PPDC Incidents Workgroup

Minutes

April 28, 2016

Workgroup Attendees: Tom Delaney (NALP), Beth Law (CSPA), Valentin Sanchez (OR Law Center), Gary Wilkinson (Scotts), Rick Kingston (SafetyCall), Kaci Buhl (NPIC), Julie Spagnoli (JM Specialty Consulting), and Margaret Jones (EPA Reg.5)

OPP Participants: Melissa Panger, Richard Dumas, Yvette Hopkins, Bob Miller, Shanna Recore?

Rich Dumas opened the meeting seeking volunteers to prepare and be a part of the Workgroup's report back to the full PPDC in mid-May. Julie Spagnoli of JM Specialty Consulting volunteered. Subsequent to the meeting, Cheryl Cleveland of BASF and Cynthia Palmer of American Bird Conservancy also volunteered. Thank you.

Rich asked for the members to provide any comments on the minutes from the previous two calls so that we can update the WG's page on the PPDC website.

The primary purpose of the call was to discuss workgroup members' rankings with a focus on the data elements that may have disagreement with the Workgroup. A total of 15 WG members provided rankings for the elements. Elements that were ranked with multiple 1's (not needed) and 3's (essential element) were the focus elements. Overall, there are not many elements that fall into this group. For many of these elements, OPP stated that it believes that they understand the differences, but want to discuss with the Workgroup. Also, OPP asked if there are any elements that were not explicitly discussed that need to be revisited.

There were several elements that had relatively low rankings (average < 2), indicating that these may be elements that the WG feels are not needed in the incident reports. Melissa Panger led the discussion on the specific elements with low rankings.

1. One area that seemed to get many low rankings dealt with identifying the person reporting the incident and location of the incident. OPP suggested that those putting a low score on these kinds of data

ED_006500_00000191-00001

elements was more about adequately securing the sensitive information rather than being an indication that EPA having the information was not important. Based on the discussion, the Workgroup appears to support the collection of these data to allow for follow-up, but OPP needs to take care in protecting PII and other sensitive information.

2. Incident end date received a fairly low ranking. The group agrees that it would be a useful piece of information, but believes would often be unknown. When building the reporting function in an incident portal, this element and some others should include an "unknown" option for the submitter.

3. The data asking if the incident was a part of a study received a low ranking primarily because the Workgroup believes that it is a rarity.

4. Requesting the signal word receive a low ranking because it is not terribly useful. However, if is an auto-populated based on the registration number, the Workgroup didn't object to it being in the database.

5. The application method received a low ranking because there is not a common nomenclature that the reporter would know. The Workgroup was supportive of requesting the element where the reporter must select from a menu. OPP commented that it envisions the use of menus whenever possible to enhance consistency and data analysis.

6. The data element asking if the product involved is a concentrate received a low ranking. Based on the discussion, there was agreement that it could be useful information, but often may be unknown. The group seems supportive of the element with a menu yes/no/unknown.

7. The number of work days lost received a number of low rankings. The concern is verification would rarely be available and thus the chance of getting quality data is very low.

8. Under the Domestic Animal category, management site received some low rankings.

9. Under the Fish and Wildlife category, the Endangered Species element received a low ranking primary because most people reporting would

not know whether or not if the species is endangered. The group discussed the idea of a menu with species and OPP will auto-populate.

10. Requesting the Pesticide Code (PC) received a low ranking because it is often unknown. Most agreed that it can be useful and could be an auto-populate element in the database.

11. Under Insect Pollinators some members ranked the source of the weather data low. The workgroup provided no comments during the call.

12. Under Insect Pollinators, some members ranked the question of whether or not the site is on the bee registry low. The workgroup provided no comments during the call.

13. Under Insect Pollinators, some members ranked the question of regarding hive health registry low. OPP explained that we think this is important to determine if there were other mitigating factors. The workgroup provided no comments during the call.

14. Under Insect Pollinators, some members ranked the question regarding any degradates low. The workgroup provided no comments during the call.

Open Discussion:

OPP needs to be cognizant that that elements may not be readily available in every case. So including an "unknown" option will be important.

Developing a framework that ensures the receipt of consistent information is a challenge.

OPP needs to be cognizant of the difference between a complaint and an incident.

The concept of acres damaged may work for agriculture, but does not work well for non-agricultural use sites. For non-agriculture, a percentage or percentage ranges may be more appropriate.

Within each data element category, OPP should consider breaking into agricultural and non-agricultural incidents.

ED_006500_00000191-00003

OPP needs to be cognizant that there are already multiple reports going to states, other parts of EPA and others.

To make incidents information public, the data need to be verifiable. OPP commented that as we develop an incidents framework, we plan to seek advice as how to make the data verifiable and how to be transparent while protecting sensitive information.