

DRAFT FRRCC Recommendations on Pesticides November 2021

How can EPA better communicate with the American public about the Agency's holistic approach to pesticide management and improve the availability of information about the science-based process?

In order to accomplish this task, the FRRCC recommends EPA act on the following action items:

1. Develop and implement a robust, multi-media campaign to educate the American public about the benefits of pesticide products to the country, and the framework EPA follows as part of their regular in-depth, science-based decision-making process. Consider framing the messaging to connect the work and importance of the products to disinfectants and to agriculture's sustainability efforts in the face of climate change. Such a campaign should include individual farmers and ranchers as the face of the effort. Information provided to the public through the campaign should be science and fact-based, and presented in a simple and straightforward manner.
2. Strengthen EPA's fleet of embedded science communicators. A team of qualified individuals should be available within the Agency to facilitate two-way communication on pesticide-related issues. Such communication should be science-based, but the approach should be one of listening, helping find answers, and potentially also assisting in convening stakeholders.
3. Continue and/or increase EPA support of the National Pesticide Information Center (NPIC) to provide objective, science-based information about pesticides to the public. EPA should consider including all Land-Grant Universities/Extension (both Ag and Natural Resources and Family and Consumer Sciences) and state departments of agriculture across the country in the partnership. NPIC could create a training packet for representatives of Land-Grant Universities/Extension and state departments of agriculture to utilize for communication to the general public. Potential information would include registration and re-registration processes, risk and mitigation assessments, and use of pesticide products by various sectors of society. The Land-Grant Universities/Extension and state departments of agriculture representatives could also be trained in effective two-way communication on pesticide issues.
4. Develop and implement a standard set of pesticide label information for consumers. Benefits of the product should be included in addition to risks and use restrictions.

How can EPA reduce barriers to bringing crop protection tools to market while at the same time protecting the environment, natural resources, human health, as well as safeguarding pollinators and endangered species?

In order to accomplish this task, the FRRCC recommends EPA act on the following action items:

1. Formalize farmer involvement in the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) registration and re-registration processes by developing an advisory board of

DRAFT FRRCC Recommendations on Pesticides November 2021

farmers and ranchers to seek and utilize farmer and rancher input to understand realistic usage rates and patterns (rather than potential), develop proposed risk assessments and risk mitigation decisions, and identify and mitigate potential risks to threatened and endangered species.

2. Seek to establish a discussion group modeled after the Animal Agriculture Discussion Group that would facilitate open dialogue between EPA and farmers and ranchers with regard to crop protection tools. The venue could provide a forum for open discussion and strengthening relationships, with an emphasis on facilitating farm visits by EPA leadership and staff to allow for full understanding of the impact of EPA decisions on farmers and ranchers.
3. Expediently implement strategies for EPA pesticide decisions to comply with the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in a manner that ensures protections of threatened and endangered species, and provides effective pest control tools through an efficient, transparent and predictable regulatory framework. The Administration and EPA should develop a multi-year work plan with the focus of achieving holistic, long-term improvements to the ESA-FIFRA program. Interagency collaboration should be encouraged in an effort to identify and implement a more efficient process for EPA to consult with Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service on pesticide decisions under the ESA, and to work with USDA to determine how field data and conservation practices can inform mitigation measures for ESA pesticide consultations. EPA should create the formal farmer and rancher involvement and discussion group concepts listed above, and utilize them early in the FIFRA-ESA program. EPA should prioritize resources to mitigate pesticide effects on species most vulnerable to pesticides (e.g., species likely to receive an ESA “jeopardy” finding in a future pesticide consultation), as well as consider splitting the workload and process between products with only agricultural uses, and products with a mixture of agricultural and non-agricultural uses.
4. Leverage the positive and productive work done by the agricultural community to date in implementing the Worker Protection Standards (WPS). EPA should explore the projects completed where the agricultural community developed culturally appropriate material in various languages and formats to reach individuals with the message of WPS. EPA should create an inventory of such resources, and spread those resources to the existing network of agricultural organizations involved in WPS implementation including Cooperative Extension, state departments of agriculture, agricultural trade associations, farmer groups, migrant health clinic network, agricultural non-profits, and education and community outreach groups. In doing so, EPA could take a leadership position to link all the efforts currently underway and leverage resources available in each state, tribal and local community, all while not causing unnecessary duplication of efforts.
5. Initiate a formal mechanism to allow for meaningful engagement with agricultural trade associations, farmer groups, and agricultural non-profits as EPA develops its regulatory approach and programming regarding WPS. Such meaningful engagement should include direct and regular communication directly from EPA WPS staff to the agricultural

DRAFT FRRCC Recommendations on Pesticides November 2021

trade associations, farmer groups, and agricultural non-profits that the stakeholders of those groups receive the information in an accurate and timely fashion. The pending changes to the WPS provide the ideal opportunity for this effort to be tested and refined.

DRAFT