

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

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

PESTICIDE PROGRAM DIALOGUE COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, May 26, 2022

11:00 a.m.

DAY 2

1 PESTICIDE PROGRAM DIALOGUE COMMITTEE ROSTER

2 May 2022

3 NAME

AFFILIATION

4 User/Grower Groups/ Farmer Representatives

5 Amy Asmus

Weed Science Society of
6 America

7 Jim Fredericks

National Pest Management
8 Association

9 Mark Johnson

Golf Course Superintendents
10 Association of America

11 Patrick Johnson

National Cotton Council

12 Dominic LaJoie

National Potato Council

13 Lauren Lurkins

Illinois Farm Bureau

14 Tim Lust

National Sorghum Producers

15 Bob Mann

National Association of
16 Landscape Professionals

17 Gary Prescher

National Corn Growers
18 Association

19 Caleb Ragland

National Soybean Association

20 Damon Reabe

National Agricultural
21 Aviation Association

22 John Wise

IR-4 Project

23

24

25

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

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

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

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

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

2 DAY TWO - MAY 26, 2022

3 HOUSEKEEPING

4 DANNY GIDDINGS: Welcome, welcome, welcome.

5 Welcome back to Day 2 of the May Pesticide Program
6 Dialogue Committee meeting. If you are just joining
7 us, thank you for being here, and we'll go over some
8 administrative housekeeping items from Day 1 again.
9 If you participated yesterday, thank you for coming
10 back, and I will try to be as brief as possible so as
11 not to bore you.

12 My name is Danny Giddings. I am Special
13 Assistant to the Assistant Administrator for the
14 Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention.
15 I am joined by Ed Messina, Director of the Office of
16 Pesticide Programs and chair of the PPDC.

17 Ed will officially welcome you all today,
18 too, in just a moment, but first I want to again draw
19 your attention to the interpretation button on the
20 bottom panel of your Zoom window to the right of your
21 screen.

22 Now, you probably will not see that just
23 yet. You will see that button as soon as we receive
24 a Spanish translation of what I'm saying right now
25 from our Spanish translators. Then we'll get that

1 interpretation service set up and you will be able to
2 go into -- click on that -- it's a globe button, and
3 select either English or Spanish to be able to fully
4 participate in the meeting. This will place you in
5 either the Spanish or English channel. And as we
6 anticipate a bilingual meeting today, it is important
7 that you choose one of these channels.

8 For our Spanish-speaking colleagues, I'm
9 now going to turn it over to our interpreter,
10 Jacqueline, who will provide these instructions in
11 Spanish.

12 Jacqueline, go ahead.

13 (Instructions provided in Spanish.)

14 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Jacqueline.

15 Now, you should be seeing that globe on the
16 bottom of your screen with the label "interpretation"
17 under it. You should be able to select your language
18 from that globe and then you can choose to mute
19 original audio. I will note that one of our speakers
20 on the first presentation is likely to be calling in
21 and so you'll want to probably not mute your original
22 audio for our morning session, because with speakers
23 who call in on the telephone, their audio will just
24 be in the main conference room.

25 So please select your language with me

1 right now. I've now selected mine and we can go on
2 with the rest of the instructions for this morning.

3 I do want to note that closed captioning
4 and live transcription is available to those who use
5 the service by clicking the closed captioning button
6 in the bottom panel of your Zoom screen.

7 If you have any issues connecting to Zoom
8 or navigating the Zoom platform, you can receive
9 assistance from EPA IT specialists by calling the EPA
10 Help Desk at 866-411-4372 or email your request to be
11 EISD@epa.gov. You may also use the Q&A function to
12 privately troubleshoot any technical issues to
13 meeting organizers.

14 Today's meeting is being recorded for the
15 purpose of having transcripts produced. Because of
16 the recording, live captioning and interpretation
17 happening for this meeting, we ask that all
18 presenters speak slowly and clearly to ensure
19 everyone can understand and participate in the
20 meeting, and I will continue to remind our speakers
21 throughout the day to be sure to watch their cadence
22 and take my own advice as well, so that our Spanish
23 interpreters can provide accurate interpretations to
24 our Spanish-speaking colleagues.

25 Members of the public are on listen-only

1 mode for the duration of today's meeting, but can
2 request to provide public comment at the end of
3 today's meeting by emailing Shannon Jewell at J-E-W-
4 E-L-L.Shannon, S-H-A-N-N-O-N, @epa.gov, or by using
5 the Q&A function within Zoom.

6 If you have any issues connecting to Zoom
7 or navigating the Zoom platform, again, call our EPA
8 IT specialists at 866-411-4372 or drop it in the Q&A
9 function.

10 For those with unreliable Internet
11 connections, you can connect to this meeting by phone
12 using the dial-in 16692545252. That's 16692545252,
13 the meeting ID 16030961891.

14 I want to do a quick walkthrough of our
15 agenda before I let Ed welcome us to the -- provide
16 an official welcome to Day 2. Starting in just a few
17 minutes, we'll have a discussion on an update, excuse
18 me, from our Farmworker and Clinician Training
19 Workgroup. At noon, we will have a lunch break. At
20 1:00, we will have an update from our Pesticide
21 Resistance Management Workgroup, and all of these
22 workgroup updates are followed by a short discussion
23 session for PPDC members to provide input and
24 feedback.

25 At 2:00, we'll have good laboratory

1 practices inspection introduction. At 2:30, we'll
2 have a update from the Emerging Agricultural
3 Technologies Workgroup. And at 3:30, we'll have a
4 moving forward session that will be led by Ed
5 Messina, and that's both a recap of this two-day
6 meeting and a discussion of how we would like the
7 PPDC to move forward into the next six months to
8 year.

9 At 4:30, we'll have a public comment
10 session. This, again, is the public's chance to
11 provide feedback on what was discussed over the last
12 two days and provide comment. Unfortunately, we
13 cannot, due to FACA rules, answer questions during
14 this session. So it will not be a Q&A, though, if
15 you email Shannon Jewell -- again, that's J-E-W-E-L-
16 L.S-H-A-N-N-O-N@epa.gov, if you have specific
17 questions, she'll be happy to route those to the
18 appropriate folks within EPA.

19 At 5:00, we will adjourn and bid farewell
20 and, of course, thank you all for your participation

21 So that's all for me this morning.

22 Ed, I want to hand it over to you for a
23 short welcome before we launch into our first
24 session.

25 ED MESSINA: Thanks, Danny. And thank you,

1 everyone, for joining back again today. If you
2 thought yesterday was chock full of incredible
3 information, I would say buckle your seatbelts.
4 We're going to get into a lot of other fun topics as
5 Danny mentioned, and then lots of good discussion.

6 And at the end, we'll do a wrap-up, we'll
7 talk about some ideas that we heard moving forward
8 and then also we are probably going to do an
9 interactive session where we ask PPDC members to
10 provide ideas on future topics that you would like to
11 hear about either from EPA or as part of a discussion
12 by the PPDC. This agenda was built out of
13 recommendations from the PPDC from the last go-round
14 so everything you're seeing on this agenda really
15 reflects what PPDC members thought should be good
16 topics for this meeting, and we will do the same at
17 the wrap-up at the end of the day for the next
18 meeting.

19 So thank you for your time again today, and
20 I'm looking forward to a great discussion and
21 presentations.

22 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Ed.

23 Let's launch right into our update on
24 progress made on the October 2021 recommendations
25 from the Farmworker and Clinician Training Workgroup.

1 You may remember that this workgroup has since
2 disbanded, but we are joined by our EPA co-chairs
3 Carolyn Schroeder, who is chief --

4 SHANNON JEWELL: Danny --

5 ED MESSINA: Hey, Danny.

6 SHANNON JEWELL: -- I'm sorry. I think you
7 may have an old copy of the agenda. I'm so sorry.
8 So we'll be moving into the Pesticide Resistance
9 Management Workgroup update now.

10 DANNY GIDDINGS: Apologies. Yeah, yeah, I
11 do have an old copy, so apologies for that technical
12 glitch.

13 We are moving into the Pesticide Resistance
14 Management Workgroup update. And Alan Reynolds, lead
15 biologist from the Emerging Technologies Branch in
16 our Biopesticides and Pollution Prevention Division,
17 as well as David Shaw, Provost and Executive Vice
18 President for Mississippi State University, will be
19 leading us through this presentation.

20 So I'll kick it over to Alan and David.

21

22

23

24

25

1 PESTICIDE RESISTANCE MANAGEMENT WORKGROUP UPDATE

2 ALAN REYNOLDS: Great. Thank you, Danny.

3 Once we get the slides up, we'll launch into the
4 presentation.

5 SHANNON JEWELL: Yeah. Sorry about that,
6 guys. I'm trying to advance here. I may have to
7 stop for just a second.

8 (Pause.)

9 SHANNON JEWELL: Okay. Here you go. Can
10 you see them?

11 ALAN REYNOLDS: Not quite yet.

12 ED MESSINA: Not yet, Shannon.

13 SHANNON JEWELL: Okay. I'm showing them on
14 screen. Let me see if I change my screen here. Sorry
15 about that guys. Just a sec.

16 (Pause.)

17 ALAN REYNOLDS: There we go.

18 SHANNON JEWELL: Okay, great.

19 ALAN REYNOLDS: Perfect. Okay. Thanks,
20 Shannon.

21 So I'll go ahead and get started. I'll
22 give a quick introduction for myself. So I'm Alan
23 Reynolds. I'm a lead biologist in the Emerging
24 Technologies Branch of the Biopesticides and
25 Pollution Prevention Division. I've been working on

1 resistance management for most of my career at EPA of
2 almost 25 years. So on behalf of my co-chairs, David
3 Shaw from Mississippi State University and the
4 recently retired Bill Chism from our Office of
5 Pesticide Programs, I'm going to be presenting an
6 overview of our implementation strategy for the
7 Resistance Management Workgroup recommendations that
8 were delivered to the full PPDC last October.

9 So, Shannon, if we could have the next
10 slide.

11 So before we get into the presentation, now
12 I'm going to turn to my colleague, Jonathan Becker,
13 at the Biological and Economic Analysis Division, and
14 he's going to go over some of the staffing changes
15 that are going to impact our implementation efforts.

16 JONATHAN BECKER: Good morning. Am I
17 coming through okay?

18 ALAN REYNOLDS: Yeah.

19 JONATHAN BECKER: So I just wanted to take
20 a moment to introduce myself and relay some personnel
21 changes. I think most of these you are already aware
22 of. Ed talked yesterday about changes in the senior
23 leadership program in OPP. Anne Overstreet is now
24 the acting division director of BEAD and Kimberly
25 Nesci, who was the acting -- or who was the division

1 director in BEAD, has moved over to USDA in the
2 Office of Pest Management Policy.

3 So I will be taking the place of Bill Chism
4 as a co-lead in BEAD, along with Nikhil Mallampalli.
5 And I'd just like to say that I'm really looking
6 forward to being on the Resistance Management
7 Workgroup.

8 And with that, I'll turn it back to Alan
9 and we'll carry on with the presentation. Thank you.

10 ALAN REYNOLDS: Thanks, Jonathan.

11 So, Shannon, could I have the next slide,
12 please. Next slide, please.

13 SHANNON JEWELL: Yeah, my apologies, Alan.
14 My system has decided to act up all the sudden. So
15 I'm working on this. Here we go.

16 ALAN REYNOLDS: Okay, thanks. Okay. So
17 just a little bit of an introduction and background.
18 So as I mentioned, the Resistance Management
19 Workgroup delivered their full report to the PPDC
20 last October and the group recommended that EPA take
21 a much more proactive role in resistance management.
22 And this recommendation report was voted to move
23 forward by the full PPDC last October. And so these
24 recommendations, you know, if implemented, would
25 represent a significant change in how OPP currently

1 does business and regulates pesticides.

2 And the recommendations certainly could
3 require a significant commitment of time and
4 resources, and I'll be going into specifically what
5 that could entail.

6 So next slide, please.

7 Okay. So first off, I'd just like to, you
8 know, make clear that, you know, the agency and the
9 Office and Pesticide Programs do value resistance
10 management. We view it as a proactive measure that
11 can help avoid potential problems, such as things --
12 issues we've seen with chemistries, like glyphosate.
13 And resistance management can certainly preserve
14 resources and efforts and benefits that the agency
15 recognizes and realizes with that ingredient.

16 Certainly, resistance management can have
17 value to pesticide users, particularly in terms of
18 prolonging the life span of pesticides. To give a
19 few examples, in the public health sector, for
20 instance, there have not been a whole lot of modes of
21 action that have been developed in recent decades.
22 So there certainly would be value in protecting and
23 prolonging the life span of the tools that are
24 currently available.

25 And, of course, with herbicides, we've

1 certainly seen significant cases of resistance, as
2 evidenced by over 80 million acres of glyphosate
3 resistant weeds.

4 Certainly, resistance management can also
5 have value for the environment. If products are --
6 durability is maintained and products are kept
7 effective that could result in fewer pesticides per
8 year. Conversely, resistance could result in more
9 use of pesticides and resulting environmental effects
10 and that could include impacts on -- potential
11 impacts on endangered species.

12 Next slide, Shannon.

13 Okay. So I'd just like to provide a brief
14 recap of the workgroup's full report and the key
15 recommendations that were made. So the report is
16 quite detailed and goes into certainly, you know, an
17 exhaustive discussion of potential resistance
18 management measures the agency could take, but there
19 were five key recommendations that the report made.

20 Shannon, can we actually have the previous
21 slide? I think we advanced one too far.

22 SHANNON JEWELL: Yep. Here we go, here we
23 go. For some reason, it's just going very slowly.
24 Is this right?

25 ALAN REYNOLDS: No, two back.

1 SHANNON JEWELL: Okay. There you go.

2 ALAN REYNOLDS: Perfect. Right there.

3 Okay, thanks.

4 So the five major recommendations that the
5 report made -- so the first of those -- sorry,
6 previous slide.

7 Okay, great. Okay. So the first key
8 recommendation had to do with pesticide labeling,
9 particularly with developing standardized language
10 for resistance management that could be easily used
11 by pesticide applicators and other stakeholders. So,
12 you know, developing clear, concise language in which
13 resistance management can be, you know, easily
14 implemented.

15 The second recommendation had to do with
16 EPA conducting a review of current policies and
17 regulations, particularly looking for, you know,
18 policies that, you know, could hinder the
19 implementation of resistance management. So looking
20 for, you know, ways to essentially remove barriers
21 from implementing resistance management.

22 The third recommendation had to do with
23 developing outreach and collaborative efforts with
24 our federal partners and other agencies. Also
25 working with our scientific advisory panel to address

1 specific resistance management issues and other
2 priority issues associated with resistance
3 management.

4 So next slide, please.

5 So the final two recommendations had to
6 deal with how EPA can encourage resistance
7 management. So the fourth recommendation recommended
8 that EPA develop cooperative agreements with industry
9 and universities to focus on training and grant
10 programs to enhance resistance management.

11 And then the final recommendation was that
12 EPA work to develop incentive programs to encourage
13 resistance management development, particularly
14 incentives for users, researchers and suppliers,
15 focusing on early detection and a timely adoption of
16 specific resistance management measures, you know,
17 between -- that could be in effect between the time
18 of detection of resistance and confirmation of
19 resistance.

20 So next slide, please.

21 Okay. So before we get into what EPA is
22 going to be doing for implementation for the PPDC
23 report, I'd like to go through some of the activities
24 that are already underway. And we have -- with the
25 conventional pesticides in 2017, EPA issued two

1 pesticide registration notices for conventional
2 pesticides. The first was 2017-1 that had to do with
3 mode of action labeling, and then 2017-2, which was
4 resistance management for herbicides.

5 So the agency has been implementing these
6 PR notices and we've been doing this through the
7 registration review process for existing active
8 ingredients and also for new active ingredients as
9 their registrations are coming through.

10 So in terms of registration review, to
11 date, the agency has implemented a resistance
12 management for 178 out of the 210 chemical decisions
13 that have been issued since those PR notices were
14 issued. So that's a fairly high level of adoption.

15 As far as new active ingredient
16 registrations, for agricultural use labels, the
17 agency has now been routinely adding resistance
18 management language using that those PR notice
19 guidances.

20 And so what we've been specifically looking
21 at in terms of those labeling that -- or that
22 labeling has been a mode of action and also our
23 recommendations to conduct scouting or resistance
24 monitoring before and after treatment, as well as
25 reporting cases of resistance, when they develop.

1 For the plant-incorporated protections --
2 and this is what I spent most of my time working on
3 -- we're currently working to improve our existing
4 strategies and we've had a functional resistance
5 management approach in place for these PIPs for over
6 20 years.

7 But we're currently, in response to cases
8 of -- recent cases of resistance, we've been working
9 to enhance our current approaches. And so some of
10 the things we've been working on, improving the
11 resistance monitoring approach. We've been working
12 on improving mitigation for when we do have cases of
13 resistance. Sometimes that's referred to as remedial
14 action. We're also looking at enhancing refuge
15 compliance. Refuges are typically used with the
16 PIPs. Those are our key resistance mitigation
17 measure, as well as also improving our communication
18 among stakeholders with respect to resistance
19 management.

20 And as I mentioned, we're currently working
21 with industry to develop this framework and we're
22 working to implement it. We should be moving that
23 forward within the next year.

24 So next slide, please.

25 Okay. So when we start talking about

1 implementing the PPDC report, certainly that report
2 was quite extensive in its recommendations. So I do
3 think we're going to need to be somewhat realistic as
4 far as managing our expectations for the
5 implementation. So particularly, we see
6 implementation of the report as really a long-term
7 effort. This is not something that we feel can be
8 fully implemented within, you know, a year or two.
9 This is something that will likely be a multi-year
10 effort to develop.

11 I'd fall back to our experience on the Bt
12 PIPs and resistance management strategy that we've
13 developed. That took years for us to develop, and
14 really it's still evolving after almost 25 years. So
15 it is, you know, a very complex subject and not
16 something that is easy just to put in place quickly.

17 So our expectations are that if we're going
18 to develop a fully functional resistance management
19 strategy for a particular sector or chemistry or
20 target pest, that it could take five years or more to
21 actually fully develop that if we follow, you know, a
22 rigorous, scientifically informed process.

23 Certainly, there will be a number of
24 challenges with implementing the PPDC report. So
25 yesterday, we heard from Ed Messina. He gave a very

1 good overview of OPP's resource picture, particularly
2 -- and also our priorities, and it was pretty clear,
3 we have a very full plate, but I think that the size
4 of that plate has been seemingly getting smaller in
5 recent years. So certainly, resources will be a
6 challenge for us as we look to implementation.

7 Resistance management measures, also, we
8 need to develop the specifics of what we're going to,
9 you know, be doing and avoiding the temptation to
10 have a one-size-fits-all approach that will likely be
11 less effective. But developing a specific resistance
12 management strategy that's, you know, targeted at
13 individual pesticides and pests will be, you know,
14 very resource heavy to do and could be quite a heavy
15 lift.

16 In terms of grants or incentives, you know,
17 that would involve potential funding. So where would
18 that come from? You know, those would be things that
19 the agency would have to work out.

20 If we're going to be mandating resistance
21 management measures, how would the enforcement work?
22 You know, that's something that's been a challenge
23 for us on the PIP side for resistance management
24 strategy there. So, you know, certainly enforcement
25 would need to be taken into consideration.

1 And then we also have to be, you know,
2 cognizant of what burdens we'd be putting on the
3 regulated community and registrants. You know,
4 certainly, any resistance management matters that
5 would be taken would have an impact on the
6 registrants themselves.

7 Next slide, please. There we go. Oops,
8 one too many.

9 SHANNON JEWELL: There you go.

10 ALAN REYNOLDS: Perfect. Thanks, Shannon.

11 Okay. So the PPDC report also presents a
12 number of policy considerations that you will need to
13 work through. So certainly, the report makes a
14 number of broad recommendations that would have
15 certainly a wide-ranging impact on our pesticide
16 regulatory policies. That could include things like
17 labeling, how we look at the risk benefit paradigm
18 for decision-making for pesticides, the use of a
19 scientific advisory panel, just to name a few things.

20 So the report does, I think, recognize
21 this reality, and so the second recommendation
22 specifically directs EPA to conduct a thorough review
23 of our policies and regulations that impact
24 resistance management and, as I mentioned previously,
25 looking for barriers that could hinder the effective

1 development of resistance management. So that would
2 seemingly be a logical first step for EPA to go
3 through that process there.

4 We also recognize, though, that for some of
5 the recommendations, rulemaking might be necessary,
6 and certainly a rulemaking is a very heavy lift for
7 EPA and something we need to take into account.

8 And then, as I previously mentioned, the
9 risk benefit paradigm for, you know, decision-making
10 and where would resistance management fit into that.
11 Certainly, you know, we could consider resistance, or
12 the risk of resistance on the risk side, and then
13 resistance management, you know, we could look at
14 that as a potential benefit.

15 Next slide, please.

16 Okay. So the report also raises some scope
17 considerations as well. So we could look at the
18 implementation. We could view it as, you know,
19 trying to implement the report for all pesticides
20 across the board. Or we could think about
21 implementing more on a targeted level, looking at
22 individual sectors, chemistries, or even target
23 pests.

24 So if we were going to take that latter
25 approach, we could identify groups of chemistries

1 that we could focus at least our initial
2 implementation efforts on. So examples there, we
3 could look at, you know, pesticides or pests that had
4 significant resistance history where we've seen cases
5 of resistance or for which resistance would result in
6 significant economic costs or burdens for users.

7 As I mentioned before, public health pests,
8 you know, there have not been a lot of modes of
9 action in recent years for those. So, you know,
10 given the value there, the public value there, that
11 might be a sector to focus on for resistance
12 management.

13 Herbicides, particularly the herbicide
14 tolerant crops where we've seen, you know,
15 significant resistance, could be another area to
16 focus on.

17 In terms of our existing active
18 ingredients, where we do have resistance management
19 concerns, as I mentioned before, we could use the
20 registration review process as a means to implement
21 resistance management, and that would be convenient
22 because, you know, changes could be implemented
23 across the board, not just product-by-product but to
24 get on essentially, you know, across the board for
25 all similar products.

1 For new active ingredients, where we have
2 resistance management concerns, the resistance
3 management strategy could be implemented at the time
4 of registration, and we've already been doing that in
5 some cases, and certainly that's been our experience
6 with the PIPs over the years.

7 But we also need to consider whether, you
8 know, resistance management should be a voluntary
9 approach or whether it should be mandatory or maybe a
10 hybrid, something that kind of combines, you know,
11 different aspects. And we do have some precedents on
12 the PIP side for that, where we have some mandatory
13 aspects, but others are more advisory in nature. So,
14 you know, that level of detail would need to be
15 worked out.

16 Next slide, please.

17 Okay. So I want to get into with these
18 last few slides what we've been doing on
19 implementation since the report went final last
20 October. I will emphasize, though, we are still very
21 early in our process of implementation, so I do not
22 have a lot of specific measures to report on. But we
23 do have a strategy in place that we're coalescing
24 around. So I'd like to go through, you know, what
25 we're thinking in terms of that.

1 So first of all, we have had a number of
2 briefings on the report. Bill Chism and I conducted
3 some briefings for our office director and the
4 division directors. We've had a lot of discussions
5 internally on how we see implementation moving
6 forward and the different pathways that we could we
7 could utilize. But what we do see as kind of a first
8 step here is we want to establish an interdivisional
9 OPP workgroup, and this would draw from a number of
10 the divisions in OPP, including the PPD, my division,
11 PRD, and the Registration Division and possibly other
12 divisions as needed. The goal of this workgroup
13 would be to take the report, evaluate, prioritize,
14 and develop an implementation strategy and plan for
15 the recommendations.

16 So really we'd be looking at things we
17 could prioritize, who would be responsible for
18 implementing the various aspects of the report and a
19 timeline. So essentially we're developing a
20 workplan. We'd plan to provide periodic updates to
21 the full PPDC in May and October meetings, as needed.

22
23 And, specifically, we envisioned this
24 interdivisional team as considering or engaging --
25 first off, triaging the PPDC report, really looking

1 for the proverbial low-hanging fruit, things that we
2 could implement on a shorter-term basis versus things
3 that would take longer time frames to implement or
4 involve more heavy resource-intensive actions or
5 involve things like rulemaking, and then what
6 recommendations that we might not be able to adapt
7 that might be, you know, outside of our, you know,
8 jurisdiction or regulatory authority and, as I
9 mentioned, what recommendations might require
10 rulemaking.

11 So next slide, please.

12 Okay. So in terms of next steps and
13 options, so where do we see, you know, perhaps some
14 of these -- you know, these low-hanging items that we
15 could start working on in the short term. So first,
16 we heard yesterday, you know, we got a very extensive
17 report on the OPPEL, the electronic labeling effort,
18 and the work that's ongoing there. We certainly see
19 a nexus there with, you know, resistance management.
20 The workgroup, our recommendation number one was very
21 specific on labeling and developing standardized,
22 easy-to-implement, easy-to-understand labeling for
23 resistance management.

24 I think that ties directly into the goals
25 of the OPPEL workgroup there. So that if we could

1 develop, you know, resistance management language,
2 that would be something that our interdivisional
3 workgroup would be, you know, focusing on, you know,
4 consistent with the recommendations that the PPDC has
5 made and the PR notices that we already had in place,
6 we could look to OPPEL and electronic labeling to
7 implement that in a way that hopefully will be usable
8 and, you know, standardized for various stakeholders.

9 In terms of new active ingredients, you
10 know, I've mentioned this risk benefit paradigm for,
11 you know, resistance management. All right. Now,
12 certainly, we could consider resistance, you know,
13 management as a benefit, while also evaluating the
14 risk of resistance and considering that on the risk
15 side, so, you know, playing that as part of our
16 decision calculus there.

17 Also ensuring that the PR notices that we
18 already have on the books, that those are being
19 implemented and developed to the full extent that we
20 can, as well as ensuring if there's any additional
21 language that our workgroup would develop, that we
22 also implement that at the time of registration.

23 For existing active ingredients, you know,
24 I've mentioned previously the registration review
25 process as a way to implement our current guidance

1 and the PR notices. We could also use that to
2 implement labeling or, you know, other mitigation
3 that our workgroup would develop.

4 Next slide, please.

5 Okay. This is actually the last slide I've
6 got. But we also see, you know, as another, you
7 know, easy-to-implement step, we can, you know, start
8 to engage with stakeholders or, you know, improve
9 upon our current outreach efforts. So one of the
10 things we thought we could do relatively easily was
11 tie into the Federal IPM Coordinating Committee
12 that's already, you know, out there and that's
13 already, you know, in operation. That's managed by
14 the USDA's Office of Pest Management Programs. We
15 could use this as a way to ensure broad awareness of
16 resistance management issues.

17 We've thought about we could set up a
18 yearly or maybe more frequently resistance management
19 meetings with various outside stakeholder groups, you
20 know, outside of what we currently do. We can engage
21 with the Resistance Action Committees. We already do
22 that, I think, to some extent, but we could perhaps
23 expand upon that.

24 In terms of the future for our PPDC
25 workgroup, you know, as Ed had mentioned yesterday,

1 the current workgroups are sunseting, you know,
2 under FACA. But there's certainly been significant
3 interest within the Resistance Management Workgroup
4 to continue on with workgroup efforts there. I
5 certainly could see, you know, certainly a need for
6 that and there could be a benefit for the agency
7 there. But if the workgroup is going to continue on,
8 it would need to proceed on a separate charge, and
9 that charge could be focused more on some of these
10 implementation considerations that I've gone through
11 today.

12 Existing panel members, as I understand,
13 you know, could be part of this new workgroup, but it
14 would have to, of course, go through the PPDC process
15 for setting up a new workgroup. So, you know, that's
16 still to be determined at this point, but it's
17 certainly an option moving forward.

18 And so that concludes my presentation. So
19 I think we can move into the discussion and question
20 phase.

21 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Alan. Yes, if
22 you're a member of the PPDC, please raise your hand
23 to be recognized if you have a question or a comment.

24 I see Marc Lame has got his hand up. So,
25 Marc, go ahead.

1 MARC LAME: Good morning, everyone.
2 Outstanding presentation and I'm just so happy that
3 BPPD has been getting into this subject. So I might
4 just take a second to go back 45 years or so when I
5 began integrated pest management. And the origins of
6 integrated pest management in the late 1970s,
7 basically came out of the problem with using DDT tox
8 on the cotton bowl worm. And, of course, the remedy
9 that, at least in part for that, was integrated pest
10 management.

11 And so I have not read your report, I'm
12 looking forward to reading the whole thing, I think.
13 And I would say that I just wonder where IPM is on
14 this issue. You mentioned the USDA's committees with
15 IPM, but your own division has the Center for
16 Excellence on IPM, and I wonder where they come in.
17 And, of course, you know, I understand that what they
18 do a lot of is nonregulatory in nature, but I
19 consider that the fourth leg -- necessary leg of the
20 environmental management stool, which is permitting
21 monitoring for compliance enforcement and then
22 technical assistance, which is a nonregulatory.

23 I have some concern that IPM is not there
24 enough. And then I would certainly urge that that be
25 part of what happens, certainly when it comes to

1 analyzing the policies and plans with regard to the
2 agency and what they're doing with integrated pest
3 management, whether it's in a nonagricultural or
4 agricultural setting, you know, as a PPDC member
5 whose charge under FACA is to analyze and recommend
6 policy changes or tweaks, as it were, and also its
7 implementation, I kind of need to see a little bit
8 more strategy from the IPM side of things.

9 But other than that, I could not be more
10 pleased with the way that you have begun, and I
11 certainly think it should continue.

12 ALAN REYNOLDS: Yeah, great comments. And,
13 you know, I agree completely with you. I think
14 really IPM is critical and integral to IRM, and
15 that's something we've learned over the years with
16 the PIPs. You know, in fact, that's been a focus of,
17 you know, how we've tried to improve and, you know,
18 buttress those strategies as really to, you know,
19 integrate IPM measures with our resistance management
20 approach.

21 You know, it's not just the PIPs. We've
22 used refuges as our primary mitigation measure and I
23 think we've learned that it's a little more -- you
24 know, to be effective, you need a little more than
25 that, you know, particularly with our harder-to-

1 manage pests. That really IPM's focus is one of the
2 best ways to reduce selection pressure for
3 resistance.

4 And, you know, I agree with you completely
5 and I think that's something, as we go to, you know,
6 look to implementation for conventional pesticides, I
7 think that would be even more key. So, you know,
8 good comments.

9 MARC LAME: Well, again, I urge you to get
10 in on the technical assistance side of it a little
11 bit more when it comes to implementation, but thank
12 you.

13 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Marc.

14 Just reminder to, please, whether you are
15 commenting or presenting, to please watch your
16 cadence and speak slowly and clearly for our
17 interpreters so they can provide an accurate
18 translation.

19 I'll now recognize Nathan Donley who has
20 his hand up.

21 NATHAN DONLEY: Great. Thanks.

22 Yeah, I'm excited about this workgroup, and
23 I see a big opportunity here to change the way EPA
24 approaches pest management resistance. Right now, it
25 seems like the major strategies to require label

1 language that, you know, says rotate or combined mode
2 of action, scout for resistance, adjust the timing
3 of your application, which are really just -- they're
4 delay strategies. They're not preventative.
5 Resistance will still develop.

6 There's really only one prevention strategy
7 and that is not to use the pesticide in the first
8 place. There's no pesticide in the field. There's
9 no selective pressure for resistance to develop. So
10 it seems to me that a successful strategy would
11 really utilize prevention as a tier one, you know,
12 thing to be done, right? So things like reducing or
13 eliminating unnecessary pesticide use, which is --
14 you know, there's a lot of; reducing prophylactic use
15 of pesticides, so that is where pesticides are used,
16 not in response to a pest problem, but in the hopes
17 that it would prevent one from occurring at a later
18 date, so it results in a lot of unnecessary pesticide
19 use.

20 And, you know, again, I think a successful
21 strategy would utilize that first, utilize EPA's
22 authority to cut down on pesticide use in the first
23 place, and then follow it up with some of these delay
24 strategies. And so I really hope a focus of your
25 work going forward would be to how we can implement a

1 lot of that prevention strategy on the front end, and
2 then follow it up with some of these delay strategies
3 on the back end.

4 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Nathan.

5 John Wise?

6 JOHN WISE: Hi. Alan, thank you for your
7 work and all of your team. I appreciate everything
8 you guys are doing.

9 I just have a comment about the thought
10 that you shared of how EPA may be able to use the
11 registration process or the registration review
12 process to further implement resistance management
13 policies, the former, which is looking at a new
14 compound and the potential added benefit, if it
15 brings opportunity to move away from other modes of
16 action and, therefore, being part of what is weighed
17 in considering a registration, that one seems very
18 intuitive and seems to me that there would be very
19 little risk of making a mistake by adding that
20 calculus.

21 The other part, though, of using the
22 registration review process seems to me to be a
23 little bit more challenging and for a couple of
24 reasons. And there may be 10 more than what I'm
25 thinking about, but a couple of them, one would be

1 that if resistance to a mode of action is recognized
2 in one part of the U.S. or one part of a region, then
3 it might suggest to you that restricting an AI
4 through a registration review would help resistance
5 management. Be careful that maybe that resistance is
6 not wide enough spread that it would represent other
7 farmers in that state or that region. So I just want
8 to share a word of caution on that.

9 And the other part that's related is that a
10 given active ingredient could be a problem for
11 resistance management for one pest which is present
12 at a certain time of the growing season, but a grower
13 may use that active ingredient at a different time of
14 the season for a different pest and you would
15 inadvertently restrict that use of a valuable tool.

16 So my point is I think you probably already
17 are thinking about this, but I wanted to share that
18 that latter consideration of policy is difficult from
19 your vantage point in where you sit in your office.

20 So but thank you again for all that you do.

21 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, John.

22 We're coming up on the noon hour and I just
23 wanted to do a quick time check. We'll give a 10-
24 minute warning. We still have time for several more
25 comments, but I just want to watch the time and give

1 a 10-minute warning.

2 Joe Grzywacz, you are recognized.

3 JOE GRZYWACZ: Great. Thank you very
4 much.

5 Alan, thanks for your presentation. I was
6 personally particularly drawn to the comments about,
7 you know, bringing in more of a public health kind of
8 attention and public health research into the work of
9 your group, and I just simply wanted to reinforce
10 that idea, especially as it pertains to, at least in
11 many farmworker and perhaps farmer operations, the
12 notion that it's not usually one pesticide that's
13 being used, but multiple pesticides that are being
14 used simultaneously.

15 And as resistance grows and operators try
16 using more and more of the same thing, you know, if
17 one is good, two is better, you know, kind of an
18 arrangement, you know, those kinds of questions in
19 the public health space are oftentimes not
20 considered. So I just really wanted to say thank you
21 for bringing public health questions back on to the
22 equation, while also being able to consider multiple
23 agents simultaneously as part of the resistance
24 problem.

25 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Joe.

1 Dr. Gouge, you are recognized.

2 DAWN GOUGE: Good morning, everybody.

3 Thank you, Alan. Fantastic. I just really
4 appreciate the fact that you connected pesticide
5 resistance to other things and other priorities that
6 both your division and your agency are focused on as
7 are we out in the trenches, so to speak.

8 As a public health entomologist, I get to
9 witness in real-time pesticide resistance year after
10 year after year. But I really wanted to just say a
11 few words that build on what Marc and Nathan
12 mentioned with regard to the benefits of having an
13 integrated pest management foundation for managing
14 pesticide resistance.

15 It not only connects pesticide resistance
16 but pollution prevention, worker and consumer safety,
17 risk reduction for workers and consumers who buy
18 products over the counter. It reduces adverse
19 impacts on nontargets, including endangered species,
20 and also supports the preservation of organisms that
21 are essential and do actual essential ecological
22 services out there in the environment. It folds in
23 soil health, water conservation, and water quality
24 issues. Integrated pest management connects all of
25 these things and many more to pesticide resistance.

1 Another one to mention and very important
2 now -- more now than ever before, we're paying
3 attention to indigenous traditional ecological
4 knowledge and how that can be folded into our
5 integrated pest management programs.

6 I think technical assistance is essential
7 in this broader realm of integrated pest management
8 benefits. Many of the projects that EPA is -- and
9 initiatives that EPA has invested in, I think label
10 and having some regulatory components to resistance
11 management, I wholeheartedly support that.

12 Thank you.

13 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you for those
14 comments, Dawn.

15 Let's hear from Cameron Douglas next.

16 CAMERON DOUGLAS: Thank you. Thanks, Alan,
17 for the update.

18 First of all, I just wanted to say on
19 behalf of my colleague who chairs the Federal IPM
20 Coordinating Committee, OPMP would be more than happy
21 to discuss opportunities for using that as a fora to
22 further discuss and do outreach on resistance
23 management, at least to the federal partners that
24 participate in FIPMCC.

25 So I also think we need to brainstorm a

1 little bit further about how we could do outreach to
2 the other diverse stakeholder groups that many of the
3 other PPDC members have spoken to being so necessary
4 to include in this conversation.

5 The second point I wanted to bring up
6 quickly is just that OPMP would strongly support the
7 formation of a new workgroup to continue some of the
8 discussions and particularly on topics that the first
9 workgroup may not have really had time to focus on,
10 including some of the technical aspects, like
11 quantifying the risks and benefits of resistance that
12 you mentioned really quickly, and also some of the
13 intersections with ESA. That's not something that
14 the first workgroup really spoke on, but our office
15 sees a lot of intersection there and a lot of
16 complicated issues and questions that need to be
17 discussed through fora like the PPDC.

18 DANNY GIDDINGS: Appreciate the input,
19 Cameron.

20 Damon Reabe, you're up next.

21 DAMON REABE: Thanks. I just want to take
22 a minute to discuss aerial application's role in
23 resistance management and just provide a couple of
24 examples. These would just be two examples of aerial
25 application's role in slowing resistance management

1 or preventing it altogether and its role in
2 integrated pest management, so that the committee
3 understands the importance of our services. The
4 aerial application is often a tool that is utilized
5 because of its ability to cover large acreages in an
6 extraordinarily timely manner. And, oftentimes, we
7 are simply on standby for applications that never
8 happen.

9 Our customers are aware of how quickly we
10 can control pests. And I'll use soybean spider
11 mites. A spider mite is a pest that oftentimes is
12 only flourishing under drought conditions. So field
13 scouts will be out monitoring fields. They're
14 monitoring the populations of the spider mites. We
15 will receive work orders that are simply standby work
16 orders when inevitably there, hopefully, is a rain
17 event that will actually kill the spider mite. If
18 the population of the mites gets to be high enough
19 and that rain event doesn't happen, we then perform
20 the applications. So that would be one example.

21 Potato late blight fungicide applications
22 are done aerially. And being a third-generation
23 business performing aerial applications, I can speak
24 to the reduction in pesticide usage by the customers
25 that have utilized aerial application as their

1 platform for pest control.

2 So I know this committee is made up of a
3 lot of diverse stakeholders and I think, oftentimes,
4 we're very quiet about what we do, and so I just want
5 to make sure I take that opportunity to make sure
6 that -- I know EPA is aware of this, but to make sure
7 that this committee is aware of this and make sure
8 that that's considered not only in this subject
9 matter, but particularly when risk assessments are
10 performed, to make sure that it is included in that
11 decision-making process. Thank you.

12 DANNY GIDDINGS: So this is Danny. We're
13 coming up on the noon hour. There is some chatter in
14 the chat about a motion to continue this group. To
15 be able to fit that in -- and we'll go a little over
16 time I'm sure -- we would need to cut off discussion.
17 So I'm going to hand it over to our chair, Ed
18 Messina, to ask how he would like to proceed, whether
19 we need a motion to end discussion and move to vote
20 on continuing the group or how we'd like to do that.

21 ED MESSINA: If folks don't mind a 10-
22 minute, you know, extension over, we can kind of see
23 if there is any business.

24 Just to clarify on the extension of PPDC
25 workgroups -- maybe it's a good time to mention this

1 -- so under FACA, there is an ability to have
2 subgroups, which we have, and they are generally
3 temporary in nature. So they have a discrete
4 assignment and then they come back to the main PPDC
5 or the main FACA and make recommendations.

6 There is an opportunity to have a workgroup
7 be a permanent standing workgroup, but what that
8 means is a new sort of FACA process with nominations
9 and resumes and appointments need to go up to the
10 administrator for selection, and that's quite a lot
11 of process and it sort of happens in the rare. So
12 because this sort of -- this temporary workgroup on
13 resistance management has completed its charge, the
14 normal course would be for it to sunset and us to
15 continue to work on it.

16 If there were a new workgroup with a new
17 charge of a similar topic, but a different part of
18 that, if someone was interested in continuing it and
19 taking the baton and working on it, then we can
20 entertain that motion. But it doesn't have to be the
21 case that we continue this workgroup. And if we keep
22 continuing it, then we'd sort of run into the FACA
23 rules that would require us to do a full process with
24 all those nominations.

25 So with that background, Danny, we can see

1 what folks want to do with that information on the
2 PPDC.

3 We also have a number of comments to get
4 through. So what we could do is table, you know, any
5 sort of votes or discussions for the wrap-up at the
6 end of the day and just continue with the comments
7 here on the workgroups without taking any motions,
8 maybe extend it for 10 minutes if folks are okay.

9 DANNY GIDDINGS: Let's do that, Ed, and I
10 see that some folks have put comments in the chat,
11 which we can either read or just keep in our scripts
12 that are going to be produced from the recording.

13 Okay. So, yeah, let's keep working through
14 comments. Feel free to comment on the substance of
15 the presentation or also on the more procedural notes
16 that Ed was just talking about.

17 So, Mark, you're recognized.

18 MARK JOHNSON: Thank you for a great
19 presentation and kudos to this workgroup as an
20 industry that recognizes resistance management is
21 critical and we have best management practices in
22 place and have educated our members and through our
23 stakeholders on IPM for years and pesticide
24 selection. And disease resistance is a big part of
25 it.

1 Now, as an industry where turf certainly
2 has a need for additional research at the university
3 level on resistance issues, I want to point out I
4 think that needs to be a strong consideration.

5 But I would just encourage Alan if this
6 moves forward and you think about the stakeholders in
7 light of the IPM, you know, we don't saturate a
8 landscape because those products are expensive and
9 we're doing cultural practices. And, as you know,
10 sometimes it boils down to the last choice. And when
11 you have the last choice, it's availability of
12 products as well if it's one or more than one.

13 So I want to just encourage the group and
14 EPA to think about the stakeholder groups and what
15 we're doing in proactive measures and a lot of what
16 you've outlined. Before things become enforceable,
17 let's address everybody and their specialty crops, if
18 you will, because turf is a specialty crop, and the
19 application across that. I think there will be
20 circumstances -- as you've outlined, when you look at
21 a species and you think about crops, I just want to
22 encourage you to stay on that path and think about
23 stakeholders that can help you achieve success,
24 because we have proactive measures in place that
25 protect water quality, encourages healthy soils,

1 right.

2 So continue this great work. I'm
3 encouraging that. But think deeper into this beyond
4 just standard agriculture and some of these
5 applications, because we do have some limitations and
6 we also have some need for some very great research
7 opportunities and funding for those.

8 Thank you.

9 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Mark.

10 I'll now recognize Jasmine Brown.

11 JASMINE BROWN: Oh, I think this was a
12 great presentation. I would really like to see this
13 workgroup continue, or a new workgroup continue with
14 a different charge.

15 Personally, I echo the comments earlier.
16 When we increase organic matter in our soil, to me,
17 that's our number one IPM strategy, it holds
18 pesticides in the soil longer so they can actually do
19 what they're intended to do. It, you know,
20 suppresses disease and pests. It also holds water in
21 the soil. A lot of fertilizers are depleting our
22 soil and tilling is depleting our soil. And so crops
23 aren't growing the way they should, they're not
24 holding product the way they should. Things are
25 leaching into groundwater because the soil structure

1 is completely destroyed.

2 So for me, I just want to put a plug in for
3 that. But I think it's a great presentation. I
4 think nationally with industry, this is a big push
5 that we could really get some results out of if we
6 put some time and effort into honing in on some key
7 messages.

8 That's my only comment. Thanks.

9 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Jasmine.

10 Dave Tamayo, you're recognized.

11 DAVE TAMAYO: Thank you. Let me know if
12 my sound doesn't work right.

13 DANNY GIDDINGS: You're coming through loud
14 and clear now.

15 DAVE TAMAYO: I can put something in the
16 chat.

17 Pardon me?

18 DANNY GIDDINGS: You're coming through loud
19 and clear.

20 DAVE TAMAYO: Okay, thank you.

21 So I put in the chat an example of how
22 resistance management needs to be applied in urban
23 situations and it's not just within a particular type
24 of use. This example shows that, you know, mosquito
25 control is being affected by very widespread

1 nonmosquito control use of pyrethroids that has, you
2 know, chronic exposure. So the mosquitoes have
3 chronic exposure to pesticides, whether or not the
4 mosquito districts are even using pyrethrins or
5 pyrethroids.

6 And so it needs to be broader than just
7 within a particular use because a resistant organism
8 doesn't really care what it's being controlled for or
9 what that exposure is from it. It just develops the
10 resistance. So keep a big picture view of that.

11 And then also I do support this ongoing
12 work, whatever is the most expedient and convenient
13 way for EPA to continue to engage in this because it
14 is really important.

15 Thank you.

16 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Dave.

17 We'll take one more verbal comment from
18 Cathy Tortorici and then we'll break for lunch.

19 CATHY TORTORICI: So my comment is the
20 following, that, first off, the presentation was
21 really good and I agree with many of the people that
22 spoke earlier about the need to be cognizant and
23 aware of the use of integrated pest management and
24 the benefits of it in thinking about long-term
25 pesticide applications and crop management.

1 I guess my comment is we haven't really
2 discussed this in any large way in terms of the
3 consultation processes that we're now involved with
4 with EPA. So my comment to EPA is that if you all
5 are going to be spending more time on that in an
6 appropriate way beyond what you've done already, we'd
7 like to maybe have a separate conversation with you
8 about this and see how it fits within the context of
9 the ESA FIFRA consultation processes that we're now
10 involved in.

11 Because, Alan, many of the ideas that you
12 brought up are quite intriguing and so we'd like to
13 pursue that and see where that might go -- the
14 appropriateness of it and where it might go.

15 Thanks.

16 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Cathy.

17 So let's table the discussion of what grows
18 out of this workgroup and the work that they did for
19 this afternoon session (inaudible). I'll note that.
20 Ed, I'm sure has already noted that.

21 And with that, let's break for lunch. It
22 is 12:10. We will reconvene at 1:00 for the
23 Farmworker and Clinician Training Workgroup update,
24 and I hope everyone enjoys their lunch. Thank you
25 for this morning's discussion.

1 ED MESSINA: Thanks, everyone. And are we
2 staying on? We're not rejoining, right, Danny?

3 DANNY GIDDINGS: Oh, yeah, same rules as
4 yesterday. Do please stay on this Zoom and mute
5 yourselves and disable your webcam. That way there's
6 no issues getting back into it.

7 (Lunch break.)

8 DANNY GIDDINGS: Good afternoon, everyone,
9 and welcome back for our afternoon sessions of Day 2
10 of the PPDC.

11 If you're just joining us, welcome.
12 I'll note that we are using Spanish interpretation
13 for this two-day meeting, and so if you haven't
14 already, you'll want to click on the interpretation
15 button on the bottom banner of your screen in the
16 Zoom app. It looks like a globe. And you'll want to
17 select either the English or Spanish channel. That
18 will put you in the channel that is speaking that
19 language, and our interpreters are here providing
20 that service for us.

21 I'll also note that you should mute --
22 select the button that says mute original audio.
23 That will make sure that you're hearing all of the
24 speakers today that are presenting in (inaudible).

25 Our first session is going to be on

1 Agriculture Emerging Technology Workgroup. I'll
2 note that this session has recently disbanded or
3 disbanded at least since the October 2021 meeting.
4 But we are joined by EPA co-chairs Carolyn Schroeder,
5 who is chief of the Certification and Worker
6 Protection Branch, and Steve Schaible, Pesticide
7 Registration Improvement Act Coordinator, and also
8 Aidan Black, who is an environmental protection
9 specialist in the Certification and Worker Protection
10 Branch.

11 SHANNON JEWELL: Danny, I'm sorry. I think
12 that they're up in a little while.

13 DANNY GIDDINGS: Oh, no, yeah, you're
14 right. I am working from the old agenda again.

15 SHANNON JEWELL: I totally --

16 DANNY GIDDINGS: Okay.

17 SHANNON JEWELL: Yeah, my apologies for not
18 making that clear to you, Danny.

19 DANNY GIDDINGS: No, we're good, we're
20 good.

21 SHANNON JEWELL: Okay.

22 DANNY GIDDINGS: So we're actually going to
23 hear from -- let's see here. Let me find where we
24 are.

25 SHANNON JEWELL: This will be the Emerging

1 Agricultural Technologies.

2 DANNY GIDDINGS: Okay. Emerging Ag
3 Technologies. Okay. So this is Amy Blankenship.

4 SHANNON JEWELL: Yep.

5 DANNY GIDDINGS: Okay. Amy Blankenship,
6 Acting Division Director in EFED, the Environmental
7 Fate and Effects Division in OPP, and the group's
8 current co-chair, Greg Watson, Crop Protection
9 Regulatory Policy Manager and Analyst at Bayer, who's
10 going to walk us through an update from this
11 workgroup.

12 So Amy and Greg, welcome, and you have the
13 floor.

14 AMY BLANKINSHIP: All right. Thank you.
15 So the slides aren't up on the screen. I'm not sure
16 if we need to reshare them.

17 SHANNON JEWELL: They are not?

18 AMY BLANKINSHIP: I do not see them, but
19 correct me, somebody else, if you do, on my end.
20 They were up and then they disappeared.

21 ED MESSINA: Yeah, same for me.

22 SHANNON JEWELL: Okay. Got it, got it.

23 (Pause.)

24 SHANNON JEWELL: How about now?

25 AMY BLANKINSHIP: The slides are up. So

1 can everybody hear me?

2 SHANNON JEWELL: Yes.

3 AMY BLANKINSHIP: Okay, great.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 EMERGING AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGIES WORKGROUP UPDATE

2 AMY BLANKINSHIP: So welcome, everybody.

3 Good afternoon. So I'm Amy Blankenship. I am in the
4 Environmental Fate and Effects Division and working
5 on emerging technology, particularly around
6 agriculture. So I'll be doing a bit of a debrief
7 from the October workgroup, and then we'll go a
8 little bit in terms of sort of the next steps around
9 this area.

10 So next slide, please.

11 So just the outline of the presentation, so
12 we're going to sort of go back in time a little bit
13 and we'll show you sort of the roster, where it was
14 at the last workgroup on. There are some additions
15 as the workgroup will kind of continue on. We'll go
16 over the original charge questions. I'll do a
17 summary of the outcomes from the October 21 report.
18 And then we'll do a little bit where I sort of talk
19 about the EPA response and some of our current
20 activities.

21 And then I'm going to turn it over to Greg
22 Watson, who is the co-chair of the new group, to talk
23 about the new charge questions, and then take some
24 feedback.

25 Next slide, please.

1 So what you're seeing here is sort of a
2 combination of the workgroup that was last year, as
3 well as there are some few additions for the group
4 that has been continuing on under the new group for
5 this year. So, you know, I just want to point out
6 Mano from CropLife America was the co-chair for the
7 last workgroup; Greg Watson is the co-chair for the
8 new workgroup here in 2022. And I am working with Ed
9 Messina here in EPA, but what you can see is that the
10 group's comprised of many different stakeholders
11 across industry, the ag community, also sort of just
12 the manufacturer groups as well, so a very wide and
13 good turnout on the folks.

14 Next slide, please.

15 So the workgroup in 2021, there were two
16 charge questions before them. One, how should EPA
17 obtain a greater understanding of how the use of
18 emerging agriculture technologies leads to reduced or
19 increased risk that differ from those resulting from
20 current methods? And, two, what changes to EPA's
21 approach to pesticide labels, if any, are needed to
22 accommodate the emerging technologies?

23 And just below, I have a link there to the
24 workgroup's October report, as well as their
25 presentation.

1 So next slide, please.

2 So what I'm going to show in the next few
3 slides are just sort of some highlights of the
4 outcomes and recommendations from that October 21
5 report. The group provided a nice list of
6 technologies that could be used to increase the
7 agency's awareness of what types of emerging
8 technologies are out there and they bin them
9 according to several categories, such as aerial and
10 ground robotics, such as unmanned aerial vehicles or
11 drones, they go by many different names, autonomous
12 tractors. They also provided a list of things
13 related to data and operations, such as weather
14 stations, pest predictions, as well as things related
15 to actually the spray and nozzle technology, direct
16 injection, and variable rate nozzles.

17 They also recommended that the agency or
18 OPP establish a regulatory equivalency for many
19 factors surrounding emerging technology, you know,
20 such as application, registration, exposure, related
21 spray drift, and residues from drone technology, as
22 well as other technologies, and also using currently
23 known exposure estimates from conventional
24 applications, such as manned aerial application
25 technology or air blasts to sort of put into context,

1 if you will, some of this new emerging technology.

2 They also encouraged the agency to balance
3 a future-looking mind set for future technologies, to
4 support adoption of these new technologies, and, in
5 some ways, it's a goal to seek standardization, so
6 the current efforts that are going on now in this
7 field can work for future technologies, because we do
8 know that this is a really rapidly evolving space
9 around emerging technologies. And so we're always
10 trying to balance what we know about the technology
11 today and how it can be applied in the future as the
12 technology evolves.

13 Next slide.

14 Related to the charge question of like, you
15 know, better understanding from the agency's
16 perspective, any reduced or increased risk, they also
17 outlined some potential challenges and benefits
18 related to this technology. So for benefits, there's
19 things such as potentially less worker exposure,
20 reduced environmental loading. They can potentially
21 be used in tough or difficult conditions when
22 traditional tractors or a manned airplane cannot be
23 used or it's hazardous. But they did also sort of
24 want to caution us that some of these benefits could
25 be overstated in the early development and rollout of

1 this technology. So they cautioned and recommended
2 the need to quantify or better understand those
3 benefits.

4 And regarding some challenges, they did
5 highlight a few of them, such as, you know, what is
6 the potential differences in offsite movement
7 compared to current application methods, potential
8 differences in efficacy or tolerances. Also, what
9 additional label language might need to be
10 considered, as well as sort of the safety around the
11 occupational exposure.

12 Next slide, please.

13 So continuing on in terms of outcomes and
14 recommendations, the first three bullets are really
15 around that second question about what changes, if
16 any, are needed regarding pesticide labels. So this
17 group really charged the agency to consider and to be
18 mindful of a digital transformation in a way that the
19 labels can be read and acted upon by autonomous
20 machines, including, you know, robots. And so this
21 is really kind of the theme that that group really
22 did sort of layout in their report, you know.

23 And moving on in terms of like cultivating
24 among the staff, the contractors, the collaborators,
25 digital competencies to accommodate traditional

1 sciences and expanding the scope of the team, and one
2 recommendation was to expand the scope of the teams
3 currently working on digital label initiatives to
4 incorporate these new technologies, which also then
5 may lead into streamlining label reviews and
6 standardizing label language so to help eliminate the
7 need for a product-by-product evaluation.

8 Additionally, the group did recommend that
9 the agency should look at what other groups are doing
10 in this field and so that we should consider similar
11 efforts for potential similarities, differences, and
12 just an overall understanding of where different
13 organizations, different groups are on these topics
14 of emerging technology. And then potentially to
15 convene a workshop to more familiarize ourselves with
16 this technology and literature and possibly identify
17 any data gaps.

18 Next slide.

19 So here I'm just going to provide a little
20 bit of our feedback on the workgroup's
21 recommendations. So really a large part, you know,
22 we really appreciate the workgroup's compilation and
23 emerging technologies and we really do agree with
24 many of the stated benefits and challenges. We do
25 really understand that this could actually, you know,

1 sort of improve the environmental footprint from a
2 learning perspective. It could offer occupational
3 worker/handler exposure benefits, particularly
4 compared to some technologies like, you know, the
5 backpack sprayer, or things like that.

6 And we do understand that there are
7 definitely challenges around that. And so really
8 what we're doing is we're working to better
9 understand this technology. Its utility, its
10 potential exposure profile is a really big area for
11 us. We really want to understand, you know, the
12 occupational handler and mixed layer pilot exposure,
13 nontarget organisms' exposure from drift, and really
14 how they compare it to the existing technologies.
15 You know, are they better, are they worse, are they
16 comparable? That will really help us all to inform
17 policy and any changes that might be needed to risk
18 assessment frameworks, and then ultimately any
19 potential changes to label language.

20 The agency also understands that we do need
21 a process to develop a more digital-based label
22 process, and we are working towards that with such
23 efforts as our OPPEL label process, and we also heard
24 a bit of that these last couple of days in the PPDC
25 itself about digital labels.

1 And really sort of, at this point, the
2 agency is really working with several domestic and
3 international partners to really understand how this
4 technology -- where it's at, its limitations, what we
5 know about it, you know, how was the exposure profile
6 similar or different from existing technologies, and
7 really how it fits into our mission and risk
8 assessment framework.

9 And we will consider whether or not we need
10 a workshop hosted at OPP possibly at a later time, if
11 necessary, but I am going to go into some detail on
12 that slide about all the different groups that we
13 really are engaged on in this topic, and we've
14 participated in several range of workshops,
15 workgroups, discussions, webinars on this topic to
16 really gain information regarding exposure, regarding
17 potential, you know, best management practices, label
18 language changes, policy implications, and all of the
19 above.

20 Next slide.

21 So just diving a little bit deeper on our
22 engagement in this area, really the main technology
23 that is really sort of at the forefront, I will say,
24 for several of these groups, both domestic,
25 internationally, is the area around drones or UAVs,

1 UASs. There's lots of different acronyms for that
2 technology. But the couple here that I wanted to
3 sort of highlight is that the agency is involved on a
4 subgroup in the OECD space that was working on
5 drones.

6 This group last year also released a report
7 on the state of knowledge of the UASs in agriculture,
8 and there's a link there to that paper. So I would
9 encourage you to look at that if you haven't already.
10 And it really sort of highlighted sort of what is
11 known in the open literature, particularly around
12 occupational exposure, offsite drift, modeling
13 capabilities, and general BMPs in general.

14 This workgroup is continuing still to this
15 day, and what we're trying to do is take that paper
16 and what is known about it, maybe where some of the
17 uncertainties are, unknowns are, and understanding,
18 you know, where those data gaps are, how can we
19 better understand them, how can we infill them and
20 move forward in terms of a regulatory process.

21 Another workgroup that is really led by
22 Canadians is the North American Remotely Piloted
23 Aerial Application Systems, or RPAAS, and, again,
24 it's made up of a diverse group of stakeholders from
25 industry, from regulatory bodies, and also from the

1 the ag sector itself. And they have a similar goal
2 in that they're trying to really understand the
3 necessary data needs from like an occupational oxide
4 exposure and those types of needs. So that's another
5 group that is also working in that space.

6 We have been engaged with and continue to
7 be engaged with registrant task force and other
8 stakeholder groups, such as CropLife America. Again,
9 you know, we're all just trying to really understand
10 the current state of the science. They are working
11 on some drift exposure protocols and, hopefully, we
12 will be getting into the field to develop some
13 empirical data for us to better understand how this
14 technology compares to existing technology.

15 We're really excited to sort of see what
16 comes out of that and that -- because we know that
17 will help us with our risk assessment frameworks and,
18 ultimately, risk management and label language
19 decisions.

20 And just sort of, lastly, we have
21 participated in a series of workshops and conferences
22 at the American Chemical Society. There is a group
23 out of North Carolina and Louisiana State, the CERSA
24 group. They held a workshop a couple years ago
25 looking at all these issues. And so I just really

1 want to underscore that the agency really is engaged
2 in this area, continues to be engaged, and will do so
3 for at least the next year as sort of this data
4 really starts to come to light. We'll really get a
5 better handle on several of these aspects related to
6 exposure and risk assessment frameworks.

7 Next slide.

8 So just briefly, I just want to highlight
9 some additional activities that have happened since
10 the October 2021 report. So as was mentioned before,
11 you know, this workgroup that did continue in 2021,
12 there were additional meetings that have occurred
13 through May. And what really is going on now is that
14 original workgroup, sort of under the auspice of sort
15 of what the workgroup is meant to be, shorter in
16 duration, looking at a very specific charge, that
17 workgroup will be sort of disbanded, but there is a
18 new workgroup that has been ongoing. It does include
19 many of the same people, but it is open to new
20 members and, ultimately, new charge questions.

21 And so that group has been engaged with us
22 on the development of those new charge questions and
23 sort of the scope of what this next year may take on
24 regarding activities around emerging technology.

25 And so at this point, I think I'm going to

1 turn it over to Greg, assuming he's on.

2 SHANNON JEWELL: I see Greg on the line.

3 Actually, he looks like he may be stuck as an
4 attendee.

5 Troy, I don't seem to have the ability to
6 make Greg Watson a panelist, but he should be.

7 ZOOM SUPPORT: On it. Give me just a
8 second.

9 SHANNON JEWELL: Thank you.

10 ZOOM SUPPORT: Greg, you're going to see a
11 pop-up that says -- oh, I guess, he jumped.

12 SHANNON JEWELL: Great.

13 ZOOM SUPPORT: Any second now, he'll be
14 back.

15 SHANNON JEWELL: I see him.

16 ZOOM SUPPORT: All right. Greg, you are
17 unmuted.

18 GREG WATSON: Great. Thank you, everyone.

19 Sorry. Apologies on the -- I'm in the San Francisco
20 airport en route from a very excellent MRL workshop
21 where the Office of Pesticide Programs was very ably
22 represented by Michael Goodis, the Deputy Director.

23 So thank you, Amy, for taking us through
24 the report of last year's group. And what I'd like
25 to do is focus on the new charge questions that we

1 have put in force, and they really do try to build
2 and actually take a deeper dive, in some cases, into
3 some of the report that Amy went through.

4 I would like, before going into the charge
5 questions, again to commend EPA as Amy's outlined. I
6 am active in a number of the group's that Amy has
7 mentioned, particularly the OECD subgroup on drones.
8 Currently, I'm actually the chairperson of the
9 Interim Executive Committee of the Unmanned Aerial
10 Pesticide Application System Task Force that is
11 working on generating the data and information to
12 inform the regularity paradigm for UAV pesticide
13 application. So again, I just commend the agency for
14 all the work and outreach that Amy has gone through.

15 So to the specific new charge questions,
16 the first one that we want to consider is really
17 focused in the environmental justice space and really
18 trying to see is there information on availability
19 and affordability of emerging technologies to all
20 communities. I really just want to point out that
21 this is an informational effort really that EPA leads
22 and we'll certainly stay agnostic as to the emerging
23 technologies that come into the marketplace, but I
24 think it's important to think about how these are
25 emerging in terms of availability.

1 And I think there's some information that
2 we can bring to bear from what is happening in the
3 refitting of the existing space, of the existing
4 application equipment, as well as the emergence of a
5 contract workforce that would be able to deliver
6 equipment and technologies.

7 To move to the second one, to account for
8 the emerging technologies, what we really want is to
9 start thinking about us also providing some advice to
10 the OPP about a process for, again, looking at --
11 again, we've pointed out some of the, in last year's
12 report, additional data and information, we think
13 might be needed, how that, again, taking that next
14 step to start applying that information to risk
15 assessment practices, and evolving SOPs, or standard
16 operating procedures, that would take these emerging
17 technologies into account.

18 And then also thinking about how we would
19 update a regulatory approach to support emerging
20 technologies, including thinking about how using the
21 label amendment process that is in place and how that
22 could actually -- what are the kinds of language that
23 would help applicators understand how to best use
24 some of these technologies. And specifically, I
25 would like to point out that we have identified a

1 targeted application case study that is part of
2 answering those questions. And by the targeted
3 application, that vernacular is sometimes referred to
4 as spot spray.

5 In other words, you would use, as an
6 example, a technology, either a UAV that would have
7 scanning capacities to fly over a field or use
8 satellite images and then so that you identify
9 there's only sections of the particular field that
10 would need an application of the pesticide.

11 So that actually has several potential
12 implications on how the agency would think about its
13 current risk assessment practice. And so this would
14 then try to start for, okay, how would those
15 practices -- think about, you know, what would be the
16 process for looking at changes, why the additional
17 information would, you know, come to bear and to
18 change those assessments, because obviously the
19 exposure dynamic of a small section of field
20 application would be different.

21 And if we do this -- do a good job in our
22 workgroup on this, it actually could be agnostic to
23 application method, even though we're going to try to
24 provide some focus, start with the manned aerial and
25 the UAV application methods to try to give us some

1 focus for how we start thinking about that.

2 And the last charge question that we have
3 there is, again, just trying to continue to think
4 about how providing advice to the agency about how --
5 continuing on to developing a digital mind set. And,
6 certainly, the efforts on the digital label are an
7 excellent start.

8 Again, as Amy's heard me say in our
9 workgroup, I certainly know or believe that we will
10 have machine language delivering pesticide
11 application language to equipment, completely away
12 from any kind of paper label. So since that is going
13 to happen, we need to be at a place where we are
14 prepared for that.

15 Next slide, please.

16 And just to try to give kind of a status on
17 kind of where we are in the next steps, we have
18 volunteers that are identified to start working.
19 Particularly, we would like to commend Dr. Dan
20 Martin, who works with USDA ARS out of Texas A&M. He
21 was fundamental in bringing forward the idea for the
22 target application case study and he's agreed to lead
23 and facilitate that effort. And, certainly, we will
24 have other volunteers that will begin to weigh in to
25 to help in that particular case study.

1 I'm also happy that we have a commitment
2 from the Association Equipment Manufacturers Sprayer
3 Leadership team to help us begin to work on the all
4 communities question. They are very clearly, because
5 of their knowledge base and what is happening in the
6 equipment space, helpful to understand what is
7 happening in the retrofitting of existing equipment
8 to add things like auto steer and, actually,
9 identifying some places where that retrofitting may
10 not be possible at least to how it is emerging.

11 And, again, as Amy has mentioned, certainly
12 we're seeking additional volunteers from outside the
13 current roster to -- because these charge questions
14 are different, and that certainly if there is
15 interest in adding the volunteers to this kind of
16 work, we would welcome that.

17 And, again, as our goal is, as was last
18 year, to work toward delivering the final report from
19 this workgroup at the fall meeting of the PPDC.

20 And, again, I thank the agency for the
21 opportunity to work on these very important charge
22 questions, as well as this important topic, and,
23 again, look forward to feedback from the PPDC on what
24 we've presented to you today.

25 Thank you very much.

1 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Greg.

2 I'm going to open it up for PPDC discussion
3 now. So if you're a member of the PPDC, please raise
4 your hand to be recognized.

5 Mayra Reiter, you are recognized.

6 MAYRA REITER: Thank you. And thank you
7 both for that great presentation.

8 I'd just like to comment on the issue of
9 worker exposure. These new technologies have the
10 potential to reduce worker exposure, but I think that
11 some caution is needed. It was mentioned during the
12 presentation that we need a better understanding on
13 how exposure profiles will change with these new
14 technologies to assess risk. But as the new
15 technologies get deployed, there's also going to be a
16 need to monitor what's really going on in the fields,
17 to ensure that what is happening in the real world
18 aligns with expectations, and also that EPA can take
19 action promptly if any problems are found.

20 Thank you.

21 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Mayra.

22 Any other comments from or questions from
23 PPDC members? Remember, raise your hand. I'll
24 recognize you, and then you can unmute yourself and
25 enable your webcam to deliver your comments.

1 I see Jasmine Brown has her hand up.

2 Jasmine.

3 JASMINE BROWN: Thanks for your
4 presentation. I, more or less, just had a question
5 -- a clarifying question. Are drones still banned in
6 nine states or are they pretty much allowed in every
7 state?

8 AMY BLANKINSHIP: So it's kind of nuanced
9 sort of to there. So the agency here at the EPA, we
10 are not actively or overtly putting UAV language on
11 our labels here at the national level, but we do
12 understand and do give deference to the states that
13 if they want to consider that technology they can do
14 so. We do sort of recommend some sort of things that
15 they consider, such as that, you know, if you're
16 considering adding it to a label that aerial
17 application is not explicitly prohibited on the
18 label. That if somebody were to use that technology
19 that they would follow the label language and the
20 safety rules relative to that.

21 And so the states can consider approving
22 it, if you will, at the state level on a case-by-case
23 basis sort of with those considerations in mind, that
24 they do at least follow the current label and that
25 aerial application is not explicitly prohibited.

1 So I don't know if Ed is still on the line,
2 if he has anything else.

3 JASMINE BROWN: Well, I guess the reason
4 I'm asking is because pretty much all tribes or
5 Indian reservations have to go by the federal labels
6 and so, if it's not addressed on the federal label
7 then, like legally speaking, they may not be able to
8 be used legally. But that's kind of a question I'm
9 hoping the workgroup can maybe look into that.
10 Because if one of the charge questions is to have it
11 available for all communities, then I want to, you
12 know, hope that that would include tribal communities
13 as well.

14 ED MESSINA: Thanks. Amy, I am here, but I
15 think you answered the question appropriately and I
16 think we can have the PPDC talk about next steps.

17 One question I had was do we need the PPDC
18 to sort of vote on a new workgroup or was that
19 established the last one? I think that was what I
20 was a little hazy on.

21 AMY BLANKINSHIP: Is that question to me?

22 ED MESSINA: Or Greg.

23 GREG WATSON: Ed I think my recollection
24 is that we made a recommendation in the October
25 meeting to continue in this new form.

1 ED MESSINA: Yeah.

2 GREG WATSON: And then that was ratified by
3 the October PPDC.

4 ED MESSINA: Yep.

5 GREG WATSON: But that's, right now, for
6 me, a long-term memory. So certainly Shannon could
7 check the record.

8 ED MESSINA: No, that was my recollection,
9 too, and I just want to make sure I wasn't --

10 AMY BLANKINSHIP: That was mine as well,
11 but checking the transcript is a good idea, or the
12 record.

13 ED MESSINA: No, I -- we're good. I think
14 we're on the same page. So there is a new workgroup
15 that is focusing on these new charge questions. So
16 what, if any, advice or information, would you like
17 to hear from the PPDC? And I know you had your one
18 slide. Any other conversation or hands raised for
19 this group?

20 DANNY GIDDINGS: Damon Reabe.

21 ED MESSINA: I was going to call on you
22 anyway, Damon.

23 DAMON REABE: Hey, thanks. So I really
24 appreciate the work that the EPA has done and this
25 workgroup has done on this subject matter. I think

1 there's a very good, comprehensive plan for moving
2 forward. This committee has heard from me on this
3 subject at every meeting, since the subject was
4 brought forward, and I would like to reiterate the
5 importance of implementing existing technologies into
6 the risk assessment process.

7 There is work being done by the NAAA and
8 the EPA to use different inputs in the ag drift
9 model. Those inputs represent current aerial
10 application equipment. So it's not new technology,
11 it's existing technology. The risk assessments are
12 utilizing aircraft and setups that are reflective of
13 operations in the 1970s and '80s. So it's many
14 decades behind the actual equipment that's being
15 used. And I think, given the fact that we're coming
16 into a time where we're going to be working through
17 Endangered Species Act compliance, we have to
18 remember that label language is law, it's directive.

19 And we have presented the NAAA Tier 3
20 proposal to EPA as actual label -- that would be
21 enforceable label language, that results in a 68
22 percent reduction of offsite movement of pesticide
23 application from aerial application equipment.

24 There are many, many, many more further
25 refinements that can be done with the existing ag

1 drift model to have numbers closer to 90 percent that
2 can land on labels and be directive to aerial
3 applicators, all of which is enforceable language.

4 So I'm just, once again, going to reiterate
5 the importance of expediting that work and then
6 making way for the factors that we know affect spray
7 drift, which is primarily droplet size, knowing full
8 well that we can promote the development of
9 technology that changes the spray cloud itself that
10 would result in dramatic reductions in drift.

11 So I feel like this workgroup has done
12 amazing work and is going to continue to do amazing
13 work, but I think a big takeaway here is the EPA is
14 going to need to very quickly open up discussions and
15 serious consideration to dramatic changes in risk
16 assessment methodology using the existing model.

17 Thanks for the time.

18 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Damon.

19 Are there any other comments or questions
20 from PPDC members? Remember, you can raise your
21 hand, unmute yourself, and enable your webcam.

22 And just a quick reminder whether you're
23 commenting or presenting today from a workgroup,
24 watch your cadence as we have some special
25 interpreters in the background who are doing their

1 best to keep up and provide accurate translations and
2 doing a very good job, if I might add.

3 Well, hearing no other comments, I wonder
4 if we should go ahead and advance in the agenda, and
5 then we can recoup this time -- because I think the
6 workgroup session -- or, sorry, the Looking Forward
7 session is going to be pretty time-intensive.
8 There's some interactive elements.

9 So I would propose -- and Mr. Chairman, if
10 you agree with this -- to go on to the next session
11 on Good Laboratory Practices Inspection Introduction.

12 Does that work for you, Ed?

13 SHANNON JEWELL: I'm just looking to -- I
14 see Eric is here. I'm just looking to make sure
15 everyone's here, Danny.

16 DANNY GIDDINGS: Oh, okay.

17 SHANNON JEWELL: So I see Eric and Dan
18 Myers. So we would be looking for Mark Lehr.

19 GREG WATSON: So if I may, if I could be
20 potentially (inaudible). Greg Watson here. While
21 you're figuring that out, just to make this group
22 aware that the OECD working party on pesticides will
23 be convening and meeting in early or mid-June. Part
24 of that will be a consideration of the UAV subgroup
25 that was mentioned earlier and they actually are --

1 as part of that report will be detailed workplans for
2 the development of information that would help inform
3 the exposure modeling, very similar to what Damon has mentioned
4 (inaudible) trying to put together efforts to provide
5 data, as well as information that is available from
6 the literature, particularly through offsite movement and estimates
7 . So again, that is part of the
8 (inaudible).

9 Another one is workgroups who will be
10 established to work on best practices that will
11 actually, again, take use of existing best management
12 practice documents that exist around the world for
13 other types of application, but to try to make them
14 more specific and more applicable to UAV application.
15 So just, again, that's why the connection of EPA's
16 effort to the OECD ongoing work is very important
17 and, again, why that it's important we have so many
18 of the members of this emerging technology that
19 are working across the spaces that (inaudible) to
20 keep track of this work.

21 Thank you.

22 SHANNON JEWELL: Okay. Danny, all of the
23 GLP presenters are here. So you should be good to
24 go.

25 DANNY GIDDINGS: Wonderful. Let me make

1 sure that I am off mute and that my audio is back,
2 and I think it is. So let's go ahead and move on to
3 the Good Laboratory Practices Inspection Program
4 update.

5 I would like to introduce Eric Miederhoff,
6 Acting Chief, Dan Myers, and Mark Lehr, both
7 chemists, all in the Pesticides Waste and Toxics
8 Branch and Monitoring Assistance and Media Programs
9 Division in the Office of Enforcement and Compliance
10 Assurance.

11 Thank you for being here and welcome, and I
12 will cede the floor to you.

13 ERIC MIEDERHOFF: Thanks, Danny. Is that
14 slide deck -- okay, great.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 GOOD LABORATORY PRACTICES INSPECTION PROGRAM UPDATE

2 ERIC MIEDERHOFF: So first slide, please.

3 And just to go further with my own
4 introduction, I'm Eric Miederhoff, Acting Branch
5 Chief of the Pesticide Waste and Toxics Branch, which
6 includes the GLP Section. My previous time with EPA,
7 I worked in the OPP Program Office in various
8 capacities. So I'm excited to see pesticides from
9 OECA perspective.

10 Next slide.

11 So I understand -- and this predated my
12 time here, but I understand that last fall the GLP
13 Section came and introduced itself to the PPDC, and I
14 was happy to hear that there seemed like a lot of
15 interest in learning more about the program. And so
16 we're back today to talk in a little more detail
17 about current GLP activities and priorities.

18 Last fall, I understand that the current
19 state of inspections across OECA was discussed with
20 PPDC where there had been a cessation, to some
21 extent, of onsite inspections during the pandemic out
22 of concern for inspector safety. During that time,
23 the section was pursuing offsite compliance
24 monitoring activities at GLP facilities, and these
25 can include things like data audits and remote video

1 tours of different facilities.

2 I'm happy to report that the section is in
3 the process of phasing back in onsite inspections.
4 In fact, the director of the GLP program, Francis
5 Liem, is currently on an onsite inspection this week
6 with one of the newer inspectors. So we're very
7 happy to be getting back out in the field.

8 I'll talk a little bit about how
9 inspections are prioritized. I think this is kind of
10 a continuation of a question that came up in the last
11 discussion with PPDC, so I wanted to talk a little
12 bit more about that and answer that question here.

13 The question was whether -- or how
14 facilities which had received offsite compliance
15 monitoring, how they would then be prioritized, if at
16 all, for an onsite inspection when those resumed. So
17 the answer is that the regulations that govern GLP
18 program activities don't require that the program
19 inspect facilities on any sort of predetermined
20 schedule. The GLP program uses a neutral scheme
21 targeting algorithm to prioritize facilities for
22 inspection. And so facilities which were subject to
23 offsite compliance monitoring during the pandemic
24 won't be given consideration outside of those normal
25 targeting criteria unless there were compliance

1 concerns identified during the offsite compliance
2 monitoring activities which merit some sort of
3 followup or onsite inspection.

4 I also wanted to make you aware of two
5 different resources that provide public-facing data
6 on GLP inspections. The first, some of you may be
7 familiar with, is the ECHO database. This is EPA
8 Enforcement Compliance History Online. That provides
9 information on EPA inspections for all different
10 media, other pesticide inspections, like WPS
11 inspections, air, water, any type of inspection you
12 could think of. That also includes GLP. And both
13 offsite compliance monitoring activities and onsite
14 inspection data are available through ECHO.

15 The other is a more targeted resource for
16 the GLP Program. It's a webpage just for GLP on the
17 compliance website. It provides a high level of
18 detail on the facility names, the dates of
19 inspections, and the inspection status. At this
20 point in time, though, only onsite inspections are
21 covered in this resource. Since the offsite
22 compliance monitoring was a fairly recent development
23 for the GLP program, we're still discussing how that
24 might be reflected on the website and be part of the
25 program going forward.

1 Were there any questions on those issues?

2 Okay. If not, we'll go ahead and advance
3 to the next slide and I'll --

4 DANNY GIDDINGS: Wait a minute, Eric. We
5 do have a question from Charlotte Sanson.

6 Charlotte, go ahead.

7 ERIC MIEDERHOFF: Okay.

8 CHARLOTTE SANSON: Yes, thank you very much
9 for that update. It's much appreciated.

10 And you may have said it and I might have
11 missed it. So is there a backlog of facilities that
12 are to be inspected or, you know, based on -- I know
13 they were doing a lot of virtually and now you're
14 back in the field. So I was just curious as to, you
15 know, where -- if you're still catching up or if you
16 feel like you've been able to maintain the pace
17 that's needed for the inspections.

18 ERIC MIEDERHOFF: Yeah, so that's an
19 interesting question to try and answer. So I
20 wouldn't say that there's a backlog necessarily.
21 It's sort of like, you know, we use the targeting
22 algorithm to start from where we are now and say, you
23 know, what are the most critical facilities to go out
24 and inspect, you know, right now. And, you know, of
25 course, we'll try and do as many as we can, as

1 resources allow.

2 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you for that. Are
3 there any other questions on this part of the
4 presentation?

5 All right. Eric, I believe you're good to
6 continue.

7 ERIC MIEDERHOFF: Thanks. So I'll go ahead
8 and introduce Dan Myers to talk about the next topic.

9 DAN MYERS: Okay. Thanks, Eric, and good
10 afternoon, everyone. I'm Dan Myers, a senior
11 inspector with the EPA GLP program and EPA's delegate
12 to the OECD GLP working party.

13 So I'll be talking about one of the
14 exciting things that are happening within our
15 program, and that is how our country and our GLP
16 Program is tied to 45 other countries -- 38 other
17 countries that are in the OECD's -- Organization for
18 Economic Cooperation and Development -- mutual
19 acceptance of data program.

20 So just as some quick background, our GLP
21 Program assures the quality of data that's being
22 submitted to regulatory authorities so that safety
23 term determinations can be made, and we have a high
24 level of confidence in the quality of that data.

25 That doesn't just apply to us within the

1 United States. Other countries have those same
2 concerns and especially when we are utilizing data
3 that gets generated in other countries or these other
4 OECD MAD countries are relying on data that's
5 generated in the United States.

6 So the question becomes, how are we all
7 assured that we can rely on this safety data? And
8 that is through making sure that these participating
9 countries have a viable inspection program that is
10 consistent with our program and consistent with
11 requirements of an overall governing entity, known as
12 the OECD, and then from that or under that, this
13 Mutual Acceptance of Data Program.

14 So through the Mutual Acceptance of Data
15 Program, each country is required to have their
16 monitoring authorities evaluated every so often. And
17 what that entails is the OECD will pick some
18 inspectors or evaluators from participating countries
19 and ask them if they would be willing to conduct an
20 onsite evaluation of another country's monitoring
21 program.

22 So that happens -- every 10 years, each of
23 these 38 countries that are part of this MAD Program
24 -- and there are other countries who are working to
25 come on board to be part of OECD's MAD -- but every

1 10 years, there is an onsite evaluation to assure all
2 the other participating countries, as well as this
3 overall governing body of the OECD, to make sure that
4 each country's monitoring authority meets a certain
5 level of quality to assure people that the safety
6 data is going to be reliable.

7 Next slide, please.

8 So even though the EPA started with the GLP
9 regulations in the 1980s, we still don't get a pass
10 with this onsite evaluation. So 10 years -- actually
11 more than that, I think 12 years has gone by -- it's
12 been delayed because of the pandemic, but our onsite
13 evaluation for the EPA for pesticides and toxic
14 substances is going to happen this year. The week of
15 July 25 is when it's scheduled to happen.

16 We have been in contact with the
17 evaluators. There have been two evaluators assigned,
18 one from Malaysia and the lead OECD evaluator for our
19 compliance monitoring authority or for us, the GLP
20 Program, is from Portugal.

21 In addition to that, there is a process
22 where new evaluators, who may be evaluating another
23 country in the future, need to go through a training
24 process, and they do that by -- one of the steps is
25 observing an onsite evaluation. So in addition to

1 that, we'll be having an observer attend our onsite
2 evaluation from France.

3 They will come over and evaluate our
4 program, which has already started. It's not just a
5 week long thing. We have been in constant
6 communication with OECD and the evaluators. There
7 are certain steps and requirements that are needed by
8 the host country prior to an OSE, some of which are
9 filling out questionnaires and information and
10 starting sections of a report that provides insight
11 on our program from top to bottom, how many
12 inspectors we have, the qualifications of inspectors,
13 what our authority is to go in and conduct
14 inspections, confidentiality procedures, what our
15 steps are for conducting inspections. All of that is
16 taking place prior to our actual physical onsite
17 evaluation. And that's something that's ongoing,
18 sharing of documents, standard operating procedures,
19 et cetera.

20 Eventually, on July 24th, which is a
21 Sunday, the inspectors or the evaluators, and myself
22 included, will arrive in Washington D.C., and on
23 Monday, the 25th, in the morning, we'll start our
24 actual onsite evaluation with meetings in Washington
25 D.C., and that will encompass getting to know each

1 other, having presentations from different programs
2 within the U.S. EPA, so that the evaluators can learn
3 about our system, and then any questions from these
4 previous documents that they've reviewed, we can
5 start to talk about those.

6 Eventually, on that Monday, we will leave
7 the D.C. area and move to a facility that claims
8 compliance with the GLP regulations and our program
9 will conduct an actual GLP inspection of this
10 facility. And these evaluators will be in attendance
11 and they will be reviewing us. So this is kind of a
12 next step up. Instead of just inspecting a specific
13 company for compliance, these evaluators will be
14 inspecting us, the GLP Program, the compliance
15 monitoring authority for compliance with requirements
16 set forth by the OECD MAD working party.

17 They'll make sure that we're asking the
18 right questions. If there are problems found at a
19 facility, that we follow up on those problems, that
20 we're not missing anything that's required during the
21 inspection, and just making sure that the inspection
22 goes smoothly and we're educated on the subject
23 matter.

24 After the onsite inspection of the facility
25 is concluded, the EPA, us, the GLP Program, will have

1 a closing conference for the facility, like we always
2 do at any inspection. And then we'll travel back to
3 Washington D.C., where at the end of that week we'll
4 have closing conferences for our OECD onsite
5 evaluation. There we'll discuss any issues that
6 might have come up, we'll discuss any concerns that
7 the evaluators may have with our program and try to
8 rectify any documents that need to be updated or need
9 to be sent to them if they haven't seen them, any
10 loose ends, tie those up.

11 Eventually, the evaluators will go back to
12 their respective countries and write a final report
13 or complete the final OECD onsite evaluation report
14 and submit that to the OECD. They'll be doing that
15 while working with us. If there are any outstanding
16 questions or if there are any deficiencies that have
17 been found, those will get rectified during this
18 report writing phase.

19 I'm happy to say that I believe this is our
20 third onsite evaluation -- it may be our fourth; I'm
21 not really sure -- definitely our third, and I'm
22 pleased and proud to report that we've had no
23 outstanding issues with any of our previous
24 evaluations, and I have no reason to believe that
25 there would be any issues with our current onsite

1 evaluation.

2 Speaking in general terms, if there were
3 any issues that come up during an onsite evaluation
4 of any country involved in the mutual acceptance of
5 data program, there is a system set up for discussing
6 those issues with the host country and setting up
7 corrective action procedures, which are agreed upon
8 by the evaluators, the host country, and the OECD MAD
9 Program, and I'll follow through with those -- any
10 corrective actions and evaluations from there on.
11 And the overall authority on whether the corrective
12 actions have been taken appropriately would lie
13 within the OECD GLP working party.

14 That's the conclusion of my portion of the
15 presentation. You can go to the next slide, please.
16 And I don't know if now's a good time to ask if there
17 are any questions or we should continue on.

18 DANNY GIDDINGS: We'll go ahead and do a
19 quick question and answer.

20 Are there any questions for Dan Myers?

21 John Wise, you're recognized.

22 JOHN WISE: Again, thank you for your work
23 and all you do, and I know for sure that especially
24 crop growers in the United States really see the
25 value of the mutual acceptance of data and being able

1 to harmonize regulations around the world. We
2 totally get that.

3 Occasionally, what I've experienced when I
4 have my GLP hat on and have people conducting trials
5 and getting data to submit to EPA is that there are
6 protocol constraints coming from other members, not
7 U.S. EPA, but other country members that are not
8 particularly science-based, in my opinion, kind of
9 arbitrary, and they put a lot of hardship on those of
10 us that are trying to collect these data for the sake
11 of our growers.

12 So I'm interested in knowing whether you
13 kind of recognize that and what steps that you,
14 representing the U.S. EPA, can lean in and try to
15 persuade those countries to become what I view as
16 more science-based, as I think you, in the U.S. EPA,
17 are compared to some of them. That's all I wanted to
18 know.

19 DAN MYERS: Yeah, thanks, John. Good
20 point.

21 So, yes, that is something that we, at the
22 GLP working party within the OECD, are very aware of
23 and constantly striving -- that is the main goal of
24 the MAD Program is to harmonize guidelines,
25 regulations, principles to make sure that that one

1 country isn't -- that there aren't constraints put on
2 one country and not another.

3 So there are working groups within our
4 working party that are constantly evaluating any of
5 these issues that come to our attention. And in
6 addition to that, there are meetings -- yearly
7 meetings where all the countries get together and
8 there's ample opportunity to bring up any of these
9 inconsistencies or anywhere that the GLP principles
10 or guidelines are not harmonized.

11 So that is something very aware -- we are
12 all very aware of and something that we're all
13 working towards, making sure that what's required in
14 one country is required in all the countries and,
15 also, it makes sense. We don't have one group of
16 inspectors that are requiring certain things that
17 other groups are not. So there's continual
18 discussion there, continually striving to harmonize
19 our procedures.

20 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you.

21 I want to now give the floor over to
22 Charlotte Sanson.

23 CHARLOTTE SANSON: Yes, thank you. And,
24 Dan, thank you for the overview on that. Definitely
25 the work that you all are doing is very much

1 appreciated.

2 And so I -- and I think you might have
3 partially already answered this, but I was curious as
4 to what drives the 10-year cycle on the onsite
5 evaluations. And I was going to ask if you had
6 discussions in between, and apparently, you know,
7 based on what you said you do, but I was curious
8 about the 10 year-cycle and sort of the thought
9 process, you know, behind that, because obviously
10 this is critically important to the success of the
11 program. And, again, thank you very much.

12 DAN MYERS: Yeah, thank you, Charlotte. So
13 there are guidance documents that have been generated
14 at the OECD level on many issues, and one of the
15 issues is these onsite evaluations, and it sets up
16 guidelines for how they take place, who has to be
17 involved, the qualification of the onsite evaluators,
18 as well as the time frame. And it's listed in there
19 the time schedule of 10 years. That document was
20 written well before I was involved, so I don't know
21 how that 10-year period came up. But it is the
22 guidance that all 38 MAD countries -- currently 38
23 and more in the future -- have to abide by.

24 Now, one thing I did not mention and that
25 is if there are issues that happen during an onsite

1 evaluation that require a corrective action, then an
2 onsite evaluation sooner than the 10 years can
3 happen. There can be a follow up visit to make sure
4 that that country would be in compliance with
5 requirements by the MAD countries.

6 DANNY GIDDINGS: All right. I see no other
7 hands, so, Dan, I'm going to kick it back to you or,
8 I suppose, perhaps to Mark for the next part of the
9 presentation.

10 DAN MYERS: That's correct. Thanks.

11 MARK LEHR: Good afternoon, everybody.
12 Dan, as he mentioned is our OECD delegate,
13 specialists in the GLP Program. We're both chemists.
14 Both have been doing GLP inspections for many, many
15 years. My job is targeting. I'm the primary point
16 person for our program for targeting, and, also, I
17 get to play with a lot of great new tech that we've
18 now been able to start implementing in the GLP
19 Program thanks to our PRIA funding.

20 So Smart Tools is an inspection management
21 software that we've developed -- or not we, not the
22 GLP Program, but people in Smart Tools have developed
23 together and organize document evidence that we are
24 collecting in the field. And we believe that it will
25 help improve our quality and our consistency in the

1 inspection process. It's already being used in other
2 inspection programs under RCRA and I believe a couple
3 of other programs. So we're now bringing that into
4 the GLP Program. And, again, because of PRIA, we are
5 able to sort of scoot to the beginning or the front
6 of the line because we're ready with funding.

7 We hope that it will reduce our report
8 turnaround time and our reporting to the laboratory
9 once we've completed the inspection and then
10 reporting to our partners, such OCE for civil
11 enforcement or OPP for scientific issues, and get
12 that flow. We're already pretty good at it. We
13 have, you know, requirements on how fast we need to
14 turn our inspection reports around, but this will
15 make it better and keep our quality where it needs to
16 be.

17 Smart Tools is going to support all phases
18 of the inspection process from the beginning, when
19 we're rooting around in Documentum, pulling studies
20 that have been submitted to the Office of Pesticide
21 Programs. We're collecting all that data at the
22 beginning of the inspection, doing our due process
23 initially, all the way through to gathering evidence
24 as we go through the inspection phase -- various
25 phases of the inspection, all the way then to peer

1 review and then again to a dissemination to our
2 various partners.

3 Collecting documents will be better
4 organized. Managing the inspectors' own
5 documentation will be better organized, such as their
6 own notes and any potential evidence that might
7 support our observations.

8 Next slide, please.

9 Smart Tools was beautifully written and
10 really impressive in the way it has a very logical
11 workflow design, which will help guide the inspectors
12 through the process. And, again, not to harp on
13 PRIA, but we've also been able to hire new
14 inspectors, and we have three new inspectors, two
15 that have never been on an onsite inspection yet
16 because of the pandemic, but it will help in their
17 training and help organize as they go through a very
18 complicated process. And when they are out on their
19 own and we're not there necessarily with our
20 experience, they can rely on this technology to help
21 guide them and organize them through the process of
22 doing a proper GLP inspection.

23 The GLP regulations will be there in a
24 drop-down menu design that corresponds to the area of
25 the laboratory that they're looking at whether it's,

1 you know, the instrumentation or archives, or what
2 have you.

3 As I've mentioned, any notes made by an
4 inspector can be organized, including the photos, and
5 we'll be used utilizing -- I'm thinking like a
6 detachable screen, like a pad, that can be pulled off
7 the keyboard so we can walk around with a stylus,
8 taking notes, which will go right into the system's
9 text system, and you can use that pad to take a photo
10 and then bring that right into the appropriate area
11 of the report.

12 Best of all, Smart Tools we will create a
13 draft report that will include all the supporting
14 documentation, which will greatly, again, enhance our
15 speed, and I believe most inspection reports will be
16 nearly complete by the time the onsite inspection is
17 completed. So once the inspector gets back to the
18 office or back to their home office, wherever they're
19 located, it's essentially just a matter of going
20 through, making sure everything is organized and
21 ready to go, and then it can go right into a peer
22 review in a very -- again, a very slick workflow
23 design.

24 Next slide, please.

25 We've already begun working on this. We've

1 wireframed it. We're ready to start writing code. I
2 think we're hoping to have this in sort of a pilot or
3 test operation in our field testing in about mid-
4 2023. We're crossing our fingers and knocking on
5 wood, of course.

6 Future plans include to add potentially a
7 targeting component, but I need to add quickly that
8 that's not in our scope of work currently. It's part
9 of our wish list going forward. We need to get the
10 system online first and then we'll add the various
11 things that -- or additional things that we'd like to
12 see, including an uplink flow of Smart Tools data to
13 our ICIS system, which is our central repository for
14 inspection report findings, and then the ECHO link
15 that Eric was talking about earlier.

16 But as you can see, included in blue there,
17 are the various steps in our inspection process once
18 we've completed the inspection, and that is the
19 writing that report. Because Smart Tools creates a
20 file, all that data, all the documentation for that
21 report is in Smart Tools.

22 So other inspectors that are doing a peer
23 review simply need to go to that file, that can go
24 directly to our supervisor, Francisco Liem, for an
25 agency review to determine what path that report

1 Tools is very, very flexible, and whether it's an
2 offsite compliance monitoring activity, as we've done
3 during the pandemic the last couple of years, or an
4 onsite, it could be utilized either way.

5 Clearly, we wouldn't necessarily be taking
6 pictures of the laboratory, but with the offsite
7 compliance monitoring activity that we do we can
8 record the -- we have a remote video component to
9 that where people are walking through with a camera
10 and showing us through video the laboratory, and when
11 we can zoom in on various things and we can certainly
12 record that and that could certainly be part of the
13 inspection report. But it's very, very flexible and
14 I'm excited for it to be utilized in different ways.

15 CHARLOTTE SANSON: Thank you.

16 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you.

17 Nathan Donley, you are recognized.

18 NATHAN DONLEY: Thank you, and thanks for
19 your presentation. I think that, you know, the GLP
20 Program is incredibly important. Since it's been
21 implemented, fraud in industry research has gone down
22 considerably. At least I hope it has. I'm pretty
23 sure it has. And so it's an incredibly important
24 program to ensure, you know, scientific integrity in
25 some of these studies, and I'm glad that we have such

1 a good oversight of it.

2 And then my next thing is really just more
3 of a general comment, and that's just that I think
4 this discussion lacks from having a separate parallel
5 discussion about how GLP is utilized in EPA's risk
6 assessment process. I've looked through so many risk
7 assessments. I've read through so many of them. And
8 I would estimate probably 90 percent of all
9 quantitative risk thresholds are developed from
10 industry GLP studies. So the peer-reviewed
11 scientific literature is often systematically
12 discounted. You know, these studies -- GLP is a
13 great fraud prevention tool, but the justification
14 for discounting a lot of peer-reviewed research is
15 GLP, and the implicit message there being that GLP is
16 somehow a measure of scientific quality, which it has
17 never been and it is not.

18 It's a great fraud prevention tool, but
19 it's not a measure of scientific quality. I think
20 it's being utilized that way incorrectly by the EPA
21 and it's ultimately having major public health
22 consequences. Industry studies, you know, typically
23 are more favorable to their products than studies
24 done by independent researchers and, you know, this
25 has been demonstrated time and again in the

1 literature. And, you know, I just think having that
2 perspective there, that the GLP is a fraud prevention
3 tool, it does nothing to prevent bias. And when
4 you're using it as a measure of scientific quality,
5 you could actually be biasing your own assessment
6 towards the safety of a product rather than the harms
7 of a product.

8 So I would love to see a parallel
9 discussion going on here about how EPA utilizes GLP
10 in its risk assessments and how that can be
11 supported in a more scientifically robust manner.

12 Thanks.

13 MARK LEHR: If I may just add to that a
14 little bit, this is something that came up maybe -- I
15 remember hearing it maybe 20 years ago. That kind of
16 dates me. But I can't speak for the entire EPA, but
17 I can speak for, I believe, the GLP Program. It is a
18 quality management system. It is a quality tool to
19 help to ensure the quality integrity of studies
20 coming in. And you're correct, it does not ensure
21 good science, bottom line.

22 One of the important things, again,
23 speaking from a GLP representative, is we hire
24 scientists because of that scientific component, and
25 we're looking at the quality control, we're looking

1 at the bias. One of the questions we engage -- or I
2 personally engaged in is a discussion on methodology,
3 you know, how it was selected; you know, the quality
4 control that's built into the method, how was that
5 determined. If it's a method that's taken from
6 something else, you know, what was the process, the
7 thought process in developing that methodology.

8 So every GLP inspection that I do, and I'd
9 note I do believe I can speak for Dan on this as
10 well, we do incorporate a lot of science. But GLP --
11 the regulations, you're correct, do not ensure good
12 quality science. They help ensure good quality data
13 or quality integrity of the data. So it's making
14 sure there is a protocol. But, you know, the quality
15 of that protocol needs to be evaluated on a case-by-
16 case basis.

17 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you. Are there any
18 other questions or comments from PPDC members?

19 Charlotte has her hand up again. Go ahead.

20 CHARLOTTE SANSON: Yeah, thank you. And I
21 meant to ask this question when Dan was speaking
22 earlier on the mutual acceptance of data. And I know
23 this is something that had come up a few years ago,
24 and maybe it would be helpful to have an update,
25 because there have been some concerns with regards to

1 China and their willingness, or maybe lack of, to
2 participate in the mutual acceptance of data process.
3 And so I was wondering if you could share anything
4 on, you know, kind of an update on that or the
5 potential to change the timeline on that. Thank you,

6 DAN MYERS: Yeah. So I don't know if I can
7 give you an actual timeline, but you're correct. The
8 U.S. EPA was working with China to set up a
9 monitoring authority there with respect to
10 pesticides. And there was a lot of work done over
11 many years and evaluations, and we went over there
12 and had discussions and training sessions with them;
13 they came over to the United States to do that as
14 well.

15 The goal of that was to set up a bilateral
16 agreement or a memorandum of understanding between
17 our country and theirs for acceptance of data and
18 sharing of data between our two countries. This was
19 not the only time that's happened. Other countries
20 have bilateral agreements with other countries.

21 The OECD has taken a look at that and has
22 started to move more towards the feeling of the
23 entire point of the mutual acceptance of data is that
24 we're all harmonized, we're all on the same page,
25 everybody's held to the same standards level, we're

1 all governed by the same body. And there's a
2 movement to not have bilateral agreements with other
3 countries and move towards getting countries as part
4 of this overall mutual acceptance of data under OECD.
5 And that's what's happening with China.

6 So specifically with us, we had an initial
7 letter of intent that has expired and we currently
8 are not pursuing a bilateral agreement with China.
9 They are still involved in OECD discussions and they
10 are still working towards becoming a member of them,
11 maybe, but I don't have a timeline on when that is
12 going to take place. But they would need to do what
13 every other country does, and that is develop their
14 compliance monitoring authority, demonstrate to OECD
15 that they are ready to have an initial onsite
16 evaluation, and then go through that evaluation and
17 then become a member of MAD.

18 DANNY GIDDINGS: Great. Thank you.

19 Any other question or comment from PPDC
20 members before we take a quick five-minute break and
21 then move on to our next session?

22 I'd recognize Dave Tamayo.

23 DAVE TAMAYO: Yeah, thank you. I just
24 wanted to follow up on Nathan's comment about the
25 need to have a discussion on the scientific merit of

1 the data and how that's considered by EPA. And I'd
2 like to see that maybe to be an agenda item on a
3 future meeting.

4 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Dave.

5 DAN MYERS: Yeah, I just will add real
6 quick that, you know, I appreciate both those
7 comments about the value of GLP data and that's
8 something that we can certainly engage with OPP on
9 and perhaps have a further discussion on in the near
10 future.

11 DANNY GIDDINGS: All right. Seeing no
12 other hands raised, I suggest that we take a quick
13 five-minute break, though I do see Ed is on and looks
14 like he is itching to say something.

15 ED MESSINA: Well, I just wanted to say hi
16 to Dan and Mark. It's been a while. Good seeing you
17 guys. And then thanks to Eric for his leadership. I
18 used to manage this program and so appreciate all the
19 great work that's been continuing and glad you're
20 finally getting your inspection tools. So it sounds
21 good.

22 DAN MYERS: Thanks, Ed. Good to see you.

23 DANNY GIDDINGS: Yes, thank you, Dan and
24 Mark for being here.

25 Let's take a quick five-minute break and

1 we'll reconvene right before 2:30 for our next
2 session.

3 (Break.)

4 DANNY GIDDINGS: Good afternoon,
5 everyone, and welcome back from break. We're now
6 about to launch into our much anticipated, at least
7 by me since I've been trying to announce it all day,
8 update on progress made on the October 2021
9 recommendations from the Farmworker and Clinician
10 Training Workgroup.

11 You may remember that this workgroup
12 has since disbanded, but we are joined by our EPA
13 co-chairs, Carolyn Schroeder, who is Chief of the
14 Certification and Worker Protection Branch, and Steve
15 Schaible, Pesticide Registration Improvement Act
16 Coordinator, and we also have with us Aidan Black,
17 who is an Environmental Protection Specialist in the
18 Certification and Worker Protection Branch.

19 Welcome, Carolyn, Steve, and Aidan. And I
20 will just remind you, as well as everyone else, to
21 speak slowly so our interpreters can accurately
22 interpret what you're saying to our Spanish-speaking
23 community.

24 And with that, I cede the floor to you.

25 STEVE SCHAIBLE: Great. Thanks, Danny.

1 FARMWORKER AND CLINICIAN TRAINING WORKGROUP UPDATE

2 STEVE SCHAIBLE: I'm Steve Schaible. I am
3 the PRIA Coordinator in the Office of Pesticide
4 Programs, and along with Carolyn and Aidan, I'd like
5 to thank the PPDC for the opportunity to present this
6 report-out on the Farmworker and Clinician Training
7 Workgroup recommendations, as well as EPA's
8 consideration of those recommendations to date.

9 As Danny mentioned, our workgroup did
10 choose to disband after the recommendations were
11 presented to the EPA, following the fall PPDC
12 meeting. While the work group was discontinued,
13 evaluation of those recommendations have been ongoing
14 within the EPA.

15 In addition, one of the reasons there was a
16 comfort level in disbanding was that there is a
17 standing quarterly stakeholder meeting with
18 farmworker advocacy groups which allows the
19 opportunity for further discussion of and feedback
20 from stakeholders regarding EPA's implementation of
21 the recommendations.

22 So in terms of what we're going to go over
23 today, we'll go over the roster of the workgroup, the
24 charge questions that were presented to the
25 workgroup, some background behind those charge

1 questions, and a description of sort of the worker
2 safety activities partnership grants and Pesticide
3 Safety Education Program activities that EPA
4 administers funded in part, or all, from PRIA set-
5 asides. And then we'll get into the recommendations
6 themselves, the farmworker training recommendations
7 and the clinician training recommendations. Our
8 workgroup did choose to break into two subgroups, and
9 we have two sets of recommendations that came from
10 each of those subgroups.

11 We will hit on an ongoing effort now to
12 reauthorize PRIA a year earlier than its expiration
13 date and how that could feed into this effort, and
14 then finally we'll take feedback and questions from
15 the PPDC.

16 There is an appendix with the slides that
17 talks about the PRIA 4 background and the reporting
18 requirements and lists out the recommendations from
19 each of the subgroups' input.

20 Next slide, please.

21 Okay. So this is our workgroup roster.
22 There was a variety of stakeholders in our workgroup,
23 which was great, I think we felt we got a broad
24 spectrum of opinions and had some really rich
25 discussions around the effectiveness and

1 appropriateness of the activities.

2 The workgroup co-chair was Mily Treviño-
3 Sauceda. She's from Alianza Nacional de Campesinas.
4 And then Carolyn and I were the co-chairs on the EPA
5 side. I would also like to recognize the efforts of
6 Aidan Black, Meleia Rose and Rachel Eberius (phonetic)
7 from Carolyn's branch and from our Pesticide
8 Reevaluation Division. They helped facilitate group
9 discussions and their efforts were greatly
10 appreciated.

11 So, within this, I won't go through the
12 individuals specifically for the sake of time, but I
13 can say that the representation on the workgroup was
14 from farmworker advocacy groups, industry and
15 industry trade groups, other Federal Government
16 agencies -- and notably in that is NIOSH CDC that
17 administers the Sensor Program -- as well as state
18 level government institutions responsible for WPS
19 implementation.

20 So with that, next slide, please.

21 So the charge questions, for those members
22 that are new to the PPDC, I can give a brief amount
23 of background. Carolyn's going to do a deeper dive
24 on this in a little bit. But PRIA is the Pesticide
25 Registration Improvement Act, and it's a fee-for-

1 service law that provides EPA fees for EPA review of
2 applications. These are one-time fees for review of
3 the applications that are submitted. These are for
4 like new active ingredients, new uses, new products.
5 And then it also authorizes maintenance fees that are
6 annual fees for evaluation of existing products.

7 And there are set-asides specifically under
8 the PRIA fees for worker safety activities,
9 partnership grants, and the Pesticide Safety
10 Education Program.

11 Prior to PRIA 4, EPA had a -- there were
12 annual reporting requirements specified in the law on
13 sort of what were the monies we spent toward these
14 activities and what were the products that were
15 produced for these activities. In PRIA 4, there was
16 some additional language that was added that got at,
17 you know, more of the outcomes around those
18 activities, and then, specifically, there was
19 language on that EPA would evaluate the
20 appropriateness and the effectiveness of the
21 activities, that we would engage with stakeholders
22 around, you know, basically, the development of the
23 grant criteria, by which those grants were awarded,
24 and then EPA would receive summaries from
25 stakeholders on their views on the appropriateness

1 and effectiveness of our use of those funds.

2 So those very much informed our charge
3 questions. I will say that what we got back related
4 and addressed these charge questions, but also was a
5 much broader feedback on sort of the views on how EPA
6 could do a better job within these activities.

7 With that, next slide. I'll turn it over
8 to Carolyn.

9 CAROLYN SCHROEDER: Okay. Hello, everyone.
10 I was going to cover just going from where Steve
11 mentioned about the charge questions and the PRIA 4
12 set-asides. I wanted to briefly cover where those
13 allocations go and what cooperative agreements --
14 those are a type of grant -- are funded through the
15 PRIA 4.

16 On this slide, there's some basic
17 information, and if you want a little bit more detail
18 for the amounts and such, there is more in the
19 appendix on these programs.

20 So the three set-asides is worker
21 protection activities, a partnership grant, and the
22 Pesticide Safety Education Program. There are three
23 cooperative agreements that receive funds from the
24 set-aside for worker protection activities. It's the
25 National Farmworker Training Program and the

1 Pesticide Resource Education Collaborative, PERC, and
2 the Health Care Initiative, which is PERC-Med, and
3 you'll hear those over and over during this
4 presentation. So I just wanted to raise those early.

5 We don't cover much in this presentation
6 regarding the partnership grant and the Pesticide
7 Safety Education. Those were really outside of the
8 scope of where we were focusing our attention on the
9 farmworker and the health care provider training
10 related to pesticide safety and the worker protection
11 standard. But I do also want to include those here
12 because they also contribute to the worker safety and
13 received the pesticide funds.

14 Something to raise here, as well, is that
15 one of the reasons this is so important to this
16 workgroup is because a lot of the implementation and
17 some of the recommendations are related to how we can
18 improve the grantee work and really where we have
19 that ability is most -- is in the request for
20 applications, at that initiation of these grants.
21 They tend to run in five-year cycles. And on that
22 implementation, we put out a request for applications
23 in RFA, and then in that RFA, we define what that
24 criteria is.

25 We follow grant guidance and requirements

1 -- funding requirements, but there is a programmatic
2 element to that where we really come into play, and
3 we can define what kind of work we're looking to get
4 done, what are the goals, what are we trying to
5 accomplish with that grant funding. And a lot of the
6 recommendations you'll see come back to that. And at
7 the start of a new cooperative agreement really is an
8 ideal time for us to, you know, tweak, play with the
9 language, figure out what are we looking for
10 incorporating into this new grant cycle.

11 You know, we do also put some of our staff
12 resources and funding that is not PRIA-related -- and
13 that's like our -- I'll call it our discretionary
14 funds, so these are funded by more than just the PRIA
15 set-asides. And some of our work falls outside of
16 these cooperative agreements as well. We've funded
17 some from contracts and other -- you know, other
18 engagements, and I'll highlight some of those as we
19 go forward, but I wanted to mention that we didn't
20 really stay in the bounds of what PRIA is doing. We
21 wanted to look at the program, the Worker Safety
22 Program, and what can we do to improve it and really
23 consider these recommendations more broadly.

24 Next slide, please.

25 So we're really going to move into now the

1 two different subgroups. I'm going to cover the
2 farmworker training recommendations and we'll spend a
3 little time here before moving on to the health care
4 provider recommendations. On this slide, there is a
5 nifty word cloud where we looked -- and that's how we
6 really kind of started off was just like let's get
7 into this, what are the frequent -- what are themes
8 that were coming up. And you see, you know,
9 "training" and "workers" and these "organizations"
10 and "farmworkers," "trainers," "worker protection
11 standard." It just really kind of got us into that
12 mind set. And what we really didn't -- this slide
13 does not cover in detail -- I think just for time
14 what we did is we tried to summarize what the
15 recommendations were.

16 There is a link on the slide deck if you
17 have it that takes you to the webpage where all the
18 full list of recommendations are, as well as in the
19 appendix we pasted them there for reference.

20 But really what I wanted to cover here is
21 that there were six high priority recommendations
22 provided and then things that were maybe a little
23 outside the scope or of lower priority. Sometimes
24 they weren't of lower priority, they just were
25 outside of the scope of the charge questions. They

1 were lumped into an "other recommendations." We
2 looked at all of these recommendations.

3 So there were about 15 recommendations in
4 all and they're all on the farmworker training and
5 how we can enhance that. Some of the themes that are
6 identified from this list of recommendations were,
7 you know, how can we improve these RFAs in the
8 future, to make sure that farmworkers, farmworker
9 organizations, worker protection trainers, they're
10 involved in the development and evaluation of those
11 training materials, now having that feedback loop and
12 that target audience contributing to improving those
13 materials.

14 And (inaudible) about improving the process
15 for training -- I kind of lumped the two together
16 here.

17 I'll move on to the third bullet. Require
18 farmworker training to work within the cultural
19 context of the audience, really taking into account
20 how the adult learner learns or what language they
21 may speak, what cultural background they have come
22 from that might help in making sure that the worker
23 protection standard safety messages are heard and
24 understood and can impact their behavior.

25 Ensure the better compliance and

1 enforcement of the training requirements, and then,
2 increasing the rigor, thoroughness, and effectiveness
3 of training. There is really a lot of focus that
4 comes back to how can we make sure that the training
5 is effective.

6 And then on the next couple slides when we
7 get there, I will mention that we did reference some
8 of these specific recommendations by number in
9 parentheses. I don't think you need to focus too
10 much during the presentation on that, but if you'd
11 like to look at it a little closer after the
12 presentation or follow along. We didn't think of
13 those -- the recommendations that we cited as
14 comprehensive, but it does tie back to where we're
15 connecting some of the progress and future projects
16 back to those recommendations.

17 And we can move on to the next slide.

18 So we really want to cover a little bit of
19 the progress. We really did carefully review the
20 recommendation and evaluated how they're being
21 addressed. I will caveat that by saying "in part
22 by." We don't think our job is done, and we'll get
23 to that. But we really wanted to highlight some of
24 the work and ways that we've been taking stakeholder
25 feedback, activities that we've currently or recently

1 have done to address some of these recommendations
2 that we're hearing.

3 And this slide, we're really covering, you
4 know, providing more opportunities to receive the
5 farmworker and the farmwork organizations'
6 perspectives. And it really -- this is
7 overarchingly, we're talking about stakeholder
8 engagements and really dialing up how we're engaging
9 -- you know, making sure we're hearing what is of
10 concern. And we think we've been doing a lot of this
11 over the last couple years, really been adding on
12 additional meeting, some of them on a quarterly
13 basis. And the list on these slides on both columns
14 are not comprehensive, but really gives you a sense
15 of the efforts we're trying to put into making sure
16 that we're getting to know and engage with the
17 farmworkers and the farmwork organizations.

18 Our Assistant Administrator and the Office
19 of Pesticide Program have a meeting quarterly with
20 farmworker advocacy groups. We've added some
21 seminars and promotional information -- excuse me,
22 we've also had some listening sessions with our ag
23 advisor, and Steve will cover a little later, but the
24 PRIA 5 initiating some -- the discussions early on
25 for the next PRIA with our NGO coalition.

1 And then, in addition, some of our
2 educational events and some of these are meant to
3 really expand and amplify the messaging that we're
4 hearing. So it's not just, you know, my branch works
5 on these issues every day, but making sure others in
6 our office and in the Office of Compliance and in the
7 regions are hearing what some of these messages are.

8 We've had the National -- used different,
9 you know, acknowledgments and recognition days, like
10 the National Hispanic Heritage Month, Farmworker
11 Awareness Week, Cesar Chavez Day and, you know, have
12 invited speakers to come and give seminars within
13 EPA.

14 We've also had a virtual Farmworker Florida
15 Community visit. That's a mouthful. But really we
16 had intended to have -- this is pre-pandemic -- to
17 have an in-person site visit in Florida where we
18 really got to, you know, meet with and see farmwork
19 in inaction and meet some of the organizations that
20 support.

21 Unfortunately, due to the pandemic, we
22 turned that into a virtual, but it really was
23 successful with over 100 participants on a weekly
24 basis for a three-part series and it had -- it was
25 our first ever virtual crop tour, and it really was a

1 success due to Jeannie Economos, who I know is on the
2 line, with the Farmworker Association of Florida. So
3 thank you, Jeannie, for that.

4 And then we initiated, in the past year, a
5 lunch-and-learn series, farmworker series, where the
6 farmworker groups are bringing to us the topics of
7 concern and interest and have been hosting these with
8 some different topics, including heat stress and
9 exposure to farmworker children, reproductive health,
10 maternal health, and improvements for the WPS
11 enforcement. And we're going to continue to try to
12 provide these opportunities to have farmworker and
13 farmworker organization perspectives.

14 Next slide.

15 And then really an area that we want to
16 focus on is the cooperative agreements. Again, these
17 are done in a five-year cycle, and we have been
18 making some tweaks to the language on the last couple
19 rounds and want to highlight some of that work.

20 We've been making changes to the evaluation
21 criteria to the grants and to the programmatic-
22 specific criteria to provide a clear and practical
23 approach to evaluate the performance and providing a
24 well conceived approach for tracking and reporting
25 progress towards achieving the expected outputs and

1 outcomes. So that's something that we're looking
2 closer at to make sure there are some measures and
3 performance criteria in there.

4 One of the examples for how we've been
5 looking into methods for ensuring effective training
6 and also ties in with the performance evaluation is
7 that some of our grantees have incorporated advisory
8 boards to bring in perspectives of different --
9 getting different feedback from different
10 stakeholders, including trainers and extension
11 service, some farmworker organizations and some
12 farmworkers individually.

13 We've had AFOP (phonetic), one of our
14 grantees, incorporate pre- and post-test training
15 knowledge checks. So they do these evaluations
16 before and after they take a WPS training, and using
17 that as a feedback loop to improve their training,
18 AFOP and PERC have developed materials in other
19 languages and they have incorporated -- engaged with
20 farmworker groups to review and incorporate some of
21 those changes into their materials.

22 We've had posters developed in a number of
23 different languages. And along those lines, we've
24 had two of our contractors -- that's the Hispanic
25 Communications Network and the Causeway Agency --

1 hold focus group sessions with farmworkers to
2 evaluate some of the worker safety posters and two of
3 the WPS training clips, and you really use that
4 material to improve and update those materials.

5 And so the point here is that we want to
6 make sure that some of these highlights -- you know,
7 we think that there's still more that can be done,
8 but wanted to point out that we're working actively
9 to do these as the opportunities on each RFA come up.

10 We're really looking at, you know,
11 considering that target audience, like I mentioned,
12 getting things in different languages. And the one I
13 want to highlight today, because this is a current
14 event, the latest request for applications included a
15 sub-award requirement to have agricultural community-
16 based projects. So PERC's most recent grant, they
17 have a funding opportunity out right now to collect
18 applications into July 1. Ed mentioned yesterday
19 that there would be an OPP update to highlight that,
20 and there's information on the PERC website now and
21 accepting applications now up through July.

22 And those are really looking to get
23 community-based projects, local and regional projects
24 to serve the farmworker community, whether it be
25 farmworkers or pesticide handlers, families of

1 farmworkers or pesticide handlers or the community
2 itself, and protecting against pesticide exposure.

3 The next slide. One more. Sorry. There
4 you go.

5 In addition, we are looking at reiterating
6 and improving the communication on some of the key
7 WPS messaging to stakeholders. We've emphasized the
8 training requirements in different outreach
9 materials. An example of that would be radio spots
10 that were done in Spanish, the Hispanic
11 Communications Network, and some of the Spanish
12 materials I already mentioned that were developed.
13 We've been reiterating WPS requirements in the
14 delivery of the pesticide safety training.

15
16 During the COVID pandemic, that we issued
17 some guidance to make sure that it's understood that
18 you still need to comply with the WPS training
19 requirements and reiterated that the delivery had to
20 be in a nondistracted environment, that you still had
21 to have the presence of a trainer and made sure they
22 understood how they could still comply under the
23 difficult conditions of COVID.

24 In addition, we have EPA approve the
25 content of the training that is given, and so the

1 materials that we're reviewing we're making sure that
2 when we approve that content of the different points,
3 we're also including some -- reiterating the
4 messaging that training must be presented to the
5 workers and, you know, at a location reasonably free
6 of distraction and conducive to training, presented
7 in a manner that workers can understand, such as
8 through a translator, and the trainers must remain
9 present during their training sessions to respond to
10 questions. Some of these requirements were added in
11 2015, in response to stakeholders that the content
12 itself is not enough, that we needed more
13 requirements around how that training should be
14 conducted in order to be effective.

15 And so, you know, we're working on looking
16 at how we can make sure that these requirements are
17 known in the field by employers and growers and
18 enforcers to make sure that this is complied with.

19 And moving on to the future considerations,
20 please, next slide.

21 So moving forward, what does this mean?
22 I'll cover some examples of progress and the
23 direction we want to go. We agree with the workgroup
24 that there's more to be done. There's room for
25 improvements and amplifications of the work that's

1 already in play. In some areas, it comes down to a
2 matter of scale, you know, where can we grow the
3 effort. And sometimes it's adding in the new
4 components and fresh ideas.

5 The workgroup recommendations, we're really
6 appreciative of the efforts. It gave us really good
7 insight, very productive conversations, discussions
8 on, you know, where are our efforts, where it's
9 preferred to focus those efforts and our resources.
10 This is a good time to highlight that our agency, our
11 current administration, is prioritizing environmental
12 justice. And fairly easily, I think it goes without
13 saying really that the work related, and these
14 recommendations given to us, are environmental
15 justice concerns in agricultural communities. So
16 this is really a good opportunity to consider where
17 you know where we can address some environmental
18 justice concerns.

19 We consider this as an ongoing effort, more
20 work to be done in considering the recommendations,
21 and then this is just the beginning. We're looking
22 for opportunities and where to implement worker
23 protection, some of these ideas. We want to continue
24 discussions with the PPDC membership or the broad
25 group of stakeholders, including the farmworker

1 organizations, farmworkers, applicators, growers,
2 farmers, our co-regulators, that includes the states
3 and the tribes and more.

4 And specific to the Office of Pesticides
5 and the recommendations, this slide really highlights
6 the area that we're looking to focus our attention.

7 In the first bullet, we have the future of
8 the RFAs, those requests for applications, and
9 considering how to really incorporate the engagement
10 within an intentional outreach to underserved
11 communities and populations and seeking for greater
12 inclusion of the perspectives that might not have
13 been previously routinely incorporated into the
14 projects, and then making sure of ongoing evaluation
15 effectiveness of those activities.

16 And an example of some of the projects
17 under consideration would be to improve the
18 visibility and accessibility of the funding
19 opportunities to stakeholders, making sure that the
20 organizations are aware -- farmworker organizations,
21 for example, are aware that these opportunities are
22 out there to apply for.

23 To have the needs assessments and applying
24 those to the future RFA assessments, an example of
25 that would be to just -- if we assess the trainer

1 programs or we're getting feedback to make sure that
2 identifying need is then incorporated more explicitly
3 in an RFA as a deliverable to achieve. And we want
4 to focus outreach to employers and farmers on some
5 key WPS protections, such as WPS training
6 requirements, and that might involve collaboration
7 with OECA, or Office of Compliance and Enforcement,
8 and also to make sure that we are working towards,
9 you know, involving -- you know, making sure that
10 farmers, growers, employers are aware of the WPS.
11 Something we're hearing is that there's not always
12 awareness of what the changes were to the 2015 rule.

13 Some of this might be difficult to do on a
14 nationwide scale. We are continuing to explore
15 opportunities to address the recommendations provided
16 by the workgroup and want to highlight that we also
17 need to navigate our resource constraints. So we
18 will continue these efforts to prioritize the actions
19 and consider the feasibility considerations, but
20 looking for feedback -- and there is some time at the
21 end of this presentation to gather feedback and input
22 from the group.

23 And move on to the next slide.

24 I'll pass it to Aidan.

25 AIDAN BLACK: Thank you, Carolyn.

1 So in addition to the farmworker training
2 recommendations, the workgroup provided EPA with nine
3 recommendations on clinician training that we have
4 summarized with the six bullets on the slide.

5 The word cloud here is a visual
6 representation of the recommendations with the words
7 displayed proportional in size to the number of times
8 they were repeated. Beyond some of the more obvious
9 keywords -- so there's "clinicians" and "pesticides"
10 -- one of the most repeated words was "reporting."

11 This is reflected in two of the highest
12 priority recommendations which were, one, to improve
13 the reporting system for pesticide incidents and,
14 two, to promote awareness of pesticide illness and
15 injury reporting among clinicians by partnering of
16 professional organizations. More broadly speaking,
17 the workgroup recommended that a wide range of health
18 care providers be targeted when we are talking about
19 clinicians.

20 The workgroup also recommended involving
21 healthcare providers with development and evaluation
22 of resources and emphasize the importance of
23 investing in needs assessments.

24 Lastly, the workgroup recommended
25 increasing partnerships with and funding

1 opportunities for organizations with front-line
2 relationships. And the full list of recommendations
3 is provided in the appendix and on the PPDC website,
4 which we have linked here.

5 Next slide, please.

6 I notice we do have a little red mark on
7 the screen, but I'll continue anyways.

8 So since receiving the recommendations from
9 the PPDC in the fall, EPA has devoted time to
10 reviewing the clinician training recommendations and
11 evaluating how they are being addressed. As Carolyn
12 covered earlier, our healthcare initiative is one of
13 the cooperative agreements that EPA funds and is
14 currently -- it currently has one grantee, PERC-Med,
15 which is in the fifth year of its five-year cycle.

16 We want to highlight some improvements and
17 accomplishments here and how they address certain
18 recommendations. They have collaborated with a
19 variety of health care providers from rural health
20 nurses to primary care clinicians. They have also
21 partnered with professional organizations, providing
22 continuing medical education credits, CMEs, for
23 health care providers on pesticide-related topics.

24 PERC-Med has also developed a couple of
25 great resources for clinicians on pesticide illness

1 reporting. One is a cheat sheet of reporting codes
2 for clinicians which has been extensively reviewed by
3 both clinicians and experts in medical codes.

4 The other is an interactive map which each
5 state's specific pesticide reporting requirements are
6 included in.

7 PERC-Med has also collaborated with several
8 federally qualified health centers and organizations
9 that serve federally qualified health centers,
10 including providing a training on prevention,
11 recognition, and treatment of pesticide-related
12 illnesses for La Comunidad Española.

13 Lastly, in order to identify and prioritize
14 various products, PERC-Med has used a call for
15 project ideas with stakeholders, as well as ongoing
16 key informant interviews as forms of needs
17 assessments.

18 Next slide, please.

19 So looking towards the future plans to
20 address the recommendations, the considerations we
21 have on this slide were split up based on whether or
22 not they fell into the scope of the current grantee.
23 So starting on the left with some PERC-Med's plans
24 for year five of their cooperative agreement, first,
25 one of their project ideas was identified in their

1 latest needs assessment. It was identified the need
2 to increase outreach and collaboration with tribal-
3 serving medical professionals, which they are
4 actively working on. They are currently in the
5 process of piloting a champions network for
6 recruiting clinicians, as well as hiring and
7 clinician scientists to develop training curriculums
8 for health care providers.

9 They're also working on developing a
10 training for community health workers and promotoras,
11 all while continuing to build strategic partnerships
12 with and provide resources for a variety of medical
13 organizations.

14 Beyond PERC-Med, EPA is also considering
15 other potential projects, such as providing funding
16 for the sensor program in collaboration with
17 CDC/NIOSH. It has also been identified that the
18 sixth edition of the Recognition and Management of
19 Pesticide Poisonings Manual has not been translated
20 into Spanish and could also be updated with a new
21 edition.

22 In addition, EPA will be looking into
23 developing a new health care initiative RFA to
24 provide additional funding opportunities for front-
25 line organizations as the cooperative agreement with

1 PERC-Med is in its final year.

2 While the farmworker and clinician training
3 workgroup wrapped up this past fall, EPA will
4 continue to explore opportunities to address the
5 recommendations provided.

6 And with that, I'll hand it over to Steve
7 who's going to talk about PRIA 5.

8 STEVE SCHAIBLE: Thanks, Aidan.

9 Okay. So again, PRIA is the Pesticide
10 Registration Improvement Act. There have been three
11 reauthorizations of that act since the initial PRIA.
12 The most recent reauthorization is PRIA 4 and it runs
13 through and expires in FY 2023, at the end of 2023.

14 EPA serves in an advisory capacity. We
15 provide technical assistance to the PRIA Coalition
16 and to Congress in reauthorizations of PRIA. I guess
17 it makes sense to explain who the PRIA Coalition is.
18 The PRIA Coalition is a coalition of stakeholders,
19 mainly industry stakeholders, as well as NGOs, and
20 collectively they negotiate and have the
21 conversations which lead to the reauthorizations of
22 PRIA. And EPA provides technical assistance to those
23 groups each time a reauthorization comes around.

24 So we've been approached by the Coalition
25 to seek reauthorization of PRIA a year early in

1 calendar year 2022. This is primarily to get off of
2 the same cycle as the Farm Bill, which tends to take
3 a lot of Congress's attention when the
4 reauthorization comes up.

5 So as part of that technical assistance and
6 part of this effort to get PRIA reauthorization done
7 a year early, EPA has been engaging with the
8 farmworker NGOs, as well as other environmental NGOs,
9 and from those discussions, I think we have some
10 indications of desires of theirs for a new
11 reauthorization of PRIA. And a lot of this does line
12 up with the feedback that we received from the PPDC
13 workgroup, and so this offers an opportunity to align
14 reporting language that's in PRIA, to make more clear
15 what is desired from EPA with regard to these set-
16 aside grants and worker safety activities.

17 It's an opportunity for the Coalition to
18 advocate to see if more funding could occur for those
19 activities.

20 And so in addition to everything that
21 Carolyn and Aidan went through in terms of what we
22 feel we're already doing a decent job of and what we
23 feel we could be doing, the PRIA 5 vehicle offers
24 another opportunity to engage in those conversations
25 and to actually bring them into the statutory realm

1 by which EPA is regulating pesticides and protecting
2 farmworkers.

3 Next slide.

4 So that concludes what we are presenting.

5 And at this point, we would be happy to take feedback
6 and/or questions from the PPDC members.

7 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you all for the
8 presentation.

9 PPDC members, you know the drill. Please
10 raise your hand if you'd like to be recognized and I
11 will call on you.

12 So Marc Lame.

13 MARC LAME: Well, that was just excellent.
14 So I think that that is a fine example of some
15 interdivisional cooperation, collaboration, and
16 production. So I want to say that up front.

17 I would add a bit of what you're trying to
18 do -- and I think you're doing it pretty well -- I
19 think it could be done better with probably, in the
20 future, a little bit more attention to diffusion of
21 your innovations, so, you know, basically getting
22 communities to adopt what you have come up with. And
23 you've done a pretty good job of it, but I think that
24 there's some other areas in there, you know, as far
25 as the diffusion goes, that could improve it.

1 I would say, and this is my criticism of a
2 number of things in the office, particularly with
3 IPM, is that, you know, years ago -- and also folks
4 had to do this because of COVID and remote stuff --
5 but even before that there was this idea that
6 wholesale diffusion was a viable way of doing things
7 and it was efficient and effective. And research
8 shows that it's really not.

9 And so I think that it would be -- in the
10 future, to look at the ways that you are diffusing
11 things and delineating, is this a retail approach or
12 is this a wholesale approach, and really that way it
13 will allow you to, you know, put your eggs in the
14 right basket. Because, obviously, you can't do
15 everything, but you've done a damn good job of
16 trying. That's for sure.

17 So anyways, that's my two bits. Thank
18 you.

19 STEVE SCHAIBLE: Thank you for that.

20 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thanks, Marc.

21 CAROLYN SCHROEDER: Yeah, thanks for the
22 comment.

23 DANNY GIDDINGS: Joe Grzywacz, you're
24 recognized.

25 JOE GRZYWACZ: Yeah, thanks so much.

1 And Carolyn and group, I really appreciate
2 the work that you guys are doing on this. You know,
3 the importance of seeing to it that the worker
4 protection standard is consistently delivered in a
5 culturally tailored way that allows learning to
6 actually take place is obviously something that's
7 really important.

8 I'm sure if you had more time, you probably
9 would have, you know, brought up some of the
10 elements, but I'm thrilled to hear that you're trying
11 to make PERC more effective. I mean, for those of us
12 at least down here in the Southeast, the stuff that
13 PERC puts out is, frankly, useless. So the utility
14 of a centralized model where, you know, just about
15 all the money for those cooperative agreements go to
16 UC Davis or Oregon Health and Sciences, it really
17 doesn't filter down to a lot of groups.

18 And so I might throw out the possibility
19 that as you're thinking about how to handle the RFA
20 in the future, maybe a regionalized model, you know,
21 where places like the Midwest and in those regions
22 where there's a lot of, you know, tractor-based
23 agriculture as opposed to hand-based agriculture
24 takes place, but something that's a little bit more
25 decentralized and perhaps not nested within

1 university institutions that aren't known for their
2 efficiencies or flexibilities in terms of their
3 ability to produce things would be something that you
4 would consider going forward.

5 But, nevertheless, the work that you're
6 doing is important. I'm just not convinced that PERC
7 is the best tool at the moment, at least as it's
8 centralized in UC Davis and Oregon Health and
9 Sciences.

10 STEVE SCHAIBLE: Thanks, Joe.

11 CAROLYN SCHROEDER: Thank you, Joe.

12 And to point out, I know I mentioned it
13 earlier in the presentation, but something we did do
14 different with this second cycle of the PERC was to
15 add on the sub-awards that do go to community-based.
16 So look for -- there's like a \$200,000 -- up to
17 \$200,000 available for some projects, for some local
18 regionalized projects, to look into that. I know
19 that's currently just -- that's something new that
20 was added.

21 And there's also some -- PERC isn't the
22 only -- they're not -- the other ones aren't
23 necessarily -- are not funded by us, but there is
24 some other materials that people have made publicly
25 available like from Penn State University, for

1 example, that might do a crop specific. So if there
2 is something you're looking for specific that's
3 obviously not a Florida-based, let me know and we can
4 see if we're aware of a different training that's
5 available, that is publicly available to share. But
6 we did have it as a repository as well for putting --
7 if you have materials, to provide them to PERC, and
8 they're hosting them on their website to make them
9 accessible, if the one-size-fits-all type of
10 materials isn't suitable for a certain farmer.

11 But I appreciate your feedback, Joe.

12 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you. I'd now like
13 to recognize Mayra Reiter.

14 MAYRA REITER: Thank you very much for that
15 presentation.

16 This is a question for Carolyn. You
17 reported changes to the RFA process to be more
18 inclusive of underserved communities and, of course,
19 that's a welcome change. But the issues with the RFA
20 process go beyond outreach. Community-based
21 farmworker organizations that are on the front lines
22 delivering direct services to farmworkers are in the
23 best position not just to design educational
24 materials, but to design and deliver training
25 programs. However, the grant application processes

1 can be very resource-intensive and these can be a
2 barrier for more participation by those
3 organizations. But the same thing is true of grant
4 management.

5 So my question is does EPA have plans to
6 address this beyond the sub-awards, but in terms of
7 potentially providing technical assistance to
8 grantees or potential grantees or other measures so
9 that they can participate more in these programs with
10 the grants.

11 CAROLYN SCHROEDER: That's a really good
12 question. It's a really good question, Mayra. There
13 is a -- we're following the Federal Government, the
14 EPA grant process. and so we're bound to a lot of
15 those policies regulations. It is worth us checking
16 in with them and seeing what they're doing because
17 it's highly unlikely, this is the only program that's
18 impacted by the challenges to filling out a --
19 because a lot of it is template language that we have
20 to use and the application process and the databases,
21 and all of that, you know, are a lot of the things
22 that could be obstacles. It is noticeable to getting
23 -- you know, federal funding can have a lot of
24 hurdles in the application process.

25 From the programmatic side, we really do

1 try to follow, you know, everything to a tee on the
2 competition process, but I think some of the things
3 you're highlighting is an overarching difficulty, a
4 challenge in the grant process. It is worth us, in
5 our office, programmatically reaching out to our
6 grants office to see if there is anything in play
7 there and if there's any other forums or avenues
8 where we can at least raise this issue, because I do
9 think it would probably impact, like I said, beyond
10 this particular -- you know, one grant.

11 We have had some more community-based. You
12 know, we have the AFOP grant and we've had grants
13 with Migrant Clinicians Network. And there are sub-
14 award opportunities under some of the grants as well.
15 But I know that's -- you know, that might be not
16 frequent enough, you know, to really say that we're
17 addressing, you know, that. Like you said,
18 developing a very good strong proposal that meets all
19 of the grant criteria can be a challenge.

20 So I really appreciate that feedback. I
21 think that's one that's for future considerations on
22 how to tackle.

23 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you. Let's turn now
24 to Becca Berkey.

25 Becca Berkey: Hi, thank you. And thank

1 you, as both Joe and Mayra said, for your
2 presentations.

3 I'm going to actually kind of echo some of
4 what they both said. But I joined the PPDC as a
5 farmworker representative and that really is because
6 I have involvement with the Farmworker Health and
7 Justice Team and Coming Clean. I'm also an
8 environmental sociologist who studies the impacts of
9 injustices on farmworkers in the U.S.

10 But more than that, and part of what I
11 wanted to comment on, is I also work -- my main role
12 is actually at a university overseeing community-
13 engaged teaching and research. So my comment is
14 really kind of coming from the intersection of those
15 perspectives.

16 So per my understanding of the work of
17 PERC, PERC-Med, the NPIC, while presented, I think,
18 in your presentation kind of as organizations in
19 themselves, they are currently housed at universities
20 as Joe pointed out, UC Davis and OSU, respectively.
21 And as someone who's currently housed and has spent
22 my whole career at institutions of higher education,
23 I know that there can be multiple challenges when
24 grants and funds are channeled through even well
25 meaning universities, so things like overhead costs,

1 keeping work moving forward as originally scoped.
2 And on top of that, universities, by and large, often
3 have fraught relationships with communities,
4 especially those that are in historically
5 underrepresented groups like farmworkers.

6 So I think that, listening to the
7 presentation, one recommendation that I have, or
8 maybe question just in general, is really what is the
9 fuller picture around the implications of those
10 university affiliations, as they may either promote
11 or hinder the work?

12 And then I also wanted to underscore,
13 regarding the clinician-oriented work, is that
14 farmworkers and their families, as you illuminated,
15 are the populations that are most overexposed to
16 pesticides. So just making sure and noting how
17 critical it is that clinicians caring for those
18 populations receive the training and ongoing support
19 to recognize and manage pesticide poisonings.

20 And thank you again for your important work
21 around these issues.

22 CAROLYN SCHROEDER: Thank you for those
23 comments.

24 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you.

25 Dave Tamayo.

1 DAVE TAMAYO: Yeah, thank you very much.

2 I wanted to echo the concerns about the
3 barriers of EPA -- well, the federal grant process in
4 general. And I'm glad that EPA recognizes the need
5 to start looking at, you know, trying to maybe
6 systematically influence how those requirements can
7 have barriers removed. So thank you for being
8 forward thinking about that.

9 I also wanted to thank Carolyn and Aidan
10 for very good presentations, and I really see that
11 you're working very hard to improve the training
12 system. One of the deficiencies that I see that
13 would be associated with training is the lack of
14 clinically useful tests that can differentiate
15 between different classes of pesticides. I know that
16 there's a very limited number of tests, and so
17 regardless of training and what's available, if
18 there's not enough tests available, then clinicians'
19 hands are going to be tied in their ability to
20 accurately identify what the cause of a poisoning is.

21 So I encourage EPA to think beyond just
22 training about what's already existing, but to also
23 figure out is there a way that EPA can get more tests
24 available either through requirements on registrants
25 or some other form, but I know that I didn't hear

1 anything addressed about that. It was a topic of
2 discussion when I was on the PPDC some years ago, and
3 I haven't seen that there's been progress in that
4 regard.

5 And then also there was a brief mention
6 about considering other languages. I know that
7 there's quite a few languages that are spoken out in
8 the fields and I know it's difficult to address that,
9 but thank you for being aware of it. And, hopefully,
10 we can make some progress in making trainings
11 available in the languages that are needed.

12 Thank you.

13 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Dave.

14 Mily, I am recognizing you.

15 MILY TREVIÑO-SAUCEDA: Hi. I just want to
16 thank Steve, Carolyn, and Aidan. And I want to echo
17 in terms of what -- well, thank them for capturing
18 what we were trying to do in the workgroup. It was a
19 lot of information. It was just so much. Sometimes,
20 it would be very intense. That doesn't surprise.
21 But the capturing -- and I want to thank the people
22 that were giving all these other recommendations,
23 because it's so true. It's so true. I mean, there
24 was a lot of information and we did talk about a lot
25 of the things that you were all mentioning, how

1 important it is that the community participates in --
2 because it's the community that's at stake here and
3 either you promote or you hinder, you know. You help
4 or not.

5 With everything that has been said, I mean,
6 what I can add is that there's a lot of work that
7 needs to be done. I can only say that, at least --
8 and I will be very outspoken as everybody who knows
9 me -- that this administration is doing a great job.
10 I'm very happy in terms of how you're working, being
11 very open. Just having the interpretation, which we
12 never had before, and it was a very different way of
13 doing and dealing with interpretation. That says a
14 lot in terms of -- that's called language justice
15 because people can hear and then when they speak, if
16 they want to speak their language, people that are
17 monolingual in one language can hear others and it's
18 simultaneously and it's very, very respectful.

19 So in terms of -- my last part is when I
20 say there's a lot of work, we've come a long ways.
21 We've been working within our communities for the
22 last like 30 some years. I always say I was five
23 years old when I started -- no, I'm just kidding --
24 but it deals with how -- I mean, I come from a
25 farmworker family. My family, as we worked in the

1 fields, we were poisoned by pesticides many times,
2 several times.

3 And we saw and we -- throughout these 30-
4 some years afterwards, seeing the most -- you know,
5 just because of the lack of information, because of
6 people not understanding, they're in a different
7 country, the culture is very different, everything
8 else, if we're not considering all that, it's
9 basically we're trying to put together something that
10 is foreign to the people who are getting that
11 information. But I assure you that we will continue
12 in this work because it's about working within the
13 cultural context of the community that makes a
14 difference.

15 And just to say the last I'm very glad that
16 -- as it was presented. It was not just presented.
17 It's information that we are going to make sure it's
18 going to be followed through. So I really appreciate
19 your work and I know that the three of you, Steve,
20 Carolyn, and Aidan, were just, you know, being very
21 patient. And, of course, there's a lot more work and
22 I know that your tolerance is very well appreciated.
23 Thank you.

24 STEVE SCHAIBLE: I don't know how it ended
25 up that "cultural context" was not the largest word

1 in the word cloud there.

2 CAROLYN SCHROEDER: That's true, right?

3 STEVE SCHAIBLE: Yeah, I'd like to say I
4 really very much appreciated all of the conversations
5 and the sometimes, hard conversations that occurred in
6 the workgroup. Thanks to everybody in the workgroup
7 for all the contributions you made towards this.

8 CAROLYN SCHROEDER: And we know it took up
9 -- a lot of the patience and tolerance and time
10 really all came from the volunteers around the
11 workgroup. So we were along for the ride. They were
12 really informative, brought a lot of internal
13 discussion to it. So we really appreciated all of
14 that engagement over the last year.

15 MILY TREVIÑO-SAUCEDA: And we did get,
16 remember, farmworkers involved and --

17 CAROLYN SCHROEDER: Mm-hmm.

18 MILY TREVIÑO-SAUCEDA: -- certainly we did
19 get that voice. And we need to continue doing that.
20 So it's helping us a lot. Thank you.

21 CAROLYN SCHROEDER: Yeah, I think our
22 meeting started as an hour, went to two hours, were
23 going to be once a month, jumped into twice a month.
24 I mean, it was a lot, so I really appreciate it. It
25 was a lot of energy and a lot of heads put together

1 to come up with the priorities.

2 Thank you.

3 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Steve, Carolyn,
4 Aidan, Mily, and everyone who provided comments on
5 this session.

6 We're going to take a five-minute break and
7 return at 3:30 for our Looking Forward with Ed
8 Messina. See you all in five minutes.

9 And, again, just mute your video and your
10 mic, but don't leave the webinar.

11 ED MESSINA: Thank you, Steve, Carolyn, and
12 others. Appreciate it.

13 (Break.)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MOVING FORWARD

2 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Dave.

3 We're now moving forward to the Looking
4 Forward session that Ed Messina will lead us through.

5 Ed, do you want to introduce the session
6 and then I've got the tally results from yesterday's
7 third vote that I can share afterwards if you kick it
8 back to me.

9 ED MESSINA: Yes, thanks, Danny.

10 I would suggest, and really I'm going to
11 open the floor to see if there's any sort of
12 outstanding, you know, motions or business that folks
13 want to clean up. I think we had some stuff from
14 this morning for resistance management. And then we
15 can maybe do the tally from yesterday's emerging
16 pathogen tally, and then move into the resistance
17 management or vice versa, whatever folks want to do,
18 any other motions that folks want to make, and then I
19 would say it would be good to hear from the PPDC
20 members what additional topics that they feel like
21 should be on the agenda for future discussions.

22 That won't be the only time we're ever able
23 to do that because as we move ahead and build the
24 agenda for the next session, we'll definitely reach
25 out to the PPDC membership via email and ask for

1 topics. And then we can kind of close for the day.

2 So I will see if anybody wants to raise
3 their hand, and barring that, I think we can --
4 great, all right -- and then we can see if there's
5 time -- we'll make sure that there's time for the
6 tally and time for discussion on the resistance
7 management work that was happening this morning.

8 So Cameron.

9 CAMERON DOUGLAS: Sure. Do you want to
10 jump into the resistance management or go back to the
11 tally from yesterday first?

12 ED MESSINA: I think since you raised your
13 hand, why don't we do resistance management.

14 CAMERON DOUGLAS: Sure. So I pulled
15 together a formal motion for the formation of a new
16 resistance management working group, and I just
17 posted it into the chat so everyone should be able to
18 see that. But the specific motion I'd like to raise
19 is to form a new PPDC workgroup with the following
20 suggested charge questions.

21 Firstly, to assist and collaborate with EPA
22 on the implementation of recommendations from the
23 first pesticide resistance management workgroup.
24 Secondly, to develop technical recommendations for
25 EPA related to establishing the analytical framework

1 for the quantification of risks and benefits from
2 resistance to specific pesticidal active ingredients.

3 And secondly, to identify how IPM
4 strategies can be leveraged and utilized on pesticide
5 labels for resistance management benefits.

6 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thank you, Cameron. Is
7 that -- that is the same language you shared with the
8 organizers earlier today, correct?

9 CAMERON DOUGLAS: Yes.

10 DANNY GIDDINGS: Okay, excellent. So,
11 everyone, I have set up a vote for this motion in an
12 app called MURAL. It allows real-time collaboration
13 for groups of any size. I am pasting that link to
14 that app into the workspace that I have set up for a
15 vote on this motion -- assuming that we get a second,
16 of course -- into the chat. I'm sending it now. You
17 can click on that link and you will go into the --
18 David Shaw just seconded the motion.

19 You will be directed with the link to the
20 MURAL app and to the workspace that I have set up.
21 You should also be able to see that workspace in my
22 share screen right now.

23 And let me explain very quickly how this is
24 going to work. So this is -- you see the language of
25 the motion right here. I see folks are entering,

1 that's excellent. And the sticky notes that you see,
2 yea, nay, or abstain, are going to be the options
3 when we have a vote. I will have to vote that -- or
4 I will have to start that voting session. Once I
5 start the voting session -- and it will be timed --
6 you will be able to simply click on one of those
7 sticky notes and that will record your vote. So
8 again, you will click on -- once I start the voting
9 session, you will click one of these sticky notes and
10 that will record your vote.

11 Before, though, we get into all that, I
12 want to make sure that everyone is being able to
13 access the MURAL app. So please let us know if you
14 haven't been able to make it into the MURAL app.

15 ED MESSINA: And then I would suggest you
16 put your name in so we know that you're a PPDC member
17 and, you know, what your vote was. I see a couple of
18 Visiting Panda and Visiting Koala names.

19 DANNY GIDDINGS: Everyone -- so yeah,
20 thanks, Ed.

21 So a quick note, these will be anonymous
22 votes, though, the link has only been shared with
23 hosts and panelists. Hosts and panelists are the
24 only ones who are able -- sorry, PPDC members, of
25 course, are the only people who are able to vote.

1 And so if you happen to be a host and panelist in the
2 Zoom webinar, say if you were on to present for
3 workgroup but you're not a member of the PPDC, please
4 don't click on the link to get into the MURAL app
5 because you won't be able to or you shouldn't be able
6 to vote. And, hopefully, no one but the hosts and
7 panelists in the Zoom app even are able to see the
8 link to MURAL.

9 I see folks are making it into the app.
10 And please don't click on the sticky notes just yet.
11 I'm going to change the color back on this really
12 quickly if I can.

13 Oh, well, it's not that important.

14 All right. Has everyone made it into the
15 app?

16 Mayra says, I cannot open MURAL but --
17 okay. But you were able to get in.

18 Mily says, you cannot open MURAL.

19 ED MESSINA: Dawn has her hand raised, too.

20 DANNY GIDDINGS: Hi, Dawn. You have your
21 hand raised. Is this about MURAL or is this about
22 the motion that you put into the chat?

23 DAWN GOUGE: Yeah, it's about the motion.
24 So no, I'll take it down for now. I'm in the MURAL.

25 DANNY GIDDINGS: Okay, thanks, Dawn.

1 Perfect.

2 Mily, have you been able to make it into
3 the chat or into the MURAL?

4 MILY TREVIÑO-SAUCEDA: No. For whatever
5 reason, it doesn't allow me. It gets me in there,
6 but then it doesn't let me do anything.

7 ED MESSINA: Yeah, because he hasn't opened
8 the voting yet.

9 MILY TREVIÑO-SAUCEDA: Oh, okay.

10 DANNY GIDDINGS: Yeah. So as long as you
11 are into the app -- you won't be able to do anything
12 but move things around like some are doing. But you
13 won't be able to vote yet. I will open the voting
14 session in just a minute. I just want to make sure
15 everyone's made it in.

16 MARC LAME: Could you tell me where the
17 MURAL app is?

18 DANNY GIDDINGS: So the link to the MURAL
19 app has been dropped in the chat and I posted it at
20 3:34. When you click on that link, it will open it
21 in a web browser, whatever your default web browser
22 is.

23 ED MESSINA: Let us know when you get in,
24 Marc.

25 MARC LAME: I'm looking in the chat and I

1 don't see --

2 DANNY GIDDINGS: Here, let me repost it.

3 ED MESSINA: And, Marc, at the bottom of
4 your screen if you click on chat, the side panel
5 should open up and you should be able to see the
6 chat. And then once you're able to see the chat,
7 then you can click on the link in the chat.

8 MARC LAME: Yeah, I'm in the chat, but I
9 don't see a link.

10 DANNY GIDDINGS: Make sure you're in the
11 chat and not in the Q&A.

12 ZOOM SUPPORT: Danny, I think you posted it
13 only to hosts and panelists. Is that what was
14 intended?

15 DANNY GIDDINGS: That's right. It should
16 only go to hosts and panelists because only our PPDC
17 members, who should all be panelists, should be able
18 to vote and should be able to access.

19 ED MESSINA: So, Marc, if you're -- make
20 sure that Marc is a panelist.

21 MARC LAME: I am. I see something. Here
22 it is.

23 ED MESSINA: Okay. I think we can open up
24 the voting, Danny. I think everyone should be in.

25 DANNY GIDDINGS: Great. Let's do it.

1 So let me close out this. I'm just setting
2 the parameters of the vote.

3 All right. You should now be able to vote
4 within MURAL. You can vote by clicking yea, nay, or
5 abstain.

6 ED MESSINA: And we'll open it for one
7 minute, Danny.

8 DANNY GIDDINGS: Here, let me put a timer
9 on.

10 ED MESSINA: You could probably put 45
11 seconds now.

12 DANNY GIDDINGS: Okay.

13 ED MESSINA: Are you seeing votes come in?

14 DANNY GIDDINGS: Yeah.

15 ED MESSINA: Good.

16 DANNY GIDDINGS: I think we've got almost
17 everyone with 30 seconds left. So two people are
18 still voting.

19 (Pause.)

20 DANNY GIDDINGS: All right. Time's up for
21 the vote. So let's end the voting session.

22 So let me share my screen very quickly, my
23 whole screen. So we have 30 votes for yea and 3
24 votes to abstain. That means the yeas have it.

25 ED MESSINA: And the motion passes. Okay.

1 DANNY GIDDINGS: And the motion passes.

2 ED MESSINA: All right. Danny, do you want
3 to -- are there any other motions that folks would
4 like to bring to the table? Please raise your hand.

5 Okay. Hearing none, Danny, if you want to
6 read the results from yesterday's poll.

7 DANNY GIDDINGS: Okay. Yeah, let me bring
8 that up. This was a motion to extend the
9 recommendations from the Emerging Pathogens Workgroup
10 to beyond traditional antimicrobials to biopesticides
11 and conventional pesticides.

12 ED MESSINA: And there were three polls.

13 DANNY GIDDINGS: Right. The third poll is
14 the one that -- it was to extend beyond
15 antimicrobials to biopesticides and conventionals.
16 Is that right?

17 ED MESSINA: Yeah, and that the first two,
18 it looked like they were passing in the comments,
19 but --

20 DANNY GIDDINGS: Yeah, the first two, I
21 didn't do an official tally. Well, this -- what I'm
22 sharing is not an official tally either. We'll do
23 the official tally once we have the transcript of the
24 session. But the first two motions passed easily and
25 did not need a count. The third -- and if memory

1 serves -- I'm having trouble remembering what the
2 first motion was. I think it was to extend the
3 workgroup. The second motion was to extend the
4 workgroup's recommendations to other antimicrobials,
5 and then the third, as I mentioned, was to extend the
6 recommendations to conventionals and biopesticides.

7 So, yeah, the first two motions passed
8 easily; did not receive counts. The third motion
9 received three counts. And, again, these are
10 unofficial counts because the official count will be
11 in the transcript of the session. But the first
12 count, the yeas were 8, the nays were 13, and the
13 abstains were 2. For the second count, the yeas
14 were 8, the nays were 14, and the abstains were 2.
15 And for the third count, the yeas were 9, the nays
16 were 12, and the abstains were 2.

17 In all three counts the nays have it, and
18 so the motion did not pass.

19 ED MESSINA: So all three motions did not
20 pass by your account.

21 DANNY GIDDINGS: No, the first two -- the
22 first two motions passed and I did not get an
23 official count for those because it was obvious.
24 There were just no nays. And we can provide those
25 official tallies for the first two.

1 I counted the third vote three times
2 because I was counting -- and I was trying to scroll
3 through the chat while others were adding new
4 messages in the chat, which was pretty difficult.
5 And that's why I say this is an unofficial count.
6 But in each of the three counts that I took on the
7 third vote --

8 ED MESSINA: I see.

9 DANNY GIDDINGS: -- the nays have it.

10 ED MESSINA: Okay, thank you.

11 All right. And did you want to do any
12 collaboration tool on potential topics. I can go
13 through my list.

14 DANNY GIDDINGS: Well, I do want to
15 recognize Dr. Gouge. She had entered a motion into
16 the chat.

17 ED MESSINA: Oh, okay. Great.

18 DANNY GIDDINGS: So, Dr. Gouge, perhaps you
19 can unmute yourself and talk about the motion you
20 entered.

21 DAWN GOUGE: Thanks, Danny. Yeah. So this
22 was just an idea that we've got this great
23 opportunity with all of this expertise, and I tend to
24 see things as having a bedrock of integrated pest
25 management as a foundation. And lots of our

1 different initiatives and some of the fantastic work
2 that the EPA groups have been doing is inherently
3 connected. So if we had the ability to form an
4 integrated pest management workgroup, that would
5 allow us to provide advice to all of these different
6 groups involved in the different initiatives with
7 regard to using integrated pest management within
8 their realm of charges that they're addressing. It
9 just seems logical to me.

10 ED MESSINA: So would this be a separate
11 workgroup from the one that was just discussed or is
12 this --

13 DAWN GOUGE: Well, you know, to be honest,
14 Ed, I was thinking of pesticide resistance management
15 when I first started typing the idea of the IPM
16 workgroup. But from my perspective -- and I am an
17 educator so I come to this honestly -- the best way
18 to reduce risks and educate people about pesticide
19 safety is to educate them on integrated pest
20 management, which is going to fundamentally change
21 how, where, when, and why they use pesticide
22 products, not that -- you know, we want them to be
23 used correctly and appropriately and judiciously when
24 needed.

25 So all of the things that I've just laundry

1 listed there -- and I'm sure there are many other
2 components that others are thinking about -- if they
3 skim through these, seem to have a foundation of
4 integrated pest management. And, yet, we don't sort
5 of have this overarching theme, which, in my mind,
6 connects all of these different things across EPA. I
7 mean, everything from children's health to air
8 quality, particularly to indoor air quality, et
9 cetera, et cetera.

10 So if we had a group of experts, we would
11 at least be able to -- I'm going to use the word
12 "infiltrate" other workgroup teams and sort of ask
13 them to consider building their recommendations and
14 their new innovations are going to fit into an
15 integrated pest management system.

16 ED MESSINA: Thanks, Dawn.

17 I'll open it up for discussion.

18 DAWN GOUGE: Thanks.

19 ED MESSINA: Marc.

20 MARC LAME: Yes. You know, related to the
21 resistance management, I think it's Cameron, I
22 believe, in his motion that passed, said leveraging
23 IPM, and then at the end he said labels, I think --
24 and I don't know if I'm correct on that Cameron or
25 not, but that that was limiting, limiting the input

1 on leveraging IPM to labels. If that's the case, I
2 think it's okay, but I -- and it's passed, but I do
3 think if that is the case, then we probably do need
4 to have an overarching IPM group, if for no other
5 reason, to look at the current policies and programs
6 regarding IPM as pollution prevention.

7 CAMERON DOUGLAS: Yep, Marc, you're
8 correct. And I concur completely with your point
9 that I had specifically tried to narrow the focus to
10 sort of lower-hanging fruit that were directly
11 related to, you know, OPP policies that might be able
12 to -- we might be able to make some recommendations
13 quickly. So I completely agree that I think there's
14 need and opportunity for a more broadly focused IPM
15 group.

16 ED MESSINA: Dave? You're on mute, I
17 think. I'm not hearing Dave if others are.

18 SHANNON JEWELL: No, I'm not hearing Dave
19 either.

20 DAVE TAMAYO: Can you hear me now?

21 ED MESSINA: Yes.

22 DAVE TAMAYO: Okay. So I wanted to follow
23 up on Dawn Gouge's point about, you know, having IPM
24 as part of a lot of different processes. And I don't
25 know that the solution is necessarily to form some

1 sort of group that's involved with everything, but I
2 think having consideration of IPM in a lot of the
3 decisions and a lot of the programmatic changes that
4 EPA is considering, having that consideration being
5 part of sort of standard operating procedures, which
6 would actually mean that, you know, the people who
7 are responsible for moving various programs along or
8 regulating things in a different way should be given
9 training on what that actually means and what sorts
10 of examples that they need to be thinking about to be
11 able to incorporate IPM principles into their core
12 job duties.

13 I'm not sure how to actually accomplish
14 that, but I think it would be good to have something
15 that's woven through, similar to how climate change
16 and environmental justice are being woven into a lot
17 of considerations that EPA is doing. So thank you.

18 ED MESSINA: Any others? Okay. Marc?

19 MARC LAME: Ed, I'm not sure if -- so are
20 we are we still on whether we're going with the IPM
21 group or are you asking for other suggestions
22 regarding topics for next time?

23 ED MESSINA: Whenever the group would like
24 to do, this is sort of your session. It seems like
25 there's a couple of -- you know, it does seem like --

1 I'm trying to see if Professor Gouge was making a
2 recommendation. I haven't heard a second for that.
3 And then I see that Jessica has posted in the chat
4 for a suggestion for a new workgroup, and she's got
5 her hand raised now.

6 MARC LAME: Okay. Well, I'll make a second
7 for Dawn's proposal and then, hopefully, when it
8 comes time, I just have something for you to address
9 to us next time.

10 ED MESSINA: Okay, great.

11 Jessica. And then we'll see if the motion
12 passes.

13 JESSICA PONDER: Hi, thank you. I
14 appreciate you letting me have my video off. I'm
15 trying to manage multiple responsibilities working at
16 home. I think many of you can relate.

17 I'm not sure whether it makes more sense to
18 be a discussion next time or a motion today. I'm
19 open to feedback from the group, but, you know, as
20 we've heard today collaborative workgroups, like the
21 emerging technologies and pesticide application,
22 these workgroups are critical for achieving the
23 shared goals for environmental justice. And so I
24 just wanted to pose for consideration whether there
25 is interest in establishing a workgroup based on this

1 model to review emerging technologies for hazard
2 identification and particularly for adverse outcomes
3 pertinent to environmental justice, such as
4 developmental neurotoxicity.

5 And given the unique breadth of expertise
6 here on the PPDC, I could see a lot of value in
7 leveraging that workgroup model and applying that to
8 new test methods and initiatives to inform risk
9 assessments. Using developmental neurotoxicity as an
10 example, there are many efforts going on within and
11 without EPA, and including an ongoing effort at the
12 OECD, to characterize these available testing
13 methods.

14 And so I was hoping maybe others would be
15 interested in joining a workgroup to review and
16 discuss those ongoing initiatives and make
17 recommendations to the agency as to how we could best
18 leverage new technologies and testing approaches to
19 protect vulnerable individuals, in particular,
20 farmworkers and their families and communities.

21 ED MESSINA: Yeah. Thanks, Jessica.

22 You know, one thing I'll throw out there
23 is, so as of right now, we have a workgroup on
24 emerging technologies, on resistance management,
25 which has IPM language in there and emerging

1 technologies -- so emerging technologies, viral,
2 resistance management, and emerging viral pathogens.

3 There is going to be a need for PPDC
4 members and others to join those workgroups to
5 provide whatever work product or recommendations as a
6 group folks would like. We're going to need members
7 for those groups. And after this meeting, we'll
8 reach out and those chairs will, you know, probably
9 reach out to solicit members.

10 And there's nothing stopping those groups
11 from adding topics or talking about additional ideas
12 that are, you know, somewhat related. For your
13 question, it seems related to the emerging
14 technologies and environmental justice that was
15 articulated in that workgroup, and then even for
16 Professor Gouge's suggestion, which is maybe
17 expanding the issues not just related to labeling for
18 IPM, but, you know, for something broader. There's
19 nothing stopping the group from, you know, adding
20 other things to that.

21 So it's okay to have other groups
22 established. We're going to need to staff those.
23 Probably, you know, it would be many members from the
24 PPDC and then like one member from EPA. So I just
25 wanted to put that out there and make sure folks were

1 aware of the sort of bandwidth issues.

2 But with that, I think, Danny, are we ready
3 to vote on the motion that's on the table right now?

4 DANNY GIDDINGS: Yeah. Well, I've got part
5 of the language in MURAL. And you know what, maybe
6 it's just easier for me to show it in Word. So what
7 you'll see in MURAL when you go into vote isn't the
8 comprehensive language that Dawn proposed, but here
9 I'm sharing it -- about to share it in Word.

10 ED MESSINA: And then if you want to share
11 your screen. Thank you.

12 DANNY GIDDINGS: Yeah. So I'm sharing my
13 screen right now.

14 So this is the motion on the table posed by
15 Dr. Gouge.

16 Form a workgroup focused on using
17 foundational IPM principles to connect multiple
18 pertinent EPA initiatives, including pesticide
19 resistance management, pollution prevention, risk
20 reduction and pesticide safety education for
21 pesticide applicators, workers generally engaged in
22 working or spending time in pest-vulnerable
23 environments, e.g., ag, schools, multi-unit housing,
24 and especially chemically sensitive people, elevating
25 awareness and understanding emerging technologies,

1 reducing adverse impacts on nontarget organisms,
2 including endangered species, like pollinators and
3 other organisms involved in essential biological
4 services, supporting environmental justice, food
5 safety, soil health, carbon sequestration,
6 climate change, water quality, and the conservation
7 of air quality, and children's health, folding in
8 indigenous traditional ecological knowledge, or ITEK,
9 folding in Ministry of Environment and Natural
10 Resources from Mexico and -- so I'm missing that last
11 part, but it's something, it seems like, on the
12 border.

13 Let me see if I can kind it. But, Dawn, is
14 that, more or less, the language that you shared?

15 DAWN GOUGE: Yes, it's definitely most of
16 it. So there is an EPA border initiative that
17 focuses on pesticide use that impacts border
18 communities. So the idea behind this is literally to
19 connect all these different efforts and to provide
20 foundational IPM principles to their benefit or for
21 their benefit.

22 DANNY GIDDINGS: Wonderful. So we've got
23 the motion, we've got a second. So let's move to
24 vote. If you will all enter MURAL again. I've got
25 part of the language. Sorry, I wasn't able to

1 transcribe all of it and enter it in MURAL, but
2 you've seen it in Word. I have not opened the voting
3 session yet and I want to wait until everyone is able
4 to get in.

5 (Pause.)

6 DANNY GIDDINGS: I'll give everyone just a
7 minute or so more to get into MURAL. Again, use the
8 same link that you used before.

9 All right. I'm going to put a minute and
10 30 on the clock for voting. That will give me time
11 to open up the voting session. So let me go ahead
12 and start the timer. In just a second, I'm going to
13 start the voting session.

14 Start voting.

15 Now, feel free to click one of the post-it
16 notes indicating your yea, nay, or abstain vote. One
17 minute left in voting.

18 (Pause.)

19 DANNY GIDDINGS: There's six votes still
20 voting. Thirty seconds left. Five people still
21 voting, 30 seconds left.

22 (Pause.)

23 DANNY GIDDINGS: Five people voting with 10
24 seconds left.

25 (Pause.)

1 DANNY GIDDINGS: All right. Voting is
2 closed.

3 Votes are 19 yea, 7 nay, 4 abstains. So
4 the yeas have it. The motion passes.

5 All right. Ed, I'll turn it over to you.
6 I think we still need to cover the topics for future
7 agendas. Is that right?

8 ED MESSINA: Yeah, and then Jessica had her
9 suggestion. So see what the --

10 DANNY GIDDINGS: Oh, Jessica has a motion,
11 okay.

12 ED MESSINA: So see if there's anything on
13 the table for that.

14 DANNY GIDDINGS: Jessica, yeah, let's
15 recognize you to talk on your motion.

16 JESSICA PONDER: Sure. I'm not really sure
17 this falls underneath the emerging technologies as we
18 just approved a new workgroup for. So if it does,
19 then, you know, maybe it should fall underneath that
20 workgroup. But I was saying this as entirely
21 separate from the pesticide application expertise
22 that I think is in the emerging technologies
23 workgroup now, because this would be more toxicology
24 related expertise. So if I need to put together --
25 put it in the chat as a formal motion, I'd be happy

1 to do that for --

2 DANNY GIDDINGS: It would be helpful for
3 voting just so I don't have to transcribe as you
4 dictate.

5 JESSICA PONDER: Sure thing.

6 DANNY GIDDINGS: So, yeah, yeah, please do
7 put it in the chat. And we can wait on that. In the
8 meantime, let's open the floor while you're doing
9 that.

10 Damon Reabe.

11 DAMON REABE: Yeah, thank you. This seems
12 like a really complex subject matter for there to be
13 a motion the floor to the PPDC to form a workgroup
14 on. It would seem more appropriate that there would
15 be a presentation given to the PPDC on -- in other
16 words, this would actually be an actual session to
17 help educate us on what it is exactly we're going to
18 be forming a workgroup about.

19 JESSICA PONDER: Sorry. Is that for me is
20 that for the previous --

21 ED MESSINA: That's for you, Jessica.

22 DAMON REABE: Yeah, JESSICA, that's for you
23 and this subject matter. I like the idea of this not
24 being part of the Application Technology Workgroup.
25 I think you're right on the money there. But, quite

1 frankly, I'm not sure that I really have a very good
2 understanding at all of what you're referring to, and
3 as a committee member, I would find it very valuable
4 to hear a session from EPA and other stakeholders as
5 to exactly what we're talking about.

6 DANNY GIDDINGS: May I suggest -- I think
7 Jessica's working on her language. It may not end up
8 being a motion for today, and it sounded like Jessica
9 was not -- was agnostic or at least uncertain whether
10 it constituted a motion to form a workgroup or if it
11 constituted more a topic for a future agenda.

12 So let's see we have -- is this -- oh, no,
13 this is Megan.

14 So, Jessica, please do continue to work on
15 the language that you were going to put in the chat
16 and we can go from there in terms of discussing
17 whether it ought to be an agenda topic for a future
18 meeting or whether there is sufficient detail or
19 sufficient understanding within the PPDC to move to
20 vote on the motion.

21 Marc, you have your hand up.

22 MARC LAME: Yes. And, hopefully, these
23 will be easier questions because the last group have
24 been pretty complex. I would like for Ed or one of
25 his folks to tell us what does it mean -- you know,

1 there's a policy to where EPA folks are cutting back
2 in the office, and I want to know what that means.
3 He touched on it a little bit as far as visiting and
4 stuff like that, but I'm talking, you know, in
5 general, and even with the regions, what does that
6 mean as far as face-to-face meetings and getting out
7 in the field, because, you know, rightfully so,
8 that's really been at a stop. I think I only know
9 the enforcement people are getting out -- the
10 enforcement and compliance people are out in the
11 field right now that I know of.

12 But are any of the new policies for the
13 office going to impact that negatively or positively,
14 because the folks that I work with, you know, it's
15 important for us to see you guys more in person. And
16 I'm pretty darn sure that's what you guys want, too.
17 I just want to know what that's going to mean to the
18 office so we can, as advisors, possibly give some
19 input. So that's something that I would like to be
20 addressed, if possible.

21 ED MESSINA: Okay, thanks, Marc.

22 MARK LAME: And then I don't know if this
23 is a time to do it or not, but I do want to put in a
24 bid for an in-person PPDC meeting in November, which
25 I know that you don't have control of, but if it

1 can't be entirely in-person, maybe it can be hybrid
2 or something like that, for folks that can make it.
3 I'm assuming things will open up a bit by then.

4 ED MESSINA: I'm hopeful, too.

5 Jasmine.

6 JASMINE BROWN: Thanks, Ed. I was just
7 beginning to unmute.

8 I'm just going to throw this out for a
9 little bit of discussion. There are several areas
10 where I feel like EPA is looking for some additional
11 guidance, and I don't know if they were necessarily
12 brought up at this meeting, but if we're proposing
13 future topics for the PPDC to work on to provide
14 guidance to EPA, I would like to -- I think the
15 emerging technologies UAV drones is a good one.

16 IPM is a good one, but it's not being
17 implemented the way we hope that it would have taken
18 fire. So that's kind of why I wasn't sure where we
19 can improve on that. Some risk assessment gaps were
20 brought up. I think that might be a good area for
21 PPDC to have a future workgroup on that.

22 There are several other gray areas.

23 Cannabis and hemp is one of them.

24 I think they're already making good headway
25 on the label and ESA reforms and the emerging

1 pathogens, you know, such as monkey pox or whatever
2 else might be coming down the road. So I wasn't sure
3 if those were included. It wasn't clear to me if
4 those were included in the current workgroups. But
5 if they weren't, I just want to throw those gray
6 areas out for the PPDC to work on in the future.

7 ED MESSINA: Okay, thanks, Jasmine.

8 I took a couple of notes there and I'll try
9 to do a wrap-up at this session on topics that I
10 heard.

11 JASMINE BROWN: Okay.

12 ED MESSINA: Megan?

13 DANNY GIDDINGS: So, Megan, you've got your
14 hand up next.

15 MEGAN PATTERSON: Everything is very slow
16 on the technology end here.

17 So I'd like to make a motion to form a
18 workgroup to address label reform, given the coverage
19 and interest from so many different entities, the
20 coverage in this meeting and then interest from so
21 many different entities on this particular issue. I
22 think that the label reform workgroup could look at
23 work that's currently being completed, but also work
24 that's been proposed or is in progress and, I guess,
25 their objective would be to identify a path forward

1 for all of those initiatives that would be a singular
2 path forward.

3 ED MESSINA: Thanks, Megan.

4 MEGAN PATTERSON: Thank you.

5 DANNY GIDDINGS: A motion is on the table.
6 I'm not sure if we've received a second for that yet.

7 ED MESSINA: Nope. There's two motions on
8 the table right now without seconds.

9 Charlotte.

10 CHARLOTTE SANSON: Yeah, thanks. I don't
11 have a motion, but I do have a topic that I think
12 would be helpful for a future PPDC. Is this an okay
13 time to bring that up?

14 ED MESSINA: Yeah, that's what we're doing.

15 CHARLOTTE SANSON: Okay, good. So I think
16 there's -- based on some of the discussion that we
17 had earlier on GLP requirements and the data that
18 registrants submit, I think it might be helpful for
19 OPP to provide an explanation of the data
20 requirements, the guidelines that are required to be
21 satisfied and the science, you know, behind that
22 because the data that's generated according to those
23 guidelines is what's used in the risk assessments,
24 and so it's a robust process. And I think it might
25 be helpful for, you know, education purposes for PPDC

1 members to have some exposure to that. So it's
2 something that I kind of take for granted, but I
3 think for folks who aren't accustomed to that, I
4 think it would be helpful.

5 And then also sort of parallel to that, how
6 OPP utilizes data from public literature that isn't
7 necessarily held to the GLP standard, but it's still
8 used as -- under consideration as best available
9 science. So I think having some of that would be
10 would be helpful for everybody just to sort of frame
11 that, you know, put that all in context.

12 ED MESSINA: Okay, thanks.

13 CHARLOTTE SANSON: Mm-hmm. I have other
14 ideas, too, but I'll let other people talk.

15 ED MESSINA: You can raise your hand again
16 and we'll let you make your points.

17 CHARLOTTE SANSON: Yeah, I will. Thanks.

18 ED MESSINA: Nathan.

19 NATHAN DONLEY: Yeah. I'd just like to
20 reiterate my point out how the agency can update its
21 policies and practices to be more inclusive of peer-
22 reviewed research by independent scientists. I think
23 that's a place that EPA can make a lot of progress
24 here and act in a more health protective manner.

25 I would like touch on environmental justice

1 for just a sec, too, because there's been some
2 research published recently identifying that people
3 of color and low-income and low-wealth communities
4 are sort of shouldering a disproportionate burden of
5 the societal harm caused by pesticides, and, you
6 know, ways in which EPA policies and practices can
7 kind of help perpetuate that.

8 These disproportionate impacts are being
9 felt, not just in the rural environment, but in the
10 urban environment as well and happen, not just from
11 pesticide use, but from the manufacturer as well. So
12 it's really the entire life cycle of the chemical
13 that's having these, you know, really terrible
14 disproportionate impacts.

15 I actually don't think this would be a good
16 topic for PPDC mainly because I think there's the
17 quick easy decisive things EPA can do right now, and
18 if EPA were to delay action this issue so we could,
19 you know, talk about it for a couple of years, I
20 think would be incredibly disrespectful to these
21 communities and unfair to them. So I hope this is
22 actually not a topic we have on PPDC because that
23 will indicate that EPA is not acting as quickly as it
24 should. And so I hope there's some internal
25 conversations going on to figure out how this office

1 can be more in alignment with the environmental
2 justice principles that are espoused by the agency at
3 large and in this administration, at least
4 rhetorically.

5 Then a topic I think would be great to have
6 and one I've been thinking about a lot is how the
7 U.S. can more closely align its approaches with
8 international treaties, so specifically the Stockholm
9 and Rotterdam conventions that about 180 or 160
10 countries, respectively, have signed on to and
11 ratified and follow. The U.S. is one of the few
12 countries in the world that is not ratified either.
13 Yesterday, I mentioned Pentachlorophenol, which the
14 agency is canceling. That phase-out will complete in
15 2027. And the rest of the world actually banned
16 Pentachlorophenol in 2015, via the listing on Annex A
17 of the Stockholm Convention. So we're 12 years
18 behind.

19 And it's not just penta, it's Endosulfan,
20 it's the same thing, banned throughout much of the
21 world in 2011, wasn't banned here until 2016. So I
22 think just listing on these conventions is generally
23 an indication that their use doesn't comply with U.S.
24 law. Most of these -- you know, most of the
25 Stockholm pesticides are banned here or being phased

1 out and most of the Rotterdam pesticides as well.

2 So I think there's steps EPA can take to
3 make sure that we're more in alignment with these
4 international treaties without, you know, having to
5 ratify them, which would require an act of Congress,
6 and we all know that's not going to happen.

7 So I love to talk about ways that EPA can
8 more closely align our country with that of the rest
9 of the world, so we're not, you know, sort of having
10 these embarrassments where we're so far behind the
11 rest of the world in, you know, protecting people in
12 this country from really harmful chemicals.

13 ED MESSINA: Thank you, Nathan.

14 Alexis.

15 ALEXIS TEMKIN: Hi, thanks. So I wanted to
16 echo a lot of what Nathan said on those topics, but
17 also add that I think I'm hearing a lot of sort of a
18 risk assessment data gap type theme from some other
19 people. That had been mentioned as a future PPDC
20 topic to at least hear discussion about and then
21 maybe potentially even form some sort of workgroup
22 on, and I think that kind of includes, as previously
23 mentioned, some of this inclusion of peer-reviewed
24 science and how it's being incorporated into risk
25 assessment, and in that -- particularly in comparison

1 to sort of GLP guidelines, GLP type studies.

2 How and when new approach methodologies, as
3 Jessica brought up, will be utilized in EPA risk
4 assessments, I think that will be a really important
5 topic as to which studies are used, approved, and how
6 they are used, whether it's a screening approach, a
7 hazard identification approach. And it's really
8 important, I think, for public health protection
9 that how those get used is discussed and sort of
10 examined.

11 And then to add kind of a couple more
12 things in that space, I think there could be a really
13 interesting topic on incorporations of pesticide
14 mixtures into risk assessments and sort of broadening
15 EPA's groupings of pesticides that they consider,
16 which right now are really limited to pesticides that
17 share almost exact mechanism of action. While
18 there's a lot of good evidence in the literature and
19 work done by other agencies in Europe, that sort of a
20 broader target organ approach might be more
21 beneficial or include more pesticides and that
22 there's evidence for that.

23 And then, lastly, is sort of maybe an
24 update on the endocrine disruptors screening program,
25 which I know, Ed, I see always sort of floating off

1 to the side in the first introductory slides. And so
2 partially the questions being where is that program,
3 what did it find and really mostly highlighting, I
4 think, the limitations of that program and where we
5 can go in the future so that EDC's endocrine
6 disruption is incorporated into risk assessments in a
7 really comprehensive and public health protective
8 way.

9 Thank you.

10 ED MESSINA: Thank you, Alexis.

11 Mayra.

12 MAYRA REITER: Yes, thank you. So I have
13 two potential topics for discussion. One of them is
14 exploring whether we can -- within the regulatory
15 framework, there are ways that EPA can help advance
16 reduced risk pesticides, whether, you know, that's
17 changes to the registration process that can be made
18 without compromising the integrity of that process,
19 or labeling or other potential measures to help in
20 that regard.

21 And the other topic was already mentioned
22 yesterday, and that's concerning bilingual labels,
23 which is something that's incredibly important and
24 something that has been discussed for years and
25 years, and I think it's really important to find a

1 way forward on that.

2 Thank you.

3 ED MESSINA: Lisa.

4 LISA DREILINGER: Hi, everyone. I have
5 just something really quick -- and actually it was
6 for Megan -- on the label reform. I agree that there
7 needs to be label reform, but I'm really unclear on
8 the ask. So I'm wondering, Megan, if you could
9 either in the chat or at a later date, before we
10 actually vote on it, clarify what the charge
11 questions might be or what you were looking to gain
12 out of it. I know we spent some time yesterday on
13 label reform and the electronic reform of the label,
14 and I'm wondering if there's a way to combine
15 efforts, not start all over again, or if I'm just
16 misinterpreting what you meant by label reform. I
17 just need a little bit more clarity.

18 ED MESSINA: And I'll ask Megan to raise
19 her hand, and then we'll go with Mily.

20 MILY TREVIÑO-SAUCEDA: In terms of the --
21 what was it called -- the resistance system -- in
22 terms of the labeling and everything, so are we --
23 this is a question more from me. Are we talking
24 about different groups within for the labels or the
25 assessments? I'm getting kind of confused because

1 there's different topics that are being talked about.

2 Sorry. But I --

3 ED MESSINA: So there's motions on the
4 table that have been seconded.

5 MILY TREVIÑO-SAUCEDA: Okay.

6 ED MESSINA: I think, at some point,
7 Danny's going to put them up and then we'll take a
8 vote on them.

9 MILY TREVIÑO-SAUCEDA: All right. I'll
10 listen. I'll read them then. Thank you.

11 ED MESSINA: Okay, thank you.

12 Megan?

13 MEGAN PATTERSON: So with my motion, I was
14 proposing that we essentially cross-walk between all
15 of the efforts that have been happening. So the idea
16 would be to utilize AAPCO's label improvement project
17 and the efforts that have been undertaken there, and
18 as well as combined with OPPEL and what's happening
19 at EPA's end of things. And then, you know, I think
20 one thing we identified through our process with the
21 APPCO project was a need to engage a variety of
22 stakeholders, so all of the stakeholders that have
23 been mentioned with an interest in label improvement
24 here during the PPDC sessions, but, also, you know
25 some of our folks in other federal agencies that have

1 an interest in making sure labels are clear and
2 concise and enforceable.

3 So I think that that's more of the idea, is
4 to make sure that the path that we're all taking
5 forward, whether that be OPPEL, whether that be the
6 AAPCO's Label Improvement Project, that all of those
7 efforts get combined and essentially were at least
8 discussed in a collective way so that we're all
9 moving in the same direction, that there aren't
10 these, you know, sort of multiple disparate projects
11 being worked on by different groups without sort of
12 cross-conversation between all of those entities.

13 So that's the idea. I don't know if that
14 clarifies sufficiently.

15 ED MESSINA: Mily's got her hand raised. And Lisa, if you want
16 to raise your hand.

17 MILY TREVIÑO-SAUCEDA: Okay. This is based
18 on another thing that I wanted to ask. And, Megan,
19 what you just explained, I have a good idea what
20 you're talking about. Thank you.

21 In terms of the farmworker group that we
22 have been involved with, so it's done with and -- but
23 there's a lot more work to do. So my question is can
24 I do a motion -- Well, I can do a motion, but I want
25 to bring up a motion about having this, you know,

1 workgroup or a separate workgroup to follow up in
2 terms of more that needs to be done. I mean, what we
3 were able to accomplish was a great part and that's
4 why I said what I said earlier, but there needs to be
5 more -- I mean, there's more that we need to be
6 looking into, not only in the trainings, but the
7 implementations, but in terms of other things
8 related.

9 So I just wanted to bring it up in terms of
10 it's not only about trainings with farmworkers. It
11 deals with -- because farmworkers have not been part
12 of the Fair Labor Standards Act, which means
13 farmworkers are not part of industrial relations,
14 there's less protections everywhere and only certain
15 protections, like the Worker Protection Standards, is
16 part of giving some kind of whatsoever protections.
17 There's a lot more. And there's certain things that
18 EPA can only work on, but I'd like to see if we could
19 explore that in terms of talking a little bit more.
20 Two years ago was the first time we were called
21 essential. Well, then there's more than just being,
22 you know, named essential. There's many more things
23 that we need to be dealing with.

24 Thank you.

25 ED MESSINA: Thanks, Mily.

1 Lisa.

2 LISA DREILINGER: So I just want to say
3 thank you, Megan. It's clear what you had in your
4 mind to me. Thank you.

5 ED MESSINA: Dave.

6 DAVE TAMAYO: Yeah, thank you. The
7 comments that I made yesterday about some of the
8 things that I felt are deficiencies or gaps in the
9 risk assessment and risk mitigation process, I think
10 are pretty closely tied to what Nathan and Alexis
11 were talking about. I would go beyond just including
12 peer-reviewed data. I would also -- excuse me, I
13 thought I had my camera on.

14 I'd go beyond just trying to include peer-
15 reviewed data. I think there's concerns about the
16 use of modeling -- appropriate modeling, what test
17 organisms are used to make determinations of risk,
18 knowledge of how things are actually used in the
19 field -- and when I say "field," I include in urban
20 environments -- and then also how the risk assessment
21 findings are incorporated into risk mitigation
22 decisions. So I think all those things should be
23 included in the discussion of risk assessment.

24 And I do support what Charlotte said, which
25 was to have EPA describe, well, what is the existing

1 process to provide context. Thank you.

2 ED MESSINA: Okay. Lauren. And then I
3 think we should probably -- Danny, are you ready for
4 a vote on the motions?

5 DANNY GIDDINGS: Yeah, I'm ready for at
6 least two.

7 ED MESSINA: Yeah, that's currently, as far
8 as I understand, all we have that have been seconded.

9 LAUREN DANA: Thanks. I'll make my
10 comments quickly.

11 I just wanted to echo Mayra's point about
12 the urgency of coming up with a bilingual label and
13 just connecting that point to what Nathan raised on
14 environmental justice and the disproportionate impact
15 of pesticide exposure on communities of color and so
16 just how urgent and how much of a priority I hope
17 that we can make -- or that the EPA can make, you
18 know, this project of creating a bilingual label.

19 I also wanted to raise or highlight a
20 specific (inaudible) that I have seen (inaudible)
21 and I have seen in our work, and I'm not sure what
22 the right place for this is within the PPDC as a new
23 member, but I'm hopeful that folks can provide some
24 input, maybe between now and the next meeting. But
25 essentially the gap of farmworkers or agricultural

1 workers being able to obtain information about
2 pesticides when they have been exposed by drift and
3 so pesticides that have not been applied by their
4 employer, and their employer who states that they do
5 not have a responsibility or ability to provide that
6 information to their employees, to the farmworkers.

7 Yeah, in our case, the employer did have
8 that information but withheld it from the
9 farmworkers. And so I'm just wondering if there's an
10 opportunity for guidance on whether the rules within
11 the WPS would require that or sort of guidance on how
12 agricultural workers can obtain that information, you
13 know, if that's not -- if that's a false gap, and
14 sort of what the way forward would be for folks to be
15 able to get that information, given how common and
16 prevalent drift is and acknowledging, again from an
17 environmental justice perspective, the increased
18 risks as weather becomes more extreme and
19 unpredictable, and I presume drift could become
20 worse.

21 So thank you very much.

22 ED MESSINA: Thank you, Lauren.

23 Okay. Danny, so we've got a lot of great
24 topics here and, of course, there's a transcript of
25 this meeting that will get posted so folks will be

1 able to see all of the suggestions. And then, as we
2 build our agenda for the next PPDC and October, we'll
3 certainly send out to the PPDC members an email that
4 will contain probably the transcript and then maybe a
5 list of things that we culled from the conversation
6 that we had here today. So I think that was a really
7 great discussion, so thank you.

8 We'll turn to our voting and close it out.
9 I'll do a little closing and then we'll do a public
10 session.

11 DANNY GIDDINGS: Great. So we will first
12 be voting on Megan Patterson's motion to form a
13 workgroup addressing label reform, which would look
14 at currently completed work or work-in-progress and
15 develop a path forward for this effort. The idea
16 here is to create a crosswalk between all the efforts
17 that have been happening, for example, AAPCO's
18 project, which I didn't get the name of, and also
19 EPA's OPPEL project. And in doing this, the
20 workgroup would engage a variety of stakeholders, all
21 of those that have been mentioned here at May's PPDC
22 meeting, but also other members of the federal
23 family, i.e., other federal agencies.

24 So this is the language that we will be
25 voting on. This is what we were able to capture from

1 the discussion, as well as what Megan put forward.

2 I'm going to now switch screens to go into
3 the -- let's see. I need to close this last vote --
4 to go into MURAL and I'm going to get rid of the
5 language from the last vote. And, please, everyone
6 on the PPDC, join me in the MURAL app using the same
7 link that we had used before.

8 I'm going to put another minute-30 on the
9 clock to give myself time to set up the vote and also
10 for everyone to join me in the MURAL app. Let's go
11 ahead and start the timer.

12 I'm starting voting now.

13 SHANNON JEWELL: Danny, this is Shannon. I
14 think in interest of time while people are voting, if
15 the attendees who want to make public comments could
16 please raise their hand, then I'll start looking
17 through that list and make sure you all are
18 registered to make comments and get you set up. So
19 if you could please work on that. This is just for
20 the attendees.

21 ED MESSINA: Thank you, Shannon.

22 DANNY GIDDINGS: Great idea, Shannon.

23 SHANNON JEWELL: Sure, thank you.

24 DANNY GIDDINGS: Five people left to vote
25 with about 30 seconds left.

1 (Pause.)

2 DANNY GIDDINGS: Five people, 20 seconds
3 left.

4 (Pause.)

5 DANNY GIDDINGS: Four people with 10
6 seconds left.

7 (Pause.)

8 DANNY GIDDINGS: All right. Voting is now
9 closed.

10 Twenty-three votes for yea, four votes to
11 abstain. So with 23 votes, the yeas have it and the
12 motion is passed.

13 ED MESSINA: Okay. You want to do the next
14 one?

15 DANNY GIDDINGS: Yeah. Let's close out of
16 this session. Everyone, please go ahead and stay in
17 MURAL. I'm just going to switch my window here to
18 show the text of Jessica Ponder's motion.

19 So this is a motion to form a workgroup to
20 review emerging technologies for hazard assessment
21 related to environmental justice, such as test
22 methods for developmental neurotoxicity. The charge
23 questions, as I understand them to be these two
24 bullets, would be to review efforts within and
25 without EPA and OECD to characterize the accuracy and

1 performance of available tests methods and approaches
2 to address developmental neurotoxicity, and, two, to
3 make recommendations for this adverse outcome and
4 others relevant to environmental justice. So that is
5 the text of the motion.

6 Let me get back into MURAL.

7 Sorry, this is clunky with all my screens
8 up. I apologize.

9 Everyone, please, join me, everyone on the
10 PPDC, that is. I'm going to put a minute-30 on the
11 clock. We'll start the voting session.

12 Sorry, Jessica, this is the easiest way for
13 me to find it later.

14 Start voting. You have a minute to vote.

15 (Pause.)

16 DANNY GIDDINGS: Thirty seconds.

17 (Pause.)

18 DANNY GIDDINGS: Nine people left to vote
19 with 30 seconds left.

20 (Pause.)

21 DANNY GIDDINGS: Five people left to vote
22 with ten seconds left.

23 (Pause.)

24 DANNY GIDDINGS: Close the session.

25 So 11 yea, 8 abstentions, 7 nays.

1 JASMINE BROWN: On these really close ones,
2 I would just suggest that maybe we table them for
3 further discussion, because they're quite split
4 through the PPDC. But if you want to go with the
5 most vote, that's fine, too. But I'm suggesting
6 that.

7 ED MESSINA: Yeah, it's pretty loose. And,
8 you know, that's a good great point. But I think,
9 you know, we can consider the motion passed.

10 The other thing is, you know, once these
11 groups are formed, we're going to need people to
12 staff them, not just from EPA, but from PPDC and
13 others. So, you know, the level of work that can be
14 done will be the amount of folks that show interest
15 in joining the group, too. So that could be
16 something that's covered at the next PPDC.

17 JASMINE BROWN: Right. Okay.

18 DANNY GIDDINGS: So I was --

19 ED MESSINA: Okay.

20 DANNY GIDDINGS: Go ahead, Ed.

21 ED MESSINA: Yeah, and I think the last one
22 that was a motion -- but I didn't hear a second and I
23 just wanted to see if anyone wanted to second Mily's
24 motion. But before we voted on it, I wanted to make
25 sure we -- if we were going to vote on it, if there

1 was a second.

2 DANNY GIDDINGS: I can't see the chat, Ed,
3 so I'm hoping that you're monitoring --

4 ED MESSINA: Yeah, I'm not seeing any
5 seconds.

6 DANNY GIDDINGS: Okay.

7 ED MESSINA: Shannon, how are you doing on
8 the --

9 SHANNON JEWELL: Yeah, yeah, Ed. Actually,
10 no one is raising hands to signal that they'd like to
11 make a public comment. So one more quick reminder,
12 if you'd like to make a public comment today of up to
13 three minutes before we end the meeting, please raise
14 your hands now.

15 ED MESSINA: Okay. So let's go over the
16 workgroups we have and then there was sort of EJ --
17 all right.

18 So the current -- just so we're on the same
19 page -- so we have the emerging technologies
20 workgroup that is continuing with its work. We have
21 the emerging pathogens workgroup that is continuing
22 with its work. We have the resistance management
23 group. And I will say some are continuing, some are
24 our new creations in my -- sorry, my notes just
25 started messing up.

1 We have the label reform group. We have an
2 IPM group. We just passed the motion on the EJ
3 group.

4 Did I miss any?

5 DANNY GIDDINGS: You mentioned -- I'm
6 sorry, did you mention the -- I was multitasking --
7 did you mention the emerging pathogen workgroup, Ed?

8 ED MESSINA: Yes. So we have --

9 DANNY GIDDINGS: To extend --

10 ED MESSINA: Yes, we have emerging
11 technologies. That's a continuation from the last
12 PPDC. Emerging pathogens, a new group being formed
13 to deal with implementation; emerging pathogens --
14 sorry, emerging technologies, emerging pathogens
15 resistance management, label reform, IPM and EJ. I
16 just wanted to make sure I captured those were the
17 groups that we have currently.

18 Anybody hear differently?

19 Okay. And then the question is -- I
20 imagine the folks that made the motion presumably
21 would be the chairs of those groups, but not
22 necessarily the case.

23 So, Shannon, how do you want the folks for
24 the newly formed workgroups to sort of work through
25 obtaining members and, you know, seeking to do work

1 during the interim time between now and the next PPDC
2 meeting? What do you recommend?

3 SHANNON JEWELL: Yeah. Well, what we had
4 last time was people submitted statements of interest
5 or many people sent CVs or resumes. I think for this
6 time we'll want people to send them to the co-chairs
7 of the groups. Since we don't have co-chairs for the
8 newly suggested groups, I'm kind of wondering --
9 because for those, we'll need to work up charge
10 questions -- specific charge questions, right?

11 ED MESSINA: That will probably be the
12 first order of business for those newly formed
13 groups.

14 SHANNON JEWELL: Okay, okay. So I'm just
15 thinking of a contact person that they could send
16 emails to.

17 ED MESSINA: Can we give them Carla? And,
18 Danny, would you mind being CC'ed on that email?

19 DANNY GIDDINGS: I can be CC'ed.

20 ED MESSINA: Yeah.

21 SHANNON JEWELL: So let me put these two
22 emails in the chat and if people -- like Ed is
23 saying, if people are interested in becoming members
24 of these working groups, then you can reach out to
25 Carla and Danny about that.

1 The way it's been in the past is we've
2 tried to cap groups at around 20 people, give or
3 take. PPDC members who want to be on the group can
4 automatically be on the groups until not more than 20
5 PPDC members. It can't be half or more of the group.
6 And I think those are our main guideline.

7 So I'll stick those email addresses in the
8 chat right now.

9 ED MESSINA: So if you'd like to be on the
10 emerging technologies, emerging pathogen, resistance
11 management, label reform, IPM or EJ workgroup, please
12 send an email. If you'd like to chair the newly
13 formed groups, then please indicate that. And we
14 will then send an email group to folks -- you know,
15 to that group of people that have sort of asked to be
16 on those groups.

17 We've also created a team site for the
18 various workgroups, so we have some technologies to
19 use Microsoft Teams to help those groups manage
20 documents and be together and, you know, sort of have
21 some tools to help collaborate and coordinate.

22 Okay. And with that, let's see -- I think
23 there is a hand raised. Lisa and Jasmine.

24 LISA DREILINGER: Thanks, Ed. I just want
25 to confirm that if we are already one of those

1 committees, we don't need to recommit ourselves or do
2 you want us to --

3 ED MESSINA: Actually, yeah. Because these
4 are new workgroups, I would say yes, except for --
5 yeah, because the emerging viral pathogen one, which
6 I mentioned, you might be interested in, that is a
7 new workgroup that's being formed. If you remember
8 the FACA rules, we're sort of discontinuing the old
9 one and the new one is going to focus on the
10 implementation pieces.

11 LISA DREILINGER: Okay.

12 ED MESSINA: So yes. For all these
13 workgroups, please submit some interest.

14 LISA DREILINGER: Thank you.

15 ED MESSINA: Jasmine.

16 JASMINE BROWN: I just had a question. Can
17 we serve on more than one of the workgroups as a PPDC
18 member?

19 ED MESSINA: Yep, yes.

20 JASMINE BROWN: Okay.

21 ED MESSINA: And non-PPDC members can serve
22 on the subgroups as well. So if there's an expert
23 you think is, you know, worthy of time and expertise
24 and you want to bring them into the workgroup, the
25 chairs will decide out of the 20, you know, who sort

1 of makes it or doesn't make it into the workgroup.

2 JASMINE BROWN: And then just one more
3 question, do we submit our resume and interest letter
4 after the charge questions come out? Because
5 personally for me, it kind of depends on what those
6 charge questions are that I want to spend time on.

7 ED MESSINA: Well, for the new ones, I
8 think they're going to be developing some charge
9 questions for consideration for the next meeting.

10 JASMINE BROWN: Okay. Thank you.

11 ED MESSINA: Mm-hmm.

12 DANNY GIDDINGS: Shannon, I know you were
13 going to drop the emails in the chat. I haven't seen
14 them yet. I have seen a bunch of folks indicating
15 interest in chairing or co-chairing some of these
16 groups. I'll just reiterate that, please, this will
17 -- the chat will be entered into the transcription.
18 But please do also, if you're one of those folks who
19 dropped into chat indicating your interest, please
20 also email your interest. And everything that Ed
21 Messina said ought to be indicated in that interest
22 communication to the emails that Shannon is about to
23 drop into the chat.

24 SHANNON JEWELL: Thanks so much, Danny.
25 And hopefully I got the list of groups right there.

1 ED MESSINA: Emerging technologies,
2 emerging pathogens, resistance management, label
3 reform, IPM cross-cutting and EJ.

4 Okay. So before I do some closeouts and
5 some thank yous, let me go over some things that I
6 heard for future topics as well. And, again, as we
7 build the agenda, there'll be another opportunity,
8 but these are some of my notes that I heard today on
9 future PPDC topics, in no particular order because I
10 was just jumping around.

11 Stockholm and Rotterdam consistency; are
12 there any risk assessment data gaps; how are mixtures
13 assessed; the endocrine disrupting screening program
14 update; environmental justice and UAVs; advance
15 reduced risk pesticides through labeling or other
16 measures; bilingual labels; GLP requirements; OPP to
17 provide an explanation of the data requirements and
18 science behind data requirements; how EPA can be more
19 inclusive of peer-reviewed data; EJ issues and the
20 disproportionate impacts; cannabis and hemp; gaps in
21 the risk assessment process; appropriate modeling;
22 test organisms; use of pesticides in the field; how
23 risk findings are incorporated in risk mitigation and
24 what is the existing process; how can workers get
25 information about when they have been exposed to

1 drift.

2 We had IPM as a topic as well. How does
3 water quality impacts analysis for pesticides -- let
4 me read that again. How does EPA conduct water
5 quality analysis impacts for pesticides; Spanish
6 labeling; more information on pesticide cancellations
7 and mitigation; the future of work and whether EPA
8 will be traveling; whether we'll have an October in-
9 person meeting, IT efforts and expanding those
10 pilots; ESA; and how to tackle ecosystem reviews.

11 And those were basically the topics that I
12 captured. Did I leave anything out on based on what
13 was discussed in the past?

14 Okay. Thank you.

15 So with about five minutes left, I can take
16 us home, unless Danny or Shannon wanted to say
17 anything before I issued a whole bunch of thank yous
18 to everyone.

19 SHANNON JEWELL: No thanks for me.

20 DANNY GIDDINGS: No, I was just going to do
21 thank yous, too, and I think you'll be able to cover
22 them sufficiently. So go ahead, Ed.

23 ED MESSINA: Okay. Well, first of all,
24 I need to thank the PPDC members for your time. I
25 know how valuable your time is, and I really

1 appreciate you sticking with us for these past two
2 days. Hopefully, the agenda and the presentations
3 reflected the fact that we really value your opinion
4 and input and that we are taking steps to incorporate
5 your recommendations into our work and policies.

6 The last October meeting got rave reviews
7 and, honestly, I was a little afraid that this one
8 would not measure up, and I've seen how that those
9 fears were not probably warranted, given the great
10 discussion that we had over these two days and the
11 great presentations.

12 And with that, I really need to thank both
13 the internal and external co-chairs of all of the
14 workgroup members who have put such great effort into
15 these workgroups. It's not just doing the
16 presentations; it's really building those
17 presentations; it's working with senior leadership
18 within EPA and the multiple -- balancing multiple
19 stakeholder interests and providing, you know, joint
20 recommendations. You heard a little bit about that
21 today. You know, those meetings did get heated at
22 times, with people having varying opinions, and it's
23 great I think -- you know, I say debate the topic,
24 not the individual. And we got the best ideas that
25 sort of rise to the top.

1 And I was really impressed with all of our
2 presenters and co-chairs and speakers. And so I
3 really need to think Tajah Blackburn, Komal Jain,
4 Alan Reynolds, David Shaw, Carolyn Schroeder, Steve
5 Schaible, Aidan Black, Amy Blankenship and Greg
6 Watson. So thank you, in particular, for those
7 presenters.

8 I think, you know, when you hear me say
9 from time to time when I'm speaking about how lucky I
10 am to be working alongside such incredible talented
11 and committed individuals that we have in OPP, I
12 think folks got a snapshot of that yesterday and
13 today, with all the presentations that were done. I
14 really appreciate all the hard work and I am honored
15 to be a part of the team here at OPP.

16 The other folks to thank are the folks that
17 made this happen behind the scenes, our Zoom platform
18 folks, again, trying this for the first time, doing
19 translations for the first time.

20 To our translators, thank you for
21 tolerating our rapid speaking and thank you for using
22 bigger words to make us sound really smart for the
23 other folks when you're translating for them. So
24 thank you to our translators.

25 To the Zoom platform folks, Troy Meese,

1 David Kovack and Elton Harrison. We could not have
2 done this without you, so a round of applause for all
3 of your talents there.

4 Danny Giddings, our incredible facilitator
5 and multimedia capture person to capture the voting
6 and doing things on the fly. I've already gotten
7 lots of comments from folks about what an incredible
8 job you did to make this meeting successful. So
9 thank you, Danny.

10 And then last but not least, Shannon, who
11 has made this meeting, you know, possible. Talk
12 about all of the work that goes behind the scenes to
13 bring many people together, I think, if you did a
14 search for Shannon's emails on PPDC, it would topple
15 about 10,000 from all the questions we get from you.

16 And I have some sad news to report, that
17 this is Shannon's last meeting. She is departing the
18 agency for bigger and better things in her life and
19 starting in the next chapter of her incredible life.
20 And she's had such an amazing career here at EPA.
21 And the PPDC has just been incredibly well served by
22 your efforts, Shannon, in all the things that you
23 pulled together. I'm going to miss you on a personal
24 note, and I thank you for your service to OPP and for
25 your service to the PPDC. So thank you, thank you,

1 thank you to Shannon.

2 SHANNON JEWELL: Thank you so much, Ed.

3 And to all of you, it's just been really the pinnacle
4 of my career at EPA to be able to work with this
5 group, and I am so grateful for that, and I've
6 learned so much about everything from all of you. So
7 thank you so much. Thanks, Ed.

8 ED MESSINA: All right. And much like how
9 incredible is this is working, we are ending at 4:59.
10 I think that couldn't be a better time to end, right
11 on time. And thank you so much again, everyone, for
12 attending. Until next time or until next time you're
13 in town or next time you send me an email, it was
14 great seeing all the familiar faces and thank you for
15 your time again.

16 Take care, everyone. Be safe.

17 (Day 2 adjourned.)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25