the translators for that one -- where overuse of

1 a pesticide, you know, leads to pest resistance and
2 then pest resistance is used as justification to
3 improve a new pesticide, then overuse of that new
4 pesticide leads to pest resistance, and it just
5 makes you crazy.

6 So I would love for this workgroup to
7 tackle how mandatory pesticide reduction targets can
8 be implemented as part of a long-term resistance
9 management strategy. You know, I appreciate the
10 discussion of IPM, but the pesticide and chemical
11 industry have been very successful at sullyng the
12 good name of IPM, in my opinion, to the point where
13 it's pretty much a meaningless term now. I've seen
14 many instances of IPM being used as justification to
15 maintain or even increase pesticide use, for
16 example, with things like seed treatments.

17 But meaningful things can be done here.
18 For instance, EPA conditioning new registration
19 decisions on the reduction of older ingredients that
20 they're supposed to replace -- and EPA has actually
21 done this about, you know, six or seven years back,
22 when it registered the new herbicide, Bicyclopyrone,
23 which was actually conditioned on atrazine use
24 modestly decreasing by -- I forget -- X amount over
25 a few years. We don't know if that's actually

1 happened because our attempts to get this info
2 through FOIA has been stymied at every turn, but at
3 least there's some precedent for this.

4 So I would just say there are creative
5 ways to get newer pesticides to actually replace
6 older ones instead of just stacking everything on
7 top of one another and spraying ten things at once.

8 Yeah, so that's all for me. Thank you.

9 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Nathan.

10 Mayra Reiter, you're recognized.

11 MAYRA REITER: Thank you. Good morning.

12 Mayra Reiter with Farmworker Justice.

13 First, thank you very much to the
14 presenters. And I second what Nathan and Marc have
15 said regarding the implementation of nonchemical
16 strategies, which is something that is extremely
17 important and it should be given priority in
18 resistance management, so that pesticide resistance
19 doesn't lead to regulatory decisions that keep old
20 highly toxic pesticides in the market that would
21 otherwise have their uses canceled, which is
22 something that increases health risks for workers
23 and for rural communities.

24 There is good science behind nontoxic
25 alternatives and proper IPM, not the kind of IPM

1 that Nathan said that relies on toxic chemicals for
2 proper IPM, and this is something that needs
3 more funding and needs to be made a priority in
4 order to protect workers and to protect rural
5 communities from the risks of these old toxic
6 pesticides.

7 Thank you.

8 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Mayra.

9 Let's go to Charlotte Sanson next.

10 CHARLOTTE SANSON: Hi, thank you very much
11 and thanks to the workgroup for the great work.
12 Very impressive.

13 So I have a question for Cameron.
14 Cameron, just a practical question here. On the
15 slide, Charge Question 1, the implementation slide,
16 where it mentions the five areas for prioritizations
17 and recommendations, and on the fifth item, explore
18 incentive programs. There's a comment there that
19 says, programs need to be science-based and
20 precompetitive. I was wondering if you could
21 provide some clarity on what precompetitive is
22 referring to. And thanks again.

23 CAMERON DOUGLASS: Of course, yep. So my
24 understanding of what is --what the folks who
25 brought up that comment and wrote that language

1 meant was incentive programs that are not tied to a
2 specific company that are generic in nature. That
3 was sort of the intent of that precompetitive term.
4 And I apologize if it wasn't clear.

5 CHARLOTTE SANSON: Okay, great. Thanks.

6 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Charlotte and
7 Cameron.

8 Next, let's go to Joe Grzywacz.

9 JOE GRZYWACZ: Hi, thanks so much for that
10 really great presentation. I appreciate and echo
11 all the comments that have already been made about
12 the importance of good labels and thinking through
13 alternative ways of reducing pesticide load in the
14 environment.

15 I actually want to comment on something
16 that was more of a side comment, Cameron, that you
17 had made, because it's now kind of transcending the
18 last day or so of the meeting, and that is, in sort
19 of an off-the-cuff way, you said, you know,
20 essentially, if the budget can bear, it would be
21 nice if we could do X, Y and Z.

22 And over the course of the last 24 hours,
23 I've heard, you know, some things that are really
24 discerning about budget. You know, yesterday, Ed
25 commented that, you know, budget constraints kept us

1 from having a meeting, suggesting that the PPDC is a
2 low priority.

3 Then we saw that approvals are increasing
4 and the request for approvals are increasing and
5 that we get some money -- EPA gets money on each one
6 of those approvals, and it circles back then to
7 Cameron and this group's comment about, you know,
8 being able to evaluate policies when one of the
9 policies is that one of the -- part of the revenue-
10 generating sequences of EPA is to approve
11 pesticides, but yet at the same time it doesn't have
12 the money to spend on protecting the environment
13 from the pesticides that they're approving.

14 And it just seems to me, to use Nathan's
15 comment, that we're in a little bit of a vicious
16 cycle that has this pesticide-centric sort of
17 orientation.

18 So I just simply wanted to raise that
19 because it seems to be a theme that I've heard
20 across several presentations about the allocation
21 and the availability of dollars, and it seems to be
22 falling in a disproportionate way, not to
23 protections that can potentially come into place,
24 but instead doing the machinery of approving
25 pesticides.

1 Thank you very much.

2 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Joe.

3 Next, I see Dawn Gouge.

4 Dawn, you are recognized.

5 DAWN GOUGE: Good morning, everybody. I
6 just wanted to add a few thoughts to -- on to what
7 others have already said so eloquently.

8 There was a paper published just this year
9 by Ling -- gosh, I'm forgetting the second author --
10 and one of the IPM center leads. Anyway, they
11 surveyed a large group of IPM coordinators across
12 the country and they were asking what are the major
13 barriers in implementing integrated pest management.
14 And from my perspective, integrated pest management
15 is the solution, or one of the most significant
16 solutions, we can use to manage pesticide
17 resistance.

18 The top thing that was reported over and
19 over again was the high cost of some of the most
20 critical factors. The second was the difficulty or
21 the perception of difficulty in the implementation
22 of IPM, and the third was the lack of awareness,
23 which seems almost criminal at this point
24 considering how many decades of work has been
25 invested in training and retraining and educating

1 and producing great materials, but clearly not
2 enough.

3 But just going back to costs, I think,
4 cost-benefit analysis is going to be critically
5 important. So let's just hone in on some of these
6 things. Getting that information out to the end
7 users and the people who are making those decisions,
8 quite often, that's people who are actually adhering
9 to the label recommendations, so factoring in -- one
10 of our highlights was to focus in on labeling --
11 pesticide product labeling and then addressing the
12 lack of awareness issue.

13 One comment regarding complexity of
14 integrated pest management and pesticide resistance
15 management in general, the more we learn about the
16 ecology of systems, the more complex they are. One
17 of my dear friends and colleagues at work, Peter
18 Ellsworth, published a paper looking at the use of
19 beneficial organisms as insects to monitor threshold
20 counts for. So the idea is that instead of just
21 simply monitoring the number of pests and the
22 trigger point is to spray at whatever point it is,
23 threshold level it is, for the crop advisor or
24 applicator, the consideration would be the survey of
25 beneficial organisms and the prevention of

1 applications when essentially the beneficiaries were
2 going to be used doing those environmental services
3 for us.

4 So it's looking like an ever more complex
5 world, and so how we simplify that and how we convey
6 that, I think is going to be critically important.

7 Thank you.

8 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Dawn. And
9 apologies. I am realizing that I mispronounced your
10 last name.

11 DAWN GOUGE: That's okay.

12 DANNY GIDDINGS: It's Dawn Gouge, and I
13 will get that correct going forward.

14 So, Charlotte, you are recognized next.

15 CHARLOTTE SANSON: I'm very sorry, Danny.
16 I did not mean to have my hand raised.

17 DANNY GIDDINGS: Oh, okay, legacy hand.
18 No worries.

19 Let's do Jessica Ponder.

20 JESSICA PONDER: Hi, thanks, everyone.
21 And I just wanted to clarify a technical point
22 because integrated pest management is extremely
23 important to reducing exposures, and a lot of good
24 points were made, but I don't want to mix up some
25 over-generalities that might kind of confuse this

1 situation.

2 It's really important to understand that
3 overall it's misuse of pesticides that leads to pest
4 resistance; it's not overuse. And when it comes to
5 a specific population, under-use of pesticides is
6 actually what leads to pesticide resistance. And
7 that's why it's so important to understand how to
8 combine different mechanisms of action, so that you
9 can reduce the total burden of pesticide use.

10 It is true, in general, that overuse of
11 pesticides can be a type of misuse, but, in general,
12 it is not true that that is the cause of pesticide
13 resistance. It's actually under-use. This is a
14 common -- this is common knowledge when it comes to
15 getting prescribed antibiotics, right? You're told
16 to take the entire course of antibiotics because if
17 you don't complete it, then you're not actually
18 going to eliminate the most resistant of the germs.

19 So it's the same situation when you're
20 dealing with any kind of pest population. If you do
21 not take a whole measure and you take a half
22 measure, you can end up with a bigger problem. And
23 that's how you end up in this -- trapped in this
24 cycle of trying to catch up from mistakes in the
25 past.

1 So I just want to make sure that that
2 point is understood.

3 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Jessica.

4 Are there any other comments or questions
5 with regards to this topic and this workgroup
6 update?

7 (No response.)

8 DANNY GIDDINGS: If there are none, I will
9 thank you, Nikhil and Cameron, for being here, for
10 leading us through this session, and we will advance
11 to our next session, which is Formation of Pesticide
12 Label Reform Workgroup. For this session, your
13 chairs are Lisa Dreilinger from Arxada, Mano Basu
14 from Crop Life America, and Gretchen Paluch, who is
15 the Pesticide Bureau Chief the Iowa Department of
16 Agriculture and Land Stewardship and our APPCO
17 liaison to the PPDC.

18 Thank you all for being here, and I turn
19 it over to you.

20 FORMATION OF PESTICIDE LABEL REFORM WORKGROUP

21 LISA DREILINGER: Great. Thank you,
22 Danny.

23 Can everyone hear me?

24 DANNY GIDDINGS: Loud and clear.

25 LISA DREILINGER: Okay, great.

1 So I thank everyone for their flexibility
2 on moving our section before lunch. But, actually,
3 I think it really complements the last workgroup
4 that just presented on Resistance Management
5 Workgroup 2.0 because label reform was mentioned a
6 number of times.

7 So based on key stakeholder feedback --
8 can you go to the next slide?

9 Sorry. Based on a key stakeholder
10 feedback, previous PPDC meetings, and as you just
11 heard other workgroup recommendations, it was
12 determined that the Label Reform Workgroup should be
13 formed. And it's really to drive efficiency,
14 increase accuracy, consistency, and really maximize
15 the resources on all ends, maximize the resources of
16 the EPA that goes into the review and approval of
17 the labels. It goes to the end consumers and the
18 states that use the labels, and then, of course, the
19 registrants that submit the labels to really get the
20 most out of all the work that goes in.

21 So the goal was to combine a diverse group
22 of members that includes, of course, industry
23 represented by some individual representation, but
24 also the trades of both non-ag and ag, EPA, the
25 partnership with the states, and, of course,

1 nongovernmental organizations. So the goal was to
2 really bring a diverse group together.

3 And on the next slide, you can see the
4 beginnings. This group is really in its, I will
5 say, pre-infancy. We have had one meeting to just
6 sort of come together and discuss this meeting, but
7 moving ahead, we are really going to try to pull
8 together a diverse group, which you can see
9 beginnings of. Anywhere you see a star, that is a
10 PPDC member. Otherwise, you also have EPA that has
11 already volunteered and some state representation
12 and some trade representation.

13 But we are also soliciting other members
14 of the PPDC, or the public that are listening right
15 now and that are super-passionate about label reform
16 to please get involved. Either reach out to myself
17 or Mano, or I believe we also have Michelle's email,
18 and that is on the last slide. But please reach out
19 if you have an interest in getting involved.

20 You can go to the next slide.

21 So far we have two streams that we are
22 going to focus on. The first is technology and the
23 second is the content of the label. Both are really
24 important. I know we heard from Ed yesterday about
25 the implementation of PRIA 5 and the resources of

1 the EPA and how critical it is to maximize the
2 resources that the agency has. As part of PRIA 5,
3 there is a set-aside for technology. So as we're
4 hoping to really maximize, in general, the
5 technology that exists in short, medium, and long-
6 term.

7 So the long-term goal is to have all the
8 data digitalized. Of course, that would maximize
9 sharing of the data and, of course, make it easier
10 to store and approve data. In the midterm, while we
11 work towards getting to full data digitalization,
12 there is an electronic labeling system that we're
13 hoping to utilize, as well as scannable technology.
14 I know it says QR codes, but, in general, it's
15 scannable technology that we're really going to be
16 focusing on. And I know that even yesterday the
17 agency has been using QR codes and scannable
18 technology to communicate and to accept feedback.
19 So we're seeing progress in these places, and it's
20 just how you use those resources and apply them to
21 labels.

22 The electronic labeling system has been in
23 its pilot phase for a while and a lot of work has
24 gone into the electronic labeling system. So the
25 goal is to use what we have currently developed in

1 order to reach that long-term data digitalization
2 role.

3 In the short term, we're hoping that label
4 templates or structured labeling might help just
5 streamline input to the EPA in making the reviews
6 a little bit more uniform and to make the work that
7 goes into reading the label maybe a little bit
8 easier.

9 Of course, it's also important what the
10 label says and the content of the label. So it's
11 providing some consistency on claims and websites
12 and, of course, scannable technology. I think
13 over the course of the last couple of years,
14 especially with the increase in the number of
15 submissions during COVID, the label consistency has
16 been a struggle and it's a place that we are
17 committed to helping come to an alignment that will,
18 hopefully, some -- to make label reviews, in
19 general, more efficient.

20 LISA DREILINGER: I think you can go to
21 the next slide, and I think I'm passing to Mano at
22 this point.

23 MANO BASU: Thank you very much, Lisa.

24 And I'm going to walk through some of the
25 benefits of structured digital label. And, again,

1 if I kept a count from yesterday and today how many
2 times the Label Workgroup was called, I could say
3 that it seems all solutions lie within the Label
4 Reform Workgroup, but, again, I do expect a lot of
5 the concerns, issues, challenges that we have heard
6 over the years will be resolved or will have some
7 success with the Label Reform Workgroup and the
8 work, you know, that this workgroup is going to look
9 into and focus.

10 Also, a big shoutout to Christian Bongard
11 who put together these next four slides, magically
12 collecting people's thoughts and input and putting
13 it in a format which is easily readable for this
14 group, and everyone else as we start thinking about,
15 you know, how does this workgroup get from pre-
16 infancy to infancy and start crawling and walking
17 over the next year with the kind of outputs that we
18 are looking for.

19 Lisa discussed all -- you know, what we
20 are -- this group initially, as we met, were
21 thinking about from a digital label perspective from
22 long term, midterm, short term, but specifically
23 going in to the registration in pertinent part,
24 accuracy is something a digital label would provide.
25 Again, during reregistration for a given AI, if

1 there are 30, 40, 50 labels, those need to be
2 transformed in maybe an Excel sheet or some other
3 format. All those are happening manually.

4 If there were digital labels, then, you
5 know, could that happen with the click of a button
6 and, you know, there could be more reliance on the
7 transfer of data from a digital system to a system
8 where these data points could be included in the
9 risk assessment process. That's where accuracy
10 would come in.

11 Efficiency, certainly, right now for any
12 label update, even if it's the smallest label, it
13 has to go through the full review process making
14 sure that all the Is are dotted and Ts are crossed.
15 For a 30-page label, it takes a long time to review
16 line-by-line and word-by-word. So if there was an
17 electronic system which should compare what was
18 there on the previous label, what's there on the new
19 updated changed label, and only those sections where
20 there was a change made could be highlighted and
21 reviewed before it's approved, that kind of
22 efficiency is brought up with a digitized label.

23 Consistency, certainly, allowing reviewers
24 to look across the various label for an AI. Looking
25 at consistency of decisions, label restrictions

1 being placed, that makes it easier.

2 Enforcement is another area where a digital label is
3 certainly very beneficial.

4 If we can go to the next slide, please.

5 So that's from a reviewer/industry
6 engagement interaction perspective. Certainly, a
7 digital label also offers several end user and
8 stakeholder benefits. And this is, as I mentioned
9 earlier, is a collective input of the group which
10 met on what these benefits are from a truly
11 digitized label. And as end user, you know, I
12 always think if I am an applicator on a crop, do I
13 really need to scan through 30 pages or read through
14 to find the exact requirements, restrictions for the
15 problem I'm interested to apply and the geography
16 I'm based in, what those restrictions and
17 applications are, and making sure I'm following the
18 rate.

19 We heard, in the past discussion, that,
20 you know, how sometimes low dose leads to
21 resistance, again, making sure that this information
22 is readily available to applicators, that they are
23 using the right doses and whatnot. To an extent,
24 you know, it may also allow applicators to compare
25 products and look for alternatives. If one product

1 is not available for a pest Y in crop X, product A
2 is not available, what other product could help in
3 managing that pest for the specific crop?

4 Looking into other third party support,
5 clearly, once the labels are digitized and all this
6 information is available, we will see other
7 companies coming into this place, offering different
8 types of services, certainly third parties, states,
9 stakeholder groups, and NGOs may get some value out
10 of this information, as well. We may see new apps
11 for the iPhones and the Android phones providing
12 additional functionality for a structured label.

13 Can you go to the next one, please?

14 Safety and stewardship is another aspect
15 or benefit of a digitized label. Again, as I
16 mentioned, reduction in that human error and misuse
17 of the information is readily available. Then a lot
18 of times you're not, as the applicator or a grower,
19 you're not necessarily relying on your memory. It's
20 an easy scan through the scannable technology and
21 here (inaudible) on your phone or a device or
22 however the -- the rate is available. The
23 restrictions are available.

24 Supporting bilingual label becomes easy
25 going forward. I mean, you know, could there be

1 more than two languages which can be supported,
2 maybe that's possible in the distant future, as
3 well.

4 We have seen a lot of ecological
5 mitigations and EPA's approach on Bulletins Live!
6 Two, how to connect the Bulletins Live!, along with
7 the digital label, making sure that information,
8 based on geotags, GPS locations are available to
9 the specific applicator in a region for, you know,
10 what they need to look into before applying a
11 pesticide.

12 So these are the overall benefits. I'm
13 sure there may be more benefits. As the group
14 starts discussing, we will identify some more. We
15 will prioritize some of these benefits or some of
16 those areas to look into within the long term,
17 midterm, short term that we have bucketed and come
18 up with an overall plan. But this is, from the
19 initial meeting of the group, an exchange of
20 information was identified as some of the benefits
21 of a truly digitized label.

22 You can go to the next slide, please.

23 So then, what are the next steps?
24 Certainly, you know, there are a lot of things that
25 we need to work on as the working group, discuss

1 aspects of what the agency is currently doing on the
2 digital label, what's available outside the agency.
3 There are already some third-party solution
4 providers which may have digitized certain labels.
5 Getting a better understanding of what's out there
6 from enforceability of labels, what are the
7 opportunities, continue to discuss the benefits of
8 these electronic labels and a rough guideline of,
9 you know, what the deliverables of the group would
10 be based on the charge questions that we finalize,
11 and discuss how from bilingual to multilingual
12 labels could work.

13 One of our tasks is certainly to recruit
14 additional members. You have the three email
15 addresses for Lisa, me, or Michelle. Feel free to
16 reach out to all of us, one of us, if you are
17 interested to join the workgroup. I know Ed
18 mentioned yesterday, you know, we want to keep the
19 workgroups manageable, maybe up to 20, but certainly
20 that there's no limit. We do want people who would
21 provide input into this work and the outcomes,
22 deliverables that we are looking for. So end users
23 are invited, as well, to bring in their perspective,
24 applicators, certainly, anyone who has their
25 perspective and sees the different needs of digital

1 label, the benefits, please reach out to us if you
2 would like to join the workgroup.

3 As, I think, the workgroup meets for the
4 first time, we will set a cadence for regular
5 meetings, whether it's for a topic like this,
6 whether it's weekly or whether it's too much and we
7 should only meet monthly. All that good discussion
8 can happen at our kickoff meeting for the workgroup.

9 I think this is the last slide and we'll
10 open it up for questions.

11 Thank you.

12 DANNY GIDDINGS: Great. Thank you, Mano.
13 Thank you, Lisa.

14 I expect a robust conversation on this
15 topic with a lot of interest. So let's open it up
16 to the PPDC members. Any questions or comments?

17 Joe, you are recognized.

18 JOE GRZYWACZ: Thanks so much for that
19 great presentation, and I'm thrilled to see the work
20 that's moving forward.

21 I've already sent you an email saying,
22 Hey, I'd like to sign up for the workgroup, but I
23 also do want to point out very publicly, you know,
24 the fact that these labels, of course, need to be
25 attentive to real users in the field, including the

1 farmworkers where it's not just language, right?
2 It's how the information is presented in a way that
3 for the -- you know, the modal education of
4 farmworkers, at least, according to the National
5 Agricultural Worker Survey, is anywhere between
6 sixth and ninth grade Mexican.

7 So therefore, you know, it's not just
8 translation. But then it's also what digital
9 devices do these folks actually really have to make
10 sure that there's some there's equality. So thanks
11 for leading this effort, I look forward to
12 participating, but let's also not forget about the
13 farmworkers that may be using some of these labels.

14 MANO BASU: Thank you, Joe, for
15 volunteering.

16 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Joe.

17 Amy Asmus, you're recognized next.

18 AMY ASMUS: Thanks. I've been talking to
19 Mano most of the morning on the side. But I, like
20 Joe, wanted to say something kind of publicly at the
21 meeting.

22 First of all, thank you for recognizing
23 this need from the viewpoint of the retailers, the
24 consultants, and the end user. We have been asking
25 for this for many, many years. The Ag Retailers

1 Association sponsored an EPA tour to the Willard
2 site, where they also pointed out the difficulty in
3 understanding labels and label inconsistencies
4 between products. Mano has asked for more end
5 users, consultants, and retailers to join this
6 group, and I hope you do.

7 Please, if you are looking at label
8 reform, bring all the stakeholders in, not just
9 regulatory ones, and look at the labels completely.
10 This is not just about technology in the labels.
11 There's a huge concern by some of us of the percent
12 of users that actually have access to electronic
13 labels when they're in the field. Jill Schrader has
14 shared with me that New Mexico is at the bottom with
15 50 percent of their people having access to
16 computers.

17 This is about clear, concise information
18 for safe and science-based applications of regulated
19 pesticides. To a lot, the label is just a
20 regulatory legal document. To me and the people I
21 work with, the label is the law and the end users
22 must be able to find needed information and
23 understand it.

24 Yes, applicators are certified, but each
25 application is product-specific and label-driven and

1 we need clear and concise labels. And so please
2 don't take this as just a technology and get it on
3 electronic labels. These labels need to be clear,
4 concise, and in a format where the information
5 needed is easily found and readily understandable.

6 Thank you very much.

7 DANNY GIDDINGS: Mano, you have your hand
8 up. Do you have a comment in response to Amy?

9 MANO BASU: No, just a quick request,
10 Danny. I see quite a few people on the chat,
11 saying, please count me in. As long as anyone --
12 someone's taking notes on who those are volunteering
13 would be great, so that we can reach out to them at
14 a later stage.

15 DANNY GIDDINGS: Sure. Yeah, we will take
16 notes on the chat in terms of who's volunteering in
17 real time. I think we'll also have access to this
18 chat post-meeting.

19 MANO BASU: Thank you.

20 DANNY GIDDINGS: So, yes, thank you, Mano.

21 Mayra Reiter, you're recognized next.

22 MAYRA REITER: Thank you. I'd like to
23 thank the presenters, and I think it's very
24 encouraging that the workgroup is going to be
25 considering how standardization is one aspect of

1 facilitating bilingual or even multilingual labels.
2 And we know that whenever you're building a database
3 to allow people to have access to information, it's
4 always better to know (inaudible) features from the
5 beginning, as opposed to trying to add features once
6 it is built. So we need to, you know, consider how
7 that access to potential multilingual labels in the
8 picture is going to be enabled so that the systems
9 that are being built now, you know, have that
10 capacity when the moment comes.

11 And another thing echoing what Joe was
12 saying earlier regarding farmworkers, access in the
13 field is going to be critical and it needs to be
14 made part of workers' training that they understand
15 how they can access this information, and that we
16 consider the barriers that they are going to be
17 facing in the field, not just in terms of literacy
18 and ability to understand the information, but even
19 just having the physical ability to have access in
20 places where cellular connections may not be
21 reliable and in places where, perhaps, you know,
22 information that needs to be posted is not being
23 posted. So these are things that need to be
24 considered when we talk about access for the
25 workers.

1 Thank you.

2 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Mayra.

3 A quick note -- a couple notes from the
4 chat. First, while we will have access to the chat
5 post-meeting, a message in the chat -- and this is a
6 message to the PPDC members. A message in the chat
7 expressing interest in participating on the
8 workgroup is not sufficient. So please do email
9 Mano, Lisa, and Michelle to express interest in
10 participating in the workgroup.

11 The second thing about the chat is, I do
12 see some comments that look like they are for public
13 record in the chat. Just a reminder to our members
14 of the PPDC, anything in this chat is not public.
15 It's just for the folks who have panelist access.
16 So if you'd like the comments in the chat to be
17 shared publicly, then you'll want to raise your hand
18 and offer them verbally. With that --

19 ED MESSINA: And, Danny -- Danny, it might
20 be good -- I see a lot more hands raised, which is
21 great, and so we'll let those folks talk. I would
22 say if you have expressed interest in the chat as
23 you're talking and if your hand is raised to
24 indicate whether you are interested so we have it
25 for the transcript, and then, Danny, at the end of

1 this, maybe we can just read the folks from the chat
2 that have expressed interest so we have it as a
3 transcript in the record and this gets published.

4 DANNY GIDDINGS: I like that idea. We can
5 do that.

6 ED MESSINA: All right. Thanks.

7 DANNY GIDDINGS: All right. So, Damon
8 Reabe, you're recognized next for verbal comments.

9 DAMON REABE: A lot of what I have to say
10 is just to reiterate or echo Amy and her comments.
11 As an applicator who reads a lot of labels, I
12 certainly can see the advantage to electronic
13 labeling. There are services that are already
14 providing those databases. So a lot of that
15 information is available. I'm excited at whatever
16 this workgroup produces.

17 But to echo what Amy says, the electronic
18 accessibility is not nearly as important to an end
19 user as standardization of formatting. It is
20 extraordinarily critical that formatting be
21 perfectly standardized in this effort. Much of the
22 confusion that comes from reading a label is the
23 lack of standardization and not knowing exactly
24 where to look.

25 There has been a lot of improvements over

1 the past decade in -- it's obvious to me there are
2 efforts to standardize, but that, I believe, is one
3 of the main focuses from an end user standpoint.

4 And then next, we have many, many products
5 that have come off patent, thousands of them, many,
6 many different manufacturers of the same active
7 ingredients. So as an end user of all of these
8 products, I think much of the effort of this
9 workgroup needs to be on the standardization
10 of the approvals during the registration process,
11 so that when we receive a delivery of XYZ product
12 and we finish it off with the generic counterpart of
13 it or we're already working with a generic and we're
14 moving to a different generic -- I'm very familiar
15 with the registration process. I know there's a lot
16 to it, but there has to be a method of standardizing
17 the exact same product that is likely being
18 manufactured at the exact same facility and being
19 put into different containers in how it is used.

20 So whatever you can do to standardize
21 labels, not just in their formatting, but then in
22 their uses is going to create a great deal of
23 clarity.

24 Thank you.

25 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Damon.

1 Jasmine Brown, you're recognized next for
2 verbal comment.

3 JASMINE BROWN: Thank you.

4 My only comment is I'm very excited that
5 this is going to be worked on and developed. It
6 would also be nice to see links to other resources
7 like (inaudible) or -- so if the label requires
8 (inaudible) there should also be a link on the
9 website linking them to that material, just because
10 oftentimes applicators have to go into --

11 DANNY GIDDINGS: Hi, Jasmine. Jasmine,
12 I'm going to stop you for just a second. Your
13 volume, you're coming in a little bit low. Can you
14 move closer to the mic or speak a little bit louder?
15 Our Spanish interpreters are also noting this.

16 JASMINE BROWN: I'm as close as I can get.
17 Can you hear me better?

18 DANNY GIDDINGS: Slightly.

19 JASMINE BROWN: I'll put my comment in
20 chat.

21 DANNY GIDDINGS: Okay, yeah, put your
22 comment in the chat and then I will read it -- if
23 that's okay with you, and then I will read it so
24 that it gets recorded in the meeting recording.

25 JASMINE BROWN: Thank you.

1 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Jasmine.
2 Anastasia Swearingen, you're recognized
3 next.

4 ANASTASIA SWEARINGEN: Hi, thank you so
5 much for this presentation.

6 I just wanted to echo some of the comments
7 that were made earlier about really it being helpful
8 in standardizing the review process from both the
9 states and EPA, if there's more consistency in
10 labels. And with that in mind and if we're thinking
11 about future electronic tools, just to make sure
12 that we have a diversity in the workgroup
13 participants, so that we are understanding the needs
14 beyond just agricultural pesticide labels. There
15 are different sections of the label and different
16 considerations for nonagricultural products.

17 So making sure we get the perspective of
18 those registrants and the users of those products,
19 so that we make sure we build something and
20 templates and things like that that are responsive
21 of all pesticide registrant needs and user needs.

22 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Anastasia.

23 Sorry, I was navigating Windows here.

24 So I want to share verbally what Jasmine
25 Brown put in the chat. This comment is attributed

1 to PPDC Member Jasmine Brown. The virtual labels
2 should also include links to other resources, i.e.,
3 WPS -- that's Worker Protection Standards -- section
4 should include a click to PERC resources so
5 applicators don't have to look at ten different
6 websites, Bullets [sic] Live! link and Federal CNT
7 page should also be included.

8 ED MESSINA: And, Danny, that is a
9 Bulletins Live! link.

10 DANNY GIDDINGS: Yes.

11 ED MESSINA: And do you want to read off
12 the names of the volunteers that we --

13 DANNY GIDDINGS: So I want to call for any
14 more verbal comments. Jasmine's hand is still up,
15 but I think that's legacy hand. Damon Reabe, I
16 think, is probably legacy hand as well. Or do you
17 have another comment?

18 DAMON REABE: Yeah, sorry. I just want to
19 thank Jasmine for the comment in the chat. And I
20 don't know if this is at all possible, but Bulletins
21 Live! Two is a valuable tool, but I have no idea if
22 it's, in any way possible, for this workgroup to
23 refine Bulletins Live! Two, but it is -- all the
24 information is there. It's time-consuming to
25 utilize. That's the most polite way I can say it.

1 So I'd love to see that updated so that
2 when we do go to Bulletins Live 2, we don't have
3 such a maze to travel to get to the needed
4 information.

5 Thank you.

6 DANNY GIDDINGS: Right. So I'll note that
7 there is more conversation in the chat. It actually
8 pertains to a topic that was covered under the last
9 workgroup, so I'm not sure how we want to handle
10 that. But let me go ahead and say for the record
11 who had volunteered in the chat for participating in
12 this new workgroup. Apologies, it's going to take
13 me a while to scroll through all of it.

14 Becca Berkey said, plus one, Joe, which I
15 assume means that you are interested in
16 participating. Is that right, Becca?

17 BECCA BERKEY: What I meant there was I
18 was just supporting Joe Grzywacz's comments.

19 DANNY GIDDINGS: Oh, okay.

20 BECCA BERKEY: Yeah.

21 DANNY GIDDINGS: So you were just
22 supporting Joe's comment. Okay, very good.

23 And then I do have an explicit request
24 from Mily Trevino-Sauceda to be added to this
25 workgroup. That's, "Please add Mily Trevino-Sauceda

1 to this group and gracias.”

2 I will also just reiterate [connection
3 issue] this workgroup [connection issue] Arling,
4 Mano, and Lisa.

5 ED MESSINA: Hey, Danny, you broke up and
6 we lost your video feed. Can you try to say that
7 again?

8 DANNY GIDDINGS: Yeah, I’m just
9 clarifying, also -- let’s see, Mayra Reiter is also
10 now saying she’s interested. So Mayra Reiter says,
11 I’m interested in taking part in the workgroup. So
12 to Mayra and Mily, I would also -- we have it here
13 on the record, but I would also encourage you to
14 email Mano Basu, Lisa Dreilinger, and Michelle
15 Arling.

16 Jeffrey, can we bring that slide with
17 their email addresses back up so that everyone can
18 have it? It’s, I believe, the last slide on the
19 presentation.

20 JEFFREY: Okay, one second.

21 ED MESSINA: And then, Danny, any comments
22 that are in their chat that folks want to bring
23 forward to the full PPDC, we have our session -- the
24 Moving Forward session, where we’ll ask, you know,
25 if there’s anything there that people want to put on

1 the record from the PPDC members. So knowing that
2 we're not bringing any of the chat into the -- it
3 will not get transcribed into the record for this
4 meeting. If there's things that folks had put in
5 the chat and they want to make sure that they are
6 brought forward at the Moving Forward session this
7 afternoon, we can bring those forward.

8 DANNY GIDDINGS: All right.

9 Mano?

10 MANO BASU: Yeah, one suggestion and one
11 question. Maybe you can add the email addresses to
12 the chat box as well, so that people have access to
13 the email address after the slides are taken down,
14 so they know who to email.

15 And the question is for the workgroup, as
16 we decide to meet, the question I received was, will
17 there be interpreters for the workgroup call if
18 enough people want to attend who do not understand
19 English and [connection issue].

20 ED MESSINA: We can take that back and see
21 if maybe the -- if that is a need, maybe we can use
22 the Zoom services. So we'll have to take that
23 question back. So --

24 MANO BASU: Thank you, Ed.

25 ED MESSINA: Were you -- in terms of the

1 workgroup, and next steps, were you -- did the
2 workgroup have charge questions that they were
3 thinking of? Would you guys want to solicit any, I
4 would say, you know recommendations or, you know --
5 is that something you'd like to do now in the time
6 we have left as well?

7 LISA DREILINGER: Yes, we would like
8 to solicit -- we have not we -- we intentionally did
9 not come up with the charge questions yet, because
10 we wanted to have this meeting first. So please
11 solicit any charge questions.

12 ED MESSINA: Okay. In that case, if any
13 PPDC members would like to raise their hand and
14 charge this workgroup with any things that -- we
15 sort of heard some of the suggestions, which are
16 great, and we've captured those, but if there are
17 any additional things you think this workgroup
18 should focus on and, in particular, if you feel like
19 there's any charge questions you'd like them to work
20 on, feel free to provide that now by raising your
21 hand.

22 DANNY GIDDINGS: Joe Grzywacz?

23 JOE GRZYWACZ: Well, I have to admit that
24 I'm a little dense because I don't really know the
25 difference between a question and a charge question.

1 But one of the things that I do really appreciate
2 from the comments that have been made that, I think,
3 may warrant some aspect of what a charge question
4 could be is just simply the importance of that
5 digital label being interconnected, for lack of a
6 better word, with other digital tools to provide the
7 necessary information on the site, and whether it's
8 the one that Damon represented that he said was
9 cumbersome to follow or specific elements of the
10 Worker Protection Standards, you know -- you know,
11 but I think the idea of trying to make those
12 interconnected, to the extent that technology is
13 available, I think, makes a lot of sense.

14 ED MESSINA: Yeah, Joe, and I should have
15 done a better job describing the difference. So
16 apologies. I think when we're thinking of charge
17 questions for the work group, synthesizing some of
18 what you said would be, you know, how can best --
19 how can EPA best have labels be readily understood
20 for multiple stakeholders, including farmworkers or
21 something like that. That's how I might develop a
22 charge.

23 Thanks, Joe.

24 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Ed. Thanks, Joe.

25 Charlotte, you're recognized.

1 CHARLOTTE SANSON: Thanks. I think one of
2 the areas that we could develop a charge question
3 for would be around how to overcome barriers for
4 adoption. I know this has been -- the digital
5 labeling has been discussed for a number of years
6 and it's good to see that it's getting some traction
7 now. But I think if we could identify, you know,
8 what are the barriers for making this work and all
9 the different aspects of it, and how -- what
10 solutions are there and how are we going to overcome
11 those, because I think for this to have a successful
12 outcome, you know, we have to be in a positive mode
13 to get through those.

14 So...

15 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Charlotte.

16 Any other suggestions for charge questions
17 or general comments or questions about the
18 workgroup?

19 Anastasia Swearingen, you're recognized.

20 ANASTASIA SWEARINGEN: Hi. Just building
21 on, you know, what was just said, I think, from my
22 perspective, a charge question has to start with
23 identifying those key areas and barriers to label
24 standardization now and then identifying the most
25 important aspects of the label to promote that

1 standardization and, you know, really thinking of
2 this again across all products.

3 So I think before we bite off too much for
4 this workgroup to chew on before the next meeting.
5 Really just prioritizing and finding out what those
6 barriers are.

7 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Anastasia.

8 Amy Asmus, you're recognized.

9 AMY ASMUS: I think one of the charge
10 questions we should look at is to look at some of
11 the work that OPEL has already done, like the
12 definitions of things on labels, and if those are
13 complete, to move them into the public so that we
14 understand some of the definitions that are used on
15 labels, and I also think OPEL had a standardized
16 format that they were looking at and had
17 proposed. I do have that condensed into a four-page
18 sheet if the group would like that, but that would
19 be a great starting point to springboard off of some
20 of the OPEL work, instead of scrapping that all and
21 starting from scratch.

22 So I think they should look back at OPEL,
23 especially at the definitions and the proposed
24 standardized format to make it clear and concise and
25 uniform as a charge question and a starting point.

1 LISA DREILINGER: I mean, Ed can probably
2 comment better or Christian, but we are definitely
3 not going to scratch all the work that was done. We
4 very much value the work that was done. And as a
5 starting point, there have been many conversations
6 with Christian who's now very well representing the
7 OPEL system. So we absolutely plan to not start
8 from scratch.

9 But, Amy, if there's anything you would
10 like to share, please share it.

11 MANO BASU: I mean, I would quickly jump
12 in and echo what Lisa has said. Certainly, there's
13 a lot of information out there, different systems
14 out there, technology providers out there. And the
15 work on this workgroup would be building upon the
16 information that is available.

17 So, Amy, if you have anything, please do
18 share. And (inaudible) also look into -- OPEL has
19 been there for a long time and it hasn't been
20 successful, making sure that we don't get into the
21 same kind of issues, concerns, errors, however we
22 want to put it, with OPEL and the future of digital
23 labeling, as we look into what this digitization
24 looks like.

25 ED MESSINA: Yeah, it's a great point.

1 And then since -- if folks are interested in my
2 perspective, this is just one person's view. This
3 is sort of how I kind of view the electronic label
4 process.

5 So when I think of electronic labels,
6 I think of the entire process. I think of the
7 submission of the data that's coming in -- and
8 we've talked about it being an electronic format,
9 so it's easy to use. We're talking about how we
10 internally manage that data as it comes in. That's
11 part of the digital transformation and using
12 Salesforce so we can kind of have that data and use
13 it as part of our review electronically. And then
14 we talk about publishing the electronic label,
15 making it easier, making the comparison of a label,
16 changes for that person as it's being published up
17 the chain and then it's access to the metadata that
18 would exist in that label for the public, vis-a-vis,
19 a website.

20 So if you're, you know, wanting to know
21 how many pesticides are available for use on hemp,
22 you know, PPOS is somewhat good, but there's -- you
23 know, we need a better data table. We need better
24 ease of doing those queries for end users of the
25 information of the label, including QR codes,

1 including callbacks to Bulletins Live!. So there's
2 different aspects of that label as it goes through
3 approval and then is ultimately published.

4 And OPEL did a good job of trying to fix
5 the front-end electronic submission piece, and what
6 was done there is some of the data tables that need
7 to be submitted, some of that work is really good
8 information for the format and the type of
9 information that should be submitted. I think
10 there's more to be done on that standardization
11 about what are the terms, so that as we're
12 manipulating the label through the system, we can
13 better do it.

14 The thing that OPEL didn't do as well is
15 it sort of built a system -- submission system that,
16 you know, is -- maybe becomes dated the minute you
17 build it. So my conversations with Christian, who's
18 been our fellow on this topic and has brought a lot
19 of information to the table, is, you know, maybe EPA
20 doesn't need to build the next data submission
21 portal. What we need to put out there is here are
22 the standard information metrics that we're looking
23 for, and the format, like language, could be XML,
24 for example, and then we could receive that
25 information.

1 So rather than building a portal where
2 everyone has to type it in, we can talk about what
3 are the standardizations of the data in and -- in
4 that format, and what are the data tables associated
5 with how we want to receive that information.

6 So just some food for thought in terms of
7 how we're thinking about the electronification of
8 the label process as a whole.

9 MANO BASU: Ed, thank you --

10 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Ed.

11 MANO BASU: -- for putting it nicely. I
12 mean, I'm sure OPEL and, you know, what worked/
13 didn't work in the past would be a nice case study
14 and for us to learn from the successes and failures
15 moving forward as we look into electronification
16 (inaudible) for label information.

17 Thank you.

18 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Ed and Mano.

19 I'm going to go to Mayra Reiter in just a
20 second. But I'm realizing that I used an acronym
21 and didn't explain it when I was relaying Jasmine
22 Brown's comment in the chat. The acronym I used was
23 PERC and it was in reference to linking to
24 additional materials and resources within the label,
25 and PERC, or P-E-R-C, is the Pesticide Educational

1 Resource Collaborative. It's hosted by UC Davis and
2 it's done through cooperative agreement with the
3 EPA. It was mentioned in some of our presentations
4 yesterday.

5 So now, let's go to Mayra Reiter, and if
6 we have no comments after her, then we will break
7 for lunch.

8 Mayra?

9 MAYRA REITER: Thank you. Just very
10 briefly regarding the charge questions. A couple of
11 things that the workgroup might want to consider
12 regarding the question is, one, how can EPA ensure
13 that the workgroup's ideas for improving labeling
14 will be implemented quickly, fairly, and universally
15 by registrants, and the other is, how can the
16 readability of paper labeling be improved.

17 Thank you.

18 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Mayra.

19 And in the chat, Jasmine asked --
20 Jasmine Brown asks, can EPA market this to John
21 Deere GPS? It sounds like a question for further
22 exploration.

23 Is there anything else that we should
24 address or any other business that we should conduct
25 before we break for lunch on this topic?

1 ED MESSINA: I'll just respond to
2 Jasmine's comment. Yes, Jasmine, we should engage
3 the equipment manufacturers, you know, on how they
4 would like to receive information from an electronic
5 label. And I think there is benefits along the
6 lines of, sort of, you know, geo-fencing areas that
7 may be ecologically sensitive and having that
8 information passed on to a user, and a potential
9 user could be that smart tractor, and there are
10 other smart tractor manufacturers out there, in
11 addition to John Deere.

12 DANNY GIDDINGS: Anastasia Swearingen,
13 you're recognized.

14 ANASTASIA SWEARINGEN: [Connection issue].

15 DANNY GIDDINGS: Anastasia, it looks like
16 you've frozen up. Did we lose Anastasia?

17 ANASTASIA SWEARINGEN: I'm back. Sorry.
18 The Zoom just kicked me out for no reason. Can you
19 hear me?

20 DANNY GIDDINGS: Loud and clear. Go
21 ahead.

22 ANASTASIA SWEARINGEN: Okay. So I just
23 had a procedural question. So in terms of what the
24 charge questions will be and workgroup membership, I
25 know Ed spoke yesterday about the kind of the

1 formation of workgroups and some limitations around
2 that. So how will we kind of go forward working in
3 this workgroup and finalize those charge questions?
4 Will it be after this meeting or will it be after
5 the fall meeting?

6 ED MESSINA: After this meeting, the
7 workgroup, you know, which was formed already, would
8 meet and then develop charge questions and work on
9 them and develop whatever reports and
10 recommendations, and then present -- much like the
11 workgroups you've seen today, would then present on
12 what activities they undertook between now and the
13 November meeting.

14 ANASTASIA SWEARINGEN: Okay. So the
15 workgroup itself can develop its charge questions;
16 it's not for the PPDC to finalize those today?

17 ED MESSINA: Correct. What can happen is
18 the workgroup can think of charge questions. They
19 can say here's the charge questions we came up with,
20 and at the next PPDC, you know, do you want to
21 ratify these charge questions, are there other
22 charge questions, and here's kind of some
23 information and conversations we had.

24 ANASTASIA SWEARINGEN: Great. Thank you.

25 ED MESSINA: Mm-hmm.

1 And if we wanted to cover -- we have the
2 Moving Forward session again later on, and if folks
3 want to -- you know, if there's a motion that
4 somebody wants for a charge question for that
5 workgroup to, you know, develop now, we can --
6 someone can make a motion and a second. We can kind
7 of vote on it if we need to. It seems like that the
8 workgroup is sort of in the formation stage and, you
9 know, it's up to folks on how -- the co-chairs of
10 the workgroup recommend, you know, sort of what
11 happens and then also any member of the PPDC that
12 wants to talk about it.

13 DANNY GIDDINGS: Great. So let's break
14 for lunch unless there are any other comments or
15 questions on this topic, and we will come back to
16 discuss emerging pathogens and the PPDC update.
17 Let's take a thirty-minute break for lunch, and then
18 we'll come back at the 1:15.

19 ED MESSINA: Well, actually, Danny, I
20 think that the Emerging Viral Pathogen Group said
21 they didn't need all that time. So if we wanted to
22 extend lunch a little bit, we could be -- we'll be
23 okay on time.

24 DANNY GIDDINGS: So do we think a
25 45-minute lunch or a full hour?

1 ED MESSINA: Well, was the lunch break
2 scheduled until 1:30?

3 DANNY GIDDINGS: It was scheduled to 1:15
4 and Emerging Pathogens was scheduled to start at
5 1:20. So we can go to 1:30 for lunch and then start
6 Emerging Pathogens at 1:30, 1:35.

7 ED MESSINA: Michelle, are you good with a
8 1:30 start time for folks?

9 MICHELLE ARLING: That sounds good.

10 ED MESSINA: All right. Thanks,
11 everyone.

12 DANNY GIDDINGS: Let's reconvene at 1:30,
13 everyone. Thank you.

14 ED MESSINA: And then let's make sure that
15 if anyone's joining, we have a slide that says, you
16 know, the PPDC will start at 1:30, so in case
17 anyone's joining just for that meeting.

18 DANNY GIDDINGS: Sounds good. Yeah,
19 I'm guessing that Jeffrey and Michelle can work on
20 that.

21 JEFFREY CHANG: Yeah, I'll edit this slide
22 to say 1:30.

23 ED MESSINA: Great. Thank you so much.
24 And we'll just leave it up so people can see it when
25 they join.

1 Have a good lunch, everyone. See you in a
2 bit.

3 (Lunch recess taken.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 AFTERNOON SESSION

2 DANNY GIDDINGS: Hey, welcome back,
3 everyone. It is 1:30.

4 Can I get just some quick hand raises from
5 the PPDC members to confirm that you are back from
6 lunch?

7 Good, 15, which I think is a good number
8 for me to go ahead and start giving some
9 administrative and housekeeping items for anyone
10 from the public who have joined us since lunch, and
11 then we can launch right into the next workgroup
12 update.

13 So if you are just joining us, welcome,
14 you are tuning in to EPA's May 2023 PPDC meeting.
15 This afternoon, we'll be getting an update from the
16 Emerging Viral Pathogen Workgroup, and we'll also be
17 getting an Endangered Species Act activities update
18 from staff here at EPA, and then we'll have kind of
19 a summary and synthesis session that our Chair and
20 Director of Office of Pesticide Programs, Director
21 Ed Messina will lead, and then we'll have to finish
22 up the day as we do each of these meetings with 30
23 minutes of public comment, during which time members
24 of the public who have been on listen-only mode for
25 the entirety of today's webinar can elect to give

1 verbal public comments and will be promoted to
2 panelists and can unmute themselves and enable their
3 webcam to give those comments.

4 ZOOM SUPPORT: Danny, I'm sorry to
5 interrupt again. Your volume is cutting in and out
6 significantly.

7 DANNY GIDDINGS: Okay. Yeah, you know
8 what, I think it has something to do with me using
9 my mouse pad, as it turns out, because as I scroll
10 through documents or scroll through my screen, I
11 think it goes in and out. So I will avoid doing
12 that while I'm talking. And I'm not even good at
13 multitasking, so it should be easy.

14 So, anyway, so, yeah, so that's what we'll
15 do. If you require language translation either into
16 Spanish or American Sign Language, you can access
17 those services using the translation button at the
18 bottom of your Zoom screen, and it looks like a
19 globe, click on that, and then choose the language
20 that you require. For ASL, a popup will appear
21 in which you will see -- a popup box, in which you
22 will see our ASL translator. For Spanish, you will
23 enter -- you'll go into a different audio channel
24 that has our Spanish interpreters in it.

25 And a quick note, if you are in the

1 English channel, you will want to -- and only the
2 English channel, you will want to deselect the box
3 that says, mute original audio, as most of the audio
4 today is coming in in English. So you'll not want
5 that muted. And if you are in the Spanish channel,
6 you will want that muted. Otherwise, you'll get a
7 soft English feed on top of your Spanish feed.

8 So with that, I think we are ready to
9 pivot slightly for an update from our Emerging Viral
10 Pathogen Workgroup. For that, we're joined by Tajah
11 Blackburn, Senior Scientist at Efficacy Branch in
12 the Antimicrobials Division in OPP. That's Office
13 of Pesticide Programs.

14 We're also joined by PPDC member Anastasia
15 Swearingen, Senior Director at the American
16 Chemistry Council, and Rhonda Jones CEO at -- sorry,
17 CEO of Scientific and Regulatory Consultants,
18 Incorporated.

19 Welcome, everybody.

20 EMERGING PATHOGENS IMPLEMENTATION: COMMITTEE UPDATE

21 TAJAH BLACKBURN: Good afternoon. Can you
22 guys hear me okay?

23 DANNY GIDDINGS: Loud and clear.

24 TAJAH BLACKBURN: Perfect.

25 Well, as I was introduced, my name is

1 Tajah Blackburn and I'm Senior Scientist in the
2 Antimicrobials Division at the Environmental
3 Protection Agency.

4 First of all, thank you to PPDC for yet
5 another opportunity to share an update. Along with
6 the other Emerging Pathogen Implementation Chairs,
7 Rhonda Jones and Anastasia Swearingen, we will
8 provide our mid-year report.

9 Next slide.

10 For the next couple of slides, I will
11 navigate you through the background timeline of
12 events. Secondly, I would highlight some of the
13 amazing, yet unbiased, accomplishments and progress
14 that the Antimicrobials Division made by immediately
15 implementing some of the recommendations of the
16 previous workgroup. Then I will spend some time
17 briefly discussing the genesis of the current
18 workgroup/committee.

19 Next, we will share the small workgroup
20 updates from the specific workgroup sessions and
21 then, finally and lastly, we will leave sufficient
22 time for questions and suggestions.

23 Next slide.

24 The initial workgroup was conceptualized
25 and proposed to PPDC by the Centers for Biocide

1 Chemistry when Komal Jain was the Executive
2 Director. This occurred in the fall of 2020.
3 The original proposal envisioned an established
4 workgroup to conduct a retrospective analysis of
5 the EPA's antimicrobial response to the COVID-19
6 pandemic.

7 From concept to reality, the formation of
8 the official Emerging Pathogen Workgroup occurred in
9 December 2020, with the first meeting occurring in
10 early 2021. The initial group consisted of 20
11 persons with representation from industry, academia,
12 trade associations, regulatory and technical
13 consultants, the transportation industry, and our
14 sister agency, the Centers for Disease Control and
15 Prevention, CDC.

16 These group members were dedicated to
17 addressing four charge questions through biweekly
18 meetings. At the workgroup's sunset, greater than
19 85 recommendations were given to the EPA's
20 Antimicrobials Division to consider, prioritize,
21 and, if adequately developed, implement.

22 Within the Antimicrobials Division, we did
23 just that. We considered each recommendation and we
24 prioritized each recommendation. And the results of
25 that exercise were presented in the Spring 2022 PPDC

1 meeting. During that same Spring meeting, PPDC
2 voted to, number one, form a workgroup to refine and
3 implement the recommendations and, secondly, to
4 expand to focus on other types of antimicrobial
5 pathogens.

6 Next slide.

7 Before going further, I really want to
8 spend some time simply highlighting some of those
9 amazing accomplishments within the Antimicrobials
10 Division regarding some of the prioritized
11 recommendations. The first two items displayed on
12 this slide, the Emerging Viral Pathogens Guidance
13 status landing page and the proactive listing of
14 organisms prior to reaching U.S. soil have served to
15 enhance and centralize any EVP triggers and updates.

16 The list remodelization efforts resulted
17 in better and clearer resources through the
18 development of List Q and other modernized lists.

19 EPA's Antimicrobials Division continues to
20 communicate with their federal partners to ensure
21 the messaging is consistent with both scheduled
22 quarterly and biweekly meetings and, of course,
23 those last minute discussions when warranted.

24 And, lastly, we have started the Spanish
25 translation process for the landing page and the

1 List Q instructions.

2 I want to simply stress that these tools
3 and enhancements were developed in a climate of
4 strained resources. These enhancements have been
5 met with favorable feedback, as AD continuously
6 strives to make their resources and tools more
7 accessible.

8 Next slide.

9 So with the remaining recommendations and
10 a yes vote from PPDC to move forward with an
11 implementation workgroup, EPIC, the Emerging
12 Pathogens Implementation Committee -- and we only
13 threw in "committee" because adding a "G" would be a
14 little different. So EPIC was formed in July 2022
15 for a two-year commitment.

16 It is important to note that some of the
17 current members are holdovers from the original
18 group. The implementation group, in its first
19 operational year, has focused on the Emerging Viral
20 Pathogen's guidance, the cornerstone of a lot of the
21 work that was done during the pandemic, identifying
22 communication and educational gaps from sectors that
23 use antimicrobial pesticides, and addressing any
24 policy changes to propose, enhance, or retain
25 policy-centric to the EVP.

1 Sure, I will speak slower.

2 Small workgroups were formed and these
3 small workgroups focused on those topics centric to
4 the formation of this particular committee. These
5 workgroup meetings were and always are booked in by
6 the EPIC meetings, the larger workgroup meetings, to
7 share the happenings to the larger meeting group.

8 Next slide.

9 So this slide identifies the current EPIC
10 membership and it signifies the continued diversity
11 in membership across industry, federal agency, trade
12 associations and consultants.

13 I will now pass the verbal baton to Rhonda
14 Jones from SRC to provide the Technical Small
15 Workgroup Update.

16 Rhonda.

17 RHONDA JONES: Thanks, Tajah.

18 For the Technical Workgroup subset,
19 although it may look like mostly the same people
20 from the last slide -- I think there's a few that
21 were not on the Technical Workgroup -- so a really
22 nice range of participants. We've got some test
23 labs in here that are very familiar with the testing
24 of viruses and disinfectants, which are really a key
25 to doing some aspects of the work that this

1 particular group was tasked with.

2 So next slide.

3 Our highest priority item that we were
4 asked to work on was a revision to the 2016 Emerging
5 Viral Pathogen Guidance. We have a listing here on
6 the slide of all of the things that the PPDC or the
7 earlier EPWG Committee asked us to implement and
8 investigate. So you can see we have taken the time
9 and touched, in our workgroup, on every one of these
10 items and we have, at this point, submitted to EPA a
11 final red line and clean version of our
12 recommendations on how this guidance should be
13 updated moving forward.

14 So let's talk a little bit on the next
15 slide about the changes that the group did end up
16 making.

17 We have done a number of things to expand
18 the guidance. In the area of surface types and
19 uses, while the original document was focused on
20 hard surface disinfection only, we have expanded to
21 soft surfaces and fabric surfaces. We've expanded
22 residual and nonresidual claims. We're including
23 laundry now, food contact sanitization, sterilants
24 and sporicides, and provided EPA the flexibility to
25 add more as the need arises or to maintain the

1 supply chain in a pandemic or outbreak-type
2 situation.

3 We also expanded the qualifying organisms
4 for the hierarchy. So previously it has been three
5 tiers based on viral structure, and now we have
6 added spores into that tier as well, as they are
7 more difficult to kill or inactivate than the
8 viruses.

9 This will give EPA additional flexibility,
10 again, should they need to rely on those kinds of
11 additional qualifiers for the EVP claims and to
12 maintain supply chain.

13 While the original policy included both
14 human and animal viruses, it wasn't clear whether an
15 animal virus could support a human virus, or vice
16 versa. That clarification has been added, and they
17 will essentially be used interchangeably to qualify
18 for an EVP claim.

19 We have expanded the communication
20 language. There was two original paragraphs of
21 label language that was allowed for the EVP. I'm
22 sorry, it was not allowed for on label, but for
23 communications, there were two state paragraphs of
24 information. We've added a smaller, shorter one
25 that's a little more concise, and we've also

1 proposed the addition of table formats, so that you
2 could very quickly look for a particular product,
3 see its EVP claim, see the contact time and the
4 dilutions and the use instructions for the product
5 all in a table format.

6 We have also proposed the expansion of
7 where the EVP communications may be used.
8 Essentially, we've expanded it from a more
9 professionally targeted healthcare professional type
10 uses to basically any user, any purchaser, wherever
11 you can communicate with those folks.

12 We have also -- of course, Tajah just
13 talked about the EPA landing page, and it was
14 developed and in place when this workgroup started.
15 So we revised a document to change really the point
16 of communication about the policy to the landing
17 page. So now all the references target the landing
18 page and send you to the landing page for additional
19 educational information.

20 We have added the allowance for a QR code
21 or a similar equivalent on label link to the EVP
22 communications so that the user can more directly,
23 at the point of purchase, access the current EVP
24 status for any product.

25 We have further expanded to allow EPA to

1 trigger the policy based on potential to impact the
2 United States before an emerging pathogen actually
3 is on soil. You see they are already doing that
4 with Marburg and Ebola additions to the landing page
5 as well already. So this just mirrors their current
6 practices.

7 We further expanded the allowance for the
8 agency to rely on other parties to identify
9 outbreaks, to identify the emerging strains and the
10 method of transmission. Before we were fairly
11 limited to CDC and World Health Organization. We've
12 expanded to add USDA and other pertinent sources so
13 that we can very quickly respond and get things onto
14 that web page.

15 And, lastly, we updated the registration
16 process and we're providing a number of templates,
17 so templates for cover letters for submissions,
18 templates of the terms agreement that must be signed
19 by the registrant, master label language templates,
20 table templates, et cetera, to make this as
21 standardized and consistent as possible.

22 Next slide.

23 So where are we going next? Our next
24 highest priority item was to look to expand the
25 Emerging Viral Pathogen policy outside of viruses.

1 So we have begun those discussions in our workgroup.
2 We continue to meet about every two weeks. And we
3 are currently focused on emerging spores, so
4 bacterial spore-forming organisms. And we are
5 working through with our current workgroup, and we
6 are about to invite a number of spore experts to
7 join us for those conversations as well. And we'll
8 be doing a literature search to support this as
9 well.

10 And so we will work our way from spores to
11 mycobacteria, through fungi and yeast to bacteria,
12 looking to see if the science and the literature
13 supports similar types of policies, as we're doing
14 here with the viruses.

15 We have a number of other medium or low
16 priority tasks that were also assigned to us that
17 are listed here, and so we will take those up as we
18 finish our high priority tasks as well. Some we're
19 already collaborating with the policy workgroup, and
20 Anastasia is going to talk about that in a minute.

21 So over to you, Anastasia, I believe.

22 ANASTASIA SWEARINGEN: Thanks, Rhonda.

23 So as Tajah noted, there's a lot of
24 overlap between our various subworkgroups of the
25 EPIC Committee. So we have a a mixed number of

1 folks who -- many of whom serve on the main policy -
2 - or on the main EPIC Workgroup.

3 So we can move to the next slide.

4 So as Rhonda noted in the EVP Policy
5 recommendation updates, we've been really exploring
6 within the policy workgroup and in the technical
7 workgroup how we might be able to provide some
8 flexibility for on label or point of sale
9 information on which products we need various EVP
10 triggered outbreaks.

11 So one thing that we've looked at in the
12 previous version of the EPIC Committee, the EVP
13 Committee, was some sort of on-pack signaling or
14 icons on the packaging, and we noted that there are
15 quite a few regulatory hurdles to getting that done
16 on package.

17 So then we looked at what was going on in
18 the PRIA discussions and in some other discussions
19 about electronic labeling and the ability to use QR
20 codes or similar means to convey information that
21 can be changed where it's not permanently on the
22 printed label.

23 So we have developed a preliminary
24 proposal within this policy workgroup working with
25 the technical group on how you might be able to use

1 a QR code to convey EVP language when that's
2 appropriate, and that is built into the updated EVP
3 recommendations, as Rhonda noted, and we'll talk a
4 little bit further about what that might look like
5 on the next slide.

6 We're also looking up -- oh, not yet,
7 sorry.

8 And so we're also looking at the idea of
9 incident reporting and how easy that is to do. And
10 so I think most people have gone to EPA's website
11 and see it's really easy to report an incident, but
12 it's a little bit more complicated to determine how
13 you might code that for an EVP violation. And so
14 Tajah has been doing some really helpful outreach to
15 OECA talking about what -- how those ones
16 are created, what information is captured. And then
17 we'll be looking in the policy workgroup as to are
18 there some changes we could recommend to make it
19 simpler to identify how you would code that and when
20 you're doing the violation reporting.

21 And we're also learning more from Tajah's
22 conversation, which she'll talk about a little bit
23 later in the presentation, about the feedback from
24 user groups. So how can we make it easier for folks
25 to understand what products to use with different

1 surfaces? So we've been exploring that, what's in
2 the realm of the possible when we think about how to
3 communicate on the use of these antimicrobial
4 products?

5 And then we've also talked about how we
6 can explore the communication tools that we have or
7 make new ones on where you use these antimicrobials
8 and how they should be used. We've heard from day
9 cares and schools and farms, and so looking at what
10 tools we might be able to recommend to communicate
11 the existing policies and how you use these
12 products.

13 So you can go to that side.

14 So here's an example, a QR code that
15 Rhonda and her staff were able to develop for us.
16 And so if you take your cell phone and scan the QR
17 code here, it takes you to a sample page that --
18 where we propose you can either get the text for an
19 emerging viral pathogen if an outbreak has been
20 triggered, and you could view that either in the
21 text form or a table form.

22 And then we thought about -- well, we're
23 also doing this in the future for bilingual
24 labeling, so for antimicrobial products. You can do
25 that as you can for other products with the -- parts

1 of the label included in the Spanish Translation
2 Guide, or you can provide that information via a
3 safety data sheet. And so in this example, it shows
4 the safety data sheet in both English and Spanish.

5 And then many of you are familiar with
6 Smart Label. So the example here is to show what
7 language would be proposed that you would see via
8 the text and then the landing page that the QR code
9 would take you to so you could click through to get
10 to that information. If you're looking at a
11 product, you know, one QR code could take you to the
12 EVP information and the Spanish labeling and other
13 information that the registrant would choose to put
14 on there.

15 So next slide.

16 And so we'll continue to work on these
17 activities. There's a lot to do still, and I think
18 the Label Reform Workgroup will be doing a lot of
19 the -- answering some of the questions around how
20 you might use QR codes and similar electronic things
21 and that will have a good overlap with that
22 electronic component of the EVP language.

23 But we'll also be looking at the product
24 compatibility and surface materials, considering
25 that with the Technical Workgroup, looking at the

1 interface with the existing PR Notice 9810 to
2 address emergencies for faster submission
3 processing, again, with the Technical Group, and as
4 Rhonda noted, assisting with the Section 18 efficacy
5 guidance and needed updates.

6 So that takes me through what the Policy
7 Workgroup has been looking at so far and will plan
8 to look at for the next part of our -- I think until
9 November.

10 So I'm going to turn it back over to you,
11 Tajah.

12 TAJAH BLACKBURN: Thank you, Anastasia.

13 So I'm a huge proponent of education and
14 communication. So it's a pleasure to lead this
15 workgroup. The members affiliated with this effort
16 are highlighted on the right side of the screen.
17 So again, a nice representation across many
18 different sectors present here.

19 Next slide.

20 So to provide some context to the original
21 charge question that was proposed and addressed by
22 the initial workgroup, that Emerging Pathogen
23 Workgroup, the question was to take this deep dive
24 to determine what education is needed during a
25 pandemic or other emergency for the public end users

1 and other regulating authorities.

2 The issue identified early on was that
3 there was ineffective messaging across several
4 sectors due to information in education gaps. To
5 address this gap, this small workgroup would serve
6 to develop targeted resources and references for
7 general and specialized messaging for key sectors at
8 different stages of a pandemic or emergency,
9 gathered through planned outreach tools, surveys, et
10 cetera, and lessons learned.

11 Next slide.

12 To better understand the gaps, we had to
13 have conversations, had to talk to these different
14 sectors to really understand the challenges with
15 EPA-registered antimicrobial products. Originally,
16 we agreed to use surveys through a list of specific
17 questions, but we found out early on that that would
18 be a significant challenge to gather information
19 from surveys due to time and other sectors that
20 experienced something that I was pretty much new to
21 called survey fatigue.

22 So we took a different approach. We
23 didn't remove surveys completely as an option for
24 gathering information, but since time was of the
25 essence, we decided to utilize alternate routes to

1 gathering information. And those alternate routes
2 consisted of literature, discussions with different
3 sectors where we just basically had conversations as
4 to what the weaknesses and challenges were with
5 antimicrobial pesticide products during the pandemic
6 and during just daily operational use.

7 So next slide.

8 To date, we have gathered information from
9 the following groups: CDC's Vessel Sanitation
10 Program, VSP; the immigrant and migrant -- that
11 should be farmworkers, migrant clinicians, teachers'
12 associations, and a specific hotel chain. We still
13 want to gather information from a couple of other
14 federal agencies, as well as ground transportation
15 groups and the healthcare user groups as well.

16 Next slide.

17 So this slide is really the crux of the
18 information as it highlights some of the recurring
19 themes that we heard across the sectors in
20 conversation and literature. And I'm just going to
21 go by -- go through these one by one because I think
22 they're just really critically important about some
23 of the challenges. And it wasn't just limited to
24 one particular sector. We were hearing these themes
25 across the sectors in which we spoke with.

1 The first one was exposure issues. There
2 was a big increase, of course, in the use of
3 antimicrobial pesticides during the pandemic, and so
4 that led to overuse and exposure issues. And one
5 particular sector even asked, why doesn't a Worker
6 Protection Standard exist for antimicrobial
7 pesticides, because it's something that's critically
8 needed and was something that would have been needed
9 during this particular season.

10 The next thing that we heard a lot about
11 was the interchangeable and inaccurate use of
12 disinfectants and sanitizers, and just what they
13 meant and how that could be effectively translated
14 to effective use for different sectors.

15 The next one really, really resonated with
16 me, and it was the language barriers, dialect
17 issues, as well as literacy challenges. And I can
18 hear my "inner Joe" speaking to me about this,
19 something that he was really, really passionate
20 about when he was a member of the Emerging Pathogen
21 Workgroup. But some of the issues and concerns
22 about, yes, translating things into Spanish and
23 other languages would be effective, but what about
24 the literacy challenges and how could we better
25 ensure that these products are being used

1 effectively and safely and used accurately based on
2 label information?

3 And then the last big thing was something
4 that Anastasia hit on, was the incompatibility
5 issues. And this particular sector that I spoke
6 with was really concerned about the lack of products
7 that could be used on a multitude of services. And
8 if something's just for hard nonporous surfaces, but
9 this is the only product I have, guess what? I'm
10 going to use it on porous surfaces and other things.
11 And then this really led to a lot of damaged
12 surfaces, things that had to be discarded after the
13 pandemic. So a really, really big concern
14 from one particular sector in general.

15 Next slide.

16 So in the future, we will continue to
17 gather the information from the sectors. Hopefully,
18 we can have all that information gathered and sifted
19 through by the end of June. And with that
20 information, our goal is to propose products. We've
21 heard a lot of input from the sectors about how
22 important infographics may be, especially for those
23 sectors where literacy is a significant challenge.

24 And so through our second year, we hope to
25 really think about products and effective tools to

1 really address some of those themes and challenges
2 that the different sectors encountered during the
3 use of these products, and then, of course, we're
4 going to finish with the Spanish translations for
5 the List Q instructions and the landing page.

6 Next slide.

7 So I started this presentation with a
8 thank you and, similarly, thank you again for this
9 opportunity to provide an update at this Workgroup's
10 midpoint. And I think now is the perfect time to
11 answer any questions that you may have.

12 Thank you.

13 Thank you, Tajah, and thank you to
14 Anastasia and Rhonda as well.

15 Let's do turn to the PPDC now for
16 discussion. If you're a member of the PPDC, please
17 raise your hand to be recognized.

18 I see Jasmine Brown has her hand up. Go
19 ahead, Jasmine.

20 JASMINE BROWN: Thank you for your
21 presentations and all the work you guys did on this.

22 I was kind of wondering, so the tribe
23 supply chain seemed to have been quite flooded. The
24 hospitals, the schools, the homes, everywhere was
25 just flooded with antimicrobial disinfectants. And

1 now there's semi-loads and palettes of expired
2 unusable disinfectants. And I don't know if your
3 policy or guidance -- you spoke briefly about
4 registration and labeling. And it sounds like, to
5 me, you guys are more focused on how to keep things
6 streamlined and easy for the public to use more of
7 it, which is great. But how do they dispose of it?

8 I just want to see if you guys have even
9 thought about that or included that, because now we
10 have -- these schools are probably going to have to
11 pay massive amounts of hazardous waste disposal and
12 they're very low-income schools as it is.

13 ANASTASIA SWEARINGEN: I don't know,
14 Tajah, if you want to address it. I just know --
15 you know, I think it's an interesting question. Our
16 charge here is to really look -- I'm getting a
17 notification my [connection issue] crashed.

18 Can you still hear me?

19 TAJAH BLACKBURN: Yes.

20 RHONDA JONES: Yes.

21 ANASTASIA SWEARINGEN: Okay. I don't know
22 what's going on with my Zoom today. Sorry.

23 So we are getting these --

24 RHONDA JONES: I'm sorry. It looks like
25 we lost Anastasia for a minute. I might jump in

1 here and just say what I think she might have said.
2 Our charge was really to look at the policy. The
3 policy does not address disposal, but each label
4 does have required disposal language and
5 instructions that should be followed in
6 accomplishing that disposal. But it is a little bit
7 outside of what our particular mandate was in this
8 case.

9 I don't know, Tajah, if you have anything
10 to add.

11 JASMINE BROWN: Yeah, and I have one more
12 question reaching beyond the product itself. Say,
13 monkeypox comes into an area. Hospitals and people
14 are advised through different guidance on how to
15 dispose of pathogen-contaminated items. Is that
16 correct?

17 RHONDA JONES: Yes, that's correct.

18 JASMINE BROWN: Okay.

19 ANASTASIA SWEARINGEN: [Connection issue]
20 everyone. I heard the tail end. And this is
21 exactly what I was going to say. The disposal
22 requirements aren't necessarily unique to products
23 that would be used for outbreaks. So that's one of
24 the reasons why it wouldn't be probably part of this
25 Group's mandate. But it is, I think, you know, a

1 question that we can provide more guidance on
2 generally, and I know EPA has plenty on -- of
3 resources on disposal.

4 DANNY GIDDINGS: Great. Thank you all.

5 And thank you, Jasmine, for your
6 questions.

7 Let's turn to Joe Grzywacz.

8 JOE GRZYWACZ: Thanks so much for that
9 really great presentation. I also appreciate the
10 "inner Joe" being channeled by you, Tajah. I really
11 appreciate that a lot. And I just simply want to
12 echo, I think the point that Jasmine brought up is
13 really a critical one. I realize that it's outside
14 the scope of this working room, you know, but I
15 know, at least from the farmworker groups that I'm
16 connected with here in Florida and the Atlantic
17 Southeast more generally, the problem that she
18 identified is there.

19 So, I mean, I think the broader issue of
20 supply chain things and then what groups do with
21 those excess products once they actually do arrive,
22 I do think that that's a really important issue for
23 EPA to, you know, at least be attentive to and,
24 again, to be able to provide some guidance on. So I
25 fully recognize it's outside the scope of this

1 group, but I really appreciate the attentiveness
2 that you guys have taken with regard to language and
3 literacy and moving this initiative forward.

4 So kudos to you on that great work.

5 DANNY GIDDINGS: Great. Thanks, Joe.

6 Are there any other comments or questions
7 for our workgroup panel? It sounds like we will
8 take back the disposal point, unless you have
9 anything to -- any comments or feedback broadly
10 about disinfectant disposal. But we will take that
11 back unless you want to say something.

12 ED MESSINA: No, I thought Rhonda gave a
13 great answer to that. So I think we're probably
14 good there. But, yeah, I'm certainly happy to talk
15 offline with the tribes that are experiencing this
16 issue.

17 DANNY GIDDINGS: Great.

18 ANASTASIA SWEARINGEN: Danny, just one
19 more thing from our group, you know, just to note,
20 it's still open for membership and you can do the
21 same process of emailing Tajah and Rhonda and I and
22 Michelle if you want to join. There's plenty of
23 work to do, and we're always looking for more
24 members.

25 DANNY GIDDINGS: Anastasia, I think that's

1 a great place to end it. So thank you to Rhonda,
2 Anastasia, and Tajah for presenting. And we are now
3 going to move on to an update on EPA's ESA
4 activities.

5 Jake Li, who is the Deputy Administrator
6 for Pesticide Programs here at OCSPP, and Jan
7 Matuszko, who is our newly permanent Director of the
8 Environmental Fate and Effects Division in OPP,
9 welcome to you both.

10 ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT ACTIVITIES UPDATE

11 JAKE LI: Thank you. Are we ready to get
12 started, Danny?

13 DANNY GIDDINGS: Yep.

14 JAKE LI: Okay, fantastic.

15 Well, good afternoon or good morning,
16 everyone. Thanks for your interest in this topic.
17 I am going to spend just a few minutes setting the
18 stage for our ESA pesticide work and then hand it
19 off to Jan to talk in more detail about what we're
20 doing, as well as some sort of upcoming actions in
21 this space.

22 So first, I want to set the context for
23 why we are moving at the speed and the scale that we
24 are on ESA FIFRA issues.

25 Next slide, please.

1 So I'm sure some of you have seen at least
2 one of these cases. These are recent Federal
3 Circuit Court decisions on ESA pesticide issues.
4 And the main takeaway from this slide is that courts
5 are increasingly frustrated with EPA for our
6 inability to fully comply with the ESA when it comes
7 to certain FIFRA decisions. And, again, these are
8 just three of the recent cases that were actually
9 penned by a range of judges from both -- sort of
10 Democratic and Republican appointed judges.

11 And we think that these cases really
12 underscore the need for EPA to diligently implement
13 our ESA workplan, which I think many of you are
14 familiar with. But for those that aren't, I'm going
15 to talk a little bit about why we developed the
16 workplan and what it says.

17 Next slide, please.

18 So last year we developed and released the
19 first ever EPA comprehensive workplan on how we
20 intend to move towards full ESA compliance over
21 time. We can't prioritize all of the FIFRA actions
22 for full ESA compliance right away. So the workplan
23 describes which types of actions we want to
24 prioritize first versus which are second and which
25 are third tier priorities.

1 The workplan also underscores the need for
2 early mitigation, even before we get a full ESA
3 biological opinion from either the Fish and Wildlife
4 Service or the National Marine Fisheries Service,
5 and this is so that we can start protecting species
6 earlier in the process and we can actually show we
7 are making that progress if we have to explain this
8 to courts.

9 And then, finally, we are also focused on
10 much more efficient approaches to implementing our
11 ESA FIFRA work because the current chemical-by-
12 chemical, species-by-species approach doesn't scale
13 up if you look at all of the chemicals and species
14 that we have to assess, even in just registration
15 review alone, putting aside new AI registrations,
16 new uses, experimental use permits, and other FIFRA
17 actions.

18 And so these are all themes that you will
19 hear more about when Jan updates you on our recent
20 and forthcoming work. But I really want to
21 underscore that these are really important themes
22 that cut across our ESA work right now.

23 Next slide, please.

24 And then last November, we issued our
25 first update to the workplan. This update you can

1 think of as really where the rubber starts to meet
2 the road on early mitigation. And in the workplan
3 update we described and proposed over 20 pages of
4 draft label language that effectively is a menu of
5 ecological mitigation measures under FIFRA that we
6 can select from our registration review of
7 conventional chemicals in order to start reducing
8 exposure to both listed and nonlisted species.

9 So again, these are FIFRA mitigation
10 measures, not ESA measures, which means that we can
11 apply the risk-benefit analysis to those measures.
12 And again, they're not designed just for ESA
13 species. They're designed to address off-target
14 ecological impacts as a whole.

15 We also talked in that workplan update
16 around proposed Bulletins Live! language, as well as
17 additional ESA strategies that Jan is going to talk
18 a bit about.

19 I'll say we got over a hundred public
20 comments on this workplan update. Many of them were
21 very, very useful. So thanks to all of you who put
22 in the time to draft these letters. They were
23 really thoughtful. We are still working our way
24 through these letters and determining next steps.
25 But I did want to thank everyone for sending those

1 letters in.

2 Jan, I'm going to turn it over to you to
3 give a bit more detail about what we're doing next.

4 JAN MATUSZKO: Great. Thank you, Jake.

5 Next slide, please.

6 So I'm going to go into a little detail.
7 I'm hoping that most of you are familiar with our
8 workplan update. But when Jake was talking about
9 the FIFRA Interim Ecological Mitigations, or IEMS,
10 as we refer to them, basically what we're talking
11 about here is that we're going to place greater
12 emphasis on addressing the ecological risks while
13 still considering the benefits and the impact of
14 mitigation. And, again, this is what -- when we're
15 talking under FIFRA.

16 Next slide, please.

17 So what are FIFRA Interim Ecological
18 Mitigations? It's basically a menu of generalized
19 ecological mitigations that are designed to reduce
20 exposure to nontarget wildlife from spray drift and
21 runoff, as well as advisory language that EPA can
22 use across a broad range of pesticides. We plan to
23 incorporate these mitigation menus in proposed and
24 final decisions for agricultural uses for
25 conventional and biopesticides. For each chemical,

1 we plan to adjust the specific mitigation
2 requirement to account for varying risks and
3 benefits of the pesticide.

4 And since these mitigation measures are
5 intended to protect listed and nontarget -- and
6 nonlisted, nontarget wildlife generally, these would
7 be included on the label and not target-specific ESA
8 species, but obviously would benefit ESA species if
9 they're present.

10 Next slide, please.

11 The update also proposed that we would
12 require a link to the Bulletins Live! Two system on
13 labels with outdoor uses. For those of you that
14 aren't familiar with our Bulletins Live! Two system,
15 which we refer to as BLT, it's a system that houses
16 measures that focus protections only in specific
17 geographical areas to minimize impacts to pesticide
18 users. We're finding that while EPA has been
19 employing bulletins for years, most pesticide users
20 and the folks that advise them are not familiar with
21 our BLT system. So we're trying to increase
22 awareness of the system and bulletins in general.

23 Finally, we also proposed standard
24 advisory language for pollinators for incident
25 reporting and for treated seed, as applicable.

1 Next slide, please.

2 So Jake mentioned we received about 100
3 comments to our workplan update. We had requested
4 comments on the IEM portion and also we had -- and
5 around the same time we posed interim decisions for
6 pesticides and registration review to demonstrate
7 how we would actually implement the IEMs for
8 specific pesticides.

9 We're currently conducting a holistic
10 review of comments received on the workplan update,
11 as well as these four pesticides. The plan is that
12 we will update the IEMs and the proposed language
13 for forthcoming decisions to reflect these comments.

14 Next slide.

15 For the most part, the types of
16 mitigations that are available to reduce spray drift
17 and runoff to nontarget species are the same,
18 whether we're focused on listed species, nonlisted
19 species, or both. As such, the FIFRA IEM team is
20 working closely with the ESA -- the other ESA teams
21 that are developing the strategies I will discuss
22 shortly, such that we are incorporating applicable
23 comments on future ESA efforts, as well.

24 One of the main comments we received
25 focused on the nexus between NRCS conservation

1 practice standards and EPA pesticide mitigation
2 measures. We are actively coordinating closely with
3 the USDA on this nexus and we plan to provide more
4 information on our efforts later in 2023.

5 Next slide.

6 So the workplan also describes new
7 initiatives that we have been undertaking based on
8 what we learned from our more recent ESA efforts.
9 This slide provides an overview of the new
10 initiatives discussed in the update.

11 First, we are working on a vulnerable
12 species pilot where we are identifying mitigation
13 measures for a subset of listed species with limited
14 ranges and where pesticides are identified as a
15 stressor. We're also working on strategies to group
16 assessments and mitigation based on the type of
17 pesticide or the type of pesticide use. An example,
18 which I will talk about in more detail, is grouping
19 herbicides all together.

20 We're also similarly starting to develop
21 strategies for a particular region. For example, we
22 can develop a cross-pesticide approach to address
23 listed species and designated critical habitats in
24 Hawaii. And I'll provide detail on both of these in
25 subsequent slides.

1 Next slide, please.

2 All right. Vulnerable species. So the
3 first effort, obviously, that I'm going to talk
4 about is our vulnerable species effort. This is one
5 -- for this pilot, we're developing a broad approach
6 to reduce spray drift and runoff transport from
7 treated fields to minimize exposure to a subset of
8 27 listed species that are particularly vulnerable
9 to pesticides.

10 Our goal is to reduce the likelihood of
11 jeopardy and adverse modification for these
12 federally listed species and their critical
13 habitats.

14 Next slide.

15 This slide lists the vulnerable species
16 that we are focusing on in the pilot. As you can
17 see, we've selected a range of different groups of
18 listed species. One criteria that we applied in
19 selecting the pilot species is that we wanted to
20 focus on those that have small ranges. In selecting
21 the species, we used data from the Fish and Wildlife
22 Service, such as five-year reviews and biological
23 opinions. For all of the selected species, Fish
24 indicated they had either medium or high
25 vulnerability and that pesticides were a stressor.

1 Next slide.

2 So this slide just discusses some of the
3 overarching thinking that we have been applying in
4 developing mitigations for these vulnerable species.

5 First, as all of the selected species have
6 small ranges, we primarily developed the mitigations
7 in the form of draft bulletins. In other words, the
8 mitigations would only apply in specific pesticide
9 use limitation areas, which we also call PULAs, such
10 that the impact of pesticide users nationally is
11 narrow.

12 In terms of how we would apply these
13 mitigations, our current thinking is that simple is
14 best. We will likely apply them broadly across
15 outdoor-use pesticides, and if no specific pesticide
16 use is in that pesticide use limitation area, then
17 there would be no mitigation required. Where it
18 makes sense, we also intend to apply the same
19 mitigations across species. And in developing the
20 species-specific mitigations, we are considering
21 their life history, their habitat, and relevant use
22 sites. This includes species-specific timing
23 restrictions, as appropriate.

24 While some of the mitigations will likely
25 be focused on minimizing pesticide exposure to the

1 species, some mitigations will likely avoid -- I
2 mean, likely include avoidance in key areas
3 inhabited by species.

4 I also want to note that we have been
5 coordinating with our federal partners as we develop
6 the mitigations. In particular, since all of these
7 species are Fish and Wildlife species, we have been
8 coordinating with the Fish and Wildlife Service
9 headquarters, as well as receiving feedback from the
10 species experts.

11 We will also be providing an early look to
12 the USDA's Office of Pest Management Policy, or
13 OPMP, next week.

14 Next slide.

15 So obviously, this slide shows our
16 timeline. We anticipate proposing the mitigations
17 for these vulnerable species actually later this
18 month and finalizing those mitigations by the end of
19 the calendar year. When we propose the mitigations,
20 the associated White Paper will also describe our
21 selection of the pilot vulnerable species and the
22 proposed mitigations, our evaluation of the
23 mitigations, our plan for implementing the
24 mitigations for these pilot species, and our current
25 thinking on how we expect to expand this approach,

1 the approach that we have taken for these pilot
2 efforts to additional vulnerable species.
3 Obviously, this expansion would not take place until
4 sometime after we finalize this pilot effort.

5 At the same time, we'll also be releasing
6 vulnerable species story maps that offer the unique
7 ability to convey geospatial information about the
8 location of these species, the protection they need
9 from pesticides, agricultural fields, monitoring
10 data, habitat descriptions, and other visuals.

11 On Endangered Species Day last month, we
12 released portions of the story maps for a subset of
13 the vulnerable species. Check it out. If you
14 haven't seen them, you can access them through our
15 existing vulnerable species website.

16 Next slide.

17 Okay. So on this slide, I'm going to
18 talk about strategies that we are developing
19 for herbicides. Through the herbicide strategy, we
20 are developing a broad approach to reduce spray
21 drift and runoff transport from treated agricultural
22 fields in the continuing -- in the United States,
23 the lower 48 of the United States to minimize
24 exposure to listed plants, which are the main types
25 impacted by herbicides, and listed species that

1 depend on plants from the use of herbicides.

2 In the case of the herbicide strategy, we
3 are addressing in excess of 900 listed species.

4 The goal is to reduce the likelihood of
5 jeopardy and adverse modification for federally
6 listed plants and listed species that depend on
7 plants and apply it broadly to herbicides.

8 In addition to making future pesticide
9 decisions for herbicides more efficient, it would
10 also increase the efficiency of future herbicide
11 biological evaluations and consultations as both EPA
12 and the Fish and Wildlife Service would focus on
13 potential effects for any remaining species that are
14 not addressed in this strategy. An example of those
15 types of species would be, say, effects to animals
16 on the treated field or newly listed species.

17 Next slide.

18 So some of the considerations that we have
19 been thinking through as we develop the herbicide
20 strategy are included on this slide. These include,
21 like, which mitigation measures can be readily
22 implemented by growers; which mitigation measures
23 are most effective and in which situations can they
24 be applied; what best management practices are
25 commonly used by growers and readily available for

1 different mitigation measures; what is the
2 prevalence of the use of different mitigation
3 measures for different crops and regions; how will
4 criteria for mitigations needed differ from one crop
5 to -- and in the different regions -- from one crop
6 to a next in -- for a different regions.

7 So as described earlier, the herbicide
8 team has been coordinating with the FIFRA IEM team,
9 such that the herbicide team is considering comments
10 that are applicable to this strategy as well. We
11 are also working with state groups to inform many of
12 these questions, too.

13 Okay. Next slide.

14 Okay. Slide 17 just gives you -- so if
15 you're not familiar, I just wanted to give you some
16 examples of the types of mitigations that we are
17 considering to reduce runoff or erosion. Some of
18 these are -- obviously, would be adjacent to the
19 field. Some of these would be on-field mitigation.
20 Some of these are controlled drainage. And these
21 are just a few examples.

22 Next slide.

23 This slide similarly shows some example
24 mitigations to reduce spray drift. These are fairly
25 common with pesticides. So buffer distance, coarser

1 droplet sizes, altering the release height, hooded
2 sprayers, windbreaks, that type of thing.

3 Okay. Next slide.

4 So EPA's herbicide team is in the
5 development phase right now. We are also
6 coordinating with USDA's Office of Pest Management
7 Policy. We have briefed them on the strategy and
8 our current thinking on mitigations, and they are
9 contributing information on the potential
10 mitigations, as well as some potential exemptions.

11 As these species are, for the very most
12 part, are covered by Fish and Wildlife Service, we
13 have also been coordinating with them regularly
14 during the development of this strategy.

15 At this point, we anticipate releasing the
16 draft herbicide strategy most likely in July and are
17 targeting to finalize the strategy by the end of
18 calendar year 2023.

19 Next slide.

20 Okay. So this slide, I'm going to sort of
21 transition to talk about the first regional strategy
22 that we're developing, and this one is for Hawaii.
23 And this effort is a joint effort between EPA and
24 the Fish and Wildlife Service.

25 Next slide.

1 So the goal is for the two agencies, with
2 input of select stakeholders, to agree on how EPA's
3 pesticide decisions can efficiently comply with the
4 ESA for Hawaii listed species. Our current thinking
5 is that we would tackle these listed species in
6 groups or bins based on how they might be exposed to
7 a pesticide.

8 For example, species in highly remote
9 areas would likely experience very different
10 exposure than species that are located in areas
11 where pesticides are used. As such, the mitigations
12 would likely vary from the different exposure bins.

13 Slide 22.

14 So what we are doing for each bin, we are
15 developing a framework for deciding what type of
16 mitigation, if any, is needed for all species and
17 critical habitats. We are then planning to identify
18 mitigation measures and then to determine when and
19 how to adopt these measures in our pesticide
20 decisions, and then we want to seek agreement with
21 the Fish and Wildlife on how to efficiently comply
22 with the ESA for each one of these bins.

23 Our timeline is such that we have been
24 actively working on the development of this through
25 this spring and we are going to continue to be this

1 summer, and we're targeting a Fall 2023 workshop,
2 And with that, next slide, I am -- thank
3 you. And I'm finished with -- we're finished with
4 our formal presentation, and we're happy to take
5 questions.

6 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Jan. Thank
7 you, Jake.

8 Let's now turn to the PPDC to take any
9 questions. As always, raise your hand in Zoom and I
10 will call you in the order that you raise your hand.

11 So, Nathan Donley, I see you have your
12 hand up. You are recognized.

13 NATHAN DONLEY: Great. Thanks. Thanks,
14 Jan and Jake. I really appreciate your work on this
15 and thanks for this presentation.

16 You know, I really just want to say that
17 we're thankful that the EPA is putting out
18 biological evaluations at a good pace and starting
19 to think about these programmatic changes, like
20 herbicide strategies, regional strategies,
21 vulnerable species pilots, that will absolutely be
22 needed moving forward. The agency has been doing a
23 lot of good work on this and, clearly, takes this
24 process seriously. So thank you.

25 Right now, you know, the hold-up in this

1 process from our view is Fish and Wildlife Service
2 failing to complete their biological opinions.
3 That's the bottleneck here. And EPA has done just
4 about everything it can do to move these chemicals
5 through consultation, in some cases even doing the
6 job of Fish and Wildlife Service in making
7 predictive jeopardy calls and adverse modification
8 of critical habitat calls.

9 And I just want to say that it's extremely
10 rare, just to put this in perspective, for a
11 government agency action to have just one jeopardy
12 call. But of the dozen or so pesticides that are in
13 registration review that EPA has initiated
14 consultation on, EPA predicts that each one will
15 result in at least 50 to 200 jeopardy calls. So I
16 just -- I can't overstate how big of a problem this
17 is, the number of imperiled species that are being
18 put at risk of extinction and have been harmed for
19 over the last 50 years by pesticides is just
20 astounding. So it really pains me that Fish and
21 Wildlife Service is not meeting the urgency of this
22 situation, but here we are. So I'll leave it at
23 that.

24 And I also want to say that while it's
25 great to see EPA making progress on initiating its

1 consultation duties, it's really important that the
2 mitigations that are put in place to either prevent
3 jeopardy, or even those that are meant to reduce
4 incidental take, be clear and enforceable. So
5 unfortunately, this has not been the case to date.
6 Many proposed mitigations, both in place through
7 bulletins and broader label changes, are really
8 entirely subjective.

9 Things like no spray buffers that are
10 only, you know, relevant when the wind is blowing in
11 a particular direction, or, you know, looking into
12 your crystal ball to make sure it won't rain in the
13 next few days after you spray, these aren't
14 practical mitigations and they never will be because
15 they are subjective and they are completely
16 unenforceable.

17 So I just urge the EPA, as it's moving
18 forward with some of these programmatic changes, to
19 really only consider simple, definitive and, most
20 importantly, enforceable mitigations, or else the
21 resulting conservation outcomes are really going to
22 be highly questionable.

23 So thank you again.

24 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you for those
25 comments, Nathan.

1 Jessica Ponder, you're recognized.

2 JESSICA PONDER: Hi, I just have a quick
3 question. I think I wanted to thank you for the
4 workload that it comes with going through deciding
5 on pilot species, you know, evaluating pilot
6 species, and I appreciate thinking down the line
7 about how this will extrapolate to other species and
8 how that can be done efficiently.

9 My question is, have you looked at CICA
10 Pass, which is an EPA tool to align genetic
11 sequences across species so that you can identify
12 who is going to be susceptible based on data you
13 have for pilot species?

14 JAN MATUSZKO: So I'll address that one,
15 Jessica. We have not done that to date. As I said,
16 our focus in identifying the current set of 27
17 species was information basically from the Fish and
18 Wildlife Service. But I appreciate your comment and
19 that is something that we could consider for
20 selecting future species and also for identifying
21 species that are similar enough to, maybe that the
22 same mitigations can apply.

23 JESSICA PONDER: Right. We'll look
24 forward to that report. Thank you.

25 JAN MATUSZKO: Thank you.

1 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Jessica.

2 Thank you, Jan.

3 Mark Johnson -- no, sorry, John Wise.

4 John Wise, you are recognized.

5 JOHN WISE: Hi, thank you for the
6 opportunity. I just have a short comment and then I
7 have two very short questions for the previous
8 presenter.

9 The short comment is just I hope we will
10 all be mindful for how important, especially crop
11 production is in the United States and especially
12 the health benefits of having robust available
13 fruits and vegetables to maintain health in our
14 population. And we all know that, but we know that
15 this challenge here of integrating ESA, if it
16 disrupts the ability of specialty crop growers to
17 have the tools to protect their crops from invasive
18 species and other new pests, there's repercussions.
19 And I'm just asking that we all be mindful of that
20 and try to keep the stakeholder-driven process that
21 IR-4 uses to put tools in the toolbox, keep it
22 rolling so that everybody benefits. That's the
23 short comment.

24 Two real quick questions. One is, Jan,
25 when you refer to maps, can you tell me possibly

1 what resolution those maps will have? And then the
2 second question is, in what ways might the delivery
3 system that a farmer would choose for a compound
4 change whether it's -- that compound is restricted
5 or not? So there might be one delivery system that
6 is an airblast sprayer that has risk of drift,
7 right, but another delivery system on the same farm
8 might be chemigation that does not have drift and,
9 therefore, a dramatically lower risk to an adjacent
10 habitat that may have endangered species.

11 So I'm interested knowing how those two
12 pieces are being used in your models. Thank you.

13 JAN MATUSZKO: Sure. Let me just start
14 out, John, by saying we understand the concerns
15 about IR-4 and our hearing that some of the
16 pesticide registrants, you know, are concerned about
17 coming in with new uses or adding new uses because
18 of all these mitigations in it. It's something that
19 we're actively discussing within the Office of
20 Pesticide Programs because we appreciate the
21 importance of some of these smaller food crops. So
22 I just wanted to hit that up first.

23 And then I'm going to answer your second
24 question first. So when we're talking about the
25 different mitigations, to the extent that a

1 different type of application procedure would
2 minimize, say, the runoff one, or in the case you
3 were talking about probably spray drift, that would
4 be a great example of where, you know, it might be
5 appropriate to exempt, you know, that particular
6 use, with that particular application from some of
7 the requirements. So those are the kinds of
8 comments that are really helpful to us for us to
9 receive.

10 And, obviously, then what we're really
11 doing is trying to provide menus of mitigations,
12 including potential exemptions, so that the
13 pesticide user gets to choose, you know, how they
14 want to comply, whether it's they want to change
15 their equipment or whether they want to, you know,
16 change the level of the boom, whether they want to
17 put in some kind of, like, vegetative filter strips,
18 whether they -- you know, that whole type of thing.
19 The whole idea is to provide options because we know
20 one size doesn't fit all. So that, I hope, answered
21 your second question.

22 The first question, honestly, I'm not
23 quite sure which maps you're talking about. I'm not
24 sure if you're talking about story maps, which are
25 really -- which are not legally enforceable. It's

1 just to provide the public with an easier way to
2 visualize what we're talking about. Folks can go in
3 and they can zoom in on the area and say, huh, you
4 know, might this apply to me coming down the pike.
5 It's to give the people that kind of information.

6 I don't know the exact resolution. What I
7 would suggest if you're interested in that, just go
8 in and type EPA ESA vulnerable species, and it will
9 take you to our website and you can play with the
10 maps and see for yourself. But I'm not sure, based
11 on the question, if you really meant maps or if you
12 meant our Bulletins Live! Two system. So the
13 Bulletins Live! Two system is where the actual
14 mitigations, the geographically specific ESA
15 mitigations would be. And the precision level of
16 those, it's very precise.

17 So what you do is you go into the system,
18 you enter in your location and it tells you for your
19 location what bulletins apply.

20 JOHN WISE: Okay. That is what I was
21 looking for. Thank you for your answer.

22 JAN MATUSZKO: Sure.

23 And, Jake and Ed, did you want to add
24 anything about the IR-4 issue?

25 ED MESSINA: No. Well, sure, the IR-4

1 issue in terms of, yes, thanks for answering that
2 question, Jan, which is, yes, we are looking at
3 this, we understand those concerns.

4 On the resolution of the maps, I
5 interpreted that question to be, you know, will it
6 be the subcounty level? I think the answer to that
7 question is, yes, right. In many cases, we're
8 trying to get better sort of, you know, resolution,
9 granularity of where those species are to make
10 informed decisions for -- that growers can make
11 those decisions, and then have that be part of the
12 data that we're using to refine our assessments.

13 So I don't know, Jan, if that's another
14 way to interpret the question.

15 JAN MATUSZKO: Yeah, what you're referring
16 to is the actual pesticide use limitation area, or
17 the PULA, to the geographic extent of which they
18 apply, and you're absolutely right about that. But,
19 again, if the user puts their location into the
20 system, it will tell them what applies to them or
21 not.

22 ED MESSINA: John, was that your question?

23 JOHN WISE: Yep. Thank you for both of
24 you.

25 ED MESSINA: Thanks.

1 DANNY GIDDINGS: Great. Thank you, all of
2 you.

3 Let's turn to Mark Johnson.

4 MARK JOHNSON: Good afternoon, everyone.
5 Thank you for the opportunity.

6 I just want a clarification. You know, in
7 the slide you've talked about crops and other crops,
8 and I'm representing the Golf Course Superintendent
9 Association and turf grass in general, right? So
10 golf courses are like a two million-acre footprint
11 across just the Continental United States, not
12 counting probably the 60 million estimated acres of
13 turf. And this group has heard me say that turf
14 before is not a row crop, right, and the root
15 systems, and the science behind filtering pollutants
16 is pretty well established.

17 With that said, when you talk about
18 agriculture and crops and then you talk about
19 mitigation, so, you know, the sprayer heights and
20 the booms on a golf course is much lower to the
21 ground to begin with and then we have the nozzle
22 selection. We mirror to ag, but we're a little bit
23 different and we're a little bit different than some
24 of the other turf applications. But you might
25 comment, please, on how you're going to address that

1 because of the needs. You know, it's like everybody
2 else, there's products and we need products.
3 Sometimes there's no alternatives. We're all about,
4 you know, contributing to the community and
5 protecting the environment because we need a healthy
6 environment to do what we do. So that's the first
7 piece is the crops in relation to the agriculture.

8 And I know you've got the specialty crop
9 interest, too. Sometimes turf is lumped into that
10 when you consider there's farmers that are growing
11 turf out there for a lot of good reasons, valuable
12 green space, and you have the recreation and all
13 those applications of it. And then different types
14 of mitigation, obviously, we have pretty well
15 established best management practices, and I know
16 you are pretty familiar with those from a lot of the
17 work that we've been doing and they're unique to all
18 the 50 states. So we're starting to boil down to
19 these different environments within the industry
20 itself, and I think that should be duly noted for
21 industries that are doing that in this work for the
22 labels.

23 So if you would comment at least on the
24 crops and inclusion, you know, how far you're going
25 to go with some of these different applications.

1 And then dealing with this mitigation -- and I know
2 you're headed down to Hawaii. You're going to
3 incorporate a lot of things. There's a lot of nice
4 golf courses down there and other applications of
5 turf; it's not just golf. So if you would, Jan,
6 give me your thoughts.

7 JAN MATUSZKO: Sure. So it depends on the
8 strategy you're talking about. When I'm talking
9 about the herbicide strategy, Mark, I'm really
10 talking about agricultural uses. We're not talking
11 about golf courses and that type of thing. Where
12 we're really going to really try to tackle the golf
13 courses, I think, for the first time and kind of try
14 to try it out, kind of, for lack of a better word,
15 is our Hawaii strategy.

16 Obviously, like you said, there are a lot
17 of golf courses in Hawaii and, you know, it's
18 localized. So it's a good opportunity for us to
19 explore that with Fish and Wildlife and figure out
20 how to address it. Obviously, we want to, just as
21 we're doing on the agricultural side to the extent
22 that you all are already employing BMPs that are
23 effective at protecting these species, we want to be
24 able to include those on our mitigation menus, such
25 that, you know, you can use them, particularly if

1 they're effective and meet the mitigation
2 requirements.

3 Jake, do you have anything you want to add
4 to that?

5 JAKE LI: No, I think that covers it.

6 Mark, I've also -- obviously, your group
7 came to meet with us a few weeks ago and we have a
8 separate chain of discussions to better understand
9 the BMPs and how we might apply that. So I look
10 forward to continuing that discussion and trying to
11 apply it to states starting off with Hawaii.

12 MR. WARDER: And, Mike, I'm familiar with
13 the BMPs, and just to let you know, I'm happy to
14 talk offline with you about this. But, you know, we
15 go on crop tours at OPP and staff get a chance to go
16 visit with growers, and I recently was able to go on
17 a crop tour that included a golf course. So I got
18 to be on the golf course without a club,
19 unfortunately. And this golf course in Florida
20 was right next to an Audubon chain and facility, and
21 they were actually instrumental in creating habitat
22 for endangered species.

23 So I think there's also some areas to
24 explore, not only on the pesticide use for golf
25 courses, but their ability to actually help with

1 creating habitat for endangered species. So I just
2 wanted to let you know that I had kind of done that
3 tour.

4 MARK JOHNSON: Thanks, Ed. Thanks, Jake.
5 Thanks, Jan. We appreciate the consideration of a
6 lot of hard work and science that's gone on for many
7 years, and we look forward to success with the ESA
8 process. Thank you very much.

9 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you all. And I
10 look forward to going on a golf course tour.

11 Let's see, Keith Jones from BPIA.

12 KEITH JONES: Thanks. Just with regard to
13 ESA, we are concerned that the biopesticides are
14 potentially being lumped in with the conventional
15 pesticides, and we believe, you know, that there
16 really have to be some different considerations for
17 the biological pesticides. So we would just
18 encourage you all as you continue with your ESA
19 work, that you keep that in mind. And I would love
20 to hear any thoughts you might have along these
21 lines.

22 I mean, do you consider them different in
23 any way? Do you have any anything you can share
24 with us? Thanks.

25 JAN MATUSZKO: Sure. I could start that

1 one out. If you are familiar with our ESA workplan,
2 you'll see that we did kind of group biopesticides
3 separately from the conventionals, as well as the
4 antimicrobials. And the biological folks have been
5 doing different stuff. Some of it is very similar.
6 When we proposed the FIFRA IEMs, we proposed that
7 those would apply to the biopesticides as well, and
8 so I hope that I'm not -- I haven't read all the
9 individual comments myself. But I hope to the
10 extent that we proposed mitigations there that you
11 think are applicable, that you all commented on
12 them.

13 In terms of the strategies that I spoke
14 about this afternoon, the herbicide strategy and the
15 vulnerable species and Hawaii effort, at this time,
16 those strategies are focused on the conventional
17 pesticides. While biopesticides still need to
18 address ESA, it's very unusual for a conventional
19 pesticide not to have an effect on at least an
20 individual of one listed species, which puts us in
21 the consultation world and needing to have
22 mitigations. That does happen sometimes in
23 biopesticides, but it doesn't happen nearly as
24 frequently and, as you said, there are some
25 differences there.

1 Ed, anything you want to say about that?

2 ED MESSINA: No, thanks, Jan.

3 DANNY GIDDINGS: Great.

4 Jasmine Brown, you are recognized.

5 JASMINE BROWN: Thank you. I wanted to
6 loop back around. I know we need food for the
7 country, but I do a lot of work in the field and, in
8 my honest opinion, crop pesticide use is rather
9 excessive. It's not that they're using at off-
10 labeled rate. The problem is, in one geographic
11 area, everyone grows the same crop. So they're all
12 using the same products at the same time, which is a
13 healthy load to the water systems and the soil
14 system.

15 The only thing I want to bring up is
16 persistence. The eco-mitigations on labels are, in
17 my opinion, typically for humans. They are not for
18 the species. For instance, they're very generic.
19 Do not apply during temperature inversions, you
20 know. Keep your height of three feet or lower.
21 Don't apply during wind speeds of ten miles per
22 hour. Those are all very generic ecological
23 mitigation measures and those protect people, just
24 not the species of concern.

25 So I'm hoping that the ESA folks seriously

1 look at those mitigations as they're doing these
2 geographic areas and put some actual language in
3 there that is species-related.

4 JAN MATUSZKO: So, Jasmine, yes, we are
5 very much looking at whether the mitigations for
6 these efforts would reduce exposure to species.
7 Obviously, that's our focus. And I highly encourage
8 you -- once we release the herbicide strategy, we'll
9 release a technical document that describes our
10 consideration of all the data -- the available data
11 that we have and that we've looked at to evaluate
12 whether these mitigations actually reduce exposure
13 to listed species. So like I said, I encourage you
14 to look at that, and if you think we missed the
15 boat, to please comment on it.

16 JASMINE BROWN: That would be great. When
17 does that come out, Jan?

18 JAN MATUSZKO: We anticipate releasing our
19 herbicide strategy in July, and there will be
20 multiple parts of it. There will be the actual
21 strategy itself that's often referred to as the
22 framework. There will be some case studies that
23 we've done to kind of show how this would apply to
24 some specific chemicals, and there will be a
25 technical document that very much describes our

1 analysis and evaluation of the various mitigations
2 we considered.

3 JASMINE BROWN: Sounds good.

4 ED MESSINA: And we'll most likely put
5 that out with an OPP update. So you'll be aware if
6 you're signed up for the OPP updates, Jasmine.

7 JAN MATUSZKO: We definitely will have an
8 OPP update for sure.

9 JASMINE BROWN: That would be great.
10 Thank you.

11 JAN MATUSZKO: You're welcome.

12 JASMINE BROWN: I'll look forward to
13 providing some ideas on that.

14 DANNY GIDDINGS: Great. Thank you,
15 Jasmine.

16 Gretchen Paluch, you're recognized.

17 GRETCHEN PALUCH: Well, I did want to say
18 thank you to the presenters for all the information
19 that was shared and then also I appreciate the
20 discussion from the committee as well on this
21 important topic.

22 My questions, the first one is based on --
23 I saw the slide related to example mitigations to
24 reduce spray drift, and I was thinking about some of
25 the discussion the committee had yesterday related

1 to some of the targeted application technologies,
2 precision ag, not just aerial targeted applications,
3 but also ground, and saw that hooded sprayers were
4 mentioned on that example mitigations. So I was
5 curious if someone from EPA could make a comment or
6 refer to whether or not they are considering some of
7 those other precision ag or targeted application
8 technologies.

9 And then my second question refers to
10 really the herbicide strategy and some of the
11 mitigation measures that are mentioned there. In
12 particular, there was a question related to
13 prevalence of different mitigation measures and
14 really how prevalent some of those measures really
15 are. And so as it relates to conservation measures,
16 whether it's cover crops, vegetative filter strips,
17 is there an effort or an approach to -- the agencies
18 look at how prevalent some of those measures are and
19 how widespread they are. And if there could be some
20 comments related to those different approaches, I'd
21 appreciate it.

22 Thank you.

23 JAN MATUSZKO: Sure. Well, first of all,
24 I want to give credit to Gretchen, because Gretchen
25 has been actually very instrumental in coordinating

1 all of our efforts to have conversations with the
2 states. So just a great big thank you to Gretchen,
3 because that's been really, really helpful.

4 So let me address your first question
5 about, you know, emerging technology. So obviously,
6 yes, we are definitely looking at things like hooded
7 sprayers. For hooded sprayers, we have existing
8 data to evaluate the effect of those hooded
9 sprayers, and when I say "the effect," the amount to
10 which that would reduce the exposure from spray
11 drift. And so that's an approach that you will
12 definitely see in the herbicide strategy, and so
13 that one is definitely included.

14 When you talk about some of the other
15 approaches that the emerging technology group was
16 discussing yesterday, we do not currently have the
17 best data on that. We don't have the data to be
18 able to evaluate the extent to which these types of
19 approaches would reduce exposure. Amy talked about
20 the fact that we're working with some folks to try
21 to gather that data. And once we have that data,
22 that is definitely something we're going to be
23 looking at. That's definitely part of the future
24 and that's definitely something that we want to be
25 able to incorporate in these mitigation menus. It's

1 just not something that you're going to see right
2 now in the proposed herbicide strategy simply
3 because of a lack of data.

4 The second question you asked was about
5 the different types of approaches and to the extent
6 to which they're being used. Obviously, you know
7 we've been querying the states on that, but our
8 primary source of information on that is the USDA
9 information. USDA has been cataloging a lot of that
10 information, particularly for their NRCS program,
11 and we've been working with them to gather the
12 information in that way.

13 I hope that helps, Gretchen.

14 GRETCHEN PALUCH: If I may just ask one
15 follow-up to that. Is there an effort to survey for
16 some of that information? Is that still moving
17 forward or is there another approach to collecting
18 it?

19 JAN MATUSZKO: So I know USDA is
20 conducting some surveys of some of that information.
21 I think you know that we are limited as a federal
22 agency as to our ability to collect information
23 under the -- what is it called? It just went right
24 out of my head. Anyway, if we're going to go out
25 with an information collection request, there's a

1 whole process we have to go through and get approval
2 from the Office of Management and Budget. It's the
3 Paperwork Reduction Act -- that's what I was trying
4 to come up with. And so that takes about two years
5 to just get that approval and we can only get that
6 approval to the extent that the statute that we work
7 under provides for us to be able to do that.

8 And since our statute really gives us the
9 ability to register pesticides, our connection is
10 really to the registrant and not to the user. So
11 that's why we are depending on USDA and others to
12 help us with that information.

13 GRETCHEN PALUCH: Thank you.

14 JAN MATUSZKO: Sure.

15 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Gretchen.

16 John, you're recognized.

17 JOHN WISE: Hi, I have one more question.
18 Actually, Jan, it's more of a comment. And you guys
19 might be already well past this in your thought
20 process, but if I put on my entomologist hat and I
21 think about your response to the question about the
22 biopesticides and how in some parts of the process,
23 you'll separate conventional products with
24 biopesticides, to me, that made a lot of sense
25 because when I think about 20th Century

1 conventional insecticides, many or most of those
2 compounds and classes are broad spectrum
3 contact, nerve poisons, and they affect multiple
4 life stages of an arthropod, whereas biopesticides
5 are more generally selective. They generally are
6 active on one or maybe more than one life stage of
7 that life cycle. And so it makes sense to think
8 about them differently.

9 But what my comment or my thought is that,
10 well, we've got a third group of products and I
11 would call them 21st Century modern reduced risk
12 insecticides, and they actually -- many or most
13 resemble biopesticides more than they do
14 conventional insecticides in that respect that
15 they're -- they tend to be selective. They tend to
16 be ingestion active, meaning that they're not --
17 many of them are not contact poisons at all. And
18 then, thirdly, they tend to be more selective on
19 single life stages. Maybe it's just the larval
20 stage or it's just the egg stage. So it's just food
21 for thought that you might have three buckets, and
22 if you didn't know where to put the 21st Century,
23 you know, reduced risk products, I think they
24 probably resemble biopesticides more than they do
25 conventional.

1 Just my two cents. We could talk offline
2 if my thoughts are useful to you. Thank you.

3 JAN MATUSZKO: Sure. Thanks, John.

4 ED MESSINA: Yeah, John, that's definitely
5 worth more than two cents. And just to give some
6 background on that, too, you know, so what Jan and
7 Jake and others are doing is, you know, talking
8 about the priority work related to the Endangered
9 Species Act. In that plan, we talked about working
10 on conventionals and antimicrobials and biopesticide
11 products.

12 And as part of our day-to-day work, we are
13 doing reviews of those products where resources
14 allow, and many of the biopesticide products going
15 through registration review, and any new active
16 ingredients, have received Endangered Species Act
17 reviews, again where resources allow, and in many
18 cases where we've done that analysis, we've been
19 able to arrive at no effects findings, in part
20 because of the low toxicity for that particular
21 pollutant or chemical that we're evaluating in the
22 environment.

23 And for the antimicrobials, they have a
24 different sort of use case scenario. So many of
25 them are being used in homes, so a different sort of

1 exposure scenario to endangered species. So
2 again, you know, we're focused on the big priority
3 areas. We're working on a lot of the conventionals.
4 There is some work, again where resources allow,
5 it's not everywhere, being done on biopesticides and
6 antimicrobial products as well. So thanks for the
7 comment.

8 JAN MATUSZKO: And I asked Billy to come
9 on camera, John, because obviously, you know, he
10 was, until recently, the Director of the
11 Biopesticide Division. And why we're coordinating,
12 he's much more on target on what we're doing with
13 biopesticides and I'm much more focused on
14 conventionals.

15 So, Billy, I'm not sure if there's
16 anything you wanted to add to this conversation.

17 BILLY SMITH: Yeah, just that -- I mean, I
18 think Ed addressed some of it, right, that there are
19 a lot of no effect calls being made because of the
20 toxicity and use of the biopesticides. But there
21 are some that are much more similar to
22 conventionals, you know, and they may only be
23 partially, right. They might be things that are
24 suffocating insects, let's say, when you apply them
25 to a field, right. So maybe we're not concerned

1 about runoff, but we are concerned about drift and
2 things like that.

3 So some of what EFED is doing does apply,
4 you know, to the biopesticides, and we've been
5 working through those, you know, side by side with
6 EFED, not doing them, you know, alone. We've been
7 doing them in conjunction with them and, you know, I
8 think it's really important that we are consistent
9 there.

10 ED MESSINA: Thanks, Billy. Great points.

11 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you all.

12 So, Damon, you're up.

13 DAMON REABE: Hi, thanks.

14 Jan, you might appreciate this. Your
15 reference to Bulletins Live! Two in your
16 presentation and applicators being aware of the
17 bulletins, I'm one of the National Ag Aviation
18 Association's PASS presenters. And the PASS Program
19 is a annual program that's given. It's a safety
20 seminar, along with an environmental stewardship
21 component, an environmental professionalism
22 component, and, finally, a security component. And
23 this year, within our environmental professionalism,
24 a portion of the program, we rolled out Bulletins
25 Live! Two and its use as this is the first year that

1 we're seeing it actively show up on the labels.

2 And so talking with my colleagues outside
3 of the aerial application industry, but in
4 agriculture, I'd feel like we are at the forefront
5 as an aerial application profession in not just the
6 awareness of the tool and the legal requirement to
7 comply with the tool, but, also, you know, some real
8 great formal training on its use.

9 And I know that many state lead agencies
10 throughout the country have been rolling it out. I
11 mean, there's a lot of training efforts. But I just
12 wanted to kind of showcase really the fact that
13 aerial applicators of crude aerial application
14 aircraft are actually the highest paid pesticide
15 applicators in the United States, and that is
16 compensatory to the level of education that's
17 required to achieve the ratings with the Federal
18 Aviation Administration in order to perform those
19 applications.

20 And I just want to, I guess, bring that to
21 your attention in large part due to the fact that
22 many times we run into spray-drift hurdles,
23 particularly with aerial application and,
24 oftentimes, the mitigation strategy is to eliminate
25 aerial application from a label in a pesticide use

1 limitation area. And I think it's important to make
2 sure that a group knows that that has long-term
3 negative consequences, and because we are taking
4 these professionals out of the decision-making
5 process and the applying process of these
6 products based on risk assessments that are
7 overestimating spray drift.

8 And I alluded to it yesterday and I don't
9 want to say this in any way -- we are well aware
10 that EPA is working very hard at adopting these Tier
11 3 inputs that we proposed, but I would say that time
12 is of the essence. Those very simple inputs that we
13 have requested to be used within the ag drift model,
14 which is very robust and very mature, has survived
15 many scientific advisory panels to prove out its
16 accuracy, those six inputs on the surface as a Tier
17 1 risk analysis of the assessment of spray drift are
18 approximately one-half of the amount of spray drift
19 that's being used for the risk assessments
20 currently.

21 And these are all -- those inputs are all
22 enforceable. In fact, those inputs are, in many
23 cases, being adjusted because some of the inputs may
24 not even be illegal on current label language when
25 considering a current Tier 1 approach that the EPA

1 and, particularly, the services are using. So that
2 would be the first update to take into
3 consideration.

4 The next is, I did allude yesterday where
5 aerial application is used and that there are many,
6 many benefits, and I don't want to take up more time
7 than I should, but the -- once we find ourselves in
8 a situation where we're not meeting the spray drift
9 risk assessment goals from aerial application, EPA
10 will soon be receiving a letter that's showcasing
11 additional enforceable tools that can be used in
12 aerial application to then began to change spray
13 drift by actual magnitudes.

14 And, again, I mentioned it yesterday in
15 our PPDC meeting, that the aircraft -- we operate 11
16 aircrafts here in Wisconsin. We've had them equipped
17 in the manner that they are equipped right now for
18 approximately seven spray seasons and we do very,
19 very diverse pesticide applications to various crops
20 for many different types of pests. This is not --
21 our spray systems are not wildly unusual, but we've
22 selected nozzles that reduce relative span. So
23 we're reducing -- dramatically reducing the amount
24 of small driftable fines that we're producing from
25 our aircraft while decreasing the number of large

1 droplets. So we're holding on to efficacy with our
2 equipment and, in fact, again, have reduced drift by
3 two magnitudes.

4 And I'm imagining that you're finding that
5 very interesting because I think that could solve a
6 tremendous amount of challenges that you're faced
7 with in going through this work.

8 Thank you for your time.

9 JAN MATUSZKO: So, Damon, I want to thank
10 you all for helping educate folks about our BLT
11 system. We really appreciate that and we really
12 need help with folks doing that.

13 I know that Amy and her team have been
14 working with you and your organization to improve
15 our risk assessments, particularly with respect to
16 spray drift. So I also want to thank you for that.
17 And we look forward to receiving this new data that
18 you just mentioned. I hope it is as impactful as
19 you indicate, because that would be very helpful for
20 all of us.

21 DAMON REABE: Yeah, thanks.

22 JAN MATUSZKO: Sure.

23 DANNY GIDDINGS: Great. Thank you, Damon.

24 Are there any other questions or comments
25 for Jan or Jake or Ed on this topic?

1 I'll just remind everyone that this is not
2 the public comment portion of the meeting. If
3 you're an attendee or still in listen only mode, you
4 can use the raise hand function if you're having
5 technical difficulties and you can also elect to
6 give public comment starting at 4:30, and you can do
7 that either by contact -- well, the best way to do
8 that is to contact Michelle Arling -- that's Arling,
9 A-R-L-I-N-G.Michelle, M-I-C-H-E-L-L-E @EPA.gov --
10 and let her know that you would like to provide
11 public comment later this afternoon, and we'll get
12 you on the schedule.

13 Jake and Jan, thank you for being here,
14 thank you for answering the questions. And I
15 believe we have -- yes, we have plenty of time for a
16 five-minute break. So let's go ahead and break for
17 five minutes and give folks a chance to get up,
18 stretch their legs, and then come back for -- let's
19 come back at 3:15. I want to preserve a little bit
20 of extra time in the Moving Forward section, because
21 I do think that that will take a little bit -- we'll
22 have plenty to discuss.

23 So let's -- sorry, let's come back at 3:00
24 -- well, let's come back at 3:20. We'll just stay
25 right on schedule. 3:20, let's come back for the

1 Moving Forward section. Thank you.

2 (Brief break.)

3 MOVING FORWARD

4 DANNY GIDDINGS: Welcome back, everyone.

5 Everyone is getting back into their chairs.

6 Let me give a really brief introduction to
7 this next session that we call "Moving Forward." In
8 the PPDC business agenda, we do kind of a summary
9 and synthetization session led by Office of
10 Pesticide Programs' Director Ed Messina for us as we
11 look to the next six months to a year of OPP
12 activities and discuss the follow-up items from this
13 meeting and what was discussed today and yesterday.

14 So let me see if Michelle is here. She'll
15 be sharing a -- what we'll call a whiteboard. In
16 reality, it's a shared Microsoft document, but is
17 what we will be working from, kind of, in real-time,
18 as Ed takes us through what was discussed during
19 this two-day meeting and any decision points that
20 need to be made, any follow-up items that need to be
21 addressed.

22 So, Ed, I'll go ahead and turn it over to
23 you.

24 And, Michelle, if you can share your
25 screen at the appropriate time --

1 ED MESSINA: Thanks, Danny.

2 DANNY GIDDINGS: -- then that will be
3 great.

4 ED MESSINA: All right. Appreciate the
5 setup. Well, so as Danny mentioned, I think we had
6 some pretty incredible topics for this PPDC. And I
7 appreciate the PPDC members recommending those
8 topics. And I think the next step would be, you
9 know, to go through and say, you know, was there
10 anything that wasn't covered that you'd like to see
11 in the next sessions for May -- for November and was
12 there anything EPA didn't cover that you'd like to
13 see covered, and then is there any discussions that
14 we like to have in this session on any of the
15 materials that were presented and are there any, you
16 know, motions or recommendations that any PPDC
17 members wanted to make, and then we'll go into the
18 public comment session.

19 And before we went there, I wanted to take
20 some time to do some thank yous here because I
21 wanted to save as much time as we could for the
22 discussion of PPDC members and then also for the
23 public comment session.

24 So there's a lot of folks to thank for
25 pulling this meeting together. I'd like to thank

1 Tom Tracy from Office of Research and Development
2 for serving as our Designated Federal Officer for
3 this meeting. We couldn't have it without him sort
4 of stepping up and RD allowing us to borrow their
5 DFO and OMS working with us on that. So thank you
6 so much to Tom Tracy.

7 Danny, I think you do an amazing job
8 facilitating. So it's really made this meeting run
9 incredibly smooth and I appreciate your
10 professionalism there.

11 Our Spanish interpreters, Jackie and
12 Julie, thank you for your work, for keeping up with
13 sometimes the fast talkers, including myself, who
14 are from -- originally from New York and could
15 probably talk much faster. So thank you for the
16 Spanish translations.

17 Our ASL and cart translators as well,
18 thank you so much, Tommy Ra, Sarah, Heidi, and
19 Patrice. I appreciate your work.

20 And then for our slide running, our newest
21 member of the Office of Pesticide Program team,
22 Jeffrey Chang. Jeffrey starts Monday, but has been
23 -- is still serving in his old job, but he helped us
24 out. He will be helping and then ultimately taking
25 over and hopefully being our Designated Federal

1 official going forward for this PPDC group. And so
2 I wanted to thank Jeffrey for sort of borrowing his
3 time where he's not officially yet in OPP, but
4 getting to run the slides and see how this operates
5 so we're well positioned for the November meeting.

6 There's a ton of IT folks, Elton, Farraz,
7 John, Troy, Lauren, who make this happen, and so
8 thank you for the flawless and -- your flawless, I
9 would say, IT services we've received here, and I
10 know a lot has happened in the background to make
11 that happen. So thank you.

12 To our presenters, who are -- there are
13 many, it's not just the presentation giving that takes
14 time and thought, but it's really all of the prep
15 work you for distilling the workgroup information
16 and presenting it in a clear and concise format
17 where everyone can understand it. I've been
18 involved in those workgroups and they get into some
19 pretty highly technical discussions. And I think
20 the presenters did an amazing job of really
21 distilling some of those complex topics.

22 So Dan Martin, Amy Blankenship, Greg
23 Watson, Mike Goodis, Jason Todd, Michelle Knoor,
24 Linda Arrington, Carolyn Schroeder, Nikhil
25 Mallampalli, Cameron Douglass, Lisa Dreilinger, Mano

1 Basu, Tajah Blackburn, Anastasia Swearingen, Rhonda
2 Jones, Jake Li, and Jan Matuszko, thank you so much
3 for your presentations. They were amazing.

4 Workgroup members for the Agricultural
5 Emerging Technologies workgroup, Pesticide
6 Resistance Management Workgroup Number 2, the
7 Pesticide Label Reform Workgroup, the Emerging
8 Pathogens Implementation Committee, and the Label
9 Workgroup, as I mentioned, I would just want to
10 thank those members and newly-formed members for
11 taking their time beyond just this meeting to meet
12 and talk about these issues of importance to OPP.
13 And I can't thank those folks enough for taking time
14 out to help the agency on each of those topics.

15 To our PPDC members, this is a long two
16 days of remote, so focusing on your screen and
17 really listening to the participants and providing
18 your perspectives. I can't thank you enough for
19 agreeing to serve on this FACA. It's incredibly
20 important. Hopefully, you've seen that we've taken
21 your views and provided a full agenda, and our next
22 session is really going to ensure and check in on
23 that and see how we can do better for November.

24 And then, for all of our attendees, we had
25 over 200, close to 300 attendees over the two days

1 logged in at any given time, so thank you for
2 everyone for taking the time to participate in the
3 meeting and providing your views and for your
4 signing up for the public session and providing your
5 views there yesterday and then starting at 4:30
6 today.

7 And then, lastly, I'll say we're looking
8 forward to meeting in person in the fall. The
9 conference room has been reserved. So we have the
10 space, November 15th through 16th, 2023. And I
11 think based on the conversations that we heard
12 today, we can look forward to continued interesting
13 conversations and informative workgroup updates.

14 And so with that, we'll put the whiteboard
15 up so folks can see it and we can sort of take notes
16 as we go and make sure we're capturing input from
17 the members.

18 And so my first question is, you know, in
19 terms of my OPP update, were there any topics that
20 we didn't cover in that update that you think we
21 should have and that you'd like to see in the
22 November meeting?

23 DANNY GIDDINGS: I'm going to call on
24 Mano. I'm not sure if this is in regards to the
25 specific question, but he does have his hand up.

1 Mano?

2 MANO BASU: Thank you very much, Danny.

3 Yeah, a specific question about the November
4 meeting. Ed, you mentioned about the in-person
5 November meeting. The question, will there be a
6 hybrid option for those who want to join virtually
7 or will it be in person only? Thank you.

8 ED MESSINA: Yeah, my initial thought
9 was the meeting would be in-person for PPDC members
10 and we would have a virtual listening broadcast
11 only. I think it would be too difficult to run a
12 hybrid meeting in-person. So that's my initial
13 thought. So my hope was to have everyone in-person,
14 like we did in the old days, and that's been
15 requested by many PPDC members, you know, why aren't
16 we meeting in person?

17 That's my initial thought. But I think,
18 as we reach out, we can, you know, take the pulse of
19 our membership and see what action folks would like
20 to take.

21 Did I answer your question, Mano?

22 MANO BASU: Yes, thank you very much.

23 ED MESSINA: Okay. Any topics that were
24 not covered in the OPP update that folks think we
25 should have talked about?

1 I'm giving myself a 100 percent score
2 then. Come on, somebody wants to hear it. There's
3 no way I covered -- there we go, Marc. Come on,
4 there we go. Thanks, Marc.

5 MARC LAME: You're welcome, Ed. You know,
6 I always like to give 95s because they're more
7 realistic than 100 percent. So that's what you'll
8 get, a 95 on this one. Very good job.

9 I very much appreciated you showing some
10 of the resource stuff, the budget stuff that you
11 guys have to work with. As an advisor, it helps me
12 to know a little bit more about what's going on.
13 I'm not an economist, but, you know, if I can see
14 how, you know, a little bit more how --
15 specifically, how --what resource allocation is in
16 your office, it might help a little bit and maybe
17 give me a dose of reality sometimes on what we have
18 to work with.

19 ED MESSINA: Okay. So I'm hearing deeper
20 dive on OPP resources.

21 Okay. Anybody else?

22 DANNY GIDDINGS: Joe Grzywacz has his hand
23 up.

24 JOE GRZYWACZ: Yeah, thanks so much. I
25 want to echo Marc on both accounts. I mean, I've

1 been a member of the PPDC only in the COVID era.

2 And I have to say out of all the electronically
3 mediated meetings that we've had, this was the best
4 one. So kudos to the team for a very well organized
5 and as seamless as possible kind of meeting.

6 But I also do want to follow up on Marc's
7 comment and put a finer point, at least from my
8 point of view I've already made reference to it,
9 about the deeper dive, and that is it seems to me
10 that to the extent that EPA is generating revenues
11 off of registering products, that it could very
12 easily be in a conflicted arrangement where they're
13 making more money off of registering products than
14 doing some of the other parts of its portfolio.

15 And so part of that deeper dive is not
16 only, you know, sort of the assets and debits that
17 are going in, but also some explanation essentially
18 of how decisions are made regarding balancing the
19 need to register products with also protecting human
20 health and the environment. How are some of those
21 decisions being made, just so that that's a little
22 bit more transparent.

23 ED MESSINA: Thanks, Joe.

24 Quick response. We get the money even if
25 we deny it, Joe, as registrants will tell you.

1 All right. What else?

2 DANNY GIDDINGS: Mayra, I see your hand
3 up.

4 MAYRA REITER: Yes, thank you. Related to
5 the points that both Marc and Joe were making in
6 relation to resources, I think it would also be
7 useful, in addition to EPA giving a breakdown where
8 all their fees go, if the agency could also cost out
9 what it would take to address all the applications
10 within the timelines created by PRIA and to finish
11 the registration reviews by the statutory deadline,
12 so that we have a better idea what the total
13 resource need is to address those issues. Thank
14 you.

15 ED MESSINA: Okay. Thanks. So to capture
16 both comments -- I might capture Joe's comment to
17 say, you know, next bullet would be, you know, how
18 are we prioritizing the nonregistration work.

19 JOE GRZYWACZ: Right. I mean, if I may --

20 ED MESSINA: And I was going to add -- I
21 was going to say, and addressing any conflicting
22 interests related to receiving fee money would be
23 the second comment.

24 JOE GRZYWACZ: And to be very clear about
25 that, what the concern is -- is especially given the

1 large amount of losses that you've had at EPA, you
2 only have so much time to do all of your work and if
3 the number of requests for registrations is going
4 up, you still only have so much time to get things
5 done, leaving less time than for the stuff that
6 really doesn't have an immediate crisis or something
7 like that that demands attention. So you're
8 constantly under the tyranny of the urgent because
9 of the increasing number of registrations coming in.
10 So that's really the critical part of it.

11 ED MESSINA: Okay. Do you think this
12 captures it? Would you add another "comma and?"

13 JOE GRZYWACZ: I think in the spirit of
14 it, I think it probably does.

15 ED MESSINA: Okay. And then the next
16 bullet would be, it sounded like to me, workforce
17 analysis, workload analysis, information on the
18 resources EPA would need to complete registration
19 review.

20 MAYRA REITER: To complete registration
21 review and the different PRIA actions per the
22 deadlines.

23 ED MESSINA: To meet deadlines. To meet
24 the deadlines, okay. Okay, thank you.

25 All right. Anything else?

1 (Recording missing section.)

2 CHARLOTTE SANSON: -- and I had my hand
3 up, so hopefully --

4 ED MESSINA: Sure.

5 CHARLOTTE SANSON: Yeah, thanks. So I
6 know you and perhaps some of your staff spend some
7 time visiting fields, going to crop tours, getting
8 to really understand the issues on the ground and,
9 also, I would expect that those sorts of visits do
10 help inform your decision-making and that sort of
11 thing. So I thought it might be interesting if you
12 could report out on your learnings from those types
13 of visits and, you know, the impact it's having.
14 And I know that -- you know, I think that's one
15 thing here, and I'm probably transitioning into a
16 suggested topic for a future PPDC.

17 But, you know, I know we have some
18 representatives, some committee members who
19 represent the grower community, which we rarely have
20 the opportunity to really hear from in terms of
21 their perspective. And putting pesticide use into
22 practical terms, putting some reality around it, so
23 that some of the assumptions, I think that are made
24 with regard to, you know, pesticides are used
25 prophylactically, at great amounts, or there's

1 certain areas in the country where the same crops
2 are grown and the same pesticides are used, you
3 know, if we could hear from them as well in terms of
4 putting some reality into that information so that
5 everybody's working with the same assumptions, so
6 kind of putting that together with what you learn
7 when you go out in the field.

8 And I know you probably really gather some
9 great information that you share with your team
10 internally.

11 ED MESSINA: Great. All right. So I
12 think we've captured a bullet here.

13 I think I would add another bullet, which
14 would be invite a grower group to provide
15 perspectives to EPA. I think, for me, I'd like to
16 know how are the new ESA mitigations working, you
17 know. But if there are other topics, Charlotte,
18 that you think, you know, they should present on,
19 but that at least is an area that I'm interested in
20 hearing from growers.

21 CHARLOTTE SANSON: Yeah, I think that
22 would be really good as well, all of those types of
23 things, because I think the more we hear from the
24 user community, the better informed everybody on
25 this committee here can be. And so anything like

1 that, I think would be really -- you know, would be
2 very helpful and insightful.

3 ED MESSINA: Okay. Thanks.

4 MICHELLE ARLING: Can I clarify whether
5 you meant to say first (inaudible) to EPA or to
6 PPDC?

7 ED MESSINA: PPDC.

8 MICHELLE ARLING: Okay.

9 ED MESSINA: It would be to EPA through
10 PPDC.

11 DANNY GIDDINGS: Great. Well, Michelle is
12 making that note, I'm going to call on Mano.

13 MANO BASU: Thank you, Danny. And, again,
14 I would like to echo what Charlotte said and maybe
15 even expand.

16 Certainly, we want to hear from the grower
17 community on, you know, the realities on the ground,
18 how pesticides are applied, what kind of mitigation
19 they already have in place, as well as, you know,
20 some of the ESA mitigations that are being proposed,
21 but also maybe expand to non-ag uses, looking into
22 -- you know, we have the golf courses speak up,
23 bringing some examples from there, as well as vector
24 control on what mitigations and restrictions they
25 already include in their applications to get, you

1 know, some reality on how often these pesticides are
2 used in a home setting, whether on a daily basis,
3 weekly basis or, you know, as and when required to
4 be effective. So I think those perspectives would
5 be important as well.

6 ED MESSINA: Thank you, Mano.

7 DANNY GIDDINGS: Alexis?

8 ED MESSINA: Michelle, did you want to
9 capture in the parentheses -- you know, we close
10 that parentheses and add a new one or -- yeah, there
11 you go.

12 ALEXIS TEMKIN: Yeah. Thanks so much,
13 everybody, for everything that was presented and
14 everyone that took time out of their schedules to be
15 here today. I wanted to add something that I'd love
16 to hear an update on, and I think I actually brought
17 it up at the last meeting, which is some updates on
18 the Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program.

19 And I know EPA's been working on it
20 because they came out with the White Paper in
21 January, which is great. But I think it's something
22 that would be really interesting to the larger PPDC
23 and the general public to just -- and there's a lot
24 of smart people on this committee, you know, to kind
25 of learn and talk about what's going on with the

1 program, the use of NAMs and what that might look
2 like in the future.

3 ED MESSINA: I was waiting for somebody to
4 call me out on that.

5 ALEXIS TEMKIN: There you go. Happy to
6 help.

7 ED MESSINA: Thanks. Yeah, and I think
8 November we're going to have much to talk about and
9 we are planning on putting some things out this
10 summer, and, yeah, we had just put out the White
11 Paper. So thanks for raising that, and I think for
12 the next November one, it will be important to
13 provide an update.

14 ALEXIS TEMKIN: Thank you.

15 DANNY GIDDINGS: All right. I see
16 Charlotte's hand. That could be legacy hand. I
17 want to check with you, Charlotte.

18 Okay. Yeah. So --

19 MS. SANSON: It was a legacy hand.

20 DANNY GIDDINGS: So Jessica Ponder, you're
21 recognized.

22 JESSICA PONDER: I wasn't sure whether
23 this counts as something not covered. I guess maybe
24 you're already planning on discussing it. But the
25 new Executive Order 14096, I think it is, was not

1 included in the Environmental Justice Executive
2 Orders discussed. So I didn't know if that was
3 already on the docket or if that's something that
4 needs to be brought up and that might actually be
5 connected to the discussion within the Endocrine
6 Disruptor --

7 ED MESSINA: Yeah, possibly. 14096? I
8 just want to make sure I got the right one.

9 JESSICA PONDER: I think that's correct,
10 yes.

11 ED MESSINA: Okay, thanks.

12 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Jessica.

13 Mily?

14 MILY TREVINO-SAUCEDA: Yes, thank you. I
15 just want to make sure there was an agreement,
16 because I didn't hear anybody say no, about making
17 sure that our working groups are considering in
18 terms of farmworker issues and what could be some
19 impacts of farmworkers and also engaging
20 farmworkers.

21 And the reason why I'm saying this is
22 because -- I did mention it yesterday -- and maybe
23 today there was another kind of other kind of --
24 other -- different kinds of presentations. But this
25 is where I'm coming from and this is where some

1 people are also representing, and I just want to
2 make sure that farmworkers are in the radar in all
3 the working groups.

4 And I'm not saying that farmworkers need
5 to participate in all their working groups, but if
6 there are some working groups where we can have
7 farmworkers engaged, it would be more than
8 appropriate because we're asking about making sure
9 that farmworkers are in the radar, more than merrier
10 to include farmworkers in some of the groups.

11 ED MESSINA: Okay. So I would, Michelle
12 -- yeah, workgroups. You're scrolling down.

13 Thanks, Michelle. Okay. She's capturing
14 that comment in our document.

15 DANNY GIDDINGS: Okay. So Joe Grzywacz.

16 JOE GRZYWACZ: Yeah, apparently, we've
17 wandered into, sort of, other issues. We're not
18 going systematically section by section and so,
19 therefore, I'm just going to, you know, put in my
20 chime for, likewise, I think continued attentiveness
21 to the farmworker population. In particular, what I
22 wonder about is, you know, before there was actually
23 a workgroup on farmworkers and healthcare providers.
24 I'd like to hear more about what next steps are
25 regarding some of those initial recommendations from

1 last year and whether that's as an independent
2 group, or as Mily suggests, seeing to it that there
3 is good representation across the other workgroups.

4 I do think that it's an important
5 constituency that needs to continue to have their
6 voices heard.

7 ED MESSINA: Thanks. Yeah, just to
8 quickly respond. So we did have a farmworker
9 workgroup. They had requested that they were done
10 with their work, so they -- at one of the PPDCs,
11 they made a motion to sort of disband the group,
12 which is fine. They submitted their report.

13 That report -- some of what Carolyn
14 reported on yesterday was some of the
15 recommendations that were in that report. And we're
16 also engaging the NEJAC as well. So we sort of have
17 some farmworker representatives. I think
18 recently we reached out and had asked if somebody
19 from this group here wanted to help or be a conduit
20 for the NEJAC to make sure that, you know,
21 farmworkers were sort of being represented in our
22 NEJAC work for environmental justice, so -- but we
23 can certainly continue to report out as we did for
24 this session some of our EJ work as it intersects
25 with farmworkers.

1 But I think maybe for that November
2 meeting -- certainly, the label implementation
3 piece, which we are, you know, working on in
4 particular and we've requested, you know, charge
5 questions, or how can we better make sure that the
6 labels that are translated and make it into the
7 hands of farmworkers as part of that effort, we can
8 continue to work on that and report out on it
9 in November.

10 DANNY GIDDINGS: Mayra, you have your hand
11 up and you are recognized.

12 MAYRA REITER: Thank you. I just like to
13 second what Mily and Joe mentioned regarding
14 farmworkers. These are issues that intersect with
15 most or, perhaps, all of the issues that the PPDC
16 works on. So it's really important that
17 consideration of how an issue impacts farmworkers be
18 woven into the work of the PPDC
19 workgroups.

20 In addition, the EJ issues that were
21 discussed yesterday are things that are going to
22 require continuing attention from the agency,
23 whether it's the implementation of the bilingual
24 labels, ensuring that they are accessible to
25 workers, the SENSOR Program. So these are things

1 that I think it's appropriate for the PPDC to
2 continue learning about and discussing, because PRIA
3 implementation is something that's going to require
4 a lot of oversight, especially when it comes to
5 the provisions affecting farmworkers and bilingual
6 labels being implemented on the ground. And we hope
7 that at future PPDC meetings there will be the time
8 and format leading to a more in-depth discussion of
9 these issues.

10 Thank you.

11 ED MESSINA: Thanks, Mayra.

12 Nathan?

13 NATHAN DONLEY: Yeah, I absolutely agree
14 with everything Mayra just said, and piggybacking on
15 the desire to have the perspectives of grower groups
16 be represented here, you know, that's wonderful,
17 that's great. There are people who are affected
18 economically from some of EPA's decisions. There
19 are also people who are paying for some of these
20 decisions with the health -- with their health and
21 the health of their families. There are species
22 that are at risk of being scrubbed from the face of
23 the planet, and there are people who can speak to
24 those perspectives. And I would be happy to line up
25 some of those as well to consider.

1 ED MESSINA: Great.

2 Michelle, if you could add that bullet.

3 All right. I think that was a great
4 discussion. Thanks. I knew there was more we could
5 do. So appreciate your input.

6 So, Michelle -- yeah, I think we just need
7 to add, you know, invite environmental groups to
8 discuss ecological impacts of pesticides to PPDC.

9 Okay. So we had the Emerging Agricultural
10 Technologies Group present a report. I just wanted
11 to see if there was any motion to be made and
12 seconded and then vote on to accept that report for
13 the full PPDC, and then present that to EPA.

14 And then also there was a request that the
15 Emerging Technology Workgroup sort of be disbanded,
16 we don't really need to vote on that, but we can
17 have a discussion about it and see if there's any
18 motions to accept the report for the full PPDC and
19 then to send it to EPA.

20 Joe?

21 JOE GRZYWACZ: I don't know if it's needed
22 or not, but I'm happy to move to accept the ETWG's
23 report for advancement.

24 ED MESSINA: Thank you. Is there a
25 second?

1 MILY TREVINO-SAUCEDA: I will second that.

2 This is Mily.

3 ED MESSINA: Thank you.

4 MILY TREVINO-SAUCEDA: Can I add this,
5 Joe? Mayra and I will be, if needed, as you were
6 asking Mr. Messina about maybe someone from our --
7 from this group would be willing to collaborate in
8 terms of what NEJAC is doing. Both groups could be
9 connected more and maybe have us also involved. I
10 mean, I've been participating with NEJAC, but then I
11 was asking Mayra -- and, Mayra, sorry, I'm putting
12 you on the spot -- but because the question was
13 asked, I think Mayra and I can be kind of like the
14 voice from here to collab. Maybe I'm not making
15 sense, but you asked a question, Mr. Messina.

16 ED MESSINA: So thanks. Mayra, would you
17 like to respond to that request?

18 MAYRA REITER: Yes. I had already told
19 Mily I'm happy to volunteer with her.

20 ED MESSINA: All right, thank you. So
21 we've added you to the next session on Environmental
22 Justice.

23 Some of the business there, we can skip
24 over that next.

25 So, Danny, are we ready to do a vote from

1 the PPDC members after it's been seconded to receive
2 the report from the Emerging Agricultural
3 Technologies Workgroup?

4 DANNY GIDDINGS: We are indeed ready to
5 vote. PPDC members, you have a link in the -- or
6 instructions, rather, in the private chat on how to
7 vote. So please refer to the chat on how you can
8 record your vote. The vote has been set up. It is
9 active. I see we already have four votes in, so
10 please go ahead.

11 If you are a PPDC member, it has been
12 moved to accept the ETWG's report and forward it to
13 the EPA. There's been a second. That motion voting
14 is now underway.

15 ED MESSINA: And, Danny, we can move on
16 and you can tell me if we've reached -- if the
17 motion is passed once you see the number of votes we
18 need.

19 DANNY GIDDINGS: That works for me, yep.

20 ED MESSINA: Okay. So we can scroll down.
21 We've addressed the session down there.

22 Resistance Management. I think we just
23 wanted to make sure, you know, to -- we have some
24 takeaways here that we captured in the document and
25 wanted to see if there was any additional bullets we

1 wanted to capture, including exploring whether
2 pollution prevention funds can be used for
3 resistance management work. And if you're
4 interested in this group, there's contacts.

5 Is there anything that folks wanted to add
6 to this session or a discussion around that?

7 Okay. Seeing no hands raised, we can move
8 on to Label Reform. Seeking members, being mindful
9 EPA chairs were (inaudible) the workgroup, be
10 mindful that there are many stakeholders for
11 labeling, consider engaging equipment manufacturers
12 in the workgroup to get their perspectives on how
13 they would like to receive information from digital
14 labels.

15 There were suggested charge questions,
16 identify barriers to implementation of adoption of
17 digital labeling and suggest ways to overcome
18 barriers and encourage adoption. How can EPA best
19 have labels be easily understood for multiple
20 stakeholders, including farmworkers? How can and
21 how should the label -- digital label be integrated
22 with other related resources, example, Bulletins
23 Live!, Worker Protection Standard, applicator
24 certification resources.

25 Identify most important aspects of

1 labeling for standardization. Review the work
2 done by OPEL, example definitions, proposed
3 standardization format, and make public if possible.

4 How can EPA ensure that the workgroup's
5 ideas will be implemented quickly, fairly, and
6 consistently by all and how can the readability of
7 labeling be improved?

8 Any discussion around these bullets or any
9 other bullets to suggest?

10 I think we had the farmworker -- impact on
11 farmworker bullet we could capture here, too, but I
12 think Michelle captured that at the bottom for all
13 workgroups.

14 Any comments or discussions around this
15 session?

16 Okay. It seems like we've fairly captured
17 that.

18 Next session.

19 DANNY GIDDINGS: And would you like a
20 report-out on the vote we just took?

21 ED MESSINA: That would be wonderful.

22 DANNY GIDDINGS: Yeah. So the motion
23 passes unanimously. I'm trying to paste in a
24 screenshot of the results into to the chat with
25 little success. But we have a full report available

1 as needed.

2 ED MESSINA: Thank you, Danny.

3 Okay. And then the sort of last order of
4 business, Emerging Pathogens Implementation
5 Committee, consider issues of supply chain and what
6 to do with excess products. Open to new members.
7 Contact Tajah Blackburn, Rhonda Jones, Anastasia
8 Swearingen, and Michelle Arling.

9 Were there any discussion or bullets that
10 folks wanted to add to this session for
11 consideration?

12 (No response.)

13 ED MESSINA: Okay. We had a great
14 discussion about the Endangered Species Act update.
15 Were there any topics that folks wanted to suggest?
16 I'm sure we'll revisit this and this will be also on
17 the agenda for the November meeting. Were there any
18 topics in particular that folks felt like we should
19 address or have a discussion around other than what
20 was discussed at the session?

21 John?

22 JOHN WISE: I think, at a minimum, having
23 a placeholder, because you all there will have many
24 things that you're working on learning, and I think
25 even us on the outside will have things and

1 experiences. So I certainly like a holding spot.
2 Maybe it doesn't require as much time on the agenda,
3 but it's an important topic. Thank you.

4 ED MESSINA: Okay. John, did that capture
5 your comment?

6 JOHN WISE: Yes, good. Thank you.

7 ED MESSINA: Okay, all right. So just to
8 refresh to the workgroups so we know kind of going
9 forward what we're working on, so it was mentioned
10 there was a Farmworkers/Clinicians Workgroup. That
11 work was completed. The Pesticide Resistance
12 Management Group was also -- that work was
13 completed. So those workgroups were sunsetted.

14 We had the Emerging Viral Pathogens
15 Workgroup in 2020 and the Emerging Agricultural
16 Technologies Workgroups. Those continued into 2023,
17 where we had the Emerging Viral Pathogen's ongoing
18 work, the Emerging Agriculture's work, which has now
19 been completed and just has been sunsetted.

20 We have Pesticide Resistance Management
21 Workgroup 2, and we have the new Pesticide Label
22 Reform Workgroup.

23 Any discussions around workgroups in
24 general that individuals wanted to have?

25 Okay. Sounds like -- oh, Jessica.

1 JESSICA PONDER: Sorry. I know you
2 discussed the reason for not moving forward with the
3 Environmental Justice workgroups early on in the
4 updates. I didn't know if it was worth having a
5 discussion about opportunities within the PPDC that
6 aren't being covered by the NEJAC. I don't know if
7 others feel the same way, but I don't feel that
8 everything related to pesticides and environmental
9 justice is actually ongoing with the NEJAC.

10 ED MESSINA: Yeah. So I did describe and
11 we did -- yeah, we had a pretty big session on all
12 the work we're engaged within the NEJAC, the charge
13 questions with NEJAC. I think the approach there
14 sort of above was to potentially have somebody be a
15 conduit between the NEJAC and this group, and we've
16 got Mayra agreeing to that and Mily. That's just
17 refreshing and setting the table. But certainly if
18 there's others -- and, Jessica -- you know, any
19 response from the PPDC members on Jessica's
20 question.

21 MILY TREVINO-SAUCEDA: I'm not necessarily
22 clear in terms of your question, Jessica.

23 JESSICA PONDER: Just we had -- I think
24 it was two different workgroups that were
25 environmental-justice related that kind of had

1 different focuses that were proposed in the 2022
2 meeting. And maybe I'm not recalling that
3 correctly, but that was my impression. I'm just --
4 I don't feel that NEJAC is really covering -- that
5 the work at NEJAC actually covers the work that we
6 were proposing in the potential PPDC workgroup.

7 ED MESSINA: Yeah, Jessica, so maybe I can
8 answer your question this way. So there was a
9 report submitted by the sunsetted Farmworker and
10 Clinician Training Workgroup. We are continuing to
11 work on those recommendations as part of our EPA,
12 you know, receipt of that information.

13 JESSICA PONDER: Right.

14 ED MESSINA: So --

15 JESSICA PONDER: Yeah, the workgroup that
16 I had passed a motion for was focused on emerging
17 technologies in terms of toxicology endpoints, and I
18 took some time between yesterday and today to kind
19 of look into the NEJAC and what's going on there,
20 and I didn't really see anything related to that.
21 So I just didn't know if that was open for
22 discussion or if that's just been decided by
23 leadership as not open for discussion.

24 ED MESSINA: Everything's open for
25 discussion. That's why we have these meetings. I'm

1 happy to discuss it. I think there is a bandwidth
2 issue for us on how we could support it, but that --

3 JESSICA PONDER: Sure.

4 ED MESSINA: -- shouldn't stop anyone from
5 you know, having conversations around -- you know,
6 amongst your groups and associations about how we
7 can do a better job in that area.

8 ED MESSINA: So yeah, we can -- we could
9 talk about it now at this session as well. That's
10 why we're doing this session and I opened it up as
11 broadly as I did.

12 DANNY GIDDINGS: Joe, then Mily.

13 JOE GRZYWACZ: Thanks for that. And I
14 would like to throw out, you know, at least a
15 possibility since you mentioned it just a few
16 moments ago, Ed, about, you know, kind of, you know,
17 hearing either today, if the possibility allows, or
18 at the next meeting, about what progress has been
19 made on the recommendations that the Farmworker and
20 Clinician Training Group had given, you know,
21 because maybe there's some additional work that may
22 necessitate additional work or the formation of an
23 additional group that maybe has a more narrow focus.

24 An additional topic that I know is near
25 and dear to EPA's heart, and it goes hand in hand

1 with pesticide -- and I apologize because I wasn't
2 able to make the EJ presentation yesterday, I had to
3 duck out of the meeting, but I can't help but wonder
4 if something about climate and climate change,
5 whether or not that's something that's worthy of
6 some discussion, particularly as it revolves around
7 integrated pest management and, you know, all the
8 things that are going to go along with at least the
9 potential for climate change and the need and the
10 use of various agents.

11 ED MESSINA: Thanks, Joe.

12 MILY TREVINO-SAUCEDA: Well, I think Joe
13 said a lot of what I was going to say. And I just
14 wanted to add that NEJAC is -- do we ask a working
15 group to deal with farmworker issues and what way
16 it's impacting farmworkers, which in the past they
17 had not been considered as much. And I was with
18 NEJAC for six years and, of course, it was at a time
19 where there wasn't that much response, but to
20 -- because of the past administration, I'll be very
21 frank here about this. But in terms of what's
22 happening right now, there's more openness and this
23 working group is doing a lot of work -- it's all
24 farmworkers -- and are giving a lot of insight and
25 information about real experiences as I was saying

1 yesterday.

2 And so this a group that, for the first
3 time I feel, has been built as a working group to
4 give recommendations, this is why we came out with
5 certain charges, and some of that information was
6 provided. And I feel very proud in a way that for a
7 whole year there were a lot of discussions about
8 issues, impacts, and recommendations, and there's a
9 lot more work that needs to be done, but at least
10 there is a farmworker working group there.

11 And what we discussed before in the PPDC
12 with the previous working group that we had, we said
13 a lot of the things that the NEJAC working group,
14 farmworker group, has also mentioned, but it was
15 more direct because it's farmworkers directly, you
16 know, providing the information and giving the
17 recommendations.

18 So I don't know if this is related to what
19 Jessica was asking, but I just want to make sure
20 it's clear that when I'm talking about making sure
21 that farmworkers are involved, it's because it makes
22 more sense when the workers are sharing what works
23 with them and what doesn't work with them, what is
24 [connection issue] it's within the cultural context
25 of -- and it's very different. The way we talk here

1 is very different than the way we talk with these
2 other kind of groups.

3 So hopefully, I'm making sense, but
4 engaging farmworkers and having these kind of groups
5 are very beneficial and they are eye-openers. And I
6 think farmworkers being called essential workers
7 because of COVID or ever since COVID, we were never
8 treated as essential workers. We were just, you
9 know -- we kept on working to make sure that
10 everybody had food on their table. But all these
11 other things were still happening and it got worse
12 because there was no monitoring, et cetera, et
13 cetera.

14 But I just wanted to bring it up and in
15 terms of it's very important. Everything that was
16 said today and yesterday, especially taking care of
17 everything in this planet is so important. But
18 at times, we've -- and the majority of the times, we
19 have been feeling that we have been invisible and
20 because we have been invisible, we, you know, were
21 more vulnerable and so a lot more things are
22 happening that cause a lot of impacts, not only in
23 people directly, but especially women that are
24 working while they're pregnant and have children not
25 only with deformities, but also with many special

1 needs. And what happens with women's reproductive
2 system is something that hasn't even been
3 considered. But it's part of the conversations that
4 we have been having in NEJAC.

5 ED MESSINA: Thanks for that perspective.

6 So, Jessica, going back to your sort of
7 question. From my perspective, there's been lots of
8 engagement with the NEJAC on similar issues that
9 were raised by the farmworker group that was in
10 PPDC.

11 Amanda Hoff is available as our EJ
12 coordinator to, you know, hear concerns as well. We
13 have a new science advisor -- a senior science
14 advisor who's devoted to environmental justice. And
15 you -- hopefully, if you were able to attend the
16 environmental justice session, you saw all the work
17 we were doing, and if you haven't, there will be a
18 transcript and those slides are available on the
19 agenda. I know, Jessica, you were there.

20 So back to your question, you know, is it
21 open for discussion? Always. It's an important
22 topic; it's open for discussion. The question -- if
23 the question is, do we need a PPDC workgroup here,
24 in addition to sort of the EPA resources, there are
25 many folks that are engaged in the NEJAC work. So

1 like getting a group together who would want to also
2 participate in this one is another thing that we
3 need to happen.

4 So I'm open to hearing and furthering that
5 discussion, or just in the context of all of the
6 work that's going on, you know, if you want to have
7 a workgroup here, we can continue that discussion.
8 So I didn't want to sort of cut you off and feel
9 like your comments weren't addressed. But I just
10 wanted to echo Mily's viewpoint, which is there is a
11 lot of work going on. There are lots of other areas
12 where we're engaging and we're happy to continue to
13 engage in those areas and also happy to engage in
14 areas outside of the NEJAC as well for environmental
15 justice issues and farmworker issues.

16 Gary?

17 GARY PRESCHER: Yes. Yeah, dovetailing on
18 the climate change comment made earlier, I'd be
19 interested in learning more. We're having more
20 discussion about how the EPA is looking at factoring
21 -- if they're factoring in any climate change
22 information into their registration or registration
23 of pesticides when it comes to using -- applying to
24 some of the sustainability practices that are now
25 being implemented across the nation here, you know,

1 and encouraged by the programs that are being rolled
2 out.

3 ED MESSINA: Will do.

4 GARY PRESCHER: So I guess I just want to
5 make sure that everybody on the panel has a better
6 understanding that you're at least factoring some of
7 those decisions in, because if we are to do, for
8 example, more cover-cropping, we need certain tools to
9 do that in terms of meeting sustainability goals out
10 here, things like that.

11 ED MESSINA: Thanks, Gary. I appreciate
12 it. So I think we'll definitely commit to having a
13 climate change session at the November meeting.
14 That should be easy to do and there is some work
15 being done in that area related to pesticide work.
16 I think we've had a prior presentation, too, on
17 climate change in the Pesticide Program. So we'll
18 make sure that we can pull a lot of that information
19 forward to November.

20 Okay. We have about 14 minutes left. I
21 just want to say anything else. I'll just leave it
22 open at that. Any other comments from PPDC members?
23 Any other topics? Just anything else? I'll leave
24 it as broad as that.

1 (No response.)

2 ED MESSINA: Okay. It seems like we've
3 exhausted the conversation. I really appreciate the
4 engagement here and the free discussion. I think
5 that's a lot of what this PPDC group is about,
6 really hearing your perspectives and challenging us
7 to do our jobs better. So I really appreciate all
8 the feedback we received throughout the meeting and
9 during this session.

10 With that, Danny, I think we can maybe
11 give folks a break and then return for the public
12 comment and then conclude the meeting.

13 DANNY GIDDINGS: Yeah, that sounds good.

14 Ed, I just want to confirm with all the
15 PPDC members that if you wanted to vote, you were
16 able to vote using PollEverywhere. No one got any
17 error message or had a vote bounce back or anything
18 like that?

19 (No response.)

20 ED MESSINA: Okay. Well, we'll take
21 silence as a good sign. Thanks, Danny.

22 DANNY GIDDINGS: That sounds good to me.
23 All right. So with that, yes, let's do take a quick
24 five-minute break before we go on to the public
25 comment session. So we will reconvene at four, say,

1 4:25.

2 ED MESSINA: Okay, thanks, everyone. And
3 thank you for an incredible meeting. We won't wrap
4 up again. We'll just conclude with the public
5 comments, save as much time as we can for all of the
6 commenters that wanted to talk.

7 So thank you, Danny, again and thanks to
8 everyone who made this meeting possible and for all
9 of your input. Appreciate it.

10 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you.

11 To attendees and members of the public who
12 are listening in, if you would like to comment, to
13 give our team a back-end time to promote you, please
14 go ahead and raise your hand now. That way we can
15 promote you to panelists and you'll ready to go at
16 4:25.

17 So again, members of the public, you can
18 raise your hand by using the reactions button at the
19 bottom of your screen, the reactions icon. It looks
20 like a smiley face with a plus symbol at the top and
21 a raised hand. That is if you would like to provide
22 public comment starting at 4:25. Our team on the
23 back end will get you promoted to panelist so that
24 you can unmute yourself and activate your webcam.

25 (Pause.)

1 PUBLIC COMMENTS

2 DANNY GIDDINGS: All right. We are back
3 for our public comment session. We are fortunate to
4 have had some folks preregister to provide public
5 comments today. I'll ask Jeffrey to pull up the
6 slide showing our preregistered public commenters.
7 I know we have several folks who have also opted to
8 provide public comments today that may not have
9 preregistered, or maybe you did. I'm not sure. But
10 we will get that -- here we go. Here is our list.

11 So let's go ahead and start. Nick, I know
12 -- I saw you had been promoted to panelist. So,
13 Nick Tindall, please feel free to unmute yourself
14 and begin your comments. We'll stick to three-
15 minute comments. This applies to everybody. Stick
16 to three-minute comments. So you will get a 30
17 seconds remaining slide when you're nearing your
18 comment allotted time.

19 And, again, we'll start with Nick.

20 Nick, go ahead.

21 NICK TINDALL: Thank you very much, and
22 I'm having some camera issues so I will just be off
23 the mic.

24 I'm Nick Tyndall with the Association of
25 Equipment Manufacturers representing the off-road

1 equipment industry and a proud member of the
2 Emerging Technologies Working Group.

3 I just wanted to state two things for the
4 record and for the broader PPDC. First, I want to
5 make everyone aware that AEM, in conjunction with a
6 partner standards making body, has initiated a
7 project to create an industry consensus standard to
8 define targeted application. Currently, when we use
9 the word "targeted application" as an industry, we
10 are referring to the See-and-Spray technology --
11 forgive me for using a brand name to give everyone
12 to know what they're talking about -- where the
13 product is only being applied to weeds because of
14 weed identification technology.

15 For the use on labels and just general,
16 you know, industry understanding, we want to put,
17 you know, actual defined standards around what is
18 targeted application, and so that should be very
19 useful in the future for future labels.

20 Secondly, I just want to state for the
21 record in regards to, you know, digital labels, some
22 people, when they think of digital labels, they have
23 this concept of the equipment, the self-propelled
24 sprayer or pull-behind sprayer units scanning a QR
25 code on the product, the active ingredient, and

1 somehow automatically configuring to meet all
2 application requirements for any situation that that
3 piece of equipment finds itself in.

4 We are nowhere near the level of that
5 technology. That isn't even something that's on the
6 five-year horizon. That's more of the ten-years-
7 and-beyond horizon. So I just want to put that out
8 there for the Digital Label Working Group to
9 understand the technological limitations the
10 industry has where they're thinking of that.

11 That's it.

12 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Nick.

13 Next up, we have William Jordan.

14 William, would you like to come off mute
15 and provide a comment?

16 WILLIAM JORDAN: I have done that and
17 I don't see my screen popping up. Am I visible?
18 And would it be possible --

19 DANNY GIDDINGS: You are visible and you
20 are coming through loud and clear.

21 ED MESSINA: We see you, Bill.

22 WILLIAM JORDAN: Okay. Would it be
23 possible to take down the public comments slide? I
24 want to show some graphics.

25 ED MESSINA: I think so, yeah. Can Bill

1 just play his screen?

2 WILLIAM JORDAN: Yeah, that will probably
3 work. Thank you.

4 ED MESSINA: Okay.

5 WILLIAM JORDAN: My name is Bill Jordan.
6 I'm affiliated with the Environmental Protection
7 Network, and I would like to address the Label
8 Reform Workgroup charge questions. But first of
9 all, I'll say I'm really impressed by the long list
10 of ideas about how digital labeling can offer
11 improvements in the safe and effective use of
12 pesticides that Mano and Lisa put up in their
13 presentation.

14 I want to say that one idea that didn't
15 get mentioned that I think has a lot of merit is
16 making it easier for people to use QR codes to
17 report poisoning incidents. That could expand the
18 scope of capturing information from the field.

19 But I think it's also important for the
20 workgroup to recognize that the moving to a digital
21 world is not going to happen overnight. In fact, as
22 Nick said, it may take years, possibly even a
23 decade. And in the meantime, it's important to pay
24 attention to -- and I'd like this workgroup to
25 address -- the current readability of labels. And

1 there are a lot of things that could be done.

2 For example, this is a label, that's the
3 ingredient statement. It's black print on a dark
4 purple background and it's essentially unreadable.
5 And in the back, this is the type font size. That's
6 also practically unreadable. Lots and lots of
7 products have unreadable labels because of the color
8 contrast, because of the font size, because of the
9 line spacing. And EPA and this workgroup ought to
10 address that.

11 Also, many labels are very long and poorly
12 organized, and Amy Asmus talked about that as well.
13 They would benefit from tables of contents,
14 headings, and so forth. Julie Spagnola worked on a
15 consumer label initiative that came up with a lot of
16 excellent recommendations about the format and
17 presentation of label text that would make them much
18 more accessible to users. And, finally, Amy and
19 Tajah and Joe have all talked about the readability.
20 There are computer programs that can assess text and
21 determine the grade level at which they can be
22 understood, whether it's a fourth grade or something
23 else.

24 The last thing that I want to offer is to
25 stress the importance of Mayra Reiter's suggested

1 question -- charge question, and that has to do with
2 the implementation of the good ideas that will
3 emerge from this workgroup. I know from the
4 experience with resistance management that not all
5 companies adopt the label changes that people have
6 put in PR notices and recommended in other texts,
7 and that creates an uneven playing field for the
8 registrant community, those who follow it and those
9 who haven't adopted those texts.

10 So figuring out how you're going to bring
11 that about, comprehensive compliance, would be
12 really important for this workgroup to address.

13 Thank you.

14 ED MESSINA: Thanks, Bill.

15 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Bill.

16 Next on the list is Hardy Kern.

17 Hardy, you're recognized for three
18 minutes.

19 ED MESSINA: You're on mute. Still on
20 mute. Still can't hear you.

21 DANNY GIDDINGS: You're not muted, but I
22 don't think your mic is working. If it's a
23 Bluetooth mic, try disabling your Bluetooth so that
24 your --

25 HARDY KERN: Did this work? There we go.

1 DANNY GIDDINGS: There we go. Now we're
2 going.

3 HARDY KERN: All right. That's what
4 everybody wants at the end of a two-day meeting,
5 somebody with technical difficulties.

6 Thank you so much. Hardy Kern, Director
7 of Government Relations for American Bird
8 Conservancy.

9 Today's conversations and presentations
10 have been really, really fantastic. And so I first
11 want to say thank you to everyone who presented
12 all the great conversations. I, again, would really
13 like to underscore the comments that were made by
14 Nathan Donley and Mily and Mayra as well.

15 I, firstly, want to thank the EPA for
16 their ESA workplan, the rollout of that, the
17 continued communication about it, the pilot
18 programs. We are really, really appreciative of all
19 the work that goes into it.

20 One thing on the pilot program, in
21 general, the birds species that have been selected,
22 the Attwater's prairie chicken is a great species to
23 focus on, but being a larger, heavier bodied game
24 bird will react a little bit differently and be
25 mitigated a little bit differently than a lot of the

1 species that are really heavily affected by
2 pesticide use right now, which are aerial
3 insectivorous birds and some other smaller passerine
4 species of grassland birds. So just one thing to
5 toss out there.

6 And another thing on the IEMs within the
7 workplan that -- the workplan update, rather, that
8 came out, we really appreciate the menu that was
9 given and there's some really great thoughts in
10 there, but two things to just sort of call attention
11 to. One, there is specific directions for use and
12 reduction of use of chemicals adjacent to -- I think
13 they're called conservation areas, meaning national
14 wildlife refuges, national parks, other, you know,
15 protected areas of land along those lines, which is
16 great.

17 However, we know that there is still
18 pretty wide use of pesticides within some of those
19 same conservation areas, such as national wildlife
20 refuges. So some chemicals that would potentially
21 be mitigated outside of a conservation area adjacent
22 to them are used very differently within the
23 boundaries. And I know that it's kind of mixing
24 territory, but just one thing to think about in
25 terms of future best management practices.

1 And then also this is something that we
2 asked in our comments and I know it would be a lot
3 of work, and this is something we'd be glad to work
4 with EPA on, but some sort of a recommendation or
5 potentially a ranking of maximum impact IEMs on
6 there in terms of, you know, promoting and helping
7 overall biodiversity or maximum number of nontarget
8 species. Reducing risks to them would be great.

9 Thirty seconds left. The last thing I
10 wanted to call attention to is neonicotinoid
11 insecticides. There is a dearth of research right
12 now on their continued effects on people, but the
13 little bits that have been widely publicized show
14 that they are extraordinarily harmful to people that
15 are regularly exposed to them, such as farmworkers
16 and communities adjacent to large groups -- large
17 tracts of agricultural land. And the last thing
18 I'll say about it is it's more than likely not that
19 there are not as many effects as there are from
20 other chemicals, but just rather that they haven't
21 been documented yet. So now is the time to be as
22 proactive as possible mitigating neonics.

23 Thank you.

24 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Hardy.

25 Kim Erndt-Pitcher, Muhammad Asif, and then

1 John Lake.

2 Starting with Kim Erndt-Pitcher, you are
3 recognized for three minutes.

4 KIM ERNDT-PITCHER: Thank you for the
5 opportunity to comment today, and I appreciate all
6 the valuable information presented and the important
7 comments that have been made.

8 Prairie Rivers Network is a statewide
9 conservation organization in Illinois, and we are
10 deeply concerned about the threats pesticides pose
11 to aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems, drinking
12 water resources, and human health. This concern is
13 heightened by a regulatory environment which seems
14 to favor industry over human and environmental
15 health.

16 Recent registrations of harmful
17 pesticides, the lack of oversight and regulations on
18 the use of treated seeds, the registration of
19 numerous herbicide tolerant seed technologies,
20 coupled with the decreases on -- of on-the-ground
21 enforcement and regulatory oversight have put our
22 people, water, and environmental health at risk.

23 Due to time, I'll just mention a couple of
24 our concerns in the following comments: First of
25 all, herbicide use is altering ecosystem health.

1 There continues to be widespread observations and
2 reports of herbicide injury across the country,
3 particularly in the Midwest. Plants and cultivated
4 and wild landscapes, as well as people and
5 communities, are not only getting exposed to
6 drifting herbicides from early spring burn-downs,
7 but also through the growing season, and this is
8 happening year after year.

9 Widely observed impacts to plants include
10 deformed foliage and declines in tree health and
11 plant death. In fact, in Illinois, Prairie Rivers
12 Tree and Plant Health Monitoring Program, which is
13 in its sixth year, has documented declines and tree
14 deaths in several species of oaks in areas that have
15 suffered multiple years of herbicide injury.

16 Even the most stringent measures to
17 prevent drift of some herbicides are not working.
18 To use the example of Dicamba, the extra provisions
19 adopted by Illinois and other states to attempt to
20 reduce the harmful off-target impacts caused by
21 particle and vapor drift, continue to be
22 unsuccessful. Vapor drift of herbicides, like
23 Dicamba and 2,4-D, is a major concern in many parts
24 of the country.

25 And my other point that I'd like to bring

1 up is pretty important, and that is that the current
2 system that's being used in many states for
3 reporting of pesticide injuries, the voluntary
4 system, is really not working. Even the record-
5 breaking numbers of incident reports in recent years
6 fails to capture the landscape scale damage to
7 plants, trees, and wildlife that is occurring in
8 many states. Illinois agencies claim that the
9 reduction in complaints indicate that our system is
10 working, but the facts on the ground tell a very
11 different story.

12 There's likely several factors
13 contributing to the recent declines and misuse
14 complaints from the strain of the pandemic, the loss
15 of faith in the reporting system, social pressures,
16 and since we're seeing injuries well removed from
17 potential sources, there's also a general lack of
18 understanding among the public about what injuries
19 look like and how to report them.

20 And, lastly, I'll just say that
21 enforcement isn't nearly as strong as we need it to
22 be and it's not hard to see why the voluntary
23 complaint process has left a lot of landowners and
24 specialty growers frustrated. Many times they
25 choose not to report on injuries because there's no

1 real expectation of resolution and the cost of
2 complaining about a neighbor can outweigh potential
3 benefits.

4 Thank you for the opportunity, and I
5 appreciate all the information you all have shared.

6 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Kim.

7 Is Muhammad Asif with us? I've not seen
8 him in the online participants.

9 Muhammad, if you are on the phone, you can
10 press *9 to be recognized and then *6 to unmute.

11 If not, let's go on to John Lake, who, I
12 believe, has been promoted to panelists.

13 John?

14 JOHN LAKE: Hello. Can you hear me?

15 DANNY GIDDINGS: You're a little bit soft,
16 but speak loudly and I think we'll be good.

17 JOHN LAKE: Nobody ever accused me of
18 speaking softly when I was in APCO. I am retired
19 from the Department of Agriculture and Pesticide
20 Registration. And it would be very informative for
21 the PPDC to have a full grasp and understanding of
22 the state officials' dilemma in being answerable to
23 members of NASDA and in trying to fulfill their
24 mission with regard to FIFRA. This is an incredible
25 battle that took an incredible toll on myself and

1 many of my state colleagues, who have also retired
2 either early or in bad health.

3 And, in addition, I would also like to ask
4 that the PPDC consider for a future topic the
5 implications of the recent ruling with respect to
6 waters of the United States and what impact that
7 will have on the interpretation of pesticide
8 labeling.

9 And, finally, echoing William Jordan's
10 comments, the e-labeling topic, I believe, now is
11 soon coming up to its 20th or 21st birthday. So
12 this topic has been really beaten to death.
13 That and structured labeling certainly would be
14 helpful from the regulators' perspective, but it may
15 be a pariah, certainly, for the industry
16 perspective.

17 Thank you.

18 DANNY GIDDINGS: So thank you, John.

19 With that, I believe that we have made it
20 through our full slate of public comments.

21 A sincere thank you to our workgroups who
22 presented today and yesterday, to our PPDC members,
23 to members of the public who listened in and shared
24 their views, and to all of the support staff that
25 made this two-day session possible.

1 A special thank you to Michelle Arling,
2 who herded all the cats here at EPA and in the PPDC
3 to make this meeting happen. You may or may not
4 know that meetings of this size and complexity take
5 a lot of work to pull off. Ed mentioned it before
6 in his closing remarks. So thank you to Michelle
7 and to the entire team on the back end who have made
8 it all possible.

9 To all the members of the PPDC, thank you
10 for all the critical work you do both to protect
11 human health and the environment and to ensure a
12 safe and sustainable food supply.

13 It's been a pleasure being your moderator
14 over the last two days. That's it for me. And from
15 all of us here at EPA, thank you for being with us.
16 Have a great evening and a wonderful weekend.

17 Ed, would you like to bring us home?

18 ED MESSINA: I just want to echo your
19 thanks of Michelle. It's an understatement to say,
20 you know, it takes a village to run this, but also,
21 you know, but for Michelle's actions and activities,
22 and taking this on as an extra assignment, we would
23 not be here today, and I would be very sad because
24 we would not have had this meeting and I would have
25 had to answer a lot of letters about why we didn't

1 have the meeting.

2 So, Michelle, thank you, thank you, thank
3 you. You are very much appreciated.

4 And, Danny once again, thanks for all of
5 your amazing work, and to the rest of the team and
6 for participants and speakers.

7 Michelle, did you want to bring us home?

8 MICHELLE ARLING: I think we might have
9 one more public comment. I just want to ask if
10 Patricia Hastings, who had her hand up right at the
11 end, was seeking to make a public comment.

12 Also, thank you for all the accolades.

13 PATRICIA HASTINGS: Yes, I did. It's a
14 very brief comment and it actually piggybacks on two
15 of the comments that were made during the meeting,
16 but not did not make the record. So I think it's
17 just about a minute.

18 ED MESSINA: Sure, go ahead.

19 PATRICIA HASTINGS: Thank you. I'm the
20 Pesticide Safety Education Program Coordinator for
21 Rutgers University, and I'd like to thank PPDC for
22 the opportunity to comment and appreciate the
23 important work that PPDC does.

24 Related to the Label Reform Working Group
25 presentation and comment, I wish to underscore an

1 important comment made by Amy Asmus of WSSA and
2 echoed by a chat comment by Wendy Sue Wheeler of
3 AAPSE, the American Association of Pesticide Safety
4 Educators.

5 Amy made a comment, and I'm paraphrasing
6 here, that for the workgroup not to lose sight that
7 label language needs to be clear and concise. And I
8 would like to add another adjective to that of label
9 language needing clear, accurate, and concise
10 language, such that all labels are consistent with
11 the most recent revision of EPA's Label Review
12 Manual. I would not want to lose that body of work
13 for future workgroups that go forward.

14 So this comment would also be applicable
15 to the Bilingual Labeling Workgroup. For example, I
16 would urge the agency to technically review and
17 revise the 2019 Spanish Translation Guide for
18 Pesticide Labeling to be consistent with the Label
19 Review Manual prior to implementation.

20 That's all I had. Thank you very much for
21 this opportunity.

22 ED MESSINA: Thank you, Patricia. And
23 it's --

24 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Patricia.

25 ED MESSINA: Yep. Thanks for all the

1 public comments. I think this is, you know, another
2 reason this meeting is so valuable for us to hear
3 all the perspectives from our multiple stakeholders,
4 and so thank you for taking the time to comment.

5 Hope everyone has a great weekend, and we
6 will see you in November, if not beforehand.

7 And thanks, everyone.

8 (Day 2 adjourned.)

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25