Some of the questions I have are as follows:

1. A number of scientists, and environmental groups say that treated seeds treated seeds fit the legal definition of and are explicitly marketed as pesticides, and therefore should be regulated under FIFRA. What is the Agencies position? Do treated seeds not meet the bar to be considered pesticides?

EPA response:

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

2. Has the dramatic increase in the use of pesticide coated seeds over the last decade indicate that it may be time to revisit the treated article exemption, which currently exempts treated seed from registration and labeling requirements?

EPA response: **Deliberative Process / Ex. 5**

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

3. Some also claim that pesticide-coated seeds possess unique pesticidal and environmental fate properties that must be regulated under FIFRA to ensure adequate protection of the environment and public health. If EPA disagrees, what steps have they taken to ensure adequate protections from the specific risks posed by seed-coatings?

EPA response: **Deliberative Process / Ex. 5**

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

4. There is an increasing body [HYPERLINK "https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11356-014-3180-5"] that are pointing to [HYPERLINK "https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2019/09/common-pesticide-makes-migrating-birds-anorexic"] environmental impacts of from neonic-coated seeds (besides pollinators). Is this something that is concerning from a risk analysis POV? Is EPA factoring these new studies into the re-registration review for neonics?

EPA response: **Deliberative Process / Ex. 5**

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

5. Is there any concern that the massive use of treated seeds (particularly corn, soybeans and wheat) have led to the overuse of pesticides, and that this might exacerbate problems such as endangered species exposure, or weed resistance?

EPA response:

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5