U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

PESTICIDE PROGRAM DIALOGUE COMMITTEE MEETING

Wednesday, May 25, 2022

11:00 a.m.

DAY 1

PESTICIDE PROGRAM DIALOGUE COMMITTEE ROSTER

May 2022

NAME	AFFILIATION
User/Grower Groups/ Farmer Representatives	
Amy Asmus	Weed Science Society of America
Jim Fredericks	National Pest Management Association
Mark Johnson	Golf Course Superintendents Association of America
Patrick Johnson	National Cotton Council
Dominic LaJoie	National Potato Council
Lauren Lurkins	Illinois Farm Bureau
Tim Lust	National Sorghum Producers
Bob Mann	National Association of Landscape Professionals
Gary Prescher	National Corn Growers Association
Caleb Ragland	National Soybean Association
Damon Reabe	National Agricultural Aviation Association
John Wise	IR-4 Project

NAME	AFFILIATION
Environmental/ Public Interest/ Animal Welfare Groups	
Nathan Donley	Center for Biological Diversity
Jessica Ponder	Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine
David Shaw	Mississippi State University
Alexis Temkin	Environmental Working Group Alternatives to Pesticides
Farmworker Representatives	
Becca Berkey	Community-Engaged Teaching and Research Program Northeastern University
Lauren Dana	Legal Aid Chicago
Mayra Reiter	Farmworker Justice
Mily Treviño-Sauceda	Alianza Nacional de Campesinas, Inc.
Public Health Representatives	
Joseph Grzywacz	Department of Family and Child Sciences Florida State University
Aaron Lloyd	Lee County Mosquito Control District

NAME	AFFILIATION
Marc Lame	Indiana University's O'Neill School of Public and Environmental Affairs
Chemical and Biopesticides Industry/Trade Associations	
Manojit Basu	CropLife America
Steven Bennett	Household and Commercial Products Association
Lisa Dreilinger	Reckitt Benckiser
Keith Jones	Biological Products Industry Alliance
Karen Reardon	RISE, Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment
Charlotte Sanson	ADAMA
Anastasia Swearingen	American Chemistry Council
State/Local/Tribal Government	
Jasmine Brown	Tribal Pesticide Program Council
Dawn Gouge	Arizona Experiment Station University of Arizona

NAME	AFFILIATION
Megan Patterson	Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry
Dave Tamayo	County of Sacramento Department of Water Resources
Wendy Sue Wheeler	Pesticide Resources and Education Program, Washington State University
Federal Agencies	
Walter Alarcon	National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Cameron Douglas	Office of Pest Management Policy, US Department of Agriculture
Charlotte Liang	Division of Plant Products and Beverages, US Food and Drug Administration
Ed Messina (Chair)	Office of Pesticide Programs Environmental Protection Agency

NAME	AFFILIATION
Cathy Tortorici	Endangered Species Act Interagency Cooperation Division National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency

P R O C E E D I N G S

DAY ONE - MAY 25, 2022

MEETING WELCOME

DANNY GIDDINGS: Hello, everyone, and welcome to Day 1 of the Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee' May meeting. A warm welcome to members of the public, PPDC members, workgroup members, and EPA and other agency staff.

My name is Danny Giddings. I'm Special Assistant to the Assistant Administrator for the Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention at EPA, and I'll be your moderator for the next couple of days.

In just a moment, I'll pass it over to EPA Director of the Office of Pesticide Programs and Chair of the PPDC, Ed Messina, to officially open the meeting. But before I do, I want to go over some quick housekeeping items. As we're all accustomed to by now, this meeting is being held virtually over Zoom for Government. And I want to draw your attention to the interpretation button on the bottom panel of your Zoom window to the right of your screen.

We want you to know that we've heard your feedback and request for Spanish language

interpretation and we're providing Spanish interpretation for this meeting. Regardless of your preferred language, you do need to click on that button and select either English or Spanish and mute original audio to be able to fully participate in the meeting. Again, please select either English or Spanish and mute original audio to be able to fully participate in the meeting. This will place you in either the Spanish or English channel, and as we anticipate a bilingual meeting today, it is important that you choose one of these channels.

For our Spanish-speaking colleagues, I will now turn it over to our interpreter Jacqueline, who will provide these instructions in Spanish.

Jacqueline?

(Instructions provided in Spanish.)

ZOOM SUPPORT: Okay, this is Zoom Support. I have enabled the interpretation channel. We had to listen to Jacqueline before I could engage that. At the bottom of your screen, you will see your controls and as you move your mouse, you'll see one for interpretation. If you have a smaller screen, you may have to select "more" in order to see the interpretation channel choices. Thank you for your understanding and your patience.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Jacqueline, and thank you, Troy.

I'm going to give everyone just a second to get in the correct channel for your language preference. And while we do that, I do want to remind people that if you are a member of the public joining us today, unless you indicated interest in providing oral comments when you registered for today's public meeting, you will be in listening mode for the duration of the event.

You may still email Shannon Jewell at J-E-W-E-L-L.Shannon -- S-H-A-N-N-O-N -- @epa.gov or use the Q&A function within Zoom to indicate that you'd like to provide public comment at the end of the day. We'll do our best to recognize you during the public comment sessions at the end of each day and after we recognize those who signed up to make public comments in advance.

And again, you can let us know that you would like to provide public comment by emailing Shannon Jewell at J-E-W-E-L-L.S-H-A-N-N-O-N@epa.gov or use the Q&A function within Zoom.

Our PPDC and workgroup co-chairs -- our PPDC members and workgroup co-chairs are designated as panelists in Zoom, meaning that they can request

to be recognized during the discussion sessions by using the raise hand function and can unmute themselves and activate their webcams after being called upon. We do have around 50 panelists during the meeting, including PPDC and workgroup members, as well as EPA staff, which means it's very, very important that you remain muted with your webcam off unless you're recognized to speak.

We do recommend using Zoom's side-by-side gallery view to see the speaker and content that we're sharing simultaneously. To do so, click on the view button at the top right corner of your Zoom screen and choose side-by-side gallery. This should split your screen with your presentation on the left and multiple speakers on the right. You can adjust the size of the left and right sides of the screen by hovering your mouse near the center of the screen and sliding the arrow to the right or left.

And, Shannon, we should be on slide 6 as I say this next part.

As I said before, you can join us live on zoom, which is the preferred method, if you plan on offering remarks, or if you need Spanish or English interpretation, or you can connect to this meeting by phone using the dial-in 646-828-7666, meeting ID

1603096189. Again, that is dial-in number 646-828-7666, meeting ID 1603096189, and those numbers should be displayed up on the screen.

If you have any issues connecting to Zoom or navigating the Zoom platform, you can receive assistance from EPA IT specialists by calling our help desk at 866-411-4372, or email your request to EISD@epa.gov. You may also use the Q&A function to privately troubleshoot any technical issues to meeting organizers.

Closed captioning and live transcription is available to those who use the service by clicking the closed captioning button in the bottom panel of your Zoom screen.

Today's meeting is being recorded for the purpose of having meeting transcripts produced. Because we are recording and because we have multiple types of live interpretation happening for today's meeting, we do ask that all presenters speak slowly and clearly to ensure that everyone can understand and participate fully in the meeting.

Finally, as I recognize members of the PPDC and public for comments, I will do my best to correctly pronounce all your names, but I do apologize ahead of time if I mispronounce your name,

and I do ask that you please correct me in the case that I do.

Please note the materials for the meeting can be viewed on the PPDC website. The link for the materials will be in the chat.

And with that, I think we are ready to begin. I will hand the meeting over to Ed Messina, Director of the Office of Pesticide Programs, for opening remarks.

Ed?

ED MESSINA: Thank you so much, Danny. Am I coming in loud and clear?

DANNY GIDDINGS: You sound great.

ED MESSINA: Great. Thanks.

Welcome, everyone, today, and thank you for joining us for this opportunity to discuss important topics related to the Office of Pesticide Programs and our mission.

I've got some opening remarks. Before, I started, I did, if folks would indulge me, want to take a moment of silence for the 19 young children that were killed yesterday and also the two teachers and the many families that are impacted by that tragedy. So I'm going to ask that we take 20 minutes [sic] of silence to recognize those that we lost

yesterday and those that are impacted.

(Moment of silence.)

ED MESSINA: Thank you for that.

So the PPDC membership was renewed in 2021, as it has been every two years, and we have 15 new members with us this year and I'd like to welcome those members. And we're going to get a chance to go around and hear from them, and with our first PPDC meeting today, so thank you for joining us and so a special welcome. And we are virtual. Our hope is to, as things progress, evaluate and really try to do an in-person meeting coming up in the future and we'll talk about it at the wrap-up on Day 2. But I wanted to welcome our new members.

We also have 25 members who reapplied and are serving for their second or third two-year term. So welcome to you and thank you so much for your continued service to the Committee.

As Danny will also discuss in a moment, we have a full agenda for the PPDC today -- for today and tomorrow. And I wanted to talk briefly about the background of the PPDC, its purpose, as well as that of the PPDC workgroups who are going to provide lots of updates for us today and tomorrow.

So just to refresh everyone's

understanding of the purpose of the PPDC, which is a federal advisory committee, the PPDC was formed in 1995 under the Federal Advisory Committee Act or FACA, which Congress passed in 1972 to create an orderly procedure by which federal agencies can seek collective advice from diverse customers, partners, and stakeholders.

The FACA establishes procedures for the management of federal advisory committees, ensures transparency of advisory committee decision-making, and ensures balanced presentations.

The PPDC supports EPA in performing its duties and responsibilities under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act, the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, and the amendments to both of these major pesticide laws by the Food Quality Protection Act or FQPA of 1996, and the Pesticide Registration Improvement Renewal Act or PRIA.

And the following is from the PPDC charter so we can all sort of be aligned on why we're all here today and coming together to provide advice to the Agency. So this is a direct reading from the from the charter and it states, "The PPDC will provide a cooperative public forum to

collaboratively discuss a wide variety of pesticide regulatory development and reform initiatives, evolving public policy and program implementation issues, and policy issues associated with evaluating and reducing risks from the use of pesticides. These evolving policy issues may include OPP's work related to environmental justice, climate change, and pollinator and imperiled species.

"And the major duties of the PPDC are to provide policy advice, information and recommendations on developing practical, protective approaches for addressing pesticide regulatory policy and including the technical and economic feasibility of any proposed regulatory changes to the current process or registering and reevaluation of pesticides."

So with this background and the charter in mind, I want to give you a bit more information on the workgroup updates you're going to hear today and tomorrow. As a refresher for those who are more familiar with the groups and as an introduction to those who are not yet familiar, so temporary work groups are sometimes formed to assist federal advisory committees with research, information gathering, and document drafting to support

committees in performing their duties.

In 2020, four PPDC workgroups were formed and started working in late 2020, and the groups explored charge questions on topics related to emerging viral pathogens, emerging agricultural technologies, farmworker and clinician training, and pesticide resistance management. And our agenda closely tracks the recommendations from the workgroups and then EPA responses to those workgroup recommendations, which were provided at the last meeting. These are all pressing areas for OPP and we are working to develop practical, protective approaches that work for our stakeholders.

And, again, at the last PPDC, which was October 27 and 28th of 2021, the four PPDC workgroups reported out on the work they had done, a tremendous amount of work that had occurred in the subworkgroups working beyond and in addition to the PPDC meeting. Three of the workgroups continued at that meeting and, one, the farmworker and clinician training group, was disbanded. This is part of the normal process and the nature of these temporary workgroups. And the workgroups also submitted recommendations to the PPDC which were discussed and sent forward as recommendations to the Agency.

The reports and presentations can be found on the CDC website in the list of documents for the October meeting. We will put a link to the October meeting in the chat, and you can find the work reports recommendations and presentations there.

And then during the workgroup updates today and tomorrow, you will hear what has happened since the recommendations were made to EPA last October, what actions EPA has already taken to address those recommendations, and then also discuss potential paths forward for discussion with a larger PPDC group.

So we're looking forward to these discussions with the committee and, again, I welcome you to the session and multiple days.

We'll also, as Danny will mention, have a public comment period at the end, and we've saved some time for discussion for each of the report-outs and each of the different agenda items. I'll say a couple of words to start some of the agenda items that Danny is going to talk through as we get to them.

And so with that, thank you again, and I will pass it back to Danny for the Committee member introductions. Over to you, Danny.

HOUSEKEEPING

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Ed. And, yeah, in just a minute, I will call roll for members of the PPDC. Before I do that, I want to do a quick walkthrough of the agenda for today.

After I call roll, Ed's going to give an update from the Office of Pesticide Programs. Then we'll break for 45 minutes for lunch at 12:30. We'll reconvene at 1:15 for an update from the Emerging Pathogens Workgroup, followed by discussion. At 2:30, we will have a session on pesticide label reform, followed by discussion. At 3:30, we'll have a discussion on EPA's recently released Endangered Species Workplan, led by Deputy Assistant Administrator for Pesticides, Jake Li, as well as an overview and update on Bulletins Live! Two. And, of course, there will be an opportunity for discussion, after this session as well.

At 4:30 is the public's opportunity for comment and we'll open up the meeting to those who signed up to provide comment. And like I said before, we'll get to as many of those who have contacted us during the meeting as time will allow before we adjourn at 5:00.

Just so you know, we have built in five-

minute breaks between sessions to give folks an opportunity to get up and stretch. Two full days of sessions, with no breaks is daunting and that's absolutely not something that we're going to try to do.

So I'll call roll for members of the PPDC right now. I'm going to call --

ZOOM SUPPORT: Danny?

DANNY GIDDINGS: Yeah, sorry. Go ahead.

ZOOM SUPPORT: This is Troy, Zoom Tech Support. I've just enabled the closed captioning live transcription feature within Zoom. For anyone requiring live transcription or captioning, down at the bottom of your screen in the controls, you will see a CC live transcript. That could also be found in the "more" area if you've got a smaller window. All you're going to do is select that and then select show subtitle or hide subtitle.

Thank you.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Troy.

PPDC MEMBER INTRODUCTIONS

DANNY GIDDINGS: So now let's go to our roll call for members of the PPDC. I'm going to call members in reverse alphabetical order, and we'll start with the new members and then we'll go to returning members. The list of members will be shown on screen. So when I call your name, please unmute your microphone, activate your webcam, tell us your name, your role, and the organization or group you represent and their mission.

And as a reminder, please mute your microphone and turn your webcam off when you are finished.

So let's go ahead and bring up the list.

First, I'd like to introduce Wendy Sue Wheeler. Wendy, would you like to provide an introduction?

WENDY SUE WHEELER: Yes. My name is Wendy Sue Wheeler. My role is I'm a representative. The organization that I represent is the American Association of Pesticide Safety Educators. And AAPSE's mission is to enhance public health and the environment through involvement in education, outreach, and research which directly benefits pest management managers, policymakers, and the public.

Good morning.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Wendy.

Now, I'd like to recognize Alexis Temkin.

ALEXIS TEMKIN: Hi, everyone. I am Alexis Temkin. I am a toxicologist at the Environmental Working Group, and our mission broadly is around research advocacy and policy around chemicals in the environment, including pesticides, but also personal care products.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Alexis.

Next, Dave Tamayo. Dave, go ahead.

DAVE TAMAYO: Yes, thank you. I'm Dave Tamayo. I'm an environmental scientist. I represent County of Sacramento Stormwater Program and I do a lot of work on pesticide policy, and I'm a former member of the PPDC I think from 2010 to 2016.

Thank you.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Wonderful, Dave. Thank you.

And, next, let's hear from Anastasia Swearingen.

ANASTASIA SWEARINGEN: Hi, I'm Anastasia Swearingen with the American Chemistry Council, Center for Biocide Chemistries. CBC represents the

biocides industry and addresses a range of scientific, regulatory, and educational uses on biocide use in industrial, institutional and residential settings. So we are antimicrobials for both industrial and public health uses.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Anastasia.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Mayra Reiter.

MAYRA REITER: Good morning. I am Mayra Reiter. I'm a project director for Professional Safety and Health with Farmworker Justice. Farmworker Justice is a national organization that works to empower migrant and seasonal farmworkers to improve their living and working conditions, immigration status, health, occupational safety and access to justice. And as part of our mission, we work for environmental justice for farmworkers, their families, and their communities, including protection from hazardous pesticide exposures.

Thank you.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Mayra.

Jessica Ponder.

JESSICA PONDER: Good morning, everyone. My name is Jessica Ponder. I'm a PhD toxicologist with the Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine. The Physicians Committee is a nationwide

nonprofit based in DC that represents over 175,000 members advocating for modernized toxicology methods that are more ethical, more efficient and more effective.

This is my first PPDC meeting and I am excited to be here as an advocate of new approach methodologies for environmental justice.

Thank you.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Welcome, Jessica, and thank you.

Megan Patterson.

MEGAN PATTERSON: My apologies. It looked like I had a little bit of a lag in internet there.

Megan Patterson, I am here as a representative of AAPCO, and that's the American Association of Pesticide Control Officials. AAPCO is an organization of pesticide regulatory officials from states, U.S. territories, federal agencies and Canadian provinces, who administer and enforce pesticide laws and regulations.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Megan, and welcome.

Bob Mann.

BOB MANN: Good morning, everyone. I'm Bob Mann with the National Association of Landscape

Professionals, where I serve on the government relations team. I come to NALP after many years in the professional lawn care industry. I've met and worked with many of you already, and for those of you who I'm meeting for the first time, I'm looking forward to working with all of you as well.

Thanks very much.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Bob.

Marc Lame?

MARC LAME: Hi, my name is Marc Lame. I'm at the Indiana University School of Public and Environmental Affairs. I'm medical entomologist by training and I teach environmental management here at the school, public and environmental affairs, as well as a public participation. My clinical work has to do with the implementation of integrated pest management with vulnerable populations, probably for the last 20,25 years working with school integrated pest management.

This is my second stint on the PPDC. I was in one before the previous administration. So I'm glad to be back at it. And, by the way, I am a public health representative.

Thank you.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Glad to have you back,

Marc, and thank you.

Let's hear from Keith Jones.

KEITH JONES: Good morning. I'm Keith Jones. I'm the Executive Director of BPIA, the Biological Products Industry Alliance. We are the trade association that represents biopesticides or reduced-risk pesticides. Our mission is advancing sustainability through biological solutions.

Thanks.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Keith.

Next, let's her from Dawn Gouge.

DAWN GOUGE: Hello, good morning, everybody. I'm Dawn Gouge. I'm a public health entomologist. I work for the University of Arizona on medically significant pests and integrated pest management. I represent the National Environmental Health Association which is the association for environmental health professionals, and their mission is to build and sustain and empower an effective environmental health workforce.

Thank you.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Dawn.

Lisa Dreilinger.

LISA DREILINGER: -- Dreilinger. I am senior director of regulatory and government affairs

at Reckitt. Reckitt is the company behind some of the consumer brands that you are probably -- already know, like Lysol, Finish, AirWick. They have hygiene, health, and nutrition. So those are the hygiene brands. And then health and nutrition is Mucinex and Enfamil.

Reckitt, in general, exists to protect, heal, and nurture in the relentless pursuit of a cleaner, healthier world. And we believe that access to the highest quality hygiene, wellness, and nourishment is a right and not a privilege.

So thank you for having me.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Lisa.

Nathan Donley.

NATHAN DONLEY: Hey there. I'm Nathan Donley. I've got my PhD in cellular biology. I studied mechanisms of cancer development at Oregon Health and Sciences University and subsequently at the Oregon Institute of Occupational Health Sciences. Currently, I am the science director for the Environmental Health Program at Center for Biological Diversity, and our mission is to save life on earth.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Nathan.

Next, let's hear from Lauren Dana.

LAUREN DANA: Hi, I'm Lauren Dana. I'm a supervisory attorney at Legal Aid Chicago. I'm a farmworker representative. I'm an attorney. I represent agricultural workers on matters related to their working conditions, living conditions, occupational health and safety, human trafficking, and immigration. And Legal Aid Chicago is a nonprofit that provides civil legal services, including to the agricultural worker/farmworker population.

Thanks.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Lauren.

And, finally, let's hear from Becca Berkey.

BECCA BERKEY: Hi, everyone. I'm Becca Berkey, and I did my doctoral work in environmental sociology and currently serve as the director of Community Engaged Teaching and Research, as well as a guest lecturer in human services at Northeastern University in Boston, Massachusetts. And I'm here to represent the farmworker health and justice team and Coming Clean, which campaigns for better working conditions, improved and stronger health and safety regulations, and ultimately better health for farmworkers based on the priorities and needs of

farmworkers at the grassroots.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Becca.

And welcome again to all of our new members. We're so glad that you are with us today and we look forward to your contributions.

Now, let's turn to our returning members. The first one needs no introduction. In fact, I think he already introduced himself. Ed Messina chairs our PPDC and has introduced him himself at the top, and will, of course, get another opportunity to introduce himself during the OPP update coming up next.

So, Ed, if you don't mind, I'm going to differ on your introduction until a little bit later

So let's hear from John Wise.

JOHN WISE: Good morning, everybody. I'm John Wise. I'm a professor of entomology at Michigan State University.

ZOOM SUPPORT: All right. This is Troy Niece (phonetic) with Zoom technical support. All of our panelists who will be speaking today, I would like to direct you to the bottom of your screen where you should see the interpretation button. It's necessary to select either the English channel or the Spanish channel. I've had some feedback in

the chat direct to me that they can hear certain people but not others.

So everyone in the event will need to select either English or Spanish, and we'll be able to take care of you. That is down at the bottom under Interpretation and you'll select your language of choice. It may be on a smaller computer monitor. It may be in the "more" area.

Thank you.

JOHN WISE: Danny, can you hear me all right?

DANNY GIDDINGS: Yeah. Go ahead, John.

JOHN WISE: So, I'm John Wise, Professor of Entomology at Michigan State University, and I represent the IR-4 Project in today's meeting. IR-4 is a NIFA-funded project --

ZOOM SUPPORT. John, my apologies. You're not in the English channel. You're in the off position, and if we're in the English channel, we can't hear you.

JOHN WISE: I should be there now.

ZOOM SUPPORT. Thank you.

JOHN WISE: Yeah, thanks.

So I'm Professor of Entomology, Michigan State University, and I represent the IR-4 Project,

and IR-4 Project is a NIFA-funded effort to develop the data necessary to bring pest management solutions to specialty crop growers in the U.S. We work to provide biopesticides and reduced-risk pesticides for specialty crop integrated pest management.

Thank you.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, John.

Next, let's hear from Mily Trevino-Sauceda.

MILY TREVINO-SAUCEDA: Hi. Can you hear --

DANNY GIDDINGS: I can hear you, Mily, though it sounds like the connection is a little bit broken.

MILY TREVINO-SAUCEDA: Okay. Remember, I'm in traffic, so hopefully you can hear me.

DANNY GIDDINGS: All right. Go ahead and just please speak loudly and slowly.

(Connection issue.)

DANNY GIDDINGS: Apologies, Mily, we're having some issues with your audio. It seems like maybe your cell phone connection isn't great.

MILY TREVINO-SAUCEDA: -- farmworker women.

Can you hear me?

DANNY GIDDINGS: You're coming in and out.

MILY TREVINO-SAUCEDA: Okay. I can wait until the end.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Okay. Yeah, that's a good idea, Mily.

Let's go on with Cathy --

MILY TREVINO-SAUCEDA: Continue.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Yeah. Let's go on with Cathy Tortorici, and then we'll come back to you, Mily, at the end. Thank you.

So Cathy Tortorici.

CATHY TORTORICI: Danny, can you hear me?

DANNY GIDDINGS: Yes, yes, I can.

CATHY TORTORICI: Great. It's Cathy Tortorici. I'm the Division Chief of the Endangered Species Act Interagency Cooperation Division at the National Marine Fisheries Service here in Silver Spring, Maryland. And we've been working with EPA for a number of years on developing biological opinions through Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act on the work that EPA is doing in terms of FIFRA for labeling.

It's been a great interaction over the years, and I say this to you all because I'm going

to be retiring at the end of June and I just wanted to say to this group I've been so impressed by your work. You're a smart group of people, a caring group of people working on really tough issues, and I've learned a tremendous amount, and I want to thank you for that, and I look forward to this meeting a lot, because it is my last meeting. I just wanted to say that.

Thank you so much.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Well --

ED MESSINA: Thank you, Cathy. It's been great having you.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Cathy, for those kind words and a big congratulations on your retirement. And we're so glad to have you back for one last meeting.

CATHY TORTORICI: Thank you.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Next, let's hear from David Shaw.

DAVID SHAW: Good morning, everyone, David Shaw --

DANNY GIDDINGS: David, we're having trouble hearing you. If you can be sure that you're in the English channel by clicking your interpretation button and then choosing English, if

that is what you'll be presenting your remarks in today, or Spanish.

DAVID SHAW: Is this better? Can you hear me now?

DANNY GIDDINGS: Yes, I can hear you now, David. Thank you.

DAVID SHAW: Okay, great. Thank you.

All right. So David Shaw. I'm a weed scientist at Mississippi State University. I'm the past president of the Weed Science Society of America. I'm also the past chair of the Herbicide Resistance Education Committee. WSSA, of course, is a nonprofit professional society that focuses on the promotion of research, education, and extension and outreach activities related to weeds and works to provide science-based information to the public and other policymakers, and we work to foster an awareness of weeds and their impacts both of managed and natural ecosystems.

Thank you.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, David.

Charlotte Sanson.

CHARLOTTE SANSON: Hi, good morning. My name is Charlotte Sanson. I am head of North America Regulatory Affairs and Sustainability for

ADAMA. And we're a global crop protection pesticide manufacturer. I represent the registrants of the regulated community for conventional pesticides whose mission is to provide crop protection tools to growers in the United States and enable their access to these tools by obtaining and defending product registrations with EPA and the states

This is my third term, and thank you very much.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Charlotte. Good to have you back.

Next, let's hear from Karen Reardon.

SHANNON JEWELL: Hi, this is actually Shannon. Karen let me know that she won't be able to attend this particular part of the meeting, but Karen represents RISE, Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment.

Thanks.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Shannon.

Damon Reabe?

DAMON REABE: Hello, my name is Damon Reabe. I'm an aerial applicator from Wisconsin here on behalf of the National Agricultural Aviation Association. For the association, I serve as the chairman of the Government Relations Committee.

The NAAA's mission is focused on two primary goals. First, it's on educating the industry on the safe application of pesticides and second is to educate the public and policymakers on the importance of our industry to society.

I apologize for the outfit. I literally did just get out of the airplane after performing some applications this morning to the forests of Michigan.

Well, you look great, Damon. So glad to have you here.

Caleb Ragland.

CALEB RAGLAND: Hello, everybody. I'm Caleb Ragland. I'm a farmer in Central Kentucky. We raise soybeans, corn, winter wheat, and pigs on our farm. And I am Secretary of the American Soybean Association, and I am here on behalf of that group and happy to be here and learn and work together.

Thank you,

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Caleb.

Next, let's hear from Gary Prescher.

GARY PRESCHER: Yes, good morning, everyone. I represent the National Corn Growers Association and this is my second term. I live in

South Central Minnesota, and I look forward to reengaging with the topics that are to be discussed today.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Gary.

Tim Lust.

TIM LUST: My name is Tim Lust. I serve as CEO of the National Sorghum Producers, the trade association that represents sorghum farmers around the country. I've worked closely with EPA and have product registration and reregistration for our crop protection tools for the last 20 plus years.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Tim.

Lauren Lurkins.

SHANNON JEWELL: Hi, this is Shannon introducing Lauren. Lauren is with the Illinois Farm Bureau. She serves as the director of Environmental Policy, a position she's held since 2013. The Illinois Farm Bureau represents 74,000 members who joined through their local farm bureaus.

And I have an apology to make. The next person on the list is Aaron Lloyd and it's written here is Andrew. So my apologies, Aaron, if you'd like to go ahead and introduce yourself.

AARON LLOYD: Sure. No worries. My name is Aaron Lloyd. I'm the assistant director for the

Lake County Mosquito Control District. Lake County is located in Southwest Florida. That's the Fort Myers area. And our district is committed to protecting the public health of the Lake County residents through suppressing mosquitoes, both nuisance and ones that may be carrying arboviruses.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Aaron, and apologies again on the name switch-up.

Charlotte Liang.

CHARLOTTE LIANG: Good morning, everyone. My name is Charlotte Liang. I'm a chemist with the U.S. Food and Drug Administration Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition, Office of Food Safety.

Our agency monitors pesticide residues in food and enforces EPA's pesticide tolerance in foods regulated by the FDA. I work on policy issues related to pesticide residues in human food.

I'm glad to be here. Thank you.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Charlotte.

Next, Dominic LaJoie.

Is Dominic LaJoie here?

(No response.)

SHANNON JEWELL: I think he's not, Danny. Thank you.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Okay.

SHANNON JEWELL: We might have to skip him.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Let's go ahead and skip him and we'll try to come back to him at the end, along with Mily.

Mark Johnson.

MARK JOHNSON: Good morning, everyone. I'm Mark Johnson with the Golf Course Superintendents Association of America. I'm the Director of Environmental Programs. We work hand in hand with our Government Affairs Team. The mission of the GCSAA is dedicated to serving our members advancing their profession and improving communities through the enjoyment, growth, and vitality of the game of golf.

My background is ecology and environmental science.

Thank you for the opportunity of a second round. Thank you very much.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Mark.

Now, let's hear from Patrick Johnson.

Patrick, are you --

PATRICK JOHNSON: Good morning. Yeah, I am -- good morning. This is Patrick Johnson. I'm a farmer in Tunica, Mississippi. We grow cotton,

rice, corn and soybeans, and I'm representing the National Cotton Council on the committee. The National Cotton Council advocates for the U.S. cotton industry for all seven segments from cotton producers to textile mills. And I'm happy to be with you all this morning.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Patrick.

Joe Grzywacz.

JOE GRZYWACZ: Hi, I'm Joe Grzywacz. I'm from Florida State University. I'm a public health researcher and I also do a lot of work with the immigrant farmworker population. And, most recently, I've been spending some time on the Emerging Viral Pathogens Workgroup. So it's great to be back.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Joe. Good to have you back.

Jim Fredericks.

JIM FREDERICKS: Good morning, everyone. I'm Jim Fredericks, the Senior Vice President for Technical and Regulatory Affairs with the National Pest Management Association. NPMA represents the pest control industry, those workers who protect food, property, and public health from pests in homes, businesses, and institutions across the

United States.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Jim.

Cameron Douglas.

CAMERON DOUGLAS: Good morning. Cameron Douglas, I'm a weed scientist and agronomist with USDA's Office of Pest Management Policy. We coordinate pest management policy across USDA agencies and also work very closely with the Office of Pesticides Programs at EPA to represent the views of American farmers.

Thank you.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Cameron.

Jasmine Brown.

JASMINE BROWN: Good morning, everyone. I am Jasmine Brown and the chairperson and environmental scientist for the Tribal Pesticide Program Council. Our group represents tribes across the nation and we foster communications between tribes and their tribal governments or Federal Government, even international governments, could be Canada, on a various array of pesticide issues.

Currently, we're working on policies regarding pollinators, hemp and cannabis. And we were also a grassroots organization that started in the '90s. Their primary reason for starting was to

focus on endocrine disruptors. So that's a big part of what triggers our risk assessment and outreach and technical assistance, and happy to be a part of the PPDC.

Thanks.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Jasmine. Good to have you here.

Steve Bennett.

STEVE BENNETT: Good morning. I'm Stephen Bennett the EVP of Scientific and Regulatory Affairs with the Household and Commercial Products Association Trade Association, a trade based in D.C., and we represent manufacturers of antimicrobial and pesticidal of products used in the household and commercial product space. Our association's mission is to protect and promote and enhance the household and commercial products industry in the lives of consumers and workers who use the products of our members. This is my third term on the panel and happy to be here.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Steve.

Manojit Basu.

MANOJIT BASU: Good morning, everyone. I'm Manojit Basu. I'm the Managing Director of Science Policy at Crop Life America. We are a

national trade association representing manufacturers, formulators, and distributors of pesticide products. Our mission is to help ensure growers and consumers have the technologies they need to protect crops, communities and ecosystems from the threat of pest weeds and diseases in an environmentally sustainable way.

This is my second term at PPDC, and I look forward to working with all of you. Thank you.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Mano.

Next, let's hear from Amy Asmus.

AMY ASMUS: Hello, I'm Amy Asmus. I'm a certified crop advisor and one of the principal owners of Asmus Farm Supply, who is an ag retailer in North Central Iowa. I represent the Weed Science Society, which the mission was shared by Dr. David Shaw earlier.

So I would just like to point out that the Weed Science Society of America fosters awareness of weeds and their impacts on managed and natural ecosystems.

This is my third term, so last time around.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Great to have you here. Thanks, Amy.

Walter Alarcon.

Walter, are you with us?

It seems like maybe Walter is not with us or having trouble joining. So let's go back and check in with Mily.

Mily, are you with us?

MILY TREVINO-SAUCEDA: Can you hear me?

DANNY GIDDINGS: Coming through loud and clear.

MILY TREVINO-SAUCEDA: Okay, great. I had to stop. Thank you, Thank you,

Mily Trevino-Sauceda. And I am the executive director of Alianza Nacional de Campesinas, which means it's a national alliance of farmworker women and we're in 20 different states. This organization is a membership-based grassroots organization. We have 15 organization groups. And we're here not only representing farmworker women, but also their families.

So I'm here and this is my second term, and I thank you for that. Thank you.

DANNY GIDDINGS: And we thank you, Mily.

Is Dominic LaJoie -- has he joined us? Is he on?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I don't see him,

Danny.

SHANNON JEWELL: No, he doesn't seem to be, Danny.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Okay. And I'm hearing from our tech support in the back that Walter Alarcon is not on either.

So I just want to give a big thank you to both returning members and new members of the PPDC for being here today and for your service to EPA. And with that, I want to hand the meeting back over to Ed Messina for a program update.

Ed.

OPP UPDATES: RECENT ACTIVITIES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

ED MESSINA: Great. Thanks, Danny. It's really an honor to be with so many distinguished members of this committee, and so thank you for your service.

So part of the agenda today, I know folks are interested to hear what OPP has been doing as of late and what's been going on with our office. So I've got a couple of slides that will take us to the lunch hour. And I'll start sharing my screen. Hopefully, it's the right one, and then we'll get rolling.

Okay. Almost success.

ZOOM SUPPORT: We have been notified in the chat that Reuben Arroyo is here.

SHANNON JEWELL: Okay.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Reuben, and sorry for missing you. Welcome.

ED MESSINA: Okay. Hopefully, folks are seeing my slides.

EDUARDO MOREIRA: Yes.

ED MESSINA: Okay, all right. Well, thanks, everyone. I'll get started

So first, just an update on who's in what chair. So, as you can see here, Ed Messina, the

current director. Arnold Layne is our deputy director for management. And then Mike Goodis was just named recently this year the official deputy director for programs. Mike comes from the Registration Division and he is now the deputy director.

On the Antimicrobials Division, Anita Pease as the director; Steve Weiss, Lisa Christ as the deputy and associate.

In the Biopesticide Pollution Prevention Division, this year, Billy was made permanent. Anne Overstreet is the current deputy, but she has actually moved over, as of this week, to the Biological and Economic Analysis Division to be the acting director, and Neil, who's been acting, will be the deputy director. That was this week.

On the Registration Division, Marietta Echeverria is still acting in that role. We've got an announcement out and are taking applications on the permanent Registration Division director. That closed recently, so we have some candidates that we'll be doing interviews with. And she is filling Mike Goodis' vacation of that role as the Registration Division director.

Dan Rosenblatt, deputy director, and then

Catherine Albe (phonetic), who was the associate director, has gone on detail to be working in the Office of Water, taking on a new role there, and so we currently have a vacancy as the associate director. I'm hoping to name somebody soon to be the acting associate director to work with Marietta.

Pesticide Reevaluation Division, Elissa Reaves is the director and then Tim Kiely was made permanent as the deputy director.

Health Effects Division, Dana Vogel, Don Wilber, Greg Akerman for that leadership team.

Environmental Fate and Effects Division, Jan Matuszko, Amy Blankenship, and Brian Anderson, and Amy was recently appointed as the acting deputy director. Jan is still the acting director and that is because Marietta Echeverria, whose position of record is the Environmental Fate and Effects Division, is doing the detail over to the Registration Division.

And then Biological and Economic Analysis Division, as I mentioned, Ann Overstreet is currently serving on a one-year detail to be the acting director for that program.

So in terms of where OPP is, we moved. While we were all remote, folks came in in different

tranches and packed up their boxes in the old Potomac Yards building and then stayed home and a bunch of movers came in and moved all of our boxes here to where I'm sitting currently, to the William Jefferson Clinton building. We are on the east wing of that building, right on Constitution Avenue, and then we're also in EPA's West Complex as well.

So senior managers have been in the building since the end of February. We've been coming in about one day a week. Then the next round of supervisors came in in March, and then staff started back in the last week of April to their current normal schedules, which are generally two to one time a week, and that's kind of been sort of the average of folks' schedules. We do have some folks that are here working full-time and sort of doing more days, but the average is sort of one to two days a week.

Employees who have relocated have new phone numbers. So if you're trying to call an OPP person and you're dialing 703, it's probably not going to work. There is a website that's updated regularly about contact information for Office of Pesticide Programs, and you'll find some new 202 phone numbers for everyone.

Please be patient. There's certainly a large number of transitions that are underway. Still figuring out, you know, where everything is in the building, unpacking and working with the hybrid environment where, you know, we're doing now, where folks are -- some folks are in the office, some folks are still working remotely, and so all of our meetings are in that hybrid environment.

I have been meeting with folks in the building. Jim was the first -- Fredericks -- was the first person I visited with, who came in, and I have visited with others. So it is possible to come see us in person if you're interested and there's a security process that requires visitors to request a form and then you'll need to provide a contact phone number in the case of any issues entering the building.

And then our conference rooms aren't really equipped with the virtual meetings yet. We've kind of done some patchwork, so there's a webcam in my conference room that hooks into a computer. Danny's in one of the conference rooms that actually is fitted with some good tech there. But we're continuing to upgrade our conference room so when you do visit and it is hybrid we actually

have a good experience.

And we're still not hosting in-person large gatherings and meetings. We're still waiting for direction from basically the EPA headquarters to determine when we'll start having larger meetings in the building.

So, in terms of our priorities you know what are we focused on in the future, certainly getting registrations out the door. Making sure that growers have the tools they need to combat the pest pressures that they address daily. Last year, we issued about 14 new active ingredients and added new tools to the portfolio, as we continue with the other priority, which is our registration review process where we're looking at new science and evaluating whether additional mitigations are needed.

We're also working on PRIA 4 technical assistance, the statute that enables us to collect fees, working with the multiple stakeholders that are in that group, industry and NGOs and others who represent perspectives on where they'd like to see OPP's priorities and using that mechanism through PRIA 4 and providing technical assistance there.

ESA implementation, also a priority.

We've got a whole session on that later on, and as folks have been following, you probably heard of the recent workplan that we issued and many other initiatives that I'll talk a little bit about later in my presentation and Jake's presentation later on.

The agency's priorities for environmental justice and climate change, putting together some plans for how we would address environmental justice and climate change. The connection for us for environmental justice in OPP is largely the workers -- farmworkers that are associated with those communities and making sure that they have the tools they need and they're educated about the potential risks to pesticides. And we have a couple of sessions on that today as well, and tomorrow.

Climate change, generally, looking at the increased vectoring of particular organisms, mosquitoes and the like, and ticks that are going to increase in ranges, to bring diseases to the United States that maybe hadn't, in a heretofore manner, hadn't had those ranges. So that's where we're connecting in the climate change issues. And, of course, growing patterns changing as a result of climate shifts, so people using a different amount of inputs in certain areas, climates changing within

the United States, so, you know, additional water is needed so how does that change our different inputs to take into account the effects of climate change on growers.

State of the science and advancing that and scientific integrity are big parts for OPP, continuing to work on new approach methods, reduced animal testing, so a lot of activity is still going on in the state of the art science. Lots of rulemaking, guidance documents, litigation, responding to OIGs and petition responses, for which we have a large number of petitions that are filed with the agency to ask us to change certain policies in light of priorities that various petitioners would like us to address.

We also -- at the foundation of OPP, is our people. We have some of the most incredible, hardworking, intelligent scientists that the world has and it's an honor and a privilege to work alongside them every day. One of my top priorities is making sure that they have the resources that they need to complete their work and that their experience here at OPP is welcoming and that there's a culture of inclusiveness. And we really are focused on that and I've got a couple of slides to

talk about that next, but we have an entire employee experience organizational development group that is devoted to certain aspects of the employee experience.

We are also continuing to be a lean office and we're looking at working with industry and others about process improvements and workflows that we can better streamline. And then along with that we have our IT improvements or digital transformation that we're hoping to complete and address better workflow, more access to the data for everyone, a unified view into the data, providing dashboards and information to our customers, which includes industry and the public and our various stakeholders so they can have a better window into the work that the OPP is doing on a regular basis.

So the employee experience, organizational development, there's a heading, GP2W, that stands for Great Place to Work. And then we also talk about the foundation of getting our mission done in OPP through the people processes and technology and sort of the bedrock of those three principles.

So under the Great Place to Work heading, which is our mission to provide leadership and shaping and inclusive culture that drives

excellence, innovation and achievement, creativity, and the employee work experience, there are a number of workgroups. We have strategic objectives related to that, so creating a high-performing organization, which is embracing our core values, implementing diversity, aligning with Great Place to Work, ensuring scientific integrity, improving recruitment and retention.

And then we have enhancing employee experience and engagement, which is convening the Employee Experience Engagement Subcommittee, hosting a Great Place to Work café series where folks can present issues related to cutting edge science and there's a discussion around that, and then really reaching down and promoting employee ideas and creating a platform for people to provide ways that we can provide a better experience.

Emerging issues, as part of the employee experience, obviously, the return to work was something that folks were interested in. We had a number of great educational seminars.

And then implementing the headquarters consolidation, which was the move. And what's interesting is the work that we're doing in OCSPP is being recognized. Arnold Layne, who, as I

mentioned, is the Deputy for Management, has been asked to speak not only within the agency about the work that we're doing in OCSPP, but also the work that we're doing for the other regional offices and sort of they're interested in what we're doing. And then outside of the agency, Arnold's been asked to talk about, you know, how are we being focused on our plan to return folks to work as part of our Great Place to Work initiative and employee experience.

So these are the various teams. We have an Employee Experience and Engagement Team, Teamwork and Collaboration Team, Work Life Balance Team, Pulse Survey Team and Communications and Transparency Team, all addressing various components of what we think are the way to drive better employee engagement and provide a culture for OPP that we want to create for ourselves.

So, in terms of the work -- and folks have seen this slide and probably in October we'll go through some of the 2022 metrics. But, as, you know, recent count from last year, my theme for presenting these slides is we had a record number of submissions, we had a record number of completions, and we have a record backlog. So that's sort of

what some of the data that I'm going to present sort of demonstrates.

So we got about 11,000 submissions to our portal. We completed about 5,000 registration actions, 2,500 PRIA applications completed, the 14 new active ingredients, new technologies that are provided for growers. We also completed 2,800 non-PRIA actions. So in addition to focusing on the PRIA actions, we are completing non-PRIA actions, not at the rate that we'd like to and certainly not commensurate with the priority that we've put in place for PRIA, getting those done.

We had a number of Section 18 emergency exemptions addressing significant pest pressures, Asian citrus psyllid, foot and mouth disease, weedy rice, glyphosate-resistant palmer amaranth, coffee lead rust, brown marmorated stink bug, and hemlock woody adelgid.

Our work in part, you'll see some of the COVID-related numbers. In '21, we had over 100 congressional inquiries. Many of them related to COVID, but not all of them. And we continue to process a lot of what are called LIST N applications.

So this is a chart that shows sort of what

we have in terms of staff. So, you know, back in 2005, we were about 800. This is normalized to reflect the fact that about almost 100 folks are now in the Office of Program Support where they had been in OPP. So if you unnormalize the chart, OPP was almost 1,000 people back in the day, but this is now normalized for the folks that moved over to OPS. So you can kind of see what OPP looks like and it's not skewed to take into account the fact that folks did move out of OPP, but are still supporting the OPP office.

So we were at a high of 603 in 2021. We're trending down to about 590 for this year to support the budget and then with the current budget amounts, assuming those are standard or flatlined, we'll be going down to 546 FTE. That also reflects significant reduction in contracts and a spend-down scenario of the balance that existed in the FIFRA fees, which was about $51 million that in PRIA -- PRIA 4, we were able to access and then spent that down.

By the end of 2022, we will have spent down that balance and so we'll be back to this sort of three funding streams that exists for OPP, which is appropriations, the FIFRA fees, and the PRIA

fees. So with those three streams of income to OPP, this is our projected forecast for where we will be by 2024.

The number of registrations that we're supporting has risen to 18,000. So this is a FY '22 number. So we're currently at 18,000 registrations. So you think about the number of registrations that are out there, what's needed to be changed, all the label changes, all the small things that come in, we're supporting a larger portfolio of registrations than we ever have in the past and that's reflected in the total Section 3 product registrations that are out the

re.

We've also completed a record number of PRIA completions, so from 2004 to 2021. Last year, we completed about 2500 PRIA completions, which is about 500 above the 2019 number, which in the world of COVID and working remotely you can see that OPP continued to work through those remote environment issues and focused on the priority of PRIA completions.

Again, even though we've had more completions, we've had more submissions, and as a result -- this is a Quarter 2 number, this is a new metric that folks maybe haven't seen -- our

renegotiation rate under PRIA is about 50 percent. It's higher in the Registration Division. It's over 50 percent, approaching 60 percent for the conventional chemicals, but when -- even BPPD and AD have been having higher renegotiation rates, and so we jumped from -- you know, the low has been around -- you know, less than 10 percent.

Back in 2005, when you can, you know, correlate that chart with the number of staff we had and the number of applications that were coming in under PRIA and adding additional, you know, PRIA codes throughout the years, we continued to do more PRIA actions with less people, and now we are having higher renegotiation rates as a result of the workload and the number of folks that we have.

The COVID submissions are starting to taper off, which is, you know, good news. So the blue line is the total pending, these are for expedited PRIA submissions, where we were getting things done ahead of schedule. We had the total combined completions as the orange line and then the -- we stopped sort of expediting these PRIA actions for COVID, but the good news is the number of submissions, the total number of pending has decreased, and we are continuing to deplete them on

a regular rate.

And then the nonexpedited COVID submissions, again, maybe the lump in the snake is starting to decrease. So the total number pending, as of May 2022, is down to about 40 submissions. It was a high of over 100 that, you know, folks were very interested in getting done and we weren't completing them -- or we were, but they were obviously, you know, completing a lot of the expedited ones. And so now we've actually -- the good news is completed a lot of a nonexpedited COVID submissions, and we're continuing to work through those. So hopefully the resource strain and needed focusing on the COVID submissions as an organization, we'll be able to take advantage of those resources. But Anita, who's the Division Director of the Antimicrobials Division, would remind everyone that there's still a lot of work that's being done in the Antimicrobials Division. So don't take that chart -- you know, I didn't run too far with it.

The number of FIFRA decisions completed through Pesticide Registration Review continues to increase. So this is a new number. For FY 2022 for Quarter 2, we're at 577, and so we're hoping to meet

our 725. In December, we put out a long and new schedule for how we were going to meet the FY 2022 deadline and the number of draft risk assessments, which is approaching sort of 95 percent completed, that there would be some potential, you know, proposed interim decisions and interim decisions that would go past the 2022 deadline. So our schedule, we continue to update online, and folks can see the various schedules.

And it's really to get the science done. It's to get it right. We don't want to just, you know, put out something just to meet a deadline. We want to make sure that we're accounting for all of the new studies that have come in, all of the cutting-edge science that we need to review, and I just think it's an amazing lift that OPP has done and completed so many draft risk assessments for so many chemicals throughout the years and as we're honing in on our FY 2022 deadline.

Endangered Species, Jake's going to talk a little bit about this more in-depth later, but we've implemented Endangered Species as part of the registration and Registration Review Program, consistent with our long-term performance goals for which we have in the 2022 to 2026 Strategic Plan.

As part of OPP's core work, we implemented a new policy for conventional and some biopesticides for new active ingredients, and then we issued the newly proposed ESA FIFRA workplan, which Jake is going to talk a little bit about more in-depth later on.

We also are implementing a number of biological opinions that we've received from the services, including Malathion and the salmonids. And then we have completed the biological evaluations and effects determinations in accordance with a lot of the litigation settlements that have occurred. So it was six final BEs, atrazine, simazine, glyphosate, imidaclorprid, thiamethoxam, and clothianidin, and then two effects determinations for Sulfoxaflor and inpurfluxam.

This is the current schedule of selected ESA activities related to BiOps and the recent biological opinions that we've received from the services and the final BiOps that we're going to be issuing soon. This is in the workplan, but I wanted to show sort of the schedule of things and the amount of work that EPA needs to complete in order to continue to comply with our ESA obligations as we review pesticide products.

So you can see that we've issued a number

of final BEs and we're scheduled to issue some upcoming final BEs and we put out some draft BEs. We also have a schedule for future draft and final BEs. The ones that are in red are litigation and the ones that are in brown are things that we added that were sort of -- for example, the rodenticides traveling together where we had settled on a particular rodenticide, it made sense to do the rodenticides as a class. So the browns are sort of dates -- are ones that we've added in ourselves, and then we've got some 10 -- we've got to approximately 10 new active ingredients each year that we're planning to do as part of the new AI for draft BEs and final BEs.

And then we continue our litigation schedule out to 2027, and we still have 30 or so additional pesticide active ingredients that will, as part of settlement, most likely be put on a schedule and these are the active ingredients that are part of that litigation, and then we have this work here for continuing.

So you can see there's certainly a lot of work that is yet to be done for issuing draft biological evaluations, working with the services on

BiOps and implementing mitigation as we proceed to address those chemicals. And also as part of the workplan, you'll see, as Jake mentioned, we're looking to make sure that mitigation is done earlier in the process as well.

So an example of what an Endangered Species Act registration might look like is the Enlist product. So if you're interested in, you know, what does this new approach look like, an example would be the Enlist product. I put it out there just to call attention to it in case you're looking for the intersection between ESA and OPP and what our work looks like and consultation with the services and commencing that and trying to get mitigations on the label to make sure that we are not arriving at jeopardy or adverse modifications for habitats and working with the services to sort of have that done, but also doing some initial work to help the services with that evaluation. Obviously, it's their call.

So when we issued that opinion, first, there were a number of counties that were not included in the additional registration. We got comments back from growers. They were worried about losing that tool in about 130 counties. So we

pretty quickly were provided new information from the registrant and, you know, from January to March, we approved a new Enlist One, Enlist Duo label that allowed it to be used with additional mitigations in the 134 counties that were reviewed based on the current mitigation and with new information about, you know, species that were in those areas.

We also had some small tweaks to the label based on where there were species ranges from the January to the March time frame. So there are now many more counties that the Enlist products can be used in from the January initial announcement and obviously a pretty thorough Endangered Species Act review process was conducted for the Enlist registrations.

Dicamba, as folks recall in December, we announced our incident report. We continued to find a large number of incidents in Dicamba and also found incidents related in Endangered Species Act areas. Very recently, in May, we filed a status report with the court as requested. The court report requires that we explain where we had been on the process and we told the court that we have implemented state-specific restrictions for Dicamba in certain states and we remain committed to working

with states interested in addressing issues related to incidents in their jurisdiction.

So for example, following registration and registrant requests to amend their labeling. In partnership with Iowa and Minnesota, we implemented additional restrictions, as requested by those states, to reduce the likelihood of volatility and offsite movement on the over-the-top application of Dicamba in those states. Dicamba is also going through registration review at this time. So there will be additional information on that as well.

We also indicated that for the '23 growing season we're going to continue to review whether over-the-top Dicamba can be used in a manner that does not pose unreasonable risks to nontarget crops and other plants. We were committed to evaluating the regulatory tools. And then we also announced to the court that, in March, we received a request from the registrant, Bayer, to amend the 2020 registration for Bayer's XtendiMax product by adding additional use restrictions that would be applicable in counties where there are certain federally listed endangered or threatened plant species.

Chlorpyrifos, another chemical that's in litigation, and I'll stick more closely to the

slides on this one, but as folks must know, in August we issued the final rule revoking all tolerances. That was in response to the Ninth Circuit's order directing the agency to issue a final rule to the 2007 petition. And after issuing the August 2021 final rule, we provided an opportunity for anyone to file an objection. The deadline was in October.

And then in February of 2022, this year, we announced the denial of all the objections. The tolerance is expired for Chlorpyrifos. And then on that same day, we published the denial of all the objections to the August 2021 rule. So at this time, using Chlorpyrifos on food and feed crops, it will result in adulterated food which cannot be legally shipped in interstate commerce. We also worked with FDA on a channels of trade guidance for any Chlorpyrifos that was applied prior to the expiration of the tolerances in the final decision.

And then recently, in terms of the litigation in March, the Eighth Circuit denied a motion to stay the tolerance rule and dismissed a petition seeking review of the Chlorpyrifos final rule revoking tolerances for lack of jurisdiction and then two other petitions challenging EPA's final

rule and order denying objections were consolidated into a single action, and so we remain pending in front of the Eighth Circuit for Chlorpyrifos.

The Agricultural Worker Protections Standard, this is a rule that we finalized in 2020. There were lawsuits challenging the revisions, so the work on the new rule has been stayed and the 2015 Worker Protection Standard remains in effect.

So in May of 2022, we published a notice in the Federal Register explaining the ongoing litigation and the effect of the stay, continuing the state for the AEZ Rule. And so we've also initiated rulemaking internally. You haven't seen anything public yet, but we've been initiating rulemaking to reconsider parts of the 2020 rule in keeping with the Executive Order by the President, 13990, concerning the protection of public health and the environment and restoring science to tackle the climate. So that's the update on the AEZ Rule. So I would say, you know, stay tuned for any upcoming rulemaking, but the 2015 rule remains in effect.

The certification of pesticide applicators rule, so we've been working really hard and the states have been working really hard to update their

training for certified pesticide applicators. I'm happy to report that we've actually reviewed all 68 territory, tribal, and federal agencies' certification plans and we've provided feedback. And we have some final plans that have actually been approved. So as of today, we have one state and two federal plans that are approved and we're going to continue to approve them on a rolling basis.

At the same time, we know that states were very concerned about the upcoming deadlines and being able to meet the rule deadline, so we issued a rule extending the date by which plans must be approved and ensuring the existing plans can remain in place to November 4th of 2022, and we also issued a proposed rule for public comment on the need for extending the expiration date beyond November 4th, 2022. We got -- about 20 comments were submitted to the docket regarding the extension. And then a final rule is currently under development and anticipated in September regarding what the final extension might be.

And so obviously, you know, we understand the states were concerned about the deadline prior to October of 2021. Because of legislation in PRIA, we were unable to actually act or put anything in

motion that works on any rule related to the CNT (phonetic) Program. And so as a result, we were approving plans and working on feedback and now we've proposed an extension.

Glyphosate and Prop 65, this is something that's gotten some recent news play and there's also litigation around this which is somewhat related to California's recent ask of the agency. So we had originally denied, in 2019, California's request to have label language that talked about their Prop 65 and the International Agency for Research on Cancer's classification. We thought that language at the time -- I'll refer you to the letter sort of where we denied that -- was going to be false and misleading under the Pesticide Program and under FIFRA.

We then received new language from California and they asked us to consider whether this new language would be appropriate. We talked about it internally, and I put the language out there at the bottom for you to peruse, but, you know, California's argument was, you know, basically this language is stating some facts, so it was very factual.

It says, you know, using this product can

expose you to glyphosate. And they talk about the IARC cancer classification and they also provided EPA's position, which is that EPA has determined that glyphosate is not likely to be carcinogenic to humans, and other authorities have made similar determinations. And a wide variety of factors affect your potential risks, including level and duration of exposure to chemical. For more information, including ways to reduce your exposure, visit the Prop 65 website for California.

So when presented with this, you know, fairly neutral language, we did indicate in a letter back to California that we did not think that this was false and misleading. We continue to stand by our determination based on the review of robust scientific evaluation that glyphosate is not potentially carcinogenic. And we say that glyphosate is not likely to be carcinogenic to humans. We say that in the letter back to California. And EPA's conclusion remains consistent with the many international expert panels and regulatory authorities.

We also said that in the brief of the Solicitor to the Supreme Court in an ancillary case related to a challenge of California's Prop 65

language, indicating that we have continued to stand by that determination.

So I've seen some, you know, recent articles about that. I think, you know, most of them are, you know, doing pretty good job reporting on that, but if you see any articles that indicate that we've changed our mind on glyphosate, you can point them to this slide and the language that's in the Solicitor General's brief, which indicates we're still standing by a determination related to the noncarcinogenecity of glyphosate and its effect on humans.

We also, as part of PRIA 4 -- you know, one of the things that the PRIA coalition can work on and requested in PRIA 4 was that we put out certain guidance on efficacy guidelines for a product performance rule, which we issued in April, which goes into effect in June. So the bedbugs, premise fire ants, and pests of pets guidelines have been created and updated per the schedule listed in PRIA 4.

The rule mainly codifies the current efficacy practices regarding product performance standards and invertebrate pests to test to support labeling claims. So that was a product that folks

were waiting for the agency to complete that was in PRIA 4 and success to us for completing that.

Design for the Environment logo, we also announced in May, we launched a new Design for the Environment, DfE, logo, at the request of industry and other stakeholders, that the logo will appear on antimicrobial products, like disinfectants and sanitizers within the year.

The DfE logo helps consumers and commercial buyers identify antimicrobial products that meet the health and safety standards of the normal pesticide registration process and the DfE products meet criteria that evaluate human health, environmental effects, product performance, packaging and ingredients. And the requirements are intended to minimize any possible risks to human health by excluding ingredients that might have the potential to negatively impact young children, cause cancer, or have other negative effects. They further protect fish and other aquatic life, minimize pollution of the air and waterways, and then ensure products have no unresolved compliance enforcement or efficacy issues.

So you can see the old logo on the left, which looks really good if you’re in the 1970s or

‘80s, and the new logo, which is maybe more appropriate for 2022. So we were happy to work with the many stakeholders who asked us to change that logo and issued that very recently.

So if you are interested in receiving updates about all of the incredible work that OPP is doing, there’s usually an OPP update a week, sometimes two. Because of the volume of work that we’re doing, there’s probably going to be one going out today or tomorrow on some grants related to workers. And so that will be coming out as a big update this week, and maybe even while we’re at the meeting. So please sign up. Stay in touch with what we’re doing. And as always, you know, we put many of these documents out for public comment. All of our science goes out for public review and we really do appreciate the comments we do receive.

You know, in particular, I would say it’s great that we have some growers who are in on this, you know, committee. We really -- when mitigation happens on the label and tools are either taken away or additional protections are put in place there, it is for a good reason. It is that we’ve found a potential public health risk, we’ve found an environmental risk, including risks to endangered

species.

And we need to hear from the growers of the importance of those tools so we can have a full picture of the impact of any of our decisions for mitigation and the ability for those mitigations to actually take place, and, you know, the realistic approach as to whether those mitigations can be used in practice is really why this PPDC and all the members on this group, why your input is so valued and why we put everything out for public comment and why we really appreciate the comments that you do send us.

So if you're interested in hearing about what you can comment on, definitely sign up for the OPP pesticide updates.

And with that, I will stop talking and we'll save some time for a little bit of a discussion.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Ed.

So, yeah, we have -- we're getting close to 12:30, but we do have some time for discussion. If you are a PPDC Member and you would like to comment or ask a question about anything that Ed just covered, please raise your hand and we will call on you. After I call on you, please unmute

yourself and enable your webcam and begin to speak.

So I see that Keith Jones from BPIA would like to speak. Please, Keith, go ahead and unmute yourself and and deliver your comments.

KEITH HONES: Thanks, and thanks, Ed. Thanks for all those updates.

Just a quick question. With Ann going on that temporary detail, will there be an acting deputy director for BPPD, and if so, do you know who it would be? Thanks.

ED MESSINA: Yes and no. So I've got to talk to Billy, but, yes, there will be a deputy, Keith.

KEITH JONES: Great. Thanks.

ED MESSINA: Nathan.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Nathan, go ahead next.

NATHAN DONLEY: Yeah, thanks, Ed. This is more concerning the sort of first half of your presentation where you sort of give overviews of the registration decisions you made under PRIA. And, you know, I appreciate why that's a big part of what you do. It's sort of your day-to-day. Those PRIA deadlines are constantly on your mind.

But I'd love to see the agency sort of identify some different measurements of success as

well because, you know, the improvements in the registration expansions and the exemptions are part of what you do, but you also do a lot of reining in of pesticide use. You also cancel uses sometimes and even cancel active ingredients, not as much as I'd like to see, but this happens. And when it does, I think the Agency should really tout that and take credit for it and provide some overviews on how often that happens to let the public know of sort of that side of your agency that is doing sort of more public health protective measures.

I think this would also help staff morale. A lot of people at the EPA join there because they want to protect the environment, protect public health, and if they see leadership sort of touting some of these other things, like use cancellations and active ingredient cancellations, in a public forum like this, I think that would be very beneficial.

And so, you know, I know you've done some great things this past year, like cancelled Pentachlorophenol; you're proposing to cancel most uses of Diuron, which is a nasty herbicide; you're proposing to cancel most uses of the dithiocarbamate fungicides, like Thiram, Ziram, and Therban. These

are great actions.

And to the extent that the final decisions track with the proposed ones, I'd really like to see you tout this more and give sort of overviews of how often this is happening at your agency, because I really view it as more in alignment with your mission than a lot of the PRIA actions. So just some food for thought.

ED MESSINA: Yeah, appreciate that. Thank you, Nathan. I will definitely add that to my update in the next PPDC. I had a little bit of that in the last PPDC, because when we issued that updated schedule for registration review, as that OPP update is there, we did talk about the hundreds of sort of mitigations that occurred as a result of our registration review, and it is important part of our program. So I think we're very much aligned and I agree with that. I'll definitely take that comment back and try to provide a deeper dive on that in the future.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Nathan.

Dave Tamayo.

DAVE TAMAYO: Yeah. Thank you very much, Ed. That was quite a lot of material you covered. Obviously, you guys are very busy. I've known that

for quite a while. One of the things that I wanted to find out is what, if anything, OPP is doing to improve how it evaluates the impact of urban use pesticides on water bodies that receive either wastewater discharges or stormwater discharges, or even direct discharges.

I mean, the reason I'm on this committee and the reason we communicate with OPP on a very regular basis is that there seemed to be some, you know, some gaps in how EPA models how pesticides move through the environment, the types of data they use to evaluate whether there's a potential impact on, you know, aquatic organisms.

About a decade ago, there was some movement in trying to improve that on a more global basis, but that seems to have -- the amount of resources that are being applied to that have been diminished. I understand your challenges, but has there been any progress in that at all in the last few years?

ED MESSINA: Yeah, I mean, we've definitely -- if you've seen recently, we've updated our aquatic life benchmark information.

Are you talking about also passthrough from POTWs or are you more -- is your question more

directed towards sort of stream health?

DAVE TAMAYO: Well, officially, I'm more interested in stormwater because that's who I represent, but we communicate with POTWs quite a bit. And just understanding, so it's not just about, you know, the standards. It's also, you know, EPA's understanding and application of how things are actually used in the environment, what type of data they use, you know, with -- because limited data sets lead to limited understanding.

Anyway, I'd like to find out more and maybe in a future meeting that could be something that could be discussed.

ED MESSINA: Yeah, actually, I -- let's put that as a future topic for OPP to kind of talk about how we do our water assessments for the PPDC. We're happy to put that on the agenda.

We've done recently a large number for CHPAC, which is the Children's Health FACA. We provided a lot of slides about how we do the human health risk side of things, and so I think with the new ESA and some of those documents, and with the recent -- you know, if you look at Enlist and sort of how we address the water runoff and the mitigations there, there's plenty to talk about, I

think, on how we do our water assessments and all the data, of which there's a lot, and all of the models that we employ that we are constantly updating, but updating on a pretty good frequency, to make sure that we've used the most conservative values that are available for us to ensure that pesticides are not impacting waterways.

We just yesterday, in fact, heard from USGS, whose -- they're working on a report that will be announced in the future -- related to, you know, assessment of water quality, and there are other organizations who are doing water quality assessments for pesticides that we want to make sure that we're incorporating that information. So I would say let's put they on the future PPDC and thank you for the comment.

DAVE TAMAYO: Thank you.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Great. And we'll take that as some feedback and put it on our future agenda.

Mily, you're up next.

MILY TREVINO-SAUCEDA: Can you hear me?

ED MESSINA: Yes.

MILY TREVINO-SAUCEDA: Okay, good. I stopped again.

ED MESSINA: I'm glad you've stopped driving and you're talking, Mily.

MILY TREVINO-SAUCEDA: Yeah. No, of course, I do. This is why you don't hear me as much when I'm driving.

I have several questions, but I'm going to try to put everything in one, and it has to do with what you were talking about, the worker protection standards. And, you know, because I represent farmworkers, farmworker women and their families, and you talked about the lawsuits, and we're not going to necessarily -- I'm not going to necessarily go in deep in terms of that, but are you saying that because the consideration of what was approved and the worker protection standards in 2015 is -- and there was a rollback with the previous administration, the zoning of -- and then there was a decision in terms of the zone being 100 feet away in terms of applications being done. It was -- gone back to 25, and this is why there was a lawsuit.

Are you saying that it's going back to the 2015 approved by the previous administration? The 2015, is that going to go back to 100 feet distance in terms of zoning when you apply chemicals? That's one question.

Then the other is about -- what about the Paraquat that EPA is allowing for more years to be used when it's been proven that it should be banned? And then organophosphates, the same thing. Are these things that are being considered? I mean, I just wanted to pose this. I have more, but at least, I want to bring this piece up.

ED MESSINA: So, Mily --

DANNY GIDDINGS: Ed, before you answer, because Mily is on her phone, for those in the English channel, they couldn't hear her questions. So can you please reiterate both of her questions and then answer?

And also just a reminder to everyone to please speak slowly and clearly so that our Spanish interpreters can keep up. Thanks.

ED MESSINA: Certainly. So Mily's question was about the application exclusion zone as it relates to the AEZ, Paraquat, and the OPs.

So, Mily, to answer your question, the 2015 rule remains in effect. So that had the AEZ in it. The 2020 modified that, but that is not in effect currently.

To answer your question about what we might do in the future, that is going to require a

new rulemaking where people will comment on our approach. So I can't sort of prejudge where we're going to land and sort of, you know, tell you exactly where the agency is going on that because I want to respect the rule-writing process.

On Paraquat, that is one of those chemicals that has a high risk and high benefit for growers, and the high risk is obviously the fact that if you ingest Paraquat, really bad things can happen, including death. And we have incidences of Paraquat deaths. Unfortunately, many of those are associated with intentional ingestion. And so the draft risk assessment, the registration review decision allowed the continued use of Paraquat. We put in significant mitigation measures, including closed loop systems, lots of training, certified applicators. So that's an example where the FIFRa statute sort of allows the risk benefit decision to enable a particularly dangerous, you know, chemical if it's not handled correctly to be continued in the marketplace.

The OPs, the other organophosphates, you know, of which Chlorpyrifos is one, but the other OPs are on the current registration review schedule. We are trying to use sort of new approach methods as

part of that analysis. So the schedule for Paraquat, I think -- for OPs, excuse me, I think is slated for 2023. I know there's a letter that folks have asked us, you know, why have we pushed that out and we have a response to some of the folks that have asked about that OP schedule, which is a chemical class that I know is of great interest to many stakeholders, but we're proceeding with our review of that chemical and the end that chemical class.

I think we'll take one more, Danny, and then we'll give folks their lunch.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Yeah, I think that's fine.

So, Charlotte, please go ahead and go.

CHARLOTTE SANSON: Yes, thank you. And I'll just -- this is really a comment and --

DANNY GIDDINGS: Charlotte, please remember to be in the English channel if that's what you're speaking.

CHARLOTTE SANSON: Oh, thank you. Yeah, I lost my connection from it.

Yes. So mine is more of a comment and a request and not a question. But I just wanted to speak to something that was mentioned earlier, that

by discussing some of the pesticides that have been critical and proven for the grower community, when those pesticides are removed from commercial opportunities, I think it's helpful to also be transparent about what the impact of the loss to the grower community as a result of that, because I know there are a lot of very thoughtful comments that -- and input that's provided to OPP during that decision process.

And I think just as important as the scientific evaluation is really being transparent about how that's impacting the grower community and just kind of putting that in balance in terms of the feedback being received from them and what options are available as a result of that loss.

ED MESSINA: Thank you, Charlotte.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Ed, so I know we need to get to lunch, but I do want to bring in one question from the chat and maybe you can comment on this, and it may indeed be covered a little bit later, too. But Dawn Gouge asked, will the Malathion biological opinion be covered with regard to ESA within the workgroup update or could Ed comment now.

ED MESSINA: I don't think we have a deep dive on the Malathion BiOp itself. I think it's

more related to the priorities. But maybe -- why don't we ask the question if there's time of -- you know, we'll have some other experts, you know, Jan and Jake and folks and maybe we can table that to the ESA timing and get their reaction to any specific questions related to the Malathion BiOp.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Sounds great. Thanks, Ed.

So that concludes our first morning session. We're going to break for a 45-minute lunch. Before we do, I need to give you some Zoom instructions.

So during lunch, please mute your mic and turn off your webcam. But don't click the "leave the meeting" button. In other words, stay in the Zoom session just on mute. This will ensure that everyone gets back into the meeting easily after lunch and make sure there's no problems with the different channels and video settings and such.

So with that, let's break for lunch. Let's come back a few minutes -- let's see, we ran about 15 minutes late. Let's give about 15 minutes back. So let's come back a few minutes before 1:30 so we can start promptly at 1:30. So please be on to 1:25 or so, and we'll get started then.

Thanks. Have a great lunch.

(Lunch break.)

RECORDING: This meeting is being recorded.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Welcome back, everyone. We hope you had a good lunch and are feeling refreshed for our first workgroup update from the Emerging Pathogens Workgroup, who conducted a retrospective on the work the EPA did around the use of the emerging viral pathogen policy and registration of antimicrobial products in response to COVID-19 pandemic.

Tajah Blackburn is a senior scientist in the Antimicrobials Division in OPP and co-chairs the workgroup with Komal Jain from the Center for Biocide Chemistries. Unfortunately, Komal is not able to join us today so Tajah will be presenting for both of them.

Tajah.

EMERGING VIRAL PATHOGENS WORKGROUP UPDATE

TAJAH BLACKBURN: Excellent. Thank you, Danny, for the introduction.

As Danny mentioned, I am a senior scientist at the Antimicrobials Division at the EPA, and along with my co-chair, Komal Jain, from the Centers for Biocide Chemistries, we have had the pleasure of leading the Emerging Pathogen Workgroup for the last year and a half. From the onset, this group was dedicated, focused, and determined, proposing greater than 80 recommendations to improve the Antimicrobials Division's processes and response to viral outbreaks.

Before I begin this midyear report, I want to state that the Emerging Viral Pathogens Guidance was activated for monkey pox and a corresponding list with the effective products through the EVP process will be made available soon. This marks the third time that the Emerging Viral Pathogens Guidance has been activated and these discussions and recommendations are even more necessary and timely.

Next slide.

This midyear report will provide a flashback capturing the document that is the impetus

to this group's formation, a historical perspective of the objectives, workgroup membership and affiliations, the charge questions we tackled, the Antimicrobials Division's prioritization of the workgroup's recommendations, next steps, and finally close with a question to PPDC who navigated our course.

Next slide.

For setting the tone of this talk, it is prudent that I spend just a little time discussing the hallmark document that led to this group's formation. The Emerging Viral Pathogen Guidance, finalized in 2016, allowed claims against emerging viral pathogens on off-label communications for certain EPA-registered disinfectant products.

Prior to the finalization of the document, there was a 30-day public comment period that resulted in a response to comment document. Just briefly, this guidance provides a voluntary two-stage process for EPA-registered disinfectant products to communicate their effectiveness through standard label language and off-label communications. Ideally, stage 1 is the pre-outbreak stage where registrants with eligible disinfectant products may request, through label

amendments or during registration of a new product, to add emerging viral pathogen designated statements to their master labels and additional terms to their product registration.

Stage 2 allows registrants with previously approved emerging viral pathogen claims to make off-label communications that the disinfectant product may be used against the specific emerging viral pathogen in the event of a disease outbreak where the established criteria have been met. The link and the header for this document are captured on this slide.

Next slide.

The criteria for activating this resource first occurred in January 2020 in response to SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes COVID-19.

March 2020 saw the activation of other events to include EPA's announcement to expedite the review process for products eligible for the emerging viral pathogen claim and the initial posting of List N on March 5th, 2020. In May of 2020, EPA expanded its expedited review program to include new products and amendments to existing product labels that required review of new efficacy data. And, as I mentioned, since this activation,

the EVP has been activated a third time to include the addition of monkey pox this week.

Next slide.

List N, posted for the first time on March 5th, 2020, has definitely proven its value in weight in awareness and communication. This list includes disinfectant products for use against SARS-CoV-2. The initial list contained approximately 90 products. As of May 13th, 2022, the current list has about 606 products, 254 with specific claims against SARS-CoV-2. And I want to mention -- and this is a very conservative number -- that this list has been viewed over 25 million times. So it's proved to be a very valuable asset during this season. This list has also undergone several viewing improvements and expanded search options.

So the question we always get is, why is it called List N? Well, it's called List N because it represented the next available alphabet in the growing resource listing of products targeted against a specific pathogen. So hence the name List N.

Next slide.

So with the EVP activated and the process of expediting off-label claims, List N and other

resources underway, the Emerging Pathogen Workgroup's co-chair's organization, the Center for Biocides Chemistries proposed this workgroup, the Emerging Pathogens Workgroup to provide a retrospective of the COVID-19 crisis as a function of the Emerging Viral Pathogen Guidance.

We addressed product availability, proper use of products, and potentially addressed misuses, bogus misleading claims. Modifications to the EVP policy were symbols, a necessary resource, List N flexibilities, pros and cons, other lists, other ways to address product selection, and finally communication.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Tajah, this is Danny.

TAJAH BLACKBURN: Yes.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Can you -- just a quick note here. Please can you slow down a little bit. Our Spanish interpreters are having a hard time keeping up.

TAJAH BLACKBURN: No worries. No worries at all.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you.

TAJAH BLACKBURN: Do I need to go back to any slides?

DANNY GIDDINGS: I don't think so. I

think as long as you just slow down that should be good.

TAJAH BLACKBURN: Okay. No problem.

So slide 7, as you can see from this slide, we are a large workgroup about 21 members strong. Members represent a mix of federal regulators, registrants, formulators, professors, science and legal experts, and members of the end-user community. I continue to applaud the commitment of the members as the time and work put towards this effort is significant.

From December 2020 through February 2022, we met with a consistent battle rhythm and we held ourselves to a milestone calendar which provided tangible results.

Next slide.

The Emerging Pathogen Workgroup had the following objectives: Number 1, To assess EPA's COVID-19 response and stakeholder experiences with the Emerging Viral Pathogens, EVP, Guidance for antimicrobial pesticides; Number 2, To assess the user experience with antimicrobial disinfection products registered by the EPA for infection control; and, lastly, Number 3, to provide recommendations to EPA for policy improvements and

identify educational gaps.

Next slide.

This group provided greater than 80 recommendations in response to the four charge questions that we began navigating through starting in December of 2020.

I think we've lost the slide deck.

SHANNON JEWELL: Sorry about that, Tajah. Let me get that right back up.

TAJAH BLACKBURN: Perfect. Thank you, Shannon.

So these are the four charge questions that we tackled. Charge question number 1, What are the strengths and weaknesses of the first use of the Emerging Viral Pathogens Guidance during the COVID-19 pandemic?

Charge question number 2, What flexibilities are needed and not provided by guidance, regulation to address issues faced in a pandemic or other emergency?

Number 3, What education is needed during a pandemic or other emergency for the public end users and other regulating authorities?

And lastly, Number 4, How can EPA's enforcement program be strengthened to expeditiously

respond to fraudulent misbranded products in the marketplace during a pandemic or other emergency?

Next slide.

The Antimicrobials Division individually analyzed each recommendation across four prioritization buckets as color-coded. Recommendations of highest importance priority are identified in green and those of medium priority are identified in yellow. The recommendations in the next two buckets were not prioritized. Additional information is needed and/or resources, process developments for these recommendations.

Consequently, recommendations identified in the red bucket as needs process improvement, needs process development, require additional work by a new workgroup.

Recommendations identified in the blue bucket as long-term issues are those parking lot issues and represent those items that EPA will not be able to address in the short-term as these recommendations require significant resources to implement.

Of note and for clearer navigation as we go forward, for the next nine slides, the slides are framed in the color representing their

prioritization designation. As a reminder, green will equal high priority, medium will be identified in yellow, red not prioritized as needs process development, and blue will be those long-term issues, those parking lot issues.

Next slide.

For each recommendation, we included overarching topics for recurring themes. Of note, some of the buckets -- some of those prioritization buckets that I mentioned that are color-coded will have the same or similar overarching topics, while others will have more specialized topics, depending on the charge question or the issue.

For recommendation of highest importance and priority, the overarching talk topics were improved communication and transparency, formation of a new workgroup, efficacy guidance, education, collaboration, and product verification.

The next six slides identify the recommendation of highest importance in prioritization and are framed in green.

Let me brace you. There's a lot of information on this slide, but I'll do my best to condense it and make it digestible. Each table will include three main column headings. The first one

is the Emerging Pathogen Workgroup recommendation, which is on the far right. The center column will detail the deliverable, either anticipated or delivered, and the last column identifies the location of the recommendation specific to the charge question within the document that was presented at the fall 2021 meeting.

The items detailed on this slide cover the overarching topic of improved communication and transparency. In the first grayed section, the workgroup's recommendation included three components, the EVP battle rhythm, that is when is the EVP triggered, how was it extended, and when is it halted, where to house communications for the EVP and associated items for transparency and, lastly, how to address viral variants.

The deliverable for these three recommendations is a public-facing EPA landing page. This landing page was initiated in November of 2021 -- so a couple weeks following the fall meeting -- and we believe that this landing page represents the best place to put the most updated information regarding the three components identified. Of note, this landing page also includes information for the two other viral pathogens that have been activated

through the EVP, including the monkey pox virus, which was added this past Monday.

The next section, with the white background, identifies the workgroup's recommendation regarding pathogen-specific testing guidance. Again, we believe that the most effective place to put this information is on that landing page with hyperlinks where relevant to lab protocols and guidance.

The next section includes recommendations associated with the list, and we talked about List N, but there are other lists as well. A recommendation for an EPA-established website, that landing page, including some of the documents and references in additional languages and a mechanism to identify effective product all satisfy that particular recommendation as a tool for placement on the landing page.

Some revisions and deliverables have already taken place, as I've mentioned, and some revisions to the List N document have taken place as well.

We would also like to add additional pandemic web content and hyperlinks when and where necessary.

Another goal is to rename the list with pathogen designation and then letter designation and to include the information, frequently asked questions in other languages as well.

The final recommendation on this page of improved communication and transparency is correcting misinformation. This effort has been ongoing and handled on a case-by-case basis. Examples of where this has taken place, where we've made corrections during this process, are listed in the deliverable column.

Again, this is evidence of the responsiveness and prioritization of these recommendations.

Next slide.

The next overarching topic is the formation of a new workgroup. There have been significant discussions around forming a new workgroup to respond to the Antimicrobials Division's organization for further clarification of the gaps in the processes and other recommendations that were not thoroughly vetted. AD has included this recommendation as highest importance and priority.

Next slide.

Under the overarching topic of efficacy guidance -- and we're still working in the high prioritization lane -- each of the workgroup's recommendations are associated with charge question 2, and that was the charge question where we revisited a lot of the regulatory documents that we use for Section 3 registration.

The recommendation listed first includes the incorporation of the electrostatic spray testing guidance into 810 Guidelines for further consideration and with further consideration to expand those uses to other use sites and strains. The electrostatic spray guidance and testing requirements will be included in the 810s and the consideration of expanding use slice and strains is ongoing.

For the next item, the residual guidance is being revised. The completion date is projected for the end of this fiscal year, not fiscal year 2021, but fiscal year 2022.

This guidance will be incorporated into the 810 Guidelines at a later date. And consistent with earlier messaging, consideration for expanding the residual guidance to other use sites and strains is an ongoing discussion.

For the last recommendation under efficacy guidance is the expansion of virucidal claims to sanitizers. That's both food and nonfood contact sanitizers and porous and nonporous use services. This will be addressed by draft guidance and posted by the end of this fiscal year. Not fiscal year 2021, but fiscal year 2022.

Next slide.

Under the overarching topic of education, the workgroup's recommendation at the top of this page, at the top of this column, is to continue education through every phase of the pandemic. Deliverables associated with this recommendation include providing ongoing updates to the webpages, that landing page that we just spoke about, and frequently asked questions throughout the pandemic through updated information pertaining to variants and expanding infographics for ease of use.

The next recommendation is to provide sector-based product information for the pathogen of concern. This has been accomplished to some degree by the recent updates to Lists N, O, and P. We also plan to develop a one-pager on how to select use products in multiple settings in multiple languages.

Areas that are highlighted represent our

external ask from stakeholders, where stakeholders can really be an asset to assist with this process. And this has definitely been an effort where we rely on our stakeholders to identify gaps through surveys, through experiences. We hope to build relationships -- additional relationship user groups and provide feedback from the registrant and end-user community.

The final recommendation on the previous slide -- on the slide for education -- is adjusting recommendations based on transmission route for better clarification of product use. Oversight of these issues is critical and evidenced by the Section 18 pivot for service-based products. Survey information -- once surveys are issued, analyzed, and compiled -- can assist with addressing this recommendation and providing hyperlinks when necessary.

Next slide, please. Perfect.

Collaboration has been an ongoing theme of this pandemic, but there are always opportunities to leverage and build and cultivate new relationships.

The first two recommendations focus on collaborating with other regulatory agencies and associations to better understand their inherent

challenges to identify EPA gaps in assistance and avenues for leveraging resources and consistent messaging. There are several deliverables that have been met -- that have met the theme of this recommendation -- to include ongoing updates to webpage, consistent webinars, and I've also included a subset of the webinars that we have participated in to just demonstrate how responsive we've been in providing our message to the end-user community.

These recommendations can also be addressed by our proposed one-pager, mentioned on the last slide, that will detail how to select and use products in multiple settings and in multiple languages. This is an effort that, again, industry can definitely assist with as we identify gaps through the surveys, build relationships with user groups, and obtain feedback from the registrant and end-user experience and the community.

Lastly, by way of a collaboration, the last overarching topic -- next slide.

So for this last particular topic of product verification, the workgroup recommended that EPA provide reassurance that products are suitable when used as directed. When antimicrobial products with public health claims are registered, efficacy

data are evaluated against established methods and standards. Additionally, there may be opportunities to conduct internal efficacy testing for maybe Section 18 products and Section 3 products through EPA Microbiology Laboratory and the Office of Research and Development.

So these recommendations and the prioritization of these recommendations represent -- and those deliverables, as well, represent AD's critical review of the recommendation, the deliverables that have been put into place, the deliverables that are in the process of being formulated to address these high priority recommendations as it relates to the original objectives of the Emerging Pathogen Workgroup.

So let's transition now to those medium-prioritized recommendations. Following the same theme that we followed before for the high-prioritized recommendations, there are some overarching topics. These overarching topics for the medium-prioritized recommendations include process efficiencies, surveys, improve communication and transparency, consistency and adverse reporting.

Next slide.

For process efficiencies, the workgroup

recommended that the Emerging Viral Pathogen Guidance approval process get integrated into efficacy reviews. We have proposed as a deliverable to include a statement in the efficacy review to alert the PM, the product manager, to notify the registrant of the requirements of the EVP claim for a future submission. This is only proposed for products that may have met the requirement for EVP claims and the registrant has not sought that claim.

Next slide.

To address the recommendations for surveys, the Antimicrobials Division, along with the assistance of the Association for Professionals in Infection Control, APIC, have developed a series of survey questions that can be tailored for specialized sectors to identify gaps, identify ways to better communicate and enhance the post-pandemic EPA assessment.

Next slide.

For the overarching topic of improved communication and transparency, the workgroup recommended a basic antimicrobial document for different audiences that addresses their antimicrobial concerns and assess challenges. As a deliverable, the basic document can include some of

the generic information included in the one-pager that I highlighted earlier, while including greater specificity for specialized sectors.

Again, the survey assessment can drive the nuts and bolts of the specialized sector experience and really speaking and identifying those gaps in operation. This is another significant opportunity for industry to assist with developing the deliverables to satisfy this recommendation.

Next slide.

For consistency, the workgroup recommended that EPA share insight on their policies and practices. As previously mentioned, webinars have been ongoing throughout the pandemic, where the Antimicrobials division members, branch chiefs have consistently shared their policies, practices, and challenges. Another possible deliverable is a meeting or a document that shares these insights on a larger platform.

The second recommendation highlights assessing and identifying regulations and areas of conflict or synergistic disinfectant uses messaging across federal agencies. The Antimicrobials Division believes that a deliverable will consist of a list of these regulations. This, again, is

another opportunity for industry assistance for researching and developing a list of these synergistic and conflicting policies.

Next slide.

For the overarching topic of adverse incident reporting, the workgroup recommended developing a process for the public to report adverse product reactions, incidents, and misuses. AD believes that the development of FAQs with hyperlinks to multiple resources, that is to poison control or other poison databases, would provide a possible deliverable to address this recommendation.

So that sums up those recommendations that were prioritized as medium, as they were framed in yellow and they kind of help navigate us through the process from those high-priority recommendations to the medium-prioritized recommendations. So now, as we transition to the next two slides, these recommendations, as I mentioned, have not been prioritized, but are characterized as needing process development and long-term issues.

These recommendations require more clarification and their overarching topics are included here to include revision of the EVP guidance, to develop potentially a process for an

icon or logo for EVP products, expansion of EVP guidance, adverse incident reporting to expand the issue that was identified under a medium-prioritized item, sustainability, communication and education, and that's a recurring theme throughout all of the recommendations, industry specific practices and, lastly, identification of products for specific use in specific areas.

Next slide.

The recommendations bucketed as long-term parking lot issues include the overarching topics of revising certain aspects of the EVP guidance for clarification, revision and expansion of PR Notice 98-10, suggestions for the Section 18 process, EVP guidance, language, and icon issues, efficacy testing, process efficiencies, novel technologies and where that plays into this universe of the Emerging Viral Pathogens Guidance, expansion of virucidal claims, expanding those uses where these products can be used, expansion of the viral hierarchy, can we consider other microorganisms, regulatory guidance for future pandemic and defining an emergency, can all of these recommendations and suggestions and deliverables speak into the space of emergencies as well. Emergency preparedness, how do

we manage that process through these recommendations -- communication, collaboration, industry-specific testing -- and, lastly, enforcement and surveillance.

Next slide.

So my brief journey through all of this information pales in comparison to the amount of recommendations really compiled by this group. So as we consider next steps, we anticipate the following. We anticipate sunsetting this Emerging Pathogen Workgroup. These folks have done an amazing amount of work at -- but all objectives have been met, resulting in an extensive list of recommendations.

We anticipate the formation of a new workgroup under PPDC with a new name and a new charter. So we haven't settled on the name yet, but a potential name has been placed here and a new charter and to provide the EPA report and the implementation of the recommendations provided by the former PPDC Emerging Pathogen Workgroup.

We are looking for members, and if folks are interested in working in this implementation/ operational phase of this new workgroup under this new charter, please, by all means, reach out to the

two co-chairs. The emails are listed here. And you'll be amazed at what you can provide to this group to help further this effort, to help speak to maybe your potential sector and how it's impacted or how it's impacted through this season, and what resources are needed, through experiences, through challenges, through wins as well to further move this group forward and to really better understand collectively the effectiveness of this document and where process improvements need to take place.

Next slide.

So as this group sunsets, we want to leave a couple of thoughts -- or we had a couple of thought starters and a couple of work products that we want to kind of leave as, I guess, our closing ceremonies in a sense.

For charge question number 1, and that was the charge question that focused on the strengths and weaknesses of the Emerging Viral Pathogens maiden voyage, if you will, for charge question number 1, the group worked on possibly clarifying the trigger criteria, considering or integrating an emergency into this space and how and what implications that would have for the documents and the recommendations that we are making, and then

finally potentially expanding the viral product eligibility criteria, so what would that look like if we expanded into other products that -- in this space as it related to an emergency or an outbreak situation.

With charge question number 3 -- and that's one that is very near and dear to my heart because it really focused on education, it focused on, you know, the gaps in what we did, how did we effectively communicate what the EVP was, was it useful, what were the challenges therein, you know, with communication, what were those gaps. And so to address charge question number 3, we really hoped to reach out to different sectors. In the past, we had a lot of representation from the transportation industry, the sector. We had airline. We had ground transportation. We had folks in the academic space.

And so just really leveraging it, pulling all that information from these different groups and, as I mentioned, potentially expanding that outreach or expanding that information from other sectors and gathering all that information into surveys so we can really assess what we did, what we did well, and what we can do better going forward, I

think, is really important

So those are the four main nuggets of information that we have compiled as part of our final efforts in this Emerging Pathogen Workgroup that may be useful for that new group when it's formed to continue this process.

Next slide.

So this is our final question to the PPDC membership. Does the PPDC support the establishment of a new workgroup with a new charter and the proposed duration of this workgroup is listed then? But that's our final question that we want to pose to PPDC membership as we close and, again, I just want to definitely say it's been a pleasure to co-chair this group. These folks have worked tirelessly and they have provided a very robust, well-cited, well-vetted document, and I'm excited about the next steps and what's to come.

So I'll close there. Thank you.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Well, thank you, Tajah, and apologies for the interruption before, but thank you for that presentation and thank you for the question for the group.

Let's now move into a discussion with the PPDC. And I first want to bring in a comment from

Dawn Gouge from the chat who says this group generated a tool that rapidly evolved into a superlative resource. List N is widely used by a highly diverse group of stakeholders on behalf of environmental workers. Thank you.

TAJAH BLACKBURN: Oh, thank you.

DANNY GIDDINGS: And she, of course, also supports, it looks like, the creation of a new workgroup on this as well.

So with that, let's hear from the rest of the PPDC. If you would like to be recognized to provide comment or question, please use the raised-hand function in Zoom and I will call on you in the order that you raise your hand just like before. And again -- and I'm checking myself on this as well -- please note our cadence and please speak slowly and clearly so that our Spanish interpreters can provide an accurate and meaningful translation.

So with that, we'll take some questions. It looks like Marc Lame has his hand up.

Marc, you're recognized to speak.

MARC LAME: Thanks, Danny.

That was just an outstanding presentation and please allow me to say that I have really missed the presentations by the experts from EPA. Just a

wonderful group of scientists and presenters. So it's a pleasure to see this.

It would come as no surprise that I agree with Dr. Gouge that this is a great tool and it probably -- the workgroup should be continued as far as implementation goes. With that, I have some questions and comments.

My concern all along -- and I was part of the public health workgroup a while back, so I'm playing catch up a little bit for the last five years, although I have read the reports.

You know, when you develop a tool like this, there's always a potential to have an umbrella, and what I mean is, is this limited to emerging viruses only, what about other pathogens, what about vector-borne diseases, and the reason I say that is because when we're talking the products themselves, that's one thing, but when we're talking education and dissemination and, you know, what is -- when you're going to have to get into implementation, many of those same people and skills cut across these things. And so I would hate to see this limited to emerging viruses.

So I recommend that you look at other pathogens, you know, keeping in mind that the worst

pandemic in human history that we know of was a bacterial pathogen and it was vector-borne and that's the Bubonic Plague. So stuff happens over and over. So I would hate to waste the agency's expertise or the expertise of this panel by limiting it to viruses or to disinfectants for that matter.

And along those lines, I have some concern that whether it's disinfectants, or whether it's more traditional pesticides, there's two types of error that we have when we have a pandemic that can be addressed with these kind of products. One is to not use them and the other one is to misuse them.

And so one of the things that we have seen in the past -- and we've seen many, many times -- is the correct use for mosquito-borne diseases and attacking mosquitoes, but also the incorrect use. During the pandemic, I think one of the things that we saw was the incorrect use of disinfectants, including by giving disinfectants to students and allowing those children to use them in classrooms. So we need to look at that and we need to look at secondary effects of those products in the ecosystem, whether that be a school ecosystem or a more natural ecosystem. So I think that's important.

So I think that this new group ought to also broaden its look at risk reduction strategies instead of relying on products and that, of course, you know, cuts back to Rachel Carson. So, you know, this goes way back. And when we think of risk reduction, we can't just think about reducing risk through using other products. And that's something that needs to be done.

And my final two comments have to do with in agencies sometimes one of the things that are done -- and in municipalities and states -- is they develop permanent hot teams. Where those experts are in place when things happen, they can be dropped into a hot zone immediately to do things, instead of having to gear up over a period of time, a/k/a, the definition of emergency or crisis. I would recommend that to be addressed and then -- in expanding that charter.

And then, finally, I would like to see -- and I don't know if this group or another group would do it -- is looking at a postmortem of the agency's pandemic response so that there can be a post-pandemic hot team put together on where they did things right and where they did things wrong, not that the agency could ever do anything wrong,

but just in case.

So I appreciate you giving me the time. I'm sorry if I took too much up, but that's why I write notes. Thank you.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Marc.

Tajah, did you have anything in response to Marc's comments or should we go on to the next comment?

TAJAH BLACKBURN: I just want to say that the transportability of a lot of the things that we are anticipating addressing through not only a viral outbreak, but through an emergency situation, and really defining what an emergency looks like, too, because that may not just be organism-specific, it may be, you know, supply chain issues and maybe these other challenges, it may be a natural disaster of some sort. And so just really making sure that when we think about these documents and we think about our response, we think about it collectively, even though our motivation or our initial -- that impetus, that starting point was that Emerging Viral Pathogen Guidance, and then how we did that.

But all of these, what you mentioned, especially the relevance to other pathogens, other situations, it's really kind of birthed out of those

discussions. And so I really appreciate you mentioning that because that brings me back to, you know, some of those early primitive conversations that we were having about this document and what to do and some of the things we still weren't able to address, you know, when we were having these -- I wouldn't even say philosophical conversations, but we were just, you know, thinking about the challenges beyond just this virus. So I appreciate these.

Thank you.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Tajah.

So John Botorf (phonetic), I just want to acknowledge your comment in the chat and we will follow up with you on that. And I also want to ask Dr. Blackburn again, because it sounds like we might have some interest in getting involved in this workgroup or the workgroup that comes out of it, can you repeat for us how someone might express their interests in getting involved in the workgroup that may be born out of this initial effort.

TAJAH BLACKBURN: But of course. I don't know if it's -- I can put in the chat as well, but you can email me directly at Blackburn.Tajah@epa.gov. So that's B-L-A-C-K-B-U-R-

N.T-A-J-A-H@epa.gov. But I can definitely drop my information in the chat, as well as Komal Jain. I can include her information as well.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Wonderful. Thank you.

Nathan Donley, you have your hand up.

NATHAN DONLEY: Thank you for your presentation, Tajah. It was really, really good to see.

I did want to just reiterate what Marc said about risk reduction. I think that's an incredibly important part of this.

And then my last thing is probably due more to a lack of knowledge on my part of this issue, but it seems like the workgroup's focus is mostly on chemical means of disinfecting, usually probably surface disinfectants, and getting those listed through List N. And I think, you know, for many pathogens, that is incredibly important. But one of the big ironies of the COVID-19 pandemic is a lot of the surface disinfectants turned out to be not really all that necessary in preventing transmission because service transmission is so rare.

And so I'm wondering if -- I imagine EPA has some oversight on things like pesticide devices

that -- like I'm envisioning like a UV sterilization component hooked up to some sort of enhanced filtration technology that, you know, could potentially be incredibly efficacious at preventing an airborne pathogen much more so than a surface disinfectant, but may need to be registered as like some sort of pesticidal device or at the very least have claims of efficacy, you know, vetted by the EPA.

So is there authority that EPA has over some of these -- I don't want to call them nonconventional because they're really not, but maybe nonchemical means of pathogen reduction that could be, you know, included as a focus of this workgroup.

TAJAH BLACKBURN: Well, yeah, as you mentioned, we did focus primarily on the chemicals as they relate to EPA's regulatory oversight. Pesticides, it doesn't fall under our regulatory authority and we do have a Device Determination Workgroup that sifts through, you know, the universe of pesticides that exists to better understand, you know, are they making pesticidal claims and should they have data to support those. But as far as a registration process for pesticides that does not

exist in the antimicrobial pesticide space, if you will.

NATHAN DONLEY: Thank you.

TAJAH BLACKBURN: No worries.

ED MESSINA: Nathan, your question is a good one and it opens up like a whole ‘nother branch of --

TAJAH BLACKBURN: It does. I’ll let you have it, Ed.

ED MESSINA: So for devices, people who are selling those devices do not come into the agency to register them in advance. They need to have data that shows that they are efficacious against the claims that they’re making. There were a large -- there were a number of enforcement actions against people making device claims for SARS-CoV-2, cleaning the air, if you will, and there was sort of, you know, an enforcement update or now, you know compliance assistance put out there.

So we are sometimes in the position where somebody asks us does this device work and programmatically we don’t really know the answer to that because we don’t do a review of the efficacy of devices. It’s only after the fact, if an enforcement action comes about, that we might assist

the enforcement office to say, well, yeah, this may or may not work. So it's a big issue, it's a big area of discussion related to sort of devices and disinfection.

So your question is a good one and it's an area that we've been pondering for some time.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you all. I do note -- I note that we are getting some questions from the public in the Q&A. We'll reserve those until the public comment session at the end of the day, but I do want to acknowledge that we've received your comment, Heather, and if you would like to provide that comment verbally starting at 4:30. Please let us know and we can try to work you into the queue.

ED MESSINA: Yeah, in the time we have left, Danny, I think maybe we could, in terms of taking care of business -- I don't see any other hands raised. One thing would be if somebody wants to make a motion to -- in terms of process, how it would work, you know, for any things related to the PPDC. So someone would make a motion, someone would second it, and then we would do it through a vote.

And, Danny, I don't know what your preference is for people maybe to type into the chat

whether they are yea or nay or raise their hand yea or nay. We can do either in terms of a count, but there is a standing question to the PPDC currently as to whether to form a new workgroup related to implementation, and so we can see if anybody wants to make a motion for that to happen and then a second and then we can vote.

I'll kick it back to you, Danny, to see what you'd like to do.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Yeah, let's have someone -- if you'd like to make a motion for a vote, please raise your hand and be recognized to create that motion, and then let's actually do the vote within the chat.

So I see Lisa Dreilinger has her hand up. Are you raising it to make a motion?

LISA DREILINGER: Yes, I'd like to make a motion to create a workgroup for implementation of the EVP -- the EVP PPDC workgroup.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Lisa.

Procedurally, I'm not sure if we need a second, but I'm wondering if that's what Joe's hand is up for.

JOE GRZYWACZ: That's exactly what it was up for.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Wonderful.

All right. So let's take a vote. You can vote by entering your yea or nay in the chat and please --

ED MESSINA: I think, if we might, if there's time for discussion --

DANNY GIDDINGS: Would this be to everyone or would it be to the hosts and panelists?

ED MESSINA: Just to the --

MARC LAME: I was just going to add a friendly amendment.

ED MESSINA: Yeah, friendly amendments, too. We can maybe have time for discussion before we take the vote, Danny.

MARC LAME: A friendly amendment to broaden the workgroup's name to just pathogens or vector -- and vector-borne pathogens, something to that effect, to go beyond viral.

ED MESSINA: Is there a second?

DANNY GIDDINGS: Jessica?

JESSICA PONDER: I would second that.

ED MESSINA: Okay. Danny, can you type in the chat what the vote is or Shannon or somebody and then all the votes -- please don't vote yet -- and then after that -- we put that in the chat, we can

have a record of the yeses and what the thing is that we voted on with the specific wording. And then we'll make sure we capture the exact wording that folks are interested in suggesting.

DANNY GIDDINGS: So what I've captured is we're voting on a motion to create a new workgroup and broaden the name of that workgroup to vector pathogens implementation. Is that when I heard from Marc and what was seconded?

ED MESSINA: So one question would be, Marc, if you wouldn't mind, that the current workplan or the current proposed actions from the prior workgroup were very specific, you know, towards the emerging viral pathogen piece, and now this new workgroup would be on implementation. Is your comment to expand the name to expand implementation of other ideas or is it really just to capture the fact that this workgroup might be doing more related to the current implementation plan.

MARC LAME: Good question, Ed. Yeah, because it does open all of that stuff up. I would say that it would begin by like taking what the workgroup has currently done and put that into implementation, but with the idea that that

implementation could be expanded to other pathogens and even strategies. I did note that in the presentation that there was -- you know, they -- expansion was mentioned, but also the idea of new thing coming up. And so I just want to -- you know, that needs to always be part of it.

ED MESSINA: And then would that be in the antimicrobial space or were you thinking this would also be expanded to conventional and biopesticides, or is it still within the AD Division? Because that would be a different shift. I just wanted to get clarity on where your thoughts were there.

MARC LAME: I think it should be expanded beyond antimicrobials. I understand, you know, the idea of keeping it in there, and if that's what folks want, you know, I'm okay with that. I just think there's a real potential. And, you know, the office has silos, but they're not that big. And I think, you know, it has the potential for some outstanding results. So that's my opinion.

ED MESSINA: So what if -- I want to make sure I capture your concept. What if -- Danny, if you want to sort of take this note. So it would be to form a new whatever you called it, workgroup, for implementation which would further refine the prior

recommendations and how to implement those and look for ways for how those ideas of implementation could be translated for other programs within OPP.

How does that sound, Marc?

MARC LAME: That sounds really good. And I would say that it even, you know, could, you know, in some ways, depending on how it's done, be a model that goes beyond OPP. But, you know, one thing at a time, Ed.

ED MESSINA: Thanks, Marc. Appreciate it.

Okay. So I think that's your question, Marc. You're adopting that language.

MARC LAME: Yes.

ED MESSINA: And then does anyone want to second that language?

DANNY GIDDINGS: So I want to recognize Dave Tamayo first. But I don't know if there's anyone -- if we should get a second on that language first.

ED MESSINA: Up to you, Danny, and Dave.

DAVE TAMAYO: Well, actually, I kind of wanted to speak to what Marc is suggesting, but you were just saying that you wanted to read that out so that -- because I want to make sure that I

understand what I'm commenting on. I have some concerns.

ED MESSINA: Yeah. Great.

DANNY GIDDINGS: So let me read out what was just established from Marc's comments, and then, Dave, I'll turn it over to you.

So this is a motion to vote to form a new workgroup for implementation, which would further refine the prior recommendations and how to implement those and look for ways for how those ideas on implementation could be translated for other programs in OPP.

DAVE TAMAYO: Okay. Yeah, I guess, you know, I did have some concerns about expanding the work of this particular workgroup to beyond antimicrobials. I don't disagree with Marc that that there needs to be some sort of a plan for if there's something like a vector-borne disease, like Bubonic Plague or, you know, something really happening fast with mosquito-borne diseases, but that's a very different type of pesticide, it's a very different type of pest management regime. And I think, you know, I would be open to this workgroup really sort of focusing on how would one expand it to considering other types of pathogens from an

antimicrobial perspective.

But I think that it would just -- I think it might be kind of a reach for people who work in antimicrobials to start thinking about what would be the -- how would the EPA respond to the need to, say, control mosquitoes or control rats or some other form of vector, not to say that there shouldn't be some consideration of that, but with respect to this particular workgroup, it seems like it would dilute the effectiveness of the workgroup to expand beyond antimicrobials.

ED MESSINA: Thanks, Dave.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Dave.

Let's see, Joe Grzywacz, was up, but he's lowered his hand. So Jasmine.

JASMINE BROWN: I just had one comment as well. The new motion, as it stands, is really long and a bit vague. I think the idea of that really needs to be put into the workplan and maybe not so much the motion. The workgroup, though, I do feel like biopesticides, conventional pesticides, and disinfectants are all already happening and so to exclude those would be a bit ignorant on our workgroup's part.

And I'm not saying not to separate them

out, but I think they're already happening. Monkey pox and other emerging pathogens are already upon us. And so, if we can take what we're doing and make it apply to other emerging things as well as the existing COVID or whatever, I think it would be great.

ED MESSINA: Jasmine, do you have -- thank you for that. Do you have suggested language changes for the group?

JASMINE BROWN: I don't, Ed. I think the group could be called whatever they want to be called. I think it's just a matter of what they want to work on in their workplan under the workgroup.

ED MESSINA: Mm-hmm. Okay. Joe?

JOE GRZYWACZ: So I just simply wanted to chime in from the point of view of we grappled -- I was on this working group and we kind of grappled with when does it turn on and when does it turn off, and I've heard lots of people commenting on both the pluses and minuses of it and I think -- and I'll let, Tajah, you know, make sure I don't mess things up too badly, but I think the spirit of the idea was fundamentally, you know, should some of the recommendations, should some of the points that the

group is trying to move forward, should it only be restricted to things like a COVID outbreak or, where necessary, can there also be extensions.

I mean, at the time, we were working with when the supply chain had shut down because of the winter storm in Texas. And we were like, okay, well, when there's a natural disaster like that, when does, you know, references to the N List and some of the other things come into play, and we thought that there might be some utility for our thinking that would go beyond the microbial space.

And so I hear both the boundaries that are being suggested by people, but I also think that there is some synergy that could be gained by expanding the list or the name of the group. So I just wanted to throw that out for people's consideration.

ED MESSINA: Thanks. I have a potential solution for the group, which is maybe we do -- sort of we do the motion and then we maybe vote on some amendments.

So Danny, the first amendment -- the first motion would be to form a new workgroup for the implementation of the current recommendations. We could then do another vote on whether to add that

the workgroup provide recommendations on how to implement and expand those to antimicrobial products. And then the third recommendation would be -- and the group could examine how to expand on conventional and other sort of pesticides, because I am hearing the back-and-forth between, you know, one, we -- this group really is -- you know, they've got a lot of recommendations in front of them that need to be looked at about how they would be implemented. There's certainly a pretty heavy lift.

But it does make -- you know, I'm hearing the other side, too. So you could argue to focus on that, but you could also focus on expanding it to certainly things that are beyond that within antimicrobials. And then I think I heard another order of increase which would be expand it to beyond antimicrobials.

So that would be my suggestion, but I would leave it to the PPDC to see if anyone wants to make any motions or second any motions and then how you guys would like to vote on this.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Lisa Dreilinger.

LISA DREILINGER: I will second Ed's suggestion. Ed can't technically make a motion, so I'll make a motion for Ed based on Ed's proposal.

I agree that it's been a heavy lift on that workgroup to sort of come out of just viruses and it's not something that wasn't considered. That's why the definition of emergency and the implications of that definition and who and what it would have applied to have been a huge topic of discussion. It is not that the workgroup disagrees with the recommendations.

I think we're going to need -- I agree if we're going to take it out of just antimicrobials, we are going to need different agency resource to help us do that.

Although, Tajah -- I will second Tajah has been phenomenal but I don't think just Tajah can do that alone. Sorry, Tajah, your hand is up.

TAJAH BLACKBURN: Well, thank you. I just want to say that, yeah, we have those preliminary discussions about operating in the antimicrobial space and a lot of the discussions and the recommendations, both centric to the antimicrobials space, can be potentially lifted to other pathogens and other threats as well. But I think really developing this as a model first on this level makes sense. Before we challenge what we're doing with other implications, we're still keeping, I guess,

our eyes and mind open to those other challenges that may prove -- may benefit from the work that we're doing in this setting. But I think expanding it now introduces a unique challenge for which may get lost in making it so big, so fast.

Thank you.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Tajah.

So, Ed, it sounds like -- let me see, let me (inaudible).

Are we then going to vote on three separate motions?

ED MESSINA: That depends on what the PPDC would like to do. I think we had -- I think Lisa made that motion. We can ask for a second and then we can vote.

Is there a second for that motion to --

JASMINE BROWN: I'm sorry. Danny, can you repeat the three motions on the table?

DANNY GIDDINGS: Yeah. And, Ed, I'm going to need help with the last two because I am not as fast as our Spanish interpreters and I wasn't able to capture what you were saying.

But the first motion is to -- a motion to form a new workgroup for the implementation of the current recommendations.

I believe the second motion is a motion for the workgroup to expand the recommendations to other antimicrobials. Is that right?

ED MESSINA: Yes.

Okay. And then the third motion would be -- and if you can dictate that for me.

ED MESSINA: It would be beyond antimicrobials to include conventional --

DANNY GIDDINGS: That's what I thought.

ED MESSINA: Conventionals and biopesticides.

Dawn?

DAWN GOUGE: Thank you, Ed.

So I just wanted to make a suggestion. I love the thought of developing the model idea and I'm -- because I'm part of the university system, we've been going through this whole process. We decided we would have an action-after-action report put together indicating, you know, what works on our particular workgroup with regard to risk mitigation on the university in classrooms specifically, and we realized that we hadn't yet finished dealing with the constantly changing environment yet anyway.

Now, everybody's taken their finals and they're all going home. So that's fantastic that

the students get to leave. So at some point, our workgroup will develop an after-action report and I just love the idea that Tajah and her team would be able to list out the elements that worked so very well for their workgroup. And with that model, we could then certainly tackle other pathogens, and back to Marc's original point about expanding this in grand style, not to imply that I think Tajah and her exhausted team, no doubt, needs to do all of that, but that the elements and the people with the right expertise could come together at a moment's notice and know what they were doing in response to a new event.

Thank you.

ED MESSINA: Thank you, Dawn.

DANNY GIDDINGS: I'd like to recognize John Wise.

JOHN WISE: I just want to second the first motion, which was to open a workgroup to implement what the previous workgroup had developed and recommended.

ED MESSINA: Okay. So at this point, we can vote on the first motion or we can -- is there a second for the motion that Lisa made, which is to sort of vote on the first one, vote on the second

one, and then vote on the third?

John, I'm interpreting your comment to just include a -- seconding the motion just to vote on the first one.

JOHN WISE: That is correct.

ED MESSINA: Yeah. So at this point, we do have a first and seconded motion to vote on the first motion. We could take a vote now and then we could see if there's a second after that to vote on the second and third motion. What does the group want to do?

Anastasia?

ANASTASIA SWEARINGEN: I just wanted to second Lisa's motion.

ED MESSINA: Okay. So, Danny, why don't we go with a vote for the first motion.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Okay.

ED MESSINA: And then please wait until the -- repost the first motion in the chat.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Yep.

ED MESSINA: -- and then we will record -- and then please vote, only PPDC members, in the chat, which would be probably how that works anyway, and then we will then proceed with the second and then the third and see which passes and which

doesn't.

DANNY GIDDINGS: All right. So I am reposting the first motion which we'll be voting on now into the chat and I'll reread it before we vote. The motion is to form a new -- the motion on the table is to form a new workgroup for the implementation of the current recommendations. Regardless, if you had entered a vote into the chat before, please enter your vote now. And, again, please just PPDC members.

(Pause.)

ED MESSINA: I'm going to -- we're going to close the voting in 20 seconds, starting now.

(Pause.)

ED MESSINA: Okay. It looks like the ayes have it. So the motion has passed.

Danny, can you put the second motion in the chat and then we'll vote on that?

DANNY GIDDINGS: Yes, we'll proceed to the second motion. The motion on the table is for the workgroup to expand their recommendations to other antimicrobials. I'm entering it into the chat now.

ED MESSINA: And I'm giving you one minute for voting, starting now.

(Pause.)

JASMINE BROWN: Just so I'm clear, when we say other microbials, we're just expanding it from viral to bacterial and other microbials.

ED MESSINA: The motion says what it says, but I think the intent was it -- was in the Antimicrobials Division, so that would include, yes, microbials and bacterial and viruses.

(Pause.)

ED MESSINA: Ten seconds of voting left.

(Pause.)

ED MESSINA: Okay, time.

It looks like the ayes have that one.

Danny, would you like to post the third one?

DANNY GIDDINGS: Yes, so we'll proceed to the third motion. The motion on the table is for the workgroup to expand recommendations beyond antimicrobials to conventional pesticides.

ED MESSINA: One minute once you put it in the chat. There we go. One minute for voting.

(Pause.)

ED MESSINA: Ten seconds for voting.

(Pause.)

ED MESSINA: Voting is closed. You want to type in closed, Danny, and then we'll know when

that's done. Closed.

Okay. We got so many right at the end there.

So I think, Danny, we'll give you time to tie that up and we can report out to the group. I think it was too close for me to call that one yea or nay.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Yeah, I think we'll need a count.

ED MESSINA: And we'll follow up with the group later. I think maybe we can go into our next session. Thank you, group, for your time.

And thank you, Tajah, for your excellent work and for this workgroup. Just an amazing job and I really appreciate you listening to the PPDC, providing feedback on the implementation and our schedule, and so I think it shows the full circle of how we can get recommendations from the PPDC, how we can respond to them and how we can -- that helped us really be better prepared for future potential outbreaks of which we are announcing another one today.

So thank you.

TAJAH BLACKBURN: Thank you, Ed. I appreciate it.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you.

ED MESSINA: Thanks.

Our next topic we added to the agenda because of feedback from PPDC members. So I appreciate that. And this is really to provide, you know, an accounting of, you know, where is the agency with regard to electronic labels. You know that we've been doing our digital transformation internally. Part of that is really to be able to have labels that apply in the current world, really delivering potentially, you know, electronic information in the future to somebody who needs to know discrete information.

So rather than needing to read a 40- or 50-page label and every line, you can distribute the content potentially using a phone to say I need to know what my application range is on potatoes. Or if you're somebody in the field who wants a different translation of that label, how can we use electronic systems to help with arriving at -- providing information to a customer out in the field.

The last pieces -- and we have this in the emerging technologies workgroup, it may be that a tractor one day is reading the label and making

decisions about application rates. So how do we position the agency to be able to provide that metadata to whatever entity technology is going to be using it in the field, so that we have more precise applications, applications that are geo-located to specific areas of the field, recording information about the rates and usage of those pesticides in the field, so we can then cycle that back to our risk analysis and have a better understanding of actual use rates, so we can have a more refined assessment.

So there's a lot of benefits here. When we talk about electronic label, it really -- there's a lot of different slices of it. It's sort of making sure that the information coming into the front end is electronic, making sure we can manage it internally in electronic means, that the metadata goes along with it as it's moving through the system, and then at the end, it can be populated electronically and it can be used.

We can also have more automation into the system. So maybe if there's a change in the label, the system can do a query on the database and provide information to that human assessor to say, yep, this is good to go, I've checked it, this is

approved. And we can do more automation and gain some efficiencies, again, harkening back to our process improvements and our digital transformation to improve the efficiency of the Office of Pesticide Programs.

So with that, we have some speakers, including members from EPA, industry, and the states. And so with that, I will kick it over to our session chairs, Claire Paisley-Jones, and the many others that are listed on the agenda.

PESTICIDE LABEL REFORM

CLAIRE PAISLEY-JONES: Thanks, Ed. That was a really great introduction.

I'm Claire Paisley-Jones, and I am here today to talk to you guys about OPPEL, the OPP electronic label or, as it was formerly known, smart label.

Next slide, please.

So --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Claire, you're not in English.

CLAIRE PAISLEY-JONES: Oh, I'm not in English? That I don't know how to fix.

ED MESSINA: The little world down there at the bottom.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You're good, you're good.

ED MESSINA: You're good.

CLAIRE PAISLEY-JONES: I'm good now. Okay. Perfect. Okay, good. Great.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Not anymore.

CLAIRE PAISLEY-JONES: Is that --

ED MESSINA: There's a little world down at the bottom.

CLAIRE PAISLEY-JONES: Okay.

ED MESSINA: If you click on that, then you can select the channel, original audio, interpretation, select English.

CLAIRE PAISLEY-JONES: Okay. Is that better? English? Okay. Am I good now?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes, thank you.

CLAIRE PAISLEY-JONES: Awesome. Thank you. Sorry about that.

So as I was just introducing before, I'm Claire Paisley-Jones. I'm here to talk about OPPEL. We used to call this smart label. Same thing, moving on down.

All right. So as you know, members of the interested pesticide community, I'm sure you've all heard the expression, the label is the law. Everything OPP does goes back to pesticide labels. Labels are the beginning and the end of Opp's process and are touched by all divisions and employees in OPP, and it is the primary way we interact with the public.

However, our current label review and retrieval system is antiquated and that leads to inconsistent labels, inefficient reviews and assessments, and inefficient responses to inquiries and emergencies. Modernizing the label and how we

interact with it will fundamentally modernize Opp.

Next slide.

Next slide, please. Oops, sorry, go back. Okay, we're good.

Background pain points. So I wanted just to give you guys some ideas, and I'm sure you're all aware of these, some of the reasons why we are pursuing this.

Reviewing labels is a slow, costly, and manual process. Labels are currently submitted as PDFs and, until very recently, as paper. No structured template means that labels have inconsistent format. And an inherently nondigital format, that's no metadata, means that data must be manually extracted into multiple databases for searching and for risk assessment, and uncontrolled vocabularies means that we have to interpret that data in order to extract it into our databases.

So the inevitable result of this is time-consuming inconsistent EPA reviews and interpretations, which include a lot of back-and-forth with registrants about these interpretations at various points during the registration and review process. We also have a limited ability to compare new registrations or amendments to existing

products, and this really just is an inefficient work process. And beyond that, once a label is registered, we can't easily answer questions about existing registrations, because we have a really limited ability to run queries.

Next slide.

So one of the solutions to these problems is structured econtent, and that's where OPPEL comes in. So with the previous name and even with this name, we're talking about electronic label, but it's really more than that. We're talking about conversion of an unstructured document into structured data, and that does include standardizing formats of labels to give you a structured label, but also includes development of standardized formal public OPP vocabulary, as well as the use of that vocabulary to delineate product use patterns by the registrant during the registration product, and that's a separate form that we call the use index.

And OPPEL is part of OPP's digital transformation effort, along with the expansion of the Pesticide Submission Portal, the OPP Structured Content Review Tool, which we're calling OSCR, and the Electronic Confidential Statement of Formulation, or eCSF, which many of you will know

piloted last year.

So together, these represent progress towards a scalable plan for OPP data management and access, a process to improve label review and risk assessment workflow and are part of OPP's vision for instantaneous access to quality information. And once all of these are in the system, we would also have the ability to have multiple views and inter -- you know, for different content and integration with other systems.

Next slide, please.

All right. So in coming up with how we were going to, you know, build this system, we have some guiding principles. And one of those is data standardization through controlled terminology and structure. So a lot of what we were doing here was trying to ensure that the vocabulary we came up with had clearly defined business requirements. So things like can a content be clearly defined; if we collect the information, would that affect assessments; and how would capture data elements be related to one another?

And we spent a lot of time doing this to ensure that we were coming up with consistent approaches to development of data models that would

avoid silos of information that cannot communicate, which has been a really big historic problem for the program.

We also wanted to ensure both consistent vocabularies and concepts, allowing us to reuse vocabulary lists from forms, where possible. And we took all of that, developed a vocabulary, and put it in a centralized standard management service called Synaptica, which is a -- it's an EPA terminology service we contract with.

Next slide.

So I just want to give you, you know, a visual representation of what we're talking about with this holistic vision for econtent. So using those purposeful linking information, we can connect different forms. Even though they're collected, you know, maybe separately, maybe at different times, we want to use the same sort of vocabulary in these different forums and collect them in the same, you know, language and the same, you know, coding, so that they can talk to each other, essentially.

So the example with OPPEL, we have the label and the use index, and in both of those, we're collecting a registration number and that inherently links the two documents as a whole. But within the

document, we're also collecting structured data naming the use site, and what that's going to allow us to do is connect information in the label that's captured as prose to the metadata collected in the use index that's associated with it. And using similar things like the registration number, we would also be able to connect with the eCSF.

And on the right, you can see that we envision this happening across multiple data streams, so having internal and externally generated documents coming in through a central hub being reviewed and then being stored in a centralized large relational database, and that is going to allow us to do things like query and not have our queries need to be based on where that information is coming from.

So, for instance, we could ask a question about, you know, all products of a certain formulation and that information would come from the CSF and we could say do all of those have this restriction on them and that would come from the use index. So it would just allow us much more flexibility than we currently have.

Next slide, please.

So here's an example of sort of what we're

talking about with OPPEL, specifically with the labeling use index. Here on top, you can see a snapshot of the environmental hazard statement as it would appear on the label, and for this particular product, which is a maple leaf product, we have a pollinator protection box, complete with, you know, image -- we have the ability to have images and formatting in here, complete with the image of a bee. And that is what will appear on the label as rendered on the final product that, you know, a user would look at. And we're still allowing the same amount of latitude that you would have currently in entering information worded as, you know, you would want within certain bounds in that section.

But in addition to that, we would collect information in the use index that's inherently associated with that same section in the label that says this label has a pollinator protection statement and specifically that pollinator protection statement is do not fly while bees are actively foraging.

So that allows us at EPA to be able to search and say I need to make sure that all of the labels that have this formulation and this product that are used on these use sites have that statement

on it and be able to really easily figure out if that mitigation was consistently applied across labels.

Next slide.

So some more goals and benefits of the structured econtent. Really what we're looking for here is increased label accuracy, quality, and consistency.

Oops, there we go.

And we're going to do that through that structured label, which is going to give you a consistent format of what, you know, the final printed label would look like, but also, as I was saying before, through the use pattern index metadata that's going to capture that text as standardized usage data endpoints.

And it's going to do that using the standard vocabulary, meaning that from the start from registration, we're talking about a shared understanding of how we're defining the terms that are used as metadata and are able to agree initially that the text on the label -- you know, as a registrant you're saying, this is what we think we're saying in the text, using the standard vocabulary that would feed into risk assessment, and

we can agree right from the start that EPA agrees that is what's said in the text.

That standard vocabulary also allows for a fair amount of built-in validation that would happen as part of the builder before it even comes to us, and that would reduce error rates and make reviews a lot easier, getting rid of some of those just little errors of omission and things like that.

Building a review tool that is specially designed to intake this information is going to give us a really improved ability to access previous reviews and versions of this so that we can see exactly what's changed and to provide consistency with similar labels.

It's also going to give us improved access to registration information for already registered products, such as the ability to search across products, which is going to give us, you know, a much better ability to, in a timely and accurate fashion, respond to inquiries. So things like what are the universe of products that are currently labeled for COVID so that we could really quickly answer that question, which is something that's really difficult for us to do now.

This also is going to allow for us to do

things like directly upload to PPLS as soon as something is approved and that gives, you know, access to approved content in real time to everyone in the community.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Hey, Claire, sorry for the interruption. Can you please slow your cadence a little bit so our interpreters can --

CLAIRE PAISLEY-JONES: Oh, sure. Sorry about that.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks.

CLAIRE PAISLEY-JONES: Sure.

So this will also -- you know, PPLS direct access, their usable metadata is going to give a possible connection with things like bulletins live and other systems that are already existing and, overall, this is just going to save us resources. So what we're talking about here is things like less paper, less places to store that paper, and, you know, a much better ability to move that around. And consistency and standardization is going to give us improved label comparison abilities and, overall, we're really just talking about, you know, being able to do more with less and this gives us possible decrease in contracts and backlogs for staff.

Next slide. Great.

So that structure and automation, again, gives us an increased capacity to do more so during submission and review, as well as after labels are accepted. So during that review process, we would have these industry facing builders that perform extensive data validation prior to submission. So that gives us things like if you forgot to put a yearly rate in and it's a site that we require that for, before you even submit it to EPA, it would say, hey, you have a problem here, you need to fill this in before you send it in, and that saves a bunch of time, especially on just those little errors of omission where, you know, we don't have to build in that back-and-forth time. And that's, you know, just going to make everyone's life easier.

And, again, that review tool will be able to identify exactly what's changed between versions. And that's going to allow EPA to be able to really focus our attention and our reviews on what's changed and have very good confidence that we know that that's all that's changed. And that also gives us the ability to maybe completely automate some types of reviews and, you know, we're thinking things like non-PRIA notifications.

And even with, you know, PRIA

notifications, this should -- the validation and the ability to identify exactly what's changed should reduce burden on EPA staff during the 21-day screen and during full reviews. And that ability to compare labels has a really important element of leveling the playing field for registrants and eliminating perceived -- you know, someone got something that we didn't get. And, overall, we expect a significant time savings to both registrants and OPP after the initial file creation.

After those labels are accepted, the benefits continue. So automation of data extraction and EPA databases is going to decrease our need for contracts and increase consistency in our risk assessment. So right now, we, you know, have to go through a whole process of interpreting the labels and putting that information into the system so that we can put them into the risk assessment. And sometimes very similar labels are interpreted differently or incorrectly and, you know, take away that time, as well as increase consistency there.

And this is going to provide the data in an easily stored and searchable format, with all the benefits, I talked before, and, also, you know, allow integration of multiple systems. And I hinted

at this before, but this could really easily allow us to connect labels with things like BulletinsLive! or with incident reporting because we're using the same format and language in all of those systems. It could also really make web-distributed labeling easier because of the structured content, making it just much easier to do that in a standard way.

We also envision enhanced cooperation with state, federal, and international partners, because of the ability to communicate faster and, you know, an ability to provide defined real-time approved content. And, overall, that would be huge. And we also think that this will give us a better ability to efficiently and accurately respond to inquiries and emergencies.

Next slide.

So I know a lot of you will know that we've been working on this for quite some time and I wanted to give you an idea of where we are now and the path forward. Right now, we're working on wrapping up IT development of the review tool and database, and we're largely done with the builders. But that doesn't mean that we're quite there yet. We really need to think about implementation because it's going to be a challenge. We have a whole lot

of registrations and a lot of them are very complicated.

Some of you who have been involved in the project for some time may know that we started this with FDA and that FDA has a similar program. You know, when you go to the the drugstore and you pick up an over-the-counter bottle, all the labels look the same, and that's because of this program that they have.

How FDA handled their call-in was to give everyone a year to transform their previous version of their leaders into the new version and they essentially just assumed that all of the submissions were correct and did, you know, some spot-checking, but there was a lot of assumption that the information was translated correctly.

Our labels are a lot more complex than some of those FDA labels. They're certainly much longer and we aren't starting with as much standardization as FDA had. And that means that OPP will likely want to assist registrants with entry and check submissions. And in order to do that, we first need to train OPP staff on the new vocabulary structure and tools.

We also want to acknowledge that initial

review of OPPEL files may take longer than traditional PDF reviews because what we're really talking about here is having to take an existing label and translate it into this new format, as well as code all that metadata, and we understand and fully anticipate that that could take a little longer, you know, submitting an amendment that way the first time, rather than, you know, just the traditional way. But we do envision that subsequent reviews would be much, much faster because they can rely on that validation and comparison I talked about before, and even in some cases, be fully automated.

So we really need to think about how we would do this call-in and there's lots of ways that we could do it. We could pursue rulemaking or we could have voluntary submissions. We could ask for everything from a day forward to be submitted in a new format or we could purposefully request specific types of registrations, possibly by AI for ESA or new AIs or something that's going through registration review so that we would see the full, you know, comparative benefits. There's just a lot of ways we could go about it.

We also need to establish formal

governance for vocabulary maintenance and training and outreach to make sure that, you know, everyone is on the same page and any updates that need to be made or made consistently. So a considered and purposeful implementation is really going to be key to the success of this project, and we're actively working on that right now.

Next slide.

I do want to acknowledge all of the stakeholder involvement we've had in this so far. I know you all know we've been working on this for a number of years. We've had a lot of communication with states and some international governments, including Canada's PMRA. We've had a lot of outreach to the regulator applicator and trade organizations over the years through meetings like this. We've had a public webinar and we've done various levels of piloting with a number of registrants.

And you can see here on the right those registrants and you can see some overlap between this eCSF and the OPPEL pilot. But what I want you all to notice about both of these is that we've tried really hard to include, you know, not only those much bigger registrant companies, but also

some smaller ones, and we also wanted to make sure we were not just looking at conventionals, but also at antimicrobials and biologicals. And the reason that we did this is we wanted to make sure from the start that we were really including the whole registrant community in ensuring that the products that we're coming up with would work not just for big companies and not just for conventionals, but hopefully for everyone.

Next slide, please.

I also want to acknowledge the current workgroup members and very similarly to what we were trying to do with the pilot registrants, you can see here that we have team members from all of the divisions in OPP and, again, we were doing that to ensure that the products we're developing serve the needs not just of, you know, registration, but also of reregistration and the risk assessment and of, you know, the ability to answer inquiries about emerging diseases and things like that. And so we really strived throughout this process from very early on to include internal stakeholders from all of those groups.

So this is the current list of the people who are involved and it is only a fraction of the

people who have been involved over the years.

Next slide, please.

I also wanted to provide you guys with some context and resources if you wanted more information. Our website contains information about OPPEL, the pilot and background documents. One of the things you might be particularly interested in is that vocabulary that we developed, which defines all of the metadata that would go into the use index and is essentially anything that would go into risk assessment or querying, and that is available on that website already publicly for you to look at. Comments are very much welcomed.

We're providing you all, with the slides, but if you search EPA OPPEL, it's the first page that comes up. You can also email us any questions you might have or comments at smartlabel@epa.gov. We changed the name of the project, but we're sticking with the same email.

I also wanted to provide you some links for information to the FDA Program just so you can sort of see what a fully-fleshed-out, been-in-practice-for-over-a-decade program really looks like and what that entails. So they have some background information available at that link.

But one of the things I think you all will find very interesting is their query tool, which is that second link, and that really demonstrates well the kinds of things and the kind of searches that you can do with that metadata that goes across different forms and things like that. And it's a really robust, really interesting tool that I think you guys would find really interesting. And the implications of having a similar tool for OPP are huge.

Next slide. And that's it for me.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Claire. And I believe we now have a presentation from our colleague from Syngenta.

SHANNON JEWELL: Actually, Danny this will be the AAPCO presentation here.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Oh, right.

SHANNON JEWELL: No worries.

LIZA FLEESON TROSSBACH: Good afternoon. Can you hear me?

SHANNON JEWELL: Yes, Liza.

LIZA FLEESON TROSSBACH: Okay, thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You're not in the English channel.

LIZA FLEESON TROSSBACH: Am I English now?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yep, thank you.

LIZA FLEESON TROSSBACH: Okay. Well, good afternoon. I'm Liza Fleeson Trossbach with the Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, Office of Pesticide Services, and I am the current President of the Association of American Pesticide Control Officials, or APPCO. And I'm going to be presenting kind of a high-level summary of APPCO's label improvement project.

Of course, Megan Patterson is our PPDC representative, and she's participating in this call as well and is available to answer questions and/or just, you know, add in with anything that she thinks I missed. And so we're excited to be able to present to the PPDC about our activities.

I was the previous PPDC representative and I -- and we have in the past --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Excuse me.

LIZA FLEESON TROSSBACH: -- talked a little bit about this project.

ZOOM SUPPORT: Liza, Liza, would you please speak slower for the interpreter?

LIZA FLEESON TROSSBACH: Of course.

ZOOM SUPPORT: Thank you.

LIZA FLEESON TROSSBACH: Of course. My

apologies.

I have presented information about the Label Improvement Project in the past, but I know we have new PPDC members, and this is certainly a new opportunity to share information.

So next slide, please.

So the Label Improvement Project was initiated by AAPCO in 2019. It was brought to the full board as a project from our president at the time, Rose Khatchadorian (phonetic), who kind of envisioned this holistic look at pesticide labels and brought this project to the board's attention. The link on the slide actually can take you to kind of the original presentation by Rose and kind of what she offered to the board. But basically the goal of this project was to develop an ideal label based on standardization, consistency, accuracy, understandability, and the ability to achieve compliance and to enforce the label.

And there have been many initiatives over the years and there have been many successes when it comes to label improvement. And the goal of this was to try to take all of those things that we've learned, pull them together, and then expand from there, looking at a label holistically. The idea

wasn't to try to talk about what's bad about a label, but rather to give an ideal or a good label as guidance to registrants, to the EPA, you know, and to states, you know, to bring everybody's ideas together.

Next slide. please.

So the way that this Label Improvement Project was envisioned and has proceeded is that we were going to proceed in phases, so in Phase One of this project, there was the development of a project plan by core -- by what we called a core project management team or a core team. In this particular phase, which I'll talk a little bit more in detail, it brought together state lead agencies or pesticide regulatory officials from states, as well as EPA, because, again, we are an association of regulatory officials so we wanted to start with kind of what we thought this project should look like, what it should encompass. And so Phase One was the development of this project plan.

Phase Two was actually taking this plan and having it executed by what we called implementation teams at the time, and these implementation teams would be comprised of not only pesticide regulatory officials both from the state

and federal governments, but also registrants and other stakeholder groups. So it could be pest management professionals, pesticide safety educators, it could be a whole variety of people depending upon what part of this project plan they were implementing.

Part of this Phase Two was also formal project management training for these implementation teams to help understand the scope of the project, how to get to that, how to put deliverables together and just to help with all that. So we felt like professional project management training was also important because we know how big of a project this is. You know, it's huge.

Next slide, please.

So again, the label improvement core team was comprised of pesticide regulatory officials actually from six states, and that includes both Megan and I, and then staff from EPA's Office of Pesticide Programs and Enforcement and Compliance Assurance Programs.

What this group did was created a framework for the plan based on what we called areas for label improvement. So working together, we looked at labels and said, okay, what are those main

areas where we think that there is room for improvement and that we think we can affect change. So we talked about and identified formatting, enforceability, directions for use and language, and then claims. And then we also talked about the future of labels and about how, looking forward, how can we make labels more flexible, more adaptable. And so that was also part of the plan, not necessarily an area for label improvement, but rather something to consider for labels moving forward.

Next slide, please.

So in the plan development phase, the core team systematically reviewed areas of label improvement, those areas that we identified, and paid attention to very specific pieces of information. So first of all, the core team identified those implementation teams and who needs to be part of those teams to ensure their successful execution.

So again, it would be for a specific area. If you were going to talk about enforceability, obviously, we would want to ensure that we had pesticide regulatory officials from across the country. That would include not only states, but

tribes and territories. We would also want to have EPA representatives, specifically their Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance. We would want pest management professionals, registrants. So for each of those areas, you would have representatives.

And you will find, should we go into the -- you know, once we get into the plan or as we move forward, if you were to see those you would see that for many of them, they're the same stakeholder groups that are represented. Obviously, we are all, you know, here talking about pesticides and we know that pesticide applications and appropriate applications start and stop with the label. And so we would have a broad range of stakeholders.

The other thing that we looked at for each of these areas is what's the scope of the area. Are we talking about only the master label, the marketplace label? Are we talking about supplemental labels? We also had to decide what types of products are we talking about. We know that there are conventional pesticides, there are 25 bee products. So for each of those, we had to determine what is the scope of the products as well. For each of those, we also looked at common

concerns. So what are the concerns with that area. You know, what are those big ticket items that we think are really important to focus on first or that we can really affect some kind of change and make an improvement.

We also talked about needed resources and as well as existing resources. So as I had mentioned, there have been a number of label initiatives and there have been great successes in some of those. So we wanted to pull from those.

Claire had just talked about OPPEL, and as part of our, for example, discussions, we talked about OPPEL and how that could feed into this or how we needed to consider that. And that's just one example of other initiatives that we certainly want to learn from and take from. We also know that there are a number of resources that impact pesticide labels in their development. There's the Label Review Manual and guidance documents, et cetera. So we identified all of those resources.

We also talked about the timeline as part of this plan development project and how long we thought it would take for implementation teams to complete, you know, their actual work. We identified deliverables that would be short-term

deliverables, so things that we could effect immediately or in the short term, maybe, you know, six months or so, and then other deliverables that are longer-term projects that may take longer. And then we also identified possible barriers to success with the idea that we can look at these barriers and perhaps find ways to address those, again, towards the overall success of the project.

Next slide, please.

So for the current status of where we are, so we do have a final draft plan. That final draft plan includes a summary of the reasons for and the potential benefits of the project. It talks a little bit about how the project can aid EPA in its efforts to improve and modernize labels, as I mentioned before. I'm using OPPEL as an example.

It talks a little bit about the team's discussions on those identified label improvement areas and it also includes some information about the proposed workplan for that work that's identified, but has not yet been completed. That is where we are right now.

Once we have an opportunity to finalize that plan, we intend to take that to the AAPCO board for their review and approval prior to moving

forward with its implementation.

Next slide.

Now, I said that I just gave you the current status of that and I have to let you know that we did have to put a pin in our project. I think everybody is well aware and has experienced the challenges from the ongoing public health crisis. And while we started this -- if you notice the date was 2019, it was actually pre-COVID-19. And while we did work throughout the last couple years on this, it has been even more challenging than usual. Obviously, all of us have been impacted both personally and professionally by COVID-19 and certainly that's true for the core team members. And so we did have to spread out the work a little bit farther. We weren't able to have the same level of communication and not meet the same way as we did before. There were so many competing priorities.

However, one of the things that has come out of it is that -- and really we're kind of waiting for the next step -- is the core team did identify that project management training that I had mentioned previously, as being critical to be able to ensure our plan is well thought-out and that we have this coordinated approach to label improvement.

The core team has chosen to postpone that project management training until in-person meetings are possible. We know that those are starting to, you know, happen again. However, we continue to, you know, watch the current public health situation.

AAPCO does support the project management training and is willing to host that or, you know, pay for that, and for the core team members, as well as the implementation teams to go through that. Now, in addition to putting the pin in it, as we had to for the public health crisis, now, given these current efforts of PPDC, we also realized that there may be an opportunity to leverage the activities, both of EPA, of PPDC maybe into one initiative. Many of the things that Claire has talked about and the goals of OPPEL are also our goals as well and we've also, of course, kept up with all the discussion about label improvement through PPDC and, you know, the workgroup.

So we also, right now, also want to kind of wait to see where this might go, the efforts of PPDC and how we may fit into that. It might be possible that, you know, we need to change our direction or reevaluate the way we started because we certainly want to support this effort and we

completely agree that it's going to take all of us, from all of our perspectives and with all of our expertise to be able to make that happen.

Next slide, please.

And then just finally for the project contacts, I do serve as the project chair and my email address is here, and then Megan Patterson, who obviously represents PPDC, she is actually the project manager currently for this. And so both of us are available to, you know, work with PPDC and figure out where this Label Improvement Project can fit or how we may let it evolve, you know, to assist these other efforts.

Thank you.

ZOOM SUPPORT: Excuse me. More feedback from the interpreters. We've had clocking at 297 words per minute. If we could please speak like we have molasses in our throats, it would be wonderful Thank you.

ED MESSINA: Thank you, Liza, and you're welcome for us giving you that clock record there.

LIZA FLEESON TROSSBACH: I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you.

ED MESSINA: I said you're welcome that we were able to clock your --

LIZA FLEESON TROSSBACH: Oh.

ED MESSINA: In case you were ever wondering --

LIZA FLEESON TROSSBACH: I apologize. I get so excited.

ED MESSINA: In case -- maybe you were ever wondering what your clock speed was.

All right. Thanks so much for that presentation. Now, we're going to have Syngenta go next. And we will -- we're eating a little bit into the time for the endangered species, but we will quickly pivot to that coming up soon.

So thank you, first, for Nina.

NINA HEARD: Thank you.

Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Nina Heard. My colleague, Eduardo Moreira, and I would like to thank the PPDC for providing this opportunity to share information concerning Syngenta's ongoing efforts to digitize crop protection label information.

Next slide, please.

So before we get into the nitty gritty details, which Eduardo is going to walk us through, I wanted to give you a little bit of the back story on our journey with labels. It started some 10

years ago and actually it started because the marketing group at Syngenta wanted to have a website where growers could go in and actually put in queries so they could say I'm in such-and-such a county in Indiana, I'm growing corn, and I need something for corn root borer, and they could actually be given exactly the information for where they were, for the crop, and for the pest that they were describing.

And this was not possible at the time. The reason it was not possible is because we did not have a database that contained the information at the correct level of digitization or granularity, if you will, to be able to provide that information in a query. So what we did was we started to look at what would get us there. And what we discovered pretty quickly was it was going to be difficult, and the reason it was going to be difficult is we had nothing digitized. All of our information was in documents, either PDFs or Word documents, and basically we were accustomed to having label information as part of a document that was then stored in a document storage system, and that was it.

So what we had was we had all of our label

information, particularly the use and usage information -- the crops, the pests, the rates -- locked into documents with no way of accessing them, except to go back and manually transcribe them, which of course is not very efficient. So what we decided to do was move towards label digitization, and the first thing we knew we had to have was an internal standard format.

So we began by looking across the indications of insecticides, fungicides, herbicides, and looking at the different label formats. And we realized pretty quickly that we did not have a standard format, not even for one of those indications. So the formats varied widely, mainly because Syngenta has lots of legacy companies, so we inherited a lot of different formats. The labels were also written in some cases by 20 or 30 people as the amendments were made. So not only did we have a problem with formats, we also had a problem with having everything in textual form and not in tables.

So consequently, where we started was was trying to convert the formats for all Syngenta labels internally in the U.S., and we worked for two years on this internally and with the EPA to come up

with an agreed format. So those were the first steps,

Now, once we had that agreed format, we could then bring in something called structured content authoring and structured content authoring allows you to create content that can be reused, so it can be tagged. For example, a first aid section if inhaled is on many, many labels and it reads the same a lot because EPA recommends the language. So we could store that one piece of text and reuse it in every single label construction that we did.

So we wanted to go to structured content authoring so that we could manage the components and store this information as data. So storing chunks of components of labels, like paragraphs, in a system where it could be retrieved and reused. And the nice thing about having something like that in a database, along with use and usage information, so crops, pests and rates, is it allows you to publish it in any format you want. So the publishing is not a problem. So when we come to things like font size restrictions or putting things in a table, it’s not an issue because we can do that.

Moreover, what we were really after was being able to query that information, so being able

to have access to it downstream. So a grower or farmer could have a handheld application and could actually go in and do queries and, eventually, so that we could also access this information by calling it up with a piece of automated application equipment to automatically download the parameters. So this was the dream, but it's taken us a long time to get through all of this work.

So in the next couple of minutes, Eduardo is going to tell you a little bit about some of the details of our structured content authoring system.

So I'll turn it over to you, Eduardo.

EDUARDO MOREIRA: Thank you, Nina.

Next slide, please.

So as Nina mentioned, we developed a format. We needed a format, so we could have structured content, reduce text variability. And that makes the label information machine readable, but also makes it people readable, so people can read. So it's not just a spreadsheet; it has a text so that is -- can be used. So by having that, as Claire mentioned, data then can flow to different needs, product safety, what have you, but also internally enables us to create more efficiently the commercial label that goes on a container.

Next slide, please.

So on the transformation of our existing labels into this format, we took labels that were written on a scripted way and put into tables to be easier to read and also have placeholders for data and parameters that you need to include when you're doing applications, and it can be used for product safety and other aspects.

Next slide, please.

So we used an off-the-shelf XML software, there are many out in the market, and then we created templates for indications as Nina mentioned. So you have insecticides, biologicals, turf and mosquito control, what have you, and then you have components, those are text with placeholder for the information. So the same components can be used across templates, across labels, and it can be using multiple master labels or production labels for commercial production. Also, we can then link that information to CSF, registration number, and other attributes that can populate the components and, therefore, the label.

So we have a resistance mode of action, we have (inaudible) award, what is the formulation or the CSF code for that. So all this is attributes

that you add to your components and you can change very easily from one label to the next one, but you need to have a format.

Next slide.

So this is an example, as Nina mentioned. So if you have first aid, those texts on the left are altering tools. They are grayed out because you cannot change. They are really revealed, improved and there are components. And then how they're going to be published, you don't have to worry about this. We'll follow the EPA requirements of publishing or guidelines that you have internally and it's -- the text is revealed and then reusable in multiple labels.

Next slide, please.

In a similar one, it can do for the directions for you, the claims. On the left side is the offering template, which is Microsoft Word, so as far as the user goes it's a Microsoft Word and all XML-based language. So you can enter the information about crops, pests, and data, active ingredient, AI equivalent for risk assessment, and this is all displayed. But also not only enter the data on the left, it's also published on the right as a text that can be then submitted to PPLS, to the

state or to artwork for printing.

Next slide, please.

Nina?

NINA HEARD: Yes, thank you, Eduardo. So just a little bit about what we're trying to do here, some of the drivers and some of the outcomes. Of course, structured content authoring is a major, major component that we see in the digitization of labels. And when you talk about digitization of labels, you can think about two different types of data. One type would be blocks of text, for example, those first aid statements that you just saw. So capturing entire blocks or components as paragraphs, for example.

The other piece, which is really more difficult, much more difficult, is to capture the use and usage information. So these are the rates, the crops, the pests, and all the parameters, all the restrictions that go with those, REIs, PHIs, all of the very detailed information that's needed for the safe use of our products. That is really where the difficulty comes in because that means you can't capture this information in lines of text. It has to be very granular so you have to have a rate that is a number and a unit of measure. So everything

has to be very precisely spelled out in detail to be able to capture those pieces of information so that they can be recalled as data from the back end.

So really, if you think about this, there are two main drivers for label digitalization. The first one is the actual creation, submission, review, and approval process of the label. So this is industry, this is state reg, this is federal reg, EPA and the states being able to review this information. It is critical that we have the information in a system so that we can parse it in whatever format that we need, as we said before.

So it doesn't prohibit us from printing labels, so we still have the printed item because obviously we're not to the point yet where we can just put a QR code on a bottle and expect everyone to be able to understand everything that's on the label by scanning it. So that paper label is still important.

But this first part speaks to the need to improve the process which, again -- and I don't need to repeat what a couple of people before me have already said, which is my luxury. It actually is a great improvement on efficiency, to be able to have this information digitized. You do away with a lot

of the paperwork. You do away with a lot of human error that happens in the creation and in the submission and review process. So having this information in a digital fashion really gives you a lot more flexibility and, therefore, a lot more speed, which is what our registrants of course were interested in, but also a lot more accuracy.

And compliance, of course, is a big issue as well. So by eliminating the human component, you also increase compliance, label compliance. So that's one piece.

The second piece, the second driver is what I call the back-end driver. So the back-end driver is means the stakeholders that need to access this information. We need to access it internally as registrants. EPA obviously needs to access it as well. Some of the reasons are the same. We run risk assessments just like EPA does. We need those worst case label parameters, too.

So it's much easier for us to be able to call this up in a database than to have our risk assessors have to go through 60 pages of a label to find the worst case use rate. So that's one piece.

The other piece, of course, is the back end in terms of the growers. So the growers, yes,

they are looking at automated applications. These are actually going on as proof of concepts. They're going on within Syngenta. They're also going on with some of the other industry working groups. So we actually have a number of programs where we're using something called a closed-loop process where a piece of automated equipment out in the field can upload all the application parameters into the application equipment automatically and do the application with also being able to have GPS mapping to appreciate where the boundaries and where the water bodies are on their particular field.

So in order to be able to do that, we have to have this information in machine-readable form, and that means granular. And it's not just automated application equipment, it's also the farm management systems, it also goes to ecatalogs and things like ag gateway projects where we're trying to come up with consistent standards for ecommerce catalogues. So it's across the board for these downstream uses.

So our desired outcomes, these are echoing what you've already heard. So an agreed common format is critical. So we have to have an agreed common format. If you remember the Syngenta story,

that's where we had to start. We didn't even have that internally. So we need to have that. We need to have it across submissions to EPA, because that's where the rubber hits the road in terms of being able to structure the content.

We need to have establishment of common data standards, so an understanding across industry and across stakeholders of what these common data standards are. If we're going to develop a digital system, we want to develop it for these stakeholders that we've talked about, as well as for registrants and regulatory authorities.

We want to be able to capture the label detail at the correct level of detail, which is something that I stressed earlier. So this granular capture is extremely important.

The other thing is we want to be sure we capture all the use and usage information, not just the worst case. Capturing worst case does not benefit the grower. They want to know real-time applications, not the absolute worst case that they can apply. So we need to capture all of the different use and usage information that's contained on the label.

And lastly, if we can do this together

with all these joint stakeholders, it's going to save an amazing amount of resources.

And if you go to my next slide, in closing, I just want to give you a sample of some of the things that are going on right now. And it's kind of an amazing time because it's like all the planets are aligning and all of these elabel initiatives are picking up across the world. So I think it's also important that we keep our heads up and look around and see what's going on in some of these different areas, so that we can leverage some of the other work that's happening. Because, eventually, of course, we hope someday -- we'll probably be gone by then -- that all of this can become global. And if we don't start moving that in that direction at some point then we'll never get there. So as much as possible, paying attention to what's going on in different areas, when we talk about combining these labels standards.

There are lots of examples here around the pond including U.S. EPA's OPPEL project. We've been in discussions with APVMA. We've talked to OECD. We've also been working on a CropLife Europe project and recently we've been talking to the CropLife America. So there's all kinds of things going on in

this space. It's a prime opportunity to join forces together and just try to come together as much as possible in a transparent way to understand what other folks are doing.

So I want to thank you for your time.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Nina and Eduardo. We're going to move on to the discussion period within this session. I do want to note, though, that we are we are running over time and we haven't given folks a break in two hours, but I know that we have some PPDC members who are eager to comment and to ask questions on this topic.

So let's try to get through the discussion period as quickly as possible, while also speaking slowly, and then we'll take a five-minute break and go on to our ESA and BulletinsLive! Two discussion.

So I want to call on Amy Asmus first. Amy, go ahead.

AMY ASMUS: Thank you. First of all, I would like to applaud all the groups that have presented up to this point. Mostly, it's been EPA, registrants, and the states that have to enforce this. I feel the desire -- I feel the need to say every frustration that you have talked about and that you are running into as you look at digitizing

this label is real world for those of us that have to advise growers and the growers that use these products.

I implore that you do not wait for perfect and leave good enough behind because good enough is better than me trying to interpret a label to one of our clients that are standing on the back of their spray rig with a very important question. So I need to ask that EPA consider this as a high priority. And I would say that Ed touched on that in his early presentation when he shared the two priorities of environmental justice and climate change. Environmental justice applied to OPP through their farmworkers and their concern of the safety of those farmworkers when they use pesticides.

A pesticide label is the law. They are legally accountable for those applications and they don't understand it. The people that are professionals that have presented on this topic don't understand it. How do you expect somebody on the ground to understand that?

So my ask is that you make this a high priority and you line it up with your environmental justice priorities through EPA and OPP. Think about those workers that use the pesticides and their need

to understand labels. Please don't wait three to six years to get perfect. Please help us as soon as you can because right now my growers have the state agents, if they choose to call those, but most of them call their agronomists, their ag retailers, and they need those questions. And we have the same concerns about our interpretations as the experts you have going through this data to digitize it.

So please make this a priority, because on the ground, we're struggling with what you are and we're legally accountable for those applications.

Thank you.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Amy.

We're going to hear from Nathan Donley first, then Mayra, than Mily, then Jim, then Damon, then Manojit, and then I do think that we need to cut the discussion there so that we can move on to other topics, namely the ESA workplan.

So go ahead, Nathan.

NATHAN DONLEY: Great. Thanks.

And I look forward to welcoming the EPA the 21st century when it arrives. You know, this is really important work and, you know, label improvement is a good topic and I'm glad we're talking about it.

And one thing that didn't get discussed, which I think is incredibly important is, EPA's ability to quickly and efficiently make label changes because change is needed for improvement. Right now, label changes often happen kind of one at a time during some decision point like reg review, registration review. And that's really an inefficient way to do things.

Thankfully, EPA has an informal policy in place called the Pesticide Label Improvement Program. It doesn't utilize it very often, but it has utilized its authority under this program in the past to make label changes across a broad swath of pesticides, like fumigants, like rodenticides.

Right now, this is an informal policy, but my organization, the Center for Biological Diversity, just put in a rulemaking petition to the EPA yesterday asking it to codify this authority in the agency's regulations and utilize it in a way to, for instance, put BulletinsLive! language on all pesticides, at least, all pesticides that are used outdoors, make sure that labels are translated into the Spanish language. EPA can do this quickly in one fell swoop. This is something the farmworker community has been screaming about for decades. EPA

can do this quickly and efficiently.

And I think shoring up the agency's ability to quickly and efficiently make label changes, not just one by one, but across a whole swath of pesticides, is a really important part of this conversation, and I hope to be a part of that moving forward. Thanks.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Nathan. Let's go to Mayra.

MAYRA REITER: Thank you. Modernizing pesticides labels is really important, and I support what Nathan just said, especially on the issue of language because given that two-thirds of farmworkers have limited English fluency, making labels available in Spanish and other languages is really critical.

So I'd like to ask the presenters, are any of you looking at ways to prioritize language accessibility and how to integrate it into the processes and systems you are developing to modernize the labels?

DANNY GIDDINGS: Do any of our presenters from either EPA, Syngenta, or AAPCO want to address that?

CLAIRE PAISLEY-JONES: Yeah, I can say we

have definitely been talking with established Spanish language groups in EPA to try to coordinate the programs because this would potentially be a much easier way to implement Spanish labeling. And having that defined vocabulary may be a good starting place to be able to translate that vocabulary and then, you know, at least you would have all of the things that affect risk assessment available in another language. So that would include a human health.

MAYRA REITER: So would that be available electronically as well as the other information be made available?

CLAIRE PAISLEY-JONES: That's the plan. That's our current thinking. We're still trying to figure out how to integrate there.

EDUARDO MOREIRA: Yeah, but it enables that. So once you have a standard text, then you have standard translations and components that can be reused and then applied to different deliverables. So, yeah, it is one way to enable that.

MANOJIT BASU: And, Danny, just to quickly chime in from an industry perspective, we are fully supportive of the dual language labels, the Spanish

label, on the pesticide products.

NINA HEARD: I think in the past, because we worked on this many years ago, and in the past, the blocker was the agreed Spanish language. That that was the blocker. But we did manage to get some critical pieces of the label, first aid, for example, emergency information translated, but the blocker before has always been the agreed translation.

CLAIRE PAISLEY-JONES: Yeah, and having the the ability to, you know, agree on translations potentially beforehand on that vocabulary might make this easier. As Eduardo mentioned during the presentation, having that ability with similarly our builder taking that information in sectioned chunks and then you can sort of render it in a multitude of different ways. So there's a potential for something there. If you had both sections, you could say, let me see Spanish, let me see English.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you all. Let's move on to Jim Fredericks.

JIM FREDERICKS: Thanks. I just want to just really make a quick comment. First of all, I want to commend the agency and the states and the registrants for all this hard work. This is a

really complicated issue and I think it's great to hear this. You know, I want to echo Amy's comments regarding really the need for this. I will tell you from the point of view of pest management professionals who are working to protect homes and businesses every single day, our labels are relatively easy to comprehend compared to some of the ag labels and we still find it difficult to navigate these things.

So when we think about a 20-page label, that's a big label for us, and I know there's 100-page labels out there. So there is definitely a need for this.

You know, and I love to hear about the efficiencies and the technological advances that will be coming down the pike with regard to machine readability and that sort of thing, but I just want to encourage everybody involved in all of these efforts to make sure we're really thinking about including readability by people and making it easier for all users, no matter what their language, to understand these labels.

So just a quick comment. Thank you.

EDUARDO MOREIRA: Thank you, Jim. I fully understand that.

CLAIRE PAISLEY-JONES: Yeah, as a person who's trying to translate that for risk assessments on a daily basis, yes, they also need to be readable by humans.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Jim. Damon.

DAMON REABE: Yeah. I'm excited to hear about all the upcoming technology. You guys have heard from me on this topic in the past. I would strongly encourage an action item from this group to immediately develop standardized paper labels. What happens beyond that is going to be very useful in the future, but I can't think of a good reason why we don't have standardized formatting for existing labels that are attached to the product packaging.

At this time and in the foreseeable future, the paper label that is attached to the pesticide package will be the primary document used in decision-making that's done on site and the delay in finding information is primarily due to the lack of standardization of the documents. So at the earliest possible time, we would love to see labels standardized.

Aerial applicators have the advantage of having to be either commercial pilots or airline transport pilots. With that type of training, we

don’t have any issues interpreting or comprehending the label language itself. The type of training we need to do in order to fly the aircraft itself puts us at an advantage in the space of, you know, understanding legalese. Thank you.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Damon.

Manojit.

MANOJIT BASU: Yeah, quickly, Danny, I’ll yield my time to Cathy, but everything I wanted to say has been captured. I would say the true digitalization, the process improvement, Spanish language label, those are some of the key issues that we need to really focus and address in the foreseeable future, sooner rather than later. But I’ll keep it short.

Thank you.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Mano. Cathy.

CATHY TORTORICI: I hope you all can hear me. This is quite impressive. You know, looking -- there’s a lot of information in those PowerPoints and I want my staff and I to study them more thoroughly, but what I’m hearing is really quite exciting. My question to the committee -- there’s two quick questions.

One is what percentage of growers do you

think would actually use an electronic label versus a paper label? I'm hoping it's higher than not, but there's always complexities with an electronic system. So I'm curious about in terms of what you know in the field the percentage of folks that might actually prefer an electronic label versus a paper label.

And I also agree with what Damon said, that having standardized paper labels would help as well. You know, from the NIMS perspective and probably also Fish and Wildlife, we do have a concern about what -- in our biological opinions, how that's translating into labels and making sure that what we're saying makes sense and can be translatable and usable and understandable from the perspective of what's going into a label or into BulletinsLive!, and so, you know, we're sensitive to that. So anything that you all are doing that can help with that translation would be great.

So I'll stop there, and thanks so much for all this hard work.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Cathy. And, unfortunately, we do need to move on to our next session. We're running about 30 minutes behind. There is some excellent discussion happening in the

chat.

If we have time after the public comment period, we will circle back to this discussion and allow for more input and feedback because there is some really good discussion happening in the chat and I want to be sure that we get to that. But in the interest of time, I do want to move on to the next session.

It's my pleasure to introduce OCSPP's Deputy Assistant Administrator for Pesticides Jake Li, to provide an update on the recently released Endangered Species Act Workplan.

As most of you know, Jake is a nationally recognized Endangered Species Act policy expert with a track record of developing innovative policies to improve both the speed and the scale of endangered species conservation. Since coming to EPA, he has worked tirelessly on developing the ESA workplan, which was released last month.

Thank you for being here, Jake, and the floor is yours.

JAKE LI: Great. Thank you, Danny. Just to check, can you hear me fine?

DANNY GIDDINGS: Yep, loud and clear.

ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT WORKPLAN AND
BULLETINS LIVE! TWO

JAKE LI: Okay, great. And I will try to talk a little slower, but you all just let me know if I'm going too fast.

So first of all, good afternoon, everyone, and on behalf of OCSPP, I want to thank you all for taking the time to engage with us through the PPDC.

As Ed said earlier, I'm going to update you on our work under the recent ESA FIFRA Workplan. And in this update, I'll focus on two topics.

First is to provide a very brief high-level overview of the workplan for those who haven't seen it yet.

Second is I know that many of you have read the workplan and have participated in briefings on its contents. So we wanted to offer something new for all of you. So for those of you, I'm going to discuss in further detail some of our upcoming plans on several pilot projects under the workplan.

So with that, let me get started.

Next slide, please.

JAKE LI: I actually -- Danny, just to make sure. I don't know that I can see the slides, but as long as everyone can see them, that's okay.

SHANNON JEWELL: Sorry, Jake. I'm working on getting those shared right now.

JAKE LI: Okay.

SHANNON JEWELL: There you go.

JAKE LI: Yep, and then we'll -- that's the correct ones. Thank you, Shannon.

So six weeks ago, we released our workplan that describes how we will move towards full ESA compliance for our Pesticide Program. Given our historic challenges with meeting these ESA obligations, you know, the reality is that it's going to take us a number of years before we can fully meet all of our obligations for every FIFRA decision. In the meantime, we'll need to prioritize the types of FIFRA actions that will bring into full ESA compliance first. So that's the first strategy in the workplan, and my next slide will actually say a bit more about this particular strategy and our priorities.

The second strategy is that we need to get early protections in place for those endangered species facing the highest risk from pesticides. In our workplan, we identify three such categories of species along with a host of policy actions to support that strategy.

The third strategy is to focus on process efficiencies. In Appendix A of the workplan, it shows our current ESA FIFRA process, how we're going to be well into the 2030s before we can complete biological evaluations for just 57 pesticide ingredients, which is just a small fraction of all of our ESA obligations in the next decade. In other words, the current ESA FIFRA process is a starting point, but it's definitely not where we need to be in four to six years from now.

And the final strategy is to expand our stakeholder engagement and find ways for them to help EPA achieve our ESA compliance goals.

So as those of you who haven't read the workplan, as you read it, if you have questions about it, feel free to reach out to our office and we're happy to answer more specific questions.

Next slide, please.

So as noted earlier, the workplan prioritizes FIFRA actions into three categories for ESA compliance. The highest priorities are court-enforceable deadlines, many of which are already in Appendix A of the workplan, and the registration of new conventional pesticide active ingredients. This is per our January 2022 policy in which we said we

will meet our ESA obligations for all new conventional pesticide AI registrations. And, on average, we anticipate approximately 10 such registrations annually.

Our second tier of priorities are registration review of conventional pesticides without court-enforceable deadlines. We estimate that there are roughly 40 such actions annually.

And our third tier are all other FIFA actions for conventional pesticides, such as new uses, Sections 18s and experimental use permits. We expect roughly 320 such actions annually. Again, this is based on past actions that we've received.

Also in this third category were all FIFRA actions for nonconventionals, including new registrations and registrations review. We expect about 150 such actions annually.

Some of you may be wondering why nonconventionals are placed in this third category, and the succinct reason is that in the past, our ESA methods have really focused on conventional chemicals. We don't have methods specific to nonconventionals for ESA analyses at this time. So we are in the process of developing those methods as described in further detail in the workplan, and in

this time that we're developing those methods, we're really trying to prioritize the conventionals for which we do have the existing ESA methods.

So in short, that's how we will generally prioritize FIFRA actions, although we will decide on a case-by-case basis whether to elevate any particular action in this priority rank.

Next slide, please. And this is actually my last slide.

I want to give you a more granular look at how EPA will prioritize certain pesticides and species for early mitigation in the next two to three years. This level of information isn't actually in the workplan because it's information that we're actively developing and refining. But, today, we did want to preview for you some of our near-term ESA actions. Again, this isn't everything that we're going to be doing on ESA in the next few years, but it does highlight some of our pilot projects that we're really excited to move forward on.

So when we talk about early ESA mitigation, one question we oftentimes get is, well, what exactly does that mean, EPA? For our agency, our plan is to begin adopting early mitigation

through pilot projects and to learn from them, because the truth is that a lot of this work is new to us and it's new to the entire federal family, right? This is the intersection of ESA FIFRA at the national level doing early mitigation. It's something that's really never happened before.

So let me start with pilot species. The reason we have pilot species is that we don't have the bandwidth at EPA at this time to adopt early mitigation for all ESA species affected by pesticides. As a result, we're starting with a subset of species that are particularly vulnerable to pesticides in order to develop a workable process to mitigate for impacts to those species earlier in the FIFRA process.

The first category of pilots species are approximately 15 ESA species that are part of an interagency pilot led by USDA, NOAA Fisheries, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and, of course, us at EPA. And that's what you're going to see in this first row here. We've already identified those species and we're currently identifying the initial set of potential mitigation measures for each of those species.

Now, these measures aren't going to be

chemical-specific, but, rather, you can think of them as a suite of mitigation measures for each of these things that EPA can apply to different classes of pesticides that affect the species.

As an interagency group, we hope to publicly announced the species and our plans for them within the next two months. And from there, we plan to get stakeholder input on those potential mitigation measures and then finalize those measures.

Once that's done, we can apply the measures to the three pesticides in this pilot and expand those measures to other pesticides that affect those pieces. So again, much more that's going to be announced within the next two months on that.

The second pilot, and this is the role below the federal pilot, is for ESA species that EPA has determined are vulnerable to pesticides based on ESA documents that the services have provided. This summer, we plan to publish the initial list of those species in order to get this pilot started, and then identify a suite of mitigation measures for those species.

As with the first pilot, these mitigations aren't necessarily going to be chemical specific,

but instead will provide options for us to address different routes of exposure to those species from various classes of pesticides. In other words, we're trying to cast a fairly broad net to be efficient.

We also hope to take lessons from the federal pilot to inform how we finalize the mitigation for the EPA vulnerable species. We'll then begin applying those mitigations where we can to FIFRA actions that affect those species.

So those are our pilot species.

Next, I want to discuss pilot chemicals in our FIFRA registration review process, and that's where I'm going to start with the third role. For these chemicals, we're also identifying species that are likely to face a proposed jeopardy or adverse modification finding during the formal consultation with the services and we're trying to adopt some mitigation for those species as part of our proposed interim decision or PID.

So this group of pilot species isn't actually identical to those from the federal pilot and our vulnerable species effort I just talked about because the main criterion for identifying this group of species is the specific interactions

between the particular pesticide that's the pilot and the species that creates a risk of jeopardy or adverse modification.

By contrast, for the two groups of pilots species identified earlier, we're developing general mitigation measures for those species that we can apply to a variety of pesticides. So again, we can have general mitigation measures for these pilots species and we can have specific pilot species based on our predictions of whether those species are likely to receive a jeopardy or adverse modification for these specific pilot chemicals.

Right now, we have about a half-dozen initial species identified for each of the pesticides on the slide. Our goal is to get experience working ESA mitigations into the FIFRA process using this very manageable list of species and then to expand that list of species to others that we know are vulnerable to pesticides.

I also want to note that these initial mitigations would occur before we have a final biological opinion from the services; in some cases, many years before we have an opinion. This is one way that we're trying to get some early mitigations to reduce or eliminate the risk of jeopardy or

adverse modification and come closer to meeting our ESA obligations as part of registration review, without waiting many years until the end of the formal consultation process.

So with that said, let me talk through the main classes of chemicals that we're going to pilot. First are the carbamates. So that's Methomyl and Carbaryl. And I'm going to talk about them together because they're under the same timeframe and the same processes. We're aiming to get some initial mitigations for these pilots species as part of our proposed interim decision, while the consultation for these two chemicals is happening in parallel. And then when we get a final biological opinion in the future, we'll, of course, need to update the labels to implement the terms of the biological opinion.

Next, I want to talk about the rodenticides. We're going to be adopting a similar approach there where we will identify an initial set of species that are highly vulnerable to these pesticides and start mitigating for those species as actually part of the proposed interim decision.

So I forgot to mention this earlier, but if you look at the legend on the lower left-hand

side of the slide, you'll see how we've coded actions that are completed, actions that are ongoing, and future work. So for rodenticides, we have identified initial group of pilot species and we're in the process of identifying some mitigations for the species in order to inform the PID that's coming up. Then we'll consider comments as part of that PID and we hope to expand the mitigations to additional species and then make our jeopardy and adverse modification predictions. And those initial mitigations, we're hoping to actually incorporate them into a draft biological evaluation so that the federal action we're going to give to the services actually includes this early mitigation.

So this is one of the novelties that we're -- the novel aspects of how we're trying to do ESA consultations. They're actually fairly common outside of the pesticide context, but we haven't taken advantage of them in the past for pesticides, and by doing so, we're really hoping to make the pesticide consultation process a lot more efficient. So that's one insight.

Next, I want to point you to the three Neonics in the penultimate row here. For these Neonics, the process is similar to the other

chemicals I've mentioned, except that we do have a final biological evaluation that's due in June. So that BE will precede the proposed interim decision, which is actually a revised PID. And after we make that -- issue that final BE, we will try to incorporate our jeopardy adverse modification predictions into the consultation and then continue to consultation with the services. So those are the pilot chemicals in registration review.

And then the final thing I want to mention is, again, in January of this year we issued a policy around new conventional active ingredients. And we put that category of actions in this slide on pilots, because our hope is also to get some mitigation for those species before we have a final biological evaluation and certainly before a final biological opinion, if one is needed. So to some degree, that's also a pilot because we've never systematically tried to get early mitigation for DCSA species as part of a new AI registration.

And with that, I know we're actually running a bit behind schedule, so I will stop there, and pass it on to our BLT folks.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Jake.

And I'd just asked that we save on any

questions for the ESA workplan until after Amy Adams and Stephen Muela give their presentation on Bulletins Live! Two.

Amy and Stephen, go ahead.

STEPHEN MUELA: Okay, great. Thank you. Yeah, so Stephen Muela. I'm one of the project leads for the Bulletins Live! Two Project, and I'm presenting today with the other lead on the project, Amy Adams, and we're going to be talking about on Bulletins Live! Two and the steps we took to modernize it this year.

Next slide, please.

So I'm going to start with a little background on the Bulletins Live! Two Program, just in case some folks aren't familiar with the system. So the idea is when EPA implements additional limitations on a pesticide that are spatially defined, we create a pesticide use limitation area, or what we call a PULA. This PULA consists of spatial data, product application, formulation information, as well as the limitation or mitigation language.

Since 2015, the way in which we display these PULAs and distribute bulletins is through a web map called Bulletins Live! Two, or BLT. So the

general process is a user would see a reference to BLT on their product label. They would then go to BLT, put in their intended application date, search for their product, and then they zoom to their intended application site to see if it coincides with any PULAs.

And if it does coincide, a user is prompted to print out a PDF that contains all this information, the information I just referenced, the spatial data and product info. And that PDF is what we refer to as a bulletin, and the user can keep it for their records to show they complied with the label directions to both go to BLT and whatever additional limitations were described in the Bulletin.

Next slide, please.

So this is just an example of a bulletin that printed out in PDF, I just mentioned. It shows the location of the user's intended application site here on the map. It shows the product they're searching for, as well as the date they are going to apply it. It also includes the tables that have product info, like the name of the product, the active ingredient, the registered use and application method, as well as a description of the

limitation.

Next slide, please.

So there are some cases in which a product label might reference BLT, but there's no PULA for that product currently up in BLT, or there might be cases where there is a PULA associated with a product, but it doesn't coincide with the user's intended application area. In either one of those cases, users will be prompted to print out a no PULA bulletin, which you see here, that just states, "Currently, no pesticide use limitation areas exist within printed map view for the month/year and product you selected, beyond the instructions specified on the pesticide label."

Users can still keep this for their records just to show that they complied with the label direction to search BLT, but that no further limitations were present.

And after that brief bit of background, I'm going to pass it over to Amy who's actually going to walk us through the changes we made this year to update BLT.

AMY ADAMS: All right. Thank you very much, Stephen.

Here is the overview of the changes that

have been made to the Bulletins Live! Two system. They went into effect in February of 2022. And we really want to highlight what the user will see changed about the experience of using Bulletins Live! Two.

First of all, the web framework for Bulletins Live! Two has been updated. This just means that the system is more compatible with modern technology. You'll see it working in a wider variety of web browsers than in the past.

The second thing that has been improved is the system capacity. That has been increased. We are seeing rising demand for the Bulletins Live! Two system. In the past, we would be asked to enter around one or two new pesticide use limitation areas per year. Now, on an annual basis, we're being asked to enter more like 30 to 40. So we had to make sure we had the capacity to handle that rising demand. But the main thing that the user sees changed about the experience is to the search process. So that brings us to number three in this slide.

The search process is more dynamic than it used to be, and this is largely thanks to a new connection that Bulletins Live! Two now has with the

EPA's pesticide product label system. We used to get complaints about the old system, having load times that would take a while. Now, the main benefit of having the connection is that it loads quickly.

But the biggest change to the search process has been to how to search for products. There were some options in the previous systems that could be confusing and could lead to errors, which I'll talk you through how we fixed that in our next slide.

All right. So in the past, you could search Bulletins Live! Two using the name of a product or its active ingredients. The problem with doing this is there are a lot of similar-sounding product names out there and it's easy to input typos when searching for active ingredients. So to avoid possible confusion that could arise from the search options, what users in BLT now have to do is search using the EPA registration number of a pesticide. This is a unique identifier that can be found on the label of a pesticide and it prevents that product from being confused with any other product out there.

So if you think of the Social Security

number system for United States citizens that prevent citizens with one name getting confused with citizens of that same name -- there are lots of Amy Adamses out there, for example -- it works similarly to that. So we don't have any possible mixups. And we have developed new web language to help users find the EPA registration number and understand what it is, including written instructions and illustrations like the illustration you see in this slide. And it also goes through just how to search the interface using this information.

And in our next slide, we have all of those links available. So if we could go to that.

All right. I'm going to go ahead and drop this in the chat as well, so that you have it available. It's working on loading for me. Sorry. But we have a written tutorial that goes through how the bulletin -- how to use the Bulletins Live! Two mapping interface, as well as a shorter set of instructions. That's the Quick Start guide and how to locate the EPA registration number and what it is is that bottom link.

And we also have a video tutorial, a webinar called Understand Bulletins Live! Two. We are in the process of updating that from the 2019

video that's posted currently. It's going to say 2022 once we do have that updated.

So if we could go to the next slide, please.

We just want to highlight this is what the old system used to look like before the mapping interface was updated to look nicer and the search options were changed.

So let's go to our next slide to see what it looks like currently.

This is our updated current interface. And all of these pink polygons that you see on the map, those are pesticide use limitation areas, or PULAs. Over on the left-hand side of the screen, we have a blue box. That is what you would use to search this system. You would enter in the top box the location. And some common questions we get asked about this is, what format do I have to enter the location of my application site, do I have to enter coordinates or an address how, what is the scale.

Well, we have pesticide application sites that are going to be smaller scale and pesticide application sites that are going to be bigger. So the location search can be entered in a variety of

formats. It works if you enter coordinates; it works if you enter zip codes. If you enter specific addresses, if you enter a state name, or a city name or a preserve name, or a county name, it will zoom to that scale. So just enter whatever location you need to in order to view the full extent of your pesticide application area.

And then, of course, you'd enter your application month in the second drop-down. And in the third drop-down, that is where the EPA registration number would be entered. You would hit search, and if you see a pink polygon, you would click on it. It would pull up a PDF bulletin, like what Stephen showed earlier, that says if there are any limitations for a given month. And if there are not, then, of course, Stephen already showed earlier what that would look like.

So let's go to our next slide.

That is all we were planning to cover. If you have any questions about the Bulletins Live! Two system, please email the Endangered Species Protection Program inbox, espp@epa.gov, or you can email either Stephen or myself. And we are happy to take questions during the Q&A period.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Amy. Thank

you, Stephen.

Let's now open it up for discussion to the PPDC. I am going to limit it to 10 minutes of discussion, and so we'll still have a little bit of time left for public comment afterwards. So please raise your hand to be recognized.

And I see John Wise has raised his hand.

JOHN WISE: All right. I have a question. By the way, thank you for the presenters and all the hard work. Excellent.

My question is, how will the EPA distinguish endangered species risks associated with pesticides depending on the various application methods allowed on the label? For example, a ground sprayer may result in a different risk to an endangered species in an adjacent habitat than a different application method, such as seed treatment, chemigation, trunk injection. So how does the application method inform the risks and then all the associated mitigations that you folks are working on?

Thank you.

JAKE LI: Great question, John. Let me provide an initial answer, and if there's anyone from EFED who wants to chime in, you are more than

welcome to. So I don't think anything about how we consider the method of exposure changes under the summary that I provided, right -- so we would still consider the actual route of exposure and then the corresponding effects to species, depending on the method of application, whether it's aerial or whatever else. I think that's been a staple of how we've done ESA assessments in the past.

So if the question is, you know, do we have anything specific that's different under what we're doing in this workplan, I don't think the answer is a yes here. With that said, I think we're always assessing our scientific methods. So that's sort of my short answer. And, again, if there is anyone in EFED or OPP who wants to add to that, you're welcome to.

DANNY GIDDINGS: All right. Thank you, Jake. Thank you, John.

I'm now going to recognize Nathan Donley.

NATHAN DONLEY: Great, thanks, and thanks for these presentations. They're great.

Jake, I'd just really like to recognize your leadership here because this process has been languishing for the last decade. I think the National Academies report was published in 2013, and

not a lot of movement has been made here until now. And I credit you a lot with that and also the EPA scientists who are putting together these really dense scientific documents, these biological evaluations. So much good work has gone into that. So thank you all for that.

And, you know, we're encouraged by the workplan and really would love to see this move very quickly from process to on-the-ground conservation measures. And it looks like we're going to be seeing a lot of that very soon, and we're already starting to see a lot of that with some of the label changes that have been made for some of these pilot chemicals. They've been really great to see.

And, you know, I'll just say I think the next decade or so of how this process plays out, a lot is going to be dictated by the pesticide registrants. And what I mean by that is, you know, if you're a registrant and you're serious about conservation of species and, you know, finding efficiencies in this process and making it better, clean up your labels and make some of these tangible changes that can have such a major impact on these species, but also get you through this process quicker and get you the regulatory certainty that

you're looking for.

Just one example, Syngenta recently removed Hawaii from their Atrazine labels, and this was incredibly smart because a full third of endangered species in the U.S. reside in just one state, Hawaii. Removing that state can increase the efficiency of this process by one-third. It can save a third of agency resources going through this process.

So, you know, I know not everyone's going to want to take Hawaii off their labels and that's fine, but be creative about things you can do to make some label changes that can shepherd you through this process much quicker. And I think EPA really has a good grasp of what those changes can look like and how they can save you time and effort, and themselves time and effort, moving forward in this process.

So there's my plea for what it's worth, and thanks again.

JAKE LI: Thank you for the commentary and observations, Nathan. All of this workplan and other work, it really has a joint effort amongst all of us at OPP, and everyone is bought into it and we're all really excited to actually, you know, make

progress.

The last slide I showed, you know, there's a lot going there, right, as you can see, and it's probably a lot more than we've ever done on this. And there's even more beyond this slide. So we are really trying to step up our game.

NATHAN DONLEY: Thank you.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Nathan.

Now, I'd like to recognize now Bob Mann.

BOB MANN: Thank you, Danny. And let me begin by thanking all of you for your wonderful presentations today.

My question/comment brushes up against what Nathan was bringing up just now. There's a lot of nexus between what we've been talking about late this afternoon -- in fact, I almost wish that on the agenda that the endangered species item was before label reform.

Now, Jake, my question is to you. In previous presentations that you've made, you've alluded to using label reform in order to accomplish your items in the Endangered Species Act. I'd like to have you elaborate upon that a little bit.

We've heard today -- you know, Ed went over the Enlist labels with the spatial restrictions

on usage. We've heard about the pesticide label reform, including the use index. And I think that these things all seem to be swirling around each other. Could you just elaborate upon what your vision is for how these would come together so that we can accomplish these goals in an efficient way?

JAKE LI: Yeah. Bob, thanks for connecting those dots. It's very perceptive of you to do so because we are very much internally trying to connect those dots. I purposely didn't try to do so in my presentation because our discussions internally are at the very nascent stage, and there are a number of ways that we believe label reform, elabeling, can really help with us moving toward ESA compliance, in particular, registration review. As we've heard today, the process for updating or amending the labels can be, you know, really cumbersome, time-consuming. And if we have to do it once as part of an interim decision, and then we have to do it again, five years later, because we have a biological opinion, that's basically two label updates. And there really has to be a faster way and more efficient way for us to make those updates.

So that's one nexus that's, I think, very

low-hanging fruit in terms of things that can really help us with the ESA process. But we can't really do that at any scale until we have an elabeling system up and running first.

And I really like some of the ideas that were offered earlier today about maybe some initial things that we can do in the meantime that can help us with maybe a few pilots and help us with multilingual labeling as well. So I actually think all of those are connected.

The other thing I'll just quickly say is that we are also thinking through what type of guidance can we give to registrants so that as registrants think about how to write their labels, they can already start thinking beforehand about at least generic mitigation measures that can help with exposure to ESA species and incorporate those into the label much earlier in the label drafting process. Right now, as you've seen, even in the PID, that's new for us, because we've never really done ESA in the PID.

So right now, we're already moving it quite a bit, you know, advance -- or earlier in the process. How can we move it even earlier, where a draft label we get already is like, well, I'm just

going to make this up 50 percent of the way there. We are hoping, through these pilots species, to demonstrate what that might look like, because, as I said earlier, we are going to identify what we believe to be appropriate mitigation measures for different methods of application for those pilots species and then try to expand them to other species.

So we could probably talk for several hours on this really excellent question, but in interest of time, I just wanted to throw out these two to three different ideas that we're all thinking through internally.

BOB MANN: Thank you.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you. And that concludes the last session before we go into public comment today.

I want to thank all of the presenters, as well as our PPDC members.

Now, turning to the public comment period. Please raise your hand if you are interested in providing public comment and have preregistered to do so, and we will promote you to panelists in the back end, our tech support team will, and then I'll call on you. And you'll be limited to three

minutes, and please do try to keep your remarks within that time.

I want to go over how you can participate via telephone, as well as on the Zoom. So participating today via telephone, please press *9 to indicate that you want to be recognized. I'll call on you by area code, and then you can unmute when I call on you by pressing *6.

Whether you are participating on Zoom or on the telephone, when you're making your comment, please state your name and affiliation if you have one, and, like I said, we ask that you please limit your remarks to three minutes. And we'll be displaying a slide with your remaining time.

For feedback purposes, please ensure that you are not connected to the phone and computer in audio at the same time.

And we're going to start with those who have preregistered. There have been folks in the Q&A box, and probably even via email, who have indicated interest in providing public comments, but may not have preregistered. We'll get to as many of those as possible after we go through the preregistered folks. And, again, you can -- if you are interested in providing comments but have not

preregistered, you can email Shannon Jewell at J-E-W-E-L-L.Shannon, S-H-A-N-N-O-N, @epa.gov, or leave us a note in the Q&A.

With that, let's get started. Our first commenter is going to be 20034655. This must be someone on the phone. That's 20034655.

SHANNON JEWELL: Danny, quickly. Can you see the public comments slides? I'm not sure if those are coming across.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Yes, I can.

SHANNON JEWELL: Okay, great.

Okay. So that person should be able to unmute.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Are you on, 20034655?

All right. Well, as we have not heard from that person, let's move on to Ray McAllister.

RAY MCALLISTER: Are we ready?

DANNY GIDDINGS: Go ahead, Ray.

RAY MCALLISTER: Thank you. Ray McAllister with CropLife America. I had a few brief questions regarding OPPEL that we heard about earlier in the afternoon. I was wondering about the status of the IT contract and if it is still affecting the progress of the OPPEL.

The second question is, could we conduct a

larger pilot project with more registrants to gain experience with OPPEL and to refine it?

Thank you.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Ray. I'm not sure that we'll be able to address your questions in today's webinar, though they will be entered into the public record, unless Ed or others want to chime in.

ED MESSINA: You know, there's a wrap-up session tomorrow, so maybe -- I'll take some notes and see if there's anything -- because we do want to save time for people to comment today, and I'll try to address that in tomorrow's wrap-up. There's no wrap-up today. We're going to end with public comment, but tomorrow there's some time for wrap-up and I'll take some notes.

RAY MCALLISTER: Thank you.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Ray. Thanks, Ed.

I believe we have the previous caller on the line now. 20034655, are you able to --

AILEEN MALDONADO: Hello?

DANNY GIDDINGS: Hi.

AILEEN MALDONADO: Oh, hi. So my name is Aileen Maldonado, and I work in industry at UPL as an ecotoxicologist. And I guess -- this is kind of

a complex question for ESA, but how, I guess, are you guys attempting to assess if a species is being impacted by a pesticide with how complex ecosystems are? And even, you know, years of studying sometimes a species, it's hard to understand what's really causing an impact, and so how are you guys going to be able to tackle that?

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you for that comment. Like I said, I'm not sure that we can address every question here today, but it has been entered into the public record after you giving it. And that may be something that we can address in the wrap-up session or through another venue unless Jake or anyone else wants to chime in.

SHANNON JEWELL: Actually, this is Shannon. I'll chime in quickly. I'm so sorry. So public comments are really only designed for the public to make comments, and it's not a question and answer session. It's really for people to get their comments and feedback on the public record. That's a FACA rule. So I apologize for that. But please feel free to email us. You're welcome to do that -- jewell.shannon@epa.gov -- and we can work on getting an answer to that question for you.

Thank you.

AILEEN MALDONADO: I'm so sorry. I didn't -- I wasn't aware of that. But thank you.

SHANNON JEWELL: Absolutely, no problem. So sorry.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Are there any other members of the public who would like to make comments? I'm looking for raised hands.

Hardy Kern from American Bird Conservancy.

HARDY KERN: Can you hear me?

DANNY GIDDINGS: I can.

HARDY KERN: Fantastic. So I just firstly want to say thank you so much to Mr. Messina, to yourself, Mr. Giddings, and Ms. Jewell and everyone who is here, the PPDC, for all the important work that's being discussed.

My name is Hardy Kern. I'm the Director of Government Relations for American Bird Conservancy's Pesticides and Birds Campaign, which is a mouthful and it takes up, you know, 80 percent of my business card.

We would first like to express our admiration for EPA's renewed commitment to ESA consultations, and we would also love to see, as I'm sure would EPA, their budget and number of full-time equivalents for ESA work doubled, which is something

that we are actively advocating for during the Congressional appropriations process. We really want to support that work. With important BiOPs on neonics and other chemicals impending, it is more important now than ever to increase EPA's capacity to properly assess and mitigate chemicals in order to protect vulnerable wildlife and habitat.

And ABC is also grateful for EPA taking time to review -- and I am sorry, I've been talking very quickly for the interpreters. ABC is also grateful for EPA taking time to review and improve pesticide labeling. One of the greatest threats to farmworkers is the improper application of pesticides. Spills and overuse also contribute to lethal and sublethal effects on wildlife and ecosystems.

Making labels comprehensive, easy to understand, and multilingual are all ways to protect farmworkers and wildlife. Thank you for the opportunity to comment today, and thank you all for the work that you do.

DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you. Are there any other members of the public who would like to be recognized for public comment?

SHANNON JEWELL: Yeah, I'm not seeing any

other hands raised, Danny.

Please remember, if you would like to make a public comment, to raise your hand.

DANNY GIDDINGS: All right. Seeing no hands raised, I think that we have 10 minutes left. I know that Ed has some closing remarks, and I don't know that 10 minutes is sufficient to go back and cover any of the topics that we ran out of time for. So thank you for -- both members of the public who contributed today. Thank you -- a sincere thank you to our workgroups who presented today, and to our PPDC members, members of the public who listened in and shared their views, and to all the support staff that helped us out today.

That's it for me. Ed, I'll turn it over to you to close us out.

ED MESSINA: Thank you so much, Danny, for doing a great job facilitating, and for all our behind-the-scenes folks, Shannon, for pulling all the materials together and running the show. And to our interpreters, muchas gracias.

So we're going to do a closing tomorrow with sort of, you know, a longer wrap-up. What I'll say today was I thought today's sessions were great. I think many of you did because I was watching the

participants list, and we were up to about 270 people who were on the Zoom call, at least as far as I could count. The tech folks can let me know if it was more. And everyone's sort of stayed. Mostly through, you know, most of the sessions, we were at around 250. So I think it just shows the fact that, you know, people are very interested in these topics.

We appreciate the feedback from the PPDC to present these important topics and really appreciate the feedback provided today.

We have an agenda tomorrow -- you can take a look at -- and more workgroup reporting out and more discussions. I will answer some questions. I've taken some notes. Maybe we can kind of wrap up on just things I noted for today on future topics for tomorrow, and I'll mention this again.

I heard a potential future PPDC topic on how EPA does water quality assessments for pesticides.

I'm thinking we'll need maybe a deeper dive on Spanish labeling efforts. In particular, we talked about electronic labeling today and that came up.

I think the question about how EPA tackles

ecosystem reviews for ESA, I think we may put that on a future topic and sort of how we do some of the science.

And then, Ray, to answer your question on the contract, for those of you who aren't familiar with this, we've issued a bid for a new mission support IT contract, a five-year contract. We selected a vendor. That contract was protested and we are now in the protest phase of that contract. Possible next steps include talking with the folks that are part of that process and then selecting a vendor, whether it's a new one or the same one again, and then running that process through contract piece.

Once that happens, we'll get a vendor on board, and I think many of the things that -- and, Ray, you're sort of interested in -- will there be, you know, an expanded pilot -- once we get a contractor in-house, the first step is going to be doing sort of user analysis, meaning what the internal users need. There will also be external user analysis. So what do the customers of those processes need, including industry, including environmental groups, and what do people want to see once we get a better system that enables us to

demonstrate any metadata and/or where things are sort of in the pipeline, you know, how soon are we going to be doing an ESA review for a particular chemical and making those dashboards a little more user-friendly. So there will be a lot of coordination that needs to happen.

So there was a bit of a delay in our desire to implement that was, in part, because the protest, but we are working expeditiously to address those protest comments and moving towards analyzing the selection process with our Office of General Counsel and our contracting folks. So stay tuned. And once we have an announcement to make on that, we'll probably do an OPP update and let folks know kind of where we are on that. A lot of the IT upgrades and elabeling are really contingent on us having an adequate mission support contract vehicle.

So with that, I think we can conclude today's session. Four minutes left. We were a little behind and then caught us up, but thank you so much, everyone, on the call for spending the day with us. And we will see you tomorrow at 11:00. I'm checking that with the Shannon and Danny.

Yeah, we'll start tomorrow. We'll do an overview of the coming events and then we'll have a number of sessions, and then I will do a wrap-up with more of a formal sort of thank you, goodbye. And then what I'd like for tomorrow for folks to think about is what are potential future PPDC topics that you would like EPA to present on, and, separately, what are some topics that you think the PPDC should have discussions around. And so if the PPDC members could come prepared tomorrow thinking of those and we'll include that in the in the wrap-up session tomorrow, and any of the future deliverables or takeaways that we need to do for housecleaning.

So, Shannon, over to you.

SHANNON JEWELL: I think that's it for today. Yeah, thank you so much, everyone, for everything you've done, Danny and the interpreters, everyone on the call. We will start back tomorrow at 11:00.

For all of you who are serving as panelists and all the committee members, as today, if you can join just a few minutes early, we can make sure the IT is working, then that will be really helpful. So if you can joint 15, 20 minutes

early, that would be great. And we'll see you all tomorrow.

ED MESSINA: Thanks, everyone. Take care.

(Day 1 adjourned.)