Appointment

From: Marshall, Venus [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=DBD81A18F6AD447F90B8ABBCB90FE9DB-VENUS ASHTON]
Sent: 8/28/2017 2:56:01 PM
To: Beck, Nancy [beck.nancy@epa.gov]; lflanagan@dclrs.com; dcrow@dclrs.com; dbeaudreau@dclrs.com
CC: Jakob, Avivah [Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov]
BCC: DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP [DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov]

Subject: Meet & Greet w/Aaron Hobbs (RISE)
Location: DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP

Start: 9/8/2017 3:00:00 PM
End: 9/8/2017 3:30:00 PM
Show Time As: Busy

Directions: Please use the **William Jefferson Clinton East Entrance located at 1201 Constitution Avenue.** Please arrive 10 minutes prior to the meeting with photo IDs to clear Security.

For an escort from Security to the meeting please call (202) 564-2902 or (202) 564-2910.

Purpose: Introductory meeting to discuss the association of the Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment (RISE) key pesticide policy issues.

Attendees will be RISE President Aaron Hobbs and a few board members.

Bolen, Derrick

Subject: Beck, Nancy Calendar
Attachments: Beck Nancy Calendar.ics

Beck, Nancy Calendar
Beck.Nancy@epa.gov
Friday, September 1, 2017 – Saturday, September 30, 2017
Time zone: (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)
(Adjusted for Daylight Saving Time)

September 2017

Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
					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	26	27	28	29	30

Busy | Tentative | Free
Out of Office | Working Elsewhere | Outside of Working Hours

September 2017

Fri, Sep 1

	All Day	HOLD
	9:00 AM – 9:30 AM	IO General call-in Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy

Sat, Sep 2 – Sun, Sep 3

	All Day	**Free**

Mon, Sep 4

	All Day	Labor Day United States
	Before 8:00 AM	**Free**
	8:00 AM – 6:00 PM	Labor Day / Office closed Cleland-Hamnett, Wendy

■	9:30 AM – 10:00 AM	OCSPP Staff Meeting (Skype Video Teleconference) WJC East 3371C - Skype Call-In Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Wise, Louise
□	**After 6:00 PM**	**Free**

Tue, Sep 5

□	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
□	8:00 AM – 9:00 AM	Personal Matters / Ex. 6
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	Chief of Staff Meeting Alm Room Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott
□	**9:00 AM – 9:30 AM**	**Free**
■	9:30 AM – 10:00 AM	RE: OCSPP Staff Meeting (Video Teleconference) - Dial-in Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO Beck, Nancy
□	**10:00 AM – 10:30 AM**	**Free**
■	10:30 AM – 11:00 AM	Problem Formulation DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
□	**11:00 AM – 11:45 AM**	**Free**
■	11:45 AM – 12:00 PM	hold
■	12:00 PM – 1:30 PM	General Old Ebbitt Beck, Nancy
□	**1:30 PM – 1:45 PM**	**Free**
■	1:45 PM – 2:00 PM	Transportation to PY
■	2:00 PM – 3:00 PM	BLAD Briefing S-12100 PYS Beck, Nancy
□	**3:00 PM – 4:00 PM**	**Free**
■	4:00 PM – 4:30 PM	Registration Process RM 12100 PY South Beck, Nancy
■	4:30 PM – 4:55 PM	Return Transportation to EPA East
□	**4:55 PM – 5:00 PM**	**Free**
□	**After 5:00 PM**	**Free**

Wed, Sep 6

□	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
■	8:00 AM – 9:00 AM	Chief of Staff Meeting Alm Room Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	IO General Meeting 3130 WJC EAST (Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Beck, Nancy

☐	**9:00 AM – 11:00 AM**	**Free**
■	11:00 AM – 12:00 PM	OPPT General 3130A WJC East (Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
■	12:00 PM – 12:30 PM	HOLD: Meet & Greet with Lonza WJCE 3130
■	12:30 PM – 1:00 PM	Fees Discussion DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
■	1:00 PM – 1:45 PM	Systematic Review Meetings DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO; DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
☐	**1:45 PM – 2:00 PM**	**Free**
■	2:00 PM – 3:00 PM	Confirmed: OIG/OCSPP mtg to discuss TSCA/Lautenberg Act Implementation -- Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Weiner, Janet
■	3:00 PM – 3:45 PM	ITRMD - ALL HANDS DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
☐	**3:45 PM – 5:00 PM**	**Free**
☐	**After 5:00 PM**	**Free**

Thu, Sep 7

☐	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
■	8:00 AM – 9:00 AM	Chief of Staff Meeting Alm Room Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	IO General Meeting 3130 WJC EAST (Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
☐	**9:00 AM – 10:00 AM**	**Free**
■	10:00 AM – 11:00 AM	Pre-Prioritization (Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 access code Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
☐	**11:00 AM – 11:30 AM**	**Free**
■	11:30 AM – 12:15 PM	Registration Review Process RM 3156 EPA East Beck, Nancy
☐	**12:15 PM – 1:00 PM**	**Free**
■	1:00 PM – 2:00 PM	CDR Reg Neg Meeting: Position Briefing DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy

▨	2:00 PM – 3:00 PM	Bi-weekly General w/Angela Hofmann 3130C EPA East Wise, Louise
▨	2:00 PM – 3:00 PM	Deputy AA Meeting 3216WJC-South Traylor, Patrick
■	3:00 PM – 4:00 PM	TSCA New Chemicals - Part 1 (CRSS and SAT) RM 3156 EPA East Beck, Nancy
☐	**4:00 PM – 4:30 PM**	**Free**
■	4:30 PM – 6:00 PM	HOLD Paperwork
☐	**After 6:00 PM**	**Free**

Fri, Sep 8

☐	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
☐	**8:00 AM – 9:15 AM**	**Free**
■	9:15 AM – 10:15 AM	Briefing: (ESA) Endangered Species Act Administrator's Office Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott
■	10:15 AM – 11:00 AM	CropLife SOC DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
■	11:00 AM – 11:30 AM	Meet & Greet w/Aaron Hobbs (RISE) DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
☐	**11:30 AM – 12:15 PM**	**Free**
■	12:15 PM – 12:45 PM	OSCP Bi-weekly 3130A WJC East Beck, Nancy
☐	**12:45 PM – 2:00 PM**	**Free**
■	2:00 PM – 2:30 PM	Discussion with Monsanto DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
☐	**2:30 PM – 5:00 PM**	**Free**
☐	**After 5:00 PM**	**Free**

Sat, Sep 9

☐	**Before 9:00 AM**	**Free**
■	9:00 AM – 10:00 AM	**Personal Matters / Ex. 6**
☐	**After 10:00 AM**	**Free**

Sun, Sep 10

☐	**All Day**	**Free**

Mon, Sep 11

☐	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
■	8:00 AM – 9:00 AM	Chief of Staff Meeting Alm Room Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	IO General Meeting 3130 WJC EAST (Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
■	9:00 AM – 9:30 AM	
■	9:30 AM – 10:00 AM	OCSPP Staff Meeting (Skype Video Teleconference) WJC East 3371C - Skype Call-In Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Wise, Louise
☐	**10:00 AM – 11:00 AM**	**Free**
■	11:00 AM – 11:30 AM	International Travel Proposal for October RM 3130C Wise, Louise
■	11:30 AM – 1:00 PM	HOLD-MD
☐	**1:00 PM – 2:00 PM**	**Free**
■	2:00 PM – 3:00 PM	General w/Arnold Layne RM 3148 EPA East Beck, Nancy
■	3:00 PM – 4:00 PM	TSCA New Chemicals - Part 2 (Focus) RM 3156 EPA East Beck, Nancy
☐	**4:00 PM – 5:00 PM**	**Free**
■	5:00 PM – 6:30 PM	HOLD Paperwork
☐	**After 6:30 PM**	**Free**

Tue, Sep 12

☐	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
☐	**8:00 AM – 8:30 AM**	**Free**
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	IO General Meeting 3130 WJC EAST (Call in Number (202) 991-0477, Access code 8384937) Beck, Nancy
☐	**9:00 AM – 9:30 AM**	**Free**
■	9:30 AM – 9:45 AM	Transportation to PY
■	9:45 AM – 10:45 AM	Neonicotinoid Briefing DCRoomPYS9100/Potomac-Yard-One Beck, Nancy
■	10:45 AM – 11:30 AM	PRD ALL HANDS RM - PYS - 9100 Beck, Nancy
■	11:30 AM – 12:15 PM	RD ALL HANDS RM - PYS - 7100 Beck, Nancy
☐	**12:15 PM – 12:20 PM**	**Free**

■	12:20 PM – 12:35 PM	Return Transportation to EPA East
□	**12:35 PM – 1:00 PM**	**Free**
■	1:00 PM – 2:00 PM	EPA meeting with Dr. Beck and EPA staff on TCE WOE (UNCLASSIFIED) 3156 EPA East, 1201 Constitution Ave; conference line: Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Underwood, Patricia M CIV (US)
▨	1:00 PM – 2:00 PM	Hurricane Irma/Harvey: PCC Meeting and Conference Call DCRoomARNB431/Executive-Conference-Room EOC_Deputy_Manager
□	**2:00 PM – 3:00 PM**	**Free**
■	3:00 PM – 3:30 PM	OGC Weekly DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
■	3:30 PM – 5:30 PM	HOLD
□	**After 5:30 PM**	**Free**

Wed, Sep 13

□	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
□	**8:00 AM – 8:30 AM**	**Free**
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	IO General Meeting 3130 WJC EAST (Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
▨	9:00 AM – 5:00 PM	CDR Inorganic Byproducts FACA-Public Meeting - September - Day 1 RRB Oceanic Suites Kramek, Niva
■	9:30 AM – 10:00 AM	ADP tracker 101 Nancys office- if we can access it from my computer Beck, Nancy
■	10:45 AM – 11:15 AM	General Conf. Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Greaves, Holly
■	11:00 AM – 12:00 PM	OPPT General 3130A WJC East (Call in Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
■	2:00 PM – 3:00 PM	OGC Weekly DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
■	3:00 PM – 3:30 PM	Axalta Coating Systems RM 3156 EPA East Building Beck, Nancy
■	4:30 PM – 5:20 PM	Overview of SNURs -- New Chemical 5(e) and Non-5(e), and Existing Chemical SNURs. DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
□	**After 5:20 PM**	**Free**

Thu, Sep 14

	Before 8:00 AM	**Free**
	8:00 AM – 8:30 AM	**Free**
	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	IO General Meeting 3130 WJC EAST Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
	8:45 AM – 9:30 AM	Chief of Staff Meeting Alm Room Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott
	9:00 AM – 3:00 PM	CDR Inorganic Byproducts FACA-Public Meeting - September - Day 2 RRB Oceanic Suites Kramek, Niva
	10:00 AM – 11:00 AM	Pre-Prioritization Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
	11:00 AM – 12:00 PM	New Chemical Bi-Weekly Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO Beck, Nancy
	1:00 PM – 1:45 PM	Risk Assessments (Human Health) RM 3156 EPA East Beck, Nancy
	1:00 PM – 2:00 PM	Hurricane Irma/Harvey: PCC Meeting and Conference Call DCRoomARNB431/Executive-Conference-Room EOC Documentation
	2:00 PM – 2:30 PM	Recusals Room 3156 East Fugh, Justina
	2:00 PM – 4:00 PM	FW: SAVE THE DATE - Personal Matters / Ex. 6 4225 WJC-E Petrole, Maryann
	3:15 PM – 4:00 PM	Meet and greet 3130A WJC East Beck, Nancy
	4:00 PM – 5:00 PM	**Free**
	After 5:00 PM	**Free**

Fri, Sep 15

	Before 8:00 AM	**Free**
	8:00 AM – 8:15 AM	**Free**
	8:15 AM – 8:45 AM	meet and greet Timgad Beck, Nancy
	8:45 AM – 9:30 AM	**Free**

■	9:30 AM – 10:15 AM	ICR review 3130 Beck, Nancy
■	9:45 AM – 10:00 AM	Mock Senator Holding Room (9:45 AM) 1154 WJC East (Judges Chambers) Lyons, Troy
■	10:00 AM – 12:00 PM	Mock Hearing for Senate Confirmed Nominees (10:00 AM) Hearing Room 1152 WJC East Lyons, Troy
□	**12:00 PM – 12:15 PM**	**Free**
■	12:15 PM – 1:15 PM	Mock Hearing Debrief and Feedback (12:15 PM) 1152 WJC East Lyons, Troy
□	**1:15 PM – 1:30 PM**	**Free**
■	1:30 PM – 2:00 PM	HOLD
□	**2:00 PM – 3:30 PM**	**Free**
■	3:30 PM – 4:00 PM	general Nancy will call Al-- whats the best #? Beck, Nancy
■	3:30 PM – 5:30 PM	HOLD Paperwork and Training
□	**After 5:30 PM**	**Free**

Sat, Sep 16

□	**All Day**	**Free**

Sun, Sep 17

□	**Before 1:00 PM**	**Free**
▨	1:00 PM – 2:00 PM	Hurricane Irma/Harvey: PCC Meeting and Conference Call DCRoomARNB431/Executive-Conference-Room EOC Documentation
□	**After 2:00 PM**	**Free**

Mon, Sep 18

□	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
■	8:00 AM – 8:30 AM	General Follow-up Rm. 3166A Mottley, Tanya
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	IO General Meeting 3130 WJC EAST (Call in Number **Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6** **Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6** Beck, Nancy
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	**Personal Matters / Ex. 6** RRB
□	**9:00 AM – 9:30 AM**	**Free**

■	9:30 AM – 10:00 AM	OCSPP Staff Meeting (Skype Video Teleconference) WJC East 3371C - Skype Call-In Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Wise, Louise
□	**10:00 AM – 10:30 AM**	**Free**
■	10:30 AM – 11:00 AM	Prebrief for DAA in advance of OIG mtg on TSCA CDR -- Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Weiner, Janet
■	11:00 AM – 11:30 AM	Sulfoxaflor RM 3156 EPA East Beck, Nancy
■	11:30 AM – 12:30 PM	OCSPP/OIG/OECA Kickoff mtg -- TSCA CDR (OPE-FY17-0025) -- Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO Weiner, Janet
□	**12:30 PM – 2:15 PM**	**Free**
■	2:15 PM – 2:30 PM	Transportation to PY Beck, Nancy
■	2:30 PM – 3:15 PM	BEAD ALL HANDS PYS RM - 9100 Beck, Nancy
□	**3:15 PM – 3:30 PM**	**Free**
■	3:30 PM – 4:00 PM	take shuttle back to HQ
■	4:00 PM – 4:50 PM	LCPFC Proposed SNUR and Ski Wax Issue DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
□	**4:50 PM – 5:00 PM**	**Free**
□	**After 5:00 PM**	**Free**

Tue, Sep 19

□	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
□	**8:00 AM – 8:30 AM**	**Free**
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	IO General Meeting 3130 WJC EAST (Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
□	**9:00 AM – 9:30 AM**	**Free**
■	9:30 AM – 10:00 AM	OGC Weekly RM 3156 EPA East Beck, Nancy
■	10:00 AM – 10:45 AM	Risk Assessments (ECO) RM 3156 EPA East Beck, Nancy
□	**10:45 AM – 11:00 AM**	**Free**
■	11:00 AM – 11:30 AM	MS Farm Bureau and MDAC Meeting DCRoomARN3528/OCIR Cory, Preston (Katherine)

■	11:30 AM – 12:30 PM	Pre-Brief for OMB Hearing on FY 2019 President's Budget DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
■	12:30 PM – 1:30 PM	NAFTA DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
□	**1:30 PM – 4:00 PM**	**Free**
■	4:00 PM – 5:00 PM	DAA Pre-Brief for PBT Section 6(h) Rulemaking Early Guidance Briefing DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
□	**After 5:00 PM**	**Free**

Wed, Sep 20

□	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
□	**8:00 AM – 8:30 AM**	**Free**
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	IO General Meeting 3130 WJC EAST (Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
□	**9:00 AM – 11:00 AM**	**Free**
■	11:00 AM – 12:00 PM	OPPT General 3130A WJC East (Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
□	**12:00 PM – 12:15 PM**	**Free**
■	12:15 PM – 12:45 PM	Stockholm and Rotterdam: Brownbag Briefing for Nancy and Louise DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
□	**12:45 PM – 1:00 PM**	**Free**
▨	1:00 PM – 3:00 PM	Mission Measures - OAR, OW, OCSPP (+R2,5,9) DCRoomWest1426/OPEI; VTC/phone will be available Kenny, Shannon
□	**3:00 PM – 4:00 PM**	**Free**
■	4:00 PM – 4:45 PM	Emergency Tolerance Exemptions and EO 13771 DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
□	**4:45 PM – 5:00 PM**	**Free**
■	5:00 PM – 6:00 PM	Need to leave.
□	**After 6:00 PM**	**Free**

Thu, Sep 21

□	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
■	8:00 AM – 9:00 AM	Chief of Staff Meeting Alm Room Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott

	8:00 AM – 6:00 PM	Hold Personal Matters / Ex. 6
	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	IO General Meeting 3130 WJC EAST (Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
	1:00 PM – 2:00 PM	Hurricane Irma/Harvey: PCC Meeting and Conference Call Dial-In: Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 EOC Documentation
	After 6:00 PM	**Free**

Fri, Sep 22

	Before 8:00 AM	**Free**
	8:00 AM – 9:30 AM	**Free**
	9:30 AM – 10:00 AM	Wendy Blake
	10:00 AM – 11:15 AM	ICR Review 3130 Beck, Nancy
	11:15 AM – 11:30 AM	**Free**
	11:30 AM – 12:45 PM	General Personal Matters / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
	12:45 PM – 2:00 PM	**Free**
	2:00 PM – 3:00 PM	PMN Internal Meeting 3130A EPA East Beck, Nancy
	3:00 PM – 3:30 PM	**Free**
	3:30 PM – 4:00 PM	Jeff/SF case
	4:00 PM – 5:00 PM	**Free**
	5:00 PM – 6:00 PM	HOLD Paperwork
	After 6:00 PM	**Free**

Sat, Sep 23 – Sun, Sep 24

	All Day	**Free**

Mon, Sep 25

	Before 8:00 AM	**Free**
	8:00 AM – 8:30 AM	**Free**
	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	IO General Meeting 3130 WJC EAST (Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
	8:30 AM – 9:30 AM	Chief of Staff Meeting Alm Room Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott

■	9:30 AM – 10:00 AM	OCSPP Staff Meeting (Skype Video Teleconference) WJC East 3371C - Skype Call-In Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Wise, Louise
■	10:00 AM – 10:45 AM	Briefing: (ESA) Endangered Species Act Administrator's Office Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott
□	**10:45 AM – 11:00 AM**	**Free**
■	11:00 AM – 12:00 PM	TSCA Section 12(b) DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
□	**12:00 PM – 1:00 PM**	**Free**
▨	1:00 PM – 2:00 PM	Hurricanes Maria/irma/Harvey: PCC Meeting and Conference Call Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 EOC_Deputy_Manager
■	2:00 PM – 4:00 PM	Coal Tar Sealcoat Request for Reconsideration (RFR) Executive Panel Briefing DCRoomARN5020/DC-AR-OEI Fine, Steven
■	4:00 PM – 5:00 PM	Pre-Prioritization (Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
□	**After 5:00 PM**	**Free**

Tue, Sep 26

□	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
□	**8:00 AM – 8:30 AM**	**Free**
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	IO General Meeting 3130 WJC EAST (Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	reg agenda items 3130 or (Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
□	**9:00 AM – 9:30 AM**	**Free**
■	9:30 AM – 10:15 AM	ECO Lab Meeting RM 3156 EPA East Beck, Nancy
■	10:15 AM – 10:45 AM	Section 5(e) Review Process RM 3156 EPA East Building Beck, Nancy
□	**10:45 AM – 11:00 AM**	**Free**
■	11:00 AM – 11:30 AM	Fall Meetings Discussion RM 3130A EPA East Beck, Nancy

■	11:30 AM – 12:00 PM	TSCA Neg-Rulemaking call in: Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Brown, Byron
□	**12:00 PM – 12:30 PM**	**Free**
■	12:30 PM – 1:00 PM	SES Performance Evaluations 3130A East; conference line Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Wise, Louise
■	1:00 PM – 1:30 PM	HOLD - Paperwork
■	1:30 PM – 2:15 PM	Hiring and PRIA with OCSPP WJC-N 3130A Flynn, Mike
□	**2:15 PM – 2:30 PM**	**Free**
■	2:30 PM – 3:00 PM	International Activities RM 3156 EPA East Beck, Nancy
□	**3:00 PM – 4:00 PM**	**Free**
■	4:00 PM – 5:00 PM	Biostimulants Draft Guidance Briefing DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
■	5:00 PM – 5:15 PM	General RM 3130A EPA East Beck, Nancy
□	**5:15 PM – 5:30 PM**	**Free**
■	5:30 PM – 6:00 PM	SAP EDSP stan will call nancy at Personal Phone / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
□	**After 6:00 PM**	**Free**

Wed, Sep 27

□	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
□	**8:00 AM – 8:30 AM**	**Free**
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	IO General Meeting 3130 WJC EAST (Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
□	**9:00 AM – 9:30 AM**	**Free**
■	9:30 AM – 10:30 AM	Briefing on 610 Lead Review DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
■	10:15 AM – 10:45 AM	Briefing: Dicamba Administrator's Office Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott
□	**10:45 AM – 11:00 AM**	**Free**
■	11:00 AM – 12:00 PM	OPPT General 3130A WJC East (Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
■	12:00 PM – 1:00 PM	CEQ 730 Jackson Place

■	12:45 PM – 1:00 PM	Transportation to OMB
■	1:00 PM – 2:00 PM	HOLD - OMB Hearing on FY 2019 President's Budget New Executive Office Office Building, OMB Headquarters Beck, Nancy
□	**2:00 PM – 2:05 PM**	**Free**
■	2:05 PM – 2:30 PM	Transportation to EPA East
■	2:30 PM – 3:00 PM	Intraspecies Factor Whitepaper 3130A EPA East Beck, Nancy
■	3:00 PM – 4:00 PM	OGC Weekly Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
■	4:00 PM – 4:50 PM	RCC activities DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
□	**4:50 PM – 5:00 PM**	**Free**
□	**5:00 PM – 5:15 PM**	**Free**
■	5:15 PM – 5:45 PM	General Maureen will call Nancy at Personal Phone / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
□	**After 5:45 PM**	**Free**

Thu, Sep 28

□	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
□	**8:00 AM – 8:30 AM**	**Free**
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	IO General Meeting 3130 WJC EAST Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
■	8:30 AM – 9:30 AM	Chief of Staff Meeting Alm Room Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott
□	**9:30 AM – 10:00 AM**	**Free**
■	10:00 AM – 11:00 AM	Region 3 Ag Advisors RM 3371C EPA East Beck, Nancy
□	10:00 AM – 3:30 PM	Annual State Agriculture Secretaries' Meeting EPA R3 Ofc (1650 Arch St., Phila., PA 19103) Rodrigues, Cecil
■	11:00 AM – 11:45 AM	New Chemicals: Non-Order SNURs Call in number 1 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 WJC East 3156 Beck, Nancy
■	11:30 AM – 12:00 PM	General Discussion 3402 WJC-N Jackson, Ryan
■	12:30 PM – 2:00 PM	Early Guidance Meeting – Regulation of PBT Chemicals under TSCA §6(h) (Tier 2, SAN 6015)

DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO
Beck, Nancy

2:45 PM – 3:00 PM APCRA Meeting in Helsinki
RM 3130A EPA East
Beck, Nancy

3:00 PM – 4:00 PM Combined New Chemical Bi-Weekly & Prep for Public Meeting Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO
Beck, Nancy

4:00 PM – 4:50 PM TRI Overview
DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO
Beck, Nancy

4:50 PM – 5:00 PM **Free**

After 5:00 PM **Free**

Fri, Sep 29

Before 8:00 AM **Free**

8:00 AM – 5:00 PM Out of Office

10:30 AM – 11:00 AM Pre Dourson Mock Hearing Meeting (10:30 AM)
DCRoomARN3528/OCIR
Frye, Tony (Robert)

11:00 AM – 12:00 PM Responses to ESA Questions
DCRoomARN4045/DC-Ariel-Rios-OGC
Baptist, Erik

1:00 PM – 2:00 PM Hurricanes Maria/Irma/Harvey: PCC Meeting and Conference Call
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
EOC_Deputy_Manager

After 5:00 PM **Free**

Sat, Sep 30

All Day **Free**

Details

Friday, September 1, 2017

Time All Day
Subject HOLD
Show Time As Out of Office

Time 9:00 AM – 9:30 AM
Subject IO General
Location Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Show Time As Busy
Attendees **Name <E-mail>** **Attendance**

Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Smith, Peterj <Smith.Peterj@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required

Monday, September 4, 2017

Time All Day
Subject Labor Day
Location United States
Show Time As Free
Categories Holiday

Time 8:00 AM – 6:00 PM
Subject Labor Day / Office closed
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Cleland-Hamnett, Wendy <Cleland-Hamnett.Wendy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required

Time 9:30 AM – 10:00 AM
Subject OCSPP Staff Meeting (Skype Video Teleconference)
Location WJC East 3371C - Skype Call-In Number: Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Monday effective 9/4/2017 until 9/25/2017 from 9:30 AM to 10:00 AM
Show Time As Busy
Updated Conference Call-In Number & added Skype Meeting link for Dial-out option.

....
.....

*Join Skype Meeting
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

This is an online meeting for Skype for Business, the professional

meetings and communications app formerly known as Lync.

Join by Phone

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Help <http://intranet.epa.gov/otopintr/webconferencing/ o365-conferencing.html>

[!OC([1033])!]

....
.....

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Organizer
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>	Required
Gorman, John <Gorman.John@epa.gov>	Required
Sisco, Debby <Sisco.Debby@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Overstreet, Anne <overstreet.anne@epa.gov>	Required
Burden, Susan <Burden.Susan@epa.gov>	Required
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Kovner, Karissa <Kovner.Karissa@epa.gov>	Required

Clark, Sharon <Clark.Sharon@epa.gov>	Required
Filippelli, John <Filippelli.John@epa.gov>	Required
Boutureira, Alan <Boutureira.Alan@epa.gov>	Required
Carter, Pamela <Carter.Pamela@epa.gov>	Required
Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>	Required
DeDora, Caroline <Dedora.Caroline@epa.gov>	Required
Berkley, Bruce <Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov>	Required
LaPosta, Dore <LaPosta.Dore@epa.gov>	Required
Mitchell, Judy-Ann <Mitchell.Judy-Ann@epa.gov>	Required
Smoot, Cameo <Smoot.Cameo@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>	Required
Vineski, Steve <Vineski.Steve@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Graves, Inza <Graves.Inza@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Scott, Elizabeth <Scott.Elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Wooge, William <Wooge.William@epa.gov>	Required
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Weiner, Janet <Weiner.Janet@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Marshall, Venus <Marshall.Venus@epa.gov>	Required

Green, Teresa <Green.Teresa@epa.gov>	Optional
Treimel, Ellen <Treimel.Ellen@epa.gov>	Optional
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Optional
Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>	Optional
Dixon, Diane <Dixon.Diane@epa.gov>	Optional
Metcalf, Alexander <Metcalf.Alexander@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Required
Pane, Vickie <Pane.Vickie@epa.gov>	Optional
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Scott, Gregory <Scott.Gregory@epa.gov>	Required
Scheifele, Hans <Scheifele.Hans@epa.gov>	Optional

Tuesday, September 5, 2017

Time 8:00 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject Personal Matters / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every September 5 effective 9/5/2017 until 9/5/2017 from 8:00 AM to 9:00 AM
Show Time As Free

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject Chief of Staff Meeting
Location Alm Room
Show Time As Busy
Please be aware there will be a hard stop at 9AM.

Please note the location starting 9 May 2017
POC: ALM Room Cheryl Woodward

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott Administrator / Ex. 6	Organizer
Greaves, Holly <greaves.holly@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required
Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>	Required
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required

Schwab, Justin <schwab.justin@epa.gov>	Required
Wagner, Kenneth <wagner.kenneth@epa.gov>	Required
Gunasekara, Mandy <Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov>	Required
Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
Palich, Christian <palich.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Required
Fotouhi, David <fotouhi.david@epa.gov>	Required
Chmielewski, Kevin <chmielewski.kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Wilcox, Jahan <wilcox.jahan@epa.gov>	Required
Davis, Patrick <davis.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Hupp, Millan <hupp.millan@epa.gov>	Required
Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Ferguson, Lincoln <ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov>	Required
Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>	Required
Graham, Amy <graham.amy@epa.gov>	Required
Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Traylor, Patrick <traylor.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Rodrick, Christian <rodrick.christian@epa.gov>	Required
McMurray, Forrest <mcmurray.forrest@epa.gov>	Required
Letendre, Daisy <letendre.daisy@epa.gov>	Required
Hewitt, James <hewitt.james@epa.gov>	Required

Darwin, Henry <darwin.henry@epa.gov>	Required
Willis, Sharnett <Willis.Sharnett@epa.gov>	Optional
Dickerson, Aaron <dickerson.aaron@epa.gov>	Optional
Shimmin, Kaitlyn <shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Optional
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
Lovell, Will (William) <lovell.william@epa.gov>	Optional
Ford, Hayley <ford.hayley@epa.gov>	Optional
Kundinger, Kelly <kundinger.kelly@epa.gov>	Required
Munoz, Charles <munoz.charles@epa.gov>	Required
White, Elizabeth <white.elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Kelly, Albert <kelly.albert@epa.gov>	Required
Burke, Marcella <burke.marcella@epa.gov>	Required
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
Abboud, Michael <abboud.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Bodine, Susan <bodine.susan@epa.gov>	Required
Sands, Jeffrey <sands.jeffrey@epa.gov>	Required
Hanson, Paige (Catherine) <hanson.catherine@epa.gov>	Required
Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Required
Wehrum, Bill <Wehrum.Bill@epa.gov>	Required
Frye, Tony (Robert) <frye.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Darwin, Veronica <darwin.veronica@epa.gov>	Required
Feeley, Drew (Robert) <Feeley.Drew@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Required
Harlow, David <harlow.david@epa.gov>	Required

Dominguez, Alexander <dominguez.alexander@epa.gov>	Required
Dourson, Michael <dourson.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Inge, Carolyn <Inge.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 9:30 AM – 10:00 AM

Subject RE: OCSPP Staff Meeting (Video Teleconference) - Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Location DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO

Show Time As Busy

*Rescheduled to Tuesday 9/5, given the Monday 9/4 holiday

To: Wise, Louise; Jewell, Shannon; Mojica, Andrea; Kaiser, Sven-Erik; Gorman, John; Sisco, Debby; Strauss, Linda; Overstreet, Anne; Burden, Susan; Morales, Oscar; Kovner, Karissa; Clark, Sharon; Filippelli, John; Boutureira, Alan; Carter, Pamela; Barone, Stan; DeDora, Caroline; Berkley, Bruce; LaPosta, Dore; Mitchell, Judy-Ann; Smoot, Cameo; Cunningham-HQ, Barbara; Cleland-Hamnett, Wendy; Schmit, Ryan; Layne, Arnold; Dinkins, Darlene; Vineski, Steve; Dunton, Cheryl; Beck, Nancy; Graves, Inza; Scott, Elizabeth; Wooge, William; Pierce, Alison; Keigwin, Richard; Weiner, Janet; Hofmann, Angela; Marshall, Venus
Cc: Jakob, Avivah; Green, Teresa; Shimkin, Martha
Subject: OCSPP Staff Meeting (Video Teleconference) - Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
When: Tuesday, September 5, 2017 9:30 AM-10:00 AM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada).
Where: DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>	Required
Mojica, Andrea <Mojica.andrea@epa.gov>	Required
Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>	Required
Gorman, John <Gorman.John@epa.gov>	Required
Sisco, Debby <Sisco.Debby@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Overstreet, Anne <overstreet.anne@epa.gov>	Required
Burden, Susan <Burden.Susan@epa.gov>	Required

Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Kovner, Karissa <Kovner.Karissa@epa.gov>	Required
Clark, Sharon <Clark.Sharon@epa.gov>	Required
Filippelli, John <Filippelli.John@epa.gov>	Required
Boutureira, Alan <Boutureira.Alan@epa.gov>	Required
Carter, Pamela <Carter.Pamela@epa.gov>	Required
Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>	Required
DeDora, Caroline <Dedora.Caroline@epa.gov>	Required
Berkley, Bruce <Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov>	Required
LaPosta, Dore <LaPosta.Dore@epa.gov>	Required
Mitchell, Judy-Ann <Mitchell.Judy-Ann@epa.gov>	Required
Smoot, Cameo <Smoot.Cameo@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>	Required
Vineski, Steve <Vineski.Steve@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Graves, Inza <Graves.Inza@epa.gov>	Required
Scott, Elizabeth <Scott.Elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Wooge, William <Wooge.William@epa.gov>	Required
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Weiner, Janet <Weiner.Janet@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Marshall, Venus <Marshall.Venus@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required

Green, Teresa <Green.Teresa@epa.gov>	Required
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO <DCRoomEast3371c@epa.gov>	Resource
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required

Time 10:30 AM – 11:00 AM
Subject Problem Formulation
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Cleland-Hamnett, Wendy <Cleland-Hamnett.Wendy@epa.gov>	Required
Fehrenbacher, Cathy <Fehrenbacher.Cathy@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Nguyen, Nhan <Nguyen.Nhan@epa.gov>	Required
Susanna Blair (Blair.Susanna@epa.gov) <Blair.Susanna@epa.gov>	Required
Camacho, Iris <Camacho.Iris@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 11:45 AM – 12:00 PM
Subject hold
Show Time As Busy

Time 12:00 PM – 1:30 PM
Subject General
Location Old Ebbitt
Show Time As Busy

Reservation at noon. I was feeling optimistic so I booked it. We can always cancel if needed.

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Palmieri, Rosario A. EOP/OMB	Required

EOP / Ex. 6

Time 1:45 PM – 2:00 PM
Subject Transportation to PY
Show Time As Busy

Your transportation request has been Updated.

Reason for update : Pick Up Time changed
Confirmation Number: 76166
Passenger Information
* Name: NANCY BECK/AA
* Number: 2025648542
* Pickup Time: 2017-09-05 13:45:00.0
* Pickup Location: EPA EAST CONSTITUTION AVE
* Drop-Off Location: POTOMAC YARD CRYSTAL CITY VA.
Vehicle Information
* Tag: G13-1037M
* Vehicle Type: CAR
* Make : CHEVROLET
* Model : VOLT
* Color : BLACK

Time 2:00 PM – 3:00 PM
Subject BLAD Briefing
Location S-12100 PYS
Show Time As Busy

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Richard Keigwin <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
	McNally, Robert <Mcnally.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
	Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>	Required
	Leahy, John <Leahy.John@epa.gov>	Required
	Hollis, Linda <Hollis.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
	Lowit, Anna <Lowit.Anna@epa.gov>	Required
	Michelle Arling <Arling.Michelle@epa.gov>	Required
	Angela Huskey <Huskey.Angela@epa.gov>	Optional

Kaczmarek, Chris <Kaczmarek.Chris@epa.gov>	Optional
Kough, John <Kough.John@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 4:00 PM – 4:30 PM
Subject Registration Process
Location RM 12100 PY South
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>	Required
Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>	Required
Kenny, Daniel <Kenny.Dan@epa.gov>	Required
McNally, Robert <Mcnally.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>	Required
Knizner, Steve <Knizner.Steve@epa.gov>	Required
Weiss, Steven <Weiss.Steven@epa.gov>	Required
Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>	Optional
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Optional
Leahy, John <Leahy.John@epa.gov>	Optional
Hebert, John <Hebert.John@epa.gov>	Optional
Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 4:30 PM – 4:55 PM
Subject Return Transportation to EPA East
Show Time As Busy

Your transportation request has been Updated.

Reason for update : Pick Up Time changed
Confirmation Number: 76167
Passenger Information
* Name: NANCY BECK/AA
* Number: 2025648542
* Pickup Time: 2017-09-05 16:35:00.0
* Pickup Location: POTOMAC YARD CRYSTAL CITY VA.

* Drop-Off Location: EPA EAST CONSTITUTION AVE
Vehicle Information
* Tag: G13-1037M
* Vehicle Type: CAR
* Make : CHEVROLET
* Model : VOLT
* Color : BLACK

Wednesday, September 6, 2017

Time 8:00 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject Chief of Staff Meeting
Location Alm Room
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott Administrator / Ex. 6	Organizer
Letendre, Daisy <letendre.daisy@epa.gov>	Required
Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Required
Wagner, Kenneth <wagner.kenneth@epa.gov>	Required
Ferguson, Lincoln <ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov>	Required
Greaves, Holly <greaves.holly@epa.gov>	Required
Davis, Patrick <davis.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Hupp, Millan <hupp.millan@epa.gov>	Required
Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>	Required
Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
Fotouhi, David <fotouhi.david@epa.gov>	Required
Wilcox, Jahan <wilcox.jahan@epa.gov>	Required
Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>	Required
Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
Gunasekara, Mandy <Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Chmielewski, Kevin <chmielewski.kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Palich, Christian <palich.christian@epa.gov>	Required

Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>	Required
Graham, Amy <graham.amy@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required
Darwin, Henry <darwin.henry@epa.gov>	Required
McMurray, Forrest <mcmurray.forrest@epa.gov>	Required
Rodrick, Christian <rodrick.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Hewitt, James <hewitt.james@epa.gov>	Required
Traylor, Patrick <traylor.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
Lovell, Will (William) <lovell.william@epa.gov>	Optional
Willis, Sharnett <Willis.Sharnett@epa.gov>	Optional
Dickerson, Aaron <dickerson.aaron@epa.gov>	Optional
Ford, Hayley <ford.hayley@epa.gov>	Optional
Shimmin, Kaitlyn <shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Kundinger, Kelly <kundinger.kelly@epa.gov>	Required
Munoz, Charles <munoz.charles@epa.gov>	Required
White, Elizabeth <white.elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Kelly, Albert <kelly.albert@epa.gov>	Required
Burke, Marcella <burke.marcella@epa.gov>	Required
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
Abboud, Michael <abboud.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Bodine, Susan <bodine.susan@epa.gov>	Required
Sands, Jeffrey <sands.jeffrey@epa.gov>	Required

Hanson, Paige (Catherine) <hanson.catherine@epa.gov>	Required
Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Required
Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Required
Schwab, Justin <schwab.justin@epa.gov>	Required
Wehrum, Bill <Wehrum.Bill@epa.gov>	Required
Frye, Tony (Robert) <frye.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Darwin, Veronica <darwin.veronica@epa.gov>	Required
Feeley, Drew (Robert) <Feeley.Drew@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Required
Harlow, David <harlow.david@epa.gov>	Required
Dominguez, Alexander <dominguez.alexander@epa.gov>	Required
Dourson, Michael <dourson.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Inge, Carolyn <Inge.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM

Subject IO General Meeting

Location 3130 WJC EAST Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/28/2017 from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM

Show Time As Busy

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required

Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Tyree, JamesN <tyree.jamesn@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 11:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Subject OPPT General
Location 3130A WJC East Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Wednesday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/27/2017 from 11:00 AM to 12:00 PM
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
Clark, Sharon <Clark.Sharon@epa.gov>	Required
Scott, Elizabeth <Scott.Elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>	Required
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Optional
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss.Linda@epa.gov <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required

Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>	Optional
Cherepy, Andrea <Cherepy.Andrea@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Required
Scheifele, Hans <Scheifele.Hans@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 12:00 PM – 12:30 PM
Subject HOLD: Meet & Greet with Lonza
Location WJCE 3130
Show Time As Busy

Time 12:30 PM – 1:00 PM
Subject Fees Discussion
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Andrea Cherepy (Cherepy.Andrea@epa.gov) <Cherepy.Andrea@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 1:00 PM – 1:45 PM
Subject Systematic Review Meetings
Location DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO; DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy

*Adding meeting materials

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Required
	Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
	Benson, Amy <Benson.Amy@epa.gov>	Required
	Branch, Francesca <branch.francesca@epa.gov>	Required
	Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Optional
	Blair, Susanna <Blair.Susanna@epa.gov>	Optional
	Camacho, Iris <Camacho.Iris@epa.gov>	Required
	DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO <DCRoomEast3371c@epa.gov>	Resource
	DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
	Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required

Time 2:00 PM – 3:00 PM

Subject Confirmed: OIG/OCSPP mtg to discuss TSCA/Lautenberg Act Implementation -- Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP

Show Time As Busy

This meeting is being scheduled at the request of Jeffrey Harris, Director of the Office of Program Evaluation, OIG.

Goal is to identify TSCA/Lautenberg Act implementation challenges where an independent external review by the OIG's Office of Program Evaluation would be helpful.

OIG wishes to better understand what OCSPP sees are the current and future challenges for the program.

Thank you,

Janet Weiner

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance

Weiner, Janet <Weiner.Janet@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Harris, Jeffrey <Harris.Jeffrey@epa.gov>	Required
Copper, Carolyn <Copper.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Required
Kincheloe, Chad <Kincheloe.Chad@epa.gov>	Required
Joseph, Lauretta <Joseph.Lauretta@epa.gov>	Required
Thompson, Thane <Thompson.Thane@epa.gov>	Required
Marshall, Venus <Marshall.Venus@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required

Time 3:00 PM – 3:45 PM
Subject ITRMD - ALL HANDS
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy

OPP/ITRMD Division Meeting with the new Deputy Assistant Administrator for OCSPP, Nancy Beck.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Barber, Delores <Barber.Delores@epa.gov>	Required
Syed, Hamaad <Syed.Hamaad@epa.gov>	Required
OPP ITRMD Managers <OPP_ITRMD_Managers@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Ingram, Earl <Ingram.Earl@epa.gov>	Optional
Guthrie, Christina <Guthrie.Christina@epa.gov>	Optional
Robbins, Steve <Robbins.Steve@epa.gov>	Optional
Katz, Brian <Katz.Brian@epa.gov>	Optional

Schultz, Robert <Schultz.Robert@epa.gov>	Optional
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Optional
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required

Thursday, September 7, 2017

Time 8:00 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject Chief of Staff Meeting
Location Alm Room
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott Administrator / Ex. 6	Organizer
Letendre, Daisy <letendre.daisy@epa.gov>	Required
Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Required
Wagner, Kenneth <wagner.kenneth@epa.gov>	Required
Ferguson, Lincoln <ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov>	Required
Greaves, Holly <greaves.holly@epa.gov>	Required
Davis, Patrick <davis.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Hupp, Millan <hupp.millan@epa.gov>	Required
Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>	Required
Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
Fotouhi, David <fotouhi.david@epa.gov>	Required
Wilcox, Jahan <wilcox.jahan@epa.gov>	Required
Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>	Required
Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
Gunasekara, Mandy <Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Chmielewski, Kevin <chmielewski.kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Palich, Christian <palich.christian@epa.gov>	Required

Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>	Required
Graham, Amy <graham.amy@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required
Darwin, Henry <darwin.henry@epa.gov>	Required
McMurray, Forrest <mcmurray.forrest@epa.gov>	Required
Rodrick, Christian <rodrick.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Hewitt, James <hewitt.james@epa.gov>	Required
Traylor, Patrick <traylor.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
Lovell, Will (William) <lovell.william@epa.gov>	Optional
Willis, Sharnett <Willis.Sharnett@epa.gov>	Optional
Dickerson, Aaron <dickerson.aaron@epa.gov>	Optional
Ford, Hayley <ford.hayley@epa.gov>	Optional
Shimmin, Kaitlyn <shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Bailey, Ethel <Bailey.Ethel@epa.gov>	Optional
Kundinger, Kelly <kundinger.kelly@epa.gov>	Required
Munoz, Charles <munoz.charles@epa.gov>	Required
White, Elizabeth <white.elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Kelly, Albert <kelly.albert@epa.gov>	Required
Burke, Marcella <burke.marcella@epa.gov>	Required
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
Abboud, Michael <abboud.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Bodine, Susan <bodine.susan@epa.gov>	Required

Sands, Jeffrey <sands.jeffrey@epa.gov>	Required
Hanson, Paige (Catherine) <hanson.catherine@epa.gov>	Required
Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Required
Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Required
Schwab, Justin <schwab.justin@epa.gov>	Required
Wehrum, Bill <Wehrum.Bill@epa.gov>	Required
Frye, Tony (Robert) <frye.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Darwin, Veronica <darwin.veronica@epa.gov>	Required
Feeley, Drew (Robert) <Feeley.Drew@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Required
Harlow, David <harlow.david@epa.gov>	Required
Dominguez, Alexander <dominguez.alexander@epa.gov>	Required
Dourson, Michael <dourson.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Inge, Carolyn <Inge.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM

Subject IO General Meeting

Location 3130 WJC EAST **Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6**

Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/28/2017 from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM

Show Time As Busy

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required

Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Tyree, JamesN <tyree.jamesn@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 10:00 AM – 11:00 AM

Subject Pre-Prioritization Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP

Show Time As Busy

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Frithsen, Jeff <Frithsen.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Blair, Susanna <Blair.Susanna@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Required
Grant, Brian <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required

Mclean, Kevin <Mclean.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Thomas, Russell <Thomas.Russell@epa.gov>	Required
Chang, Daniel <chang.daniel@epa.gov>	Required
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
Widawsky, David <Widawsky.David@epa.gov>	Required
Frazer, Brian <Frazer.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Davies, Clive <Davies.Clive@epa.gov>	Required
Sweet, Lauren <sweet.lauren@epa.gov>	Required
Celeste, Laurel <celeste.laurel@epa.gov>	Required
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Optional
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Wolf, Joel <Wolf.Joel@epa.gov>	Required

Time 11:30 AM – 12:15 PM
Subject Registration Review Process
Location RM 3156 EPA East
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Smith, Charles <Smith.Charles@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Guilaran, Yu-Ting <Guilaran.Yu-Ting@epa.gov>	Required
Weiss, Steven <Weiss.Steven@epa.gov>	Required
Knizner, Steve <Knizner.Steve@epa.gov>	Required
McNally, Robert <Mcnally.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Optional
Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>	Optional

Kyprianou, Rose <Kyprianou.Rose@epa.gov>	Optional
Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>	Optional
Fehir, Richard <Fehir.Richard@epa.gov>	Optional
Leahy, John <Leahy.John@epa.gov>	Optional
Hollis, Linda <Hollis.Linda@epa.gov>	Optional
Mendelsohn, Mike <mendelsohn.mike@epa.gov>	Optional
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Optional
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Mendelsohn, Mike <mendelsohn.mike@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 1:00 PM – 2:00 PM
Subject CDR Reg Neg Meeting: Position Briefing
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Required
Sharkey, Susan <Sharkey.Susan@epa.gov>	Required
Kramek, Niva <kramek.niva@epa.gov>	Required
Wolf, Joel <Wolf.Joel@epa.gov>	Required
Smith, ThomasA <smith.thomasa@epa.gov>	Required
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Optional

Reisman, Larry <Reisman.Larry@epa.gov>	Optional
Turk, David <Turk.David@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 2:00 PM – 3:00 PM
Subject Bi-weekly General w/Angela Hofmann
Location 3130C EPA East
Recurrence Occurs every 2 week(s) on Wednesday effective 9/13/2017 until 9/27/2017 from 1:00 PM to 2:00 PM
Show Time As Tentative
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Organizer
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Required

Time 2:00 PM – 3:00 PM
Subject Deputy AA Meeting
Location 3216WJC-South
Show Time As Tentative
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Traylor, Patrick <traylor.patrick@epa.gov>	Organizer
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required
Fotouhi, David <fotouhi.david@epa.gov>	Required
Davis, Patrick <davis.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Gunasekara, Mandy <Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov>	Required
Personal Email / Ex. 6	Optional

Time 3:00 PM – 4:00 PM
Subject TSCA New Chemicals - Part 1 (CRSS and SAT)
Location RM 3156 EPA East
Show Time As Busy
Purpose:

Meeting is required so Nancy Beck can better understand what work is done prior to each of the standard TSCA New Chemical Meetings (i.e., CRSS, SAT and Focus) and what discussions/decisions are made at these meetings.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
Henry, Tala <henry.tala@epa.gov>	Required
David Widawsky <Widawsky.David@epa.gov>	Required
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Required
Canavan, Sheila <Canavan.Sheila@epa.gov>	Required
Williamson, Tracy <Williamson.Tracy@epa.gov>	Required
Rice, Cody <Rice.Cody@epa.gov>	Required
Fehrenbacher, Cathy <Fehrenbacher.Cathy@epa.gov>	Required
Stedeford, Todd <Stedeford.Todd@epa.gov>	Required
Nguyen, Nhan <Nguyen.Nhan@epa.gov>	Required
Edelstein, Rebecca <Edelstein.Rebecca@epa.gov>	Required
Allison, Rose <Allison.Rose@epa.gov>	Required
Moss, Kenneth <Moss.Kenneth@epa.gov>	Required
Schweer, Greg <Schweer.Greg@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Optional
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Scheifele, Hans <Scheifele.Hans@epa.gov>	Optional
Christian, Myrta <Christian.Myrta@epa.gov>	Optional
Eisenreich, Karen <Eisenreich.Karen@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 4:30 PM – 6:00 PM

Subject HOLD Paperwork
Show Time As Busy

Friday, September 8, 2017

Time 9:15 AM – 10:15 AM
Subject Briefing: (ESA) Endangered Species Act
Location Administrator's Office
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott Administrator / Ex. 6	Organizer
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required

Time 10:15 AM – 11:00 AM
Subject CropLife SOC
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Richard Keigwin (Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov) <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
mjtomalewski@croplifeamerica.org <mjtomalewski@croplifeamerica.org>	Required
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Rachel Lattimore <RLattimore@croplifeamerica.org>	Optional
PARRISH, MICHAEL [AG/1920] <michael.parrish@monsanto.com>	Optional
Tamichi, Eric <Eric.Tamichi@valent.com>	Optional
Beau Greenwood <BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org>	Optional
Avivah Jakob (Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov) <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 11:00 AM – 11:30 AM
Subject Meet & Greet w/Aaron Hobbs (RISE)
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP

Show Time As Busy

Directions: Please use the William Jefferson Clinton East Entrance located at 1201 Constitution Avenue. Please arrive 10 minutes prior to the meeting with photo IDs to clear Security.

For an escort from Security to the meeting please call (202) 564-2902 or (202) 564-2910.

Purpose: Introductory meeting to discuss the association of the Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment (RISE) key pesticide policy issues.

Attendees will be RISE President Aaron Hobbs and a few board members.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Optional
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
lflanagan@dclrs.com <lflanagan@dclrs.com>	Required
dcrow@dclrs.com <dcrow@dclrs.com>	Required
dbeaudreau@dclrs.com <dbeaudreau@dclrs.com>	Required

Time 12:15 PM – 12:45 PM
Subject OSCP Bi-weekly
Location 3130A WJC East
Show Time As Busy

Can we do 12:15 instead?

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required

Time 2:00 PM – 2:30 PM
Subject Discussion with Monsanto
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy
Attendees **Name <E-mail>** **Attendance**

Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Perlis, Robert <Perlis.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Saturday, September 9, 2017

Time 9:00 AM – 10:00 AM
Subject Personal Matters / Ex. 6
Show Time As Busy

Monday, September 11, 2017

Time 8:00 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject Chief of Staff Meeting
Location Alm Room
Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday effective 9/1/2017 until 9/29/2017 from 8:00 AM to 9:00 AM
Show Time As Busy
Please note the location starting 9 May 2017
POC: ALM Room Cheryl Woodward

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott Administrator / Ex. 6	Organizer
Kundinger, Kelly <kundinger.kelly@epa.gov>	Required
Munoz, Charles <munoz.charles@epa.gov>	Required
White, Elizabeth <white.elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required
Kelly, Albert <kelly.albert@epa.gov>	Required
Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
Burke, Marcella <burke.marcella@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
Abboud, Michael <abboud.michael@epa.gov>	Required

Bodine, Susan <bodine.susan@epa.gov>	Required
Palich, Christian <palich.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>	Required
Sands, Jeffrey <sands.jeffrey@epa.gov>	Required
Hanson, Paige (Catherine) <hanson.catherine@epa.gov>	Required
Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Required
Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Required
Schwab, Justin <schwab.justin@epa.gov>	Required
Wehrum, Bill <Wehrum.Bill@epa.gov>	Required
Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Frye, Tony (Robert) <frye.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Darwin, Veronica <darwin.veronica@epa.gov>	Required
Feeley, Drew (Robert) <Feeley.Drew@epa.gov>	Required
Gunasekara, Mandy <Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov>	Required
Ferguson, Lincoln <ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Required
Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>	Required
Greaves, Holly <greaves.holly@epa.gov>	Required
Wilcox, Jahan <wilcox.jahan@epa.gov>	Required
Wagner, Kenneth <wagner.kenneth@epa.gov>	Required
Rodrick, Christian <rodrick.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Hewitt, James <hewitt.james@epa.gov>	Required
Fotouhi, David <fotouhi.david@epa.gov>	Required
Darwin, Henry <darwin.henry@epa.gov>	Required
Traylor, Patrick <traylor.patrick@epa.gov>	Required

Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Required
Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>	Required
Harlow, David <harlow.david@epa.gov>	Required
Dominguez, Alexander <dominguez.alexander@epa.gov>	Required
Dourson, Michael <dourson.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Letendre, Daisy <letendre.daisy@epa.gov>	Required
Hupp, Millan <hupp.millan@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
McMurray, Forrest <mcmurray.forrest@epa.gov>	Required
Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Chmielewski, Kevin <chmielewski.kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Inge, Carolyn <Inge.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Lovell, Will (William) <lovell.william@epa.gov>	Optional
Dickerson, Aaron <dickerson.aaron@epa.gov>	Optional
Ford, Hayley <ford.hayley@epa.gov>	Optional
Willis, Sharnett <Willis.Sharnett@epa.gov>	Optional
Shimmin, Kaitlyn <shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM

Subject IO General Meeting

Location 3130 WJC EAST Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/28/2017 from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM

Show Time As Busy

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer

Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Tyree, JamesN <tyree.jamesn@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 9:00 AM – 9:30 AM
Subject
Show Time As Busy

Time 9:30 AM – 10:00 AM
Subject OCSPP Staff Meeting (Skype Video Teleconference)
Location WJC East 3371C - Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Monday effective 9/4/2017 until 9/25/2017 from 9:30 AM to 10:00 AM
Show Time As Busy
Updated Conference Call-In Number & added Skype Meeting link for Dial-out option.

....
.....

* Join Skype Meeting

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

This is an online meeting for Skype for Business, the professional meetings and communications app formerly known as Lync.

Join by Phone

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Help <http://intranet.epa.gov/otopintr/webconferencing/ o365-conferencing.html>

[!OC([1033])!]

....
.....

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Organizer
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>	Required
Gorman, John <Gorman.John@epa.gov>	Required
Sisco, Debby <Sisco.Debby@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Overstreet, Anne <overstreet.anne@epa.gov>	Required

Burden, Susan <Burden.Susan@epa.gov>	Required
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Kovner, Karissa <Kovner.Karissa@epa.gov>	Required
Clark, Sharon <Clark.Sharon@epa.gov>	Required
Filippelli, John <Filippelli.John@epa.gov>	Required
Boutureira, Alan <Boutureira.Alan@epa.gov>	Required
Carter, Pamela <Carter.Pamela@epa.gov>	Required
Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>	Required
DeDora, Caroline <Dedora.Caroline@epa.gov>	Required
Berkley, Bruce <Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov>	Required
LaPosta, Dore <LaPosta.Dore@epa.gov>	Required
Mitchell, Judy-Ann <Mitchell.Judy-Ann@epa.gov>	Required
Smoot, Cameo <Smoot.Cameo@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>	Required
Vineski, Steve <Vineski.Steve@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Graves, Inza <Graves.Inza@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Scott, Elizabeth <Scott.Elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Wooge, William <Wooge.William@epa.gov>	Required
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required

Weiner, Janet <Weiner.Janet@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Marshall, Venus <Marshall.Venus@epa.gov>	Required
Green, Teresa <Green.Teresa@epa.gov>	Optional
Treimel, Ellen <Treimel.Ellen@epa.gov>	Optional
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Optional
Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>	Optional
Dixon, Diane <Dixon.Diane@epa.gov>	Optional
Metcalf, Alexander <Metcalf.Alexander@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Required
Pane, Vickie <Pane.Vickie@epa.gov>	Optional
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Scott, Gregory <Scott.Gregory@epa.gov>	Required
Scheifele, Hans <Scheifele.Hans@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 11:00 AM – 11:30 AM
Subject International Travel Proposal for October
Location RM 3130C
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Organizer
Adams, Denise <Adams.Denise@epa.gov>	Required
Berkley, Bruce <Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov>	Required
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required

Time 11:30 AM – 1:00 PM
Subject HOLD-MD
Show Time As Busy
11:45 Del Friscos

Time 2:00 PM – 3:00 PM
Subject General w/Arnold Layne
Location RM 3148 EPA East
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Arnold Layne (Layne.Arnold@epa.gov) <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Arnold Layne (Layne.Arnold@epa.gov) <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 3:00 PM – 4:00 PM
Subject TSCA New Chemicals - Part 2 (Focus)
Location RM 3156 EPA East
Show Time As Busy
*Attaching materials

Purpose:
Meeting is required so Nancy Beck can better understand what work is done prior to each of the standard TSCA New Chemical Meetings (i.e., CRSS, SAT and Focus) and what discussions/decisions are made at these meetings.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
Henry, Tala <henry.tala@epa.gov>	Required
David Widawsky <Widawsky.David@epa.gov>	Required
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Required
Canavan, Sheila <Canavan.Sheila@epa.gov>	Required
Williamson, Tracy <Williamson.Tracy@epa.gov>	Required
Rice, Cody <Rice.Cody@epa.gov>	Required
Fehrenbacher, Cathy <Fehrenbacher.Cathy@epa.gov>	Required
Stedeford, Todd <Stedeford.Todd@epa.gov>	Required
Nguyen, Nhan <Nguyen.Nhan@epa.gov>	Required
Edelstein, Rebecca <Edelstein.Rebecca@epa.gov>	Required

Allison, Rose <Allison.Rose@epa.gov>	Required
Moss, Kenneth <Moss.Kenneth@epa.gov>	Required
Schweer, Greg <Schweer.Greg@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Bevington, Charles <Bevington.Charles@epa.gov>	Optional
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Optional
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Optional
Eisenreich, Karen <Eisenreich.Karen@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 5:00 PM – 6:30 PM
Subject HOLD Paperwork
Show Time As Busy

Tuesday, September 12, 2017

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject IO General Meeting
Location 3130 WJC EAST Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/28/2017 from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required

Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Tyree, JamesN <tyree.jamesn@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 9:30 AM – 9:45 AM
Subject Transportation to PY
Show Time As Busy

Your transportation request has been Updated.

Reason for update : Pick Up Time changed
Confirmation Number: 76168
Passenger Information
* Name: NANCY BECK/AA
* Number: 2025648542
* Pickup Time: 2017-09-12 09:30:00.0
* Pickup Location: EPA EAST CONSTITUTION AVE

Vehicle Information

* Tag: G13-1008M
* Vehicle Type: CAR
* Make : CHEVROLET
* Model : VOLT
* Color : BLACK
* Drop-Off Location: POTOMAC YARD CRYSTAL CITY VA.

Time 9:45 AM – 10:45 AM
Subject Neonicotinoid Briefing
Location DCRoomPYS9100/Potomac-Yard-One
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Jones, Ricardo <Jones.Ricardo@epa.gov>	Required

Anderson, Neil <Anderson.Neil@epa.gov>	Required
Housenger, Justin <Housenger.Justin@epa.gov>	Required
Sappington, Keith <Sappington.Keith@epa.gov>	Required
Wait, Monica <Wait.Monica@epa.gov>	Required
Welch, Kara <welch.kara@epa.gov>	Required
Myers, Clayton <Myers.Clayton@epa.gov>	Required
Wyatt, TJ <Wyatt.Tj@epa.gov>	Required
Swartz, Christina <Swartz.Christina@epa.gov>	Required
Collantes, Margarita <Collantes.Margarita@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Guilaran, Yu-Ting <Guilaran.Yu-Ting@epa.gov>	Required
Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>	Required
Miller, Wynne <Miller.Wynne@epa.gov>	Required
Vogel, Dana <Vogel.Dana@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Optional
Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>	Optional
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Optional
Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>	Optional
DCRoomPYS9100/Potomac-Yard-One <DCRoomPYS9100@epa.gov>	Resource
Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>	Optional
Pease, Anita <Pease.Anita@epa.gov>	Optional
Sherman, Kelly <Sherman.Kelly@epa.gov>	Optional
Smith, Charles <Smith.Charles@epa.gov>	Optional
Snyderman, Steven <Snyderman.Steven@epa.gov>	Optional

Spatz, Dana <Spatz.Dana@epa.gov>	Optional
Garber, Kristina <Garber.Kristina@epa.gov>	Optional
Corbin, Mark <Corbin.Mark@epa.gov>	Optional
Blankinship, Amy <Blankinship.Amy@epa.gov>	Optional
Wagman, Michael <Wagman.Michael@epa.gov>	Optional
Peck, Charles <Peck.Charles@epa.gov>	Optional
Bohaty, Rochelle <Bohaty.Rochelle@epa.gov>	Optional
Donovan, Elizabeth <Donovan.Elizabeth@epa.gov>	Optional
Sankula, Sujatha <Sankula.Sujatha@epa.gov>	Optional
Koper, Christopher <Koper.Christopher@epa.gov>	Optional
Orrick, Greg <Orrick.Greg@epa.gov>	Optional
Mroz, Ryan <Mroz.Ryan@epa.gov>	Optional
Grable, Melissa <Grable.Melissa@epa.gov>	Optional
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Moriarty, Thomas <moriarty.thomas@epa.gov>	Optional
Zinn, Nicole <Zinn.Nicole@epa.gov>	Optional
Harty, Thomas <harty.thomas@epa.gov>	Optional
Ruhman, Mohammed <Ruhman.Mohammed@epa.gov>	Optional
Sells, Dexter <Sells.Dexter@epa.gov>	Optional
Elissa Reaves <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 10:45 AM – 11:30 AM
Subject PRD ALL HANDS
Location RM - PYS - 9100
Show Time As Busy

OPP/PRD Division Meeting with the new Deputy Assistant Administrator for OCSPP, Nancy Beck.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer

Guilaran, Yu-Ting <Guilaran.Yu-Ting@epa.gov>	Required
Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>	Required
OPP PRD Managers <OPP_PRD_Managers@epa.gov>	Required
Arrington, Linda <Arrington.Linda@epa.gov>	Optional
Anderson, Neil <Anderson.Neil@epa.gov>	Optional
Costello, Kevin <Costello.Kevin@epa.gov>	Optional
Sherman, Kelly <Sherman.Kelly@epa.gov>	Optional
Lowit, Anna <Lowit.Anna@epa.gov>	Optional
Smith, Charles <Smith.Charles@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 11:30 AM – 12:15 PM
Subject RD ALL HANDS
Location RM - PYS - 7100
Show Time As Busy

OPP/RD Division Meeting with the new Deputy Assistant Administrator for OCSPP, Nancy Beck.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
OPP RD Branch Chiefs <OPP_RD_Branch_Chiefs@epa.gov>	Required
Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>	Required
Shah, Pv <Shah.Pv@epa.gov>	Optional
Davis, Kable <Davis.Kable@epa.gov>	Optional
Laws, Meredith <Laws.Meredith@epa.gov>	Optional
Giles-Parker, Cynthia <Giles-Parker.Cynthia@epa.gov>	Optional
Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>	Optional
Holloman, Rachel <Holloman.Rachel@epa.gov>	Optional
Johnson, Marion <Johnson.Marion@epa.gov>	Optional
Kenny, Daniel <Kenny.Dan@epa.gov>	Optional
Garvie, Heather <Garvie.Heather@epa.gov>	Optional

Kish, Tony <Kish.Tony@epa.gov>	Optional
Baris, Reuben <Baris.Reuben@epa.gov>	Optional
Leifer, Kerry <Leifer.Kerry@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 12:20 PM – 12:35 PM
Subject Return Transportation to EPA East
Show Time As Busy

Your transportation request has been confirmed.

Confirmation Number: 76169
Passenger Information
* Name: NANCY BECK/AA
* Number: 2025648542
* Pickup Time: 2017-09-12 12:20:00.0
* Pickup Location: POTOMAC YARD CRYSTAL CITY VA.
* Drop-Off Location: EPA EAST CONSTITUTION AVE
Vehicle Information
* Tag: G13-1037M
* Vehicle Type: CAR
* Make : CHEVROLET
* Model : VOLT
* Color : BLACK

Time 1:00 PM – 2:00 PM
Subject EPA meeting with Dr. Beck and EPA staff on TCE WOE (UNCLASSIFIED)
Location 3156 EPA East, 1201 Constitution Ave; conference line: Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
conference Code: Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Show Time As Busy

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED
: UNCLASSIFIED
: UNCLASSIFIED

Please arrive 15 minutes early to clear security and call 202-564-2902 for escort.
Please let me know if there are others who should be included.
Details to follow.
CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIEDCLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIEDCLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Underwood, Patricia M CIV (US) <patricia.m.underwood.civ@mail.mil>	Organizer
Johnson, Mark S CIV USARMY MEDCOM APHC (US) <mark.s.johnson.civ@mail.mil>	Required

Seibert, John F CIV OSD OUSD ATL (US) <john.f.seibert.civ@mail.mil>	Required
Hanson, Jarod M MAJ USARMY MEDCOM APHC (US) <jarod.m.hanson.mil@mail.mil>	Required
Leach, Glenn J CTR USARMY MEDCOM APHC (US) <glenn.j.leach.ctr@mail.mil>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Anita.K.Meyer@usace.army.mil <Anita.K.Meyer@usace.army.mil>	Required
Parsons, Doug <Parsons.Douglas@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Krasnic, Toni <krasnic.toni@epa.gov>	Optional
Sullivan, Maureen SES OSD OUSD ATL (US) <maureen.sullivan18.civ@mail.mil>	Optional
Jumsil, Nicha CTR OSD OUSD ATL (US) <nicha.jumsil.ctr@mail.mil>	Optional

---

Time 1:00 PM – 2:00 PM
Subject Hurricane Irma/Harvey: PCC Meeting and Conference Call
Location DCRoomARNB431/Executive-Conference-Room
Show Time As Tentative

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Meeting documents will be distributed prior the the meeting.

Hurricane Harvey/Irma Policy Coordinating Committee

Agenda

September 12, 2017

Opening Remarks Ryan Jackson

Barry Breen

Situational Updates

For each situational update would you please address the following topic areas in addition to Regional/Program specific highlights:

What are you being asked to do/support from our Federal, State and Local partners?

* Are there actions you are considering leaning forward on to address a need or expedite our response activities?

* Are there program policy, legal, or resource issues impacting your operations?

* Discussion of recovery efforts

Region 2

Region 4

Region 3

OPA

OLEM

Harvey Update Region 6

General Discussion

Next Meeting

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	EOC_Deputy_Manager <EOC_Deputy_Manager@epa.gov>	Organizer
	EOC Documentation <EOC_Documentation@epa.gov>	Required
	Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
	Cheatham, Reggie <cheatham.reggie@epa.gov>	Required
	Breen, Barry <Breen.Barry@epa.gov>	Required

Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Wagner, Kenneth <wagner.kenneth@epa.gov>	Required
Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Required
Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Required
Shapiro, Mike <Shapiro.Mike@epa.gov>	Required
Coleman, Sam <Coleman.Sam@epa.gov>	Required
Gray, David <gray.david@epa.gov>	Required
Edlund, Carl <Edlund.Carl@epa.gov>	Required
Heard, Anne <Heard.Anne@epa.gov>	Required
Kaplan, Robert <kaplan.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Rodrigues, Cecil <rodrigues.cecil@epa.gov>	Required
Kelly, Albert <kelly.albert@epa.gov>	Required
Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Washington, Tiffeny <Washington.Tiffeny@epa.gov>	Required
Simon, Nigel <Simon.Nigel@epa.gov>	Required
Davis, Patrick <davis.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Brooks, Becky <Brooks.Becky@epa.gov>	Required
Armstead, John A. <Armstead.John@epa.gov>	Required
Melvin, Karen <Melvin.Karen@epa.gov>	Required
Richardson, RobinH <Richardson.RobinH@epa.gov>	Required
Clark, Becki <Clark.Becki@epa.gov>	Required
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
Indermark, Michele <Indermark.Michele@epa.gov>	Required
Smith, Monica <smith.monica@epa.gov>	Required

Carroll, Craig <Carroll.Craig@epa.gov>	Required
Kling, David <Kling.Dave@epa.gov>	Required
Shaw, Betsy <Shaw.Betsy@epa.gov>	Required
Kavlock, Robert <Kavlock.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Minoli, Kevin <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Fotouhi, David <fotouhi.david@epa.gov>	Required
Hill, Franklin <Hill.Franklin@epa.gov>	Required
Irizarry, Gilberto <Irizarry.Gilberto@epa.gov>	Required
Webster, James <Webster.James@epa.gov>	Required
Badalamente, Mark <Badalamente.Mark@epa.gov>	Required
Starfield, Lawrence <Starfield.Lawrence@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Peterson, Mary <Peterson.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Guerriero, Margaret <guerriero.margaret@epa.gov>	Required
Ballotti, Doug <ballotti.douglas@epa.gov>	Required
Borries, Samuel <borries.samuel@epa.gov>	Required
Prince, John <Prince.John@epa.gov>	Required
Mosher, Eric <Mosher.Eric@epa.gov>	Required
Mears, Mary <Mears.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Drazan, Dan <Drazan.Dan@epa.gov>	Required
Flynn, Mike <Flynn.Mike@epa.gov>	Optional
Gross, Bonnie <Gross.bonnie@epa.gov>	Optional
Glenn, Onis <glenn.onis@epa.gov>	Optional

Jenkins, Brandi <Jenkins.Brandi@epa.gov>	Optional
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
Newton, Cheryl <Newton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Optional
Dorsey, Claudette <Dorsey.Claudette@epa.gov>	Optional
Veal, Lee <Veal.Lee@epa.gov>	Optional
Moore, Tony <moore.tony@epa.gov>	Optional
EOC_Manager, <EOC_Manager@epa.gov>	Optional
Mike Kohlflynn Personal Email / Ex. 6	Optional
Leonard, Paul <leonard.paul@epa.gov>	Optional
Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Optional
Rodan, Bruce <rodan.bruce@epa.gov>	Optional
Grevatt, Peter <Grevatt.Peter@epa.gov>	Optional
Mccabe, Catherine <McCabe.Catherine@epa.gov>	Optional
Fonseca, Silvina <Fonseca.Silvina@epa.gov>	Optional
Levine, Carolyn <Levine.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Price, Lisa <Price.Lisa@epa.gov>	Optional
Snowbarger, Robert <Snowbarger.Robert@epa.gov>	Optional
Personal Email / Ex. 6	Optional
Edwards, Jonathan <Edwards.Jonathan@epa.gov>	Optional
Opalski, Dan <Opalski.Dan@epa.gov>	Optional
Perovich, Gina <Perovich.Gina@epa.gov>	Optional
Lincoln, Larry <Lincoln.Larry@epa.gov>	Optional
Leslie PHamm Personal Email / Ex. 6	Optional
Lapierre, Kenneth <Lapierre.Kenneth@epa.gov>	Optional
Gettle, Jeaneanne <Gettle.Jeaneanne@epa.gov>	Optional

Jones-Johnson, Shea <Jones-Johnson.Shea@epa.gov>	Optional
Scheraga, Joel <Scheraga.Joel@epa.gov>	Optional
Allen, Reginald <Allen.Reginald@epa.gov>	Optional
Chu, Ed <Chu.Ed@epa.gov>	Optional
Nalipinski, Mike <Nalipinski.Mike@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 3:00 PM – 3:30 PM
Subject OGC Weekly
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Richard Keigwin <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>	Required
Mclean, Kevin <Mclean.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Graves, Inza <Graves.Inza@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Brian Grant <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Perlis, Robert <Perlis.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Lee, Khisa <Lee.Khisa@epa.gov>	Required
Simons, Andrew <Simons.Andrew@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Kaczmarek, Chris <Kaczmarek.Chris@epa.gov>	Required
Arnold Layne (Layne.Arnold@epa.gov) <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required

Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Anderson, Monique <anderson.monique@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <blunck.chris@epa.gov>	Required
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required
Celeste, Laurel <celeste.laurel@epa.gov>	Optional
Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Richard Keigwin <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Brian Grant <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Arnold Layne (Layne.Arnold@epa.gov) <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <blunck.chris@epa.gov>	Required
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 3:30 PM – 5:30 PM
Subject HOLD
Show Time As Busy

Wednesday, September 13, 2017

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject IO General Meeting
Location 3130 WJC EAST Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/28/2017 from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required

Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Tyree, JamesN <tyree.jamesn@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 9:00 AM – 5:00 PM
Subject CDR Inorganic Byproducts FACA-Public Meeting - September - Day 1
Location RRB Oceanic Suites
Show Time As Tentative

Agenda is attached and first day is below

Wednesday, September 13 (9:00 AM – 5:00 PM)

Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review (9:00 – 9:40 AM)

Discuss Exemptions Proposal (9:40 – 10:45 AM)

David Lennett, Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), will share

the updated proposal. Committee Members will discuss questions of clarification and share strengths, considerations and concerns.

Break (10:45 – 11:00 AM)

Discuss Categories Proposal (11:00 – 11:40 AM)

Susan Sharkey, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, will share the updated proposal. Committee Members will discuss questions of clarification and share strengths, considerations and concerns.

Discuss Part 3 Data Proposal (11:40 AM – 12:30 PM)

Susan Sharkey, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, will share the updated proposal. Committee Members will discuss questions of clarification and share strengths, considerations and concerns.

Lunch (12:30 – 1:30 PM)

Approaches E and F – Limit Reporting for Site-Specific Catalyst Recycling (E) and for Reuse of Inorganic Byproducts (F) (1:30 – 2:10 PM) [Contingent on development of proposals]

Jim Cooper, American Fuel and Petrochemical Manufacturers (AFPM) and others, will provide updated descriptions of these approaches. Approach E would limit reporting for catalyst recycling, when as an inorganic byproduct that is recycled, reused, or reprocessed either at the site of byproduct manufacture or at a different site, is returned to the site of byproduct manufacture for further use or processing. Approach F would limit reporting for inorganic byproducts that are isolated from a process and later reintroduced into that same process. The Committee will discuss questions of clarification, share strengths and considerations/concerns, and whether to continue exploring these approaches.

Statement on Modernizing Data Collection (2:10 - 2:35 PM)

Amy Kyle, Sierra Club and California Communities Against Toxics, will describe this recommendation to EPA on how to modernize agency data collection and reporting. The Committee will discuss questions of clarification, share strengths and considerations/concerns, and whether to continue exploring this approach.

Small Business Interests Presentation (2:35 – 2:50)

Tayyaba Waqar, Assistant Chief Counsel for Environmental Policy,

Small Business Administration Office of Advocacy

Public Comment Period (2:50 – 3:10 PM)

Explanation of Process for Caucus Discussions and Cross-Caucus Package Workgroup Discussions (3:10 – 3:20 PM)

Break (3:20 – 3:35 PM)

Caucus Discussions (3:35 – 5:00 PM)

Caucuses will discuss updated proposals. Suggested questions for Caucuses to address include:

* Where do you agree with the package/components and why?
* Could you agree with the package/components with modifications? If so, what modifications would be needed?
* What additional information is needed to make a decision on a package or its components, and how and who will get it?
* Who will represent the Caucus on the Cross-Caucus Package Workgroup?
* What guidance is needed for Caucus representatives on the Cross-Caucus Package Workgroup discussion?

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Kramek, Niva <kramek.niva@epa.gov>	Organizer
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Cunningham-HQ, Barbara <Cunningham-HQ.Barbara@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Required
Wolf, Joel <Wolf.Joel@epa.gov>	Required
Sharkey, Susan <Sharkey.Susan@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required

ED_002528_00001707-00067

Time 9:30 AM – 10:00 AM
Subject ADP tracker 101
Location Nancys office- if we can access it from my computer
Show Time As Busy
Personal Matters / Ex. 6 I'm not sure Monday will work.
Hows about Wednesday?
And I do have lotus notes.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Smith, Peterj <Smith.Peterj@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 10:45 AM – 11:15 AM
Subject General
Location Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Show Time As Busy

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Greaves, Holly <greaves.holly@epa.gov>	Organizer
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required

Time 11:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Subject OPPT General
Location 3130A WJC East Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Wednesday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/27/2017 from 11:00 AM to 12:00 PM
Show Time As Busy

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
Clark, Sharon <Clark.Sharon@epa.gov>	Required
Scott, Elizabeth <Scott.Elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>	Required
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Optional
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss.Linda@epa.gov <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required

Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>	Optional
Cherepy, Andrea <Cherepy.Andrea@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Required
Scheifele, Hans <Scheifele.Hans@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 2:00 PM – 3:00 PM
Subject OGC Weekly
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Richard Keigwin <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>	Required
Mclean, Kevin <Mclean.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Graves, Inza <Graves.Inza@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Brian Grant <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Perlis, Robert <Perlis.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Simons, Andrew <Simons.Andrew@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Kaczmarek, Chris <Kaczmarek.Chris@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required

Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Anderson, Monique <anderson.monique@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Optional
Dyner, Mark <dyner.mark@epa.gov>	Optional
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

Time 3:00 PM – 3:30 PM
Subject Axalta Coating Systems
Location RM 3156 EPA East Building
Show Time As Busy

Meeting location is 1201 Constitution Avenue, NW Washington, DC
Please have the guards call 202-564-2902 or 202-564-2910 for an escort

Purpose: To learn about TSCA regulatory, research, and reform priorities under the new administration (and in light of the recently passed TSCA legislation) as well as to share a bit about Axalta's strategy, approach to research, and investment priorities.

Other attendees will be:

Barry Snyder, SVP Chief Technology Officer
Joanne Hardy, Director R&D Americas
Diana Nash, Global Product Stewardship & Regulatory Leader

Contact Person: Gary Regulski, NA Regulatory Affairs Manager/TSCA Coordinator
Personal Phone / Ex. 6

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Rodan, Bruce <rodan.bruce@epa.gov>	Required
gary.j.regulski@axaltacs.com <gary.j.regulski@axaltacs.com>	Required
Barry Snyder <barry.snyder@axaltacs.com>	Optional
Joanne R Hardy <joanne.r.hardy@axaltacs.com>	Optional
Diane Nash <diane.nash@axaltacs.com>	Optional

Frithsen, Jeff <Frithsen.Jeff@epa.gov>	Optional
gary.j.regulski@axaltacs.com <gary.j.regulski@axaltacs.com>	Required
Barry Snyder <barry.snyder@axaltacs.com>	Optional
Joanne R Hardy <joanne.r.hardy@axaltacs.com>	Optional
Diane Nash <diane.nash@axaltacs.com>	Optional

Time 4:30 PM – 5:20 PM

Subject Overview of SNURs -- New Chemical 5(e) and Non-5(e), and Existing Chemical SNURs.

Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP

Show Time As Busy

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Purpose: Provide overview of TSCA section 5(a) SNURs; New Chemical 5(e) and Non-5(e), and Existing Chemical SNURs.
POC for Meeting Materials: Chris Blunck

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
Greg Schweer (Schweer.Greg@epa.gov) <Schweer.Greg@epa.gov>	Required
Wolf, Joel <Wolf.Joel@epa.gov>	Required
Brian Grant <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <blunck.chris@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Mclean, Kevin <Mclean.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Sadowsky, Don <Sadowsky.Don@epa.gov>	Optional

Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Optional
Thaler, Elizabeth <thaler.elizabeth@epa.gov>	Optional
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Optional
Canavan, Sheila <Canavan.Sheila@epa.gov>	Optional
Wills, Jennifer <Wills.Jennifer@epa.gov>	Optional
Andrea Cherepy (Cherepy.Andrea@epa.gov) <Cherepy.Andrea@epa.gov>	Optional

---

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject IO General Meeting
Location 3130 WJC EAST Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/28/2017 from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required

Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Tyree, JamesN <tyree.jamesn@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 8:45 AM – 9:30 AM
Subject Chief of Staff Meeting
Location Alm Room
Show Time As Busy
Please note the location starting 9 May 2017
POC: ALM Room Cheryl Woodward

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott Administrator / Ex. 6	Organizer
Kundinger, Kelly <kundinger.kelly@epa.gov>	Required
Munoz, Charles <munoz.charles@epa.gov>	Required
White, Elizabeth <white.elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required
Kelly, Albert <kelly.albert@epa.gov>	Required
Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
Burke, Marcella <burke.marcella@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
Abboud, Michael <abboud.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Bodine, Susan <bodine.susan@epa.gov>	Required
Palich, Christian <palich.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>	Required
Sands, Jeffrey <sands.jeffrey@epa.gov>	Required
Hanson, Paige (Catherine) <hanson.catherine@epa.gov>	Required

Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Required
Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Required
Schwab, Justin <schwab.justin@epa.gov>	Required
Wehrum, Bill <Wehrum.Bill@epa.gov>	Required
Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Frye, Tony (Robert) <frye.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Darwin, Veronica <darwin.veronica@epa.gov>	Required
Feeley, Drew (Robert) <Feeley.Drew@epa.gov>	Required
Gunasekara, Mandy <Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov>	Required
Ferguson, Lincoln <ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Required
Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>	Required
Greaves, Holly <greaves.holly@epa.gov>	Required
Wilcox, Jahan <wilcox.jahan@epa.gov>	Required
Wagner, Kenneth <wagner.kenneth@epa.gov>	Required
Rodrick, Christian <rodrick.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Hewitt, James <hewitt.james@epa.gov>	Required
Fotouhi, David <fotouhi.david@epa.gov>	Required
Darwin, Henry <darwin.henry@epa.gov>	Required
Traylor, Patrick <traylor.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Required
Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>	Required
Harlow, David <harlow.david@epa.gov>	Required
Dominguez, Alexander <dominguez.alexander@epa.gov>	Required
Dourson, Michael <dourson.michael@epa.gov>	Required

Letendre, Daisy <letendre.daisy@epa.gov>	Required
Hupp, Millan <hupp.millan@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
McMurray, Forrest <mcmurray.forrest@epa.gov>	Required
Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Chmielewski, Kevin <chmielewski.kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Inge, Carolyn <Inge.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Lovell, Will (William) <lovell.william@epa.gov>	Optional
Dickerson, Aaron <dickerson.aaron@epa.gov>	Optional
Ford, Hayley <ford.hayley@epa.gov>	Optional
Willis, Sharnett <Willis.Sharnett@epa.gov>	Optional
Shimmin, Kaitlyn <shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 9:00 AM – 3:00 PM
Subject CDR Inorganic Byproducts FACA-Public Meeting - September - Day 2
Location RRB Oceanic Suites
Show Time As Tentative
Agenda attached and second day below.

Thursday, September 14 (9:00 AM – 3:00 PM)

Cross-Caucus Package Workgroup Discussion (9:00 – 11:30 AM)

* What do you like about approaches and how might they be combined into a package that will be acceptable and meet as many interests of all stakeholders as possible?

* Are there any components of approaches that are problematic and how might they be changed to address as many interests of all

stakeholders as possible?

Lunch and Caucus Discussions (11:30 AM – 1:00 PM)

Report Back to Full Committee on Caucus Discussions (1:00 – 2:00 PM)

* Identification of tentative package(s) that Committee Members can "live with"

* Refinements of package(s), as appropriate

* Identification of issues for more discussion or refinement and next steps

Public Comment Period (2:00 – 2:15 PM)

Discussion of Timeline and Next Steps (2:15 – 2:50 PM)

Discuss the approach and schedule for refining package(s) and obtaining and integrating constituent input.

Meeting Wrap-Up, Review of Next Step and Closure (2:50 – 3:00 PM)

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Kramek, Niva <kramek.niva@epa.gov>	Organizer
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Cunningham-HQ, Barbara <Cunningham-HQ.Barbara@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Required
Wolf, Joel <Wolf.Joel@epa.gov>	Required
Sharkey, Susan <Sharkey.Susan@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required

ED_002528_00001707-00076

Time 10:00 AM – 11:00 AM

Subject Pre-Prioritization Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP

Show Time As Busy

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Frithsen, Jeff <Frithsen.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Susanna Blair (Blair.Susanna@epa.gov) <Blair.Susanna@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Henry, Tala <henry.tala@epa.gov>	Required
Brian Grant <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Mclean, Kevin <Mclean.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Thomas, Russell <Thomas.Russell@epa.gov>	Required
Chang, Daniel <chang.daniel@epa.gov>	Required
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
David Widawsky <Widawsky.David@epa.gov>	Required
Frazer, Brian <Frazer.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Davies, Clive <Davies.Clive@epa.gov>	Required
Lauren Sweet (sweet.lauren@epa.gov) <sweet.lauren@epa.gov>	Required
Celeste, Laurel <celeste.laurel@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Wolf, Joel <Wolf.Joel@epa.gov>	Required
Mojica, Andrea <Mojica.andrea@epa.gov>	Optional
Anderson, Steve <Anderson.Steve@epa.gov>	Optional
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required

Susanna Blair (Blair.Susanna@epa.gov) <Blair.Susanna@epa.gov>	Required
Henry, Tala <henry.tala@epa.gov>	Required
Brian Grant <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
David Widawsky <Widawsky.David@epa.gov>	Required
Lauren Sweet (sweet.lauren@epa.gov) <sweet.lauren@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 11:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Subject New Chemical Bi-Weekly Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Location DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO

Show Time As Busy

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
Widawsky, David <Widawsky.David@epa.gov>	Required
Henry, Tala <henry.tala@epa.gov>	Required
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Required
Grant, Brian <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Mclean, Kevin <Mclean.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Sadowsky, Don <Sadowsky.Don@epa.gov>	Required
Scheifele, Hans <scheifele.hans@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO <DCRoomEast3371c@epa.gov>	Resource
Canavan, Sheila <Canavan.Sheila@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Required

Greg Schweer (Schweer.Greg@epa.gov) <Schweer.Greg@epa.gov>	Required
Stedeford, Todd <Stedeford.Todd@epa.gov>	Required
Cherepy, Andrea <Cherepy.Andrea@epa.gov>	Required
Wills, Jennifer <Wills.Jennifer@epa.gov>	Required
Thaler, Elizabeth <thaler.elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required

Time 1:00 PM – 1:45 PM
Subject Risk Assessments (Human Health)
Location RM 3156 EPA East
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Vogel, Dana <Vogel.Dana@epa.gov>	Required
Jeffrey Dawson (Dawson.Jeff@epa.gov) <Dawson.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Knizner, Steve <Knizner.Steve@epa.gov>	Required
Weiss, Steven <Weiss.Steven@epa.gov>	Required
McNally, Robert <Mcnally.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>	Required
Parsons, Laura <Parsons.Laura@epa.gov>	Optional
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Elissa Reaves <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>	Optional
Kough, John <Kough.John@epa.gov>	Optional
Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>	Required
Mendelsohn, Mike <mendelsohn.mike@epa.gov>	Optional
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Optional
Lowit, Anna <Lowit.Anna@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 1:00 PM – 2:00 PM
Subject Hurricane Irma/Harvey: PCC Meeting and Conference Call
Location DCRoomARNB431/Executive-Conference-Room
Show Time As Tentative
Updated with revised meeting attachments.

Date Updated - Meeting will be Thursday, Sept 14.

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Hurricane Harvey/Irma Policy Coordinating Committee

Agenda

September 14, 2017

Opening Remarks Ryan Jackson

Barry Breen

Situational Updates

For each situational update would you please address the following topic areas in addition to Regional/Program specific highlights:

What are you being asked to do/support from our Federal, State and Local partners?

* Are there actions you are considering leaning forward on to address a need or expedite our response activities?

* Are there program policy, legal, or resource issues impacting your operations?

* Discussion of recovery efforts

Region 2

Region 4

Region 3

OPA

OLEM

Harvey Update Region 6

General Discussion

Next Meeting

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	EOC Documentation <EOC_Documentation@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
	Cheatham, Reggie <cheatham.reggie@epa.gov>	Required
	Breen, Barry <Breen.Barry@epa.gov>	Required
	Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
	Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>	Required
	Wagner, Kenneth <wagner.kenneth@epa.gov>	Required
	Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Required
	Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Required
	Shapiro, Mike <Shapiro.Mike@epa.gov>	Required
	Coleman, Sam <Coleman.Sam@epa.gov>	Required
	Gray, David <gray.david@epa.gov>	Required
	Edlund, Carl <Edlund.Carl@epa.gov>	Required
	Heard, Anne <Heard.Anne@epa.gov>	Required
	Kaplan, Robert <kaplan.robert@epa.gov>	Required
	Rodrigues, Cecil <rodrigues.cecil@epa.gov>	Required
	Kelly, Albert <kelly.albert@epa.gov>	Required

Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Washington, Tiffeny <Washington.Tiffeny@epa.gov>	Required
Simon, Nigel <Simon.Nigel@epa.gov>	Required
Davis, Patrick <davis.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Brooks, Becky <Brooks.Becky@epa.gov>	Required
Armstead, John A. <Armstead.John@epa.gov>	Required
Melvin, Karen <Melvin.Karen@epa.gov>	Required
Richardson, RobinH <Richardson.RobinH@epa.gov>	Required
Clark, Becki <Clark.Becki@epa.gov>	Required
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
Indermark, Michele <Indermark.Michele@epa.gov>	Required
Smith, Monica <smith.monica@epa.gov>	Required
Carroll, Craig <Carroll.Craig@epa.gov>	Required
Kling, David <Kling.Dave@epa.gov>	Required
Shaw, Betsy <Shaw.Betsy@epa.gov>	Required
Kavlock, Robert <Kavlock.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Minoli, Kevin <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Fotouhi, David <Fotouhi.David@epa.gov>	Required
Hill, Franklin <Hill.Franklin@epa.gov>	Required
Irizarry, Gilberto <Irizarry.Gilberto@epa.gov>	Required
Webster, James <Webster.James@epa.gov>	Required
Badalamente, Mark <Badalamente.Mark@epa.gov>	Required
Starfield, Lawrence <Starfield.Lawrence@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required

Peterson, Mary <Peterson.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Guerriero, Margaret <guerriero.margaret@epa.gov>	Required
Ballotti, Doug <ballotti.douglas@epa.gov>	Required
Borries, Samuel <borries.samuel@epa.gov>	Required
Prince, John <Prince.John@epa.gov>	Required
Mosher, Eric <Mosher.Eric@epa.gov>	Required
Mears, Mary <Mears.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Drazan, Dan <Drazan.Dan@epa.gov>	Required
Schlieger, Brian <schlieger.brian@epa.gov>	Required
Oh, Peter <Oh.Peter@epa.gov>	Required
Flynn, Mike <Flynn.Mike@epa.gov>	Optional
Gross, Bonnie <Gross.bonnie@epa.gov>	Optional
Glenn, Trey <Glenn.Trey@epa.gov>	Optional
Jenkins, Brandi <Jenkins.Brandi@epa.gov>	Optional
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
Newton, Cheryl <Newton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Optional
Dorsey, Claudette <Dorsey.Claudette@epa.gov>	Optional
Veal, Lee <Veal.Lee@epa.gov>	Optional
Moore, Tony <moore.tony@epa.gov>	Optional
EOC_Manager, <EOC_Manager@epa.gov>	Optional
Personal Email / Ex. 6	Optional
Leonard, Paul <leonard.paul@epa.gov>	Optional
Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Optional
Rodan, Bruce <rodan.bruce@epa.gov>	Optional

Grevatt, Peter <Grevatt.Peter@epa.gov>	Optional
Mccabe, Catherine <McCabe.Catherine@epa.gov>	Optional
Fonseca, Silvina <Fonseca.Silvina@epa.gov>	Optional
Levine, Carolyn <Levine.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Price, Lisa <Price.Lisa@epa.gov>	Optional
Snowbarger, Robert <Snowbarger.Robert@epa.gov>	Optional
Personal Email / Ex. 6	Optional
Edwards, Jonathan <Edwards.Jonathan@epa.gov>	Optional
Opalski, Dan <Opalski.Dan@epa.gov>	Optional
Perovich, Gina <Perovich.Gina@epa.gov>	Optional
Lincoln, Larry <Lincoln.Larry@epa.gov>	Optional
Personal Email / Ex. 6	Optional
Lapierre, Kenneth <Lapierre.Kenneth@epa.gov>	Optional
Gettle, Jeaneanne <Gettle.Jeaneanne@epa.gov>	Optional
Jones-Johnson, Shea <Jones-Johnson.Shea@epa.gov>	Optional
Scheraga, Joel <Scheraga.Joel@epa.gov>	Optional
Allen, Reginald <Allen.Reginald@epa.gov>	Optional
Chu, Ed <Chu.Ed@epa.gov>	Optional
Nalipinski, Mike <Nalipinski.Mike@epa.gov>	Optional
Edwards, Crystal <Edwards.Crystal@epa.gov>	Optional
Mugdan, Walter <Mugdan.Walter@epa.gov>	Optional
EOC_Deputy_Manager <EOC_Deputy_Manager@epa.gov>	Optional
Caraballo, Mario <Caraballo.Mario@epa.gov>	Optional
Michaud, John <Michaud.John@epa.gov>	Optional
Mclain, Jennifer <Mclain.Jennifer@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 2:00 PM – 2:30 PM
Subject Recusals
Location Room 3156 East
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Fugh, Justina <Fugh.Justina@epa.gov>	Organizer
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Griffo, Shannon <Griffo.Shannon@epa.gov>	Required

Time 2:00 PM – 4:00 PM
Subject FW: SAVE THE DATE - Personal Matters / Ex. 6
Location 4225 WJC-E
Show Time As Tentative

Please join OARM and OCSPP in celebrating Personal Matters / Ex. 6 distinguished career service at EPA by stopping by to network with Personal Matters / Ex. 6 on Thursday, September 14, 2017.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Petrole, Maryann <Petrole.Maryann@epa.gov>	Organizer
OCSPP ALL <OCSPP_ALL@epa.gov>	Required
Carter, Pamela <Carter.Pamela@epa.gov>	Required
OARM-OA-OAGOV <OARMOAOAGOV@epa.gov>	Required
Ridings, Sharon <Ridings.Sharon@epa.gov>	Required
Vizian, Donna <Vizian.Donna@epa.gov>	Optional
Showman, John <Showman.John@epa.gov>	Optional
Cooper, Marian <Cooper.Marian@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 3:15 PM – 4:00 PM
Subject Meet and greet
Location 3130A WJC East
Show Time As Busy
Categories Red Category
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Mike Dourson <michael.dourson@uc.edu>	Required
Personal Email / Ex. 6	Required

Dourson, Michael (Personal Email / Ex. 6 Optional

Personal Email / Ex. 6

Friday, September 15, 2017

Time 8:15 AM – 8:45 AM
Subject meet and greet
Location Timgad
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Martinez, Jeannette <Martinez.Jeannette@epa.gov>	Required

Time 9:30 AM – 10:15 AM
Subject ICR review
Location 3130
Show Time As Busy

To go through ICRs as we have done for regs.

****
Materials are attached. A dynamic presentation of the same information is now accessible in SharePoint <https://usepa.sharepoint.com/sites/OCSPP_Community/RCS/ICRs/Lists/ICR%20Status/AllItems.aspx> and includes different views showing
* what's pending OMB action
* what's in OEI pending submission to OMB
* what's in RCS pending submission to OEI
* what's in the program offices, and
* upcoming 1st FR publications and ICR submissions.
The attached Excel file was downloaded from that site and manipulated by hand to provide similar views offline.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Smith, Peterj <Smith.Peterj@epa.gov>	Required
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Mosby, Jackie <Mosby.Jackie@epa.gov>	Optional
Parrott, Patricia <parrott.patricia@epa.gov>	Optional
Overstreet, Anne <overstreet.anne@epa.gov>	Optional

Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Mosby, Jackie <Mosby.Jackie@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 9:45 AM – 10:00 AM
Subject Mock Senator Holding Room (9:45 AM)
Location 1154 WJC East (Judges Chambers)
Show Time As Busy
Please meet in the Judges' Chambers prior to the start of the hearing.

WORKING CONTACT:

Kaitlyn Shimmin

Shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov <mailto:Shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov>

C: Personal Phone / Ex. 6

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Shimmin, Kaitlyn <shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov>	Required
Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
Gunasekara, Mandy <Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov>	Required
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required
Schwab, Justin <Schwab.Justin@epa.gov>	Required
Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required

Letendre, Daisy <letendre.daisy@epa.gov>	Required
Frye, Tony (Robert) <frye.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>	Required
Palich, Christian <palich.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>	Required
Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
Feeley, Drew <Drew.Feeley@mail.house.gov>	Required

Time 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Subject Mock Hearing for Senate Confirmed Nominees (10:00 AM)
Location Hearing Room 1152 WJC East
Show Time As Busy
10:00 AM to 12:00 PM: Mock Hearing

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Shimmin, Kaitlyn <shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov>	Required
Palich, Christian <palich.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Fotouhi, David <fotouhi.david@epa.gov>	Required
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required
Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Required
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
Schwab, Justin <schwab.justin@epa.gov>	Required
Gunasekara, Mandy <Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required

ED_002528_00001707-00088

Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>	Required
Rodrick, Christian <rodrick.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Graham, Amy <graham.amy@epa.gov>	Required
Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
Frye, Tony (Robert) <frye.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Ford, Hayley <ford.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Munoz, Charles <munoz.charles@epa.gov>	Required
Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>	Required
Levine, Carolyn <Levine.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Required
Richardson, RobinH <Richardson.RobinH@epa.gov>	Required
Cheatham-Strickland, Latonia <Cheatham-Strickland.Latonia@epa.gov>	Required
Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>	Required
Minoli, Kevin <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Haman, Patricia <Haman.Patricia@epa.gov>	Required
Hupp, Millan <hupp.millan@epa.gov>	Optional
Abboud, Michael <abboud.michael@epa.gov>	Optional
Ferguson, Lincoln <ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov>	Optional
Greaves, Holly <greaves.holly@epa.gov>	Optional
Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>	Optional
Letendre, Daisy <letendre.daisy@epa.gov>	Optional
McMurray, Forrest <mcmurray.forrest@epa.gov>	Optional
Chmielewski, Kevin <chmielewski.kevin@epa.gov>	Optional
Traylor, Patrick <traylor.patrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Wilcox, Jahan <wilcox.jahan@epa.gov>	Optional

Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>	Optional
Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Optional
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
Darwin, Veronica <darwin.veronica@epa.gov>	Optional
Davis, Patrick <davis.patrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Darwin, Henry <darwin.henry@epa.gov>	Optional
Dominguez, Alexander <dominguez.alexander@epa.gov>	Optional
Kelly, Albert <kelly.albert@epa.gov>	Optional
Bodine, Susan <bodine.susan@epa.gov>	Optional
wwehrum@hunton.com <wwehrum@hunton.com>	Optional
Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>	Optional
Albores, Richard <Albores.Richard@epa.gov>	Optional
Lubetsky, Jonathan <Lubetsky.Jonathan@epa.gov>	Optional
Lewis, Josh <Lewis.Josh@epa.gov>	Optional
Thundiyil, Karen <Thundiyil.Karen@epa.gov>	Optional
Catherine.E.Curry EOP / Ex. 6 EOP / Ex. 6	Optional
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 12:15 PM – 1:15 PM
Subject Mock Hearing Debrief and Feedback (12:15 PM)
Location 1152 WJC East
Show Time As Busy

This will be a debrief by the political staff to the nominees on their mock hearing performance.

WORKING CONTACT:

Kaitlyn Shimmin

Shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov <mailto:Shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov>

C: Personal Phone / Ex. 6

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Shimmin, Kaitlyn <shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov>	Required
	Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
	Gunasekara, Mandy <Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov>	Required
	Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
	Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
	Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
	Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required
	Schwab, Justin <Schwab.Justin@epa.gov>	Required
	Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Required
	Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
	Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required
	Letendre, Daisy <letendre.daisy@epa.gov>	Required
	Frye, Tony (Robert) <frye.robert@epa.gov>	Required
	Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
	Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>	Required
	Palich, Christian <palich.christian@epa.gov>	Required
	Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>	Required
	Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
	Feeley, Drew <Drew.Feeley@mail.house.gov>	Required
	Minoli, Kevin <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov>	Optional
	Albores, Richard <Albores.Richard@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 1:30 PM – 2:00 PM
Subject HOLD
Show Time As Busy

Time 3:30 PM – 4:00 PM

Subject general
Location Nancy will call Al-- whats the best #?
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
McGartland, Al <McGartland.Al@epa.gov>	Required

Time 3:30 PM – 5:30 PM
Subject HOLD Paperwork and Training
Show Time As Busy

Sunday, September 17, 2017

Time 1:00 PM – 2:00 PM
Subject Hurricane Irma/Harvey: PCC Meeting and Conference Call
Location DCRoomARNB431/Executive-Conference-Room
Show Time As Tentative
Updated with attachments.

Date Updated - Meeting will be Sunday, Sept. 17.

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Meeting invite will be updated with attachments.

PLEASE MUTE YOUR PHONE & DO NOT PLACE THE CONFERENCE ON HOLD. HANGING UP IS OKAY IF NECESSARY.

Agenda

September 17, 2017

Opening Remarks Ryan Jackson

Barry Breen

Situational Updates

For each situational update would you please address the following topic areas in addition to Regional/Program specific highlights:

* What are you being asked to do/support from our Federal, State and Local partners?
* Are there actions you are considering leaning forward on to address a need or expedite our response activities?
* Are there program policy, legal, or resource issues impacting your operations?
* Discussion of recovery efforts

Region 2

Region 4

Region 3

Region 5

Region 7

OPA

OLEM

Harvey Update Region 6

General Discussion

Next Meeting

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
EOC Documentation <EOC_Documentation@epa.gov>	Organizer
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Cheatham, Reggie <cheatham.reggie@epa.gov>	Required
Breen, Barry <Breen.Barry@epa.gov>	Required
Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Wagner, Kenneth <wagner.kenneth@epa.gov>	Required

ED_002528_00001707-00093

Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Required
Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Required
Shapiro, Mike <Shapiro.Mike@epa.gov>	Required
Coleman, Sam <Coleman.Sam@epa.gov>	Required
Gray, David <gray.david@epa.gov>	Required
Edlund, Carl <Edlund.Carl@epa.gov>	Required
Heard, Anne <Heard.Anne@epa.gov>	Required
Kaplan, Robert <kaplan.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Rodrigues, Cecil <rodrigues.cecil@epa.gov>	Required
Kelly, Albert <kelly.albert@epa.gov>	Required
Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Washington, Tiffeny <Washington.Tiffeny@epa.gov>	Required
Simon, Nigel <Simon.Nigel@epa.gov>	Required
Davis, Patrick <davis.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Brooks, Becky <Brooks.Becky@epa.gov>	Required
Armstead, John A. <Armstead.John@epa.gov>	Required
Melvin, Karen <Melvin.Karen@epa.gov>	Required
Richardson, RobinH <Richardson.RobinH@epa.gov>	Required
Clark, Becki <Clark.Becki@epa.gov>	Required
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
Indermark, Michele <Indermark.Michele@epa.gov>	Required
Smith, Monica <smith.monica@epa.gov>	Required
Carroll, Craig <Carroll.Craig@epa.gov>	Required
Kling, David <Kling.Dave@epa.gov>	Required
Shaw, Betsy <Shaw.Betsy@epa.gov>	Required

Kavlock, Robert <Kavlock.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Minoli, Kevin <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Fotouhi, David <Fotouhi.David@epa.gov>	Required
Hill, Franklin <Hill.Franklin@epa.gov>	Required
Irizarry, Gilberto <Irizarry.Gilberto@epa.gov>	Required
Webster, James <Webster.James@epa.gov>	Required
Badalamente, Mark <Badalamente.Mark@epa.gov>	Required
Starfield, Lawrence <Starfield.Lawrence@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Peterson, Mary <Peterson.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Guerriero, Margaret <guerriero.margaret@epa.gov>	Required
Ballotti, Doug <ballotti.douglas@epa.gov>	Required
Borries, Samuel <borries.samuel@epa.gov>	Required
Prince, John <Prince.John@epa.gov>	Required
Mosher, Eric <Mosher.Eric@epa.gov>	Required
Mears, Mary <Mears.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Drazan, Dan <Drazan.Dan@epa.gov>	Required
Schlieger, Brian <schlieger.brian@epa.gov>	Required
Oh, Peter <Oh.Peter@epa.gov>	Required
Flynn, Mike <Flynn.Mike@epa.gov>	Optional
Gross, Bonnie <Gross.bonnie@epa.gov>	Optional
Glenn, Trey <Glenn.Trey@epa.gov>	Optional
Jenkins, Brandi <Jenkins.Brandi@epa.gov>	Optional

Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
Newton, Cheryl <Newton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Optional
Dorsey, Claudette <Dorsey.Claudette@epa.gov>	Optional
Veal, Lee <Veal.Lee@epa.gov>	Optional
Moore, Tony <moore.tony@epa.gov>	Optional
EOC_Manager, <EOC_Manager@epa.gov>	Optional
Mike Kohlflynn Personal Email / Ex. 6	Optional
Leonard, Paul <leonard.paul@epa.gov>	Optional
Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Optional
Rodan, Bruce <rodan.bruce@epa.gov>	Optional
Grevatt, Peter <Grevatt.Peter@epa.gov>	Optional
Mccabe, Catherine <McCabe.Catherine@epa.gov>	Optional
Fonseca, Silvina <Fonseca.Silvina@epa.gov>	Optional
Levine, Carolyn <Levine.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Price, Lisa <Price.Lisa@epa.gov>	Optional
Snowbarger, Robert <Snowbarger.Robert@epa.gov>	Optional
Personal Email / Ex. 6	Optional
Edwards, Jonathan <Edwards.Jonathan@epa.gov>	Optional
Opalski, Dan <Opalski.Dan@epa.gov>	Optional
Perovich, Gina <Perovich.Gina@epa.gov>	Optional
Lincoln, Larry <Lincoln.Larry@epa.gov>	Optional
Leslie PHamm Personal Email / Ex. 6	Optional
Lapierre, Kenneth <Lapierre.Kenneth@epa.gov>	Optional
Gettle, Jeaneanne <Gettle.Jeaneanne@epa.gov>	Optional
Jones-Johnson, Shea <Jones-Johnson.Shea@epa.gov>	Optional

Scheraga, Joel <Scheraga.Joel@epa.gov>	Optional
Allen, Reginald <Allen.Reginald@epa.gov>	Optional
Chu, Ed <Chu.Ed@epa.gov>	Optional
Nalipinski, Mike <Nalipinski.Mike@epa.gov>	Optional
Edwards, Crystal <Edwards.Crystal@epa.gov>	Optional
Mugdan, Walter <Mugdan.Walter@epa.gov>	Optional
EOC_Deputy_Manager <EOC_Deputy_Manager@epa.gov>	Optional
Caraballo, Mario <Caraballo.Mario@epa.gov>	Optional
Michaud, John <Michaud.John@epa.gov>	Optional
Mclain, Jennifer <Mclain.Jennifer@epa.gov>	Optional

Monday, September 18, 2017

Time 8:00 AM – 8:30 AM
Subject General Follow-up
Location Rm. 3166A
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Organizer
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject IO General Meeting
Location 3130 WJC EAST Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/28/2017 from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required

Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Tyree, JamesN <tyree.jamesn@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject Personal Matters / Ex. 6
Location RRB
Show Time As Busy

Pamela Younger/ Iris
USEPA - OITA/OMIS
Ronald Reagan Bldg., (2680R) Rm. 31215
1300 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W.
Washington, DC 20004
Tel. 202-564-6631

Time 9:30 AM – 10:00 AM
Subject OCSPP Staff Meeting (Skype Video Teleconference)
Location WJC East 3371C - Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Monday effective 9/4/2017 until 9/25/2017 from 9:30 AM to 10:00 AM
Show Time As Busy

Updated Conference Call-In Number & added Skype Meeting link for Dial-out option.

....
.....

* Join Skype Meeting
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

This is an online meeting for Skype for Business, the professional meetings and communications app formerly known as Lync.

Join by Phone

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Help <http://intranet.epa.gov/otopintr/webconferencing/ o365-conferencing.html>

[!OC([1033])!]

....
.....

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Organizer
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>	Required
Gorman, John <Gorman.John@epa.gov>	Required
Sisco, Debby <Sisco.Debby@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Overstreet, Anne <overstreet.anne@epa.gov>	Required

Burden, Susan <Burden.Susan@epa.gov>	Required
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Kovner, Karissa <Kovner.Karissa@epa.gov>	Required
Clark, Sharon <Clark.Sharon@epa.gov>	Required
Filippelli, John <Filippelli.John@epa.gov>	Required
Boutureira, Alan <Boutureira.Alan@epa.gov>	Required
Carter, Pamela <Carter.Pamela@epa.gov>	Required
Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>	Required
DeDora, Caroline <Dedora.Caroline@epa.gov>	Required
Berkley, Bruce <Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov>	Required
LaPosta, Dore <LaPosta.Dore@epa.gov>	Required
Mitchell, Judy-Ann <Mitchell.Judy-Ann@epa.gov>	Required
Smoot, Cameo <Smoot.Cameo@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>	Required
Vineski, Steve <Vineski.Steve@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Graves, Inza <Graves.Inza@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Scott, Elizabeth <Scott.Elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Wooge, William <Wooge.William@epa.gov>	Required
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required

Weiner, Janet <Weiner.Janet@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Marshall, Venus <Marshall.Venus@epa.gov>	Required
Green, Teresa <Green.Teresa@epa.gov>	Optional
Treimel, Ellen <Treimel.Ellen@epa.gov>	Optional
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Optional
Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>	Optional
Dixon, Diane <Dixon.Diane@epa.gov>	Optional
Metcalf, Alexander <Metcalf.Alexander@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Required
Pane, Vickie <Pane.Vickie@epa.gov>	Optional
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Scott, Gregory <Scott.Gregory@epa.gov>	Required
Scheifele, Hans <Scheifele.Hans@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 10:30 AM – 11:00 AM

Subject Prebrief for DAA in advance of OIG mtg on TSCA CDR -- Call in number
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP

Show Time As Busy

This prebrief is at the request of the DAA, in advance of the kickoff mtg (later same day) with the OIG on this preliminary research.

For more info, see attached notification memo. OPPT please feel free to invite others as appropriate.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Weiner, Janet <Weiner.Janet@epa.gov>	Organizer
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required

Moose, Lindsay <Moose.Lindsay@epa.gov>	Required
Wolf, Joel <Wolf.Joel@epa.gov>	Required
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
Sharkey, Susan <Sharkey.Susan@epa.gov>	Required
Kramek, Niva <kramek.niva@epa.gov>	Required
Blair, Susanna <Blair.Susanna@epa.gov>	Required
Gorder, Chris <Gorder.Chris@epa.gov>	Required
Nguyen, Nhan <Nguyen.Nhan@epa.gov>	Required
Latham, John <Latham.John@epa.gov>	Required
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 11:00 AM – 11:30 AM
Subject Sulfoxaflor
Location RM 3156 EPA East
Show Time As Busy

Purpose: To discuss the delay in the Section 3 approval for Sulfoxaflor on citrus, sorghum and soybean uses.

Attendees:

Renee Manusifi, American Soybean Association
Mike Aerts, Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association
Don Parker, National Cotton Council
Steve Hensley, National Cotton Council
Tim Lust, National Sorghum Producers
Dale Murden, Texas Citrus Mutual

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Jbischoff@cgagroup.com <Jbischoff@cgagroup.com>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>	Required
Kenny, Daniel <Kenny.Dan@epa.gov>	Required

Laws, Meredith <Laws.Meredith@epa.gov> Required

Time 11:30 AM – 12:30 PM

Subject OCSPP/OIG/OECA Kickoff mtg -- TSCA CDR (OPE-FY17-0025) -- Call in **Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6**

Location DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO

Show Time As Busy

9/18 Update: appending sign in sheet.

8/28 Update: Adding OCSPP DAA Nancy Beck as attendee and moving mtg ½ hour later to accommodate her schedule.

This mtg is being scheduled at the request of OIG project manager, Chad Kincheloe. The OIG plans to begin preliminary research on EPA's Chemical Data Reporting (CDR) under the Toxic Substance Control Act (TSCA). See attached Notification Memo for further information.

Meeting's purpose is to discuss OIG's objectives, the purpose of OIG's project and any areas of concern that program offices may have. OIG will also answer questions about the project process, reporting procedures, methods used to gather and analyze data, and what to expect during the course of the project.

Managers: Please feel free to delegate or invite others on your staff as appropriate.

Thanks so much,

Janet Weiner

OCSPP AFC

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Weiner, Janet <Weiner.Janet@epa.gov>	Organizer
Kincheloe, Chad <Kincheloe.Chad@epa.gov>	Required
Harris, Jeffrey <Harris.Jeffrey@epa.gov>	Required
Parker, Barry <Parker.Barry@epa.gov>	Required
Curley, Ganesa <Curley.Ganesa@epa.gov>	Required
Latham, John <Latham.John@epa.gov>	Required

Moose, Lindsay <Moose.Lindsay@epa.gov>	Required
Wolf, Joel <Wolf.Joel@epa.gov>	Required
Spriggs, Gwendolyn <Spriggs.Gwendolyn@epa.gov>	Required
Sullivan, Greg <Sullivan.Greg@epa.gov>	Required
Miles, James <miles.james@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Optional
Sharkey, Susan <Sharkey.Susan@epa.gov>	Optional
Kramek, Niva <kramek.niva@epa.gov>	Optional
Blair, Susanna <Blair.Susanna@epa.gov>	Optional
Gorder, Chris <Gorder.Chris@epa.gov>	Optional
Nguyen, Nhan <Nguyen.Nhan@epa.gov>	Optional
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Optional
Kabler, Lauren <Kabler.Lauren@epa.gov>	Optional
Saenz, Diana <Saenz.Diana@epa.gov>	Optional
Lott, Don <Lott.Don@epa.gov>	Optional
Ellis, Tony <Ellis.Tony@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 2:15 PM – 2:30 PM
Subject Transportation to PY
Show Time As Busy

There is no car available to return to EPA East on this day.

Your transportation request has been confirmed.

Confirmation Number: 76339
Passenger Information
* Name: NANCY BECK/DAA
* Number: 2025648542
* Pickup Time: 2017-09-18 14:15:00.0
* Pickup Location: EPA EAST CONSTITUTION AVE

* Drop-Off Location: POTOMAC YARD CRYSTAL CITY VA.
Vehicle Information
* Tag: G13-1037M
* Vehicle Type: CAR
* Make : CHEVROLET
* Model : VOLT
* Color : BLACK

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
	Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required

Time 2:30 PM – 3:15 PM
Subject BEAD ALL HANDS
Location PYS RM - 9100
Show Time As Busy

OPP/BEAD Division Meeting with the new Deputy Assistant Administrator for OCSPP, Nancy Beck.

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Wynne Miller <Miller.Wynne@epa.gov>	Required
	OPP BEAD Managers <OPP_BEAD_Managers@epa.gov>	Required
	Kaul, Monisha <Kaul.Monisha@epa.gov>	Optional
	Pease, Anita <Pease.Anita@epa.gov>	Optional
	Jones, Arnet <Jones.Arnet@epa.gov>	Optional
	Sims, Diann <Sims.Diann@epa.gov>	Optional
	Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>	Optional
	Nguyen, Thuy <Nguyen.Thuy@epa.gov>	Optional
	Lawrence, Susan <Lawrence.Susan@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 3:30 PM – 4:00 PM
Subject take shuttle back to HQ
Show Time As Busy

Time 4:00 PM – 4:50 PM
Subject LCPFC Proposed SNUR and Ski Wax Issue
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy

Purpose: Provide update the development of the LCPFC SNUR and overview of ski was investigation.

POC for Meeting Materials: Chris Blunck

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
	Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
	Wolf, Joel <Wolf.Joel@epa.gov>	Required
	Lloyd, Tyler <Lloyd.Tyler@epa.gov>	Required
	Grant, Brian <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
	Mclean, Kevin <Mclean.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
	Anderson, Steve <Anderson.Steve@epa.gov>	Required
	Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
	Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
	Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Required
	Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
	DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
	Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
	Grant, Brian <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
	Anderson, Steve <Anderson.Steve@epa.gov>	Required
	Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
	Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
	Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Required

Tuesday, September 19, 2017

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject IO General Meeting
Location 3130 WJC EAST Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/28/2017 from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM

Show Time As Busy

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Tyree, JamesN <tyree.jamesn@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 9:30 AM – 10:00 AM

Subject OGC Weekly

Location RM 3156 EPA East

Show Time As Busy

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance

Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Richard Keigwin <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>	Required
Mclean, Kevin <Mclean.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Graves, Inza <Graves.Inza@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Brian Grant <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Perlis, Robert <Perlis.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Lee, Khisa <Lee.Khisa@epa.gov>	Required
Simons, Andrew <Simons.Andrew@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Kaczmarek, Chris <Kaczmarek.Chris@epa.gov>	Required
Arnold Layne (Layne.Arnold@epa.gov) <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Anderson, Monique <anderson.monique@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <blunck.chris@epa.gov>	Required
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required

Time 10:00 AM – 10:45 AM
Subject Risk Assessments (ECO)
Location RM 3156 EPA East
Show Time As Busy
Attendees **Name <E-mail>** **Attendance**

Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>	Required
Anderson, Brian <Anderson.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Nesci, Kimberly <Nesci.Kimberly@epa.gov>	Required
Knizner, Steve <Knizner.Steve@epa.gov>	Required
Weiss, Steven <Weiss.Steven@epa.gov>	Required
McNally, Robert <Mcnally.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>	Required
Parsons, Laura <Parsons.Laura@epa.gov>	Optional
Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>	Optional
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Optional
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Donovan, Elizabeth <Donovan.Elizabeth@epa.gov>	Optional
Borges, Shannon <Borges.Shannon@epa.gov>	Optional
Spatz, Dana <Spatz.Dana@epa.gov>	Optional
Sappington, Keith (Sappington.Keith@epa.gov) <Sappington.Keith@epa.gov>	Optional

---

Time 11:00 AM – 11:30 AM
Subject MS Farm Bureau and MDAC Meeting
Location DCRoomARN3528/OCIR
Show Time As Busy

Here are the tentative items we'd like to visit on:

* WOTUS

* Dicamba

* WPS

* State Pollinator Plans

* Kaput Feral Hog Bait

* Section 18's

Feel free to loop in your group from OPP, as we work very closely with Rick and his team there, and have a great relationship with those folks, I might add.

I've copied John Campbell, Deputy Commissioner at MDAC, and Andy Whittington, MS Farm Bureau Environmental Programs Coordinator and member of the EPA PPDC (Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee), on this e-mail.

Attendees	**Name <E-mail>**	**Attendance**
	Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
	Bennett, Tate <bennett.tate@epa.gov>	Required
	Gordon, Stephen <gordon.stephen@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 11:30 AM – 12:30 PM
Subject Pre-Brief for OMB Hearing on FY 2019 President's Budget
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy

Attendees	**Name <E-mail>**	**Attendance**
	Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
	Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
	Richard Keigwin <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
	Arnold Layne (Layne.Arnold@epa.gov) <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
	Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>	Required
	Graves, Inza <Graves.Inza@epa.gov>	Required
	Bruce Berkley <Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov>	Required
	DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
	Scott, Gregory <Scott.Gregory@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 12:30 PM – 1:30 PM
Subject NAFTA
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Metcalf, Alexander <Metcalf.Alexander@epa.gov>	Required
Celeste, Laurel <celeste.laurel@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required

Time 4:00 PM – 5:00 PM
Subject DAA Pre-Brief for PBT Section 6(h) Rulemaking Early Guidance Briefing
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Required
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Required
Widawsky, David <Widawsky.David@epa.gov>	Required
Frazer, Brian <Frazer.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Symmes, Brian <Symmes.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Wheeler, Cindy <Wheeler.Cindy@epa.gov>	Required
Wolf, Joel <Wolf.Joel@epa.gov>	Required
Rice, Cody <Rice.Cody@epa.gov>	Required
Passe, Loraine <Passe.Loraine@epa.gov>	Required

Price, Michelle <Price.Michelle@epa.gov>	Required
Winchester, Erik <Winchester.Erik@epa.gov>	Required
Yakal, Randy <yakal.randy@epa.gov>	Required
Edmonds, Marc <Edmonds.Marc@epa.gov>	Required
Coleman, Todd <coleman.todd@epa.gov>	Required
Tierney, Meghan <Tierney.Meghan@epa.gov>	Required
Berol, David <Berol.David@epa.gov>	Required
Grant, Brian <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Mclean, Kevin <Mclean.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Lehman, Timothy <Lehman.Timothy@epa.gov>	Required
Catilina, Eliane <Catilina.Eliane@epa.gov>	Required
Kramek, Niva <kramek.niva@epa.gov>	Required
Shafer, Jonathan <shafer.jonathan@epa.gov>	Required
Suazo, Stephanie <Suazo.Stephanie@epa.gov>	Required
Wilkins, John <Wilkins.John@epa.gov>	Required
Yowell, John <yowell.john@epa.gov>	Required
Jarmul, Stephanie <jarmul.stephanie@epa.gov>	Required
Gimlin, Peter <Gimlin.Peter@epa.gov>	Required
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Aranda, Amber <aranda.amber@epa.gov>	Optional
Smith, Peterj <Smith.Peterj@epa.gov>	Optional
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Optional
Eisenreich, Karen <Eisenreich.Karen@epa.gov>	Optional
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Optional

Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Scheifele, Hans <Scheifele.Hans@epa.gov>	Optional

Wednesday, September 20, 2017

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject IO General Meeting
Location 3130 WJC EAST Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/28/2017 from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Tyree, JamesN <tyree.jamesn@epa.gov>	Optional

Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 11:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Subject OPPT General
Location 3130A WJC East Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Wednesday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/27/2017 from 11:00 AM to 12:00 PM
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
Clark, Sharon <Clark.Sharon@epa.gov>	Required
Scott, Elizabeth <Scott.Elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>	Required
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Optional
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss.Linda@epa.gov <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>	Optional
Cherepy, Andrea <Cherepy.Andrea@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Required
Scheifele, Hans <Scheifele.Hans@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 12:15 PM – 12:45 PM
Subject Stockholm and Rotterdam: Brownbag Briefing for Nancy and Louise
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy
Purpose: To brief OCSPP/DAAs on substance of upcoming POPRC and CRC meetings

*Karissa will coordinate substance with your offices. Please bring your lunch!

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
	Kovner, Karissa <Kovner.Karissa@epa.gov>	Required
	Dawson, Jeffrey <Dawson.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
	Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
	Blunck, Christopher <blunck.chris@epa.gov>	Required
	Perron, Monique <Perron.Monique@epa.gov>	Required
	Aranda, Amber <aranda.amber@epa.gov>	Required
	Nazef, Laura <Nazef.Laura@epa.gov>	Required
	Myrick, Pamela <Myrick.Pamela@epa.gov>	Required
	Richard Keigwin <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
	Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
	DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
	Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required

Time 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM
Subject Mission Measures - OAR, OW, OCSPP (+R2,5,9)
Location DCRoomWest1426/OPEI; VTC/phone will be available
Show Time As Tentative

Mission Measures Workshop, to be led by Henry Darwin

Invitees: AA, DAA, Office Directors and Lead Region Representatives for OAR and OW

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	Kenny, Shannon <Kenny.Shannon@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Dunham, Sarah <Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov>	Required
	Darwin, Henry <darwin.henry@epa.gov>	Required

Shaw, Betsy <Shaw.Betsy@epa.gov>	Required
Best-Wong, Benita <Best-Wong.Benita@epa.gov>	Required
Shapiro, Mike <Shapiro.Mike@epa.gov>	Required
Edwards, Jonathan <Edwards.Jonathan@epa.gov>	Required
Grundler, Christopher <grundler.christopher@epa.gov>	Required
Page, Steve <Page.Steve@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Alexis <Strauss.Alexis@epa.gov>	Required
Sawyers, Andrew <Sawyers.Andrew@epa.gov>	Required
Grevatt, Peter <Grevatt.Peter@epa.gov>	Required
Kaplan, Robert <kaplan.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Mccabe, Catherine <McCabe.Catherine@epa.gov>	Required
Rees, Sarah <rees.sarah@epa.gov>	Required
Tomiak, Robert <tomiak.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Tejada, Matthew <Tejada.Matthew@epa.gov>	Required
Dalbey, Matthew <dalbey.matthew@epa.gov>	Required
Shaw, Nena <Shaw.Nena@epa.gov>	Required
Campbell, Jennie <Campbell.Jennie@epa.gov>	Required
Olender, Marc <Olender.Marc@epa.gov>	Required
Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
Letendre, Daisy <letendre.daisy@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required

Edwards, Crystal <Edwards.Crystal@epa.gov>	Optional
Penman, Crystal <Penman.Crystal@epa.gov>	Optional
Debell, Kevin <debell.kevin@epa.gov>	Optional
Perez, Idalia <Perez.Idalia@epa.gov>	Optional
Balasa, Kate <balasa.kate@epa.gov>	Optional
Goodin, John <Goodin.John@epa.gov>	Optional
Lape, Jeff <lape.jeff@epa.gov>	Optional
DeDora, Caroline <DeDora.Caroline@epa.gov>	Optional
Bloom, David <Bloom.David@epa.gov>	Optional
OBrien, Kathy <Obrien.Kathy@epa.gov>	Optional
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Optional
Vuong, Stephanie <Vuong.Stephanie@epa.gov>	Optional
Bohan, Suzanne <bohan.suzanne@epa.gov>	Optional
Newton, Cheryl <Newton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Optional
Korleski, Christopher <korleski.christopher@epa.gov>	Optional
LaPosta, Dore <LaPosta.Dore@epa.gov>	Optional
Mugdan, Walter <Mugdan.Walter@epa.gov>	Optional
Hall, JohnM <hall.johnm@epa.gov>	Optional
Berkley, Bruce <Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 4:00 PM – 4:45 PM
Subject Emergency Tolerance Exemptions and EO 13771
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy
Conference Call
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Owens, Nicole <Owens.Nicole@epa.gov>	Required

Avivah Jakob (Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov) <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>	Required
Richard Keigwin <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Miller, Wynne <Miller.Wynne@epa.gov>	Required
Jim Laity EOP / Ex. 6	Optional
Jones, Danielle Y. EOP / Ex. 6 EOP / Ex. 6	Optional
Nickerson, William <Nickerson.William@epa.gov>	Optional
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Optional
Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>	Optional
Pease, Anita <Pease.Anita@epa.gov>	Optional
Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>	Optional
Wyatt, TJ <Wyatt.Tj@epa.gov>	Optional
Kenny, Daniel <Kenny.Dan@epa.gov>	Optional
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Optional
Maignan, Tawanda <Maignan.Tawanda@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 5:00 PM – 6:00 PM
Subject Need to leave.
Show Time As Busy

Thursday, September 21, 2017

Time 8:00 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject Chief of Staff Meeting
Location Alm Room
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott Administrator / Ex. 6	Organizer
Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Required

Ferguson, Lincoln <ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov>	Required
Greaves, Holly <greaves.holly@epa.gov>	Required
Davis, Patrick <davis.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Hupp, Millan <hupp.millan@epa.gov>	Required
Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>	Required
Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
Fotouhi, David <fotouhi.david@epa.gov>	Required
Wilcox, Jahan <wilcox.jahan@epa.gov>	Required
Schwab, Justin <schwab.justin@epa.gov>	Required
Munoz, Charles <munoz.charles@epa.gov>	Required
Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>	Required
Darwin, Veronica <darwin.veronica@epa.gov>	Required
Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
Letendre, Daisy <letendre.daisy@epa.gov>	Required
Kelly, Albert <kelly.albert@epa.gov>	Required
Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Required
Frye, Tony (Robert) <frye.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Dominguez, Alexander <dominguez.alexander@epa.gov>	Required
Abboud, Michael <abboud.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Wagner, Kenneth <wagner.kenneth@epa.gov>	Required
Darwin, Henry <darwin.henry@epa.gov>	Required
McMurray, Forrest <mcmurray.forrest@epa.gov>	Required
Rodrick, Christian <rodrick.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Hewitt, James <hewitt.james@epa.gov>	Required

Traylor, Patrick <traylor.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Gunasekara, Mandy <Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov>	Required
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
Feeley, Drew (Robert) <feeley.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Chmielewski, Kevin <chmielewski.kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Palich, Christian <palich.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>	Required
Graham, Amy <graham.amy@epa.gov>	Required
Bodine, Susan <bodine.susan@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required
Dickerson, Aaron <dickerson.aaron@epa.gov>	Optional
Willis, Sharnett <Willis.Sharnett@epa.gov>	Optional
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
Lovell, Will (William) <lovell.william@epa.gov>	Optional
Shimmin, Kaitlyn <shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Ford, Hayley <ford.hayley@epa.gov>	Optional
Kundinger, Kelly <kundinger.kelly@epa.gov>	Required
White, Elizabeth <white.elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Burke, Marcella <burke.marcella@epa.gov>	Required
Sands, Jeffrey <sands.jeffrey@epa.gov>	Required
Hanson, Paige (Catherine) <hanson.catherine@epa.gov>	Required
Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Required

Wehrum, Bill <Wehrum.Bill@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Required
Harlow, David <harlow.david@epa.gov>	Required
Dourson, Michael <dourson.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Inge, Carolyn <Inge.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 8:00 AM – 6:00 PM
Subject Hold Personal Matters / Ex. 6
Show Time As Out of Office

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject IO General Meeting
Location 3130 WJC EAST Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/28/2017 from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Optional

Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Tyree, JamesN <tyree.jamesn@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 1:00 PM – 2:00 PM

Subject Hurricane Irma/Harvey: PCC Meeting and Conference Call

Location Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Show Time As Tentative

To ensure that all recipient received the invite for todays meeting, we are re-sending the PCC invite for today. In addition, documents for the meeting are attached:

PCC Objectives

PCC Agenda

Region 2 SitRep

Region 4 SitRep

Region 6 SitRep

FEMA's Senior Leaders Brief

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Please use government email or phone for communication regarding the Agency's hurricane response. Do not create government records on personal devices. Any government records on personal devices become discoverable or subject to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance

EOC Documentation <EOC_Documentation@epa.gov>	Organizer
PCC Harvey <PCC_Harvey@epa.gov>	Required

Friday, September 22, 2017

Time 9:30 AM – 10:00 AM
Subject Wendy Blake
Show Time As Busy

Time 10:00 AM – 11:15 AM
Subject ICR Review
Location 3130
Show Time As Busy

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

To go through ICRs as we have regs.
The updated ICR list should be available well before we meet.

Materials are attached, and includes different views showing
* what's pending OMB action
* what's in OEI pending submission to OMB
* what's in RCS pending submission to OEI
* what's in the program offices, and
* upcoming 1st FR publications and ICR submissions.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Smith, Peterj <Smith.Peterj@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Avivah Jakob (Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov) <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Optional
Rice, Cody <Rice.Cody@epa.gov>	Optional
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 11:30 AM – 12:45 PM
Subject General
Location Del Friscos
Show Time As Busy
Download and Brainstorm next steps for hearings.

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Required
	Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>	Required
	Avivah Jakob (Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov) <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
	Avivah Jakob (Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov) <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 2:00 PM – 3:00 PM
Subject PMN Internal Meeting
Location 3130A EPA East
Show Time As Busy

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Schweer, Greg <Schweer.Greg@epa.gov>	Required
	Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
	Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 3:30 PM – 4:00 PM
Subject Jeff/5F case
Show Time As Busy

Time 5:00 PM – 6:00 PM
Subject HOLD Paperwork
Show Time As Busy

Monday, September 25, 2017

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject IO General Meeting
Location 3130 WJC EAST Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/28/2017 from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM
Show Time As Busy

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
	Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required

Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Tyree, JamesN <tyree.jamesn@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 8:30 AM – 9:30 AM
Subject Chief of Staff Meeting
Location Alm Room
Show Time As Busy
Please note the location starting 9 May 2017

POC: ALM Room Cheryl Woodward

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott < Administrator / Ex. 6	Organizer
Darwin, Henry <darwin.henry@epa.gov>	Required
Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Required
Ferguson, Lincoln <ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov>	Required
Greaves, Holly <greaves.holly@epa.gov>	Required

Davis, Patrick <davis.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Hupp, Millan <hupp.millan@epa.gov>	Required
McMurray, Forrest <mcmurray.forrest@epa.gov>	Required
Rodrick, Christian <rodrick.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Required
Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
Fotouhi, David <fotouhi.david@epa.gov>	Required
Wilcox, Jahan <wilcox.jahan@epa.gov>	Required
Schwab, Justin <schwab.justin@epa.gov>	Required
Munoz, Charles <munoz.charles@epa.gov>	Required
Hewitt, James <hewitt.james@epa.gov>	Required
Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>	Required
Darwin, Veronica <darwin.veronica@epa.gov>	Required
Traylor, Patrick <traylor.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
Gunasekara, Mandy <Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov>	Required
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
Feeley, Drew (Robert) <feeley.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Letendre, Daisy <letendre.daisy@epa.gov>	Required
Chmielewski, Kevin <chmielewski.kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Kelly, Albert <kelly.albert@epa.gov>	Required
Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Required

Frye, Tony (Robert) <frye.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Dominguez, Alexander <dominguez.alexander@epa.gov>	Required
Palich, Christian <palich.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Abboud, Michael <abboud.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>	Required
Wagner, Kenneth <wagner.kenneth@epa.gov>	Required
Graham, Amy <graham.amy@epa.gov>	Required
Bodine, Susan <bodine.susan@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required
Shimmin, Kaitlyn <shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Optional
Dickerson, Aaron <dickerson.aaron@epa.gov>	Optional
Willis, Sharnett <Willis.Sharnett@epa.gov>	Optional
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
Ford, Hayley <ford.hayley@epa.gov>	Optional
Lovell, Will (William) <lovell.william@epa.gov>	Optional
Kundinger, Kelly <kundinger.kelly@epa.gov>	Required
White, Elizabeth <white.elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Burke, Marcella <burke.marcella@epa.gov>	Required
Sands, Jeffrey <sands.jeffrey@epa.gov>	Required
Hanson, Paige (Catherine) <hanson.catherine@epa.gov>	Required
Wehrum, Bill <Wehrum.Bill@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Required

Harlow, David <harlow.david@epa.gov>	Required
Dourson, Michael <dourson.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Inge, Carolyn <Inge.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 9:30 AM – 10:00 AM
Subject OCSPP Staff Meeting (Skype Video Teleconference)
Location WJC East 3371C - * Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Monday effective 9/4/2017 until 9/25/2017 from 9:30 AM to 10:00 AM
Show Time As Busy

Updated Conference Call-In Number & added Skype Meeting link for Dial-out option.

....
.....

* Join Skype Meeting
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

This is an online meeting for Skype for Business, the professional meetings and communications app formerly known as Lync.

Join by Phone

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Help <http://intranet.epa.gov/otopintr/webconferencing/ o365-conferencing.html>

[!OC([1033])!]

....
.....

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Organizer

Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>	Required
Gorman, John <Gorman.John@epa.gov>	Required
Sisco, Debby <Sisco.Debby@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Overstreet, Anne <overstreet.anne@epa.gov>	Required
Burden, Susan <Burden.Susan@epa.gov>	Required
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Kovner, Karissa <Kovner.Karissa@epa.gov>	Required
Clark, Sharon <Clark.Sharon@epa.gov>	Required
Filippelli, John <Filippelli.John@epa.gov>	Required
Boutureira, Alan <Boutureira.Alan@epa.gov>	Required
Carter, Pamela <Carter.Pamela@epa.gov>	Required
Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>	Required
DeDora, Caroline <Dedora.Caroline@epa.gov>	Required
Berkley, Bruce <Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov>	Required
LaPosta, Dore <LaPosta.Dore@epa.gov>	Required
Mitchell, Judy-Ann <Mitchell.Judy-Ann@epa.gov>	Required
Smoot, Cameo <Smoot.Cameo@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>	Required

Vineski, Steve <Vineski.Steve@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Graves, Inza <Graves.Inza@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Scott, Elizabeth <Scott.Elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Wooge, William <Wooge.William@epa.gov>	Required
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Weiner, Janet <Weiner.Janet@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Marshall, Venus <Marshall.Venus@epa.gov>	Required
Green, Teresa <Green.Teresa@epa.gov>	Optional
Treimel, Ellen <Treimel.Ellen@epa.gov>	Optional
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Optional
Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>	Optional
Dixon, Diane <Dixon.Diane@epa.gov>	Optional
Metcalf, Alexander <Metcalf.Alexander@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Required
Pane, Vickie <Pane.Vickie@epa.gov>	Optional
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Scott, Gregory <Scott.Gregory@epa.gov>	Required
Scheifele, Hans <Scheifele.Hans@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 10:00 AM – 10:45 AM
Subject Briefing: (ESA) Endangered Species Act
Location Administrator's Office
Show Time As Busy

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Administrator / Ex. 6	Pruitt, Scott Administrator / Ex. 6	Organizer
	Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
	Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required
	Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Required
	Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required
	Ferguson, Lincoln <ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov>	Required
	Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 11:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Subject TSCA Section 12(b)
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy
POC for Meeting Materials: Chris Blunck

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
	Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
	Loraine Passe <Passe.Loraine@epa.gov>	Required
	Myrick, Pamela <Myrick.Pamela@epa.gov>	Required
	Carroll, Megan <Carroll.Megan@epa.gov>	Required
	Sirmons, Chandler <Sirmons.Chandler@epa.gov>	Required
	DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
	Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
	Blunck, Christopher <blunck.chris@epa.gov>	Required
	Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
	Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Optional
	Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required

Time 1:00 PM – 2:00 PM

Subject Hurricanes Maria/Irma/Harvey: PCC Meeting and Conference Call

Location Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Show Time As Tentative

PLEASE: As a reminder, do not place your phone line on hold during the call. Doing so will cause all participants to hear on-hold music and the speakers cannot be heard.

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Meeting invite has been updated with attachments.The PCC agenda will include updates/status reports for hurricanes Jose and Maria as appropriate.

Please use government email or phone for communication regarding the Agency's hurricane response. Do not create government records on personal devices. Any government records on personal devices become discoverable or subject to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
EOC_Deputy_Manager <EOC_Deputy_Manager@epa.gov>	Organizer
PCC Harvey <PCC_Harvey@epa.gov>	Required
Coleman, Sam <Coleman.Sam@epa.gov>	Required
Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Optional
Fonseca, Silvina <Fonseca.Silvina@epa.gov>	Optional
Stepp, Cathy <stepp.cathy@epa.gov>	Optional
Gray, David <gray.david@epa.gov>	Optional
Perovich, Gina <Perovich.Gina@epa.gov>	Optional
Armstead, John A. <Armstead.John@epa.gov>	Optional
Carroll, Craig <Carroll.Craig@epa.gov>	Optional
Brooks, Becky <Brooks.Becky@epa.gov>	Optional
Levine, Carolyn <Levine.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Optional

Mccabe, Catherine <McCabe.Catherine@epa.gov>	Optional
Mclain, Jennifer <Mclain.Jennifer@epa.gov>	Optional
Irizarry, Gilberto <Irizarry.Gilberto@epa.gov>	Optional
Richardson, RobinH <Richardson.RobinH@epa.gov>	Optional
Kling, David <Kling.Dave@epa.gov>	Optional
Mosher, Eric <Mosher.Eric@epa.gov>	Optional
Rodrigues, Cecil <rodrigues.cecil@epa.gov>	Optional
Newton, Cheryl <Newton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Optional
Edwards, Jonathan <Edwards.Jonathan@epa.gov>	Optional
Fotouhi, David <Fotouhi.David@epa.gov>	Optional
Mears, Mary <Mears.Mary@epa.gov>	Optional
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Optional
Flynn, Mike <Flynn.Mike@epa.gov>	Optional
Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Optional
Jenkins, Brandi <Jenkins.Brandi@epa.gov>	Optional
Breen, Barry <Breen.Barry@epa.gov>	Optional
Veal, Lee <Veal.Lee@epa.gov>	Optional
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Optional
Boynton, Lisa <Boynton.Lisa@epa.gov>	Optional
Leonard, Paul <leonard.paul@epa.gov>	Optional
Snowbarger, Robert <Snowbarger.Robert@epa.gov>	Optional
Cacho, Julia <Cacho.Julia@epa.gov>	Optional
Gettle, Jeaneanne <Gettle.Jeaneanne@epa.gov>	Optional
Michaud, John <Michaud.John@epa.gov>	Optional
Kelly, Albert <kelly.albert@epa.gov>	Optional

Chu, Ed <Chu.Ed@epa.gov>	Optional
Cheatham, Reggie <cheatham.reggie@epa.gov>	Optional
Clark, Becki <Clark.Becki@epa.gov>	Optional
Indermark, Michele <Indermark.Michele@epa.gov>	Optional
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
Schlieger, Brian <schlieger.brian@epa.gov>	Optional
Mugdan, Walter <Mugdan.Walter@epa.gov>	Optional
Simon, Nigel <Simon.Nigel@epa.gov>	Optional
Gross, Bonnie <Gross.bonnie@epa.gov>	Optional
Davis, Patrick <davis.patrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Rodan, Bruce <rodan.bruce@epa.gov>	Optional
Peterson, Mary <Peterson.Mary@epa.gov>	Optional
Heard, Anne <Heard.Anne@epa.gov>	Optional
Shapiro, Mike <Shapiro.Mike@epa.gov>	Optional
Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>	Optional
Jenkins, Katherine <jenkins.katherine@epa.gov>	Optional
Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Optional
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Optional
Lapierre, Kenneth <Lapierre.Kenneth@epa.gov>	Optional
Grevatt, Peter <Grevatt.Peter@epa.gov>	Optional
Edlund, Carl <Edlund.Carl@epa.gov>	Optional
EOC_Manager, <EOC_Manager@epa.gov>	Optional
Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 2:00 PM – 4:00 PM
Subject Coal Tar Sealcoat Request for Reconsideration (RFR) Executive Panel Briefing
Location DCRoomARN5020/DC-AR-OEI

Show Time As Busy

Additional background material: Final CoalTar RFR Briefing Package 20170925 <https://usepa-my.sharepoint.com/personal/thoma_connie_epa_gov/Documents/14003%20Deliberation/Panel%20Materials/Final%20CoalTar%20RFR%20Briefing%20%20Package%20201709 25?e=5%3Aa4773cac0a1b4799a71ab2492adb2081>

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Adobe Connect Meeting

Name: Request for Reconsideration

Summary: Executive Panel Briefing

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Title of meeting or event: Coal Tar Sealcoat Request for Reconsideration (RFR) Executive Panel Briefing

Purpose: Brief Three Executive Panel Members regarding an Information Quality Guidelines Request

Desired Outcome: Agency's response to the Pavement Coatings Technology Council's RFR

Will there be advanced materials submitted? Yes

The individual providing materials: Connie Thoma

Date desired for meeting no later than: July 26 to 28, 2017

Length of meeting/event: 2.0 hours

Location: WJCN 5020

Participants:

1. Panel Members

Steven Fine, Acting CIO/AA OEI

fine.steven@epa.gov <mailto:fine.steven@epa.gov>

Samantha Dravis, EPA Policy Advisor

dravis.samantha@epa.gov <mailto:dravis.samantha@epa.gov>

Nancy Beck, Acting DAA OCSPP

beck.nancy@epa.gov <mailto:breen.barry@epa.gov>

2. Presenters

Mike Shapiro, Acting AA OW

shapiro.mike@epa.gov <mailto:shapiro.mike@epa.gov>

Scot Hagerthey, Supervisory Ecologist, ORD/NCEA

hagerthey.scot@epa.gov <mailto:hagerthey.scot@epa.gov>

3. Advisors

Tracy Sheppard, Attorney Advisor Office of General Counsel

sheppard.tracy@epa.gov <mailto:sheppard.tracy@epa.gov>

Rebecca Moser, Director OEI/OEIP

moser.rebecca@epa.gov <mailto:moser.rebecca@epa.gov>

Monica Jones, Deputy Director OEI/OEIP

jones.monica@epa.gov <mailto:jones.monica@epa.gov>

Vincia Holloman, Acting Director OEI/OEIP/EQMD

holloman.vincia@epa.gov <mailto:holloman.vincia@epa.gov>

4. Technical Staff

Kevin Kirby

IQG Lead, OEI/OEIP/EQMD

kirby.kevin@epa.gov <mailto:kirby.kevin@epa.gov>

Connie Thoma, RFR Manager, OEI/OEIP/EQMD

thoma.connie@epa.gov <mailto:thoma.connie@epa.gov>

Gary Norris, Supervisory Physical Scientist, ORD/NERL

norris.gary@epa.gov <mailto:norris.gary@epa.gov>

Kate Schofield, Ecologist, ORD/NCEA

schofield.kate@epa.gov <mailto:schofield.kate@epa.gov>

Sue Norton, Ecologist, ORD/NCEA

norton.susan@epa.gov <mailto:norton.susan@epa.gov>

Christopher Kloss, OW/WPD

kloss.christoper@epa.gov <mailto:kloss.christoper@epa.gov>

ED_002528_00001707-00136

Erika Farris, Environmental Scientist, OW

farris.erika@epa.gov <mailto:farris.erika@epa.gov>

As of June 29, 2017: Meeting scheduled per CThoma. Susan

As of August 17, 2017: Meeting rescheduled per CThoma.-Susan

As of September 22, 2017: Meeting materials added per MJones request-Susan

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Fine, Steven <fine.steven@epa.gov>	Organizer
Shapiro, Mike <Shapiro.Mike@epa.gov>	Required
Hagerthey, Scot <Hagerthey.Scot@epa.gov>	Required
Sheppard, Tracy <Sheppard.Tracy@epa.gov>	Required
Moser, Rebecca <Moser.Rebecca@EPA.GOV>	Required
Jones, Monica <Jones.Monica@epa.gov>	Required
Holloman, Vincia <Holloman.Vincia@epa.gov>	Required
Kirby, Kevin <KIRBY.KEVIN@EPA.GOV>	Required
Thoma, Connie <Thoma.Connie@epa.gov>	Required
Norris, Gary <Norris.Gary@epa.gov>	Required
Schofield, Kate <Schofield.Kate@epa.gov>	Required
Norton, Sue <Norton.Susan@epa.gov>	Required
Kloss, Christopher <Kloss.Christopher@epa.gov>	Required
Farris, Erika D. <Farris.Erika@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Jacks, Susan <Jacks.Susan@epa.gov>	Optional
Jones, Tawaunna <Jones.Tawaunna@epa.gov>	Optional
Jones-Parra, Lisa <Jones-Parra.Lisa@epa.gov>	Optional
Grogard, Megan <Grogard.Megan@epa.gov>	Optional

ED_002528_00001707-00137

Sawyers, Andrew <Sawyers.Andrew@epa.gov>	Optional
Frace, Sheila <Frace.Sheila@epa.gov>	Optional
Nagle, Deborah <Nagle.Deborah@epa.gov>	Optional
Urban, Rachel <Urban.Rachel@epa.gov>	Optional
Borum, Denis <Borum.Denis@epa.gov>	Optional
Heninger, Brian <Heninger.Brian@epa.gov>	Optional
Pasurka, Carl <Pasurka.Carl@epa.gov>	Optional
McGartland, Al <McGartland.Al@epa.gov>	Optional
Dockins, Chris <Dockins.Chris@epa.gov>	Optional
Marten, Alex <Marten.Alex@epa.gov>	Optional
Snyder, Brett <Snyder.Brett@epa.gov>	Optional
Bowen, Jennifer <Bowen.Jennifer@epa.gov>	Optional
Watkins, Stephen <watkins.stephen@epa.gov>	Optional
Fegley, Robert <Fegley.Robert@epa.gov>	Optional
Tallent, Robert <Tallent.Robert@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 4:00 PM – 5:00 PM
Subject Pre-Prioritization Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy

Hi everyone,

Our next meeting is Monday the 25th. Rusty unfortunately won't be able to join us and provide the ORD-NCCT update. My apologies for not being able to move the meeting, but there didn't seem to be any other options next week. So moving forward for the next two weeks the plan is:

Sept 25 4pm– Discuss reaction/edits to:
1. Background of the Pre-Prioritization document – attached
2. 1-pager outlining our approach to 'Working the 2014 Work Plan chemicals' – attached
a. This was discussed last week after the Work Plan presentation. It was clear that the Work Plan would entail two approaches 1) Working the 2014 Work Plan as mandated by the statute and 2) developing an additional work plan method above and beyond the 2014 Plan
3. Any additional thoughts from other 2-pagers that were updated

after the initial discussions: SCIL, Canada, high-throughput methods, Work Plan (#2 above), and sectors

Oct 2 10am – Rusty's update on ORD-NCCT progress

If each group would please forward the most recent versions of your 2 pagers. I would like to start getting these finalized and it would be helpful to send them out in 1 document.
I received the updated version from Lauren and the SCIL group which is also attached.
Also the most recent goal and guiding principles document is attached.

If you have any edits on these prior to the upcoming meetings you can send them on to me or technical questions on to the specific groups.

Thanks so much,
Susanna

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Frithsen, Jeff <Frithsen.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Susanna Blair (Blair.Susanna@epa.gov) <Blair.Susanna@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Henry, Tala <henry.tala@epa.gov>	Required
Brian Grant <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Mclean, Kevin <Mclean.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Thomas, Russell <Thomas.Russell@epa.gov>	Required
Chang, Daniel <chang.daniel@epa.gov>	Required
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
David Widawsky <Widawsky.David@epa.gov>	Required
Frazer, Brian <Frazer.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Davies, Clive <Davies.Clive@epa.gov>	Required
Lauren Sweet (sweet.lauren@epa.gov) <sweet.lauren@epa.gov>	Required

DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Mojica, Andrea <Mojica.andrea@epa.gov>	Optional
Wolf, Joel <Wolf.Joel@epa.gov>	Optional
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Optional
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Anderson, Steve <anderson.steve@epa.gov>	Required
Celeste, Laurel <celeste.laurel@epa.gov>	Required

Tuesday, September 26, 2017

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject IO General Meeting
Location 3130 WJC EAST Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/28/2017 from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Optional

Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Tyree, JamesN <tyree.jamesn@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject reg agenda items
Location 3130 or Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Show Time As Busy

Does 8:30 work to have a targeted discussion on the reg agenda questions from OP?
Please include others as needed

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Richard Keigwin (Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov) <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Smith, Peterj <Smith.Peterj@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Avivah Jakob (Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov) <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Mary Hanley (Hanley.Mary@epa.gov) <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Clark, Sharon <Clark.Sharon@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 9:30 AM – 10:15 AM
Subject ECO Lab Meeting
Location RM 3156 EPA East
Show Time As Busy

Directions: Please use the William Jefferson Clinton East Entrance located at 1201 Constitution Avenue. Please arrive 15 minutes prior to the meeting with photo IDs to clear Security.

EPA Contact: For an escort from Security to the meeting call (202) 564-2902 or (202) 564-2910.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
conrad.lass@ogilvygr.com <conrad.lass@ogilvygr.com>	Required
Richard Keigwin <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Optional
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Optional
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 10:15 AM – 10:45 AM
Subject Section 5(e) Review Process
Location RM 3156 EPA East Building
Show Time As Busy

Purpose/Subject: To discuss Section 5 (e) Review Process—with Christine Bryant and Bob Skoglund from Covestro

Location Address: 1201 Constitution Avenue, NW – Washington, DC

Please have the guards call 202-564-2910 or 202-564-2902 for an escort.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
hutchinsont@gtlaw.com <hutchinsont@gtlaw.com>	Required
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Optional
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required

Time 11:00 AM – 11:30 AM
Subject Fall Meetings Discussion
Location RM 3130A EPA East
Show Time As Busy

Does 11am work instead?
I have to do another call at 11:30.

Thanks.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Avivah Jakob (Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov) <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Marshall, Venus <Marshall.Venus@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Clark, Sharon <Clark.Sharon@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 11:30 AM – 12:00 PM
Subject TSCA Neg-Rulemaking
Location Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Organizer
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required

Time 12:30 PM – 1:00 PM
Subject SES Performance Evaluations
Location 3130A East; Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Organizer
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required

Time 1:00 PM – 1:30 PM
Subject HOLD - Paperwork
Show Time As Busy

Time 1:30 PM – 2:15 PM
Subject Hiring and PRIA with OCSPP
Location WJC-N 3130A
Show Time As Busy

Sct: Tamika Burton, 564-4711

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	Flynn, Mike <Flynn.Mike@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
	Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
	Bloom, David <Bloom.David@epa.gov>	Required
	Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Optional
	Layne, Arnold <layne.arnold@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 2:30 PM – 3:00 PM
Subject International Activities
Location RM 3156 EPA East
Show Time As Busy

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Mosby, Jackie <Mosby.Jackie@epa.gov>	Required
	Herndon, George <Herndon.George@epa.gov>	Required
	Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>	Optional
	Wormell, Lance <Wormell.Lance@epa.gov>	Optional
	Parrott, Patricia <parrott.patricia@epa.gov>	Optional
	Hall, Wanda <Hall.Wanda@epa.gov>	Optional
	Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Optional
	Lowit, Anna <Lowit.Anna@epa.gov>	Optional
	Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Optional
	Marshall, Venus <Marshall.Venus@epa.gov>	Optional
	Diane Isbell <Isbell.Diane@epa.gov>	Optional
	Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Optional
	Emdur, Zoe <Emdur.Zoe@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 4:00 PM – 5:00 PM
Subject Biostimulants Draft Guidance Briefing
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
McNally, Robert <Mcnally.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>	Required
Hollis, Linda <Hollis.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Jones, Russell <Jones.Russell@epa.gov>	Required
Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>	Required
Kaczmarek, Chris <Kaczmarek.Chris@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Optional
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Gsell, Alyssa <Gsell.Alyssa@epa.gov>	Optional
Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 5:00 PM – 5:15 PM
Subject General
Location RM 3130A EPA East
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Required
Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>	Optional

Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required

Time 5:30 PM – 6:00 PM
Subject SAP EDSP
Location stan will call nancy at 564-1273
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>	Required

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject IO General Meeting
Location 3130 WJC EAST Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/28/2017 from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional

Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Tyree, JamesN <tyree.jamesn@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 9:30 AM – 10:30 AM
Subject Briefing on 610 Lead Review
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy

Purpose: To brief Nancy on the 610 Lead Review. Background: Section 610 of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) requires that federal agencies review each rule that has or will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities (SISNOSE) within ten years of publication of the final rule. EPA initiates a Section 610 review in order to determine if the provisions of a rule that are related to small entities should be continued without change, rescinded, or amended to minimize adverse economic impacts on small entities.

POC for Meeting Materials: Chris Blunck

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Frazer, Brian <Frazer.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Symmes, Brian (Symmes.Brian@epa.gov) <Symmes.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Price, Michelle <Price.Michelle@epa.gov>	Required
Tierney, Meghan <Tierney.Meghan@epa.gov>	Required
Shafer, Jonathan <shafer.jonathan@epa.gov>	Required
Goodlow, Toiya <Goodlow.Toiya@epa.gov>	Required
Shannon, Julie <Shannon.Julie@EPA.GOV>	Required
Silagi, William <Silagi.William@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <blunck.chris@epa.gov>	Required
Scheifele, Hans <scheifele.hans@epa.gov>	Required

Anderson, Steve <anderson.steve@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Smith, Peterj <Smith.Peterj@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Edmonds, Marc <Edmonds.Marc@epa.gov>	Optional
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource

---

Time 10:15 AM – 10:45 AM
Subject Briefing: Dicamba
Location Administrator's Office
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott Administrator / Ex. 6	Organizer
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required

Time 11:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Subject OPPT General
Location 3130A WJC East Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Wednesday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/27/2017 from 11:00 AM to 12:00 PM
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
Clark, Sharon <Clark.Sharon@epa.gov>	Required
Scott, Elizabeth <Scott.Elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>	Required
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Optional
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required

Strauss.Linda@epa.gov <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>	Optional
Cherepy, Andrea <Cherepy.Andrea@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Required
Scheifele, Hans <Scheifele.Hans@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 12:00 PM – 1:00 PM
Subject CEQ
Location 730 Jackson Place
Show Time As Busy
Chris Prandoni

Time 12:45 PM – 1:00 PM
Subject Transportation to OMB
Show Time As Busy
Pick up van by metro elevator on 12 street

Janet Chapman Personal Phone / Ex. 6 Contact Person

Time 1:00 PM – 2:00 PM
Subject HOLD - OMB Hearing on FY 2019 President's Budget
Location New Executive Office Office Building, OMB Headquarters
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Richard Keigwin <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Arnold Layne (Layne.Arnold@epa.gov) <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>	Required

Graves, Inza <Graves.Inza@epa.gov>	Required
Bruce Berkley <Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov>	Required
Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Richard Keigwin <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Arnold Layne (Layne.Arnold@epa.gov) <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Bruce Berkley <Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov>	Required

Time 2:05 PM – 2:30 PM
Subject Transportation to EPA East
Show Time As Busy

Time 2:30 PM – 3:00 PM
Subject Intraspecies Factor Whitepaper
Location 3130A EPA East
Show Time As Busy
Purpose: Discuss Risk Assessment Forum White Paper on the Intraspecies Factor

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Lowit, Anna <Lowit.Anna@epa.gov>	Required
Axelrad, Daniel <Axelrad.Daniel@epa.gov>	Required
Setzer, Woodrow <Setzer.Woodrow@epa.gov>	Required
Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 3:00 PM – 4:00 PM
Subject OGC Weekly Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy
Attendees **Name <E-mail>** **Attendance**

Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Cunningham-HQ, Barbara <Cunningham-HQ.Barbara@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>	Required
Mclean, Kevin <Mclean.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Graves, Inza <Graves.Inza@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Grant, Brian <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Perlis, Robert <Perlis.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Simons, Andrew <Simons.Andrew@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Kaczmarek, Chris <Kaczmarek.Chris@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Anderson, Monique <anderson.monique@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Optional
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Cunningham-HQ, Barbara <Cunningham-HQ.Barbara@epa.gov>	Required

Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Grant, Brian <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required

Time 4:00 PM – 4:50 PM
Subject RCC activities
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy

Purpose: To discuss what the office is planning on doing and level of interest re the Regulatory Cooperation Council.
POC for Meeting Materials: Chris Blunck (OPPT) Avivah Jakob (OPP)

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Required
Moss, Kenneth <Moss.Kenneth@epa.gov>	Required
Myrick, Pamela <Myrick.Pamela@epa.gov>	Required
Nazef, Laura <Nazef.Laura@epa.gov>	Required
Moose, Lindsay <Moose.Lindsay@epa.gov>	Required
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Required
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>	Required

Mosby, Jackie <Mosby.Jackie@epa.gov>	Required
Herndon, George <Herndon.George@epa.gov>	Required
Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Metcalf, Alexander <Metcalf.Alexander@epa.gov>	Required
Wormell, Lance <Wormell.Lance@epa.gov>	Optional
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Diane Isbell <Isbell.Diane@epa.gov>	Optional
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Optional
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Emdur, Zoe <Emdur.Zoe@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 5:15 PM – 5:45 PM
Subject General
Location Maureen will call Nancy at 202-564-1273
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Sullivan, Maureen SES OSD OUSD ATL (US) <maureen.sullivan18.civ@mail.mil>	Required

---

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject IO General Meeting
Location 3130 WJC EAST Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/28/2017 from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required

Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Tyree, JamesN <tyree.jamesn@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 8:30 AM – 9:30 AM
Subject Chief of Staff Meeting
Location Alm Room
Show Time As Busy
Please note the location starting 9 May 2017

POC: ALM Room Cheryl Woodward

Attendees	**Name <E-mail>**	**Attendance**
Administrator / Ex. 6	Pruitt, Scott < Administrator / Ex. 6	Organizer
	Darwin, Henry <darwin.henry@epa.gov>	Required
	Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Required
	Ferguson, Lincoln <ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov>	Required
	Greaves, Holly <greaves.holly@epa.gov>	Required
	Davis, Patrick <davis.patrick@epa.gov>	Required

Hupp, Millan <hupp.millan@epa.gov>	Required
McMurray, Forrest <mcmurray.forrest@epa.gov>	Required
Rodrick, Christian <rodrick.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>	Required
Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
Fotouhi, David <fotouhi.david@epa.gov>	Required
Wilcox, Jahan <wilcox.jahan@epa.gov>	Required
Schwab, Justin <schwab.justin@epa.gov>	Required
Munoz, Charles <munoz.charles@epa.gov>	Required
Hewitt, James <hewitt.james@epa.gov>	Required
Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>	Required
Darwin, Veronica <darwin.veronica@epa.gov>	Required
Traylor, Patrick <traylor.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
Gunasekara, Mandy <Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov>	Required
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
Feeley, Drew (Robert) <feeley.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Letendre, Daisy <letendre.daisy@epa.gov>	Required
Chmielewski, Kevin <chmielewski.kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Kelly, Albert <kelly.albert@epa.gov>	Required
Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Required
Frye, Tony (Robert) <frye.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Dominguez, Alexander <dominguez.alexander@epa.gov>	Required

Palich, Christian <palich.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Abboud, Michael <abboud.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>	Required
Wagner, Kenneth <wagner.kenneth@epa.gov>	Required
Graham, Amy <graham.amy@epa.gov>	Required
Bodine, Susan <bodine.susan@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required
Shimmin, Kaitlyn <shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Dickerson, Aaron <dickerson.aaron@epa.gov>	Optional
Willis, Sharnett <Willis.Sharnett@epa.gov>	Optional
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
Ford, Hayley <ford.hayley@epa.gov>	Optional
Lovell, Will (William) <lovell.william@epa.gov>	Optional
Darwin, Henry <darwin.henry@epa.gov>	Required
Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Required
Ferguson, Lincoln <ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov>	Required
Greaves, Holly <greaves.holly@epa.gov>	Required
Davis, Patrick <davis.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Hupp, Millan <hupp.millan@epa.gov>	Required
McMurray, Forrest <mcmurray.forrest@epa.gov>	Required
Rodrick, Christian <rodrick.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Required

Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
Fotouhi, David <fotouhi.david@epa.gov>	Required
Wilcox, Jahan <wilcox.jahan@epa.gov>	Required
Schwab, Justin <schwab.justin@epa.gov>	Required
Munoz, Charles <munoz.charles@epa.gov>	Required
Hewitt, James <hewitt.james@epa.gov>	Required
Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>	Required
Darwin, Veronica <darwin.veronica@epa.gov>	Required
Traylor, Patrick <traylor.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
Gunasekara, Mandy <Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov>	Required
Feeley, Drew (Robert) <feeley.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Letendre, Daisy <letendre.daisy@epa.gov>	Required
Chmielewski, Kevin <chmielewski.kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Kelly, Albert <kelly.albert@epa.gov>	Required
Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Required
Frye, Tony (Robert) <frye.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Dominguez, Alexander <dominguez.alexander@epa.gov>	Required
Palich, Christian <palich.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Abboud, Michael <abboud.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>	Required
Wagner, Kenneth <wagner.kenneth@epa.gov>	Required

Graham, Amy <graham.amy@epa.gov>	Required
Bodine, Susan <bodine.susan@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required
Shimmin, Kaitlyn <shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Optional
Dickerson, Aaron <dickerson.aaron@epa.gov>	Optional
Willis, Sharnett <Willis.Sharnett@epa.gov>	Optional
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
Ford, Hayley <ford.hayley@epa.gov>	Optional
Lovell, Will (William) <lovell.william@epa.gov>	Optional
Kundinger, Kelly <kundinger.kelly@epa.gov>	Required
White, Elizabeth <white.elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Burke, Marcella <burke.marcella@epa.gov>	Required
Sands, Jeffrey <sands.jeffrey@epa.gov>	Required
Hanson, Paige (Catherine) <hanson.catherine@epa.gov>	Required
Wehrum, Bill <Wehrum.Bill@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Required
Harlow, David <harlow.david@epa.gov>	Required
Dourson, Michael <dourson.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Inge, Carolyn <Inge.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 10:00 AM – 11:00 AM
Subject Region 3 Ag Advisors
Location RM 3371C EPA East
Show Time As Busy
Meeting Title: Region 3 State Agriculture Secretaries Meeting
Room Location with VTC: R3 RA Conference Room
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 >) (R3 is Hosting and will open the Line)
Date/Time 9/28/17 - - 9:45am- 11:45am
R3 IT Contact: James Robson (215-814-5656).

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>	Required
	Avivah Jakob (Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov) <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
	Richard Keigwin (Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov) <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
	Wagner, Kenneth <wagner.kenneth@epa.gov>	Required
	Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
	DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO <DCRoomEast3371c@epa.gov>	Resource
	Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
	Avivah Jakob (Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov) <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
	Richard Keigwin (Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov) <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
	Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 10:00 AM – 3:30 PM
Subject Annual State Agriculture Secretaries' Meeting
Location EPA R3 Ofc (1650 Arch St., Phila., PA 19103)
Show Time As Free
Final Agenda Attached.

Hello All: This email invite is to confirm the next State Agriculture Secretaries Meeting with EPA Region III. The meeting will be held on Thursday, September 28th, 2017 from 10 am – 3:30 pm at U.S. EPA Region III Office in Philadelphia (location: 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103.

*Final Agenda Attached.

* Once you have arrived in the Lobby of the US EPA Region III Office, ask Security to call (215-814-2900) for an escort to the RA's Conference Room. Please make sure you have valid identification to enter the building.

* Lunch will be provided for $10 per person. Lunch include a house salad, assorted hoagie and wrap trays, cookies and beverage. If you

should have any food restrictions, there are alternative eateries in the area that deliver as well.

*If you should need a list of Hotels or Parking locations, please contact our Front Office at 215-814-2900.

If you should have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Rhonda Purnell or Renee Searfoss of the Regional Administrator's Staff, at 215-814-2900.

Thank You.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Rodrigues, Cecil <rodrigues.cecil@epa.gov>	Organizer
Scuse, Michael (DDA) <Michael.Scuse@state.de.us>	Required
joe.bartenfelder@maryland.gov <joe.bartenfelder@maryland.gov>	Required
rredding@pa.gov <rredding@pa.gov>	Required
basil.gooden@governor.virginia.gov <basil.gooden@governor.virginia.gov>	Required
kleonhardt@wvda.us <kleonhardt@wvda.us>	Required
Hatton, Joseph <jhatton@wvda.us>	Required
Armstead, John A. <Armstead.John@epa.gov>	Required
Nitsch, Chad <Nitsch.Chad@epa.gov>	Required
Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Wildermuth, Lisa (DDA <lisa.wildermuth@state.de.us>	Optional
amanda.wilson@maryland.gov <amanda.wilson@maryland.gov>	Optional
McCrone, Nicole D <nmccrone@pa.gov>	Optional
Branch-Ellis, Desire (GOV <Desire.Branch-Ellis@governor.virginia.gov>	Optional
Gothard, Robin <RGothard@wvda.us>	Optional

Martin, Jodee <jodeemartin@wvda.us>	Optional
szarefoss@pa.gov <szarefoss@pa.gov>	Optional
deborah.proud@maryland.gov <deborah.proud@maryland.gov>	Optional
Shenk, Kelly <shenk.kelly@epa.gov>	Optional
Ferrell, Mark <Ferrell.Mark@epa.gov>	Optional
Miller, Linda <miller.linda@epa.gov>	Optional
D'Andrea, Michael <DANDREA.MICHAEL@EPA.GOV>	Optional
White, Terri-A <White.Terri-A@epa.gov>	Optional
Zieba, Kyle <Zieba.Kyle@epa.gov>	Optional
Brown, Kinshasa <Brown.Kinshasa@epa.gov>	Optional
Hamilton, Brian <Hamilton.Brian@epa.gov>	Optional
Searfoss, Renee <searfoss.renee@epa.gov>	Optional
Purnell, Rhonda <Purnell.rhonda@epa.gov>	Optional
Gomez, Magdalin <Gomez.Magdalin@epa.gov>	Optional
Brown, Karl <kbrown@pa.gov>	Optional

Time 11:00 AM – 11:45 AM

Subject New Chemicals: Non-Order SNURs Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Location WJC East 3156

Show Time As Busy

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Cherepy, Andrea <Cherepy.Andrea@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required

Scheifele, Hans <Scheifele.Hans@epa.gov>	Required
Grant, Brian <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required
Wills, Jennifer <Wills.Jennifer@epa.gov>	Optional
Sadowsky, Don <Sadowsky.Don@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Thaler, Elizabeth <thaler.elizabeth@epa.gov>	Optional
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 11:30 AM – 12:00 PM
Subject General Discussion
Location 3402 WJC-N
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Organizer
Flynn, Mike <Flynn.Mike@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required

Time 12:30 PM – 2:00 PM
Subject Early Guidance Meeting – Regulation of PBT Chemicals under TSCA §6(h) (Tier 2, SAN 6015)
Location DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO
Show Time As Busy

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

BACKGROUND
OCSPP is developing a proposed rule to implement EPA's mandate under §6(h) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). TSCA §6(h) requires EPA to prohibit or limit the manufacture (including import), processing, distribution in commerce, use, and/or any manner or method of disposal of certain persistent, bioaccumulative, and toxic (PBT) chemicals. TSCA §6(h) requires the Agency to address the risks of injury to health or the environment that it determines are presented by the PBT chemicals and to reduce exposure to them to the extent practicable. Although EPA is not required to conduct a TSCA risk evaluation to support the rulemaking, the Agency may need to

conduct a variety of analyses to, among other things, demonstrate the costs, benefits, and practicability of the regulatory options that will be developed. In addition, OCSPP anticipates that this rulemaking will be subject to the requirement for a Small Business Advocacy Review panel under the Regulatory Flexibility Act and various other consultation requirements. This rulemaking is subject to statutory deadlines. EPA must issue a notice of proposed rulemaking by June 21, 2019, and promulgate a final rule by December 22, 2020.

PURPOSE OF THIS MEETING
This is an Early Guidance meeting under EPA's Action Development Process (ADP). Under the ADP, Early Guidance is the formal first step in the development process for Tier 1 and Tier 2 rulemakings. Early guidance from management is used to establish policy and analytical priorities and communicate expectations for the rulemaking workgroup. At this step of the process, senior managers from the participating offices are afford the opportunity to meaningfully contribute to the priority-setting and general direction for the workgroup's efforts by identifying any issues of significant interest or concern. The OCSPP DAA (Nancy Beck) will provide early guidance, i.e., establishes policy and analytical priorities for the rulemaking and communicates expectations for the development of the rule, with input from participating AAs from across the Agency.

Can I delegate this meeting? Yes. As the ADP procedures require, the meeting invitation is directed to the AAs for the offices that are participating in the development of this action. The invited (Acting) AAs, at their discretion, may delegate attendance to someone else within their offices – usually another senior manager - who is authorized to speak on their behalf. If appropriate, please forward or delegate this invitation.

Does my office need to participate? Attendance is required only if the invited AAs, their management-level designees, and/or the workgroup representative(s) (if authorized to speak on an invited AA's behalf) expect to will raise any issues or concerns related to the development of the action to the OCSPP DAA for consideration. If there are multiple representatives on the workgroup from an participating office, that office is expected to reconcile any disparate views and present a unified position concerning any question or issue at the early guidance meeting. Seating in the conference room is limited, so each office is asked to please send its designated management official or representative and "+1". Others may participate via conference call.

Can I call-in for the meeting? Yes. Please dial	Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6	

What happens after the meeting? After the meeting, OCSPP will document the key issues/questions discussed during the meeting, as well as any decisions about the early development of the action and actions that need to be taken in follow-up to the meeting. OCSPP will also document any direction received after the meeting if further senior-level consider is necessary. OCSPP will distribute the early guidance document to all workgroup members and other meeting participants, and upload a copy of the documentation to the ADP Tracker database. In keeping with the direction provided at this step in the process, the workgroup will then begin to develop an analytical blueprint that sets out its plan for collecting needed information;

conducting scientific, legal, and economic analyses (as applicable); and consulting with affected stakeholders.

MEETING INVITEES
OCSPP has invited the following senior leaders, with their respective Regulatory Steering Committee <http://intranet.epa.gov/adplibrary/rsc/rsc.htm> representatives listed in parenthesis:

OCHP – Ruth Etzel (Brenda Foos)
OECA – Larry Starfield (Keith Bartlett)
OGC – Kevin Minoli (Andy Simons/Kevin McLean)
OLEM – Barry Breen (Gerain Cogliano/Bill Noggle)
OP – Samantha Dravis (Mark Corrales/Stuart Miles-McLean)
ORD – Bob Kavlock (Bob Fegley/Jackie McQueen/Stephen Watkins)

The participating offices are represented on the rulemaking workgroup, as follows:
OCHP – Zaida Figueroa
OECA – Mark Garvey (OCE)
OGC – Brian Grant (primary, PTSLO), Steve Anderson (PTSLO)
OLEM – Stiven Foster (OPM)
OP – Sharon Cooperstein (primary, PRAD), Glenn Farber (PRAD)
ORD – Jace Cuje (primary, OSP), Dan Vallero (NERL)

BRIEFING MATERIALS
OCSPP will disseminate briefing materials at least 5 work days before the meeting. Early guidance meeting materials are considered pre-decisional, deliberative internal documents. The materials should not be cited, quoted or released, nor should they be distributed broadly within EPA.

POINTS OF CONTACT
* Meeting coordinator: Peter Smith (202-564-0262)
* Meeting materials: Cindy Wheeler (202-566-0484).

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Smith, Peterj <Smith.Peterj@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
Wheeler, Cindy <Wheeler.Cindy@epa.gov>	Required
Frazer, Brian <Frazer.Brian@epa.gov>	Required

ED_002528_00001707-00164

Gimlin, Peter <Gimlin.Peter@epa.gov>	Required
Widawsky, David <Widawsky.David@epa.gov>	Required
Rice, Cody <Rice.Cody@epa.gov>	Required
Etzel, Ruth <Etzel.Ruth@epa.gov>	Required
Figueroa, Zaida <Figueroa.Zaida@epa.gov>	Required
Minoli, Kevin <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Mclean, Kevin <Mclean.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Grant, Brian <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Starfield, Lawrence <Starfield.Lawrence@epa.gov>	Required
Garvey, Mark <Garvey.Mark@epa.gov>	Required
Breen, Barry <Breen.Barry@epa.gov>	Required
Foster, Stiven <Foster.Stiven@epa.gov>	Required
Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
Cooperstein, Sharon <Cooperstein.Sharon@epa.gov>	Required
Farber, Glenn <Farber.Glenn@epa.gov>	Required
Kavlock, Robert <Kavlock.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Cuje, Jace <Cuje.Jace@epa.gov>	Required
Vallero, Dan <Vallero.Daniel@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Optional
Green, Teresa <Green.Teresa@epa.gov>	Optional
Chun, Melissa <Chun.Melissa@epa.gov>	Optional
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Optional
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Canavan, Sheila <Canavan.Sheila@epa.gov>	Optional

Wolf, Joel <Wolf.Joel@epa.gov>	Optional
Kramek, Niva <kramek.niva@epa.gov>	Optional
Comnes, Meredith <comnes.meredith@epa.gov>	Optional
Feustel, Ingrid <feustel.ingrid@epa.gov>	Optional
Jarmul, Stephanie <jarmul.stephanie@epa.gov>	Optional
Lloyd, Tyler <Lloyd.Tyler@epa.gov>	Optional
Passe, Loraine <Passe.Loraine@epa.gov>	Optional
Yakal, Randy <yakal.randy@epa.gov>	Optional
Symmes, Brian <Symmes.Brian@epa.gov>	Optional
Winchester, Erik <Winchester.Erik@epa.gov>	Optional
Courtnage, Robert <Courtnage.Robert@EPA.GOV>	Optional
Coleman, Todd <coleman.todd@epa.gov>	Optional
Price, Michelle <Price.Michelle@epa.gov>	Optional
Edmonds, Marc <Edmonds.Marc@epa.gov>	Optional
Shafer, Jonathan <shafer.jonathan@epa.gov>	Optional
Wilkins, John <Wilkins.John@epa.gov>	Optional
Yowell, John <yowell.john@epa.gov>	Optional
Catilina, Eliane <Catilina.Eliane@epa.gov>	Optional
Giuffria, Jonathon <giuffria.jonathon@epa.gov>	Optional
Suazo, Stephanie <Suazo.Stephanie@epa.gov>	Optional
Foos, Brenda <Foos.Brenda@epa.gov>	Optional
Bartlett, Keith <Bartlett.Keith@epa.gov>	Optional
Simons, Andrew <Simons.Andrew@epa.gov>	Optional
Cogliano, Gerain <Cogliano.Gerain@epa.gov>	Optional
Noggle, William <Noggle.William@epa.gov>	Optional

Corrales, Mark <Corrales.Mark@epa.gov>	Optional
Miles-McLean, Stuart <Miles-Mclean.Stuart@epa.gov>	Optional
OP ADP Calendar <OP_ADP_Calendar@epa.gov>	Optional
Fegley, Robert <Fegley.Robert@epa.gov>	Optional
McQueen, Jacqueline <McQueen.Jacqueline@epa.gov>	Optional
Watkins, Stephen <watkins.stephen@epa.gov>	Optional
Gwinn, Maureen <gwinn.maureen@epa.gov>	Optional
Blackburn, Elizabeth <Blackburn.Elizabeth@epa.gov>	Optional
Rodan, Bruce <rodan.bruce@epa.gov>	Optional
Hauchman, Fred <hauchman.fred@epa.gov>	Optional
Miles, James <miles.james@epa.gov>	Optional
Aranda, Amber <aranda.amber@epa.gov>	Optional
Sullivan, Greg <Sullivan.Greg@epa.gov>	Optional
Saenz, Diana <Saenz.Diana@epa.gov>	Optional
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Optional
DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO <DCRoomEast3371c@epa.gov>	Resource
Burden, Susan <Burden.Susan@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 2:45 PM – 3:00 PM
Subject APCRA Meeting in Helsinki
Location RM 3130A EPA East
Show Time As Busy

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Gwinn, Maureen <gwinn.maureen@epa.gov>	Required

Kavlock, Robert <Kavlock.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Gentry, Nathan <Gentry.Nathan@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 3:00 PM – 4:00 PM

Subject Combined New Chemical Bi-Weekly & Prep for Public Meeting (Call in Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Location DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO

Show Time As Busy

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
Canavan, Sheila <Canavan.Sheila@epa.gov>	Required
Widawsky, David <Widawsky.David@epa.gov>	Required
Henry, Tala <henry.tala@epa.gov>	Required
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Required
Grant, Brian <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Mclean, Kevin <Mclean.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Sadowsky, Don <Sadowsky.Don@epa.gov>	Required
Scheifele, Hans <scheifele.hans@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO <DCRoomEast3371c@epa.gov>	Resource
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Required
Schweer, Greg <Schweer.Greg@epa.gov>	Required
Stedeford, Todd <Stedeford.Todd@epa.gov>	Required
Cherepy, Andrea <Cherepy.Andrea@epa.gov>	Required
Wills, Jennifer <Wills.Jennifer@epa.gov>	Required
Thaler, Elizabeth <thaler.elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required

Greg Schweer (Schweer.Greg@epa.gov) <Schweer.Greg@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required

Time 4:00 PM – 4:50 PM
Subject TRI Overview
Location DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO
Show Time As Busy
Purpose: Overview of the TRI program

POC for Meeting Materials: Andrea Cherepy

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Cherepy, Andrea <Cherepy.Andrea@epa.gov>	Required
Reisman, Larry <Reisman.Larry@epa.gov>	Required
Devito, Steve <Devito.Steve@epa.gov>	Required
Tomassoni, Guy <Tomassoni.Guy@epa.gov>	Required
Turk, David <Turk.David@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO <DCRoomEast3371c@epa.gov>	Resource
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional

Friday, September 29, 2017

Time 8:00 AM – 5:00 PM
Subject Out of Office
Show Time As Busy

Time 10:30 AM – 11:00 AM
Subject Pre Dourson Mock Hearing Meeting (10:30 AM)
Location DCRoomARN3528/OCIR
Show Time As Busy

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance

Frye, Tony (Robert) <frye.robert@epa.gov>	Organizer
Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Required
Palich, Christian <palich.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Rodrick, Christian <rodrick.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Required
Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Munoz, Charles <munoz.charles@epa.gov>	Required
Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Clark, Sharon <Clark.Sharon@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Optional
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 11:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Subject Responses to ESA Questions
Location DCRoomARN4045/DC-Ariel-Rios-OGC
Show Time As Busy

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Organizer
Perlis, Robert <Perlis.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Mclean, Kevin <Mclean.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Required

Knorr, Michele <knorr.michele@epa.gov>	Required
Marshall, Tom <marshall.tom@epa.gov>	Required
Siegal, Tod <Siegal.Tod@epa.gov>	Required
Dyner, Mark <dyner.mark@epa.gov>	Required
Kaczmarek, Chris <Kaczmarek.Chris@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 1:00 PM – 2:00 PM

Subject Hurricanes Maria/Irma/Harvey: PCC Meeting and Conference Call

Location Dial-In: Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Show Time As Tentative

PLEASE: As a reminder, do not place your phone line on hold during the call. Doing so will cause all participants to hear on-hold music and the speakers cannot be heard.

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Meeting invite has been updated with attachments for the meeting.

Please use government email or phone for communication regarding the Agency's hurricane response. Do not create government records on personal devices. Any government records on personal devices become discoverable or subject to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
EOC_Deputy_Manager <EOC_Deputy_Manager@epa.gov>	Organizer
PCC Harvey <PCC_Harvey@epa.gov>	Required
Cacho, Julia <Cacho.Julia@epa.gov>	Required
Gettle, Jeaneanne <Gettle.Jeaneanne@epa.gov>	Optional
Mosher, Eric <Mosher.Eric@epa.gov>	Optional
EOC Documentation <EOC_Documentation@epa.gov>	Optional
Fotouhi, David <Fotouhi.David@epa.gov>	Optional

Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Optional
Clark, Becki <Clark.Becki@epa.gov>	Optional
Edlund, Carl <Edlund.Carl@epa.gov>	Optional
Armstead, John A. <Armstead.John@epa.gov>	Optional
Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Optional
Leonard, Paul <leonard.paul@epa.gov>	Optional
Davis, Patrick <davis.patrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Irizarry, Gilberto <Irizarry.Gilberto@epa.gov>	Optional
Stepp, Cathy <stepp.cathy@epa.gov>	Optional
Price, Lisa <Price.Lisa@epa.gov>	Optional
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Optional
Kling, David <Kling.Dave@epa.gov>	Optional
Jenkins, Brandi <Jenkins.Brandi@epa.gov>	Optional
Mears, Mary <Mears.Mary@epa.gov>	Optional
Perovich, Gina <Perovich.Gina@epa.gov>	Optional
Veal, Lee <Veal.Lee@epa.gov>	Optional
Coleman, Sam <Coleman.Sam@epa.gov>	Optional
Mclain, Jennifer <Mclain.Jennifer@epa.gov>	Optional
Breen, Barry <Breen.Barry@epa.gov>	Optional
Mugdan, Walter <Mugdan.Walter@epa.gov>	Optional
Indermark, Michele <Indermark.Michele@epa.gov>	Optional
Flynn, Mike <Flynn.Mike@epa.gov>	Optional
Shapiro, Mike <Shapiro.Mike@epa.gov>	Optional
Schlieger, Brian <schlieger.brian@epa.gov>	Optional
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional

Lapierre, Kenneth <Lapierre.Kenneth@epa.gov>	Optional
Cheatham, Reggie <cheatham.reggie@epa.gov>	Optional
Levine, Carolyn <Levine.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Simon, Nigel <Simon.Nigel@epa.gov>	Optional
Perrin, Alan <Perrin.Alan@epa.gov>	Optional
Boynton, Lisa <Boynton.Lisa@epa.gov>	Optional
Carroll, Craig <Carroll.Craig@epa.gov>	Optional
Heard, Anne <Heard.Anne@epa.gov>	Optional
Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>	Optional

ED_002528_00001707-00173

Message

From: Bolen, Derrick [bolen.derrick@epa.gov]
Sent: 8/16/2018 2:24:56 PM
To: Kaminer, Joan [Kaminer.Joan@epa.gov]
CC: Beck, Nancy [Beck.Nancy@epa.gov]
Subject: NB FOIA
Attachments: Redacted_Beck_Calenadar1.18.pdf; Redacted_Beck_Calenadar2.18.pdf; Redacted_Beck_Calenadar5.17.pdf; Redacted_Beck_Calenadar6.17.pdf; Redacted_Beck_Calenadar7.17.pdf; Redacted_Beck_Calenadar8.17.pdf; Redacted_Beck_Calenadar9.17.pdf; Redacted_Beck_Calenadar10.17.pdf; Redacted_Beck_Calenadar11.17.pdf; Redacted_Beck_Calenadar12.17.pdf

Joan-

Attached are the redactions. Also can you or someone else help to make sure that the content of the meetings Nancy had with Pruitt align with the FOIAs of his calendars?

Per Nancy the following have been redacted from the body of invites.

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5; Personal Privacy / Ex. 6

Thank you,
Derrick Bolen

Bolen, Derrick

Subject: Beck, Nancy Calendar
Attachments: Beck Nancy Calendar.ics

Beck, Nancy Calendar
Beck.Nancy@epa.gov
Friday, September 1, 2017 – Saturday, September 30, 2017
Time zone: (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)
(Adjusted for Daylight Saving Time)

September 2017

Su	Mo	Tu	We	Th	Fr	Sa
					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	26	27	28	29	30

Busy | Tentative | Free
Out of Office | Working Elsewhere | Outside of Working Hours

September 2017

Fri, Sep 1

	All Day	HOLD
	9:00 AM – 9:30 AM	IO General Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy

Sat, Sep 2 – Sun, Sep 3

	All Day	**Free**

Mon, Sep 4

	All Day	Labor Day United States
	Before 8:00 AM	**Free**
	8:00 AM – 6:00 PM	Labor Day / Office closed Cleland-Hamnett, Wendy

■	9:30 AM – 10:00 AM	OCSPP Staff Meeting (Skype Video Teleconference) WJC East 3371C - Skype Call-In N Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Wise, Louise
□	**After 6:00 PM**	**Free**

Tue, Sep 5

□	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
□	8:00 AM – 9:00 AM	Personal Matters / Ex. 6
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	Chief of Staff Meeting Alm Room Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott
□	**9:00 AM – 9:30 AM**	**Free**
■	9:30 AM – 10:00 AM	RE: OCSPP Staff Meeting (Video Teleconference) - Dial-In Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO Beck, Nancy
□	**10:00 AM – 10:30 AM**	**Free**
■	10:30 AM – 11:00 AM	Problem Formulation DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
□	**11:00 AM – 11:45 AM**	**Free**
■	11:45 AM – 12:00 PM	hold
■	12:00 PM – 1:30 PM	General Old Ebbitt Beck, Nancy
□	**1:30 PM – 1:45 PM**	**Free**
■	1:45 PM – 2:00 PM	Transportation to PY
■	2:00 PM – 3:00 PM	BLAD Briefing S-12100 PYS Beck, Nancy
□	**3:00 PM – 4:00 PM**	**Free**
■	4:00 PM – 4:30 PM	Registration Process RM 12100 PY South Beck, Nancy
■	4:30 PM – 4:55 PM	Return Transportation to EPA East
□	**4:55 PM – 5:00 PM**	**Free**
□	**After 5:00 PM**	**Free**

Wed, Sep 6

□	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
■	8:00 AM – 9:00 AM	Chief of Staff Meeting Alm Room Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	IO General Meeting 3130 WJC EAST Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Beck, Nancy

☐	**9:00 AM – 11:00 AM**	**Free**
■	11:00 AM – 12:00 PM	OPPT General 3130A WJC East (Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
■	12:00 PM – 12:30 PM	HOLD: Meet & Greet with Lonza WJCE 3130
■	12:30 PM – 1:00 PM	Fees Discussion DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
■	1:00 PM – 1:45 PM	Systematic Review Meetings DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO; DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
☐	**1:45 PM – 2:00 PM**	**Free**
■	2:00 PM – 3:00 PM	Confirmed: OIG/OCSPP mtg to discuss TSCA/Lautenberg Act Implementation -- Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Weiner, Janet
■	3:00 PM – 3:45 PM	ITRMD - ALL HANDS DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
☐	**3:45 PM – 5:00 PM**	**Free**
☐	**After 5:00 PM**	**Free**

Thu, Sep 7

☐	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
■	8:00 AM – 9:00 AM	Chief of Staff Meeting Alm Room Adm14Pruitt, Scott
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	IO General Meeting 3130 WJC EAST (Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
☐	**9:00 AM – 10:00 AM**	**Free**
■	10:00 AM – 11:00 AM	Pre-Prioritization Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
☐	**11:00 AM – 11:30 AM**	**Free**
■	11:30 AM – 12:15 PM	Registration Review Process RM 3156 EPA East Beck, Nancy
☐	**12:15 PM – 1:00 PM**	**Free**
■	1:00 PM – 2:00 PM	CDR Reg Neg Meeting: Position Briefing DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy

	2:00 PM – 3:00 PM	Bi-weekly General w/Angela Hofmann 3130C EPA East Wise, Louise
	2:00 PM – 3:00 PM	Deputy AA Meeting 3216WJC-South Traylor, Patrick
	3:00 PM – 4:00 PM	TSCA New Chemicals - Part 1 (CRSS and SAT) RM 3156 EPA East Beck, Nancy
	4:00 PM – 4:30 PM	**Free**
	4:30 PM – 6:00 PM	HOLD Paperwork
	After 6:00 PM	**Free**

Fri, Sep 8

	Before 8:00 AM	**Free**
	8:00 AM – 9:15 AM	**Free**
	9:15 AM – 10:15 AM	Briefing: (ESA) Endangered Species Act Administrator's Office Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott
	10:15 AM – 11:00 AM	CropLife SOC DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
	11:00 AM – 11:30 AM	Meet & Greet w/Aaron Hobbs (RISE) DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
	11:30 AM – 12:15 PM	**Free**
	12:15 PM – 12:45 PM	OSCP Bi-weekly 3130A WJC East Beck, Nancy
	12:45 PM – 2:00 PM	**Free**
	2:00 PM – 2:30 PM	Discussion with Monsanto DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
	2:30 PM – 5:00 PM	**Free**
	After 5:00 PM	**Free**

Sat, Sep 9

	Before 9:00 AM	**Free**
	9:00 AM – 10:00 AM	Personal Matters / Ex. 6
	After 10:00 AM	**Free**

Sun, Sep 10

	All Day	**Free**

Mon, Sep 11

☐	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
■	8:00 AM – 9:00 AM	Chief of Staff Meeting Alm Room Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	IO General Meeting 3130 WJC EAST Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
■	9:00 AM – 9:30 AM	
■	9:30 AM – 10:00 AM	OCSPP Staff Meeting (Skype Video Teleconference) WJC East 3371C - Skype Call-In Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Wise, Louise
☐	**10:00 AM – 11:00 AM**	**Free**
■	11:00 AM – 11:30 AM	International Travel Proposal for October RM 3130C Wise, Louise
■	11:30 AM – 1:00 PM	HOLD-MD
☐	**1:00 PM – 2:00 PM**	**Free**
■	2:00 PM – 3:00 PM	General w/Arnold Layne RM 3148 EPA East Beck, Nancy
■	3:00 PM – 4:00 PM	TSCA New Chemicals - Part 2 (Focus) RM 3156 EPA East Beck, Nancy
☐	**4:00 PM – 5:00 PM**	**Free**
■	5:00 PM – 6:30 PM	HOLD Paperwork
☐	**After 6:30 PM**	**Free**

Tue, Sep 12

☐	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
☐	**8:00 AM – 8:30 AM**	**Free**
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	IO General Meeting 3130 WJC EAST Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
☐	**9:00 AM – 9:30 AM**	**Free**
■	9:30 AM – 9:45 AM	Transportation to PY
■	9:45 AM – 10:45 AM	Neonicotinoid Briefing DCRoomPYS9100/Potomac-Yard-One Beck, Nancy
■	10:45 AM – 11:30 AM	PRD ALL HANDS RM - PYS - 9100 Beck, Nancy
■	11:30 AM – 12:15 PM	RD ALL HANDS RM - PYS - 7100 Beck, Nancy
☐	**12:15 PM – 12:20 PM**	**Free**

■	12:20 PM – 12:35 PM	Return Transportation to EPA East
□	**12:35 PM – 1:00 PM**	**Free**
■	1:00 PM – 2:00 PM	EPA meeting with Dr. Beck and EPA staff on TCE WOE (UNCLASSIFIED) 3156 EPA East, 1201 Constitution Ave; conference line: Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Underwood, Patricia M CIV (US)
▨	1:00 PM – 2:00 PM	Hurricane Irma/Harvey: PCC Meeting and Conference Call DCRoomARNB431/Executive-Conference-Room EOC_Deputy_Manager
□	**2:00 PM – 3:00 PM**	**Free**
■	3:00 PM – 3:30 PM	OGC Weekly DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
■	3:30 PM – 5:30 PM	HOLD
□	**After 5:30 PM**	**Free**

Wed, Sep 13

□	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
□	**8:00 AM – 8:30 AM**	**Free**
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	IO General Meeting 3130 WJC EAST (Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
▨	9:00 AM – 5:00 PM	CDR Inorganic Byproducts FACA-Public Meeting - September - Day 1 RRB Oceanic Suites Kramek, Niva
■	9:30 AM – 10:00 AM	ADP tracker 101 Nancys office- if we can access it from my computer Beck, Nancy
■	10:45 AM – 11:15 AM	General Conf. Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Greaves, Holly
■	11:00 AM – 12:00 PM	OPPT General 3130A WJC East (Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
■	2:00 PM – 3:00 PM	OGC Weekly DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
■	3:00 PM – 3:30 PM	Axalta Coating Systems RM 3156 EPA East Building Beck, Nancy
■	4:30 PM – 5:20 PM	Overview of SNURs -- New Chemical 5(e) and Non-5(e), and Existing Chemical SNURs. DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
□	**After 5:20 PM**	**Free**

Thu, Sep 14

	Before 8:00 AM	**Free**
	8:00 AM – 8:30 AM	**Free**
	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	IO General Meeting 3130 WJC EAST Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
	8:45 AM – 9:30 AM	Chief of Staff Meeting Alm Room Administrator / Ex. 6
	9:00 AM – 3:00 PM	CDR Inorganic Byproducts FACA-Public Meeting - September - Day 2 RRB Oceanic Suites Kramek, Niva
	10:00 AM – 11:00 AM	Pre-Prioritization Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
	11:00 AM – 12:00 PM	New Chemical Bi-Weekly Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO Beck, Nancy
	1:00 PM – 1:45 PM	Risk Assessments (Human Health) RM 3156 EPA East Beck, Nancy
	1:00 PM – 2:00 PM	Hurricane Irma/Harvey: PCC Meeting and Conference Call DCRoomARNB431/Executive-Conference-Room EOC Documentation
	2:00 PM – 2:30 PM	Recusals Room 3156 East Fugh, Justina
	2:00 PM – 4:00 PM	FW: SAVE THE DATE Personal Matters / Ex. 6 4225 WJC-E Petrole, Maryann
	3:15 PM – 4:00 PM	Meet and greet 3130A WJC East Beck, Nancy
	4:00 PM – 5:00 PM	**Free**
	After 5:00 PM	**Free**

Fri, Sep 15

	Before 8:00 AM	**Free**
	8:00 AM – 8:15 AM	**Free**
	8:15 AM – 8:45 AM	meet and greet Timgad Beck, Nancy
	8:45 AM – 9:30 AM	**Free**

■	9:30 AM – 10:15 AM	ICR review 3130 Beck, Nancy
■	9:45 AM – 10:00 AM	Mock Senator Holding Room (9:45 AM) 1154 WJC East (Judges Chambers) Lyons, Troy
■	10:00 AM – 12:00 PM	Mock Hearing for Senate Confirmed Nominees (10:00 AM) Hearing Room 1152 WJC East Lyons, Troy
□	**12:00 PM – 12:15 PM**	**Free**
■	12:15 PM – 1:15 PM	Mock Hearing Debrief and Feedback (12:15 PM) 1152 WJC East Lyons, Troy
□	**1:15 PM – 1:30 PM**	**Free**
■	1:30 PM – 2:00 PM	HOLD
□	**2:00 PM – 3:30 PM**	**Free**
■	3:30 PM – 4:00 PM	general Nancy will call Al-- whats the best #? Beck, Nancy
■	3:30 PM – 5:30 PM	HOLD Paperwork and Training
□	**After 5:30 PM**	**Free**

Sat, Sep 16

□	**All Day**	**Free**

Sun, Sep 17

□	**Before 1:00 PM**	**Free**
▨	1:00 PM – 2:00 PM	Hurricane Irma/Harvey: PCC Meeting and Conference Call DCRoomARNB431/Executive-Conference-Room EOC Documentation
□	**After 2:00 PM**	**Free**

Mon, Sep 18

□	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
■	8:00 AM – 8:30 AM	General Follow-up Rm. 3166A Mottley, Tanya
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	IO General Meeting 3130 WJC EAST (Call in Number **Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6** **Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6** Beck, Nancy
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	**Personal Matters / Ex. 6** RRB
□	**9:00 AM – 9:30 AM**	**Free**

■	9:30 AM – 10:00 AM	OCSPP Staff Meeting (Skype Video Teleconference) WJC East 3371C - Skype Call-In Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Wise, Louise
□	**10:00 AM – 10:30 AM**	**Free**
■	10:30 AM – 11:00 AM	Prebrief for DAA in advance of OIG mtg on TSCA CDR -- Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Weiner, Janet
■	11:00 AM – 11:30 AM	Sulfoxaflor RM 3156 EPA East Beck, Nancy
■	11:30 AM – 12:30 PM	OCSPP/OIG/OECA Kickoff mtg -- TSCA CDR (OPE-FY17-0025) -- Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO Weiner, Janet
□	**12:30 PM – 2:15 PM**	**Free**
■	2:15 PM – 2:30 PM	Transportation to PY Beck, Nancy
■	2:30 PM – 3:15 PM	BEAD ALL HANDS PYS RM - 9100 Beck, Nancy
□	**3:15 PM – 3:30 PM**	**Free**
■	3:30 PM – 4:00 PM	take shuttle back to HQ
■	4:00 PM – 4:50 PM	LCPFC Proposed SNUR and Ski Wax Issue DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
□	**4:50 PM – 5:00 PM**	**Free**
□	**After 5:00 PM**	**Free**

Tue, Sep 19

□	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
□	**8:00 AM – 8:30 AM**	**Free**
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	IO General Meeting 3130 WJC EAST Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
□	**9:00 AM – 9:30 AM**	**Free**
■	9:30 AM – 10:00 AM	OGC Weekly RM 3156 EPA East Beck, Nancy
■	10:00 AM – 10:45 AM	Risk Assessments (ECO) RM 3156 EPA East Beck, Nancy
□	**10:45 AM – 11:00 AM**	**Free**
■	11:00 AM – 11:30 AM	MS Farm Bureau and MDAC Meeting DCRoomARN3528/OCIR Cory, Preston (Katherine)

■	11:30 AM – 12:30 PM	Pre-Brief for OMB Hearing on FY 2019 President's Budget DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
■	12:30 PM – 1:30 PM	NAFTA DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
□	**1:30 PM – 4:00 PM**	**Free**
■	4:00 PM – 5:00 PM	DAA Pre-Brief for PBT Section 6(h) Rulemaking Early Guidance Briefing DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
□	**After 5:00 PM**	**Free**

Wed, Sep 20

□	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
□	**8:00 AM – 8:30 AM**	**Free**
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	IO General Meeting 3130 WJC EAST (Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
□	**9:00 AM – 11:00 AM**	**Free**
■	11:00 AM – 12:00 PM	OPPT General 3130A WJC East (Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
□	**12:00 PM – 12:15 PM**	**Free**
■	12:15 PM – 12:45 PM	Stockholm and Rotterdam: Brownbag Briefing for Nancy and Louise DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
□	**12:45 PM – 1:00 PM**	**Free**
▨	1:00 PM – 3:00 PM	Mission Measures - OAR, OW, OCSPP (+R2,5,9) DCRoomWest1426/OPEI; VTC/phone will be available Kenny, Shannon
□	**3:00 PM – 4:00 PM**	**Free**
■	4:00 PM – 4:45 PM	Emergency Tolerance Exemptions and EO 13771 DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
□	**4:45 PM – 5:00 PM**	**Free**
■	5:00 PM – 6:00 PM	Need to leave
□	**After 6:00 PM**	**Free**

Thu, Sep 21

□	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
■	8:00 AM – 9:00 AM	Chief of Staff Meeting Alm Room Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott

■	8:00 AM – 6:00 PM	Hold Personal Matters / Ex. 6
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	IO General Meeting 3130 WJC EAST (Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
▨	1:00 PM – 2:00 PM	Hurricane Irma/Harvey: PCC Meeting and Conference Call Dial-In: Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 EOC Documentation
□	**After 6:00 PM**	**Free**

Fri, Sep 22

□	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
□	**8:00 AM – 9:30 AM**	**Free**
■	9:30 AM – 10:00 AM	Wendy Blake
■	10:00 AM – 11:15 AM	ICR Review 3130 Beck, Nancy
□	**11:15 AM – 11:30 AM**	**Free**
■	11:30 AM – 12:45 PM	General Del Friscos Beck, Nancy
□	**12:45 PM – 2:00 PM**	**Free**
■	2:00 PM – 3:00 PM	PMN Internal Meeting 3130A EPA East Beck, Nancy
□	**3:00 PM – 3:30 PM**	**Free**
■	3:30 PM – 4:00 PM	Jeff/SF case
□	**4:00 PM – 5:00 PM**	**Free**
■	5:00 PM – 6:00 PM	HOLD Paperwork
□	**After 6:00 PM**	**Free**

Sat, Sep 23 – Sun, Sep 24

□	**All Day**	**Free**

Mon, Sep 25

□	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
□	**8:00 AM – 8:30 AM**	**Free**
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	IO General Meeting 3130 WJC EAST (Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
■	8:30 AM – 9:30 AM	Chief of Staff Meeting Alm Room Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott

■	9:30 AM – 10:00 AM	OCSPP Staff Meeting (Skype Video Teleconference) WJC East 3371C - Skype Call-In Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Wise, Louise
■	10:00 AM – 10:45 AM	Briefing: (ESA) Endangered Species Act Administrator's Office Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott
□	**10:45 AM – 11:00 AM**	**Free**
■	11:00 AM – 12:00 PM	TSCA Section 12(b) DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
□	**12:00 PM – 1:00 PM**	**Free**
▨	1:00 PM – 2:00 PM	Hurricanes Maria/irma/Harvey: PCC Meeting and Conference Call Dial-In: Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 EOC_Deputy_Manager
■	2:00 PM – 4:00 PM	Coal Tar Sealcoat Request for Reconsideration (RFR) Executive Panel Briefing DCRoomARN5020/DC-AR-OEI Fine, Steven
■	4:00 PM – 5:00 PM	Pre-Prioritization (Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
□	**After 5:00 PM**	**Free**

Tue, Sep 26

□	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
□	**8:00 AM – 8:30 AM**	**Free**
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	IO General Meeting 3130 WJC EAST (Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	reg agenda items 3130 or (Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
□	**9:00 AM – 9:30 AM**	**Free**
■	9:30 AM – 10:15 AM	ECO Lab Meeting RM 3156 EPA East Beck, Nancy
■	10:15 AM – 10:45 AM	Section 5(e) Review Process RM 3156 EPA East Building Beck, Nancy
□	**10:45 AM – 11:00 AM**	**Free**
■	11:00 AM – 11:30 AM	Fall Meetings Discussion RM 3130A EPA East Beck, Nancy

■	11:30 AM – 12:00 PM	TSCA Neg-Rulemaking call in: Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Brown, Byron
□	**12:00 PM – 12:30 PM**	**Free**
■	12:30 PM – 1:00 PM	SES Performance Evaluations 3130A East; conference line Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Wise, Louise
■	1:00 PM – 1:30 PM	HOLD - Paperwork
■	1:30 PM – 2:15 PM	Hiring and PRIA with OCSPP WJC-N 3130A Flynn, Mike
□	**2:15 PM – 2:30 PM**	**Free**
■	2:30 PM – 3:00 PM	International Activities RM 3156 EPA East Beck, Nancy
□	**3:00 PM – 4:00 PM**	**Free**
■	4:00 PM – 5:00 PM	Biostimulants Draft Guidance Briefing DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
■	5:00 PM – 5:15 PM	General RM 3130A EPA East Beck, Nancy
□	**5:15 PM – 5:30 PM**	**Free**
■	5:30 PM – 6:00 PM	SAP EDSP stan will call nancy at Personal Phone / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
□	**After 6:00 PM**	**Free**

Wed, Sep 27

□	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
□	**8:00 AM – 8:30 AM**	**Free**
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	IO General Meeting 3130 WJC EAST (Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
□	**9:00 AM – 9:30 AM**	**Free**
■	9:30 AM – 10:30 AM	Briefing on 610 Lead Review DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
■	10:15 AM – 10:45 AM	Briefing: Dicamba Administrator's Office Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott
□	**10:45 AM – 11:00 AM**	**Free**
■	11:00 AM – 12:00 PM	OPPT General 3130A WJC East (Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
■	12:00 PM – 1:00 PM	CEQ 730 Jackson Place

■	12:45 PM – 1:00 PM	Transportation to OMB
■	1:00 PM – 2:00 PM	HOLD - OMB Hearing on FY 2019 President's Budget New Executive Office Office Building, OMB Headquarters Beck, Nancy
□	**2:00 PM – 2:05 PM**	**Free**
■	2:05 PM – 2:30 PM	Transportation to EPA East
■	2:30 PM – 3:00 PM	Intraspecies Factor Whitepaper 3130A EPA East Beck, Nancy
■	3:00 PM – 4:00 PM	OGC Weekly Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
■	4:00 PM – 4:50 PM	RCC activities DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP Beck, Nancy
□	**4:50 PM – 5:00 PM**	**Free**
□	**5:00 PM – 5:15 PM**	**Free**
■	5:15 PM – 5:45 PM	General Maureen will call Nancy at Personal Phone / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
□	**After 5:45 PM**	**Free**

Thu, Sep 28

□	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
□	**8:00 AM – 8:30 AM**	**Free**
■	8:30 AM – 9:00 AM	IO General Meeting 3130 WJC EAST Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Beck, Nancy
■	8:30 AM – 9:30 AM	Chief of Staff Meeting Alm Room Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott
□	**9:30 AM – 10:00 AM**	**Free**
■	10:00 AM – 11:00 AM	Region 3 Ag Advisors RM 3371C EPA East Beck, Nancy
□	10:00 AM – 3:30 PM	Annual State Agriculture Secretaries' Meeting EPA R3 Ofc (1650 Arch St., Phila., PA 19103) Rodrigues, Cecil
■	11:00 AM – 11:45 AM	New Chemicals: Non-Order SNURs Call in number 1 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 WJC East 3156 Beck, Nancy
■	11:30 AM – 12:00 PM	General Discussion 3402 WJC-N Jackson, Ryan
■	12:30 PM – 2:00 PM	Early Guidance Meeting – Regulation of PBT Chemicals under TSCA §6(h) (Tier 2, SAN 6015)

DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO
Beck, Nancy

■	2:45 PM – 3:00 PM	APCRA Meeting in Helsinki RM 3130A EPA East Beck, Nancy
■	3:00 PM – 4:00 PM	Combined New Chemical Bi-Weekly & Prep for Public Meeting Call in number: Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO Beck, Nancy
■	4:00 PM – 4:50 PM	TRI Overview DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO Beck, Nancy
□	**4:50 PM – 5:00 PM**	**Free**
□	**After 5:00 PM**	**Free**

Fri, Sep 29

□	**Before 8:00 AM**	**Free**
■	8:00 AM – 5:00 PM	Out of Office
■	10:30 AM – 11:00 AM	Pre Dourson Mock Hearing Meeting (10:30 AM) DCRoomARN3528/OCIR Frye, Tony (Robert)
■	11:00 AM – 12:00 PM	Responses to ESA Questions DCRoomARN4045/DC-Ariel-Rios-OGC Baptist, Erik
▨	1:00 PM – 2:00 PM	Hurricanes Maria/Irma/Harvey: PCC Meeting and Conference Call Dial-In: Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 EOC_Deputy_Manager
□	**After 5:00 PM**	**Free**

Sat, Sep 30

□	**All Day**	**Free**

Details

Friday, September 1, 2017

Time All Day
Subject HOLD
Show Time As Out of Office

Time 9:00 AM – 9:30 AM
Subject IO General
Location Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Show Time As Busy
Attendees **Name <E-mail>** **Attendance**

Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Smith, Peterj <Smith.Peterj@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required

Monday, September 4, 2017

Time All Day
Subject Labor Day
Location United States
Show Time As Free
Categories Holiday

Time 8:00 AM – 6:00 PM
Subject Labor Day / Office closed
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Cleland-Hamnett, Wendy <Cleland-Hamnett.Wendy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required

Time 9:30 AM – 10:00 AM
Subject OCSPP Staff Meeting (Skype Video Teleconference)
Location WJC East 3371C - Skype Call-In Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Monday effective 9/4/2017 until 9/25/2017 from 9:30 AM to 10:00 AM
Show Time As Busy

Updated Conference Call-In Number & added Skype Meeting link for Dial-out option.

....
.....

*Join Skype Meeting
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

This is an online meeting for Skype for Business, the professional

meetings and communications app formerly known as Lync.

Join by Phone

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Help <http://intranet.epa.gov/otopintr/webconferencing/ o365-conferencing.html>

[!OC([1033])!]

....
.....

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Organizer
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>	Required
Gorman, John <Gorman.John@epa.gov>	Required
Sisco, Debby <Sisco.Debby@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Overstreet, Anne <overstreet.anne@epa.gov>	Required
Burden, Susan <Burden.Susan@epa.gov>	Required
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Kovner, Karissa <Kovner.Karissa@epa.gov>	Required

Clark, Sharon <Clark.Sharon@epa.gov>	Required
Filippelli, John <Filippelli.John@epa.gov>	Required
Boutureira, Alan <Boutureira.Alan@epa.gov>	Required
Carter, Pamela <Carter.Pamela@epa.gov>	Required
Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>	Required
DeDora, Caroline <Dedora.Caroline@epa.gov>	Required
Berkley, Bruce <Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov>	Required
LaPosta, Dore <LaPosta.Dore@epa.gov>	Required
Mitchell, Judy-Ann <Mitchell.Judy-Ann@epa.gov>	Required
Smoot, Cameo <Smoot.Cameo@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>	Required
Vineski, Steve <Vineski.Steve@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Graves, Inza <Graves.Inza@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Scott, Elizabeth <Scott.Elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Wooge, William <Wooge.William@epa.gov>	Required
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Weiner, Janet <Weiner.Janet@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Marshall, Venus <Marshall.Venus@epa.gov>	Required

Green, Teresa <Green.Teresa@epa.gov>	Optional
Treimel, Ellen <Treimel.Ellen@epa.gov>	Optional
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Optional
Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>	Optional
Dixon, Diane <Dixon.Diane@epa.gov>	Optional
Metcalf, Alexander <Metcalf.Alexander@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Required
Pane, Vickie <Pane.Vickie@epa.gov>	Optional
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Scott, Gregory <Scott.Gregory@epa.gov>	Required
Scheifele, Hans <Scheifele.Hans@epa.gov>	Optional

Tuesday, September 5, 2017

Time 8:00 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject **Personal Matters / Ex. 6**
Recurrence
Show Time As Free

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject Chief of Staff Meeting
Location Alm Room
Show Time As Busy

Please be aware there will be a hard stop at 9AM.

Please note the location starting 9 May 2017
POC: ALM Room Cheryl Woodward

Attendees	**Name <E-mail>**	**Attendance**
Administrator / Ex. 6	Pruitt, Scott Administrator / Ex. 6	Organizer
	Greaves, Holly <greaves.holly@epa.gov>	Required
	Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required
	Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>	Required
	Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required

Schwab, Justin <schwab.justin@epa.gov>	Required
Wagner, Kenneth <wagner.kenneth@epa.gov>	Required
Gunasekara, Mandy <Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov>	Required
Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
Palich, Christian <palich.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Required
Fotouhi, David <fotouhi.david@epa.gov>	Required
Chmielewski, Kevin <chmielewski.kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Wilcox, Jahan <wilcox.jahan@epa.gov>	Required
Davis, Patrick <davis.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Hupp, Millan <hupp.millan@epa.gov>	Required
Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Ferguson, Lincoln <ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov>	Required
Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>	Required
Graham, Amy <graham.amy@epa.gov>	Required
Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Traylor, Patrick <traylor.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Rodrick, Christian <rodrick.christian@epa.gov>	Required
McMurray, Forrest <mcmurray.forrest@epa.gov>	Required
Letendre, Daisy <letendre.daisy@epa.gov>	Required
Hewitt, James <hewitt.james@epa.gov>	Required

Darwin, Henry <darwin.henry@epa.gov>	Required
Willis, Sharnett <Willis.Sharnett@epa.gov>	Optional
Dickerson, Aaron <dickerson.aaron@epa.gov>	Optional
Shimmin, Kaitlyn <shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Optional
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
Lovell, Will (William) <lovell.william@epa.gov>	Optional
Ford, Hayley <ford.hayley@epa.gov>	Optional
Kundinger, Kelly <kundinger.kelly@epa.gov>	Required
Munoz, Charles <munoz.charles@epa.gov>	Required
White, Elizabeth <white.elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Kelly, Albert <kelly.albert@epa.gov>	Required
Burke, Marcella <burke.marcella@epa.gov>	Required
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
Abboud, Michael <abboud.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Bodine, Susan <bodine.susan@epa.gov>	Required
Sands, Jeffrey <sands.jeffrey@epa.gov>	Required
Hanson, Paige (Catherine) <hanson.catherine@epa.gov>	Required
Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Required
Wehrum, Bill <Wehrum.Bill@epa.gov>	Required
Frye, Tony (Robert) <frye.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Darwin, Veronica <darwin.veronica@epa.gov>	Required
Feeley, Drew (Robert) <Feeley.Drew@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Required
Harlow, David <harlow.david@epa.gov>	Required

Dominguez, Alexander <dominguez.alexander@epa.gov>	Required
Dourson, Michael <dourson.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Inge, Carolyn <Inge.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 9:30 AM – 10:00 AM

Subject RE: OCSPP Staff Meeting (Video Teleconference) - Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Location DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO

Show Time As Busy

*Rescheduled to Tuesday 9/5, given the Monday 9/4 holiday

To: Wise, Louise; Jewell, Shannon; Mojica, Andrea; Kaiser, Sven-Erik; Gorman, John; Sisco, Debby; Strauss, Linda; Overstreet, Anne; Burden, Susan; Morales, Oscar; Kovner, Karissa; Clark, Sharon; Filippelli, John; Boutureira, Alan; Carter, Pamela; Barone, Stan; DeDora, Caroline; Berkley, Bruce; LaPosta, Dore; Mitchell, Judy-Ann; Smoot, Cameo; Cunningham-HQ, Barbara; Cleland-Hamnett, Wendy; Schmit, Ryan; Layne, Arnold; Dinkins, Darlene; Vineski, Steve; Dunton, Cheryl; Beck, Nancy; Graves, Inza; Scott, Elizabeth; Wooge, William; Pierce, Alison; Keigwin, Richard; Weiner, Janet; Hofmann, Angela; Marshall, Venus
Cc: Jakob, Avivah; Green, Teresa; Shimkin, Martha
Subject: OCSPP Staff Meeting (Video Teleconference) - Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
When: Tuesday, September 5, 2017 9:30 AM-10:00 AM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada).
Where: DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>	Required
Mojica, Andrea <Mojica.andrea@epa.gov>	Required
Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>	Required
Gorman, John <Gorman.John@epa.gov>	Required
Sisco, Debby <Sisco.Debby@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Overstreet, Anne <overstreet.anne@epa.gov>	Required
Burden, Susan <Burden.Susan@epa.gov>	Required

Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Kovner, Karissa <Kovner.Karissa@epa.gov>	Required
Clark, Sharon <Clark.Sharon@epa.gov>	Required
Filippelli, John <Filippelli.John@epa.gov>	Required
Boutureira, Alan <Boutureira.Alan@epa.gov>	Required
Carter, Pamela <Carter.Pamela@epa.gov>	Required
Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>	Required
DeDora, Caroline <Dedora.Caroline@epa.gov>	Required
Berkley, Bruce <Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov>	Required
LaPosta, Dore <LaPosta.Dore@epa.gov>	Required
Mitchell, Judy-Ann <Mitchell.Judy-Ann@epa.gov>	Required
Smoot, Cameo <Smoot.Cameo@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>	Required
Vineski, Steve <Vineski.Steve@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Graves, Inza <Graves.Inza@epa.gov>	Required
Scott, Elizabeth <Scott.Elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Wooge, William <Wooge.William@epa.gov>	Required
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Weiner, Janet <Weiner.Janet@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Marshall, Venus <Marshall.Venus@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required

Green, Teresa <Green.Teresa@epa.gov>	Required
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO <DCRoomEast3371c@epa.gov>	Resource
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required

Time 10:30 AM – 11:00 AM
Subject Problem Formulation
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Cleland-Hamnett, Wendy <Cleland-Hamnett.Wendy@epa.gov>	Required
Fehrenbacher, Cathy <Fehrenbacher.Cathy@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Nguyen, Nhan <Nguyen.Nhan@epa.gov>	Required
Susanna Blair (Blair.Susanna@epa.gov) <Blair.Susanna@epa.gov>	Required
Camacho, Iris <Camacho.Iris@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 11:45 AM – 12:00 PM
Subject hold
Show Time As Busy

Time 12:00 PM – 1:30 PM
Subject General
Location Old Ebbitt
Show Time As Busy

Reservation at noon. I was feeling optimistic so I booked it. We can always cancel if needed.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Palmieri, Rosario A. EOP/OMB	Required

EOP / Ex. 6

Time 1:45 PM – 2:00 PM
Subject Transportation to PY
Show Time As Busy

Your transportation request has been Updated.

Reason for update : Pick Up Time changed
Confirmation Number: 76166
Passenger Information
* Name: NANCY BECK/AA
* Number: 2025648542
* Pickup Time: 2017-09-05 13:45:00.0
* Pickup Location: EPA EAST CONSTITUTION AVE
* Drop-Off Location: POTOMAC YARD CRYSTAL CITY VA.
Vehicle Information
* Tag: G13-1037M
* Vehicle Type: CAR
* Make : CHEVROLET
* Model : VOLT
* Color : BLACK

Time 2:00 PM – 3:00 PM
Subject BLAD Briefing
Location S-12100 PYS
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Richard Keigwin <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
McNally, Robert <Mcnally.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>	Required
Leahy, John <Leahy.John@epa.gov>	Required
Hollis, Linda <Hollis.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Lowit, Anna <Lowit.Anna@epa.gov>	Required
Michelle Arling <Arling.Michelle@epa.gov>	Required
Angela Huskey <Huskey.Angela@epa.gov>	Optional

Kaczmarek, Chris <Kaczmarek.Chris@epa.gov>	Optional
Kough, John <Kough.John@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 4:00 PM – 4:30 PM
Subject Registration Process
Location RM 12100 PY South
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>	Required
Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>	Required
Kenny, Daniel <Kenny.Dan@epa.gov>	Required
McNally, Robert <Mcnally.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>	Required
Knizner, Steve <Knizner.Steve@epa.gov>	Required
Weiss, Steven <Weiss.Steven@epa.gov>	Required
Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>	Optional
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Optional
Leahy, John <Leahy.John@epa.gov>	Optional
Hebert, John <Hebert.John@epa.gov>	Optional
Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 4:30 PM – 4:55 PM
Subject Return Transportation to EPA East
Show Time As Busy

Your transportation request has been Updated.

Reason for update : Pick Up Time changed
Confirmation Number: 76167
Passenger Information
* Name: NANCY BECK/AA
* Number: 2025648542
* Pickup Time: 2017-09-05 16:35:00.0
* Pickup Location: POTOMAC YARD CRYSTAL CITY VA.

* Drop-Off Location: EPA EAST CONSTITUTION AVE
Vehicle Information
* Tag: G13-1037M
* Vehicle Type: CAR
* Make : CHEVROLET
* Model : VOLT
* Color : BLACK

Wednesday, September 6, 2017

Time 8:00 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject Chief of Staff Meeting
Location Alm Room
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott < Administrator / Ex. 6	Organizer
Letendre, Daisy <letendre.daisy@epa.gov>	Required
Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Required
Wagner, Kenneth <wagner.kenneth@epa.gov>	Required
Ferguson, Lincoln <ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov>	Required
Greaves, Holly <greaves.holly@epa.gov>	Required
Davis, Patrick <davis.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Hupp, Millan <hupp.millan@epa.gov>	Required
Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>	Required
Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
Fotouhi, David <fotouhi.david@epa.gov>	Required
Wilcox, Jahan <wilcox.jahan@epa.gov>	Required
Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>	Required
Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
Gunasekara, Mandy <Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Chmielewski, Kevin <chmielewski.kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Palich, Christian <palich.christian@epa.gov>	Required

Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>	Required
Graham, Amy <graham.amy@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required
Darwin, Henry <darwin.henry@epa.gov>	Required
McMurray, Forrest <mcmurray.forrest@epa.gov>	Required
Rodrick, Christian <rodrick.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Hewitt, James <hewitt.james@epa.gov>	Required
Traylor, Patrick <traylor.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
Lovell, Will (William) <lovell.william@epa.gov>	Optional
Willis, Sharnett <Willis.Sharnett@epa.gov>	Optional
Dickerson, Aaron <dickerson.aaron@epa.gov>	Optional
Ford, Hayley <ford.hayley@epa.gov>	Optional
Shimmin, Kaitlyn <shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Kundinger, Kelly <kundinger.kelly@epa.gov>	Required
Munoz, Charles <munoz.charles@epa.gov>	Required
White, Elizabeth <white.elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Kelly, Albert <kelly.albert@epa.gov>	Required
Burke, Marcella <burke.marcella@epa.gov>	Required
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
Abboud, Michael <abboud.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Bodine, Susan <bodine.susan@epa.gov>	Required
Sands, Jeffrey <sands.jeffrey@epa.gov>	Required

Hanson, Paige (Catherine) <hanson.catherine@epa.gov>	Required
Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Required
Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Required
Schwab, Justin <schwab.justin@epa.gov>	Required
Wehrum, Bill <Wehrum.Bill@epa.gov>	Required
Frye, Tony (Robert) <frye.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Darwin, Veronica <darwin.veronica@epa.gov>	Required
Feeley, Drew (Robert) <Feeley.Drew@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Required
Harlow, David <harlow.david@epa.gov>	Required
Dominguez, Alexander <dominguez.alexander@epa.gov>	Required
Dourson, Michael <dourson.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Inge, Carolyn <Inge.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM

Subject IO General Meeting

Location 3130 WJC EAST Call in Number **Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6**

Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/28/2017 from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM

Show Time As Busy

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required

Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Tyree, JamesN <tyree.jamesn@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 11:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Subject OPPT General
Location 3130A WJC East Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Wednesday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/27/2017 from 11:00 AM to 12:00 PM
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
Clark, Sharon <Clark.Sharon@epa.gov>	Required
Scott, Elizabeth <Scott.Elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>	Required
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Optional
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss.Linda@epa.gov <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required

Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>	Optional
Cherepy, Andrea <Cherepy.Andrea@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Required
Scheifele, Hans <Scheifele.Hans@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 12:00 PM – 12:30 PM
Subject HOLD: Meet & Greet with Lonza
Location WJCE 3130
Show Time As Busy

Time 12:30 PM – 1:00 PM
Subject Fees Discussion
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Andrea Cherepy (Cherepy.Andrea@epa.gov) <Cherepy.Andrea@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 1:00 PM – 1:45 PM
Subject Systematic Review Meetings
Location DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO; DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy

*Adding meeting materials

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Required
	Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
	Benson, Amy <Benson.Amy@epa.gov>	Required
	Branch, Francesca <branch.francesca@epa.gov>	Required
	Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Optional
	Blair, Susanna <Blair.Susanna@epa.gov>	Optional
	Camacho, Iris <Camacho.Iris@epa.gov>	Required
	DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO <DCRoomEast3371c@epa.gov>	Resource
	DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
	Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required

Time 2:00 PM – 3:00 PM

Subject Confirmed: OIG/OCSPP mtg to discuss TSCA/Lautenberg Act Implementation -- Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP

Show Time As Busy

This meeting is being scheduled at the request of Jeffrey Harris, Director of the Office of Program Evaluation, OIG.

Goal is to identify TSCA/Lautenberg Act implementation challenges where an independent external review by the OIG's Office of Program Evaluation would be helpful.

OIG wishes to better understand what OCSPP sees are the current and future challenges for the program.

Thank you,

Janet Weiner

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance

Weiner, Janet <Weiner.Janet@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Harris, Jeffrey <Harris.Jeffrey@epa.gov>	Required
Copper, Carolyn <Copper.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Required
Kincheloe, Chad <Kincheloe.Chad@epa.gov>	Required
Joseph, Lauretta <Joseph.Lauretta@epa.gov>	Required
Thompson, Thane <Thompson.Thane@epa.gov>	Required
Marshall, Venus <Marshall.Venus@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required

Time 3:00 PM – 3:45 PM
Subject ITRMD - ALL HANDS
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy

OPP/ITRMD Division Meeting with the new Deputy Assistant Administrator for OCSPP, Nancy Beck.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Barber, Delores <Barber.Delores@epa.gov>	Required
Syed, Hamaad <Syed.Hamaad@epa.gov>	Required
OPP ITRMD Managers <OPP_ITRMD_Managers@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Ingram, Earl <Ingram.Earl@epa.gov>	Optional
Guthrie, Christina <Guthrie.Christina@epa.gov>	Optional
Robbins, Steve <Robbins.Steve@epa.gov>	Optional
Katz, Brian <Katz.Brian@epa.gov>	Optional

Schultz, Robert <Schultz.Robert@epa.gov>	Optional
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Optional
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required

Thursday, September 7, 2017

Time 8:00 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject Chief of Staff Meeting
Location Alm Room
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott Administrator / Ex. 6	Organizer
Letendre, Daisy <letendre.daisy@epa.gov>	Required
Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Required
Wagner, Kenneth <wagner.kenneth@epa.gov>	Required
Ferguson, Lincoln <ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov>	Required
Greaves, Holly <greaves.holly@epa.gov>	Required
Davis, Patrick <davis.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Hupp, Millan <hupp.millan@epa.gov>	Required
Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>	Required
Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
Fotouhi, David <fotouhi.david@epa.gov>	Required
Wilcox, Jahan <wilcox.jahan@epa.gov>	Required
Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>	Required
Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
Gunasekara, Mandy <Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Chmielewski, Kevin <chmielewski.kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Palich, Christian <palich.christian@epa.gov>	Required

Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>	Required
Graham, Amy <graham.amy@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required
Darwin, Henry <darwin.henry@epa.gov>	Required
McMurray, Forrest <mcmurray.forrest@epa.gov>	Required
Rodrick, Christian <rodrick.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Hewitt, James <hewitt.james@epa.gov>	Required
Traylor, Patrick <traylor.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
Lovell, Will (William) <lovell.william@epa.gov>	Optional
Willis, Sharnett <Willis.Sharnett@epa.gov>	Optional
Dickerson, Aaron <dickerson.aaron@epa.gov>	Optional
Ford, Hayley <ford.hayley@epa.gov>	Optional
Shimmin, Kaitlyn <shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Bailey, Ethel <Bailey.Ethel@epa.gov>	Optional
Kundinger, Kelly <kundinger.kelly@epa.gov>	Required
Munoz, Charles <munoz.charles@epa.gov>	Required
White, Elizabeth <white.elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Kelly, Albert <kelly.albert@epa.gov>	Required
Burke, Marcella <burke.marcella@epa.gov>	Required
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
Abboud, Michael <abboud.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Bodine, Susan <bodine.susan@epa.gov>	Required

Sands, Jeffrey <sands.jeffrey@epa.gov>	Required
Hanson, Paige (Catherine) <hanson.catherine@epa.gov>	Required
Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Required
Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Required
Schwab, Justin <schwab.justin@epa.gov>	Required
Wehrum, Bill <Wehrum.Bill@epa.gov>	Required
Frye, Tony (Robert) <frye.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Darwin, Veronica <darwin.veronica@epa.gov>	Required
Feeley, Drew (Robert) <Feeley.Drew@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Required
Harlow, David <harlow.david@epa.gov>	Required
Dominguez, Alexander <dominguez.alexander@epa.gov>	Required
Dourson, Michael <dourson.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Inge, Carolyn <Inge.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM

Subject IO General Meeting

Location 3130 WJC EAST (Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/28/2017 from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM

Show Time As Busy

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required

Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Tyree, JamesN <tyree.jamesn@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 10:00 AM – 11:00 AM

Subject Pre-Prioritization Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP

Show Time As Busy

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Frithsen, Jeff <Frithsen.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Blair, Susanna <Blair.Susanna@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Required
Grant, Brian <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required

Mclean, Kevin <Mclean.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Thomas, Russell <Thomas.Russell@epa.gov>	Required
Chang, Daniel <chang.daniel@epa.gov>	Required
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
Widawsky, David <Widawsky.David@epa.gov>	Required
Frazer, Brian <Frazer.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Davies, Clive <Davies.Clive@epa.gov>	Required
Sweet, Lauren <sweet.lauren@epa.gov>	Required
Celeste, Laurel <celeste.laurel@epa.gov>	Required
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Optional
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Wolf, Joel <Wolf.Joel@epa.gov>	Required

Time 11:30 AM – 12:15 PM
Subject Registration Review Process
Location RM 3156 EPA East
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Smith, Charles <Smith.Charles@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Guilaran, Yu-Ting <Guilaran.Yu-Ting@epa.gov>	Required
Weiss, Steven <Weiss.Steven@epa.gov>	Required
Knizner, Steve <Knizner.Steve@epa.gov>	Required
McNally, Robert <Mcnally.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Optional
Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>	Optional

Kyprianou, Rose <Kyprianou.Rose@epa.gov>	Optional
Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>	Optional
Fehir, Richard <Fehir.Richard@epa.gov>	Optional
Leahy, John <Leahy.John@epa.gov>	Optional
Hollis, Linda <Hollis.Linda@epa.gov>	Optional
Mendelsohn, Mike <mendelsohn.mike@epa.gov>	Optional
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Optional
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Mendelsohn, Mike <mendelsohn.mike@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 1:00 PM – 2:00 PM
Subject CDR Reg Neg Meeting: Position Briefing
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Required
Sharkey, Susan <Sharkey.Susan@epa.gov>	Required
Kramek, Niva <kramek.niva@epa.gov>	Required
Wolf, Joel <Wolf.Joel@epa.gov>	Required
Smith, ThomasA <smith.thomasa@epa.gov>	Required
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Optional

Reisman, Larry <Reisman.Larry@epa.gov>	Optional
Turk, David <Turk.David@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 2:00 PM – 3:00 PM
Subject Bi-weekly General w/Angela Hofmann
Location 3130C EPA East
Recurrence Occurs every 2 week(s) on Wednesday effective 9/13/2017 until 9/27/2017 from 1:00 PM to 2:00 PM
Show Time As Tentative
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Organizer
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Required

Time 2:00 PM – 3:00 PM
Subject Deputy AA Meeting
Location 3216WJC-South
Show Time As Tentative
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Traylor, Patrick <traylor.patrick@epa.gov>	Organizer
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required
Fotouhi, David <fotouhi.david@epa.gov>	Required
Davis, Patrick <davis.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Gunasekara, Mandy <Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov>	Required
Personal Email / Ex. 6	Optional

Time 3:00 PM – 4:00 PM
Subject TSCA New Chemicals - Part 1 (CRSS and SAT)
Location RM 3156 EPA East
Show Time As Busy
Purpose:

Meeting is required so Nancy Beck can better understand what work is done prior to each of the standard TSCA New Chemical Meetings (i.e., CRSS, SAT and Focus) and what discussions/decisions are made at these meetings.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
Henry, Tala <henry.tala@epa.gov>	Required
David Widawsky <Widawsky.David@epa.gov>	Required
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Required
Canavan, Sheila <Canavan.Sheila@epa.gov>	Required
Williamson, Tracy <Williamson.Tracy@epa.gov>	Required
Rice, Cody <Rice.Cody@epa.gov>	Required
Fehrenbacher, Cathy <Fehrenbacher.Cathy@epa.gov>	Required
Stedeford, Todd <Stedeford.Todd@epa.gov>	Required
Nguyen, Nhan <Nguyen.Nhan@epa.gov>	Required
Edelstein, Rebecca <Edelstein.Rebecca@epa.gov>	Required
Allison, Rose <Allison.Rose@epa.gov>	Required
Moss, Kenneth <Moss.Kenneth@epa.gov>	Required
Schweer, Greg <Schweer.Greg@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Optional
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Scheifele, Hans <Scheifele.Hans@epa.gov>	Optional
Christian, Myrta <Christian.Myrta@epa.gov>	Optional
Eisenreich, Karen <Eisenreich.Karen@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 4:30 PM – 6:00 PM

Subject HOLD Paperwork
Show Time As Busy

Friday, September 8, 2017

Time 9:15 AM – 10:15 AM
Subject Briefing: (ESA) Endangered Species Act
Location Administrator's Office
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott Administrator / Ex. 6	Organizer
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required

Time 10:15 AM – 11:00 AM
Subject CropLife SOC
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Richard Keigwin (Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov) <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
mjtomalewski@croplifeamerica.org <mjtomalewski@croplifeamerica.org>	Required
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Rachel Lattimore <RLattimore@croplifeamerica.org>	Optional
PARRISH, MICHAEL [AG/1920] <michael.parrish@monsanto.com>	Optional
Tamichi, Eric <Eric.Tamichi@valent.com>	Optional
Beau Greenwood <BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org>	Optional
Avivah Jakob (Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov) <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 11:00 AM – 11:30 AM
Subject Meet & Greet w/Aaron Hobbs (RISE)
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP

Show Time As Busy

Directions: Please use the William Jefferson Clinton East Entrance located at 1201 Constitution Avenue. Please arrive 10 minutes prior to the meeting with photo IDs to clear Security.

For an escort from Security to the meeting please call (202) 564-2902 or (202) 564-2910.

Purpose: Introductory meeting to discuss the association of the Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment (RISE) key pesticide policy issues.

Attendees will be RISE President Aaron Hobbs and a few board members.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Optional
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
lflanagan@dclrs.com <lflanagan@dclrs.com>	Required
dcrow@dclrs.com <dcrow@dclrs.com>	Required
dbeaudreau@dclrs.com <dbeaudreau@dclrs.com>	Required

Time 12:15 PM – 12:45 PM
Subject OSCP Bi-weekly
Location 3130A WJC East
Show Time As Busy

Can we do 12:15 instead?

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required

Time 2:00 PM – 2:30 PM
Subject Discussion with Monsanto
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy
Attendees **Name <E-mail>** **Attendance**

ED_002528_00001824-00043

Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Perlis, Robert <Perlis.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Saturday, September 9, 2017

Time 9:00 AM – 10:00 AM
Subject Personal Matters / Ex. 6
Show Time As Busy

Monday, September 11, 2017

Time 8:00 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject Chief of Staff Meeting
Location Alm Room
Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday effective 9/1/2017 until 9/29/2017 from 8:00 AM to 9:00 AM
Show Time As Busy
Please note the location starting 9 May 2017
POC: ALM Room Cheryl Woodward

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott < Administrator / Ex. 6	Organizer
Kundinger, Kelly <kundinger.kelly@epa.gov>	Required
Munoz, Charles <munoz.charles@epa.gov>	Required
White, Elizabeth <white.elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required
Kelly, Albert <kelly.albert@epa.gov>	Required
Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
Burke, Marcella <burke.marcella@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
Abboud, Michael <abboud.michael@epa.gov>	Required

Bodine, Susan <bodine.susan@epa.gov>	Required
Palich, Christian <palich.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>	Required
Sands, Jeffrey <sands.jeffrey@epa.gov>	Required
Hanson, Paige (Catherine) <hanson.catherine@epa.gov>	Required
Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Required
Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Required
Schwab, Justin <schwab.justin@epa.gov>	Required
Wehrum, Bill <Wehrum.Bill@epa.gov>	Required
Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Frye, Tony (Robert) <frye.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Darwin, Veronica <darwin.veronica@epa.gov>	Required
Feeley, Drew (Robert) <Feeley.Drew@epa.gov>	Required
Gunasekara, Mandy <Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov>	Required
Ferguson, Lincoln <ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Required
Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>	Required
Greaves, Holly <greaves.holly@epa.gov>	Required
Wilcox, Jahan <wilcox.jahan@epa.gov>	Required
Wagner, Kenneth <wagner.kenneth@epa.gov>	Required
Rodrick, Christian <rodrick.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Hewitt, James <hewitt.james@epa.gov>	Required
Fotouhi, David <fotouhi.david@epa.gov>	Required
Darwin, Henry <darwin.henry@epa.gov>	Required
Traylor, Patrick <traylor.patrick@epa.gov>	Required

Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Required
Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>	Required
Harlow, David <harlow.david@epa.gov>	Required
Dominguez, Alexander <dominguez.alexander@epa.gov>	Required
Dourson, Michael <dourson.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Letendre, Daisy <letendre.daisy@epa.gov>	Required
Hupp, Millan <hupp.millan@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
McMurray, Forrest <mcmurray.forrest@epa.gov>	Required
Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Chmielewski, Kevin <chmielewski.kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Inge, Carolyn <Inge.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Lovell, Will (William) <lovell.william@epa.gov>	Optional
Dickerson, Aaron <dickerson.aaron@epa.gov>	Optional
Ford, Hayley <ford.hayley@epa.gov>	Optional
Willis, Sharnett <Willis.Sharnett@epa.gov>	Optional
Shimmin, Kaitlyn <shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject IO General Meeting
Location 3130 WJC EAST (Call in Number: Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/28/2017 from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer

Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Tyree, JamesN <tyree.jamesn@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 9:00 AM – 9:30 AM
Subject
Show Time As Busy

Time 9:30 AM – 10:00 AM
Subject OCSPP Staff Meeting (Skype Video Teleconference)
Location WJC East 3371C - Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Monday effective 9/4/2017 until 9/25/2017 from 9:30 AM to 10:00 AM
Show Time As Busy
Updated Conference Call-In Number & added Skype Meeting link for Dial-out option.

....
.....

* Join Skype Meeting

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

This is an online meeting for Skype for Business, the professional meetings and communications app formerly known as Lync.

Join by Phone

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Help <http://intranet.epa.gov/otopintr/webconferencing/ o365-conferencing.html>

[!OC([1033])!]

....
.....

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Organizer
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>	Required
Gorman, John <Gorman.John@epa.gov>	Required
Sisco, Debby <Sisco.Debby@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Overstreet, Anne <overstreet.anne@epa.gov>	Required

Burden, Susan <Burden.Susan@epa.gov>	Required
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Kovner, Karissa <Kovner.Karissa@epa.gov>	Required
Clark, Sharon <Clark.Sharon@epa.gov>	Required
Filippelli, John <Filippelli.John@epa.gov>	Required
Boutureira, Alan <Boutureira.Alan@epa.gov>	Required
Carter, Pamela <Carter.Pamela@epa.gov>	Required
Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>	Required
DeDora, Caroline <Dedora.Caroline@epa.gov>	Required
Berkley, Bruce <Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov>	Required
LaPosta, Dore <LaPosta.Dore@epa.gov>	Required
Mitchell, Judy-Ann <Mitchell.Judy-Ann@epa.gov>	Required
Smoot, Cameo <Smoot.Cameo@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>	Required
Vineski, Steve <Vineski.Steve@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Graves, Inza <Graves.Inza@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Scott, Elizabeth <Scott.Elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Wooge, William <Wooge.William@epa.gov>	Required
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required

Weiner, Janet <Weiner.Janet@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Marshall, Venus <Marshall.Venus@epa.gov>	Required
Green, Teresa <Green.Teresa@epa.gov>	Optional
Treimel, Ellen <Treimel.Ellen@epa.gov>	Optional
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Optional
Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>	Optional
Dixon, Diane <Dixon.Diane@epa.gov>	Optional
Metcalf, Alexander <Metcalf.Alexander@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Required
Pane, Vickie <Pane.Vickie@epa.gov>	Optional
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Scott, Gregory <Scott.Gregory@epa.gov>	Required
Scheifele, Hans <Scheifele.Hans@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 11:00 AM – 11:30 AM
Subject International Travel Proposal for October
Location RM 3130C
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Organizer
Adams, Denise <Adams.Denise@epa.gov>	Required
Berkley, Bruce <Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov>	Required
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required

Time 11:30 AM – 1:00 PM
Subject HOLD-MD
Show Time As Busy
11:45 Del Friscos

Time 2:00 PM – 3:00 PM
Subject General w/Arnold Layne
Location RM 3148 EPA East
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Arnold Layne (Layne.Arnold@epa.gov) <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Arnold Layne (Layne.Arnold@epa.gov) <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 3:00 PM – 4:00 PM
Subject TSCA New Chemicals - Part 2 (Focus)
Location RM 3156 EPA East
Show Time As Busy
*Attaching materials

Purpose:
Meeting is required so Nancy Beck can better understand what work is done prior to each of the standard TSCA New Chemical Meetings (i.e., CRSS, SAT and Focus) and what discussions/decisions are made at these meetings.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
Henry, Tala <henry.tala@epa.gov>	Required
David Widawsky <Widawsky.David@epa.gov>	Required
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Required
Canavan, Sheila <Canavan.Sheila@epa.gov>	Required
Williamson, Tracy <Williamson.Tracy@epa.gov>	Required
Rice, Cody <Rice.Cody@epa.gov>	Required
Fehrenbacher, Cathy <Fehrenbacher.Cathy@epa.gov>	Required
Stedeford, Todd <Stedeford.Todd@epa.gov>	Required
Nguyen, Nhan <Nguyen.Nhan@epa.gov>	Required
Edelstein, Rebecca <Edelstein.Rebecca@epa.gov>	Required

Allison, Rose <Allison.Rose@epa.gov>	Required
Moss, Kenneth <Moss.Kenneth@epa.gov>	Required
Schweer, Greg <Schweer.Greg@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Bevington, Charles <Bevington.Charles@epa.gov>	Optional
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Optional
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Optional
Eisenreich, Karen <Eisenreich.Karen@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 5:00 PM – 6:30 PM
Subject HOLD Paperwork
Show Time As Busy

Tuesday, September 12, 2017

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject IO General Meeting
Location 3130 WJC EAST Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/28/2017 from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required

Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Tyree, JamesN <tyree.jamesn@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 9:30 AM – 9:45 AM
Subject Transportation to PY
Show Time As Busy

Your transportation request has been Updated.

Reason for update : Pick Up Time changed
Confirmation Number: 76168
Passenger Information
* Name: NANCY BECK/AA
* Number: 2025648542
* Pickup Time: 2017-09-12 09:30:00.0
* Pickup Location: EPA EAST CONSTITUTION AVE

Vehicle Information

* Tag: G13-1008M
* Vehicle Type: CAR
* Make : CHEVROLET
* Model : VOLT
* Color : BLACK
* Drop-Off Location: POTOMAC YARD CRYSTAL CITY VA.

Time 9:45 AM – 10:45 AM
Subject Neonicotinoid Briefing
Location DCRoomPYS9100/Potomac-Yard-One
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Jones, Ricardo <Jones.Ricardo@epa.gov>	Required

Anderson, Neil <Anderson.Neil@epa.gov>	Required
Housenger, Justin <Housenger.Justin@epa.gov>	Required
Sappington, Keith <Sappington.Keith@epa.gov>	Required
Wait, Monica <Wait.Monica@epa.gov>	Required
Welch, Kara <welch.kara@epa.gov>	Required
Myers, Clayton <Myers.Clayton@epa.gov>	Required
Wyatt, TJ <Wyatt.Tj@epa.gov>	Required
Swartz, Christina <Swartz.Christina@epa.gov>	Required
Collantes, Margarita <Collantes.Margarita@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Guilaran, Yu-Ting <Guilaran.Yu-Ting@epa.gov>	Required
Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>	Required
Miller, Wynne <Miller.Wynne@epa.gov>	Required
Vogel, Dana <Vogel.Dana@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Optional
Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>	Optional
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Optional
Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>	Optional
DCRoomPYS9100/Potomac-Yard-One <DCRoomPYS9100@epa.gov>	Resource
Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>	Optional
Pease, Anita <Pease.Anita@epa.gov>	Optional
Sherman, Kelly <Sherman.Kelly@epa.gov>	Optional
Smith, Charles <Smith.Charles@epa.gov>	Optional
Snyderman, Steven <Snyderman.Steven@epa.gov>	Optional

Spatz, Dana <Spatz.Dana@epa.gov>	Optional
Garber, Kristina <Garber.Kristina@epa.gov>	Optional
Corbin, Mark <Corbin.Mark@epa.gov>	Optional
Blankinship, Amy <Blankinship.Amy@epa.gov>	Optional
Wagman, Michael <Wagman.Michael@epa.gov>	Optional
Peck, Charles <Peck.Charles@epa.gov>	Optional
Bohaty, Rochelle <Bohaty.Rochelle@epa.gov>	Optional
Donovan, Elizabeth <Donovan.Elizabeth@epa.gov>	Optional
Sankula, Sujatha <Sankula.Sujatha@epa.gov>	Optional
Koper, Christopher <Koper.Christopher@epa.gov>	Optional
Orrick, Greg <Orrick.Greg@epa.gov>	Optional
Mroz, Ryan <Mroz.Ryan@epa.gov>	Optional
Grable, Melissa <Grable.Melissa@epa.gov>	Optional
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Moriarty, Thomas <moriarty.thomas@epa.gov>	Optional
Zinn, Nicole <Zinn.Nicole@epa.gov>	Optional
Harty, Thomas <harty.thomas@epa.gov>	Optional
Ruhman, Mohammed <Ruhman.Mohammed@epa.gov>	Optional
Sells, Dexter <Sells.Dexter@epa.gov>	Optional
Elissa Reaves <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 10:45 AM – 11:30 AM
Subject PRD ALL HANDS
Location RM - PYS - 9100
Show Time As Busy

OPP/PRD Division Meeting with the new Deputy Assistant Administrator for OCSPP, Nancy Beck.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer

Guilaran, Yu-Ting <Guilaran.Yu-Ting@epa.gov>	Required
Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>	Required
OPP PRD Managers <OPP_PRD_Managers@epa.gov>	Required
Arrington, Linda <Arrington.Linda@epa.gov>	Optional
Anderson, Neil <Anderson.Neil@epa.gov>	Optional
Costello, Kevin <Costello.Kevin@epa.gov>	Optional
Sherman, Kelly <Sherman.Kelly@epa.gov>	Optional
Lowit, Anna <Lowit.Anna@epa.gov>	Optional
Smith, Charles <Smith.Charles@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 11:30 AM – 12:15 PM
Subject RD ALL HANDS
Location RM - PYS - 7100
Show Time As Busy

OPP/RD Division Meeting with the new Deputy Assistant Administrator for OCSPP, Nancy Beck.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
OPP RD Branch Chiefs <OPP_RD_Branch_Chiefs@epa.gov>	Required
Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>	Required
Shah, Pv <Shah.Pv@epa.gov>	Optional
Davis, Kable <Davis.Kable@epa.gov>	Optional
Laws, Meredith <Laws.Meredith@epa.gov>	Optional
Giles-Parker, Cynthia <Giles-Parker.Cynthia@epa.gov>	Optional
Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>	Optional
Holloman, Rachel <Holloman.Rachel@epa.gov>	Optional
Johnson, Marion <Johnson.Marion@epa.gov>	Optional
Kenny, Daniel <Kenny.Dan@epa.gov>	Optional
Garvie, Heather <Garvie.Heather@epa.gov>	Optional

Kish, Tony <Kish.Tony@epa.gov>	Optional
Baris, Reuben <Baris.Reuben@epa.gov>	Optional
Leifer, Kerry <Leifer.Kerry@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 12:20 PM – 12:35 PM
Subject Return Transportation to EPA East
Show Time As Busy

Your transportation request has been confirmed.

Confirmation Number: 76169
Passenger Information
* Name: NANCY BECK/AA
* Number: 2025648542
* Pickup Time: 2017-09-12 12:20:00.0
* Pickup Location: POTOMAC YARD CRYSTAL CITY VA.
* Drop-Off Location: EPA EAST CONSTITUTION AVE
Vehicle Information
* Tag: G13-1037M
* Vehicle Type: CAR
* Make : CHEVROLET
* Model : VOLT
* Color : BLACK

Time 1:00 PM – 2:00 PM
Subject EPA meeting with Dr. Beck and EPA staff on TCE WOE (UNCLASSIFIED)
Location 3156 EPA East, 1201 Constitution Ave; Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Show Time As Busy

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED
: UNCLASSIFIED
: UNCLASSIFIED

Please arrive 15 minutes early to clear security and call 202-564-2902 for escort.
Please let me know if there are others who should be included.
Details to follow.
CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIEDCLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIEDCLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Underwood, Patricia M CIV (US) <patricia.m.underwood.civ@mail.mil>	Organizer
Johnson, Mark S CIV USARMY MEDCOM APHC (US) <mark.s.johnson.civ@mail.mil>	Required

Seibert, John F CIV OSD OUSD ATL (US) <john.f.seibert.civ@mail.mil>	Required
Hanson, Jarod M MAJ USARMY MEDCOM APHC (US) <jarod.m.hanson.mil@mail.mil>	Required
Leach, Glenn J CTR USARMY MEDCOM APHC (US) <glenn.j.leach.ctr@mail.mil>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Anita.K.Meyer@usace.army.mil <Anita.K.Meyer@usace.army.mil>	Required
Parsons, Doug <Parsons.Douglas@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Krasnic, Toni <krasnic.toni@epa.gov>	Optional
Sullivan, Maureen SES OSD OUSD ATL (US) <maureen.sullivan18.civ@mail.mil>	Optional
Jumsil, Nicha CTR OSD OUSD ATL (US) <nicha.jumsil.ctr@mail.mil>	Optional

---

Time 1:00 PM – 2:00 PM
Subject Hurricane Irma/Harvey: PCC Meeting and Conference Call
Location DCRoomARNB431/Executive-Conference-Room
Show Time As Tentative

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Meeting documents will be distributed prior the the meeting.

Hurricane Harvey/Irma Policy Coordinating Committee

Agenda

September 12, 2017

Opening Remarks Ryan Jackson

Barry Breen

Situational Updates

For each situational update would you please address the following topic areas in addition to Regional/Program specific highlights:

What are you being asked to do/support from our Federal, State and Local partners?

* Are there actions you are considering leaning forward on to address a need or expedite our response activities?

* Are there program policy, legal, or resource issues impacting your operations?

* Discussion of recovery efforts

Region 2

Region 4

Region 3

OPA

OLEM

Harvey Update Region 6

General Discussion

Next Meeting

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	EOC_Deputy_Manager <EOC_Deputy_Manager@epa.gov>	Organizer
	EOC Documentation <EOC_Documentation@epa.gov>	Required
	Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
	Cheatham, Reggie <cheatham.reggie@epa.gov>	Required
	Breen, Barry <Breen.Barry@epa.gov>	Required

Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Wagner, Kenneth <wagner.kenneth@epa.gov>	Required
Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Required
Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Required
Shapiro, Mike <Shapiro.Mike@epa.gov>	Required
Coleman, Sam <Coleman.Sam@epa.gov>	Required
Gray, David <gray.david@epa.gov>	Required
Edlund, Carl <Edlund.Carl@epa.gov>	Required
Heard, Anne <Heard.Anne@epa.gov>	Required
Kaplan, Robert <kaplan.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Rodrigues, Cecil <rodrigues.cecil@epa.gov>	Required
Kelly, Albert <kelly.albert@epa.gov>	Required
Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Washington, Tiffeny <Washington.Tiffeny@epa.gov>	Required
Simon, Nigel <Simon.Nigel@epa.gov>	Required
Davis, Patrick <davis.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Brooks, Becky <Brooks.Becky@epa.gov>	Required
Armstead, John A. <Armstead.John@epa.gov>	Required
Melvin, Karen <Melvin.Karen@epa.gov>	Required
Richardson, RobinH <Richardson.RobinH@epa.gov>	Required
Clark, Becki <Clark.Becki@epa.gov>	Required
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
Indermark, Michele <Indermark.Michele@epa.gov>	Required
Smith, Monica <smith.monica@epa.gov>	Required

Carroll, Craig <Carroll.Craig@epa.gov>	Required
Kling, David <Kling.Dave@epa.gov>	Required
Shaw, Betsy <Shaw.Betsy@epa.gov>	Required
Kavlock, Robert <Kavlock.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Minoli, Kevin <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Fotouhi, David <fotouhi.david@epa.gov>	Required
Hill, Franklin <Hill.Franklin@epa.gov>	Required
Irizarry, Gilberto <Irizarry.Gilberto@epa.gov>	Required
Webster, James <Webster.James@epa.gov>	Required
Badalamente, Mark <Badalamente.Mark@epa.gov>	Required
Starfield, Lawrence <Starfield.Lawrence@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Peterson, Mary <Peterson.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Guerriero, Margaret <guerriero.margaret@epa.gov>	Required
Ballotti, Doug <ballotti.douglas@epa.gov>	Required
Borries, Samuel <borries.samuel@epa.gov>	Required
Prince, John <Prince.John@epa.gov>	Required
Mosher, Eric <Mosher.Eric@epa.gov>	Required
Mears, Mary <Mears.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Drazan, Dan <Drazan.Dan@epa.gov>	Required
Flynn, Mike <Flynn.Mike@epa.gov>	Optional
Gross, Bonnie <Gross.bonnie@epa.gov>	Optional
Glenn, Onis <glenn.onis@epa.gov>	Optional

Jenkins, Brandi <Jenkins.Brandi@epa.gov>	Optional
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
Newton, Cheryl <Newton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Optional
Dorsey, Claudette <Dorsey.Claudette@epa.gov>	Optional
Veal, Lee <Veal.Lee@epa.gov>	Optional
Moore, Tony <moore.tony@epa.gov>	Optional
EOC_Manager, <EOC_Manager@epa.gov>	Optional
Mike Kohlflynn < Personal Email / Ex. 6	Optional
Leonard, Paul <leonard.paul@epa.gov>	Optional
Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Optional
Rodan, Bruce <rodan.bruce@epa.gov>	Optional
Grevatt, Peter <Grevatt.Peter@epa.gov>	Optional
Mccabe, Catherine <McCabe.Catherine@epa.gov>	Optional
Fonseca, Silvina <Fonseca.Silvina@epa.gov>	Optional
Levine, Carolyn <Levine.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Price, Lisa <Price.Lisa@epa.gov>	Optional
Snowbarger, Robert <Snowbarger.Robert@epa.gov>	Optional
Personal Email / Ex. 6	Optional
Edwards, Jonathan <Edwards.Jonathan@epa.gov>	Optional
Opalski, Dan <Opalski.Dan@epa.gov>	Optional
Perovich, Gina <Perovich.Gina@epa.gov>	Optional
Lincoln, Larry <Lincoln.Larry@epa.gov>	Optional
Leslie PHamm Personal Email / Ex. 6	Optional
Lapierre, Kenneth <Lapierre.Kenneth@epa.gov>	Optional
Gettle, Jeaneanne <Gettle.Jeaneanne@epa.gov>	Optional

Jones-Johnson, Shea <Jones-Johnson.Shea@epa.gov>	Optional
Scheraga, Joel <Scheraga.Joel@epa.gov>	Optional
Allen, Reginald <Allen.Reginald@epa.gov>	Optional
Chu, Ed <Chu.Ed@epa.gov>	Optional
Nalipinski, Mike <Nalipinski.Mike@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 3:00 PM – 3:30 PM
Subject OGC Weekly
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy
Call in number **Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6**

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Richard Keigwin <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>	Required
Mclean, Kevin <Mclean.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Graves, Inza <Graves.Inza@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Brian Grant <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Perlis, Robert <Perlis.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Lee, Khisa <Lee.Khisa@epa.gov>	Required
Simons, Andrew <Simons.Andrew@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Kaczmarek, Chris <Kaczmarek.Chris@epa.gov>	Required
Arnold Layne (Layne.Arnold@epa.gov) <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required

Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Anderson, Monique <anderson.monique@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <blunck.chris@epa.gov>	Required
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required
Celeste, Laurel <celeste.laurel@epa.gov>	Optional
Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Richard Keigwin <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Brian Grant <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Arnold Layne (Layne.Arnold@epa.gov) <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <blunck.chris@epa.gov>	Required
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 3:30 PM – 5:30 PM
Subject HOLD
Show Time As Busy

Wednesday, September 13, 2017

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject IO General Meeting
Location 3130 WJC EAST Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/28/2017 from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required

Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Tyree, JamesN <tyree.jamesn@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 9:00 AM – 5:00 PM
Subject CDR Inorganic Byproducts FACA-Public Meeting - September - Day 1
Location RRB Oceanic Suites
Show Time As Tentative

Agenda is attached and first day is below

Wednesday, September 13 (9:00 AM – 5:00 PM)

Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review (9:00 – 9:40 AM)

Discuss Exemptions Proposal (9:40 – 10:45 AM)

David Lennett, Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), will share

the updated proposal. Committee Members will discuss questions of clarification and share strengths, considerations and concerns.

Break (10:45 – 11:00 AM)

Discuss Categories Proposal (11:00 – 11:40 AM)

Susan Sharkey, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, will share the updated proposal. Committee Members will discuss questions of clarification and share strengths, considerations and concerns.

Discuss Part 3 Data Proposal (11:40 AM – 12:30 PM)

Susan Sharkey, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, will share the updated proposal. Committee Members will discuss questions of clarification and share strengths, considerations and concerns.

Lunch (12:30 – 1:30 PM)

Approaches E and F – Limit Reporting for Site-Specific Catalyst Recycling (E) and for Reuse of Inorganic Byproducts (F) (1:30 – 2:10 PM) [Contingent on development of proposals]

Jim Cooper, American Fuel and Petrochemical Manufacturers (AFPM) and others, will provide updated descriptions of these approaches. Approach E would limit reporting for catalyst recycling, when as an inorganic byproduct that is recycled, reused, or reprocessed either at the site of byproduct manufacture or at a different site, is returned to the site of byproduct manufacture for further use or processing. Approach F would limit reporting for inorganic byproducts that are isolated from a process and later reintroduced into that same process. The Committee will discuss questions of clarification, share strengths and considerations/concerns, and whether to continue exploring these approaches.

Statement on Modernizing Data Collection (2:10 - 2:35 PM)

Amy Kyle, Sierra Club and California Communities Against Toxics, will describe this recommendation to EPA on how to modernize agency data collection and reporting. The Committee will discuss questions of clarification, share strengths and considerations/concerns, and whether to continue exploring this approach.

Small Business Interests Presentation (2:35 – 2:50)

Tayyaba Waqar, Assistant Chief Counsel for Environmental Policy,

ED_002528_00001824-00066

Small Business Administration Office of Advocacy

Public Comment Period (2:50 – 3:10 PM)

Explanation of Process for Caucus Discussions and Cross-Caucus Package Workgroup Discussions (3:10 – 3:20 PM)

Break (3:20 – 3:35 PM)

Caucus Discussions (3:35 – 5:00 PM)

Caucuses will discuss updated proposals. Suggested questions for Caucuses to address include:

* Where do you agree with the package/components and why?
* Could you agree with the package/components with modifications? If so, what modifications would be needed?
* What additional information is needed to make a decision on a package or its components, and how and who will get it?
* Who will represent the Caucus on the Cross-Caucus Package Workgroup?
* What guidance is needed for Caucus representatives on the Cross-Caucus Package Workgroup discussion?

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Kramek, Niva <kramek.niva@epa.gov>	Organizer
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Cunningham-HQ, Barbara <Cunningham-HQ.Barbara@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Required
Wolf, Joel <Wolf.Joel@epa.gov>	Required
Sharkey, Susan <Sharkey.Susan@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required

ED_002528_00001824-00067

Time 9:30 AM – 10:00 AM
Subject ADP tracker 101
Location Nancys office- if we can access it from my computer
Show Time As Busy
Personal Matters / Ex. 6 I'm not sure Monday will work.
Hows about Wednesday?
And I do have lotus notes.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Smith, Peterj <Smith.Peterj@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 10:45 AM – 11:15 AM
Subject General
Location Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Show Time As Busy

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Greaves, Holly <greaves.holly@epa.gov>	Organizer
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required

Time 11:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Subject OPPT General
Location 3130A WJC East Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Wednesday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/27/2017 from 11:00 AM to 12:00 PM
Show Time As Busy

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
Clark, Sharon <Clark.Sharon@epa.gov>	Required
Scott, Elizabeth <Scott.Elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>	Required
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Optional
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss.Linda@epa.gov <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required

Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>	Optional
Cherepy, Andrea <Cherepy.Andrea@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Required
Scheifele, Hans <Scheifele.Hans@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 2:00 PM – 3:00 PM
Subject OGC Weekly
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Richard Keigwin <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>	Required
Mclean, Kevin <Mclean.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Graves, Inza <Graves.Inza@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Brian Grant <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Perlis, Robert <Perlis.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Simons, Andrew <Simons.Andrew@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Kaczmarek, Chris <Kaczmarek.Chris@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required

Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Anderson, Monique <anderson.monique@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Optional
Dyner, Mark <dyner.mark@epa.gov>	Optional
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

Time 3:00 PM – 3:30 PM
Subject Axalta Coating Systems
Location RM 3156 EPA East Building
Show Time As Busy

Meeting location is 1201 Constitution Avenue, NW Washington, DC
Please have the guards call 202-564-2902 or 202-564-2910 for an escort

Purpose: To learn about TSCA regulatory, research, and reform priorities under the new administration (and in light of the recently passed TSCA legislation) as well as to share a bit about Axalta's strategy, approach to research, and investment priorities.

Other attendees will be:

Barry Snyder, SVP Chief Technology Officer
Joanne Hardy, Director R&D Americas
Diana Nash, Global Product Stewardship & Regulatory Leader

Contact Person: Gary Regulski, NA Regulatory Affairs Manager/TSCA Coordinator
Personal Phone / Ex. 6

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Rodan, Bruce <rodan.bruce@epa.gov>	Required
gary.j.regulski@axaltacs.com <gary.j.regulski@axaltacs.com>	Required
Barry Snyder <barry.snyder@axaltacs.com>	Optional
Joanne R Hardy <joanne.r.hardy@axaltacs.com>	Optional
Diane Nash <diane.nash@axaltacs.com>	Optional

Frithsen, Jeff <Frithsen.Jeff@epa.gov>	Optional
gary.j.regulski@axaltacs.com <gary.j.regulski@axaltacs.com>	Required
Barry Snyder <barry.snyder@axaltacs.com>	Optional
Joanne R Hardy <joanne.r.hardy@axaltacs.com>	Optional
Diane Nash <diane.nash@axaltacs.com>	Optional

Time 4:30 PM – 5:20 PM

Subject Overview of SNURs -- New Chemical 5(e) and Non-5(e), and Existing Chemical SNURs.

Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP

Show Time As Busy

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Purpose: Provide overview of TSCA section 5(a) SNURs; New Chemical 5(e) and Non-5(e), and Existing Chemical SNURs.
POC for Meeting Materials: Chris Blunck

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
Greg Schweer (Schweer.Greg@epa.gov) <Schweer.Greg@epa.gov>	Required
Wolf, Joel <Wolf.Joel@epa.gov>	Required
Brian Grant <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <blunck.chris@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Mclean, Kevin <Mclean.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Sadowsky, Don <Sadowsky.Don@epa.gov>	Optional

Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Optional
Thaler, Elizabeth <thaler.elizabeth@epa.gov>	Optional
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Optional
Canavan, Sheila <Canavan.Sheila@epa.gov>	Optional
Wills, Jennifer <Wills.Jennifer@epa.gov>	Optional
Andrea Cherepy (Cherepy.Andrea@epa.gov) <Cherepy.Andrea@epa.gov>	Optional

---

Thursday, September 14, 2017

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject IO General Meeting
Location 3130 WJC EAST Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/28/2017 from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required

Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Tyree, JamesN <tyree.jamesn@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 8:45 AM – 9:30 AM
Subject Chief of Staff Meeting
Location Alm Room
Show Time As Busy
Please note the location starting 9 May 2017
POC: ALM Room Cheryl Woodward

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott Administrator / Ex. 6	Organizer
Kundinger, Kelly <kundinger.kelly@epa.gov>	Required
Munoz, Charles <munoz.charles@epa.gov>	Required
White, Elizabeth <white.elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required
Kelly, Albert <kelly.albert@epa.gov>	Required
Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
Burke, Marcella <burke.marcella@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
Abboud, Michael <abboud.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Bodine, Susan <bodine.susan@epa.gov>	Required
Palich, Christian <palich.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>	Required
Sands, Jeffrey <sands.jeffrey@epa.gov>	Required
Hanson, Paige (Catherine) <hanson.catherine@epa.gov>	Required

Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Required
Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Required
Schwab, Justin <schwab.justin@epa.gov>	Required
Wehrum, Bill <Wehrum.Bill@epa.gov>	Required
Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Frye, Tony (Robert) <frye.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Darwin, Veronica <darwin.veronica@epa.gov>	Required
Feeley, Drew (Robert) <Feeley.Drew@epa.gov>	Required
Gunasekara, Mandy <Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov>	Required
Ferguson, Lincoln <ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Required
Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>	Required
Greaves, Holly <greaves.holly@epa.gov>	Required
Wilcox, Jahan <wilcox.jahan@epa.gov>	Required
Wagner, Kenneth <wagner.kenneth@epa.gov>	Required
Rodrick, Christian <rodrick.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Hewitt, James <hewitt.james@epa.gov>	Required
Fotouhi, David <fotouhi.david@epa.gov>	Required
Darwin, Henry <darwin.henry@epa.gov>	Required
Traylor, Patrick <traylor.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Required
Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>	Required
Harlow, David <harlow.david@epa.gov>	Required
Dominguez, Alexander <dominguez.alexander@epa.gov>	Required
Dourson, Michael <dourson.michael@epa.gov>	Required

Letendre, Daisy <letendre.daisy@epa.gov>	Required
Hupp, Millan <hupp.millan@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
McMurray, Forrest <mcmurray.forrest@epa.gov>	Required
Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Chmielewski, Kevin <chmielewski.kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Inge, Carolyn <Inge.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Lovell, Will (William) <lovell.william@epa.gov>	Optional
Dickerson, Aaron <dickerson.aaron@epa.gov>	Optional
Ford, Hayley <ford.hayley@epa.gov>	Optional
Willis, Sharnett <Willis.Sharnett@epa.gov>	Optional
Shimmin, Kaitlyn <shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 9:00 AM – 3:00 PM
Subject CDR Inorganic Byproducts FACA-Public Meeting - September - Day 2
Location RRB Oceanic Suites
Show Time As Tentative
Agenda attached and second day below.

Thursday, September 14 (9:00 AM – 3:00 PM)

Cross-Caucus Package Workgroup Discussion (9:00 – 11:30 AM)

* What do you like about approaches and how might they be combined into a package that will be acceptable and meet as many interests of all stakeholders as possible?

* Are there any components of approaches that are problematic and how might they be changed to address as many interests of all

stakeholders as possible?

Lunch and Caucus Discussions (11:30 AM – 1:00 PM)

Report Back to Full Committee on Caucus Discussions (1:00 – 2:00 PM)

* Identification of tentative package(s) that Committee Members can "live with"

* Refinements of package(s), as appropriate

* Identification of issues for more discussion or refinement and next steps

Public Comment Period (2:00 – 2:15 PM)

Discussion of Timeline and Next Steps (2:15 – 2:50 PM)

Discuss the approach and schedule for refining package(s) and obtaining and integrating constituent input.

Meeting Wrap-Up, Review of Next Step and Closure (2:50 – 3:00 PM)

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Kramek, Niva <kramek.niva@epa.gov>	Organizer
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Cunningham-HQ, Barbara <Cunningham-HQ.Barbara@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Required
Wolf, Joel <Wolf.Joel@epa.gov>	Required
Sharkey, Susan <Sharkey.Susan@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required

ED_002528_00001824-00076

Time 10:00 AM – 11:00 AM

Subject Pre-Prioritization (Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP

Show Time As Busy

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Frithsen, Jeff <Frithsen.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Susanna Blair (Blair.Susanna@epa.gov) <Blair.Susanna@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Henry, Tala <henry.tala@epa.gov>	Required
Brian Grant <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Mclean, Kevin <Mclean.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Thomas, Russell <Thomas.Russell@epa.gov>	Required
Chang, Daniel <chang.daniel@epa.gov>	Required
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
David Widawsky <Widawsky.David@epa.gov>	Required
Frazer, Brian <Frazer.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Davies, Clive <Davies.Clive@epa.gov>	Required
Lauren Sweet (sweet.lauren@epa.gov) <sweet.lauren@epa.gov>	Required
Celeste, Laurel <celeste.laurel@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Wolf, Joel <Wolf.Joel@epa.gov>	Required
Mojica, Andrea <Mojica.andrea@epa.gov>	Optional
Anderson, Steve <Anderson.Steve@epa.gov>	Optional
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required

Susanna Blair (Blair.Susanna@epa.gov) <Blair.Susanna@epa.gov>	Required
Henry, Tala <henry.tala@epa.gov>	Required
Brian Grant <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
David Widawsky <Widawsky.David@epa.gov>	Required
Lauren Sweet (sweet.lauren@epa.gov) <sweet.lauren@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 11:00 AM – 12:00 PM

Subject New Chemical Bi-Weekly Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Location DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO

Show Time As Busy

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
Widawsky, David <Widawsky.David@epa.gov>	Required
Henry, Tala <henry.tala@epa.gov>	Required
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Required
Grant, Brian <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Mclean, Kevin <Mclean.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Sadowsky, Don <Sadowsky.Don@epa.gov>	Required
Scheifele, Hans <scheifele.hans@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO <DCRoomEast3371c@epa.gov>	Resource
Canavan, Sheila <Canavan.Sheila@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Required

Greg Schweer (Schweer.Greg@epa.gov) <Schweer.Greg@epa.gov>	Required
Stedeford, Todd <Stedeford.Todd@epa.gov>	Required
Cherepy, Andrea <Cherepy.Andrea@epa.gov>	Required
Wills, Jennifer <Wills.Jennifer@epa.gov>	Required
Thaler, Elizabeth <thaler.elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required

Time 1:00 PM – 1:45 PM
Subject Risk Assessments (Human Health)
Location RM 3156 EPA East
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Vogel, Dana <Vogel.Dana@epa.gov>	Required
Jeffrey Dawson (Dawson.Jeff@epa.gov) <Dawson.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Knizner, Steve <Knizner.Steve@epa.gov>	Required
Weiss, Steven <Weiss.Steven@epa.gov>	Required
McNally, Robert <Mcnally.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>	Required
Parsons, Laura <Parsons.Laura@epa.gov>	Optional
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Elissa Reaves <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>	Optional
Kough, John <Kough.John@epa.gov>	Optional
Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>	Required
Mendelsohn, Mike <mendelsohn.mike@epa.gov>	Optional
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Optional
Lowit, Anna <Lowit.Anna@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 1:00 PM – 2:00 PM
Subject Hurricane Irma/Harvey: PCC Meeting and Conference Call
Location DCRoomARNB431/Executive-Conference-Room
Show Time As Tentative
Updated with revised meeting attachments.

Date Updated - Meeting will be Thursday, Sept 14.

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Hurricane Harvey/Irma Policy Coordinating Committee

Agenda

September 14, 2017

Opening Remarks Ryan Jackson

Barry Breen

Situational Updates

For each situational update would you please address the following topic areas in addition to Regional/Program specific highlights:

What are you being asked to do/support from our Federal, State and Local partners?

* Are there actions you are considering leaning forward on to address a need or expedite our response activities?

* Are there program policy, legal, or resource issues impacting your operations?

* Discussion of recovery efforts

Region 2

Region 4

Region 3

OPA

OLEM

Harvey Update Region 6

General Discussion

Next Meeting

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	EOC Documentation <EOC_Documentation@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
	Cheatham, Reggie <cheatham.reggie@epa.gov>	Required
	Breen, Barry <Breen.Barry@epa.gov>	Required
	Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
	Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>	Required
	Wagner, Kenneth <wagner.kenneth@epa.gov>	Required
	Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Required
	Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Required
	Shapiro, Mike <Shapiro.Mike@epa.gov>	Required
	Coleman, Sam <Coleman.Sam@epa.gov>	Required
	Gray, David <gray.david@epa.gov>	Required
	Edlund, Carl <Edlund.Carl@epa.gov>	Required
	Heard, Anne <Heard.Anne@epa.gov>	Required
	Kaplan, Robert <kaplan.robert@epa.gov>	Required
	Rodrigues, Cecil <rodrigues.cecil@epa.gov>	Required
	Kelly, Albert <kelly.albert@epa.gov>	Required

Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Washington, Tiffeny <Washington.Tiffeny@epa.gov>	Required
Simon, Nigel <Simon.Nigel@epa.gov>	Required
Davis, Patrick <davis.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Brooks, Becky <Brooks.Becky@epa.gov>	Required
Armstead, John A. <Armstead.John@epa.gov>	Required
Melvin, Karen <Melvin.Karen@epa.gov>	Required
Richardson, RobinH <Richardson.RobinH@epa.gov>	Required
Clark, Becki <Clark.Becki@epa.gov>	Required
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
Indermark, Michele <Indermark.Michele@epa.gov>	Required
Smith, Monica <smith.monica@epa.gov>	Required
Carroll, Craig <Carroll.Craig@epa.gov>	Required
Kling, David <Kling.Dave@epa.gov>	Required
Shaw, Betsy <Shaw.Betsy@epa.gov>	Required
Kavlock, Robert <Kavlock.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Minoli, Kevin <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Fotouhi, David <Fotouhi.David@epa.gov>	Required
Hill, Franklin <Hill.Franklin@epa.gov>	Required
Irizarry, Gilberto <Irizarry.Gilberto@epa.gov>	Required
Webster, James <Webster.James@epa.gov>	Required
Badalamente, Mark <Badalamente.Mark@epa.gov>	Required
Starfield, Lawrence <Starfield.Lawrence@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required

Peterson, Mary <Peterson.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Guerriero, Margaret <guerriero.margaret@epa.gov>	Required
Ballotti, Doug <ballotti.douglas@epa.gov>	Required
Borries, Samuel <borries.samuel@epa.gov>	Required
Prince, John <Prince.John@epa.gov>	Required
Mosher, Eric <Mosher.Eric@epa.gov>	Required
Mears, Mary <Mears.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Drazan, Dan <Drazan.Dan@epa.gov>	Required
Schlieger, Brian <schlieger.brian@epa.gov>	Required
Oh, Peter <Oh.Peter@epa.gov>	Required
Flynn, Mike <Flynn.Mike@epa.gov>	Optional
Gross, Bonnie <Gross.bonnie@epa.gov>	Optional
Glenn, Trey <Glenn.Trey@epa.gov>	Optional
Jenkins, Brandi <Jenkins.Brandi@epa.gov>	Optional
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
Newton, Cheryl <Newton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Optional
Dorsey, Claudette <Dorsey.Claudette@epa.gov>	Optional
Veal, Lee <Veal.Lee@epa.gov>	Optional
Moore, Tony <moore.tony@epa.gov>	Optional
EOC_Manager, <EOC_Manager@epa.gov>	Optional
Personal Email / Ex. 6	Optional
Leonard, Paul <leonard.paul@epa.gov>	Optional
Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Optional
Rodan, Bruce <rodan.bruce@epa.gov>	Optional

Grevatt, Peter <Grevatt.Peter@epa.gov>	Optional
Mccabe, Catherine <McCabe.Catherine@epa.gov>	Optional
Fonseca, Silvina <Fonseca.Silvina@epa.gov>	Optional
Levine, Carolyn <Levine.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Price, Lisa <Price.Lisa@epa.gov>	Optional
Snowbarger, Robert <Snowbarger.Robert@epa.gov>	Optional
Personal Email / Ex. 6	Optional
Edwards, Jonathan <Edwards.Jonathan@epa.gov>	Optional
Opalski, Dan <Opalski.Dan@epa.gov>	Optional
Perovich, Gina <Perovich.Gina@epa.gov>	Optional
Lincoln, Larry <Lincoln.Larry@epa.gov>	Optional
Personal Email / Ex. 6	Optional
Lapierre, Kenneth <Lapierre.Kenneth@epa.gov>	Optional
Gettle, Jeaneanne <Gettle.Jeaneanne@epa.gov>	Optional
Jones-Johnson, Shea <Jones-Johnson.Shea@epa.gov>	Optional
Scheraga, Joel <Scheraga.Joel@epa.gov>	Optional
Allen, Reginald <Allen.Reginald@epa.gov>	Optional
Chu, Ed <Chu.Ed@epa.gov>	Optional
Nalipinski, Mike <Nalipinski.Mike@epa.gov>	Optional
Edwards, Crystal <Edwards.Crystal@epa.gov>	Optional
Mugdan, Walter <Mugdan.Walter@epa.gov>	Optional
EOC_Deputy_Manager <EOC_Deputy_Manager@epa.gov>	Optional
Caraballo, Mario <Caraballo.Mario@epa.gov>	Optional
Michaud, John <Michaud.John@epa.gov>	Optional
Mclain, Jennifer <Mclain.Jennifer@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 2:00 PM – 2:30 PM
Subject Recusals
Location Room 3156 East
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Fugh, Justina <Fugh.Justina@epa.gov>	Organizer
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Griffo, Shannon <Griffo.Shannon@epa.gov>	Required

Time 2:00 PM – 4:00 PM
Subject FW: SAVE THE DATE - Personal Matters / Ex. 6
Location 4225 WJC-E
Show Time As Tentative

Please join OARM and OCSPP in celebrating Personal Matters / Ex. 6 of distinguished career service at EPA by stopping by to network with Personal Matters / Ex. 6 on Thursday, September 14, 2017.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Petrole, Maryann <Petrole.Maryann@epa.gov>	Organizer
OCSPP ALL <OCSPP_ALL@epa.gov>	Required
Carter, Pamela <Carter.Pamela@epa.gov>	Required
OARM-OA-OAGOV <OARMOAOAGOV@epa.gov>	Required
Ridings, Sharon <Ridings.Sharon@epa.gov>	Required
Vizian, Donna <Vizian.Donna@epa.gov>	Optional
Showman, John <Showman.John@epa.gov>	Optional
Cooper, Marian <Cooper.Marian@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 3:15 PM – 4:00 PM
Subject Meet and greet
Location 3130A WJC East
Show Time As Busy
Categories Red Category
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Mike Dourson <michael.dourson@uc.edu>	Required
Personal Email / Ex. 6	Required

Dourson, Michael Personal Email / Ex. 6 Optional

Personal Email / Ex. 6

Friday, September 15, 2017

Time 8:15 AM – 8:45 AM
Subject meet and greet
Location Timgad
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Martinez, Jeannette <Martinez.Jeannette@epa.gov>	Required

Time 9:30 AM – 10:15 AM
Subject ICR review
Location 3130
Show Time As Busy

To go through ICRs as we have done for regs.

****
Materials are attached. A dynamic presentation of the same information is now accessible in SharePoint <https://usepa.sharepoint.com/sites/OCSPP_Community/RCS/ICRs/Lists/ICR%20Status/AllItems.aspx> and includes different views showing
* what's pending OMB action
* what's in OEI pending submission to OMB
* what's in RCS pending submission to OEI
* what's in the program offices, and
* upcoming 1st FR publications and ICR submissions.
The attached Excel file was downloaded from that site and manipulated by hand to provide similar views offline.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Smith, Peterj <Smith.Peterj@epa.gov>	Required
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Mosby, Jackie <Mosby.Jackie@epa.gov>	Optional
Parrott, Patricia <parrott.patricia@epa.gov>	Optional
Overstreet, Anne <overstreet.anne@epa.gov>	Optional

Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Mosby, Jackie <Mosby.Jackie@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 9:45 AM – 10:00 AM
Subject Mock Senator Holding Room (9:45 AM)
Location 1154 WJC East (Judges Chambers)
Show Time As Busy
Please meet in the Judges' Chambers prior to the start of the hearing.

WORKING CONTACT:

Kaitlyn Shimmin

Shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov <mailto:Shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov>

C: Personal Phone / Ex. 6

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Shimmin, Kaitlyn <shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov>	Required
Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
Gunasekara, Mandy <Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov>	Required
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required
Schwab, Justin <Schwab.Justin@epa.gov>	Required
Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required

Letendre, Daisy <letendre.daisy@epa.gov>	Required
Frye, Tony (Robert) <frye.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>	Required
Palich, Christian <palich.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>	Required
Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
Feeley, Drew <Drew.Feeley@mail.house.gov>	Required

Time 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Subject Mock Hearing for Senate Confirmed Nominees (10:00 AM)
Location Hearing Room 1152 WJC East
Show Time As Busy
10:00 AM to 12:00 PM: Mock Hearing

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Shimmin, Kaitlyn <shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov>	Required
Palich, Christian <palich.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Fotouhi, David <fotouhi.david@epa.gov>	Required
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required
Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Required
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
Schwab, Justin <schwab.justin@epa.gov>	Required
Gunasekara, Mandy <Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required

ED_002528_00001824-00088

Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>	Required
Rodrick, Christian <rodrick.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Graham, Amy <graham.amy@epa.gov>	Required
Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
Frye, Tony (Robert) <frye.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Ford, Hayley <ford.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Munoz, Charles <munoz.charles@epa.gov>	Required
Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>	Required
Levine, Carolyn <Levine.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Required
Richardson, RobinH <Richardson.RobinH@epa.gov>	Required
Cheatham-Strickland, Latonia <Cheatham-Strickland.Latonia@epa.gov>	Required
Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>	Required
Minoli, Kevin <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Haman, Patricia <Haman.Patricia@epa.gov>	Required
Hupp, Millan <hupp.millan@epa.gov>	Optional
Abboud, Michael <abboud.michael@epa.gov>	Optional
Ferguson, Lincoln <ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov>	Optional
Greaves, Holly <greaves.holly@epa.gov>	Optional
Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>	Optional
Letendre, Daisy <letendre.daisy@epa.gov>	Optional
McMurray, Forrest <mcmurray.forrest@epa.gov>	Optional
Chmielewski, Kevin <chmielewski.kevin@epa.gov>	Optional
Traylor, Patrick <traylor.patrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Wilcox, Jahan <wilcox.jahan@epa.gov>	Optional

Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>	Optional
Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Optional
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
Darwin, Veronica <darwin.veronica@epa.gov>	Optional
Davis, Patrick <davis.patrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Darwin, Henry <darwin.henry@epa.gov>	Optional
Dominguez, Alexander <dominguez.alexander@epa.gov>	Optional
Kelly, Albert <kelly.albert@epa.gov>	Optional
Bodine, Susan <bodine.susan@epa.gov>	Optional
wwehrum@hunton.com <wwehrum@hunton.com>	Optional
Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>	Optional
Albores, Richard <Albores.Richard@epa.gov>	Optional
Lubetsky, Jonathan <Lubetsky.Jonathan@epa.gov>	Optional
Lewis, Josh <Lewis.Josh@epa.gov>	Optional
Thundiyil, Karen <Thundiyil.Karen@epa.gov>	Optional
Catherine.E.Curry EOP / Ex. 6 EOP / Ex. 6	Optional
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 12:15 PM – 1:15 PM
Subject Mock Hearing Debrief and Feedback (12:15 PM)
Location 1152 WJC East
Show Time As Busy

This will be a debrief by the political staff to the nominees on their mock hearing performance.

WORKING CONTACT:

Kaitlyn Shimmin

Shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov <mailto:Shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov>

C: Personal Phone / Ex. 6

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Shimmin, Kaitlyn <shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov>	Required
	Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
	Gunasekara, Mandy <Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov>	Required
	Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
	Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
	Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
	Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required
	Schwab, Justin <Schwab.Justin@epa.gov>	Required
	Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Required
	Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
	Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required
	Letendre, Daisy <letendre.daisy@epa.gov>	Required
	Frye, Tony (Robert) <frye.robert@epa.gov>	Required
	Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
	Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>	Required
	Palich, Christian <palich.christian@epa.gov>	Required
	Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>	Required
	Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
	Feeley, Drew <Drew.Feeley@mail.house.gov>	Required
	Minoli, Kevin <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov>	Optional
	Albores, Richard <Albores.Richard@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 1:30 PM – 2:00 PM
Subject HOLD
Show Time As Busy

Time 3:30 PM – 4:00 PM

Subject general
Location Nancy will call Al-- whats the best #?
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
McGartland, Al <McGartland.Al@epa.gov>	Required

Time 3:30 PM – 5:30 PM
Subject HOLD Paperwork and Training
Show Time As Busy

Sunday, September 17, 2017

Time 1:00 PM – 2:00 PM
Subject Hurricane Irma/Harvey: PCC Meeting and Conference Call
Location DCRoomARNB431/Executive-Conference-Room
Show Time As Tentative
Updated with attachments.

Date Updated - Meeting will be Sunday, Sept. 17.

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Meeting invite will be updated with attachments.

PLEASE MUTE YOUR PHONE & DO NOT PLACE THE CONFERENCE ON HOLD. HANGING UP IS OKAY IF NECESSARY.

Agenda

September 17, 2017

Opening Remarks Ryan Jackson

Barry Breen

Situational Updates

For each situational update would you please address the following topic areas in addition to Regional/Program specific highlights:

* What are you being asked to do/support from our Federal, State and Local partners?
* Are there actions you are considering leaning forward on to address a need or expedite our response activities?
* Are there program policy, legal, or resource issues impacting your operations?
* Discussion of recovery efforts

Region 2

Region 4

Region 3

Region 5

Region 7

OPA

OLEM

Harvey Update Region 6

General Discussion

Next Meeting

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
EOC Documentation <EOC_Documentation@epa.gov>	Organizer
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Cheatham, Reggie <cheatham.reggie@epa.gov>	Required
Breen, Barry <Breen.Barry@epa.gov>	Required
Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Wagner, Kenneth <wagner.kenneth@epa.gov>	Required

ED_002528_00001824-00093

Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Required
Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Required
Shapiro, Mike <Shapiro.Mike@epa.gov>	Required
Coleman, Sam <Coleman.Sam@epa.gov>	Required
Gray, David <gray.david@epa.gov>	Required
Edlund, Carl <Edlund.Carl@epa.gov>	Required
Heard, Anne <Heard.Anne@epa.gov>	Required
Kaplan, Robert <kaplan.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Rodrigues, Cecil <rodrigues.cecil@epa.gov>	Required
Kelly, Albert <kelly.albert@epa.gov>	Required
Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Washington, Tiffeny <Washington.Tiffeny@epa.gov>	Required
Simon, Nigel <Simon.Nigel@epa.gov>	Required
Davis, Patrick <davis.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Brooks, Becky <Brooks.Becky@epa.gov>	Required
Armstead, John A. <Armstead.John@epa.gov>	Required
Melvin, Karen <Melvin.Karen@epa.gov>	Required
Richardson, RobinH <Richardson.RobinH@epa.gov>	Required
Clark, Becki <Clark.Becki@epa.gov>	Required
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
Indermark, Michele <Indermark.Michele@epa.gov>	Required
Smith, Monica <smith.monica@epa.gov>	Required
Carroll, Craig <Carroll.Craig@epa.gov>	Required
Kling, David <Kling.Dave@epa.gov>	Required
Shaw, Betsy <Shaw.Betsy@epa.gov>	Required

Kavlock, Robert <Kavlock.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Minoli, Kevin <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Fotouhi, David <Fotouhi.David@epa.gov>	Required
Hill, Franklin <Hill.Franklin@epa.gov>	Required
Irizarry, Gilberto <Irizarry.Gilberto@epa.gov>	Required
Webster, James <Webster.James@epa.gov>	Required
Badalamente, Mark <Badalamente.Mark@epa.gov>	Required
Starfield, Lawrence <Starfield.Lawrence@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Peterson, Mary <Peterson.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Guerriero, Margaret <guerriero.margaret@epa.gov>	Required
Ballotti, Doug <ballotti.douglas@epa.gov>	Required
Borries, Samuel <borries.samuel@epa.gov>	Required
Prince, John <Prince.John@epa.gov>	Required
Mosher, Eric <Mosher.Eric@epa.gov>	Required
Mears, Mary <Mears.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Drazan, Dan <Drazan.Dan@epa.gov>	Required
Schlieger, Brian <schlieger.brian@epa.gov>	Required
Oh, Peter <Oh.Peter@epa.gov>	Required
Flynn, Mike <Flynn.Mike@epa.gov>	Optional
Gross, Bonnie <Gross.bonnie@epa.gov>	Optional
Glenn, Trey <Glenn.Trey@epa.gov>	Optional
Jenkins, Brandi <Jenkins.Brandi@epa.gov>	Optional

Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
Newton, Cheryl <Newton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Optional
Dorsey, Claudette <Dorsey.Claudette@epa.gov>	Optional
Veal, Lee <Veal.Lee@epa.gov>	Optional
Moore, Tony <moore.tony@epa.gov>	Optional
EOC_Manager, <EOC_Manager@epa.gov>	Optional
Mike Kohlflynn Personal Email / Ex. 6	Optional
Leonard, Paul <leonard.paul@epa.gov>	Optional
Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Optional
Rodan, Bruce <rodan.bruce@epa.gov>	Optional
Grevatt, Peter <Grevatt.Peter@epa.gov>	Optional
Mccabe, Catherine <McCabe.Catherine@epa.gov>	Optional
Fonseca, Silvina <Fonseca.Silvina@epa.gov>	Optional
Levine, Carolyn <Levine.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Price, Lisa <Price.Lisa@epa.gov>	Optional
Snowbarger, Robert <Snowbarger.Robert@epa.gov>	Optional
Personal Email / Ex. 6	Optional
Edwards, Jonathan <Edwards.Jonathan@epa.gov>	Optional
Opalski, Dan <Opalski.Dan@epa.gov>	Optional
Perovich, Gina <Perovich.Gina@epa.gov>	Optional
Lincoln, Larry <Lincoln.Larry@epa.gov>	Optional
Leslie PHamm Personal Email / Ex. 6	Optional
Lapierre, Kenneth <Lapierre.Kenneth@epa.gov>	Optional
Gettle, Jeaneanne <Gettle.Jeaneanne@epa.gov>	Optional
Jones-Johnson, Shea <Jones-Johnson.Shea@epa.gov>	Optional

Scheraga, Joel <Scheraga.Joel@epa.gov>	Optional
Allen, Reginald <Allen.Reginald@epa.gov>	Optional
Chu, Ed <Chu.Ed@epa.gov>	Optional
Nalipinski, Mike <Nalipinski.Mike@epa.gov>	Optional
Edwards, Crystal <Edwards.Crystal@epa.gov>	Optional
Mugdan, Walter <Mugdan.Walter@epa.gov>	Optional
EOC_Deputy_Manager <EOC_Deputy_Manager@epa.gov>	Optional
Caraballo, Mario <Caraballo.Mario@epa.gov>	Optional
Michaud, John <Michaud.John@epa.gov>	Optional
Mclain, Jennifer <Mclain.Jennifer@epa.gov>	Optional

Monday, September 18, 2017

Time 8:00 AM – 8:30 AM
Subject General Follow-up
Location Rm. 3166A
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Organizer
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject IO General Meeting
Location 3130 WJC EAST Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/28/2017 from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required

Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Tyree, JamesN <tyree.jamesn@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject Personal Matters / Ex. 6
Location RRB
Show Time As Busy

Pamela Younger/ Iris
USEPA - OITA/OMIS
Ronald Reagan Bldg., (2680R) Rm. 31215
1300 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W.
Washington, DC 20004
Tel. 202-564-6631

Time 9:30 AM – 10:00 AM
Subject OCSPP Staff Meeting (Skype Video Teleconference)
Location WJC East 3371C - Skype Call-In Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Monday effective 9/4/2017 until 9/25/2017 from 9:30 AM to 10:00 AM
Show Time As Busy

Updated Conference Call-In Number & added Skype Meeting link for Dial-out option.

....
.....

* Join Skype Meeting

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

This is an online meeting for Skype for Business, the professional meetings and communications app formerly known as Lync.

Join by Phone

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Help <http://intranet.epa.gov/otopintr/webconferencing/ o365-conferencing.html>

[!OC([1033])!]

....
.....

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Organizer
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>	Required
Gorman, John <Gorman.John@epa.gov>	Required
Sisco, Debby <Sisco.Debby@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Overstreet, Anne <overstreet.anne@epa.gov>	Required

Burden, Susan <Burden.Susan@epa.gov>	Required
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Kovner, Karissa <Kovner.Karissa@epa.gov>	Required
Clark, Sharon <Clark.Sharon@epa.gov>	Required
Filippelli, John <Filippelli.John@epa.gov>	Required
Boutureira, Alan <Boutureira.Alan@epa.gov>	Required
Carter, Pamela <Carter.Pamela@epa.gov>	Required
Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>	Required
DeDora, Caroline <Dedora.Caroline@epa.gov>	Required
Berkley, Bruce <Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov>	Required
LaPosta, Dore <LaPosta.Dore@epa.gov>	Required
Mitchell, Judy-Ann <Mitchell.Judy-Ann@epa.gov>	Required
Smoot, Cameo <Smoot.Cameo@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>	Required
Vineski, Steve <Vineski.Steve@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Graves, Inza <Graves.Inza@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Scott, Elizabeth <Scott.Elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Wooge, William <Wooge.William@epa.gov>	Required
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required

Weiner, Janet <Weiner.Janet@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Marshall, Venus <Marshall.Venus@epa.gov>	Required
Green, Teresa <Green.Teresa@epa.gov>	Optional
Treimel, Ellen <Treimel.Ellen@epa.gov>	Optional
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Optional
Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>	Optional
Dixon, Diane <Dixon.Diane@epa.gov>	Optional
Metcalf, Alexander <Metcalf.Alexander@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Required
Pane, Vickie <Pane.Vickie@epa.gov>	Optional
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Scott, Gregory <Scott.Gregory@epa.gov>	Required
Scheifele, Hans <Scheifele.Hans@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 10:30 AM – 11:00 AM

Subject Prebrief for DAA in advance of OIG mtg on TSCA CDR -- Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP

Show Time As Busy

This prebrief is at the request of the DAA, in advance of the kickoff mtg (later same day) with the OIG on this preliminary research.

For more info, see attached notification memo. OPPT please feel free to invite others as appropriate.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Weiner, Janet <Weiner.Janet@epa.gov>	Organizer
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required

Moose, Lindsay <Moose.Lindsay@epa.gov>	Required
Wolf, Joel <Wolf.Joel@epa.gov>	Required
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
Sharkey, Susan <Sharkey.Susan@epa.gov>	Required
Kramek, Niva <kramek.niva@epa.gov>	Required
Blair, Susanna <Blair.Susanna@epa.gov>	Required
Gorder, Chris <Gorder.Chris@epa.gov>	Required
Nguyen, Nhan <Nguyen.Nhan@epa.gov>	Required
Latham, John <Latham.John@epa.gov>	Required
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 11:00 AM – 11:30 AM
Subject Sulfoxaflor
Location RM 3156 EPA East
Show Time As Busy

Purpose: To discuss the delay in the Section 3 approval for Sulfoxaflor on citrus, sorghum and soybean uses.

Attendees:

Renee Manusifi, American Soybean Association
Mike Aerts, Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association
Don Parker, National Cotton Council
Steve Hensley, National Cotton Council
Tim Lust, National Sorghum Producers
Dale Murden, Texas Citrus Mutual

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Jbischoff@cgagroup.com <Jbischoff@cgagroup.com>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>	Required
Kenny, Daniel <Kenny.Dan@epa.gov>	Required

Laws, Meredith <Laws.Meredith@epa.gov> Required

Time 11:30 AM – 12:30 PM

Subject OCSPP/OIG/OECA Kickoff mtg -- TSCA CDR (OPE-FY17-0025) -- Call in Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Location DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO

Show Time As Busy

9/18 Update: appending sign in sheet.

8/28 Update: Adding OCSPP DAA Nancy Beck as attendee and moving mtg ½ hour later to accommodate her schedule.

This mtg is being scheduled at the request of OIG project manager, Chad Kincheloe. The OIG plans to begin preliminary research on EPA's Chemical Data Reporting (CDR) under the Toxic Substance Control Act (TSCA). See attached Notification Memo for further information.

Meeting's purpose is to discuss OIG's objectives, the purpose of OIG's project and any areas of concern that program offices may have. OIG will also answer questions about the project process, reporting procedures, methods used to gather and analyze data, and what to expect during the course of the project.

Managers: Please feel free to delegate or invite others on your staff as appropriate.

Thanks so much,

Janet Weiner

OCSPP AFC

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Weiner, Janet <Weiner.Janet@epa.gov>	Organizer
Kincheloe, Chad <Kincheloe.Chad@epa.gov>	Required
Harris, Jeffrey <Harris.Jeffrey@epa.gov>	Required
Parker, Barry <Parker.Barry@epa.gov>	Required
Curley, Ganesa <Curley.Ganesa@epa.gov>	Required
Latham, John <Latham.John@epa.gov>	Required

Moose, Lindsay <Moose.Lindsay@epa.gov>	Required
Wolf, Joel <Wolf.Joel@epa.gov>	Required
Spriggs, Gwendolyn <Spriggs.Gwendolyn@epa.gov>	Required
Sullivan, Greg <Sullivan.Greg@epa.gov>	Required
Miles, James <miles.james@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Optional
Sharkey, Susan <Sharkey.Susan@epa.gov>	Optional
Kramek, Niva <kramek.niva@epa.gov>	Optional
Blair, Susanna <Blair.Susanna@epa.gov>	Optional
Gorder, Chris <Gorder.Chris@epa.gov>	Optional
Nguyen, Nhan <Nguyen.Nhan@epa.gov>	Optional
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Optional
Kabler, Lauren <Kabler.Lauren@epa.gov>	Optional
Saenz, Diana <Saenz.Diana@epa.gov>	Optional
Lott, Don <Lott.Don@epa.gov>	Optional
Ellis, Tony <Ellis.Tony@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 2:15 PM – 2:30 PM
Subject Transportation to PY
Show Time As Busy

There is no car available to return to EPA East on this day.

Your transportation request has been confirmed.

Confirmation Number: 76339
Passenger Information
* Name: NANCY BECK/DAA
* Number: 2025648542
* Pickup Time: 2017-09-18 14:15:00.0
* Pickup Location: EPA EAST CONSTITUTION AVE

* Drop-Off Location: POTOMAC YARD CRYSTAL CITY VA.
Vehicle Information
* Tag: G13-1037M
* Vehicle Type: CAR
* Make : CHEVROLET
* Model : VOLT
* Color : BLACK

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required

Time 2:30 PM – 3:15 PM
Subject BEAD ALL HANDS
Location PYS RM - 9100
Show Time As Busy

OPP/BEAD Division Meeting with the new Deputy Assistant Administrator for OCSPP, Nancy Beck.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wynne Miller <Miller.Wynne@epa.gov>	Required
OPP BEAD Managers <OPP_BEAD_Managers@epa.gov>	Required
Kaul, Monisha <Kaul.Monisha@epa.gov>	Optional
Pease, Anita <Pease.Anita@epa.gov>	Optional
Jones, Arnet <Jones.Arnet@epa.gov>	Optional
Sims, Diann <Sims.Diann@epa.gov>	Optional
Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>	Optional
Nguyen, Thuy <Nguyen.Thuy@epa.gov>	Optional
Lawrence, Susan <Lawrence.Susan@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 3:30 PM – 4:00 PM
Subject take shuttle back to HQ
Show Time As Busy

Time 4:00 PM – 4:50 PM
Subject LCPFC Proposed SNUR and Ski Wax Issue
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy

Purpose: Provide update the development of the LCPFC SNUR and overview of ski was investigation.

POC for Meeting Materials: Chris Blunck

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
	Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
	Wolf, Joel <Wolf.Joel@epa.gov>	Required
	Lloyd, Tyler <Lloyd.Tyler@epa.gov>	Required
	Grant, Brian <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
	Mclean, Kevin <Mclean.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
	Anderson, Steve <Anderson.Steve@epa.gov>	Required
	Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
	Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
	Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Required
	Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
	DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
	Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
	Grant, Brian <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
	Anderson, Steve <Anderson.Steve@epa.gov>	Required
	Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
	Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
	Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Required

Tuesday, September 19, 2017

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject IO General Meeting
Location 3130 WJC EAST Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/28/2017 from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM

Show Time As Busy

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Tyree, JamesN <tyree.jamesn@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 9:30 AM – 10:00 AM

Subject OGC Weekly

Location RM 3156 EPA East

Show Time As Busy

Call in number: **Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6**

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance

Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Richard Keigwin <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>	Required
Mclean, Kevin <Mclean.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Graves, Inza <Graves.Inza@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Brian Grant <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Perlis, Robert <Perlis.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Lee, Khisa <Lee.Khisa@epa.gov>	Required
Simons, Andrew <Simons.Andrew@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Kaczmarek, Chris <Kaczmarek.Chris@epa.gov>	Required
Arnold Layne (Layne.Arnold@epa.gov) <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Anderson, Monique <anderson.monique@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <blunck.chris@epa.gov>	Required
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required

Time	10:00 AM – 10:45 AM
Subject	Risk Assessments (ECO)
Location	RM 3156 EPA East
Show Time As	Busy
Attendees	**Name <E-mail>** **Attendance**

Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>	Required
Anderson, Brian <Anderson.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Nesci, Kimberly <Nesci.Kimberly@epa.gov>	Required
Knizner, Steve <Knizner.Steve@epa.gov>	Required
Weiss, Steven <Weiss.Steven@epa.gov>	Required
McNally, Robert <Mcnally.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>	Required
Parsons, Laura <Parsons.Laura@epa.gov>	Optional
Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>	Optional
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Optional
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Donovan, Elizabeth <Donovan.Elizabeth@epa.gov>	Optional
Borges, Shannon <Borges.Shannon@epa.gov>	Optional
Spatz, Dana <Spatz.Dana@epa.gov>	Optional
Sappington, Keith (Sappington.Keith@epa.gov) <Sappington.Keith@epa.gov>	Optional

---

Time 11:00 AM – 11:30 AM
Subject MS Farm Bureau and MDAC Meeting
Location DCRoomARN3528/OCIR
Show Time As Busy

Here are the tentative items we'd like to visit on:

* WOTUS

* Dicamba

* WPS

* State Pollinator Plans

* Kaput Feral Hog Bait

* Section 18's

Feel free to loop in your group from OPP, as we work very closely with Rick and his team there, and have a great relationship with those folks, I might add.

I've copied John Campbell, Deputy Commissioner at MDAC, and Andy Whittington, MS Farm Bureau Environmental Programs Coordinator and member of the EPA PPDC (Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee), on this e-mail.

Attendees	**Name <E-mail>**	**Attendance**
	Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
	Bennett, Tate <bennett.tate@epa.gov>	Required
	Gordon, Stephen <gordon.stephen@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 11:30 AM – 12:30 PM
Subject Pre-Brief for OMB Hearing on FY 2019 President's Budget
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy

Attendees	**Name <E-mail>**	**Attendance**
	Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
	Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
	Richard Keigwin <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
	Arnold Layne (Layne.Arnold@epa.gov) <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
	Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>	Required
	Graves, Inza <Graves.Inza@epa.gov>	Required
	Bruce Berkley <Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov>	Required
	DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
	Scott, Gregory <Scott.Gregory@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 12:30 PM – 1:30 PM
Subject NAFTA
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Metcalf, Alexander <Metcalf.Alexander@epa.gov>	Required
Celeste, Laurel <celeste.laurel@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required

Time 4:00 PM – 5:00 PM
Subject DAA Pre-Brief for PBT Section 6(h) Rulemaking Early Guidance Briefing
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy
Call in number **Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6**
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Required
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Required
Widawsky, David <Widawsky.David@epa.gov>	Required
Frazer, Brian <Frazer.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Symmes, Brian <Symmes.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Wheeler, Cindy <Wheeler.Cindy@epa.gov>	Required
Wolf, Joel <Wolf.Joel@epa.gov>	Required
Rice, Cody <Rice.Cody@epa.gov>	Required
Passe, Loraine <Passe.Loraine@epa.gov>	Required

Price, Michelle <Price.Michelle@epa.gov>	Required
Winchester, Erik <Winchester.Erik@epa.gov>	Required
Yakal, Randy <yakal.randy@epa.gov>	Required
Edmonds, Marc <Edmonds.Marc@epa.gov>	Required
Coleman, Todd <coleman.todd@epa.gov>	Required
Tierney, Meghan <Tierney.Meghan@epa.gov>	Required
Berol, David <Berol.David@epa.gov>	Required
Grant, Brian <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Mclean, Kevin <Mclean.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Lehman, Timothy <Lehman.Timothy@epa.gov>	Required
Catilina, Eliane <Catilina.Eliane@epa.gov>	Required
Kramek, Niva <kramek.niva@epa.gov>	Required
Shafer, Jonathan <shafer.jonathan@epa.gov>	Required
Suazo, Stephanie <Suazo.Stephanie@epa.gov>	Required
Wilkins, John <Wilkins.John@epa.gov>	Required
Yowell, John <yowell.john@epa.gov>	Required
Jarmul, Stephanie <jarmul.stephanie@epa.gov>	Required
Gimlin, Peter <Gimlin.Peter@epa.gov>	Required
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Aranda, Amber <aranda.amber@epa.gov>	Optional
Smith, Peterj <Smith.Peterj@epa.gov>	Optional
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Optional
Eisenreich, Karen <Eisenreich.Karen@epa.gov>	Optional
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Optional

Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Scheifele, Hans <Scheifele.Hans@epa.gov>	Optional

Wednesday, September 20, 2017

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject IO General Meeting
Location 3130 WJC EAST Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/28/2017 from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Tyree, JamesN <tyree.jamesn@epa.gov>	Optional

Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 11:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Subject OPPT General
Location 3130A WJC East Call in number **Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6** **Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6**
Recurrence Occurs every Wednesday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/27/2017 from 11:00 AM to 12:00 PM
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
Clark, Sharon <Clark.Sharon@epa.gov>	Required
Scott, Elizabeth <Scott.Elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>	Required
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Optional
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss.Linda@epa.gov <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>	Optional
Cherepy, Andrea <Cherepy.Andrea@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Required
Scheifele, Hans <Scheifele.Hans@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 12:15 PM – 12:45 PM
Subject Stockholm and Rotterdam: Brownbag Briefing for Nancy and Louise
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy
Purpose: To brief OCSPP/DAAs on substance of upcoming POPRC and CRC meetings

*Karissa will coordinate substance with your offices. Please bring your lunch!

Call in number: **Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6**

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
	Kovner, Karissa <Kovner.Karissa@epa.gov>	Required
	Dawson, Jeffrey <Dawson.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
	Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
	Blunck, Christopher <blunck.chris@epa.gov>	Required
	Perron, Monique <Perron.Monique@epa.gov>	Required
	Aranda, Amber <aranda.amber@epa.gov>	Required
	Nazef, Laura <Nazef.Laura@epa.gov>	Required
	Myrick, Pamela <Myrick.Pamela@epa.gov>	Required
	Richard Keigwin <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
	Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
	DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
	Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required

Time 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM
Subject Mission Measures - OAR, OW, OCSPP (+R2,5,9)
Location DCRoomWest1426/OPEI; VTC/phone will be available
Show Time As Tentative

Mission Measures Workshop, to be led by Henry Darwin

Invitees: AA, DAA, Office Directors and Lead Region Representatives for OAR and OW

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	Kenny, Shannon <Kenny.Shannon@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Dunham, Sarah <Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov>	Required
	Darwin, Henry <darwin.henry@epa.gov>	Required

Shaw, Betsy <Shaw.Betsy@epa.gov>	Required
Best-Wong, Benita <Best-Wong.Benita@epa.gov>	Required
Shapiro, Mike <Shapiro.Mike@epa.gov>	Required
Edwards, Jonathan <Edwards.Jonathan@epa.gov>	Required
Grundler, Christopher <grundler.christopher@epa.gov>	Required
Page, Steve <Page.Steve@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Alexis <Strauss.Alexis@epa.gov>	Required
Sawyers, Andrew <Sawyers.Andrew@epa.gov>	Required
Grevatt, Peter <Grevatt.Peter@epa.gov>	Required
Kaplan, Robert <kaplan.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Mccabe, Catherine <McCabe.Catherine@epa.gov>	Required
Rees, Sarah <rees.sarah@epa.gov>	Required
Tomiak, Robert <tomiak.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Tejada, Matthew <Tejada.Matthew@epa.gov>	Required
Dalbey, Matthew <dalbey.matthew@epa.gov>	Required
Shaw, Nena <Shaw.Nena@epa.gov>	Required
Campbell, Jennie <Campbell.Jennie@epa.gov>	Required
Olender, Marc <Olender.Marc@epa.gov>	Required
Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
Letendre, Daisy <letendre.daisy@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required

Edwards, Crystal <Edwards.Crystal@epa.gov>	Optional
Penman, Crystal <Penman.Crystal@epa.gov>	Optional
Debell, Kevin <debell.kevin@epa.gov>	Optional
Perez, Idalia <Perez.Idalia@epa.gov>	Optional
Balasa, Kate <balasa.kate@epa.gov>	Optional
Goodin, John <Goodin.John@epa.gov>	Optional
Lape, Jeff <lape.jeff@epa.gov>	Optional
DeDora, Caroline <DeDora.Caroline@epa.gov>	Optional
Bloom, David <Bloom.David@epa.gov>	Optional
OBrien, Kathy <Obrien.Kathy@epa.gov>	Optional
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Optional
Vuong, Stephanie <Vuong.Stephanie@epa.gov>	Optional
Bohan, Suzanne <bohan.suzanne@epa.gov>	Optional
Newton, Cheryl <Newton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Optional
Korleski, Christopher <korleski.christopher@epa.gov>	Optional
LaPosta, Dore <LaPosta.Dore@epa.gov>	Optional
Mugdan, Walter <Mugdan.Walter@epa.gov>	Optional
Hall, JohnM <hall.johnm@epa.gov>	Optional
Berkley, Bruce <Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 4:00 PM – 4:45 PM
Subject Emergency Tolerance Exemptions and EO 13771
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy
Conference Call
Call in number **Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6**

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Owens, Nicole <Owens.Nicole@epa.gov>	Required

Avivah Jakob (Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov) <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>	Required
Richard Keigwin <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Miller, Wynne <Miller.Wynne@epa.gov>	Required
Jim Laity EOP / Ex. 6	Optional
Jones, Danielle Y. EOP/OMB EOP / Ex. 6	Optional
Nickerson, William <Nickerson.William@epa.gov>	Optional
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Optional
Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>	Optional
Pease, Anita <Pease.Anita@epa.gov>	Optional
Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>	Optional
Wyatt, TJ <Wyatt.Tj@epa.gov>	Optional
Kenny, Daniel <Kenny.Dan@epa.gov>	Optional
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Optional
Maignan, Tawanda <Maignan.Tawanda@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 5:00 PM – 6:00 PM
Subject Need to leave.
Show Time As Busy

Thursday, September 21, 2017

Time 8:00 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject Chief of Staff Meeting
Location Alm Room
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott Administrator / Ex. 6	Organizer
Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Required

Ferguson, Lincoln <ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov>	Required
Greaves, Holly <greaves.holly@epa.gov>	Required
Davis, Patrick <davis.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Hupp, Millan <hupp.millan@epa.gov>	Required
Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>	Required
Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
Fotouhi, David <fotouhi.david@epa.gov>	Required
Wilcox, Jahan <wilcox.jahan@epa.gov>	Required
Schwab, Justin <schwab.justin@epa.gov>	Required
Munoz, Charles <munoz.charles@epa.gov>	Required
Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>	Required
Darwin, Veronica <darwin.veronica@epa.gov>	Required
Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
Letendre, Daisy <letendre.daisy@epa.gov>	Required
Kelly, Albert <kelly.albert@epa.gov>	Required
Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Required
Frye, Tony (Robert) <frye.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Dominguez, Alexander <dominguez.alexander@epa.gov>	Required
Abboud, Michael <abboud.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Wagner, Kenneth <wagner.kenneth@epa.gov>	Required
Darwin, Henry <darwin.henry@epa.gov>	Required
McMurray, Forrest <mcmurray.forrest@epa.gov>	Required
Rodrick, Christian <rodrick.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Hewitt, James <hewitt.james@epa.gov>	Required

Traylor, Patrick <traylor.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Gunasekara, Mandy <Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov>	Required
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
Feeley, Drew (Robert) <feeley.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Chmielewski, Kevin <chmielewski.kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Palich, Christian <palich.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>	Required
Graham, Amy <graham.amy@epa.gov>	Required
Bodine, Susan <bodine.susan@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required
Dickerson, Aaron <dickerson.aaron@epa.gov>	Optional
Willis, Sharnett <Willis.Sharnett@epa.gov>	Optional
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
Lovell, Will (William) <lovell.william@epa.gov>	Optional
Shimmin, Kaitlyn <shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Ford, Hayley <ford.hayley@epa.gov>	Optional
Kundinger, Kelly <kundinger.kelly@epa.gov>	Required
White, Elizabeth <white.elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Burke, Marcella <burke.marcella@epa.gov>	Required
Sands, Jeffrey <sands.jeffrey@epa.gov>	Required
Hanson, Paige (Catherine) <hanson.catherine@epa.gov>	Required
Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Required

Wehrum, Bill <Wehrum.Bill@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Required
Harlow, David <harlow.david@epa.gov>	Required
Dourson, Michael <dourson.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Inge, Carolyn <Inge.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 8:00 AM – 6:00 PM
Subject Hold Personal Matters / Ex. 6
Show Time As Out of Office

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject IO General Meeting
Location 3130 WJC EAST Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/28/2017 from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Optional

Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Tyree, JamesN <tyree.jamesn@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 1:00 PM – 2:00 PM

Subject Hurricane Irma/Harvey: PCC Meeting and Conference Call

Location Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Show Time As Tentative

To ensure that all recipient received the invite for todays meeting, we are re-sending the PCC invite for today. In addition, documents for the meeting are attached:

PCC Objectives

PCC Agenda

Region 2 SitRep

Region 4 SitRep

Region 6 SitRep

FEMA's Senior Leaders Brief

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Please use government email or phone for communication regarding the Agency's hurricane response. Do not create government records on personal devices. Any government records on personal devices become discoverable or subject to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance

	EOC Documentation <EOC_Documentation@epa.gov>	Organizer
	PCC Harvey <PCC_Harvey@epa.gov>	Required

Friday, September 22, 2017

Time 9:30 AM – 10:00 AM
Subject Wendy Blake
Show Time As Busy

Time 10:00 AM – 11:15 AM
Subject ICR Review
Location 3130
Show Time As Busy
Call in number **Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6**

To go through ICRs as we have regs.
The updated ICR list should be available well before we meet.

Materials are attached, and includes different views showing
* what's pending OMB action
* what's in OEI pending submission to OMB
* what's in RCS pending submission to OEI
* what's in the program offices, and
* upcoming 1st FR publications and ICR submissions.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Smith, Peterj <Smith.Peterj@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Avivah Jakob (Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov) <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Optional
Rice, Cody <Rice.Cody@epa.gov>	Optional
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 11:30 AM – 12:45 PM
Subject General
Location Del Friscos
Show Time As Busy
Download and Brainstorm next steps for hearings.

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Required
	Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>	Required
	Avivah Jakob (Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov) <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
	Avivah Jakob (Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov) <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 2:00 PM – 3:00 PM
Subject PMN Internal Meeting
Location 3130A EPA East
Show Time As Busy

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Schweer, Greg <Schweer.Greg@epa.gov>	Required
	Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
	Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 3:30 PM – 4:00 PM
Subject Jeff/5F case
Show Time As Busy

Time 5:00 PM – 6:00 PM
Subject HOLD Paperwork
Show Time As Busy

Monday, September 25, 2017

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject IO General Meeting
Location 3130 WJC EAST Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/28/2017 from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM
Show Time As Busy

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
	Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required

Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Tyree, JamesN <tyree.jamesn@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 8:30 AM – 9:30 AM
Subject Chief of Staff Meeting
Location Alm Room
Show Time As Busy
Please note the location starting 9 May 2017

POC: ALM Room Cheryl Woodward

Attendees	**Name <E-mail>**	**Attendance**
Administrator / Ex. 6	Pruitt, Scott Administrator / Ex. 6	Organizer
	Darwin, Henry <darwin.henry@epa.gov>	Required
	Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Required
	Ferguson, Lincoln <ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov>	Required
	Greaves, Holly <greaves.holly@epa.gov>	Required

Davis, Patrick <davis.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Hupp, Millan <hupp.millan@epa.gov>	Required
McMurray, Forrest <mcmurray.forrest@epa.gov>	Required
Rodrick, Christian <rodrick.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Required
Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
Fotouhi, David <fotouhi.david@epa.gov>	Required
Wilcox, Jahan <wilcox.jahan@epa.gov>	Required
Schwab, Justin <schwab.justin@epa.gov>	Required
Munoz, Charles <munoz.charles@epa.gov>	Required
Hewitt, James <hewitt.james@epa.gov>	Required
Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>	Required
Darwin, Veronica <darwin.veronica@epa.gov>	Required
Traylor, Patrick <traylor.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
Gunasekara, Mandy <Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov>	Required
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
Feeley, Drew (Robert) <feeley.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Letendre, Daisy <letendre.daisy@epa.gov>	Required
Chmielewski, Kevin <chmielewski.kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Kelly, Albert <kelly.albert@epa.gov>	Required
Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Required

Frye, Tony (Robert) <frye.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Dominguez, Alexander <dominguez.alexander@epa.gov>	Required
Palich, Christian <palich.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Abboud, Michael <abboud.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>	Required
Wagner, Kenneth <wagner.kenneth@epa.gov>	Required
Graham, Amy <graham.amy@epa.gov>	Required
Bodine, Susan <bodine.susan@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required
Shimmin, Kaitlyn <shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Optional
Dickerson, Aaron <dickerson.aaron@epa.gov>	Optional
Willis, Sharnett <Willis.Sharnett@epa.gov>	Optional
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
Ford, Hayley <ford.hayley@epa.gov>	Optional
Lovell, Will (William) <lovell.william@epa.gov>	Optional
Kundinger, Kelly <kundinger.kelly@epa.gov>	Required
White, Elizabeth <white.elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Burke, Marcella <burke.marcella@epa.gov>	Required
Sands, Jeffrey <sands.jeffrey@epa.gov>	Required
Hanson, Paige (Catherine) <hanson.catherine@epa.gov>	Required
Wehrum, Bill <Wehrum.Bill@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Required

Harlow, David <harlow.david@epa.gov>	Required
Dourson, Michael <dourson.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Inge, Carolyn <Inge.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 9:30 AM – 10:00 AM

Subject OCSPP Staff Meeting (Skype Video Teleconference)

Location WJC East 3371C - Skype Call-In Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Recurrence Occurs every Monday effective 9/4/2017 until 9/25/2017 from 9:30 AM to 10:00 AM

Show Time As Busy

Updated Conference Call-In Number & added Skype Meeting link for Dial-out option.

....
.....

* Join Skype Meeting
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

This is an online meeting for Skype for Business, the professional meetings and communications app formerly known as Lync.

Join by Phone

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Help <http://intranet.epa.gov/otopintr/webconferencing/ o365-conferencing.html>

[!OC([1033])!]

....
.....

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Organizer

Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>	Required
Gorman, John <Gorman.John@epa.gov>	Required
Sisco, Debby <Sisco.Debby@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Overstreet, Anne <overstreet.anne@epa.gov>	Required
Burden, Susan <Burden.Susan@epa.gov>	Required
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Kovner, Karissa <Kovner.Karissa@epa.gov>	Required
Clark, Sharon <Clark.Sharon@epa.gov>	Required
Filippelli, John <Filippelli.John@epa.gov>	Required
Boutureira, Alan <Boutureira.Alan@epa.gov>	Required
Carter, Pamela <Carter.Pamela@epa.gov>	Required
Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>	Required
DeDora, Caroline <Dedora.Caroline@epa.gov>	Required
Berkley, Bruce <Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov>	Required
LaPosta, Dore <LaPosta.Dore@epa.gov>	Required
Mitchell, Judy-Ann <Mitchell.Judy-Ann@epa.gov>	Required
Smoot, Cameo <Smoot.Cameo@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>	Required

Vineski, Steve <Vineski.Steve@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Graves, Inza <Graves.Inza@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Scott, Elizabeth <Scott.Elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Wooge, William <Wooge.William@epa.gov>	Required
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Weiner, Janet <Weiner.Janet@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Marshall, Venus <Marshall.Venus@epa.gov>	Required
Green, Teresa <Green.Teresa@epa.gov>	Optional
Treimel, Ellen <Treimel.Ellen@epa.gov>	Optional
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Optional
Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>	Optional
Dixon, Diane <Dixon.Diane@epa.gov>	Optional
Metcalf, Alexander <Metcalf.Alexander@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Required
Pane, Vickie <Pane.Vickie@epa.gov>	Optional
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Scott, Gregory <Scott.Gregory@epa.gov>	Required
Scheifele, Hans <Scheifele.Hans@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 10:00 AM – 10:45 AM
Subject Briefing: (ESA) Endangered Species Act
Location Administrator's Office
Show Time As Busy

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Administrator / Ex. 6	Pruitt, Scott Administrator / Ex. 6	Organizer
	Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
	Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required
	Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Required
	Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required
	Ferguson, Lincoln <ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov>	Required
	Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 11:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Subject TSCA Section 12(b)
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy
POC for Meeting Materials: Chris Blunck

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
	Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
	Loraine Passe <Passe.Loraine@epa.gov>	Required
	Myrick, Pamela <Myrick.Pamela@epa.gov>	Required
	Carroll, Megan <Carroll.Megan@epa.gov>	Required
	Sirmons, Chandler <Sirmons.Chandler@epa.gov>	Required
	DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
	Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
	Blunck, Christopher <blunck.chris@epa.gov>	Required
	Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
	Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Optional
	Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required

Time 1:00 PM – 2:00 PM

Subject Hurricanes Maria/Irma/Harvey: PCC Meeting and Conference Call

Location Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Show Time As Tentative

PLEASE: As a reminder, do not place your phone line on hold during the call. Doing so will cause all participants to hear on-hold music and the speakers cannot be heard.

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Meeting invite has been updated with attachments.The PCC agenda will include updates/status reports for hurricanes Jose and Maria as appropriate.

Please use government email or phone for communication regarding the Agency's hurricane response. Do not create government records on personal devices. Any government records on personal devices become discoverable or subject to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
EOC_Deputy_Manager <EOC_Deputy_Manager@epa.gov>	Organizer
PCC Harvey <PCC_Harvey@epa.gov>	Required
Coleman, Sam <Coleman.Sam@epa.gov>	Required
Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Optional
Fonseca, Silvina <Fonseca.Silvina@epa.gov>	Optional
Stepp, Cathy <stepp.cathy@epa.gov>	Optional
Gray, David <gray.david@epa.gov>	Optional
Perovich, Gina <Perovich.Gina@epa.gov>	Optional
Armstead, John A. <Armstead.John@epa.gov>	Optional
Carroll, Craig <Carroll.Craig@epa.gov>	Optional
Brooks, Becky <Brooks.Becky@epa.gov>	Optional
Levine, Carolyn <Levine.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Optional

Mccabe, Catherine <McCabe.Catherine@epa.gov>	Optional
Mclain, Jennifer <Mclain.Jennifer@epa.gov>	Optional
Irizarry, Gilberto <Irizarry.Gilberto@epa.gov>	Optional
Richardson, RobinH <Richardson.RobinH@epa.gov>	Optional
Kling, David <Kling.Dave@epa.gov>	Optional
Mosher, Eric <Mosher.Eric@epa.gov>	Optional
Rodrigues, Cecil <rodrigues.cecil@epa.gov>	Optional
Newton, Cheryl <Newton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Optional
Edwards, Jonathan <Edwards.Jonathan@epa.gov>	Optional
Fotouhi, David <Fotouhi.David@epa.gov>	Optional
Mears, Mary <Mears.Mary@epa.gov>	Optional
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Optional
Flynn, Mike <Flynn.Mike@epa.gov>	Optional
Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Optional
Jenkins, Brandi <Jenkins.Brandi@epa.gov>	Optional
Breen, Barry <Breen.Barry@epa.gov>	Optional
Veal, Lee <Veal.Lee@epa.gov>	Optional
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Optional
Boynton, Lisa <Boynton.Lisa@epa.gov>	Optional
Leonard, Paul <leonard.paul@epa.gov>	Optional
Snowbarger, Robert <Snowbarger.Robert@epa.gov>	Optional
Cacho, Julia <Cacho.Julia@epa.gov>	Optional
Gettle, Jeaneanne <Gettle.Jeaneanne@epa.gov>	Optional
Michaud, John <Michaud.John@epa.gov>	Optional
Kelly, Albert <kelly.albert@epa.gov>	Optional

Chu, Ed <Chu.Ed@epa.gov>	Optional
Cheatham, Reggie <cheatham.reggie@epa.gov>	Optional
Clark, Becki <Clark.Becki@epa.gov>	Optional
Indermark, Michele <Indermark.Michele@epa.gov>	Optional
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
Schlieger, Brian <schlieger.brian@epa.gov>	Optional
Mugdan, Walter <Mugdan.Walter@epa.gov>	Optional
Simon, Nigel <Simon.Nigel@epa.gov>	Optional
Gross, Bonnie <Gross.bonnie@epa.gov>	Optional
Davis, Patrick <davis.patrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Rodan, Bruce <rodan.bruce@epa.gov>	Optional
Peterson, Mary <Peterson.Mary@epa.gov>	Optional
Heard, Anne <Heard.Anne@epa.gov>	Optional
Shapiro, Mike <Shapiro.Mike@epa.gov>	Optional
Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>	Optional
Jenkins, Katherine <jenkins.katherine@epa.gov>	Optional
Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Optional
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Optional
Lapierre, Kenneth <Lapierre.Kenneth@epa.gov>	Optional
Grevatt, Peter <Grevatt.Peter@epa.gov>	Optional
Edlund, Carl <Edlund.Carl@epa.gov>	Optional
EOC_Manager, <EOC_Manager@epa.gov>	Optional
Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 2:00 PM – 4:00 PM
Subject Coal Tar Sealcoat Request for Reconsideration (RFR) Executive Panel Briefing
Location DCRoomARN5020/DC-AR-OEI

Show Time As Busy

Additional background material: Final CoalTar RFR Briefing Package 20170925 <https://usepa-my.sharepoint.com/personal/thoma_connie_epa_gov/Documents/14003%20Deliberation/Panel%20Materials/Final%20CoalTar%20RFR%20Briefing%20%20Package%20201709 25?e=5%3Aa4773cac0a1b4799a71ab2492adb2081>

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Adobe Connect Meeting

Name: Request for Reconsideration

Summary: Executive Panel Briefing

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Title of meeting or event: Coal Tar Sealcoat Request for Reconsideration (RFR) Executive Panel Briefing

Purpose: Brief Three Executive Panel Members regarding an Information Quality Guidelines Request

Desired Outcome: Agency's response to the Pavement Coatings Technology Council's RFR

Will there be advanced materials submitted? Yes

The individual providing materials: Connie Thoma

Date desired for meeting no later than: July 26 to 28, 2017

Length of meeting/event: 2.0 hours

Location: WJCN 5020

Participants:

1. Panel Members

Steven Fine, Acting CIO/AA OEI

fine.steven@epa.gov <mailto:fine.steven@epa.gov>

Samantha Dravis, EPA Policy Advisor

dravis.samantha@epa.gov <mailto:dravis.samantha@epa.gov>

Nancy Beck, Acting DAA OCSPP

beck.nancy@epa.gov <mailto:breen.barry@epa.gov>

2. Presenters

Mike Shapiro, Acting AA OW

shapiro.mike@epa.gov <mailto:shapiro.mike@epa.gov>

Scot Hagerthey, Supervisory Ecologist, ORD/NCEA

hagerthey.scot@epa.gov <mailto:hagerthey.scot@epa.gov>

3. Advisors

Tracy Sheppard, Attorney Advisor Office of General Counsel

sheppard.tracy@epa.gov <mailto:sheppard.tracy@epa.gov>

Rebecca Moser, Director OEI/OEIP

moser.rebecca@epa.gov <mailto:moser.rebecca@epa.gov>

Monica Jones, Deputy Director OEI/OEIP

jones.monica@epa.gov <mailto:jones.monica@epa.gov>

Vincia Holloman, Acting Director OEI/OEIP/EQMD

holloman.vincia@epa.gov <mailto:holloman.vincia@epa.gov>

4. Technical Staff

Kevin Kirby

IQG Lead, OEI/OEIP/EQMD

kirby.kevin@epa.gov <mailto:kirby.kevin@epa.gov>

Connie Thoma, RFR Manager, OEI/OEIP/EQMD

thoma.connie@epa.gov <mailto:thoma.connie@epa.gov>

Gary Norris, Supervisory Physical Scientist, ORD/NERL

norris.gary@epa.gov <mailto:norris.gary@epa.gov>

Kate Schofield, Ecologist, ORD/NCEA

schofield.kate@epa.gov <mailto:schofield.kate@epa.gov>

Sue Norton, Ecologist, ORD/NCEA

norton.susan@epa.gov <mailto:norton.susan@epa.gov>

Christopher Kloss, OW/WPD

kloss.christoper@epa.gov <mailto:kloss.christoper@epa.gov>

ED_002528_00001824-00136

Erika Farris, Environmental Scientist, OW

farris.erika@epa.gov <mailto:farris.erika@epa.gov>

As of June 29, 2017: Meeting scheduled per CThoma. Susan

As of August 17, 2017: Meeting rescheduled per CThoma.-Susan

As of September 22, 2017: Meeting materials added per MJones request-Susan

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Fine, Steven <fine.steven@epa.gov>	Organizer
Shapiro, Mike <Shapiro.Mike@epa.gov>	Required
Hagerthey, Scot <Hagerthey.Scot@epa.gov>	Required
Sheppard, Tracy <Sheppard.Tracy@epa.gov>	Required
Moser, Rebecca <Moser.Rebecca@EPA.GOV>	Required
Jones, Monica <Jones.Monica@epa.gov>	Required
Holloman, Vincia <Holloman.Vincia@epa.gov>	Required
Kirby, Kevin <KIRBY.KEVIN@EPA.GOV>	Required
Thoma, Connie <Thoma.Connie@epa.gov>	Required
Norris, Gary <Norris.Gary@epa.gov>	Required
Schofield, Kate <Schofield.Kate@epa.gov>	Required
Norton, Sue <Norton.Susan@epa.gov>	Required
Kloss, Christopher <Kloss.Christopher@epa.gov>	Required
Farris, Erika D. <Farris.Erika@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Jacks, Susan <Jacks.Susan@epa.gov>	Optional
Jones, Tawaunna <Jones.Tawaunna@epa.gov>	Optional
Jones-Parra, Lisa <Jones-Parra.Lisa@epa.gov>	Optional
Grogard, Megan <Grogard.Megan@epa.gov>	Optional

Sawyers, Andrew <Sawyers.Andrew@epa.gov>	Optional
Frace, Sheila <Frace.Sheila@epa.gov>	Optional
Nagle, Deborah <Nagle.Deborah@epa.gov>	Optional
Urban, Rachel <Urban.Rachel@epa.gov>	Optional
Borum, Denis <Borum.Denis@epa.gov>	Optional
Heninger, Brian <Heninger.Brian@epa.gov>	Optional
Pasurka, Carl <Pasurka.Carl@epa.gov>	Optional
McGartland, Al <McGartland.Al@epa.gov>	Optional
Dockins, Chris <Dockins.Chris@epa.gov>	Optional
Marten, Alex <Marten.Alex@epa.gov>	Optional
Snyder, Brett <Snyder.Brett@epa.gov>	Optional
Bowen, Jennifer <Bowen.Jennifer@epa.gov>	Optional
Watkins, Stephen <watkins.stephen@epa.gov>	Optional
Fegley, Robert <Fegley.Robert@epa.gov>	Optional
Tallent, Robert <Tallent.Robert@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 4:00 PM – 5:00 PM
Subject Pre-Prioritization Call in number **Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6**
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy

Hi everyone,

Our next meeting is Monday the 25th. Rusty unfortunately won't be able to join us and provide the ORD-NCCT update. My apologies for not being able to move the meeting, but there didn't seem to be any other options next week. So moving forward for the next two weeks the plan is:

Sept 25 4pm– Discuss reaction/edits to:
1. Background of the Pre-Prioritization document – attached
2. 1-pager outlining our approach to 'Working the 2014 Work Plan chemicals' – attached
a. This was discussed last week after the Work Plan presentation. It was clear that the Work Plan would entail two approaches 1) Working the 2014 Work Plan as mandated by the statute and 2) developing an additional work plan method above and beyond the 2014 Plan
3. Any additional thoughts from other 2-pagers that were updated

after the initial discussions: SCIL, Canada, high-throughput methods, Work Plan (#2 above), and sectors

Oct 2 10am – Rusty's update on ORD-NCCT progress

If each group would please forward the most recent versions of your 2 pagers. I would like to start getting these finalized and it would be helpful to send them out in 1 document.
I received the updated version from Lauren and the SCIL group which is also attached.
Also the most recent goal and guiding principles document is attached.

If you have any edits on these prior to the upcoming meetings you can send them on to me or technical questions on to the specific groups.

Thanks so much,
Susanna

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Frithsen, Jeff <Frithsen.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Susanna Blair (Blair.Susanna@epa.gov) <Blair.Susanna@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Henry, Tala <henry.tala@epa.gov>	Required
Brian Grant <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Mclean, Kevin <Mclean.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Thomas, Russell <Thomas.Russell@epa.gov>	Required
Chang, Daniel <chang.daniel@epa.gov>	Required
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
David Widawsky <Widawsky.David@epa.gov>	Required
Frazer, Brian <Frazer.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Davies, Clive <Davies.Clive@epa.gov>	Required
Lauren Sweet (sweet.lauren@epa.gov) <sweet.lauren@epa.gov>	Required

DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Mojica, Andrea <Mojica.andrea@epa.gov>	Optional
Wolf, Joel <Wolf.Joel@epa.gov>	Optional
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Optional
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Anderson, Steve <anderson.steve@epa.gov>	Required
Celeste, Laurel <celeste.laurel@epa.gov>	Required

Tuesday, September 26, 2017

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM

Subject IO General Meeting

Location 3130 WJC EAST (Call in Number **Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6**

Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/28/2017 from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM

Show Time As Busy

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Optional

Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Tyree, JamesN <tyree.jamesn@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject reg agenda items
Location 3130 or Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Show Time As Busy

Does 8:30 work to have a targeted discussion on the reg agenda questions from OP?
Please include others as needed

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Richard Keigwin (Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov) <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Smith, Peterj <Smith.Peterj@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Avivah Jakob (Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov) <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Mary Hanley (Hanley.Mary@epa.gov) <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Clark, Sharon <Clark.Sharon@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 9:30 AM – 10:15 AM
Subject ECO Lab Meeting
Location RM 3156 EPA East
Show Time As Busy

Directions: Please use the William Jefferson Clinton East Entrance located at 1201 Constitution Avenue. Please arrive 15 minutes prior to the meeting with photo IDs to clear Security.

EPA Contact: For an escort from Security to the meeting call (202) 564-2902 or (202) 564-2910.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
conrad.lass@ogilvygr.com <conrad.lass@ogilvygr.com>	Required
Richard Keigwin <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Optional
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Optional
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 10:15 AM – 10:45 AM
Subject Section 5(e) Review Process
Location RM 3156 EPA East Building
Show Time As Busy

Purpose/Subject: To discuss Section 5 (e) Review Process—with Christine Bryant and Bob Skoglund from Covestro

Location Address: 1201 Constitution Avenue, NW – Washington, DC

Please have the guards call 202-564-2910 or 202-564-2902 for an escort.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
hutchinsont@gtlaw.com <hutchinsont@gtlaw.com>	Required
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Optional
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required

Time 11:00 AM – 11:30 AM
Subject Fall Meetings Discussion
Location RM 3130A EPA East
Show Time As Busy

Does 11am work instead?
I have to do another call at 11:30.

Thanks.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Avivah Jakob (Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov) <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Marshall, Venus <Marshall.Venus@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Clark, Sharon <Clark.Sharon@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 11:30 AM – 12:00 PM
Subject TSCA Neg-Rulemaking
Location Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Organizer
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required

Time 12:30 PM – 1:00 PM
Subject SES Performance Evaluations
Location 3130A East; Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Organizer
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required

Time 1:00 PM – 1:30 PM
Subject HOLD - Paperwork
Show Time As Busy

Time 1:30 PM – 2:15 PM
Subject Hiring and PRIA with OCSPP
Location WJC-N 3130A
Show Time As Busy

Sct: Tamika Burton, Personal Phone / Ex. 6

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	Flynn, Mike <Flynn.Mike@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
	Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
	Bloom, David <Bloom.David@epa.gov>	Required
	Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Optional
	Layne, Arnold <layne.arnold@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 2:30 PM – 3:00 PM
Subject International Activities
Location RM 3156 EPA East
Show Time As Busy
Call in number **Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6**

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Mosby, Jackie <Mosby.Jackie@epa.gov>	Required
	Herndon, George <Herndon.George@epa.gov>	Required
	Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>	Optional
	Wormell, Lance <Wormell.Lance@epa.gov>	Optional
	Parrott, Patricia <parrott.patricia@epa.gov>	Optional
	Hall, Wanda <Hall.Wanda@epa.gov>	Optional
	Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Optional
	Lowit, Anna <Lowit.Anna@epa.gov>	Optional
	Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Optional
	Marshall, Venus <Marshall.Venus@epa.gov>	Optional
	Diane Isbell <Isbell.Diane@epa.gov>	Optional
	Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Optional
	Emdur, Zoe <Emdur.Zoe@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 4:00 PM – 5:00 PM
Subject Biostimulants Draft Guidance Briefing
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
McNally, Robert <Mcnally.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>	Required
Hollis, Linda <Hollis.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Jones, Russell <Jones.Russell@epa.gov>	Required
Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>	Required
Kaczmarek, Chris <Kaczmarek.Chris@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Optional
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Gsell, Alyssa <Gsell.Alyssa@epa.gov>	Optional
Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 5:00 PM – 5:15 PM
Subject General
Location RM 3130A EPA East
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Required
Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>	Optional

Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required

Time 5:30 PM – 6:00 PM
Subject SAP EDSP
Location stan will call nancy at Personal Phone / Ex. 6
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>	Required

Wednesday, September 27, 2017

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject IO General Meeting
Location 3130 WJC EAST Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/28/2017 from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional

Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Tyree, JamesN <tyree.jamesn@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 9:30 AM – 10:30 AM
Subject Briefing on 610 Lead Review
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy

Purpose: To brief Nancy on the 610 Lead Review. Background: Section 610 of the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) requires that federal agencies review each rule that has or will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities (SISNOSE) within ten years of publication of the final rule. EPA initiates a Section 610 review in order to determine if the provisions of a rule that are related to small entities should be continued without change, rescinded, or amended to minimize adverse economic impacts on small entities.

POC for Meeting Materials: Chris Blunck

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Frazer, Brian <Frazer.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Symmes, Brian (Symmes.Brian@epa.gov) <Symmes.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Price, Michelle <Price.Michelle@epa.gov>	Required
Tierney, Meghan <Tierney.Meghan@epa.gov>	Required
Shafer, Jonathan <shafer.jonathan@epa.gov>	Required
Goodlow, Toiya <Goodlow.Toiya@epa.gov>	Required
Shannon, Julie <Shannon.Julie@EPA.GOV>	Required
Silagi, William <Silagi.William@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <blunck.chris@epa.gov>	Required
Scheifele, Hans <scheifele.hans@epa.gov>	Required

Anderson, Steve <anderson.steve@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Smith, Peterj <Smith.Peterj@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Edmonds, Marc <Edmonds.Marc@epa.gov>	Optional
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource

---

Time 10:15 AM – 10:45 AM
Subject Briefing: Dicamba
Location Administrator's Office
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Administrator / Ex. 6 Pruitt, Scott Administrator / Ex. 6	Organizer
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required

Time 11:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Subject OPPT General
Location 3130A WJC East Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Wednesday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/27/2017 from 11:00 AM to 12:00 PM
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
Clark, Sharon <Clark.Sharon@epa.gov>	Required
Scott, Elizabeth <Scott.Elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>	Required
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Optional
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required

Strauss.Linda@epa.gov <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hartman, Mark <Hartman.Mark@epa.gov>	Optional
Cherepy, Andrea <Cherepy.Andrea@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Required
Scheifele, Hans <Scheifele.Hans@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 12:00 PM – 1:00 PM
Subject CEQ
Location 730 Jackson Place
Show Time As Busy
Chris Prandoni

Time 12:45 PM – 1:00 PM
Subject Transportation to OMB
Show Time As Busy
Pick up van by metro elevator on 12 street

Janet Chapman Personal Phone / Ex. 6 Contact Person

Time 1:00 PM – 2:00 PM
Subject HOLD - OMB Hearing on FY 2019 President's Budget
Location New Executive Office Office Building, OMB Headquarters
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Richard Keigwin <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Arnold Layne (Layne.Arnold@epa.gov) <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>	Required

Graves, Inza <Graves.Inza@epa.gov>	Required
Bruce Berkley <Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov>	Required
Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Richard Keigwin <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Arnold Layne (Layne.Arnold@epa.gov) <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Bruce Berkley <Berkley.Bruce@epa.gov>	Required

Time 2:05 PM – 2:30 PM
Subject Transportation to EPA East
Show Time As Busy

Time 2:30 PM – 3:00 PM
Subject Intraspecies Factor Whitepaper
Location 3130A EPA East
Show Time As Busy
Purpose: Discuss Risk Assessment Forum White Paper on the Intraspecies Factor

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Lowit, Anna <Lowit.Anna@epa.gov>	Required
Axelrad, Daniel <Axelrad.Daniel@epa.gov>	Required
Setzer, Woodrow <Setzer.Woodrow@epa.gov>	Required
Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 3:00 PM – 4:00 PM
Subject OGC Weekly Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance

Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Cunningham-HQ, Barbara <Cunningham-HQ.Barbara@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Barone, Stan <Barone.Stan@epa.gov>	Required
Mclean, Kevin <Mclean.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Graves, Inza <Graves.Inza@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Grant, Brian <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Perlis, Robert <Perlis.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Simons, Andrew <Simons.Andrew@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Kaczmarek, Chris <Kaczmarek.Chris@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Anderson, Monique <anderson.monique@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Optional
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Cunningham-HQ, Barbara <Cunningham-HQ.Barbara@epa.gov>	Required

Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Grant, Brian <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required

Time 4:00 PM – 4:50 PM
Subject RCC activities
Location DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
Show Time As Busy

Purpose: To discuss what the office is planning on doing and level of interest re the Regulatory Cooperation Council.
POC for Meeting Materials: Chris Blunck (OPPT) Avivah Jakob (OPP)

Call in number: **Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6**

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Required
Moss, Kenneth <Moss.Kenneth@epa.gov>	Required
Myrick, Pamela <Myrick.Pamela@epa.gov>	Required
Nazef, Laura <Nazef.Laura@epa.gov>	Required
Moose, Lindsay <Moose.Lindsay@epa.gov>	Required
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Required
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>	Required

Mosby, Jackie <Mosby.Jackie@epa.gov>	Required
Herndon, George <Herndon.George@epa.gov>	Required
Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Metcalf, Alexander <Metcalf.Alexander@epa.gov>	Required
Wormell, Lance <Wormell.Lance@epa.gov>	Optional
DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP <DCRoomEast3156@epa.gov>	Resource
Diane Isbell <Isbell.Diane@epa.gov>	Optional
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Optional
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Emdur, Zoe <Emdur.Zoe@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 5:15 PM – 5:45 PM
Subject General
Location Maureen will call Nancy at Personal Phone / Ex. 6
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Sullivan, Maureen SES OSD OUSD ATL (US) <maureen.sullivan18.civ@mail.mil>	Required

---

Thursday, September 28, 2017

Time 8:30 AM – 9:00 AM
Subject IO General Meeting
Location 3130 WJC EAST Call in Number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Recurrence Occurs every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday effective 9/6/2017 until 9/28/2017 from 8:30 AM to 9:00 AM
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Dunton, Cheryl <Dunton.Cheryl@epa.gov>	Required
Strauss, Linda <Strauss.Linda@epa.gov>	Required

Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>	Required
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required
Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>	Required
Keller, Kaitlin <keller.kaitlin@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Morales, Oscar <Morales.Oscar@epa.gov>	Required
Shimkin, Martha <Shimkin.Martha@epa.gov>	Optional
Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional
Tyree, JamesN <tyree.jamesn@epa.gov>	Optional
Erik Baptist (baptist.erik@epa.gov) <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 8:30 AM – 9:30 AM
Subject Chief of Staff Meeting
Location Alm Room
Show Time As Busy
Please note the location starting 9 May 2017

POC: ALM Room Cheryl Woodward

Attendees	**Name <E-mail>**	**Attendance**
Administrator / Ex. 6	Pruitt, Scott Administrator / Ex. 6	Organizer
	Darwin, Henry <darwin.henry@epa.gov>	Required
	Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Required
	Ferguson, Lincoln <ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov>	Required
	Greaves, Holly <greaves.holly@epa.gov>	Required
	Davis, Patrick <davis.patrick@epa.gov>	Required

Hupp, Millan <hupp.millan@epa.gov>	Required
McMurray, Forrest <mcmurray.forrest@epa.gov>	Required
Rodrick, Christian <rodrick.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>	Required
Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
Fotouhi, David <fotouhi.david@epa.gov>	Required
Wilcox, Jahan <wilcox.jahan@epa.gov>	Required
Schwab, Justin <schwab.justin@epa.gov>	Required
Munoz, Charles <munoz.charles@epa.gov>	Required
Hewitt, James <hewitt.james@epa.gov>	Required
Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>	Required
Darwin, Veronica <darwin.veronica@epa.gov>	Required
Traylor, Patrick <traylor.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
Gunasekara, Mandy <Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov>	Required
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Required
Feeley, Drew (Robert) <feeley.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Letendre, Daisy <letendre.daisy@epa.gov>	Required
Chmielewski, Kevin <chmielewski.kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Kelly, Albert <kelly.albert@epa.gov>	Required
Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Required
Frye, Tony (Robert) <frye.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Dominguez, Alexander <dominguez.alexander@epa.gov>	Required

Palich, Christian <palich.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Abboud, Michael <abboud.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>	Required
Wagner, Kenneth <wagner.kenneth@epa.gov>	Required
Graham, Amy <graham.amy@epa.gov>	Required
Bodine, Susan <bodine.susan@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required
Shimmin, Kaitlyn <shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Dickerson, Aaron <dickerson.aaron@epa.gov>	Optional
Willis, Sharnett <Willis.Sharnett@epa.gov>	Optional
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
Ford, Hayley <ford.hayley@epa.gov>	Optional
Lovell, Will (William) <lovell.william@epa.gov>	Optional
Darwin, Henry <darwin.henry@epa.gov>	Required
Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Required
Ferguson, Lincoln <ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov>	Required
Greaves, Holly <greaves.holly@epa.gov>	Required
Davis, Patrick <davis.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Hupp, Millan <hupp.millan@epa.gov>	Required
McMurray, Forrest <mcmurray.forrest@epa.gov>	Required
Rodrick, Christian <rodrick.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Greenwalt, Sarah <greenwalt.sarah@epa.gov>	Required

Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Required
Fotouhi, David <fotouhi.david@epa.gov>	Required
Wilcox, Jahan <wilcox.jahan@epa.gov>	Required
Schwab, Justin <schwab.justin@epa.gov>	Required
Munoz, Charles <munoz.charles@epa.gov>	Required
Hewitt, James <hewitt.james@epa.gov>	Required
Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>	Required
Darwin, Veronica <darwin.veronica@epa.gov>	Required
Traylor, Patrick <traylor.patrick@epa.gov>	Required
Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
Gunasekara, Mandy <Gunasekara.Mandy@epa.gov>	Required
Feeley, Drew (Robert) <feeley.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Yamada, Richard (Yujiro) <yamada.richard@epa.gov>	Required
Letendre, Daisy <letendre.daisy@epa.gov>	Required
Chmielewski, Kevin <chmielewski.kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Kelly, Albert <kelly.albert@epa.gov>	Required
Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Required
Frye, Tony (Robert) <frye.robert@epa.gov>	Required
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Dominguez, Alexander <dominguez.alexander@epa.gov>	Required
Palich, Christian <palich.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Abboud, Michael <abboud.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>	Required
Wagner, Kenneth <wagner.kenneth@epa.gov>	Required

Graham, Amy <graham.amy@epa.gov>	Required
Bodine, Susan <bodine.susan@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Brittany <bolen.brittany@epa.gov>	Required
Shimmin, Kaitlyn <shimmin.kaitlyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Optional
Dickerson, Aaron <dickerson.aaron@epa.gov>	Optional
Willis, Sharnett <Willis.Sharnett@epa.gov>	Optional
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
Ford, Hayley <ford.hayley@epa.gov>	Optional
Lovell, Will (William) <lovell.william@epa.gov>	Optional
Kundinger, Kelly <kundinger.kelly@epa.gov>	Required
White, Elizabeth <white.elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required
Burke, Marcella <burke.marcella@epa.gov>	Required
Sands, Jeffrey <sands.jeffrey@epa.gov>	Required
Hanson, Paige (Catherine) <hanson.catherine@epa.gov>	Required
Wehrum, Bill <Wehrum.Bill@epa.gov>	Required
Bolen, Derrick <bolen.derrick@epa.gov>	Required
Harlow, David <harlow.david@epa.gov>	Required
Dourson, Michael <dourson.michael@epa.gov>	Required
Inge, Carolyn <Inge.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 10:00 AM – 11:00 AM
Subject Region 3 Ag Advisors
Location RM 3371C EPA East
Show Time As Busy
Meeting Title: Region 3 State Agriculture Secretaries Meeting
Room Location with VTC: R3 RA Conference Room
Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6 >) (R3 is Hosting and will open the Line)
Date/Time 9/28/17 - - 9:45am- 11:45am
R3 IT Contact: James Robson (215-814-5656).

Attendees	Name <E-mail>	Attendance
	Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
	Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>	Required
	Avivah Jakob (Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov) <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
	Richard Keigwin (Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov) <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
	Wagner, Kenneth <wagner.kenneth@epa.gov>	Required
	Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
	DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO <DCRoomEast3371c@epa.gov>	Resource
	Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional
	Avivah Jakob (Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov) <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
	Richard Keigwin (Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov) <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
	Louise Wise (Wise.Louise@epa.gov) <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required

---

Time 10:00 AM – 3:30 PM
Subject Annual State Agriculture Secretaries' Meeting
Location EPA R3 Ofc (1650 Arch St., Phila., PA 19103)
Show Time As Free
Final Agenda Attached.

Hello All: This email invite is to confirm the next State Agriculture Secretaries Meeting with EPA Region III. The meeting will be held on Thursday, September 28th, 2017 from 10 am – 3:30 pm at U.S. EPA Region III Office in Philadelphia (location: 1650 Arch Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103.

*Final Agenda Attached.

* Once you have arrived in the Lobby of the US EPA Region III Office, ask Security to call (215-814-2900) for an escort to the RA's Conference Room. Please make sure you have valid identification to enter the building.

* Lunch will be provided for $10 per person. Lunch include a house salad, assorted hoagie and wrap trays, cookies and beverage. If you

should have any food restrictions, there are alternative eateries in the area that deliver as well.

*If you should need a list of Hotels or Parking locations, please contact our Front Office at 215-814-2900.

If you should have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Rhonda Purnell or Renee Searfoss of the Regional Administrator's Staff, at 215-814-2900.

Thank You.

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Rodrigues, Cecil <rodrigues.cecil@epa.gov>	Organizer
Scuse, Michael (DDA) <Michael.Scuse@state.de.us>	Required
joe.bartenfelder@maryland.gov <joe.bartenfelder@maryland.gov>	Required
rredding@pa.gov <rredding@pa.gov>	Required
basil.gooden@governor.virginia.gov <basil.gooden@governor.virginia.gov>	Required
kleonhardt@wvda.us <kleonhardt@wvda.us>	Required
Hatton, Joseph <jhatton@wvda.us>	Required
Armstead, John A. <Armstead.John@epa.gov>	Required
Nitsch, Chad <Nitsch.Chad@epa.gov>	Required
Bennett, Tate <Bennett.Tate@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Wildermuth, Lisa (DDA <lisa.wildermuth@state.de.us>	Optional
amanda.wilson@maryland.gov <amanda.wilson@maryland.gov>	Optional
McCrone, Nicole D <nmccrone@pa.gov>	Optional
Branch-Ellis, Desire (GOV <Desire.Branch-Ellis@governor.virginia.gov>	Optional
Gothard, Robin <RGothard@wvda.us>	Optional

ED_002528_00001824-00160

Martin, Jodee <jodeemartin@wvda.us>	Optional
szarefoss@pa.gov <szarefoss@pa.gov>	Optional
deborah.proud@maryland.gov <deborah.proud@maryland.gov>	Optional
Shenk, Kelly <shenk.kelly@epa.gov>	Optional
Ferrell, Mark <Ferrell.Mark@epa.gov>	Optional
Miller, Linda <miller.linda@epa.gov>	Optional
D'Andrea, Michael <DANDREA.MICHAEL@EPA.GOV>	Optional
White, Terri-A <White.Terri-A@epa.gov>	Optional
Zieba, Kyle <Zieba.Kyle@epa.gov>	Optional
Brown, Kinshasa <Brown.Kinshasa@epa.gov>	Optional
Hamilton, Brian <Hamilton.Brian@epa.gov>	Optional
Searfoss, Renee <searfoss.renee@epa.gov>	Optional
Purnell, Rhonda <Purnell.rhonda@epa.gov>	Optional
Gomez, Magdalin <Gomez.Magdalin@epa.gov>	Optional
Brown, Karl <kbrown@pa.gov>	Optional

Time 11:00 AM – 11:45 AM

Subject New Chemicals: Non-Order SNURs Call in number Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Location WJC East 3156

Show Time As Busy

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Cherepy, Andrea <Cherepy.Andrea@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Required

Scheifele, Hans <Scheifele.Hans@epa.gov>	Required
Grant, Brian <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Required
Wills, Jennifer <Wills.Jennifer@epa.gov>	Optional
Sadowsky, Don <Sadowsky.Don@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Thaler, Elizabeth <thaler.elizabeth@epa.gov>	Optional
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 11:30 AM – 12:00 PM
Subject General Discussion
Location 3402 WJC-N
Show Time As Busy
Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Organizer
Flynn, Mike <Flynn.Mike@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required

Time 12:30 PM – 2:00 PM
Subject Early Guidance Meeting – Regulation of PBT Chemicals under TSCA §6(h) (Tier 2, SAN 6015)
Location DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO
Show Time As Busy

Call-in number: **Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6**

BACKGROUND
OCSPP is developing a proposed rule to implement EPA's mandate under §6(h) of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). TSCA §6(h) requires EPA to prohibit or limit the manufacture (including import), processing, distribution in commerce, use, and/or any manner or method of disposal of certain persistent, bioaccumulative, and toxic (PBT) chemicals. TSCA §6(h) requires the Agency to address the risks of injury to health or the environment that it determines are presented by the PBT chemicals and to reduce exposure to them to the extent practicable. Although EPA is not required to conduct a TSCA risk evaluation to support the rulemaking, the Agency may need to

conduct a variety of analyses to, among other things, demonstrate the costs, benefits, and practicability of the regulatory options that will be developed. In addition, OCSPP anticipates that this rulemaking will be subject to the requirement for a Small Business Advocacy Review panel under the Regulatory Flexibility Act and various other consultation requirements. This rulemaking is subject to statutory deadlines. EPA must issue a notice of proposed rulemaking by June 21, 2019, and promulgate a final rule by December 22, 2020.

PURPOSE OF THIS MEETING

This is an Early Guidance meeting under EPA's Action Development Process (ADP). Under the ADP, Early Guidance is the formal first step in the development process for Tier 1 and Tier 2 rulemakings. Early guidance from management is used to establish policy and analytical priorities and communicate expectations for the rulemaking workgroup. At this step of the process, senior managers from the participating offices are afford the opportunity to meaningfully contribute to the priority-setting and general direction for the workgroup's efforts by identifying any issues of significant interest or concern. The OCSPP DAA (Nancy Beck) will provide early guidance, i.e., establishes policy and analytical priorities for the rulemaking and communicates expectations for the development of the rule, with input from participating AAs from across the Agency.

Can I delegate this meeting? Yes. As the ADP procedures require, the meeting invitation is directed to the AAs for the offices that are participating in the development of this action. The invited (Acting) AAs, at their discretion, may delegate attendance to someone else within their offices – usually another senior manager - who is authorized to speak on their behalf. If appropriate, please forward or delegate this invitation.

Does my office need to participate? Attendance is required only if the invited AAs, their management-level designees, and/or the workgroup representative(s) (if authorized to speak on an invited AA's behalf) expect to will raise any issues or concerns related to the development of the action to the OCSPP DAA for consideration. If there are multiple representatives on the workgroup from an participating office, that office is expected to reconcile any disparate views and present a unified position concerning any question or issue at the early guidance meeting. Seating in the conference room is limited, so each office is asked to please send its designated management official or representative and "+1". Others may participate via conference call.

Can I call-in for the meeting? Yes. **Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6**

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

What happens after the meeting? After the meeting, OCSPP will document the key issues/questions discussed during the meeting, as well as any decisions about the early development of the action and actions that need to be taken in follow-up to the meeting. OCSPP will also document any direction received after the meeting if further senior-level consider is necessary. OCSPP will distribute the early guidance document to all workgroup members and other meeting participants, and upload a copy of the documentation to the ADP Tracker database. In keeping with the direction provided at this step in the process, the workgroup will then begin to develop an analytical blueprint that sets out its plan for collecting needed information;

conducting scientific, legal, and economic analyses (as applicable); and consulting with affected stakeholders.

MEETING INVITEES
OCSPP has invited the following senior leaders, with their respective Regulatory Steering Committee <http://intranet.epa.gov/adplibrary/rsc/rsc.htm> representatives listed in parenthesis:

OCHP – Ruth Etzel (Brenda Foos)
OECA – Larry Starfield (Keith Bartlett)
OGC – Kevin Minoli (Andy Simons/Kevin McLean)
OLEM – Barry Breen (Gerain Cogliano/Bill Noggle)
OP – Samantha Dravis (Mark Corrales/Stuart Miles-McLean)
ORD – Bob Kavlock (Bob Fegley/Jackie McQueen/Stephen Watkins)

The participating offices are represented on the rulemaking workgroup, as follows:
OCHP – Zaida Figueroa
OECA – Mark Garvey (OCE)
OGC – Brian Grant (primary, PTSLO), Steve Anderson (PTSLO)
OLEM – Stiven Foster (OPM)
OP – Sharon Cooperstein (primary, PRAD), Glenn Farber (PRAD)
ORD – Jace Cuje (primary, OSP), Dan Vallero (NERL)

BRIEFING MATERIALS
OCSPP will disseminate briefing materials at least 5 work days before the meeting. Early guidance meeting materials are considered pre-decisional, deliberative internal documents. The materials should not be cited, quoted or released, nor should they be distributed broadly within EPA.

POINTS OF CONTACT
* Meeting coordinator: Peter Smith (202-564-0262)
* Meeting materials: Cindy Wheeler (202-566-0484).

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Wise, Louise <Wise.Louise@epa.gov>	Required
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Smith, Peterj <Smith.Peterj@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
Wheeler, Cindy <Wheeler.Cindy@epa.gov>	Required
Frazer, Brian <Frazer.Brian@epa.gov>	Required

ED_002528_00001824-00164

Gimlin, Peter <Gimlin.Peter@epa.gov>	Required
Widawsky, David <Widawsky.David@epa.gov>	Required
Rice, Cody <Rice.Cody@epa.gov>	Required
Etzel, Ruth <Etzel.Ruth@epa.gov>	Required
Figueroa, Zaida <Figueroa.Zaida@epa.gov>	Required
Minoli, Kevin <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Mclean, Kevin <Mclean.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Grant, Brian <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Starfield, Lawrence <Starfield.Lawrence@epa.gov>	Required
Garvey, Mark <Garvey.Mark@epa.gov>	Required
Breen, Barry <Breen.Barry@epa.gov>	Required
Foster, Stiven <Foster.Stiven@epa.gov>	Required
Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>	Required
Cooperstein, Sharon <Cooperstein.Sharon@epa.gov>	Required
Farber, Glenn <Farber.Glenn@epa.gov>	Required
Kavlock, Robert <Kavlock.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Cuje, Jace <Cuje.Jace@epa.gov>	Required
Vallero, Dan <Vallero.Daniel@epa.gov>	Required
Hofmann, Angela <Hofmann.Angela@epa.gov>	Optional
Green, Teresa <Green.Teresa@epa.gov>	Optional
Chun, Melissa <Chun.Melissa@epa.gov>	Optional
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Optional
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Canavan, Sheila <Canavan.Sheila@epa.gov>	Optional

Wolf, Joel <Wolf.Joel@epa.gov>	Optional
Kramek, Niva <kramek.niva@epa.gov>	Optional
Comnes, Meredith <comnes.meredith@epa.gov>	Optional
Feustel, Ingrid <feustel.ingrid@epa.gov>	Optional
Jarmul, Stephanie <jarmul.stephanie@epa.gov>	Optional
Lloyd, Tyler <Lloyd.Tyler@epa.gov>	Optional
Passe, Loraine <Passe.Loraine@epa.gov>	Optional
Yakal, Randy <yakal.randy@epa.gov>	Optional
Symmes, Brian <Symmes.Brian@epa.gov>	Optional
Winchester, Erik <Winchester.Erik@epa.gov>	Optional
Courtnage, Robert <Courtnage.Robert@EPA.GOV>	Optional
Coleman, Todd <coleman.todd@epa.gov>	Optional
Price, Michelle <Price.Michelle@epa.gov>	Optional
Edmonds, Marc <Edmonds.Marc@epa.gov>	Optional
Shafer, Jonathan <shafer.jonathan@epa.gov>	Optional
Wilkins, John <Wilkins.John@epa.gov>	Optional
Yowell, John <yowell.john@epa.gov>	Optional
Catilina, Eliane <Catilina.Eliane@epa.gov>	Optional
Giuffria, Jonathon <giuffria.jonathon@epa.gov>	Optional
Suazo, Stephanie <Suazo.Stephanie@epa.gov>	Optional
Foos, Brenda <Foos.Brenda@epa.gov>	Optional
Bartlett, Keith <Bartlett.Keith@epa.gov>	Optional
Simons, Andrew <Simons.Andrew@epa.gov>	Optional
Cogliano, Gerain <Cogliano.Gerain@epa.gov>	Optional
Noggle, William <Noggle.William@epa.gov>	Optional

Corrales, Mark <Corrales.Mark@epa.gov>	Optional
Miles-McLean, Stuart <Miles-Mclean.Stuart@epa.gov>	Optional
OP ADP Calendar <OP_ADP_Calendar@epa.gov>	Optional
Fegley, Robert <Fegley.Robert@epa.gov>	Optional
McQueen, Jacqueline <McQueen.Jacqueline@epa.gov>	Optional
Watkins, Stephen <watkins.stephen@epa.gov>	Optional
Gwinn, Maureen <gwinn.maureen@epa.gov>	Optional
Blackburn, Elizabeth <Blackburn.Elizabeth@epa.gov>	Optional
Rodan, Bruce <rodan.bruce@epa.gov>	Optional
Hauchman, Fred <hauchman.fred@epa.gov>	Optional
Miles, James <miles.james@epa.gov>	Optional
Aranda, Amber <aranda.amber@epa.gov>	Optional
Sullivan, Greg <Sullivan.Greg@epa.gov>	Optional
Saenz, Diana <Saenz.Diana@epa.gov>	Optional
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Optional
DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO <DCRoomEast3371c@epa.gov>	Resource
Burden, Susan <Burden.Susan@epa.gov>	Optional
Henry, Tala <Henry.Tala@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 2:45 PM – 3:00 PM
Subject APCRA Meeting in Helsinki
Location RM 3130A EPA East
Show Time As Busy
Call in Number **Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6**

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Required
Gwinn, Maureen <gwinn.maureen@epa.gov>	Required

Kavlock, Robert <Kavlock.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Gentry, Nathan <Gentry.Nathan@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 3:00 PM – 4:00 PM

Subject Combined New Chemical Bi-Weekly & Prep for Public Meeting (Call in number 1 **Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6**

Location DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO

Show Time As Busy

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <mottley.tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Doa, Maria <Doa.Maria@epa.gov>	Required
Canavan, Sheila <Canavan.Sheila@epa.gov>	Required
Widawsky, David <Widawsky.David@epa.gov>	Required
Henry, Tala <henry.tala@epa.gov>	Required
Vendinello, Lynn <Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov>	Required
Grant, Brian <Grant.Brian@epa.gov>	Required
Mclean, Kevin <Mclean.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Sadowsky, Don <Sadowsky.Don@epa.gov>	Required
Scheifele, Hans <scheifele.hans@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO <DCRoomEast3371c@epa.gov>	Resource
Blunck, Christopher <Blunck.Chris@epa.gov>	Required
Schweer, Greg <Schweer.Greg@epa.gov>	Required
Stedeford, Todd <Stedeford.Todd@epa.gov>	Required
Cherepy, Andrea <Cherepy.Andrea@epa.gov>	Required
Wills, Jennifer <Wills.Jennifer@epa.gov>	Required
Thaler, Elizabeth <thaler.elizabeth@epa.gov>	Required

Greg Schweer (Schweer.Greg@epa.gov) <Schweer.Greg@epa.gov>	Required
Bertrand, Charlotte <Bertrand.Charlotte@epa.gov>	Required

Time 4:00 PM – 4:50 PM
Subject TRI Overview
Location DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO
Show Time As Busy
Purpose: Overview of the TRI program

POC for Meeting Materials: Andrea Cherepy

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Organizer
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Mottley, Tanya <Mottley.Tanya@epa.gov>	Required
Cherepy, Andrea <Cherepy.Andrea@epa.gov>	Required
Reisman, Larry <Reisman.Larry@epa.gov>	Required
Devito, Steve <Devito.Steve@epa.gov>	Required
Tomassoni, Guy <Tomassoni.Guy@epa.gov>	Required
Turk, David <Turk.David@epa.gov>	Required
DCRoomEast3371C/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP-IO-OPMO <DCRoomEast3371c@epa.gov>	Resource
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional

Friday, September 29, 2017

Time 8:00 AM – 5:00 PM
Subject Out of Office
Show Time As Busy

Time 10:30 AM – 11:00 AM
Subject Pre Dourson Mock Hearing Meeting (10:30 AM)
Location DCRoomARN3528/OCIR
Show Time As Busy

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance

Frye, Tony (Robert) <frye.robert@epa.gov>	Organizer
Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>	Required
Palich, Christian <palich.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Rodrick, Christian <rodrick.christian@epa.gov>	Required
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Required
Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <beck.nancy@epa.gov>	Required
Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>	Required
Munoz, Charles <munoz.charles@epa.gov>	Required
Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>	Required
Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>	Required
Morris, Jeff <Morris.Jeff@epa.gov>	Required
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>	Required
Clark, Sharon <Clark.Sharon@epa.gov>	Optional
Pierce, Alison <Pierce.Alison@epa.gov>	Optional
Schmit, Ryan <schmit.ryan@epa.gov>	Optional
Hanley, Mary <Hanley.Mary@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 11:00 AM – 12:00 PM
Subject Responses to ESA Questions
Location DCRoomARN4045/DC-Ariel-Rios-OGC
Show Time As Busy

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	**Attendance**
Baptist, Erik <baptist.erik@epa.gov>	Organizer
Perlis, Robert <Perlis.Robert@epa.gov>	Required
Mclean, Kevin <Mclean.Kevin@epa.gov>	Required
Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>	Required

Knorr, Michele <knorr.michele@epa.gov>	Required
Marshall, Tom <marshall.tom@epa.gov>	Required
Siegal, Tod <Siegal.Tod@epa.gov>	Required
Dyner, Mark <dyner.mark@epa.gov>	Required
Kaczmarek, Chris <Kaczmarek.Chris@epa.gov>	Optional

Time 1:00 PM – 2:00 PM

Subject Hurricanes Maria/Irma/Harvey: PCC Meeting and Conference Call

Location Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Show Time As Tentative

PLEASE: As a reminder, do not place your phone line on hold during the call. Doing so will cause all participants to hear on-hold music and the speakers cannot be heard.

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Meeting invite has been updated with attachments for the meeting.

Please use government email or phone for communication regarding the Agency's hurricane response. Do not create government records on personal devices. Any government records on personal devices become discoverable or subject to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).

Attendees

Name <E-mail>	Attendance
EOC_Deputy_Manager <EOC_Deputy_Manager@epa.gov>	Organizer
PCC Harvey <PCC_Harvey@epa.gov>	Required
Cacho, Julia <Cacho.Julia@epa.gov>	Required
Gettle, Jeaneanne <Gettle.Jeaneanne@epa.gov>	Optional
Mosher, Eric <Mosher.Eric@epa.gov>	Optional
EOC Documentation <EOC_Documentation@epa.gov>	Optional
Fotouhi, David <Fotouhi.David@epa.gov>	Optional

Falvo, Nicholas <falvo.nicholas@epa.gov>	Optional
Clark, Becki <Clark.Becki@epa.gov>	Optional
Edlund, Carl <Edlund.Carl@epa.gov>	Optional
Armstead, John A. <Armstead.John@epa.gov>	Optional
Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>	Optional
Leonard, Paul <leonard.paul@epa.gov>	Optional
Davis, Patrick <davis.patrick@epa.gov>	Optional
Irizarry, Gilberto <Irizarry.Gilberto@epa.gov>	Optional
Stepp, Cathy <stepp.cathy@epa.gov>	Optional
Price, Lisa <Price.Lisa@epa.gov>	Optional
Forsgren, Lee <Forsgren.Lee@epa.gov>	Optional
Kling, David <Kling.Dave@epa.gov>	Optional
Jenkins, Brandi <Jenkins.Brandi@epa.gov>	Optional
Mears, Mary <Mears.Mary@epa.gov>	Optional
Perovich, Gina <Perovich.Gina@epa.gov>	Optional
Veal, Lee <Veal.Lee@epa.gov>	Optional
Coleman, Sam <Coleman.Sam@epa.gov>	Optional
Mclain, Jennifer <Mclain.Jennifer@epa.gov>	Optional
Breen, Barry <Breen.Barry@epa.gov>	Optional
Mugdan, Walter <Mugdan.Walter@epa.gov>	Optional
Indermark, Michele <Indermark.Michele@epa.gov>	Optional
Flynn, Mike <Flynn.Mike@epa.gov>	Optional
Shapiro, Mike <Shapiro.Mike@epa.gov>	Optional
Schlieger, Brian <schlieger.brian@epa.gov>	Optional
Cory, Preston (Katherine) <Cory.Preston@epa.gov>	Optional

Lapierre, Kenneth <Lapierre.Kenneth@epa.gov>	Optional
Cheatham, Reggie <cheatham.reggie@epa.gov>	Optional
Levine, Carolyn <Levine.Carolyn@epa.gov>	Optional
Simon, Nigel <Simon.Nigel@epa.gov>	Optional
Perrin, Alan <Perrin.Alan@epa.gov>	Optional
Boynton, Lisa <Boynton.Lisa@epa.gov>	Optional
Carroll, Craig <Carroll.Craig@epa.gov>	Optional
Heard, Anne <Heard.Anne@epa.gov>	Optional
Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>	Optional

ED_002528_00001824-00173

Responsible Industry for Sound Environment Meeting with OCSPP DAA

Date: September 8, 2017

Who: Aaron Hobbs, RISE President; and a few board members

Purpose: An introductory meeting for Nancy to tell her about the association and its key pesticide policy issues.

Background:

- Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment (RISE) is a national trade association that represents the manufactures, formulators and distributors of "specialty pesticides" used for mosquito and other vector control, on home lawns and gardens, on golf courses, in structural pest control and in vegetation management

- Engaged at the federal, state and local levels.

- **What does RISE do?** Provide information about pesticides, their use and regulation; share news releases, fact sheets, and other valuable resources highlighting the benefits of the products of members; communicate with policymakers and regulators to ensure products are used properly and are available when needed.

- **What are specialty pesticides?** Pest management tools used to protect health and safety as well as enhance our quality of life and the environment. These products are used in both the private and public sphere around homes, lawns, golf courses, commercial greenhouses and nurseries, and on flowers and trees. Pesticides are also used in vegetation management and promote safe transportation in waterways, along roadways, railroads and utility right-of-ways. The problems caused by plant diseases and invasive species, as well as pests such as health-threatening cockroaches, termites, ticks, fire ants, mosquitoes, weeds and rodents, call for the safe and responsible use of pesticides.

- Headquartered in Washington, D.C.

Website: [HYPERLINK "http://www.pestfacts.org/"]

Appointment

From: Google Calendar [calendar-notification@google.com]
Sent: 9/8/2017 2:49:25 PM
To: Beck, Nancy [Beck.Nancy@epa.gov]

Subject: Declined: Meet & Greet w/Aaron Hobbs (RISE) @ Fri Sep 8, 2017 11am - 11:30am (EDT) (Beck, Nancy)
Attachments: invite.ics
Location: DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP

Start: 9/8/2017 3:00:00 PM
End: 9/8/2017 3:30:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: (none)

lflanagan@dclrs.com has declined this invitation.

Meet & Greet w/Aaron Hobbs (RISE)

When Fri Sep 8, 2017 11am – 11:30am Eastern Time

Where DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP (map)

Calendar Beck, Nancy

Who
- Beck, Nancy - organizer
- lflanagan@dclrs.com - creator
- DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP
- dcrow@dclrs.com
- dbeaudreau@dclrs.com
- Jakob, Avivah - optional

Directions: Please use the William Jefferson Clinton East Entrance located at 1201 Constitution Avenue. Please arrive 10 minutes prior to the meeting with photo IDs to clear Security.

For an escort from Security to the meeting please c **Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)**

Purpose: Introductory meeting to discuss the association of the Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment (RISE) key pesticide policy issues.

Attendees will be RISE President Aaron Hobbs and a few board members.

Invitation from Google Calendar

You are receiving this courtesy email at the account beck.nancy@epa.gov because you are an attendee of this event.

To stop receiving future updates for this event, decline this event. Alternatively you can sign up for a Google account at https://www.google.com/calendar/ and control your notification settings for your entire calendar.

Forwarding this invitation could allow any recipient to modify your RSVP response. Learn More.

Appointment

From: lflanagan@dclrs.com [lflanagan@dclrs.com]
To: Beck, Nancy [beck.nancy@epa.gov]; lflanagan@dclrs.com

Subject: Meet & Greet w/Aaron Hobbs (RISE)
Location: DCRoomEast3156/DC-EPA-EAST-OCSPP

Start: 9/8/2017 3:00:00 PM
End: 9/8/2017 3:30:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: (none)

Directions: Please use the William Jefferson Clinton East Entrance located at 1201 Constitution Avenue. Please arrive 10 minutes prior to the meeting with photo IDs to clear Security.

For an escort from Security to the meeting please call (202) 564-2902 or (202) 564-2910.

Purpose: Introductory meeting to discuss the association of the Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment (RISE) key pesticide policy issues.

Attendees will be RISE President Aaron Hobbs and a few board members.

Message

From: Jakob, Avivah [Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov]
Sent: 9/7/2017 9:46:49 PM
To: Beck, Nancy [Beck.Nancy@epa.gov]; Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
CC: Wise, Louise [Wise.Louise@epa.gov]
Subject: Fwd: Meeting request with Nancy Beck

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Laurie Flanagan <lflanagan@dclrs.com>
Date: September 7, 2017 at 5:40:20 PM EDT
To: "Jakob, Avivah" <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>
Cc: "dcrow@dclrs.com" <dcrow@dclrs.com>, "dbeaudreau@dclrs.com" <dbeaudreau@dclrs.com>, "Marshall, Venus" <Marshall.Venus@epa.gov>, "Milhouse, Gloria" <Milhouse.Gloria@epa.gov>, Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>, Karen Reardon <kreardon@pestfacts.org>, "Stephanie L. Binns" <sbinns@pestfacts.org>
Subject: Re: Meeting request with Nancy Beck

Tomorrow's meeting with RISE President Aaron Hobbs will include the following people:

- Aaron Hobbs, Karen Reardon and Stephanie Binns, RISE
- Mike Seyfert and Jill Hollihan, FMC
- Jay Vroom, CropLife America (will stay from earlier meeting)
- Cindy Baker, Gowan (will stay from earlier meeting)
- Laurie Flanagan, DCLRS, RISE consultant

We would like to provide some introductory background on RISE and also briefly discuss:

- RISE 2018 regulatory priorities including registration review;
- Labels Live workshop;
- Montgomery County, MD court case; and
- Endangered Species Act consultations.

Thanks and see you tomorrow.

On Fri, Aug 25, 2017 at 9:06 PM, Laurie Flanagan <lflanagan@dclrs.com> wrote:
Thank you both very much.

Sent from my iPad

On Aug 25, 2017, at 9:06 PM, Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov> wrote:

Hi Laurie,

Venus Marshall will be in contact with you (cc'd) to set up this meeting.

Regards,

Avivah Jakob

Acting Special Assistant

Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW

Washington, DC 20460

Tel. (202) 564.3256

From: Laurie Flanagan [mailto:lflanagan@dclrs.com]
Sent: Monday, August 21, 2017 5:49 PM
To: Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov>
Cc: dcrow@dclrs.com; dbeaudreau@dclrs.com; Marshall, Venus <Marshall.Venus@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Meeting request with Nancy Beck

Thank you very much.

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 21, 2017, at 5:46 PM, Jakob, Avivah <Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov> wrote:

> Hi Laurie,
>
> I'm checking Nancy's availability and will let you know.

Regards,

Avivah Jakob

Acting Special Assistant

Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW

Washington, DC 20460

Tel. (202) 564.3256

From: Laurie Flanagan [mailto:lflanagan@dclrs.com]
Sent: Monday, August 21, 2017 11:12 AM
To: jakob.aviva@epa.gov
Cc: Marshall, Venus <Marshall.Venus@epa.gov>; David Crow <dcrow@dclrs.com>; David G. Beaudreau <dbeaudreau@dclrs.com>
Subject: Meeting request with Nancy Beck

Ms. Jakob,

I am writing to request a meeting with RISE President Aaron Hobbs and a few of our board members. This would simply be an introductory meeting to tell her a little about the association and our key pesticide policy issues.

RISE (Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment) is the national trade association that represents the manufactures,

formulators and distributors of specialty pesticides used for mosquito and other vector control, on home lawns and gardens, on golf courses, in structural pest control and in vegetation management.

Aaron is free on the dates below or we can look at additional dates later in September that may work for Ms. Beck if one of the dates below does not work:

9/5 - 3pm or 4pm

9/8 - Any time that day between 9am and 4pm

--

Regards,

Laurie-Ann Flanagan

Executive Vice President

D.C. Legislative and Regulatory Services, Inc.

2221 S. Clark Street, 11th Floor

Arlington, VA 22202

(202) 872-4850

--
Regards,

Laurie-Ann Flanagan
Executive Vice President
D.C. Legislative and Regulatory Services, Inc.
2221 S. Clark Street, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22202

(202) 872-4850

Message

From: Beck, Nancy [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=168ECB5184AC44DE95A913297F353745-BECK, NANCY]
Sent: 9/7/2017 9:17:56 PM
To: Jakob, Avivah [Jakob.Avivah@epa.gov]
CC: Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: RISE Mtg Background Info.

Thanks!

Nancy B. Beck, Ph.D., DABT
Deputy Assistant Administrator, OCSPP
P: 202-564-1273
M: 202-731-9910
beck.nancy@epa.gov

From: Jakob, Avivah
Sent: Thursday, September 7, 2017 5:14 PM
To: Beck, Nancy <Beck.Nancy@epa.gov>
Cc: Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>
Subject: RISE Mtg Background Info.

Nancy – attached (and below) is general information about RISE - - I'm checking w/ OPP to see if there are any specific topics you should be aware of in addition to having this information.

Date: September 8, 2017
Who: Aaron Hobbs, RISE President; and a few board members
Purpose: An introductory meeting for Nancy to tell her about the association and its key pesticide policy issues.
Background:

- Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment (RISE) is a national trade association that represents the manufactures, formulators and distributors of "specialty pesticides" used for mosquito and other vector control, on home lawns and gardens, on golf courses, in structural pest control and in vegetation management

- Engaged at the federal, state and local levels.

- **What does RISE do?** Provide information about pesticides, their use and regulation; share news releases, fact sheets, and other valuable resources highlighting the benefits of the products of members; communicate with policymakers and regulators to ensure products are used properly and are available when needed.

- **What are specialty pesticides?** Pest management tools used to protect health and safety as well as enhance our quality of life and the environment. These products are used in both the private and public sphere around homes, lawns, golf courses, commercial greenhouses and nurseries, and on flowers and trees. Pesticides are also used in vegetation management and promote safe transportation in waterways, along roadways, railroads and utility right-of-ways. The problems caused by plant diseases and invasive species, as well as pests such as health-threatening cockroaches, termites, ticks, fire ants, mosquitoes, weeds and rodents, call for the safe and responsible use of pesticides.

- Headquartered in Washington, D.C.

Website: http://www.pestfacts.org/

Avivah Jakob
Acting Special Assistant
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20460
Tel. (202) 564.3256

Mississippi Bee Stewardship Program Survey

1. Are you a Beekeeper or a Row Crop Farmer?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Beekeeper	41.2%	68
Row Crop Farmer	58.8%	97
answered question		165
skipped question		0

2. Please indicate what portion of the state you have bees in (check all that

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Northeast	20.0%	13
Delta	7.7%	5
Central	35.4%	23
South MS	38.5%	25
Blackbelt Prairie Area	4.6%	3
answered question		65
skipped question		100

3. What Is your primary purpose for beekeeping (check all that apply)?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Hobby	59.4%	38
Honey production,	65.6%	42
Pollination services,	23.4%	15
Queen production,	17.2%	11
Bee production (selling packages, nucs, etc.),	18.8%	12
Bee rescue (swarm trapping and colony removal)	18.8%	12
answered question		64
skipped question		101

4. What is the relative size of your beekeeping operation?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
50 or less hives	73.8%	48

50 to 250 hives	18.5%	12
250 to 500 hives	6.2%	4
500 or more hives	1.5%	1
answered question		**65**
skipped question		**100**

5. How long have you been a beekeeper?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
0 to 5 years	46.9%	30
5 to 10 years	25.0%	16
10-15 years	4.7%	3
Over 15 years	23.4%	15
answered question		**64**
skipped question		**101**

6. Do you move your bees to row crops for honey production or to fruit or nut

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	15.9%	10
No	84.1%	53
answered question		**63**
skipped question		**102**

7. Over the last 18 months, has your awareness of the importance of pollinator

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	84.1%	53
No	15.9%	10
answered question		**63**
skipped question		**102**

8. If Yes---please indicate the source of this information (check all that apply):

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
MSU Extension Service	83.3%	45

Farm Bureau	42.6%	23
Bee related publications	72.2%	39
Other Beekeepers	53.7%	29
Social media	22.2%	12
Other Ag Industry Associations	9.3%	5
Other national or local media sources	29.6%	16
	answered question	**54**
	skipped question	**111**

9. In your opinion, what is the most significant production problem for you as a beekeeper (Rank them 1 to 5 in order of

Answer Options	1	2	3	4	5	6	Rating Average	Response Count
Varoa mite/Viruses	36	9	5	2	3	0	1.67	55
Small hive beetle	11	26	7	10	3	0	2.44	57
Loss of forage	2	8	17	15	3	0	3.20	45
Theft/vandalism	3	1	0	3	21	9	4.76	37
Pesticide exposure	1	7	20	8	7	1	3.36	44
Unsure	4	0	4	3	4	10	4.32	25
							answered question	**65**
							skipped question	**100**

10. Are your bees kept near/on row crop farms?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Never	46.2%	30
Sometimes	35.4%	23
All The Time	18.5%	12
	answered question	**65**
	skipped question	**100**

11. If your bees are near/on row crop areas—do you utilize any of the

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	30.6%	15
No	69.4%	34
	answered question	**49**
	skipped question	**116**

12. Do you have other standing pesticide mitigation arrangements/measures to

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	10.3%	4
No	89.7%	35
answered question		**39**
skipped question		**126**

13. If your bees are near/on row crop areas –has the Mississippi Bee

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	34.1%	15
No	65.9%	29
answered question		**44**
skipped question		**121**

14. If your bees are near/on row crop areas –do you discuss or have you ever

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	47.9%	23
No	52.1%	25
answered question		**48**
skipped question		**117**

15. If your bees are near/on row crop areas –do you utilize the Bee Aware Flag

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	19.1%	9
No	80.9%	38
answered question		**47**
skipped question		**118**

16. If your bees are near/on row crop areas–does your farm host take any

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	43.5%	20
No	56.5%	26
answered question		**46**
skipped question		**119**

17. Please indicate what portion of the state you farm (check all that apply).

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Northeast	5.3%	5
Delta	76.8%	73
Central	9.5%	9
South MS	3.2%	3
Blackbelt Prairie Area	6.3%	6
answered question		**95**
skipped question		**70**

18. Please indicate the commodities you produce (check all that apply):

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Cotton	35.5%	33
Rice	43.0%	40
Corn	68.8%	64
Soybeans	92.5%	86
Milo	39.8%	37
answered question		**93**
skipped question		**72**

19. How long have you been actively engaged in farming?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
0 to 5 years	3.2%	3
5 to 10 years	7.4%	7
10-15 years	12.8%	12
Over 15 years	76.6%	72
answered question		**94**

skipped question	71

20. Over the last 18 months, has your awareness of the importance of pollinator

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	97.8%	91
No	2.2%	2
answered question		93
skipped question		72

21. If Yes--please indicate the source of this information: Check all that apply

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
MSU Extension Service	76.7%	69
Farm Bureau	95.6%	86
Ag Press/Publications	66.7%	60
Other Farmers	22.2%	20
Social media	23.3%	21
Other Ag Industry Associations	31.1%	28
Other national or local media sources	24.4%	22
answered question		90
skipped question		75

22. Have you heard of the Mississippi Bee Stewardship Program?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	93.5%	86
No	6.5%	6
answered question		92
skipped question		73

23. Do you host bees on any portion of your farming operation?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	42.4%	39
No	57.6%	53

answered question	92
skipped question	73

24. If you host bees on your farm, do you utilize any of the cooperative

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	61.1%	22
No	30.6%	11
N/A	8.3%	3
answered question		36
skipped question		129

25. Do you have other standing pesticide mitigation arrangements/measures to

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	44.4%	16
No	52.8%	19
N/A	2.8%	1
answered question		36
skipped question		129

26. If you host bees on your farm--has the Mississippi Bee Stewardship Program

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	66.7%	24
No	13.9%	5
N/A	19.4%	7
answered question		36
skipped question		129

27. If you host bees on your farm--do you discuss or have you ever discussed

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	66.7%	24
No	16.7%	6
N/A	16.7%	6

answered question	36
skipped question	129

28. If you host bees on your farm--do you encourage your host beekeeper to

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	45.7%	16
No	8.6%	3
Not Needed	31.4%	11
N/A	14.3%	5
answered question		35
skipped question		130

29. If you host bees on your farm--how do you modify or would you be willing to

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Apply insecticides early in the morning	58.8%	20
Apply insecticides later in the afternoon	61.8%	21
Ensure wind velocity is low	82.4%	28
Utilize insecticides with less toxicity	23.5%	8
Avoid spraying during bloom	5.9%	2
Nothing	8.8%	3
answered question		34
skipped question		131

30. How do you typically apply insecticides on the farm?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Ground	25.3%	22
Air	9.2%	8
Both	65.5%	57
answered question		87
skipped question		78

31. Do you discuss or have you ever discussed insecticide applications in regard

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Farm workers	45.1%	32
Ground applicators	45.1%	32
Aerial applicators	74.6%	53
Consultants/Scouts	59.2%	42
Surrounding Farmers	38.0%	27
answered question		**71**
skipped question		**94**

PPDC Pollinator Protection Plan Metrics WG - Meeting Minutes

12/01/2016

Attendees:
(in person) Mike Goodis, Lead; Marietta Echeverria, Co-Lead; Meredith Laws; Dee Colby; Mary Clock-Rust; Tom Steeger
(phone) Stephanie Binns (for Aaron Hobbs), Ray Brinkmeyer, Michele Colopy; Steven Coy; Richard Crespin; Mark Dykes; David Epstein; Jayme Mestes; Jim Fredericks; Nichelle Harriot; Tim Hatten; Dudley Hoskins; Rose Kachadoorian; Jeanette Klopchin; Don Parker; Peg Perreault; Caydee Savinelli; Julie Shapiro; Al Summers; Andy Whittington

Agenda (attached)
Welcome, Introductions, Ground Rules, Agenda Review – Mike and Marietta
Workgroup members introduced themselves.

Review of Meeting Minutes from November 1, 2016 - Dee
Meeting minutes were finalized from the November meeting and will be posted on the PPDC website.

Report on the Work Plan Subgroup – Caydee Savinelli
(Draft Work Plan attached)

Caydee presented the work plan flow chart that the Subgroup developed to help guide the Workgroup through a succession of Project Stages toward development of a plan for evaluating pollinator protection plans' effectiveness at a national level. Comments were positive in that the plan seemed realistic, the flow captures major stages, and that it would be a work in progress as we proceed through the Project Stages. There was some discussion about: needing to keep the scope narrow and to areas with verifiable data, managed bees being the 'umbrella' for pollinator protection, and formulation of metrics. The Work Plan addresses formulation of metrics in future months after we assess metrics that are currently being used and then decide which are pertinent to our objective going forward.

Discuss characterizing the states' plans and their scopes – Jeanette Klopchin
Refer to [HYPERLINK "https://aapco.files.wordpress.com/2016/06/master-mp3-inventory-june-2016-master-update-may-2016.pdf"] *for the AAPCO lists of all MP3 plans that are in place.*

Jeanette went through a list of states' pollinator protection plans mentioning points of interest to the group; a key point being that of the states with pollinator plans in place, very few include metrics.

Report on progress of tribes – Mary Clock-Rust
Mary is the tribal plans coordinator for the Tribal Pesticide Program Council (TPPC) Workgroup. TPPC felt it was a priority to have a workgroup for pollinator protection. There are currently 15 tribes participating and others are encouraged to join. Tribes are mostly interested in protection of native bees. They are looking at using the pollinator protection plan template that was developed for tribes in EPA Region 9. Email Mary if you have questions about tribal plan development at clock-rust.mary@epa.gov.

Finalize a framework for a Work Plan - Mike
Mike thought it would be helpful going forward if the Work Plan Subgroup would continue to update the work plan as information is added and/or time frames are adjusted. Discussion was generated around surveys being the most commonly used metric in state plans and the degree of variability among plans. This discussion provided segue into formation of a second subgroup which would look at plans collectively and highlight commonalities.

Form subgroup for Project Stage 4 – Marietta
Project Stage 4 is to evaluate processes/products associated with each plan for areas of commonality. Subgroup II would look for commonality among plans, identify common themes and list metrics associated with these themes. Jeanette Klopchin, Caydee Savinelli, Stephanie Binns, and Peg Perreault volunteered to form Subgroup II. We would like to have a report from the subgroup to discuss at the January Workgroup Meeting.

Meeting Recap – Mike
The next teleconference date will be in January 2017. There had been an exchange of emails prior to the December meeting where members shared publications, etc. to help inform the group of issues of potential interest to the Workgroup. It was asked if group members sending informative emails out to the group in between meetings is acceptable. There were no objections.

FOLLOW UP:
1. **Subgroup II**: Investigate commonality among state plans and associated metrics
2. **Agency**: Choose a meeting time and agenda for next month corresponding to Stages 5-6 in the work plan

PPDC Subgroup - Common Themes of State MP3s

Composed by: Jeanette Klopchin, Caydee Savinelli, Stephanie Anne-Binns, Pegg Perault

Objectives

1. Reduce pesticide exposure through enhanced communication and collaboration among stakeholders.
2. Ensure positive relationships and peaceful co-existences among beekeepers, landowners and pesticide applicators, everyone to be part of the solution.
3. Utilize specific BMP's target state=specific problems.

Outreach

1. Outreach and education program to raise awareness of importance of pollinators.
2. Training and education of pesticide applicators on pollinator stewardship.
3. Public service announcements, Press releases
4. Website - How to protect pollinators, safe alternatives to pesticides.
5. Engage public - active participation in reversing pollinator decline.
6. Partnerships with Extension, trade associations, government agencies to promote the plan.

Communication

1. Beekeeper BMPs
2. Landowner/leaseholder BMPs
3. Pesticide user BMPs
4. Farmer/applicator BMPs
5. Interactive map of hive locations/pesticide use
6. System to or promotion of system to report all suspected pesticide poisonings of honey bees.

Location of Apiaries of Beehives in Landscape

1. Drift Watch
2. Kelly Registration
3. Bee Flags – MS, MO, GA
4. State Apiary Mapping – ND, FL
5. Sensitive Crop Registry

Pesticide Risk Mitigation

1. Provide information for safer alternative pesticides.
2. Pollinator protection info in pesticide applicator training materials.
3. Label interpretation.
4. Expand opportunities for identifying pollinator protection areas.
5. Utilize IPM

Applicators BMPs

1. Take an IPM approach to pest control.
2. Choose appropriate pesticides to reduce the risk to pollinators from pesticides.
3. Understanding/interpretation pollinator language on labels.
4. Select products that are lower risk to honey bees if available.

5. Pesticide applicators are encouraged to work with beekeepers in regards to timing of the applications to reduce risk to honey bees.
6. Always use products at the recommended label rates and spray intervals with appropriate application equipment.
7. Inform beekeepers 48 hours before an insecticide application (Before applying a pesticide, identify and notify beekeepers of the application).
8. Method for growers and applicators to identify and contact beekeepers prior to an application - 1-2 mile radius of treatment.
9. Avoid applications when honey bees are actively foraging.
10. Don't allow pesticides to drift to non-target areas.
11. Check the application area for the presence of bees before spraying and avoid the use of pesticides during bloom or when pollinators are present.
12. When possible make applications early in the morning or in the evening to minimize the exposure of bees to pesticides.

Landowners / Growers BMPs

1. Communicate with leaseholders about honeybee issues.
2. Work with beekeepers to choose hive locations.
3. Decide who is responsible for locating hives and notifying beekeepers of application.
4. Notify ground and aerial applicators of hive locations.
5. Consider the timing of pesticide applications, and apply products according to the label.
6. Apply insecticides when drift onto bee hives is not likely.
7. Agronomists should consider pollinator impacts when making pesticide recommendations.
8. Always follow the pesticide label exactly regarding application timing and dose.
9. Use Integrated Pest Management (IPM) guidelines for your crop pest problems.
10. Heed pesticide labels that say "highly toxic to bees," "toxic to bees" or "extended residual toxicity".
11. To help choose products that are less toxic to pollinators, refer to the "Bee precaution pesticide rating" online tool from University of California Integrated Pest Management Program (UC IPM). Also see EPA's "Information on Residue Toxicity Times."
12. Avoid spraying pesticides on blooming plants being visited by pollinators. This includes crops, weeds in cropland, and wildflowers or weeds in field margins/ditches.
13. If treated seed is used:
    a. Remove blooming crop weeds before planting treated seed.
    b. Reduce dust release when planting treated seed.
    c. Collect and properly dispose of any spilled treated seed. Treated seed can be toxic to birds and other wildlife if ingested.
    d. Refer to the ASTA and CropLife guide to seed treatments
14. Educate yourself about safe pesticide use. The pesticide applicator certification training manual is a useful resource for everyone, and is required training for some types of pesticide applicators.
15. Consider using buffer strips between pollinator habitat and land that gets sprayed regularly with pesticides.

Beekeeper BMPs

With Landowners

1. Be a good partner with landowners - be flexible and work to develop a long-standing relationship
2. Work with the landowner to select apiary locations.
3. Beekeepers should be aware of the needs of the landowner
4. Communicate with land owners and consider your hive locations in relation to pesticide applications and other activities on the property.
5. Be aware of property boundaries and neighboring landowners when locating colonies.
6. Notify all adjoining landowners when placing, removing or moving hives.
7. When granted permission to keep hives on a parcel, do not ""sublet"" and allow other beekeepers to bring in their hives.
8. Do not assume that because you've worked with a landowner before, you can bring your hives in again without written permission."
9. Keep the landowner informed of hive locations, status, and concerns, and be willing to consider removing hives if the need arises.

With Applicators

1. Collaborate with applicators when informed that a pesticide application is planned.
2. Make preparations in case hives need to be moved.
3. Don't leave hives in orchards or fields that are unmarked.
4. Inform local Mosquito Abatement District of beehive locations."
5. Ensure visibility of hives by obvious colors and locations. Posting a sign or placard with contact information is good practice."

Forage and Nutrition

1. Manage forage in non-crop areas for bees.
2. Plant and maintain habitat
3. Avoid invasive plants and noxious weeds
4. A minimum goal is at least three plant species flowering at all times from early spring through late fall, but the more diverse the wildflower mix the better. The total seed count should be comprised mostly of forb seeds so that grasses do not crowd out forbs.
5. Annuals can be planted in the first year for rapid establishment of floral resources and weed blocking while perennial plants get established.
6. Match the seed mix to local site conditions (soil type, moisture, sun exposure, etc.)
7. A good seed mix will contain plants that host butterfly larvae (e.g., milkweeds for monarch butterflies) and bunch grasses (e.g., little bluestem) that provide nesting habitat for bees and birds.
8. If shrubs or trees are desired at your site, these can be chosen to benefit pollinators as well: American basswood, willows, and many fruit trees have flowers attractive to pollinators.
9. A combination of prescribed fire and end-of-season haying are critical to stimulate flowering in many plant species. Mowing can be done in lieu of burning, but fire is better than mowing at stimulating flowering over time.

Metrics/Evaluation Methods

1. Changes in behavior
    a. Improvements in levels of communication and cooperation among stakeholders.
    b. Working relationships among beekeepers, farmers, and pesticide applicators
2. Changes in overall pollinator health.
    a. Colony loss data across the state where the Plan would apply (instate surveys and credible research; Bee Informed Partnership)
3. Changes in pollinator friendly forage (quality/quantity)

Metrics Example: Wisconsin Set One

1. Behavioral surveys – measure plan use and behavioral change pre/post plan release. Track website hits regarding plan.
2. Track the number of organizations, agencies, residents and others plus what programs (e.g. Conservation Reserve Program (CRP)) are using plan recommendations.
3. Survey readers on how the plan content improves their knowledge of pollinator health issues.
4. Develop and record an annual survey that organizations can distribute at growers' conferences.

Metrics Example: Wisconsin Set Two

1. Track honey bee health and colony loss:
    a. Hive health checklist via statewide inspection
    b. Bee Informed surveys for colony loss
    c. Expand the NASS survey on managed bees/honey production
2. Long-term monitoring research to track wild pollinator populations (collaborative effort).
3. Identify where pollinator habitat is currently and monitor over time.
4. Track acres of pollinator-friendly plantings along highway rights-of-way. DOT could monitor.
5. Track acres of pollinator friendly plants in Conservation Reserve Program and other private land programs.
6. Work with specific landowners or land mangers as a pilot program.
7. Identify and offer incentives for "whole-farm" conservation planning.
8. Work with homeowners planting pollinator friendly plants.
9. Work with organizations advocating/planting pollinator friendly plants, e.g., Master Gardeners.
10. Develop a baseline evaluation tool that could be used on a county or regional basis to evaluate education/awareness every 3-10 years. Gather current and new partners to apply for grant funding.
11. Increase participation of large operators in Bee Informed surveys (large operators underrepresented in current surveys).

Appointment

From: Whittington, Andy [awhittington@msfb.org]
Sent: 2/15/2017 6:38:22 PM
To: Clock-Rust, Mary [Clock-Rust.Mary@epa.gov]; David.Epstein@ARS.USDA.GOV; Dudley@nasda.org; Echeverria, Marietta [Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov]; Goodis, Michael [Goodis.Michael@epa.gov]; Jeanette.klopchin@freshfromflorida.com; Jfredericks@pestworld.org; Julie Shapiro [jshapiro@keystone.org]; Laws, Meredith [Laws.Meredith@epa.gov]; Moriarty, Thomas [Moriarty.Thomas@epa.gov]; NHarriott@beyondpesticides.org; Perreault, Peg [Perreault.Peg@epa.gov]; Rose Kachadoorian [rkachadoorian@oda.state.or.us]; Shepard, Robin [robin.shepard@ces.uwex.edu]; Steeger, Thomas [Steeger.Thomas@epa.gov]; TVA@pollinator.org; Tim Hatten [timhatten@invertebrateecology.com]; acatchot@ext.msstate.edu; ahobbs@pestfacts.org; caydee.savinelli@syngenta.com; dparker@cotton.org; dvane@umd.edu; jelyons@usgs.gov; jgore@drec.msstate.edu; jharris@entomology.msstate.edu; jmestes@crstepd.org; joshua.orear@nass.usda.gov; krennich@umd.edu; mdykes@tamu.edu; progdirector@pollinatorstewardship.org; richard@collaborateup.com; rsbrinkmeyer@dow.com; steven@coybeecompany.com; summers@ichibanenterprises.org; tomrappahan@gmail.com; tuckerb@hit.net

Subject: PPDC Workgroup Call-In Meeting Invitation & Agenda
Location: Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6
Start: [redacted]
End: 3/15/2017 6:30:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative

Recurrence: (none)

Join us for the Pollinator Protection Plans Metrics Workgroup (January) Call-in Meeting. The agenda and supporting materials are attached.

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

If you have never attended an Adobe Connect meeting before:

Test your connection: http://epawebconferencing.acms.com/common/help/en/support/meeting_test.htm

Get a quick overview: http://www.adobe.com/products/adobeconnect.html

Adobe, the Adobe logo, Acrobat and Adobe Connect are either registered trademarks or trademarks of Adobe Systems Incorporated in the United States and/or other countries.

Wednesday, April 25th

3:00 – 5:00 PM **Registration Opens**

5:30-7:00 PM **Welcome Reception -** Salon 4 Foyer
Sponsored by Valent U.S.A.

Thursday, April 26th

6:30 AM **Registration Opens**

7:00-8:00 AM **Networking Breakfast -** Salon 4 & Foyer
Sponsored by Syngenta Crop Protection

8:00-10:00 AM **General Session** – Salon 4

- Welcome: Jay Vroom (CLA); Aaron Hobbs (RISE); Janet Collins (CLA)
- Keynote: Henry Darwin, Chief of Operations, EPA
- Precision Ag Equipment Panel:
    - Mark Anderson, GVM, Inc.
    - Ben Chostner, Blue River Technology
    - Jeff Grimm, CapstanAg
    - Jeff Smigiel, Micro-Matic
    - Rick Rice, AMVAC
    - Nancy Westcott, GoatThroat Pumps
    - Bruce Woodcock, Aventech
- Introduction of 2018 CLASS - *Sponsored by FMC Corporation*

10:00-10:30 AM **Coffee Break -** Salon 1 – 3 Foyer
Sponsored by TKI NovaSource

10:30 AM-12:00 PM **Series I, Studio D - Pesticide Imports and Exports: Facilitating Global Commerce**

Administrative procedures for importing pesticides into the U.S. and exporting them to other countries require adjustment from time to time. Speakers will discuss the challenges of export certification for pesticide products and the import of active ingredients for formulation of products into the U.S.

- *Moderator*: Doreen Manchester, CropLife America
- Jim Barron, Arysta LifeScience
- John Conner, Crowell & Moring LLP
- Annette Kirk, Monsanto
- Ray McAllister, CropLife America

ED_002528_00019738-00001

10:30 AM-12:00 PM **Series I, Studio E - Application of Environmental Epidemiology in Risk Assessment and Decision-Making**

Regulatory Authorities are increasingly discussing the use of environmental epidemiology in risk assessment. The utility of these data for regulatory purposes can be limited due to data quality and transparency, insufficient exposure measurements and general deficiencies in study design. In this session, perspectives on concerns and efforts to advance the use of and define the suitability of environmental epidemiology studies for regulatory decision making will be discussed as well as a specific project from the Health and Environmental Sciences Institute (HESI).

- *Moderator:* Cindy Smith, Gowan Company
- Carol Burns, Burns Epidemiology Consulting, LLC
- David Miller, U.S. EPA OPP, Health Effects Division
- Christian Strupp, Gowan Company

10:30 AM-12:00 PM **Series I, Salon 4 - What We've Learned, What We Need: The FIFRA/ESA Consultation Process**

Recently, USDA Secretary of Agriculture Sonny Purdue announced the establishment of an Interagency Working Group to coordinate Endangered Species Act (ESA) consultations for pesticide registrations and registration review under FIFRA. Additionally, at the end of the year, the NMFS released a final Biological Opinion on the first three Registration Review consultations (EPA Biological Evaluations) on organophosphates conducted under the Interim Process proposed by the Agencies under the NAS Expert Panel Report (Nov 2013). In this session, speakers from the federal agencies will address what they've learned about the consultation process to date and what they still need to develop going forward.

12:00-1:15 PM **Lunch -** Salon 4 & Foyer

Sponsored by Crowell & Moring LLP

Grower Panel

- Vince Restucci (R.D. Offutt)
- Kip Tom (Tom Farms)
- Tyler Wegmeyer (Wegmeyer Farms)

ED_002528_00019738-00002

1:15-2:45 PM

Series II, Salon 1-3 - EPA Labels Live!: Pesticide Labels from the Lab to Your Neighborhood

How does a pesticide product get from the lab to your yard and community? Via the EPA stamped label! Join us for our third annual interactive session specifically designed for EPA and government agency staff (though participation is open to all conference attendees). Attendees are invited to visit with pesticide registrants who work with pesticides at all stages of the pesticide product life cycle. This year features new content on specialty use sites, consumer product packaging, supplemental distribution and more! Participants will leave with a new understanding of how registrants design products and labeling with end users in mind and will learn what it takes to get products from development to safe and effective application.

1:15 PM-2:45 PM

Series II, Studio E - Trading Up: How Crop Protection Influences Agricultural Exports (and Vice Versa)

Smooth global trade in agricultural products requires cooperation of governments worldwide to establish, implement and enforce international standards for pesticide residues in food. Speakers will address the challenges of establishing Codex Maximum Residue Limits (MRL), national MRL systems and MRLs for imported produce.

- *Moderator*: Christoph Neumann, CropLife International
- Julie Chao, USDA Foreign Agricultural Service
- David Miller, U.S. EPA OPP, Health Effects Division
- Daniella Taveau, King & Spalding
- Carmen Tiu, Corteva Agrisciences

1:15-2:45 PM

Series II, Studio D - Charting a Path Forward for the Use of Population Modeling in Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA) of Pesticides

Implementation and use of population models for ERA and management has not fully reflected advances in the area. Possible reasons for this include the broad diversity of models and approaches; lack of specific guidance on when to use models and the corresponding degree of complexity; how to deal with uncertainty in data and model output; and how to translate model output into risk analysis decisions. We propose to use this session to 1.) clearly identify reasons for underutilization of population models in ERA decision-making; 2.) identify regulatory needs concerning population modeling (e.g. data, code, guidance); *and* 3.) address these through multi-stakeholder discussions.

- *Moderator*: Valery Forbes, University of Minnesota
- *Moderator*: Nika Galic, Syngenta Crop Protection
- Kris Garber, U.S. EPA OPP, Environmental Fate and Effects Division
- Amelie Schmolke, Waterborne Environmental, Inc.

ED_002528_00019738-00003

1:15-2:45 PM

Series II, Salon 4 - Emerging Unmanned Aerial Systems Technology for Precision Ag

Precision agriculture is increasingly important to the application of crop protection products. Risk mitigation requirements based on potential spray drift and surface water exposure negatively impact our registrations, registration reviews and endangered species assessments. Significant progress in the precise application of pesticides will dramatically affect ecological risk assessment conclusions. Come learn the latest regulations, the differences between public and commercial use, examples of applications using UAS for precision agriculture and an outlook for technology developments.

- *Moderator*: Tulinda Larsen, Agricultural Aerial Remote Sensing Standards Council
- Robert Blair, Three Canyon Farms
- Diana Marina Cooper, PrecisionHawk
- Jim Williams, JHW Unmanned Solutions LLC

2:45-3:00 PM

Coffee Break - Salon 1 – 3 Foyer

Sponsored by PBI-Gordon

3:00 PM-4:30 PM

Series III, Salon 5-6 - Label Workshop: Industry and Agency Perspectives on Registration Workflows

(This is an invitation-only, space-limited session for EPA staff and invited RISE and CropLife America members. Please contact Stephanie Binns if you are interested in this session or would like more information.)

Both product registrants and EPA staff contribute to the product registration process, but we often lack clarity about what happens on either side of a regulatory submission. This workshop will focus on the complexities of registrant and EPA workflows, and will include a facilitated discussion of common registration challenges from both industry and Agency perspectives. This is a working session and attendees will be expected to participate in the dialogue and come ready to seek mutual understanding and solutions.

3:00-4:30 PM

Series III, Studio E - Establishing Tolerances and MRLs: Down in the Weeds

Technical and policy challenges keep the process of establishing tolerances and maximum residue limits (MRL) interesting. Speakers will address the impact of food concentration factors, European hazard cut-off criteria and the FAO-WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR) on MRLs.

- *Moderator*: Amelia Jackson-Gheissari, Monsanto
- Peter Day, European Crop Protection Association
- Michael Doherty, U.S. EPA
- Miguel García-Winder, Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture
- Lois Rossi, Rossi Consulting
- Yen-Ching Wu, McCormick

ED_002528_00019738-00004

3:00-4:30 PM

Series III, Salon 4 - When Endangered Species Mitigation and Risk Management Meet: Perspectives on Outcome

Ecological risk assessment (ERA) drives the end products of the FIFRA/ESA consultation process, as well as the establishment of protection goals. Much focus has been given to establishing guidance for assessment methods and model development and evaluation. But what does a protection goal look like when it is applied to a given site or practice and what might be the consequences, intended or unintended? What is the on-the-ground likelihood of jeopardy to a species occurring as envisioned from the national level, and how does the possibility for adverse effects on critical habitat play out? Speakers in this session will address agricultural best management practices, economic perspectives, and state and local management of listed species and pesticide use, and how those factors in turn reflect on a national consultation that may conclude in the presumption of jeopardy to a given species.

- *Moderator*: Bernalyn McGaughey, Compliance Services International
- Jeb Barzen, Private Lands Conservation LLC
- Leah Duzy, Compliance Services International
- Jennifer Muladore, Huron Pines
- Ashlea Rives Frank, FIFRA Endangered Species Task Force

3:00-4:30 PM

Series III, Studio D - Novel Approaches for Assessing Inhalation Risk in Human Health Risk Assessments

One of the strategic focal areas of adopting risk and science-based methodologies and integrated approaches to testing and assessment (IATA) is optimization and acceptance of *in-vitro* methods for oral and acute inhalation toxicity testing. This session will discuss application of *in-vitro* assays of merit, considerations of assay development and approaches to help bolster a new paradigm for inhalation risk assessment in the U.S.

- *Moderator*: Tessa Serex, Corteva Agriscience
- Holger Behrsing, Institute for In Vitro Sciences
- Sheila Flack, Syngenta Crop Protection
- Annie Jarabek, U.S. EPA ORD, Human Health Risk Assessment

4:45 PM – 6:00 PM

Reception - Salon 1-3 Foyer

Sponsored by Latham & Watkins LLP and Nufarm

Friday, April 27th

7:00-8:00 AM

Networking Breakfast - Salon 4 & Foyer

Sponsored by Corteva Agriscience

ED_002528_00019738-00005

8:00-9:30 AM **General Session –** Salon 4
U.S. *Environmental Protection Agency Panel*
- *Moderator:* Ray McAllister, CropLife America
- Michael Goodis, EPA OPP, Registration Division
- Yu-Ting Guilaran, EPA OPP, Pesticide Re-evaluation Division
- Kimberly Nesci, EPA OPP, Environmental Fate and Effects Division

9:30-9:45 AM **Coffee Break -** Salon 1 – 3 Foyer
Sponsored by Bergeson & Campbell, P.C.

9:45-11:00 AM **Series IV, Studio D - Toxicity Testing and Risk Assessment for Human Health Protection: How Should We Approach Globalization of the Agrochemical Market?**
The U.S. is usually an important market for agrochemicals although these chemicals are often developed for a global market. There are, however, many aspects of toxicity testing and risk assessment that are region-specific, yet scientific approaches continue to advance more rapidly than global regulations. In this session, these concepts will be explored with a focus upon approaches used by the Environmental Protection Agency.
- *Moderator*: Claire Terry, Corteva Agriscience
- Pat Bishop, Humane Society International/The Humane Society of the United States
- Kevin Leiner, Syngenta Crop Protection
- Anna Lowit, U.S. EPA OPP, Office of the Director
- Dana Vogel, U.S. EPA OPP, Health Effects Division

9:45-11:00 AM **Series IV, Salon 1-3 - Pollinator Protection Priorities**
Protection of pollinators in agricultural production requires a partnership of farmers, beekeepers, regulators and crop protection providers. EPA, state and industry speakers will focus on state Managed Pollinator Protection Plans (MP3) and the implementation of EPA's acute risk mitigation plan for pollinators.
- *Moderator*: Tim Joseph, Landis International
- David Fischer, Bayer
- Cary Giguere, Vermont Agency of Agriculture *(tentative)*
- Meredith Laws, U.S. EPA OPP, Registration Division
- Tom Steeger, U.S. EPA OPP, Environmental Fate and Effects Division

ED_002528_00019738-00006

9:45-11:00 AM

Series IV, Studio E - Challenges and Recommendations for Generating and Utilizing Higher-Tier Data in Ecological Risk Assessment and Risk Management of Pesticides

Registration of pesticides requires evaluation of the potential ecological risk using a tiered testing and assessment approach. Standardized eco-toxicity tests and conservative exposure estimates are used at lower tiers to assess potential risks. However, if lower-tier assessments indicate that a substance may pose a risk to the environment, those risks can then be re-evaluated with less conservative assumptions, and by using refined exposure and/or effects assessments. This session will present a summary of a recent tripartite workshop that focused on overcoming challenges and providing recommendations for generating and utilizing higher-tier data to inform ecological risk assessments and the risk management applied to assessment of pesticides. These recommendations are intended to help the regulated community and EPA improve the design, conduct, evaluation and application of higher tier data to inform regulatory decision making.

- *Moderator*: Steven Levine, Monsanto
- Kevin Costello, U.S. EPA OPP, Pesticide Re-Evaluation Division
- Laura McConnell, Bayer
- Ed Odenkirchen, U.S. EPA OPP, Environmental Fate and Effects Division

11:00-11:15 AM

Coffee Break - Salon 1 – 3 Foyer

Sponsored by Intrinsik

11:15 AM-12:30 PM

Series V, Salon 4 - State of Toxicology Assessment in Human Health Risk Assessments

Within the 21st century, the U.S. is poised to advance practices of toxicity testing and human health assessment of environmental agents, chemicals and pesticides. Several focal areas, to be examined and discussed by EPA staff, include movement to use of *in-vitro* models from existing *in-vivo* models, programs currently used for assessment of specific topics such as the Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program, the Comparative Thyroid Assay and the Hazard and Science Policy Committee.

- *Moderator*: Rick Reiss, Exponent
- Stan Barone, U.S. EPA Office of Science Coordination and Policy
- Warren Casey, National Institutes of Health
- Anna Lowit, U.S. EPA OPP, Office of the Director

ED_002528_00019738-00007

11:15 AM-12:30 PM **Series V, Salon 1-3 - Other Ingredients and Their Roles in Crop Protection**

Active ingredients need the help of other ingredients to accomplish the job of crop protection, and these can have their own regulatory challenges. This session will discuss EPA's substantial similarity clinic that compares product formulations and issues surrounding disclosure of inert ingredients.

- Moderator: Paul Kierkus, BASF
- Richard Engler, Bergeson & Campbell
- Pasquale Falcigno, BASF
- Elissa Reaves, U.S. EPA OPP, Health Effects Division
- Kerry Leifer, U.S. EPA OPP, Registration Division

12:30 PM **Adjourn**

ED_002528_00019738-00008

CropLife America & RISE
Regulatory Conference
Partnering for Progress April 25 - 27, 2018

March 7, 2018

Ms. Darlene Dinkins
U.S. EPA, Office of Pesticide Programs
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
Mail Code: 7506P
Washington, DC 20460

Dear Ms. Dinkins:

We are delighted to invite Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) staff to be speakers and attendees at our 2018 CropLife America & RISE Regulatory Conference. The Conference will take place April 25-27 at the Renaissance Arlington Capital View Hotel, located at 2800 S. Potomac Avenue, Arlington, Virginia, 22202. This year's Conference will focus on ongoing regulatory science and policy issues currently engaging our industry and will feature content created specifically for EPA guests.

The attached spreadsheet outlines the preferred EPA speaker along with the session topic, date, and time for each EPA employee we are inviting to speak. While we list our preferred speakers, we know there may be other Agency staff better suited to speak on these topics, so we also include a short description of what we would like each EPA staff member to speak about. Please use this to help you determine the most appropriate person to speak in each slot.

As part of the Conference, RISE is also holding its third annual special 90-minute session, *EPA Labels Live!*, designed specifically for OPP staff members. All OPP staff, and particularly those in the Registration Division (RD), are invited to attend this programmed session on April 26 from 1:15-2:45 p.m. This year's session will feature new content on topics including product formulation varieties, registrant label workflows, business reasons for supplemental distribution, stewardship in consumer product packaging, and specialty use sites. The session will include examples and displays to help Agency staff better understand the use and development of products they regulate.

Other sessions will provide technical and policy input on issues related to ecological and human health risk assessment, including use of alternative testing methods to reduce animal studies; endangered species risk assessment; pollinators; inerts and mixtures in registration and registration review; and use of epidemiologic study approaches to risk assessment and application of the FQPA Safety Factor in risk management.

This year, we are also hosting an interactive labeling workshop to encourage mutual understanding between Registration Division, Environmental Fate and Effects Division, and Health Effects Division staff and our members responsible for product registration and labeling. The workshop, which takes place April 26 from 3:00-4:30 p.m., will address the complexities of registrant and EPA workflows and will include a facilitated discussion of common registration challenges from both industry and Agency perspectives. We are in

communication with Registration Division staff to plan the workshop and coordinate EPA attendees, and we appreciate your support in encouraging appropriate EPA staff to attend.

An additional new element of this year's Conference is the introduction of precision agriculture technologies and equipment to demonstrate use of computer-assisted programs for more focused pesticide application, mapping and atmospheric data collection. We hope that this showcase will provide realistic view of technological capabilities to focus applications to reduce off-target environmental impacts, and potentially reduce the need for overly conservative mitigation measures.

Please be assured that attendance for federal government staff at any of the Regulatory Conference sessions or events is complimentary and does not require registration or advance RSVP. We encourage all interested OPP employees to attend and have included a complete agenda to aid in your planning.

Thank you for considering our request. If you have any questions about the Conference, please don't hesitate to contact us. Stephanie Binns [sbinns@pestfacts.org, (202) 872-3862] will be our primary contact to coordinate EPA's participation and can assist you with any necessary details. We look forward to seeing you there!

Best regards,

Janet E. Collins
Executive Vice President, CropLife America

Aaron Hobbs
President, RISE

Appointment

From: Jewell, Shannon [jewell.shannon@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/5/2018 5:26:02 PM
To: Layne, Arnold [Layne.Arnold@epa.gov]; Lowit, Anna [Lowit.Anna@epa.gov]; Weiss, Steven [Weiss.Steven@epa.gov]; Miller, Wynne [Miller.Wynne@epa.gov]; McNally, Robert [Mcnally.Robert@epa.gov]; Echeverria, Marietta [Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov]; Mosby, Jackie [Mosby.Jackie@epa.gov]; Vogel, Dana [Vogel.Dana@epa.gov]; Barber, Delores [barber.delores@epa.gov]; Guilaran, Yu-Ting [Guilaran.Yu-Ting@epa.gov]; Goodis, Michael [Goodis.Michael@epa.gov]

Subject: Annual Meeting with the CropLife Board of Directors
Attachments: FINAL DRAFT EPA Agenda.pdf
Location: Renaissance Arlington Capital View (The Potomac Room)

Start: 3/5/2018 8:00:00 PM
End: 3/5/2018 10:00:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative

Location confirmed: Renaissance Arlington Capital View, Potomac Room

DRAFT AGENDA

Prepared by:	Jay Vroom
Date:	March 5, 2018
Reviewed by:	CLA Senior Management Team
Status:	**DRAFT**
To:	Rick Keigwin, EPA

Title: **CLA Meeting with EPA OPP Staff**
Date: **Monday, March 5, 3:00 – 5:00 PM**
Venue: **Renaissance Arlington Capital View**
2800 S. Potomac Avenue
Arlington, VA

	Lead	Time (mins)
1. Welcome / Overview	Blome, Vroom, Keigwin	
2. Label Changes – How to respond to pest control needs of growers when changes are required	Vroom Keigwin Restucci Smith	
3. Seed Production a. High-value crop requiring pest control products b. Special attention to worker protection	Vroom Tom Hultine	
4. ESA – How EPA's role has evolved, and may continue to evolve	Lattimore Vroom	
5. PRIA – Steady state resources are vital	Greenwood Goldberg	
6. GLP Challenges & Opportunities	Collins	
7. US – EU and Other Trading Countries/MRL Concerns	Collins Keigwin	
8. RISE-CLA 2018 Regulatory Conference	Collins Hobbs Keigwin	
9. Any other business / Adjourn		

Participants:
CLA Board of Directors
Jon Akins, TKI
Jim Blome, Bayer CropScience
Andrew Bodane, Sipcam Advan
Jeff Bunting, GROWMARK
Don Chew, PBI/Gordon
Eric Cowling, Helena Chemical
Bill Culpepper, SePRO
Brendan Deck, Nufarm Americas
Vern Hawkins, Syngenta
Jeff Johnson, Nichino America
Andy Lee, Valent USA Corporation
Brent McGowan, Wilbur-Ellis
Chris Payne, CNI
Steve Petersen, Gowan Company LLC
Paul Rea, BASF
Mark Ripato, Tenkoz
Mike Steffeck, Pinnacle Ag Holdings
Dave Swihart, Scotts Miracle0Gro
Mike Vande Logt, Winfield
Jason Ward, Lonza

ED_002528_00020436-00001

CLA Board of Directors (*cont'd*)
Susanne Wasson, Corteva Agriscience
Rob Williams, ADAMA
Eric Wintemute, AMVAC Chemical Corporation

CLA Strategic Oversight Council
John Cummings, FMC
Steve Goldberg, BASF
Kevin Henry, TKI
Michael Parrish, Monsanto
Scott Rawlins, Wilbur-Ellis
Scott Schertz, Schertz Aerial
Cindy Smith, Gowan
Eric Tamichi, Valent USA
Mark Trostle, Crop Production Services

Members & Guests
John Buckley, Wilbur-Ellis
Jeff Cassady, SCPA
Daren Coppock, Ag Retailers Association
Amy Davis, Novozymes
Evan Hultine, Hultine Farms
Tommy Jackson, Syngenta
Lisa Nichols, Loveland Products
Vince Restucci, RD Offutt
Charlotte Sanson, Bayer CropScience
Mike Seyfert, FMC Corporation
Kip Tom, Tom Farms
Kathy Wescott, CPS

CropLife America and RISE Staff
Jay Vroom, **President & CEO**
Janet Collins, **Executive Vice President, Science & Regulatory Affairs**
Beau Greenwood, **Executive Vice President, Government Relations & Public Affairs**
Bill Kuckuck, **Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer**
Rachel Lattimore, **Senior Vice President and General Counsel**
Aaron Hobbs, **President, RISE**
Kellie Bray, **Senior Director, Government Affairs**
Jeff Case, **Senior Director, Government Affairs**
Ethan Mathews, **Director, Government Affairs**
Doreen Manchester, **Deputy General Counsel**
Gen O'Sullivan, **Director, Communications and Marketing**

ED_002528_00020436-00002

Message

From: Echeverria, Marietta [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=36C56B7169144626BD6AADEA25992D4E-MARIETTA ECHEVERRIA]
Sent: 4/20/2018 7:41:51 PM
To: OPP EFED Managers [OPP_EFED_Managers@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: CLA/RISE Regulatory Conference - session discussion
Attachments: 2018 Regulatory Conference Agenda_4.20.18.pdf; CropLife EPA Invitation Letter FINAL.pdf

---

From: Dinkins, Darlene
Sent: Friday, April 20, 2018 12:10 PM
To: OPP Division Directors <OPP_Division_Directors@epa.gov>; OPP Deputy & Associate Directors <OPP_Deputy_&_Associate_Directors@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Lowit, Anna <Lowit.Anna@epa.gov>
Cc: Sisco, Debby <Sisco.Debby@epa.gov>; Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>
Subject: CLA/RISE Regulatory Conference - session discussion

Please find attached the final agenda for the CLA/RISE Regulatory Conference, April 25-27 at the Renaissance Arlington Capital View Hotel. Feel free to share this information with staff. I have also attached the invitation letter, which states "attendance for federal government staff at any of the sessions is complimentary and does not require registration or advance RSVP."

Darlene Dinkins
Office of Pesticide Programs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
(703) 305-5214

From: Stephanie Ann Binns [mailto:sbinns@pestfacts.org]
Sent: Friday, April 20, 2018 11:44 AM
To: Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: CLA/RISE Regulatory Conference - session discussion

Hi Darlene,

A copy of the final conference agenda is attached. Please feel free to share it with OPP staff.

Thanks so much for your help throughout this process!
Stephanie

Wednesday, April 25th

3:00 – 5:00 PM **Registration Opens**

5:30-7:00 PM **Welcome Reception -** Salon 4 Foyer
Sponsored by Valent U.S.A.

Thursday, April 26th

6:30 AM **Registration Opens**

7:00-8:00 AM **Networking Breakfast -** Salon 4 & Foyer
Sponsored by Syngenta Crop Protection

8:00-10:00 AM **General Session** – Salon 4

- Welcome: Jay Vroom (CLA); Aaron Hobbs (RISE); Janet Collins (CLA)
- Keynote: Henry Darwin, Chief of Operations, EPA
- Precision Ag Equipment Panel:
  - Mark Anderson, GVM, Inc.
  - Ben Chostner, Blue River Technology
  - Jeff Grimm, CapstanAg
  - Jeff Smigiel, Micro-Matic
  - Rick Rice, AMVAC
  - Nancy Westcott, GoatThroat Pumps
  - Bruce Woodcock, Aventech
- Introduction of 2018 CLASS - *Sponsored by FMC Corporation*

10:00-10:30 AM **Coffee Break -** Salon 1 – 3 Foyer
Sponsored by TKI NovaSource

10:30 AM-12:00 PM **Series I, Studio D - Pesticide Imports and Exports: Facilitating Global Commerce**

Administrative procedures for importing pesticides into the U.S. and exporting them to other countries require adjustment from time to time. Speakers will discuss the challenges of export certification for pesticide products and the import of active ingredients for formulation of products into the U.S.

- *Moderator*: Doreen Manchester, CropLife America
- Jim Barron, Arysta LifeScience
- John Conner, Crowell & Moring LLP
- Annette Kirk, Monsanto
- Ray McAllister, CropLife America

ED_002528_00021774-00001

10:30 AM-12:00 PM **Series I, Studio E - Application of Environmental Epidemiology in Risk Assessment and Decision-Making**

Regulatory Authorities are increasingly discussing the use of environmental epidemiology in risk assessment. The utility of these data for regulatory purposes can be limited due to data quality and transparency, insufficient exposure measurements and general deficiencies in study design. In this session, perspectives on concerns and efforts to advance the use of and define the suitability of environmental epidemiology studies for regulatory decision making will be discussed as well as a specific project from the Health and Environmental Sciences Institute (HESI).

- *Moderator:* Cindy Smith, Gowan Company
- Carol Burns, Burns Epidemiology Consulting, LLC
- David Miller, U.S. EPA OPP, Health Effects Division
- Christian Strupp, Gowan Company

10:30 AM-12:00 PM **Series I, Salon 4 - What We've Learned, What We Need: The FIFRA/ESA Consultation Process**

Recently, USDA Secretary of Agriculture Sonny Purdue announced the establishment of an Interagency Working Group to coordinate Endangered Species Act (ESA) consultations for pesticide registrations and registration review under FIFRA. Additionally, at the end of the year, the NMFS released a final Biological Opinion on the first three Registration Review consultations (EPA Biological Evaluations) on organophosphates conducted under the Interim Process proposed by the Agencies under the NAS Expert Panel Report (Nov 2013). In this session, speakers from the federal agencies will address what they've learned about the consultation process to date and what they still need to develop going forward.

12:00-1:15 PM **Lunch -** Salon 4 & Foyer

Sponsored by Crowell & Moring LLP

Grower Panel

- Vince Restucci (R.D. Offutt)
- Kip Tom (Tom Farms)
- Tyler Wegmeyer (Wegmeyer Farms)

ED_002528_00021774-00002

1:15-2:45 PM

Series II, Salon 1-3 - EPA Labels Live!: Pesticide Labels from the Lab to Your Neighborhood

How does a pesticide product get from the lab to your yard and community? Via the EPA stamped label! Join us for our third annual interactive session specifically designed for EPA and government agency staff (though participation is open to all conference attendees). Attendees are invited to visit with pesticide registrants who work with pesticides at all stages of the pesticide product life cycle. This year features new content on specialty use sites, consumer product packaging, supplemental distribution and more! Participants will leave with a new understanding of how registrants design products and labeling with end users in mind and will learn what it takes to get products from development to safe and effective application.

1:15 PM-2:45 PM

Series II, Studio E - Trading Up: How Crop Protection Influences Agricultural Exports (and Vice Versa)

Smooth global trade in agricultural products requires cooperation of governments worldwide to establish, implement and enforce international standards for pesticide residues in food. Speakers will address the challenges of establishing Codex Maximum Residue Limits (MRL), national MRL systems and MRLs for imported produce.

- *Moderator*: Christoph Neumann, CropLife International
- Julie Chao, USDA Foreign Agricultural Service
- David Miller, U.S. EPA OPP, Health Effects Division
- Daniella Taveau, King & Spalding
- Carmen Tiu, Corteva Agrisciences

1:15-2:45 PM

Series II, Studio D - Charting a Path Forward for the Use of Population Modeling in Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA) of Pesticides

Implementation and use of population models for ERA and management has not fully reflected advances in the area. Possible reasons for this include the broad diversity of models and approaches; lack of specific guidance on when to use models and the corresponding degree of complexity; how to deal with uncertainty in data and model output; and how to translate model output into risk analysis decisions. We propose to use this session to 1.) clearly identify reasons for underutilization of population models in ERA decision-making; 2.) identify regulatory needs concerning population modeling (e.g. data, code, guidance); *and* 3.) address these through multi-stakeholder discussions.

- *Moderator*: Valery Forbes, University of Minnesota
- *Moderator*: Nika Galic, Syngenta Crop Protection
- Kris Garber, U.S. EPA OPP, Environmental Fate and Effects Division
- Amelie Schmolke, Waterborne Environmental, Inc.

ED_002528_00021774-00003

1:15-2:45 PM

Series II, Salon 4 - Emerging Unmanned Aerial Systems Technology for Precision Ag

Precision agriculture is increasingly important to the application of crop protection products. Risk mitigation requirements based on potential spray drift and surface water exposure negatively impact our registrations, registration reviews and endangered species assessments. Significant progress in the precise application of pesticides will dramatically affect ecological risk assessment conclusions. Come learn the latest regulations, the differences between public and commercial use, examples of applications using UAS for precision agriculture and an outlook for technology developments.

- *Moderator*: Tulinda Larsen, Agricultural Aerial Remote Sensing Standards Council
- Robert Blair, Three Canyon Farms
- Diana Marina Cooper, PrecisionHawk
- Jim Williams, JHW Unmanned Solutions LLC

2:45-3:00 PM

Coffee Break - Salon 1 – 3 Foyer

Sponsored by PBI-Gordon

3:00 PM-4:30 PM

Series III, Salon 5-6 - Label Workshop: Industry and Agency Perspectives on Registration Workflows

(This is an invitation-only, space-limited session for EPA staff and invited RISE and CropLife America members. Please contact Stephanie Binns if you are interested in this session or would like more information.)

Both product registrants and EPA staff contribute to the product registration process, but we often lack clarity about what happens on either side of a regulatory submission. This workshop will focus on the complexities of registrant and EPA workflows, and will include a facilitated discussion of common registration challenges from both industry and Agency perspectives. This is a working session and attendees will be expected to participate in the dialogue and come ready to seek mutual understanding and solutions.

3:00-4:30 PM

Series III, Studio E - Establishing Tolerances and MRLs: Down in the Weeds

Technical and policy challenges keep the process of establishing tolerances and maximum residue limits (MRL) interesting. Speakers will address the impact of food concentration factors, European hazard cut-off criteria and the FAO-WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR) on MRLs.

- *Moderator*: Amelia Jackson-Gheissari, Monsanto
- Peter Day, European Crop Protection Association
- Michael Doherty, U.S. EPA
- Miguel García-Winder, Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture
- Lois Rossi, Rossi Consulting
- Yen-Ching Wu, McCormick

ED_002528_00021774-00004

3:00-4:30 PM

Series III, Salon 4 - When Endangered Species Mitigation and Risk Management Meet: Perspectives on Outcome

Ecological risk assessment (ERA) drives the end products of the FIFRA/ESA consultation process, as well as the establishment of protection goals. Much focus has been given to establishing guidance for assessment methods and model development and evaluation. But what does a protection goal look like when it is applied to a given site or practice and what might be the consequences, intended or unintended? What is the on-the-ground likelihood of jeopardy to a species occurring as envisioned from the national level, and how does the possibility for adverse effects on critical habitat play out? Speakers in this session will address agricultural best management practices, economic perspectives, and state and local management of listed species and pesticide use, and how those factors in turn reflect on a national consultation that may conclude in the presumption of jeopardy to a given species.

- *Moderator*: Bernalyn McGaughey, Compliance Services International
- Jeb Barzen, Private Lands Conservation LLC
- Leah Duzy, Compliance Services International
- Jennifer Muladore, Huron Pines
- Ashlea Rives Frank, FIFRA Endangered Species Task Force

3:00-4:30 PM

Series III, Studio D - Novel Approaches for Assessing Inhalation Risk in Human Health Risk Assessments

One of the strategic focal areas of adopting risk and science-based methodologies and integrated approaches to testing and assessment (IATA) is optimization and acceptance of *in-vitro* methods for oral and acute inhalation toxicity testing. This session will discuss application of *in-vitro* assays of merit, considerations of assay development and approaches to help bolster a new paradigm for inhalation risk assessment in the U.S.

- *Moderator*: Tessa Serex, Corteva Agriscience
- Holger Behrsing, Institute for In Vitro Sciences
- Sheila Flack, Syngenta Crop Protection
- Annie Jarabek, U.S. EPA ORD, Human Health Risk Assessment

4:45 PM – 6:00 PM

Reception - Salon 1-3 Foyer

Sponsored by Latham & Watkins LLP and Nufarm

Friday, April 27th

7:00-8:00 AM

Networking Breakfast - Salon 4 & Foyer

Sponsored by Corteva Agriscience

ED_002528_00021774-00005

8:00-9:30 AM **General Session –** Salon 4

U.S. *Environmental Protection Agency Panel*

- *Moderator:* Ray McAllister, CropLife America
- Michael Goodis, EPA OPP, Registration Division
- Yu-Ting Guilaran, EPA OPP, Pesticide Re-evaluation Division
- Kimberly Nesci, EPA OPP, Environmental Fate and Effects Division

9:30-9:45 AM **Coffee Break -** Salon 1 – 3 Foyer

Sponsored by Bergeson & Campbell, P.C.

9:45-11:00 AM **Series IV, Studio D - Toxicity Testing and Risk Assessment for Human Health Protection: How Should We Approach Globalization of the Agrochemical Market?**

The U.S. is usually an important market for agrochemicals although these chemicals are often developed for a global market. There are, however, many aspects of toxicity testing and risk assessment that are region-specific, yet scientific approaches continue to advance more rapidly than global regulations. In this session, these concepts will be explored with a focus upon approaches used by the Environmental Protection Agency.

- *Moderator*: Claire Terry, Corteva Agriscience
- Pat Bishop, Humane Society International/The Humane Society of the United States
- Kevin Leiner, Syngenta Crop Protection
- Anna Lowit, U.S. EPA OPP, Office of the Director
- Dana Vogel, U.S. EPA OPP, Health Effects Division

9:45-11:00 AM **Series IV, Salon 1-3 - Pollinator Protection Priorities**

Protection of pollinators in agricultural production requires a partnership of farmers, beekeepers, regulators and crop protection providers. EPA, state and industry speakers will focus on state Managed Pollinator Protection Plans (MP3) and the implementation of EPA's acute risk mitigation plan for pollinators.

- *Moderator*: Tim Joseph, Landis International
- David Fischer, Bayer
- Cary Giguere, Vermont Agency of Agriculture *(tentative)*
- Meredith Laws, U.S. EPA OPP, Registration Division
- Tom Steeger, U.S. EPA OPP, Environmental Fate and Effects Division

ED_002528_00021774-00006

9:45-11:00 AM

Series IV, Studio E - Challenges and Recommendations for Generating and Utilizing Higher-Tier Data in Ecological Risk Assessment and Risk Management of Pesticides

Registration of pesticides requires evaluation of the potential ecological risk using a tiered testing and assessment approach. Standardized eco-toxicity tests and conservative exposure estimates are used at lower tiers to assess potential risks. However, if lower-tier assessments indicate that a substance may pose a risk to the environment, those risks can then be re-evaluated with less conservative assumptions, and by using refined exposure and/or effects assessments. This session will present a summary of a recent tripartite workshop that focused on overcoming challenges and providing recommendations for generating and utilizing higher-tier data to inform ecological risk assessments and the risk management applied to assessment of pesticides. These recommendations are intended to help the regulated community and EPA improve the design, conduct, evaluation and application of higher tier data to inform regulatory decision making.

- *Moderator*: Steven Levine, Monsanto
- Kevin Costello, U.S. EPA OPP, Pesticide Re-Evaluation Division
- Laura McConnell, Bayer
- Ed Odenkirchen, U.S. EPA OPP, Environmental Fate and Effects Division

11:00-11:15 AM

Coffee Break - Salon 1 – 3 Foyer

Sponsored by Intrinsik

11:15 AM-12:30 PM

Series V, Salon 4 - State of Toxicology Assessment in Human Health Risk Assessments

Within the 21st century, the U.S. is poised to advance practices of toxicity testing and human health assessment of environmental agents, chemicals and pesticides. Several focal areas, to be examined and discussed by EPA staff, include movement to use of *in-vitro* models from existing *in-vivo* models, programs currently used for assessment of specific topics such as the Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program, the Comparative Thyroid Assay and the Hazard and Science Policy Committee.

- *Moderator*: Rick Reiss, Exponent
- Stan Barone, U.S. EPA Office of Science Coordination and Policy
- Warren Casey, National Institutes of Health
- Anna Lowit, U.S. EPA OPP, Office of the Director

ED_002528_00021774-00007

11:15 AM-12:30 PM **Series V, Salon 1-3 - Other Ingredients and Their Roles in Crop Protection**

Active ingredients need the help of other ingredients to accomplish the job of crop protection, and these can have their own regulatory challenges. This session will discuss EPA's substantial similarity clinic that compares product formulations and issues surrounding disclosure of inert ingredients.

- Moderator: Paul Kierkus, BASF
- Richard Engler, Bergeson & Campbell
- Pasquale Falcigno, BASF
- Elissa Reaves, U.S. EPA OPP, Health Effects Division
- Kerry Leifer, U.S. EPA OPP, Registration Division

12:30 PM **Adjourn**

ED_002528_00021774-00008

CropLife America & RISE
Regulatory Conference
Partnering for Progress April 25 - 27, 2018

March 7, 2018

Ms. Darlene Dinkins
U.S. EPA, Office of Pesticide Programs
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
Mail Code: 7506P
Washington, DC 20460

Dear Ms. Dinkins:

We are delighted to invite Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) staff to be speakers and attendees at our 2018 CropLife America & RISE Regulatory Conference. The Conference will take place April 25-27 at the Renaissance Arlington Capital View Hotel, located at 2800 S. Potomac Avenue, Arlington, Virginia, 22202. This year's Conference will focus on ongoing regulatory science and policy issues currently engaging our industry and will feature content created specifically for EPA guests.

The attached spreadsheet outlines the preferred EPA speaker along with the session topic, date, and time for each EPA employee we are inviting to speak. While we list our preferred speakers, we know there may be other Agency staff better suited to speak on these topics, so we also include a short description of what we would like each EPA staff member to speak about. Please use this to help you determine the most appropriate person to speak in each slot.

As part of the Conference, RISE is also holding its third annual special 90-minute session, *EPA Labels Live!*, designed specifically for OPP staff members. All OPP staff, and particularly those in the Registration Division (RD), are invited to attend this programmed session on April 26 from 1:15-2:45 p.m. This year's session will feature new content on topics including product formulation varieties, registrant label workflows, business reasons for supplemental distribution, stewardship in consumer product packaging, and specialty use sites. The session will include examples and displays to help Agency staff better understand the use and development of products they regulate.

Other sessions will provide technical and policy input on issues related to ecological and human health risk assessment, including use of alternative testing methods to reduce animal studies; endangered species risk assessment; pollinators; inerts and mixtures in registration and registration review; and use of epidemiologic study approaches to risk assessment and application of the FQPA Safety Factor in risk management.

This year, we are also hosting an interactive labeling workshop to encourage mutual understanding between Registration Division, Environmental Fate and Effects Division, and Health Effects Division staff and our members responsible for product registration and labeling. The workshop, which takes place April 26 from 3:00-4:30 p.m., will address the complexities of registrant and EPA workflows and will include a facilitated discussion of common registration challenges from both industry and Agency perspectives. We are in

communication with Registration Division staff to plan the workshop and coordinate EPA attendees, and we appreciate your support in encouraging appropriate EPA staff to attend.

An additional new element of this year's Conference is the introduction of precision agriculture technologies and equipment to demonstrate use of computer-assisted programs for more focused pesticide application, mapping and atmospheric data collection. We hope that this showcase will provide realistic view of technological capabilities to focus applications to reduce off-target environmental impacts, and potentially reduce the need for overly conservative mitigation measures.

Please be assured that attendance for federal government staff at any of the Regulatory Conference sessions or events is complimentary and does not require registration or advance RSVP. We encourage all interested OPP employees to attend and have included a complete agenda to aid in your planning.

Thank you for considering our request. If you have any questions about the Conference, please don't hesitate to contact us. Stephanie Binns [sbinns@pestfacts.org, (202) 872-3862] will be our primary contact to coordinate EPA's participation and can assist you with any necessary details. We look forward to seeing you there!

Best regards,

Janet E. Collins
Executive Vice President, CropLife America

Aaron Hobbs
President, RISE

Appointment

From: Echeverria, Marietta [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=36C56B7169144626BD6AADEA25992D4E-MARIETTA ECHEVERRIA]
Sent: 3/5/2018 2:31:12 PM
To: Nesci, Kimberly [nesci.kimberly@epa.gov]

Subject: FW: Annual Meeting with the CropLife Board of Directors
Attachments: FINAL DRAFT EPA Agenda.pdf
Location: Residence Inn Capital View (The Potomac Room)

Start: 3/5/2018 8:00:00 PM
End: 3/5/2018 10:00:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative

-----Original Appointment-----
From: Keigwin, Richard
Sent: Wednesday, January 03, 2018 11:52 AM
To: Keigwin, Richard; Layne, Arnold; Lowit, Anna; Weiss, Steven; Miller, Wynne; McNally, Robert; Echeverria, Marietta; Mosby, Jackie; Vogel, Dana; Barber, Delores; Guilaran, Yu-Ting; Goodis, Michael
Subject: Annual Meeting with the CropLife Board of Directors
When: Monday, March 05, 2018 3:00 PM-5:00 PM (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada).
Where: Residence Inn Capital View (The Potomac Room)

Final agenda attached

DRAFT AGENDA

Prepared by:	Jay Vroom
Date:	March 5, 2018
Reviewed by:	CLA Senior Management Team
Status:	**DRAFT**
To:	Rick Keigwin, EPA

Title: **CLA Meeting with EPA OPP Staff**
Date: **Monday, March 5, 3:00 – 5:00 PM**
Venue: **Renaissance Arlington Capital View**
2800 S. Potomac Avenue
Arlington, VA

	Lead	Time (mins)
1. Welcome / Overview	Blome, Vroom, Keigwin	
2. Label Changes – How to respond to pest control needs of growers when changes are required	Vroom Keigwin Restucci Smith	
3. Seed Production a. High-value crop requiring pest control products b. Special attention to worker protection	Vroom Tom Hultine	
4. ESA – How EPA's role has evolved, and may continue to evolve	Lattimore Vroom	
5. PRIA – Steady state resources are vital	Greenwood Goldberg	
6. GLP Challenges & Opportunities	Collins	
7. US – EU and Other Trading Countries/MRL Concerns	Collins Keigwin	
8. RISE-CLA 2018 Regulatory Conference	Collins Hobbs Keigwin	
9. Any other business / Adjourn		

Participants:
CLA Board of Directors
Jon Akins, TKI
Jim Blome, Bayer CropScience
Andrew Bodane, Sipcam Advan
Jeff Bunting, GROWMARK
Don Chew, PBI/Gordon
Eric Cowling, Helena Chemical
Bill Culpepper, SePRO
Brendan Deck, Nufarm Americas
Vern Hawkins, Syngenta
Jeff Johnson, Nichino America
Andy Lee, Valent USA Corporation
Brent McGowan, Wilbur-Ellis
Chris Payne, CNI
Steve Petersen, Gowan Company LLC
Paul Rea, BASF
Mark Ripato, Tenkoz
Mike Steffeck, Pinnacle Ag Holdings
Dave Swihart, Scotts Miracle0Gro
Mike Vande Logt, Winfield
Jason Ward, Lonza

ED_002528_00022151-00001

CLA Board of Directors (*cont'd*)
Susanne Wasson, Corteva Agriscience
Rob Williams, ADAMA
Eric Wintemute, AMVAC Chemical Corporation

CLA Strategic Oversight Council
John Cummings, FMC
Steve Goldberg, BASF
Kevin Henry, TKI
Michael Parrish, Monsanto
Scott Rawlins, Wilbur-Ellis
Scott Schertz, Schertz Aerial
Cindy Smith, Gowan
Eric Tamichi, Valent USA
Mark Trostle, Crop Production Services

Members & Guests
John Buckley, Wilbur-Ellis
Jeff Cassady, SCPA
Daren Coppock, Ag Retailers Association
Amy Davis, Novozymes
Evan Hultine, Hultine Farms
Tommy Jackson, Syngenta
Lisa Nichols, Loveland Products
Vince Restucci, RD Offutt
Charlotte Sanson, Bayer CropScience
Mike Seyfert, FMC Corporation
Kip Tom, Tom Farms
Kathy Wescott, CPS

CropLife America and RISE Staff
Jay Vroom, **President & CEO**
Janet Collins, **Executive Vice President, Science & Regulatory Affairs**
Beau Greenwood, **Executive Vice President, Government Relations & Public Affairs**
Bill Kuckuck, **Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer**
Rachel Lattimore, **Senior Vice President and General Counsel**
Aaron Hobbs, **President, RISE**
Kellie Bray, **Senior Director, Government Affairs**
Jeff Case, **Senior Director, Government Affairs**
Ethan Mathews, **Director, Government Affairs**
Doreen Manchester, **Deputy General Counsel**
Gen O'Sullivan, **Director, Communications and Marketing**

ED_002528_00022151-00002

Appointment

From: Mary Jo Tomalewski [mjtomalewski@croplifeamerica.org]
Sent: 2/7/2017 10:05:50 PM
To: Mary Jo Tomalewski [mjtomalewski@croplifeamerica.org]; Andrew Bodane [abodane@sipcamadvan.com]; Andy Lee [andy.lee@valent.com]; Brendan Deck [Brendan.Deck@us.nufarm.com]; Cassidy, David [dcassidy@tkinet.com]; Chris Payne [cpayne@cniag.com]; Culpepper, William [billc@sepro.com]; Dave Rummel [dave.rummel@adama.com]; Diane Allemang [diane.allemang@fmc.com]; Don Chew [dchew@pbigordon.com]; Eric Wintemute [ericw@amvac-chemical.com]; Hawkins, Vern [Vern.Hawkins@syngenta.com]; James Blome [james.blome@bayer.com]; Jeff Bunting (jbunting@growmark.com) [jbunting@growmark.com]; Jeffrey Johnson [jjohnson@nichino.net]; Jim Hay [James.R.Hay@dupont.com]; Johnson, Gregory [GregJ@fine-americas.com]; Lee Schaber [lee.schaber@scotts.com]; Leigh Shockey [lshockey@drexchem.com]; Lisa Safarian [lisa.m.safarian@monsanto.com]; Mark Ripato [mripato@tenkoz.com]; Mike Steffeck [mike.steffeck@pinnacleag.com]; Milton Allen [AllenM@helenachemical.com]; Paul Rea [paul.rea@basf.com]; Rico Christensen [Rico.Christensen@arysta.com]; Spencer Vance [spencerv@albaughinc.com]; Steve Petersen [spetersen@gowanco.com]; Susanne Wasson [lswasson@dow.com]; Ted Ramirez [ted.ramirez@lonza.com]; Tretter, David [dave.tretter@cpsagu.com]; Vande Logt, Mike (MBVandelogt@landolakes.com) [MBVandelogt@landolakes.com]; Vicente Gongora [vicente.gongora@uniphos.com]; Vradenburg, Dan [drv@wilburellis.com]; Aaron Hobbs [ahobbs@pestfacts.org]; Beau Greenwood [BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org]; Bill Kuckuck [bkuckuck@CropLifeAmerica.org]; Bob Graney [robert.graney@bayer.com]; Brittany Benton [BBenton@croplifeamerica.org]; Carol Diaz [carol.diaz@basf.com]; Cindy Smith [csmith@gowanco.com]; Ed Duskin [eduskin@earthlink.net]; Elisha Modisett Kemp [elmodisett@dow.com]; Eric Tamichi [Eric.Tamichi@valent.com]; Francesca Purcell [fpurcell@croplifeamerica.org]; Fred Bosco [FBosco@croplifeamerica.org]; Genevieve O'Sullivan [gosullivan@croplifeamerica.org]; Goldberg, Steven J. [steven.goldberg@basf.com]; Imad Saab [isaab@croplifeamerica.org]; Jacob Yohn [jyohn@croplifeamerica.org]; Janet Collins [jcollins@croplifeamerica.org]; Jay Vroom [JVroom@croplifeamerica.org]; Jeff Case [JCase@croplifeamerica.org]; Jeff Cassady [jeff.cassady@southcrop.org]; live.com#john.cummings@fmc.com [john.cummings@fmc.com]; Jon Akins [jakins@tkinet.com]; live.com#kathleen.azzarello@syngenta.com [kathleen.azzarello@syngenta.com]; Kathryn Allen [kathryn.allen@bayer.com]; Kristin Landis [KLandis@croplifeamerica.org]; Laisha Dismuke [LDismuke@croplifeamerica.org]; Mark Trostle [mark.trostle@cpsagu.com]; McFarland, Janis [janis.mcfarland@syngenta.com]; Megan Christy [megan.christy@southcrop.org]; live.com#michael.parrish@monsanto.com [michael.parrish@monsanto.com]; Michelle Tiller [mtiller@croplifeamerica.org]; Rachel Lattimore [RLattimore@croplifeamerica.org]; Ray McAllister [RMcAllister@croplifeamerica.org]; Reshma Arrington [rarrington@croplifeamerica.org]; Sarah Macedo [SMacedo@croplifeamerica.org]; live.com#srawlins@wilburellis.com [srawlins@wilburellis.com]; Scott Schertz [ScottSchertz@schertzaerial.com]; Tim Donnelly [timd@amvac-chemical.com]; Tracy Boisselle [tracy.d.boisselle@monsanto.com]; Vukich, Jake [jacob.j.vukich@usa.dupont.com]; Courtney Baker [cbaker@pbigordon.com]; Karen Reardon [kreardon@pestfacts.org]; Jewell, Shannon [jewell.shannon@epa.gov]; Dinkins, Darlene [Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov]; Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
CC: Ashley Newell [anewell@cniag.com]; Barbara Weddle [WeddleB@helenachemical.com]; Dayna Sussman [Dayna.Sussman@arysta.com]; Deborah Romano [Deborah.Romano@fmc.com]; Di Conger [DCONGER@dow.com]; Faye Graham [fayeg@sepro.com]; Jeanne Santos [Jeanne.Santos@Valent.com]; Jennifer Klein [jennifer.klein@adama.com]; Juliet Williams [jnwilliams@wilburellis.com]; Karen May [kmay@drexchem.com]; Kathy Law [klaw@nichino.net]; Katie Hewlett [M-Katie.Hewlett-1@USA.dupont.com]; Katie Smithwick [katie.smithwick@us.nufarm.com]; Lori Rynerson [lori.rynerson@paghllc.com]; Marsha Fisher [mfisher@sipcamadvan.com]; Monica Knickerbocker [mknickerbocker@wilburellis.com]; Neasha State [nmstate@landolakes.com]; Pat Eckhart [PECKHART@growmark.com]; Pruette, Deborah [DeborahP@amvac-chemical.com]; Sarah Moothart [SarahM@fine-americas.com]; Sherri Nash [SNash@GOWANCO.com]; Sherry Jones (Sherry.Jones@bayer.com) [Sherry.Jones@bayer.com]; Susan Dale [sdale@drexchem.com]; Susan Schuh [susan.schuh@basf.com]; Teresa Gallegos [teresa.gallegos@cpsagu.com]; Toni Bumgartner [toni.bumgartner@scotts.com]; Tracy Boisselle [Tracy.D.Boiselle@monsanto.com]; Mackenzie Doheny [mdoheny@pestfacts.org]; Sci Reg [SciReg@CropLifeAmerica.org]; Spencer Vance [spencerv@albaughllc.com]; VUKICH, JACOB J [Jacob.J.Vukich@dupont.com]; Michele Parra [mparra@pestfacts.org]; Sussman, Dayna [Dayna.Sussman@pspcorporate.com]

Subject: CLA Winter Board Meeting: Meeting with EPA
Location: Studio E, The Renaissance Arlington Capital View, 2800 S. Potomac Avenue, Arlington, VA

Start: 2/27/2017 8:00:00 PM
End: 2/27/2017 10:00:00 PM
Show Time As: Busy

Recurrence: (none)

Appointment

From: Keigwin, Richard [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=151BAABB6A2246A3A312F12A706C0A05-RICHARD P KEIGWIN JR]
Sent: 1/3/2018 4:51:37 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]; Arnold Layne (Layne.Arnold@epa.gov) [Layne.Arnold@epa.gov]; Anna Lowit (Lowit.Anna@epa.gov) [Lowit.Anna@epa.gov]; Weiss, Steven [Weiss.Steven@epa.gov]; Wynne Miller [Miller.Wynne@epa.gov]; McNally, Robert [Mcnally.Robert@epa.gov]; Marietta Echeverria (Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov) [Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov]; Jackie Mosby (Mosby.Jackie@epa.gov) [Mosby.Jackie@epa.gov]; Dana Vogel (Vogel.Dana@epa.gov) [Vogel.Dana@epa.gov]; Delores Barber (Barber.Delores@epa.gov) [Barber.Delores@epa.gov]; Guilaran, Yu-Ting [Guilaran.Yu-Ting@epa.gov]; Goodis, Michael [Goodis.Michael@epa.gov]

Subject: Annual Meeting with the CropLife Board of Directors
Attachments: FINAL DRAFT EPA Agenda.pdf
Location: Renaissance Arlington Capital View (The Potomac Room)

Start: 3/5/2018 8:00:00 PM
End: 3/5/2018 10:00:00 PM
Show Time As: Busy

Location confirmed: Renaissance Arlington Capital View, Potomac Room

DRAFT AGENDA

Prepared by:	Jay Vroom
Date:	March 5, 2018
Reviewed by:	CLA Senior Management Team
Status:	**DRAFT**
To:	Rick Keigwin, EPA

Title: **CLA Meeting with EPA OPP Staff**
Date: **Monday, March 5, 3:00 – 5:00 PM**
Venue: **Renaissance Arlington Capital View**
2800 S. Potomac Avenue
Arlington, VA

	Lead	Time (mins)
1. Welcome / Overview	Blome, Vroom, Keigwin	
2. Label Changes – How to respond to pest control needs of growers when changes are required	Vroom Keigwin Restucci Smith	
3. Seed Production a. High-value crop requiring pest control products b. Special attention to worker protection	Vroom Tom Hultine	
4. ESA – How EPA's role has evolved, and may continue to evolve	Lattimore Vroom	
5. PRIA – Steady state resources are vital	Greenwood Goldberg	
6. GLP Challenges & Opportunities	Collins	
7. US – EU and Other Trading Countries/MRL Concerns	Collins Keigwin	
8. RISE-CLA 2018 Regulatory Conference	Collins Hobbs Keigwin	
9. Any other business / Adjourn		

Participants:
CLA Board of Directors
Jon Akins, TKI
Jim Blome, Bayer CropScience
Andrew Bodane, Sipcam Advan
Jeff Bunting, GROWMARK
Don Chew, PBI/Gordon
Eric Cowling, Helena Chemical
Bill Culpepper, SePRO
Brendan Deck, Nufarm Americas
Vern Hawkins, Syngenta
Jeff Johnson, Nichino America
Andy Lee, Valent USA Corporation
Brent McGowan, Wilbur-Ellis
Chris Payne, CNI
Steve Petersen, Gowan Company LLC
Paul Rea, BASF
Mark Ripato, Tenkoz
Mike Steffeck, Pinnacle Ag Holdings
Dave Swihart, Scotts Miracle0Gro
Mike Vande Logt, Winfield
Jason Ward, Lonza

ED_002528_00031418-00001

CLA Board of Directors (*cont'd*)
Susanne Wasson, Corteva Agriscience
Rob Williams, ADAMA
Eric Wintemute, AMVAC Chemical Corporation

CLA Strategic Oversight Council
John Cummings, FMC
Steve Goldberg, BASF
Kevin Henry, TKI
Michael Parrish, Monsanto
Scott Rawlins, Wilbur-Ellis
Scott Schertz, Schertz Aerial
Cindy Smith, Gowan
Eric Tamichi, Valent USA
Mark Trostle, Crop Production Services

Members & Guests
John Buckley, Wilbur-Ellis
Jeff Cassady, SCPA
Daren Coppock, Ag Retailers Association
Amy Davis, Novozymes
Evan Hultine, Hultine Farms
Tommy Jackson, Syngenta
Lisa Nichols, Loveland Products
Vince Restucci, RD Offutt
Charlotte Sanson, Bayer CropScience
Mike Seyfert, FMC Corporation
Kip Tom, Tom Farms
Kathy Wescott, CPS

CropLife America and RISE Staff
Jay Vroom, **President & CEO**
Janet Collins, **Executive Vice President, Science & Regulatory Affairs**
Beau Greenwood, **Executive Vice President, Government Relations & Public Affairs**
Bill Kuckuck, **Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer**
Rachel Lattimore, **Senior Vice President and General Counsel**
Aaron Hobbs, **President, RISE**
Kellie Bray, **Senior Director, Government Affairs**
Jeff Case, **Senior Director, Government Affairs**
Ethan Mathews, **Director, Government Affairs**
Doreen Manchester, **Deputy General Counsel**
Gen O'Sullivan, **Director, Communications and Marketing**

ED_002528_00031418-00002

Appointment

From: Sharpe, Kristinn [Sharpe.Kristinn@epa.gov]
Sent: 12/22/2017 2:42:16 PM
To: Sharpe, Kristinn [Sharpe.Kristinn@epa.gov]; Fred Bosco [FBosco@croplifeamerica.org]; Subramanian, Hema [Subramanian.Hema@epa.gov]; Sachs, Robert [Sachs.Robert@epa.gov]; Aaron Hobbs [ahobbs@pestfacts.org]; Corona, Elizabeth [Corona.Elizabeth@epa.gov]; Sands, Jeffrey [sands.jeffrey@epa.gov]; janet collins [jcollins@croplifeamerica.org]; Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]; Jay Vroom [JVroom@croplifeamerica.org]; EPA Smart Sectors [sectors@epa.gov]; Beau Greenwood [BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org]
CC: Hughes, Hayley [hughes.hayley@epa.gov]; Shaw, Nena [Shaw.Nena@epa.gov]

Subject: CLA and EPA Smart Sectors - EPA West
Location: HQ-Room-WJCW-4128-50pp

Start: 1/3/2018 6:00:00 PM
End: 1/3/2018 7:00:00 PM
Show Time As: Busy

We will discuss CLA's April meeting.

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Appointment

From: Jewell, Shannon [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=1862C405CF704EE692D5F61FAFF12688-JEWELL, SHA]
Sent: 5/8/2017 8:42:25 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]; Guilaran, Yu-Ting [Guilaran.Yu-Ting@epa.gov]; Goodis, Michael [Goodis.Michael@epa.gov]; Miller, Wynne [Miller.Wynne@epa.gov]

Subject: RISE Leadership Committee
Location: PYS-12621

Start: 6/8/2017 1:00:00 PM
End: 6/8/2017 2:00:00 PM
Show Time As: Busy

6/6/17: Updating with Agenda and Attendees

Agenda:

- Introductions
- Overview of RISE
- Agency Priorities and Challenges
- Regulatory Reform
- Opportunities to Engage
- Adjourn

Attendees: Jill Holihan (FMC), Carrie Tackema (Nufarm), Karen Larson (Clarke), Stephanie Binns (RISE), and Aaron Hobbs (RISE)

From: Aaron Hobbs [mailto:ahobbs@pestfacts.org]
Sent: Monday, May 08, 2017 1:56 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>
Subject: checkin & visit

Rick,

I'd like to bring a small group over to see you the morning of June 8. Our Regulatory Affairs Committee meets the day before and the leadership of the committee, plus a few others, would like to sit with you for a discussion. Many of your colleagues within OPP have met with us which is very valuable and now we'd like to start having more strategic leadership discussions as well. This committee within RISE has been growing well and benefitted from some new volunteer leadership. Meeting with you is the logical next step for them and I know you'll have a thoughtful and mutually beneficial conversation. Will you please let me know a good time for us to come over the morning of June 8?

Thank you sir. Look forward to your college report. We had a cub scout campout this weekend, so quite a few years before we do college visits!

Sincerely,

Aaron Hobbs
President
RISE, Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment

202-872-3861
www.pestfacts.org
www.debugthemyths.com

Message

From: David Hobbs [combatferret20@gmail.com]
Sent: 7/30/2018 5:29:20 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
Subject: Ban Pesticides That Threaten Endangered Species

Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA), any agency action requires a finding that it "is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered species or threatened species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of habitat." The December 31, 2017 Biological Opinion from NMFS followed an ecological assessment that relied upon multiple lines of evidence to determine effects on species and their designated habitats. These include "the direct and indirect toxicity of each chemical to aquatic taxa groups (e.g., fish, mammals, invertebrates); specific chemical characteristics of each pesticide (e.g., degradation rates, bioaccumulation rates, sorption affinities, etc.); expected environmental concentrations calculated for generic aquatic habitats; authorized pesticide product labels; maps showing the spatial overlap of listed species' habitats with pesticide use areas; and species' temporal use of those lands and/or aquatic habitats on which each pesticide has permitted uses."

The Biological Opinion finds, "[P]esticides containing chlorpyrifos are likely to jeopardize the continued existence of 38 of the 77 listed species, and adversely modify 37 of the 50 designated critical habitats." For malathion, 38 of 77 listed species are likely to be jeopardized and 37 of the 50 designated critical habitats adversely modified. Likewise, diazinon likely jeopardizes 25 of 77 listed species and adversely modifies 18 of the 50 designated critical habitats. Species affected include salmon, steelhead, sturgeon, coral, and sea turtles, as well as orcas and seals that depend on salmon as a food source.

Although EPA is required to consult with the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and NMFS when registering a pesticide, the agencies have been sued over the years for disregarding this requirement and failing to ensure adequate protections for endangered species. A 2013 report from the National Academy of Sciences identified deficiencies and provided recommendations for all the agencies involved in pesticide consultations. We ask you to ensure that EPA abides by the law in the future in ensuring protection for endangered species.

Mr. David Hobbs
5202 Gate Post Ln
Wilmington, NC 28412
9106160231

Message

From: Sharpe, Kristinn [Sharpe.Kristinn@epa.gov]
Sent: 11/5/2017 9:33:30 PM
To: Jay Vroom [JVroom@croplifeamerica.org]
CC: Sachs, Robert [Sachs.Robert@epa.gov]; Sands, Jeffrey [sands.jeffrey@epa.gov]; Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]; Aaron Hobbs [ahobbs@pestfacts.org]; janet collins [jcollins@croplifeamerica.org]; Beau Greenwood [BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org]; Corona, Elizabeth [Corona.Elizabeth@epa.gov]
Subject: Re: RISE-CLA 2018 Regulatory Conference

Hi Jay,

Thank you for the thought-provoking conversation on Friday. I will follow up with Jeff and Rick to find a time for all of us to come together for a follow-up discussion, hopefully in early December.

All my best,
Kristinn

Kristinn Sharpe
US EPA Smart Sectors Liaison
202-343-9062

> On Nov 4, 2017, at 12:28 PM, Jay Vroom <JVroom@croplifeamerica.org> wrote:
>
> Dear All,
>
> Yesterday Kristinn and Bob came to pay a visit to the offices of CLA and RISE as a follow up to the one-month earlier event at EPA where the "EPA Smart Sectors" program was re-launched.
>
> We had a very good discussion about the issues and interactions between EPA and CLA/RISE over the years—including this week's successful PPDC meeting.
>
> One opportunity we focused on regarding the "Smart Sectors" EPA program may be the 2018 Regulatory Conference by CLA and RISE. It is scheduled for April 25-27, 2018 at the Renaissance Capitol View Hotel (right across the street from EPA OPP offices in Crystal City, VA).
>
> As Rick can attest, this conference in recent years has been successful in providing many on his OPP staff the opportunity to attend educational sessions offered by RISE and CLA and to increase understanding by both EPA staff and industry attendees. We're eager to expand that to other EPA staff/offices and also bring over USDA staff as well. In 2018 we hope to continue that successful trend and even hope to bring to the event (or to an open lot nearby) some examples of large pesticide and fertilizer application equipment to allow conference attendees to have a chance to "climb aboard" the operating cabs of such a machine to see first hand the sophistication of the equipment, GPS precision application technologies, spray drift management systems, etc.
>
> We think that all this could fit nicely into the objectives of the EPA Smart Sectors program and are eager to find some time to talk with all of you about further ideas and planning options!
>
> Note also that what we've been building goes beyond just pesticide issues—and other ag interests including farm equipment, seeds and fertilizers all have potential to be actively engaged in this event next spring. ALSO—our conference dates for 2018 are the same week as Earth Day 2018 (Sunday April 22) so there may be some good synergy on that broader platform as well!
>
> Look forward to finding a time—probably in December—when all of us might come together and brainstorm further? Thanks!
>
> Jay
>
> Jay Vroom
> President & CEO
> CropLife America
> 1156 15th Street, NW
> Suite 400
> Washington, DC 20005
> 202 872 3850 (O)
> 202 427 7932 (M)
> Vroom@croplifeamerica.org
> www.croplifeamerica.org
>
>

Message

From: Jay Vroom [JVroom@croplifeamerica.org]
Sent: 11/4/2017 4:27:17 PM
To: Sharpe, Kristinn [Sharpe.Kristinn@epa.gov]; Sachs, Robert [Sachs.Robert@epa.gov]; Sands, Jeffrey [sands.jeffrey@epa.gov]; Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
CC: Aaron Hobbs [ahobbs@pestfacts.org]; janet collins [jcollins@croplifeamerica.org]; Beau Greenwood [BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org]
Subject: RISE-CLA 2018 Regulatory Conference

Dear All,

Yesterday Kristinn and Bob came to pay a visit to the offices of CLA and RISE as a follow up to the one-month earlier event at EPA where the "EPA Smart Sectors" program was re-launched.

We had a very good discussion about the issues and interactions between EPA and CLA/RISE over the years—including this week's successful PPDC meeting.

One opportunity we focused on regarding the "Smart Sectors" EPA program may be the 2018 Regulatory Conference by CLA and RISE. It is scheduled for April 25-27, 2018 at the Renaissance Capitol View Hotel (right across the street from EPA OPP offices in Crystal City, VA).

As Rick can attest, this conference in recent years has been successful in providing many on his OPP staff the opportunity to attend educational sessions offered by RISE and CLA and to increase understanding by both EPA staff and industry attendees. We're eager to expand that to other EPA staff/offices and also bring over USDA staff as well. In 2018 we hope to continue that successful trend and even hope to bring to the event (or to an open lot nearby) some examples of large pesticide and fertilizer application equipment to allow conference attendees to have a chance to "climb aboard" the operating cabs of such a machine to see first hand the sophistication of the equipment, GPS precision application technologies, spray drift management systems, etc.

We think that all this could fit nicely into the objectives of the EPA Smart Sectors program and are eager to find some time to talk with all of you about further ideas and planning options!

Note also that what we've been building goes beyond just pesticide issues—and other ag interests including farm equipment, seeds and fertilizers all have potential to be actively engaged in this event next spring. ALSO—our conference dates for 2018 are the same week as Earth Day 2018 (Sunday April 22) so there may be some good synergy on that broader platform as well!

Look forward to finding a time—probably in December—when all of us might come together and brainstorm further? Thanks!

Jay

Jay Vroom
President & CEO
CropLife America
1156 15th Street, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20005
202 872 3850 (O)
202 427 7932 (M)
Vroom@croplifeamerica.org
www.croplifeamerica.org

Message

From: Sharpe, Kristinn [Sharpe.Kristinn@epa.gov]
Sent: 1/4/2018 9:50:07 PM
To: Jay Vroom [JVroom@croplifeamerica.org]; Fred Bosco [FBosco@croplifeamerica.org]; Subramanian, Hema [Subramanian.Hema@epa.gov]; Sachs, Robert [Sachs.Robert@epa.gov]; Aaron Hobbs [ahobbs@pestfacts.org]; Corona, Elizabeth [Corona.Elizabeth@epa.gov]; janet collins [jcollins@croplifeamerica.org]; Sands, Jeffrey [sands.jeffrey@epa.gov]; Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]; EPA Smart Sectors [sectors@epa.gov]; Beau Greenwood [BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org]; Fred Bosco [FBosco@croplifeamerica.org]; Aaron Hobbs [ahobbs@pestfacts.org]; Ray McAllister [rmcallister@croplifeamerica.org]
CC: Hughes, Hayley [hughes.hayley@epa.gov]; Shaw, Nena [Shaw.Nena@epa.gov]; Mary Jo Tomalewski [mjtomalewski@croplifeamerica.org]; Letendre, Daisy [letendre.daisy@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: CLA and EPA Smart Sectors - EPA West

Hi Jay and everyone,

Thank you for helping make the meeting a productive one. I'm looking forward to working more closely with Janet to help line up some EPA speakers for the April conference.

I need to connect with Daisy, Nena, and Elizabeth as well as Jeff and Hema to see if they would like to attend/speak at the January meeting and will hopefully get back to you by COB tomorrow. I will definitely be there!

More soon,
Kristinn

Kristinn L. Sharpe
Smart Sectors Program Liaison
Office of Policy, Immediate Office
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office: (202) 343-9062
Mobile: (202) 256-3126
www.epa.gov/smartsectors

SMART SECTORS
A PROGRAM OF U.S. EPA

From: Jay Vroom [mailto:JVroom@croplifeamerica.org]
Sent: Wednesday, January 03, 2018 7:30 PM
To: Sharpe, Kristinn <Sharpe.Kristinn@epa.gov>; Fred Bosco <FBosco@croplifeamerica.org>; Subramanian, Hema <Subramanian.Hema@epa.gov>; Sachs, Robert <Sachs.Robert@epa.gov>; Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>; Corona, Elizabeth <Corona.Elizabeth@epa.gov>; janet collins <jcollins@croplifeamerica.org>; Sands, Jeffrey <sands.jeffrey@epa.gov>; Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>; EPA Smart Sectors <sectors@epa.gov>; Beau Greenwood <BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org>; Fred Bosco <FBosco@croplifeamerica.org>; Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>; Ray McAllister <rmcallister@croplifeamerica.org>
Cc: Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>; Shaw, Nena <Shaw.Nena@epa.gov>; Mary Jo Tomalewski <mjtomalewski@croplifeamerica.org>
Subject: RE: CLA and EPA Smart Sectors - EPA West

Kristinn,

Thanks for a most productive meeting today—and thanks to all your EPA colleagues who committed time for our discussion.

As follow up, I have:

1. You and Janet Collins will be the principal contacts as we advance and refine added ideas for Smart Sectors engagement with the April RISE CLA Regulatory Conference.
2. We invite you and whomever is appropriate to represent EPA Smart Sectors Program to come meet with our CLA Strategic Oversight Council (SOC) January 25 or 26 here at our offices. If it's appropriate also for Jeff Sands to be with your Smart Sectors group great, or if we can find a separate time for Jeff to meet with our SOC group (to talk more specific policy issues) we can go either way—maybe you and Jeff can huddle and work out what you think is best and get back to me?

   Topics that seem appropriate to review with our SOC by you would include:
   - What Smart Sectors is all about and how individual companies can engage as well as industry groups like CLA
   - Some of the topics we reviewed that are of importance across several different offices of EPA including OPP, OGC, ORD, OW, etc.
   - What we are working on the coordinate with respect to the April Regulatory Conference—including invite to the Administrator to speak (we'll get our formal invite letter to him/Haley Ford tomorrow)
   - How the role of Ag Advisor is shaping up under Administrator Pruitt (Jeff!)
   - How Smart Sectors is looking at IT systems, and other means to better streamline industry reporting to EPA to streamline compliance burden, etc.

   Meantime tomorrow I'll ask Mary Jo to get to you tomorrow a full list of the member company reps on our SOC and a general time outline of our meeting so you might choose from a "menu of time slots" on January 25 and 26 that work best for you all.

   Thanks again, Jay

Jay Vroom
President & CEO
CropLife America
Direct Dial: 202.872.3850
Mobile: 202.427.7932
Executive Assistant: Mary Jo Tomalewski (202.872.3849, mjtomalewski@croplifeamerica.org)

From: Sharpe, Kristinn [mailto:Sharpe.Kristinn@epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 3, 2018 9:25 AM
To: Fred Bosco <FBosco@croplifeamerica.org>; Subramanian, Hema <Subramanian.Hema@epa.gov>; Sachs, Robert <Sachs.Robert@epa.gov>; Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>; Corona, Elizabeth <Corona.Elizabeth@epa.gov>; Sands, Jeffrey <sands.jeffrey@epa.gov>; Janet Collins <jcollins@croplifeamerica.org>; Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>; Jay Vroom <JVroom@croplifeamerica.org>; EPA Smart Sectors <sectors@epa.gov>; Beau Greenwood <BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org>; Fred Bosco <FBosco@croplifeamerica.org>; Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>; Jay Vroom <JVroom@croplifeamerica.org>; Beau Greenwood <BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org>
Cc: Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>; Shaw, Nena <Shaw.Nena@epa.gov>
Subject: CLA and EPA Smart Sectors - EPA West

Good morning and happy 2018 everyone!

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

If you are braving the cold and heading over here in person, please arrive a few minutes early to allow time to go through EPA's security screening. Please enter through EPA's West entrance on Constitution Ave (between 14th St and 12th St), and let the guards know you are here to see me. If you need more details, here is a helpful EPA website for visitors: https://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/visiting-epa-headquarters

This email is being sent to everyone who received the calendar invitation, so please forward to anyone who may not have been on the original invitation.

Thanks, and see you soon,
Kristinn

Kristinn L. Sharpe
Smart Sectors Program Liaison
Office of Policy, Immediate Office
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office: (202) 343-9062
Mobile: (202) 256-3126

SMART SECTORS
A PROGRAM OF U.S. EPA

Message

From: Jay Vroom [JVroom@croplifeamerica.org]
Sent: 1/4/2018 12:30:05 AM
To: Sharpe, Kristinn [Sharpe.Kristinn@epa.gov]; Fred Bosco [FBosco@croplifeamerica.org]; Subramanian, Hema [Subramanian.Hema@epa.gov]; Sachs, Robert [Sachs.Robert@epa.gov]; Aaron Hobbs [ahobbs@pestfacts.org]; Corona, Elizabeth [Corona.Elizabeth@epa.gov]; janet collins [jcollins@croplifeamerica.org]; Sands, Jeffrey [sands.jeffrey@epa.gov]; Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]; EPA Smart Sectors [sectors@epa.gov]; Beau Greenwood [BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org]; Fred Bosco [FBosco@croplifeamerica.org]; Aaron Hobbs [ahobbs@pestfacts.org]; Ray McAllister [rmcallister@croplifeamerica.org]
CC: Hughes, Hayley [hughes.hayley@epa.gov]; Shaw, Nena [Shaw.Nena@epa.gov]; Mary Jo Tomalewski [mjtomalewski@croplifeamerica.org]
Subject: RE: CLA and EPA Smart Sectors - EPA West

Kristinn,

Thanks for a most productive meeting today—and thanks to all your EPA colleagues who committed time for our discussion.

As follow up, I have:

1. You and Janet Collins will be the principal contacts as we advance and refine added ideas for Smart Sectors engagement with the April RISE CLA Regulatory Conference.
2. We invite you and whomever is appropriate to represent EPA Smart Sectors Program to come meet with our CLA Strategic Oversight Council (SOC) January 25 or 26 here at our offices. If it's appropriate also for Jeff Sands to be with your Smart Sectors group great, or if we can find a separate time for Jeff to meet with our SOC group (to talk more specific policy issues) we can go either way—maybe you and Jeff can huddle and work out what you think is best and get back to me?

   Topics that seem appropriate to review with our SOC by you would include:
   - What Smart Sectors is all about and how individual companies can engage as well as industry groups like CLA
   - Some of the topics we reviewed that are of importance across several different offices of EPA including OPP, OGC, ORD, OW, etc.
   - What we are working on the coordinate with respect to the April Regulatory Conference—including invite to the Administrator to speak (we'll get our formal invite letter to him/Haley Ford tomorrow)
   - How the role of Ag Advisor is shaping up under Administrator Pruitt (Jeff!)
   - How Smart Sectors is looking at IT systems, and other means to better streamline industry reporting to EPA to streamline compliance burden, etc.

   Meantime tomorrow I'll ask Mary Jo to get to you tomorrow a full list of the member company reps on our SOC and a general time outline of our meeting so you might choose from a "menu of time slots" on January 25 and 26 that work best for you all.

   Thanks again, Jay

Jay Vroom
President & CEO
CropLife America
Direct Dial: 202.872.3850
Mobile: 202.427.7932
Executive Assistant: Mary Jo Tomalewski (202.872.3849, mjtomalewski@croplifeamerica.org)

From: Sharpe, Kristinn [mailto:Sharpe.Kristinn@epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 3, 2018 9:25 AM
To: Fred Bosco <FBosco@croplifeamerica.org>; Subramanian, Hema <Subramanian.Hema@epa.gov>; Sachs, Robert <Sachs.Robert@epa.gov>; Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>; Corona, Elizabeth <Corona.Elizabeth@epa.gov>; Sands, Jeffrey <sands.jeffrey@epa.gov>; Janet Collins <jcollins@croplifeamerica.org>; Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>; Jay Vroom <JVroom@croplifeamerica.org>; EPA Smart Sectors <sectors@epa.gov>; Beau Greenwood <BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org>; Fred Bosco <FBosco@croplifeamerica.org>; Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>; Jay Vroom <JVroom@croplifeamerica.org>; Beau Greenwood <BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org>
Cc: Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>; Shaw, Nena <Shaw.Nena@epa.gov>
Subject: CLA and EPA Smart Sectors - EPA West

Good morning and happy 2018 everyone!

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

If you are braving the cold and heading over here in person, please arrive a few minutes early to allow time to go through EPA's security screening. Please enter through EPA's West entrance on Constitution Ave (between 14th St and 12th St), and let the guards know you are here to see me. If you need more details, here is a helpful EPA website for visitors: https://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/visiting-epa-headquarters

This email is being sent to everyone who received the calendar invitation, so please forward to anyone who may not have been on the original invitation.

Thanks, and see you soon,
Kristinn

Kristinn L. Sharpe
Smart Sectors Program Liaison
Office of Policy, Immediate Office
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office: (202) 343-9062
Mobile: (202) 256-3126

SMART SECTORS
A PROGRAM OF U.S. EPA

Message

From: Sharpe, Kristinn [Sharpe.Kristinn@epa.gov]
Sent: 1/3/2018 7:47:26 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]; Corona, Elizabeth [Corona.Elizabeth@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: CLA and EPA Smart Sectors - EPA West

Sorry team. I think I put you on hold instead of on mute while waiting for Jeff and Hema to arrive.

Rick, let me know if you have anyone you want me to work with as a POC in your shop with respect to helping CLA line up speakers from other offices. If you have specific divisions within offices or specific individuals you'd like me to reach out to, I'm happy to hear suggestions.

Thanks so much,
Kristinn

Kristinn L. Sharpe
Smart Sectors Program Liaison
Office of Policy, Immediate Office
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office: (202) 343-9062
Mobile: (202) 256-3126

SMART SECTORS
A PROGRAM OF U.S. EPA

From: Keigwin, Richard
Sent: Wednesday, January 03, 2018 1:08 PM
To: Sharpe, Kristinn <Sharpe.Kristinn@epa.gov>
Cc: Jay Vroom <JVroom@croplifeamerica.org>; Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>; janet collins <jcollins@croplifeamerica.org>; Beau Greenwood <BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org>
Subject: RE: CLA and EPA Smart Sectors - EPA West

OPP is on the line. Getting lots of music.

From: Sharpe, Kristinn
Sent: Wednesday, January 03, 2018 9:25 AM
To: Fred Bosco <FBosco@croplifeamerica.org>; Subramanian, Hema <Subramanian.Hema@epa.gov>; Sachs, Robert <Sachs.Robert@epa.gov>; Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>; Corona, Elizabeth <Corona.Elizabeth@epa.gov>; Sands, Jeffrey <sands.jeffrey@epa.gov>; janet collins <jcollins@croplifeamerica.org>; Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>; Jay Vroom <JVroom@croplifeamerica.org>; EPA Smart Sectors <sectors@epa.gov>; Beau Greenwood <BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org>; Fred Bosco <FBosco@croplifeamerica.org>; Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>; Jay Vroom <JVroom@croplifeamerica.org>; Beau Greenwood <BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org>
Cc: Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>; Shaw, Nena <Shaw.Nena@epa.gov>
Subject: CLA and EPA Smart Sectors - EPA West

Good morning and happy 2018 everyone!

I am looking forward to our meeting this afternoon at 1 p.m. in 4128 EPA West. If you are calling in, the number is 866-299-3188, pass code: 202-343-9062#.

If you are braving the cold and heading over here in person, please arrive a few minutes early to allow time to go through EPA's security screening. Please enter through EPA's West entrance on Constitution Ave (between 14th St and 12th St), and let the guards know you are here to see me. If you need more details, here is a helpful EPA website for visitors: https://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/visiting-epa-headquarters

This email is being sent to everyone who received the calendar invitation, so please forward to anyone who may not have been on the original invitation.

Thanks, and see you soon,
Kristinn

Kristinn L. Sharpe
Smart Sectors Program Liaison
Office of Policy, Immediate Office
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office: (202) 343-9062
Mobile: (202) 256-3126

SMART SECTORS
A PROGRAM OF U.S. EPA

Message

From: Sharpe, Kristinn [Sharpe.Kristinn@epa.gov]
Sent: 1/3/2018 2:24:44 PM
To: Fred Bosco [FBosco@croplifeamerica.org]; Subramanian, Hema [Subramanian.Hema@epa.gov]; Sachs, Robert [Sachs.Robert@epa.gov]; Aaron Hobbs [ahobbs@pestfacts.org]; Corona, Elizabeth [Corona.Elizabeth@epa.gov]; Sands, Jeffrey [sands.jeffrey@epa.gov]; janet collins [jcollins@croplifeamerica.org]; Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]; Jay Vroom [JVroom@croplifeamerica.org]; EPA Smart Sectors [sectors@epa.gov]; Beau Greenwood [BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org]; Fred Bosco [FBosco@croplifeamerica.org]; Aaron Hobbs [ahobbs@pestfacts.org]; Jay Vroom [JVroom@croplifeamerica.org]; Beau Greenwood [BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org]
CC: Hughes, Hayley [hughes.hayley@epa.gov]; Shaw, Nena [Shaw.Nena@epa.gov]
Subject: CLA and EPA Smart Sectors - EPA West

Good morning and happy 2018 everyone!

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

If you are braving the cold and heading over here in person, please arrive a few minutes early to allow time to go through EPA's security screening. Please enter through EPA's West entrance on Constitution Ave (between 14th St and 12th St), and let the guards know you are here to see me. If you need more details, here is a helpful EPA website for visitors: https://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/visiting-epa-headquarters

This email is being sent to everyone who received the calendar invitation, so please forward to anyone who may not have been on the original invitation.

Thanks, and see you soon,
Kristinn

Kristinn L. Sharpe
Smart Sectors Program Liaison
Office of Policy, Immediate Office
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office: (202) 343-9062
Mobile: (202) 256-3126

SMART SECTORS
A PROGRAM OF U.S. EPA

Message

From: Sharpe, Kristinn [Sharpe.Kristinn@epa.gov]
Sent: 12/22/2017 3:02:33 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
Subject: Re: RISE-CLA 2018 Regulatory Conference

PS - I can try to move it to noon if you' d prefer to be in the meeting.

Kristinn Sharpe
US EPA Smart Sectors Liaison
202-343-9062

> On Dec 22, 2017, at 9:57 AM, Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov> wrote:
>
> Kristinn--
>
> Will a call-in number be provided? I have to be in Crystal City at 2pm on January 3rd, so for me to be able to participate, I'll need to join you all via teleconference.
>
> --Rick
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Sharpe, Kristinn
> Sent: Friday, December 22, 2017 9:50 AM
> To: Jay Vroom <JVroom@croplifeamerica.org>
> Cc: Sachs, Robert <Sachs.Robert@epa.gov>; Sands, Jeffrey <sands.jeffrey@epa.gov>; Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>; Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>; janet collins <jcollins@croplifeamerica.org>; Beau Greenwood <BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org>; Corona, Elizabeth <Corona.Elizabeth@epa.gov>; Subramanian, Hema <Subramanian.Hema@epa.gov>
> Subject: Re: RISE-CLA 2018 Regulatory Conference
>
> Hi Jay,
>
> Happy holidays to you!
>
> After some back and forth with folks here and on your staff, I am just choosing a date and time that appears to work for most invitees, and I can just move it if it absolutely doesn' t work for someone. You hopefully received an invitation from me for Wednesday, January 3rd from 1-2 at EPA' s West building.
>
> Look forward to seeing you in the New Year, Kristinn
>
> Kristinn Sharpe
> US EPA Smart Sectors Liaison
> 202-256-3126
>
>> On Dec 22, 2017, at 7:54 AM, Jay Vroom <JVroom@croplifeamerica.org> wrote:
>>
>> Happy holidays, Kristinn!
>>
>> I just noticed that December has "evaporated" on all of us! I know you're incredibly busy and want to reach out to ask that we seek to find a time as early in January as possible to meet and talk about some next step options we have further refined for EPA consideration around this April 2018 Regulatory Conference.
>>
>> Any chance you could find time for a meeting on Jan 2,3,4 or 5?
>>
>> Thanks and all the best,
>>
>> Jay
>>
>> Jay Vroom
>> President & CEO
>> CropLife America
>> Direct Dial: 202.872.3850
>> Mobile: 202.427.7932
>> Executive Assistant: Mary Jo Tomalewski (202.872.3849,
>> mjtomalewski@croplifeamerica.org)
>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Sharpe, Kristinn [mailto:Sharpe.Kristinn@epa.gov]
>> Sent: Sunday, November 5, 2017 4:34 PM

>> To: Jay Vroom <JVroom@croplifeamerica.org>
>> Cc: Sachs, Robert <Sachs.Robert@epa.gov>; Sands, Jeffrey
>> <sands.jeffrey@epa.gov>; Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>;
>> Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>; Janet Collins
>> <jcollins@croplifeamerica.org>; Beau Greenwood
>> <BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org>; Corona, Elizabeth
>> <Corona.Elizabeth@epa.gov>
>> Subject: Re: RISE-CLA 2018 Regulatory Conference
>>
>> Hi Jay,
>>
>> Thank you for the thought-provoking conversation on Friday. I will follow up with Jeff and Rick to find a time for all of us to come together for a follow-up discussion, hopefully in early December.
>>
>> All my best,
>> Kristinn
>>
>> Kristinn Sharpe
>> US EPA Smart Sectors Liaison
>> 202-343-9062
>>
>>> On Nov 4, 2017, at 12:28 PM, Jay Vroom <JVroom@croplifeamerica.org> wrote:
>>>
>>> Dear All,
>>>
>>> Yesterday Kristinn and Bob came to pay a visit to the offices of CLA and RISE as a follow up to the one-month earlier event at EPA where the "EPA Smart Sectors" program was re-launched.
>>>
>>> We had a very good discussion about the issues and interactions between EPA and CLA/RISE over the years—including this week's successful PPDC meeting.
>>>
>>> One opportunity we focused on regarding the "Smart Sectors" EPA program may be the 2018 Regulatory Conference by CLA and RISE. It is scheduled for April 25-27, 2018 at the Renaissance Capitol View Hotel (right across the street from EPA OPP offices in Crystal City, VA).
>>>
>>> As Rick can attest, this conference in recent years has been successful in providing many on his OPP staff the opportunity to attend educational sessions offered by RISE and CLA and to increase understanding by both EPA staff and industry attendees. We're eager to expand that to other EPA staff/offices and also bring over USDA staff as well. In 2018 we hope to continue that successful trend and even hope to bring to the event (or to an open lot nearby) some examples of large pesticide and fertilizer application equipment to allow conference attendees to have a chance to "climb aboard" the operating cabs of such a machine to see first hand the sophistication of the equipment, GPS precision application technologies, spray drift management systems, etc.
>>>
>>> We think that all this could fit nicely into the objectives of the EPA Smart Sectors program and are eager to find some time to talk with all of you about further ideas and planning options!
>>>
>>> Note also that what we've been building goes beyond just pesticide issues—and other ag interests including farm equipment, seeds and fertilizers all have potential to be actively engaged in this event next spring. ALSO—our conference dates for 2018 are the same week as Earth Day 2018 (Sunday April 22) so there may be some good synergy on that broader platform as well!
>>>
>>> Look forward to finding a time—probably in December—when all of us might come together and brainstorm further? Thanks!
>>>
>>> Jay
>>>
>>> Jay Vroom
>>> President & CEO
>>> CropLife America
>>> 1156 15th Street, NW
>>> Suite 400
>>> Washington, DC 20005
>>> 202 872 3850 (O)
>>> 202 427 7932 (M)
>>> Vroom@croplifeamerica.org
>>> www.croplifeamerica.org
>>>
>>>

Message

From: Sharpe, Kristinn [Sharpe.Kristinn@epa.gov]
Sent: 12/22/2017 2:59:46 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
CC: Jay Vroom [JVroom@croplifeamerica.org]; Sachs, Robert [Sachs.Robert@epa.gov]; Sands, Jeffrey [sands.jeffrey@epa.gov]; Aaron Hobbs [ahobbs@pestfacts.org]; janet collins [jcollins@croplifeamerica.org]; Beau Greenwood [BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org]; Corona, Elizabeth [Corona.Elizabeth@epa.gov]; Subramanian, Hema [Subramanian.Hema@epa.gov]
Subject: Re: RISE-CLA 2018 Regulatory Conference

Yes, absolutely. Adding now.

Kristinn Sharpe
US EPA Smart Sectors Liaison
202-343-9062

> On Dec 22, 2017, at 9:57 AM, Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov> wrote:
>
> Kristinn--
>
> Will a call-in number be provided? I have to be in Crystal City at 2pm on January 3rd, so for me to be able to participate, I'll need to join you all via teleconference.
>
> --Rick
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Sharpe, Kristinn
> Sent: Friday, December 22, 2017 9:50 AM
> To: Jay Vroom <JVroom@croplifeamerica.org>
> Cc: Sachs, Robert <Sachs.Robert@epa.gov>; Sands, Jeffrey <sands.jeffrey@epa.gov>; Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>; Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>; janet collins <jcollins@croplifeamerica.org>; Beau Greenwood <BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org>; Corona, Elizabeth <Corona.Elizabeth@epa.gov>; Subramanian, Hema <Subramanian.Hema@epa.gov>
> Subject: Re: RISE-CLA 2018 Regulatory Conference
>
> Hi Jay,
>
> Happy holidays to you!
>
> After some back and forth with folks here and on your staff, I am just choosing a date and time that appears to work for most invitees, and I can just move it if it absolutely doesn't work for someone. You hopefully received an invitation from me for Wednesday, January 3rd from 1-2 at EPA's West building.
>
> Look forward to seeing you in the New Year, Kristinn
>
> Kristinn Sharpe
> US EPA Smart Sectors Liaison
> 202-256-3126
>
>> On Dec 22, 2017, at 7:54 AM, Jay Vroom <JVroom@croplifeamerica.org> wrote:
>>
>> Happy holidays, Kristinn!
>>
>> I just noticed that December has "evaporated" on all of us! I know you're incredibly busy and want to reach out to ask that we seek to find a time as early in January as possible to meet and talk about some next step options we have further refined for EPA consideration around this April 2018 Regulatory Conference.
>>
>> Any chance you could find time for a meeting on Jan 2,3,4 or 5?
>>
>> Thanks and all the best,
>>
>> Jay
>>
>> Jay Vroom
>> President & CEO
>> CropLife America
>> Direct Dial: 202.872.3850
>> Mobile: 202.427.7932
>> Executive Assistant: Mary Jo Tomalewski (202.872.3849,
>> mjtomalewski@croplifeamerica.org)

>>
>> -----Original Message-----
>> From: Sharpe, Kristinn [mailto:Sharpe.Kristinn@epa.gov]
>> Sent: Sunday, November 5, 2017 4:34 PM
>> To: Jay Vroom <JVroom@croplifeamerica.org>
>> Cc: Sachs, Robert <Sachs.Robert@epa.gov>; Sands, Jeffrey
>> <sands.jeffrey@epa.gov>; Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>;
>> Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>; Janet Collins
>> <jcollins@croplifeamerica.org>; Beau Greenwood
>> <BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org>; Corona, Elizabeth
>> <Corona.Elizabeth@epa.gov>
>> Subject: Re: RISE-CLA 2018 Regulatory Conference
>>
>> Hi Jay,
>>
>> Thank you for the thought-provoking conversation on Friday. I will follow up with Jeff and Rick to find a time for all of us to come together for a follow-up discussion, hopefully in early December.
>>
>> All my best,
>> Kristinn
>>
>> Kristinn Sharpe
>> US EPA Smart Sectors Liaison
>> 202-343-9062
>>
>>> On Nov 4, 2017, at 12:28 PM, Jay Vroom <JVroom@croplifeamerica.org> wrote:
>>>
>>> Dear All,
>>>
>>> Yesterday Kristinn and Bob came to pay a visit to the offices of CLA and RISE as a follow up to the one-month earlier event at EPA where the "EPA Smart Sectors" program was re-launched.
>>>
>>> We had a very good discussion about the issues and interactions between EPA and CLA/RISE over the years—including this week's successful PPDC meeting.
>>>
>>> One opportunity we focused on regarding the "Smart Sectors" EPA program may be the 2018 Regulatory Conference by CLA and RISE. It is scheduled for April 25-27, 2018 at the Renaissance Capitol View Hotel (right across the street from EPA OPP offices in Crystal City, VA).
>>>
>>> As Rick can attest, this conference in recent years has been successful in providing many on his OPP staff the opportunity to attend educational sessions offered by RISE and CLA and to increase understanding by both EPA staff and industry attendees. We're eager to expand that to other EPA staff/offices and also bring over USDA staff as well. In 2018 we hope to continue that successful trend and even hope to bring to the event (or to an open lot nearby) some examples of large pesticide and fertilizer application equipment to allow conference attendees to have a chance to "climb aboard" the operating cabs of such a machine to see first hand the sophistication of the equipment, GPS precision application technologies, spray drift management systems, etc.
>>>
>>> We think that all this could fit nicely into the objectives of the EPA Smart Sectors program and are eager to find some time to talk with all of you about further ideas and planning options!
>>>
>>> Note also that what we've been building goes beyond just pesticide issues—and other ag interests including farm equipment, seeds and fertilizers all have potential to be actively engaged in this event next spring. ALSO—our conference dates for 2018 are the same week as Earth Day 2018 (Sunday April 22) so there may be some good synergy on that broader platform as well!
>>>
>>> Look forward to finding a time—probably in December—when all of us might come together and brainstorm further? Thanks!
>>>
>>> Jay
>>>
>>> Jay Vroom
>>> President & CEO
>>> CropLife America
>>> 1156 15th Street, NW
>>> Suite 400
>>> Washington, DC 20005
>>> 202 872 3850 (O)
>>> 202 427 7932 (M)
>>> Vroom@croplifeamerica.org
>>> www.croplifeamerica.org
>>>
>>>

Message

From: Jay Vroom [JVroom@croplifeamerica.org]
Sent: 12/22/2017 12:53:28 PM
To: Sharpe, Kristinn [Sharpe.Kristinn@epa.gov]
CC: Sachs, Robert [Sachs.Robert@epa.gov]; Sands, Jeffrey [sands.jeffrey@epa.gov]; Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]; Aaron Hobbs [ahobbs@pestfacts.org]; janet collins [jcollins@croplifeamerica.org]; Beau Greenwood [BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org]; Corona, Elizabeth [Corona.Elizabeth@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: RISE-CLA 2018 Regulatory Conference

Happy holidays, Kristinn!

I just noticed that December has "evaporated" on all of us! I know you're incredibly busy and want to reach out to ask that we seek to find a time as early in January as possible to meet and talk about some next step options we have further refined for EPA consideration around this April 2018 Regulatory Conference.

Any chance you could find time for a meeting on Jan 2,3,4 or 5?

Thanks and all the best,

Jay

Jay Vroom
President & CEO
CropLife America
Direct Dial: 202.872.3850
Mobile: 202.427.7932
Executive Assistant: Mary Jo Tomalewski (202.872.3849, mjtomalewski@croplifeamerica.org)

-----Original Message-----
From: Sharpe, Kristinn [mailto:Sharpe.Kristinn@epa.gov]
Sent: Sunday, November 5, 2017 4:34 PM
To: Jay Vroom <JVroom@croplifeamerica.org>
Cc: Sachs, Robert <Sachs.Robert@epa.gov>; Sands, Jeffrey <sands.jeffrey@epa.gov>; Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>; Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>; Janet Collins <jcollins@croplifeamerica.org>; Beau Greenwood <BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org>; Corona, Elizabeth <Corona.Elizabeth@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: RISE-CLA 2018 Regulatory Conference

Hi Jay,

Thank you for the thought-provoking conversation on Friday. I will follow up with Jeff and Rick to find a time for all of us to come together for a follow-up discussion, hopefully in early December.

All my best,
Kristinn

Kristinn Sharpe
US EPA Smart Sectors Liaison
202-343-9062

> On Nov 4, 2017, at 12:28 PM, Jay Vroom <JVroom@croplifeamerica.org> wrote:
>
> Dear All,
>
> Yesterday Kristinn and Bob came to pay a visit to the offices of CLA and RISE as a follow up to the one-month earlier event at EPA where the “EPA Smart Sectors” program was re-launched.
>
> We had a very good discussion about the issues and interactions between EPA and CLA/RISE over the years—including this week’s successful PPDC meeting.
>
> One opportunity we focused on regarding the “Smart Sectors” EPA program may be the 2018 Regulatory Conference by CLA and RISE. It is scheduled for April 25-27, 2018 at the Renaissance Capitol View Hotel (right across the street from EPA OPP offices in Crystal City, VA).
>
> As Rick can attest, this conference in recent years has been successful in providing many on his OPP staff the opportunity to attend educational sessions offered by RISE and CLA and to increase understanding by both EPA staff and industry attendees. We’re eager to expand that to other EPA staff/offices and also bring over USDA staff as well. In 2018 we hope to continue that successful trend and even hope to bring to the event (or to an open lot nearby) some examples of large pesticide and fertilizer application equipment to allow conference attendees to have a chance to “climb aboard” the

operating cabs of such a machine to see first hand the sophistication of the equipment, GPS precision application technologies, spray drift management systems, etc.
>
> We think that all this could fit nicely into the objectives of the EPA Smart Sectors program and are eager to find some time to talk with all of you about further ideas and planning options!
>
> Note also that what we've been building goes beyond just pesticide issues—and other ag interests including farm equipment, seeds and fertilizers all have potential to be actively engaged in this event next spring. ALSO—our conference dates for 2018 are the same week as Earth Day 2018 (Sunday April 22) so there may be some good synergy on that broader platform as well!
>
> Look forward to finding a time—probably in December—when all of us might come together and brainstorm further? Thanks!
>
> Jay
>
> Jay Vroom
> President & CEO
> CropLife America
> 1156 15th Street, NW
> Suite 400
> Washington, DC 20005
> 202 872 3850 (O)
> 202 427 7932 (M)
> Vroom@croplifeamerica.org
> www.croplifeamerica.org
>
>

Message

From: Johns, Linda [LJohns@mt.gov]
Sent: 1/9/2018 7:56:51 PM
To: Liza Fleeson [Liza.Fleeson@vdacs.virginia.gov]; Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]; ahobbs@pestfacts.org
CC: Irene King [IKing@nmda.nmsu.edu]
Subject: Speaker Invite for 2018 ASPCRO Conference

The Association of Structural Pest Control Regulatory Officials (ASPCRO) will hold its 2018 Annual Meeting August 20 – August 24 in San Antonio, TX. We are planning a session currently titled "Succession Planning: Pesticides & Regulation" on Thursday, August 23 at 8:00 AM and concluding at 9:00 AM. This session is follow-up from the 2017 Annual Meeting and thus we are extending this invitation to you to participate as one of the presenters for this session.

This session we will focus on planning and developing laws and regulations that are currently relevant yet flexible enough to address the future of the dynamic environment that is pesticides and the challenges often faced when undertaking such an effort. These may include those that are imposed by an organization itself or the paradigm shift from reactive to proactive regulations and related programs.

I would like the opportunity to discuss the session with you further. Please let me know of your availability and willingness to participate and when we may be able to schedule a conference call. In the interim, please do not hesitate to contact me or Irene King 9NM) Vice President & Planning Committee Chair, at IKing@nmda.nmsu.edu or (575) 646-2733 should you have any questions or need additional information.

Thank you and I look forward to hearing from you.

Linda Johns
Program Manager
Montana Department of Agriculture
302 North Roberts * PO Box 200201 * Helena, MT 59620-0201
Phone (406) 444-3676 * Fax (406) 444-9493
http://agr.mt.gov/Pesticides

"The individual who says it is not possible should move out of the way of those doing it" Tricia Cunningham

Message

From: Aaron Hobbs [ahobbs@pestfacts.org]
Sent: 5/9/2017 5:58:08 PM
To: Jewell, Shannon [jewell.shannon@epa.gov]
CC: Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: checkin & visit

Shannon,

Good afternoon. Yes 9am works well. Thank you and thank you for the quick follow-up.

Aaron Hobbs
President
RISE, Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment
202-872-3861
www.pestfacts.org
www.debugthemyths.com

From: Jewell, Shannon [mailto:jewell.shannon@epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, May 08, 2017 4:42 PM
To: Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>
Cc: Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: checkin & visit

Hello Aaron,

Would 9am on the morning of June 8th work for you? I will go ahead and put a hold on the hour for your group.

Thank you,
Shannon

Shannon Jewell · (703) 347-0109 · jewell.shannon@epa.gov

From: Keigwin, Richard
Sent: Monday, May 08, 2017 2:03 PM
To: Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>
Cc: Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: checkin & visit

Good to hear from you. The college visits went fine, and we now have a winner – my son will be going to James Madison University in the fall. Makes things a lot easier, at least for the next two years. I can do the Northern Virginia-to-Charlottesville-to-Harrisonburg-to-Northern Virginia circuit in a day!

Regarding the morning of June 8th, let's try to make that happen. We have several of our regional managers in town that day, but I'm sure I can break away for an hour to meet with your group. Shannon, the miracle worker, will make it happen.

I hope all is well. I lucked out on the cub scout front – neither of my boys are outdoorsy people. It's been hard to even get them to go on day hikes! Don't they know what both of their parents do? ☺

Talk with you soon.

From: Aaron Hobbs [mailto:ahobbs@pestfacts.org]
Sent: Monday, May 08, 2017 1:56 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>
Subject: checkin & visit

Rick,

Hello sir. How were the college visits? I think our conference went well, what are you hearing from your team?

Also, I'd like to bring a small group over to see you the morning of June 8. Our Regulatory Affairs Committee meets the day before and the leadership of the committee, plus a few others, would like to sit with you for a discussion. Many of your colleagues within OPP have met with us which is very valuable and now we'd like to start having more strategic leadership discussions as well. This committee within RISE has been growing well and benefitted from some new volunteer leadership. Meeting with you is the logical next step for them and I know you'll have a thoughtful and mutually beneficial conversation. Will you please let me know a good time for us to come over the morning of June 8?

Thank you sir. Look forward to your college report. We had a cub scout campout this weekend, so quite a few years before we do college visits!

Sincerely,

Aaron Hobbs
President
RISE, Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment
202-872-3861
www.pestfacts.org
www.debugthemyths.com

Message

From: Jewell, Shannon [jewell.shannon@epa.gov]
Sent: 5/8/2017 8:42:06 PM
To: Aaron Hobbs [ahobbs@pestfacts.org]
CC: Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: checkin & visit

Hello Aaron,

Would 9am on the morning of June 8th work for you? I will go ahead and put a hold on the hour for your group.

Thank you,
Shannon

Shannon Jewell · (703) 347-0109 · jewell.shannon@epa.gov

From: Keigwin, Richard
Sent: Monday, May 08, 2017 2:03 PM
To: Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>
Cc: Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: checkin & visit

Good to hear from you. The college visits went fine, and we now have a winner – my son will be going to James Madison University in the fall. Makes things a lot easier, at least for the next two years. I can do the Northern Virginia-to-Charlottesville-to-Harrisonburg-to-Northern Virginia circuit in a day!

Regarding the morning of June 8th, let's try to make that happen. We have several of our regional managers in town that day, but I'm sure I can break away for an hour to meet with your group. Shannon, the miracle worker, will make it happen.

I hope all is well. I lucked out on the cub scout front – neither of my boys are outdoorsy people. It's been hard to even get them to go on day hikes! Don't they know what both of their parents do? ☺

Talk with you soon.

From: Aaron Hobbs [mailto:ahobbs@pestfacts.org]
Sent: Monday, May 08, 2017 1:56 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>
Subject: checkin & visit

Rick,

Hello sir. How were the college visits? I think our conference went well, what are you hearing from your team?

Also, I'd like to bring a small group over to see you the morning of June 8. Our Regulatory Affairs Committee meets the day before and the leadership of the committee, plus a few others, would like to sit with you for a discussion. Many of your colleagues within OPP have met with us which is very valuable and now we'd like to start having more strategic leadership discussions as well. This committee within RISE has been growing well and benefitted from some new volunteer leadership. Meeting with you is the logical next step for them and I know you'll have a thoughtful and mutually beneficial conversation. Will you please let me know a good time for us to come over the morning of June 8?

Thank you sir. Look forward to your college report. We had a cub scout campout this weekend, so quite a few years before we do college visits!

Sincerely,

Aaron Hobbs
President
RISE, Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment
202-872-3861
www.pestfacts.org
www.debugthemyths.com

Message

From: Aaron Hobbs [ahobbs@pestfacts.org]
Sent: 5/8/2017 5:56:05 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
Subject: checkin & visit

Rick,

Hello sir. How were the college visits? I think our conference went well, what are you hearing from your team?

Also, I'd like to bring a small group over to see you the morning of June 8. Our Regulatory Affairs Committee meets the day before and the leadership of the committee, plus a few others, would like to sit with you for a discussion. Many of your colleagues within OPP have met with us which is very valuable and now we'd like to start having more strategic leadership discussions as well. This committee within RISE has been growing well and benefitted from some new volunteer leadership. Meeting with you is the logical next step for them and I know you'll have a thoughtful and mutually beneficial conversation. Will you please let me know a good time for us to come over the morning of June 8?

Thank you sir. Look forward to your college report. We had a cub scout campout this weekend, so quite a few years before we do college visits!

Sincerely,

Aaron Hobbs
President
RISE, Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment
202-872-3861
www.pestfacts.org
www.debugthemyths.com

Message

From: Aaron Hobbs [ahobbs@pestfacts.org]
Sent: 3/7/2017 7:24:29 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Hello & Congrats

Personal Matters / Ex. 6

Aaron Hobbs
President
RISE, Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment
202-872-3861
www.pestfacts.org
www.debugthemyths.com

From: Keigwin, Richard [mailto:Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, February 28, 2017 1:23 PM
To: Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>
Subject: Re: Hello & Congrats

Personal Matters / Ex. 6

Rick Keigwin
Acting Director, Office of Pesticide Programs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 28, 2017, at 1:12 PM, Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org> wrote:

Personal Matters / Ex. 6

Aaron Hobbs
RISE
202-872-3860
www.debugthemyths.com

On Feb 24, 2017, at 10:55 AM, Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov> wrote:

Aaron—

Good to hear from you! Sorry I won't see you on Monday; jealous that you will be in one of my favorite cities – I love Atlanta!

Not sure about doing this on a permanent basis. Haven't decided whether or not it's something that I would like to do long-term; not sure that I'll be asked.

Talk with you soon.
--Rick

From: Aaron Hobbs [mailto:ahobbs@pestfacts.org]
Sent: Friday, February 24, 2017 10:13 AM
To: Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>
Subject: Hello & Congrats

Rick,

Personal Matters / Ex. 6

Sincerely,

Aaron Hobbs
President
RISE, Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment
202-872-3861
www.pestfacts.org
www.debugthemyths.com

Message

From: Aaron Hobbs [ahobbs@pestfacts.org]
Sent: 5/9/2017 7:56:57 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: checkin & visit

Personal Matters / Ex. 6

Shannon has us set up for the 8th. I look forward to seeing you then.

Aaron Hobbs
President
RISE, Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment
202-872-3861
www.pestfacts.org
www.debugthemyths.com

From: Keigwin, Richard [mailto:Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, May 08, 2017 2:03 PM
To: Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>
Cc: Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: checkin & visit

Personal Matters / Ex. 6

Regarding the morning of June 8th, let's try to make that happen. We have several of our regional managers in town that day, but I'm sure I can break away for an hour to meet with your group. Shannon, the miracle worker, will make it happen.

Personal Matters / Ex. 6

Talk with you soon.

From: Aaron Hobbs [mailto:ahobbs@pestfacts.org]
Sent: Monday, May 08, 2017 1:56 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>
Subject: checkin & visit

Rick,

Hello sir. How were the college visits? I think our conference went well, what are you hearing from your team?

Also, I'd like to bring a small group over to see you the morning of June 8. Our Regulatory Affairs Committee meets the day before and the leadership of the committee, plus a few others, would like to sit with you for a discussion. Many of your colleagues within OPP have met with us which is very valuable and now we'd like to start having more strategic leadership discussions as well. This committee within RISE has been growing well and benefitted from some new volunteer leadership. Meeting with you is the logical next step for them and I know you'll have a thoughtful and mutually beneficial conversation. Will you please let me know a good time for us to come over the morning of June 8?

Thank you sir. Look forward to your college report. We had a cub scout campout this weekend, so quite a few years before we do college visits!

Sincerely,

Aaron Hobbs
President
RISE, Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment
202-872-3861
www.pestfacts.org
www.debugthemyths.com

Message

From: Aaron Hobbs [ahobbs@pestfacts.org]
Sent: 1/30/2018 9:52:52 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Speaker Invite for 2018 ASPCRO Conference

Personal Matters / Ex. 6

Aaron Hobbs
President
RISE, Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment
202-872-3861
www.pestfacts.org
www.debugthemyths.com

From: Keigwin, Richard [mailto:Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 09, 2018 3:48 PM
To: Johns, Linda <LJohns@mt.gov>
Cc: Liza Fleeson <Liza.Fleeson@vdacs.virginia.gov>; Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>; Irene King <IKing@nmda.nmsu.edu>
Subject: Re: Speaker Invite for 2018 ASPCRO Conference

Linda—

Personal Matters / Ex. 6

—Rick

Rick Keigwin
Director, Office of Pesticide Programs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Phone: 703-305-7090
Website: www.epa.gov/pesticides
Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 9, 2018, at 11:58 AM, Johns, Linda <LJohns@mt.gov> wrote:

<image001.gif>
The Association of Structural Pest Control Regulatory Officials (ASPCRO) will hold its 2018 Annual Meeting August 20 – August 24 in San Antonio, TX. We are planning a session currently

titled "Succession Planning: Pesticides & Regulation" on Thursday, August 23 at 8:00 AM and concluding at 9:00 AM. This session is follow-up from the 2017 Annual Meeting and thus we are extending this invitation to you to participate as one of the presenters for this session.

This session we will focus on planning and developing laws and regulations that are currently relevant yet flexible enough to address the future of the dynamic environment that is pesticides and the challenges often faced when undertaking such an effort. These may include those that are imposed by an organization itself or the paradigm shift from reactive to proactive regulations and related programs.

I would like the opportunity to discuss the session with you further. Please let me know of your availability and willingness to participate and when we may be able to schedule a conference call. In the interim, please do not hesitate to contact me or Irene King 9NM) Vice President & Planning Committee Chair, at IKing@nmda.nmsu.edu or (575) 646-2733 should you have any questions or need additional information.

Thank you and I look forward to hearing from you.

Linda Johns
Program Manager
Montana Department of Agriculture
302 North Roberts * PO Box 200201 * Helena, MT 59620-0201
Phone (406) 444-3676 * Fax (406) 444-9493
http://agr.mt.gov/Pesticides

"The individual who says it is not possible should move out of the way of those doing it" Tricia Cunningham

Message

From: Zimmerman, Dea [Zimmerman.Dea@epa.gov]
Sent: 12/8/2017 7:34:50 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]; Dinkins, Darlene [Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov]; Jewell, Shannon [jewell.shannon@epa.gov]
Subject: Action Requested: Certify PPDC Meeting Transcripts
Attachments: Chair Certification of Transcripts for November 2017 PPDC Meeting.docx; November 1-2017 PPDC Meeting Full.pdf; November 1-2017 PPDC Meeting Mini.pdf; November 2-2017 PPDC Meeting Full.pdf; November 2-2017 PPDC Meeting Mini.pdf

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Dea Zimmerman
PREP Coordinator, Regional and State Liaison
U.S. EPA - Office of Pesticide Programs
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago IL 60604
telephone (312) 353-6344
fax (312) 408-2246

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

OFFICE OF CHEMICAL SAFETY
AND POLLUTION PREVENTION

Chair Certification

I, Richard P. Keigwin, Jr., Chair for the Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee (PPDC) certify the meeting transcripts for November 1-2, 2017, are complete and accurately reflect the discussions and decisions of said meeting.

_____ _____

Richard P. Keigwin, Jr. **Date**
PPDC Chair

UNITED STATES

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

PESTICIDE PROGRAM DIALOGUE

COMMITTEE MEETING

DAY ONE - NOVEMBER 1, 2017

Conference Center - Lobby Level

2777 Crystal Drive

One Potomac Yard South

Arlington, Virginia 22202

1 P R O C E E D I N G S
2 MR. KEIGWIN: Is this on? Now it is. Okay.
3 So, we want to welcome you all to the new PPDC,
4 Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee. I see a number of
5 familiar faces, and some new faces around the table as
6 well. So thank you all for joining us.
7 To kick things off this morning, I first want to
8 introduce Dr. Nancy Beck, who is the Deputy Assistant
9 Administrator for the Office of Chemical Safety and
10 Pollution Prevention.
11 DR. BECK: Great. Good morning. How is
12 everyone? All right. Nice to see you all here. I
13 especially want to welcome the new members of our
14 committee. Stepping up and volunteering is, you know,
15 an awesome thing that public citizens can do, so I
16 appreciate all the time you're going to take, because
17 your engagement will really help us.
18 I encourage you all to be active and to be very
19 vocal, because the more vocal you are, the better our
20 outcomes will be in the end. And I look forward to the
21 introductions and meeting you all over the next two
22 days.
23 I also want to welcome members of the public
24 that are here today. Your constructive input is also
25 extremely important to us. It is through your feedback

ED_002528_00039557-00002

1 that we're going to learn, we're going to grow, and
2 we're going to ensure that we're putting forth the best
3 regulations to protect public health and the
4 environment, and to also ensure that we're maximizing
5 the benefits of pesticides to ensure appropriate food
6 security, which is very important.
7 I also want to introduce some other key members
8 of our new team. To the right is Kate Bennett. If you
9 haven't met her yet, she is from our Office of Public
10 Engagement and she has been spending most of her summer
11 with the agricultural community. After me you'll hear a
12 little bit from Jeff Sands, who is our new agricultural
13 advisor working in the Administrator's Office. And I
14 also want to introduce Charlotte Bertrand. There we go.
15 Charlotte is our new acting principal deputy assistant
16 administrator. We stole her from OLEM, because she has
17 a really strong background in risk assessment and
18 program management, so she is an incredible asset to our
19 team. So, thank you, Charlotte.
20 I'll just give you a little bit about my
21 background, so you can understand where I'm coming from.
22 I came to EPA in May with about 20 years of applied
23 public health experience. I worked at the Washington
24 State Department of Health, so I have a little bit of a
25 northwest bias, and I came to D.C. to be a fellow in the

ED_002528_00039557-00003

1 Office of Research and Development, where I worked on
2 looking at how we can incorporate human susceptibility
3 and variability into hazard assessments.
4 And then after about two years I went to the
5 Office of Management and Budget, where I finally became
6 an official government employee, and I spent about 10
7 years in the Office of Information and Regulatory
8 Affairs. And this was really an eye-opening and amazing
9 experience to be a career staffer on the White House
10 grounds.
11 One of the many things I learned about is that
12 there's lots of different types of science, right? So
13 there's what I'll call exploratory scientific research,
14 which helps us look at new ideas and hypotheses and
15 helps us view where we should put our future research
16 dollars. This is extremely important research, and I
17 don't want anyone to think that I underestimate its
18 value.
19 But the other type of research is the scientific
20 research that's robust enough to support a regulation,
21 and this is extremely important research. In these
22 studies, we have to look at them a little bit
23 differently. We need to ensure that they are sound
24 methodology, we need to ensure that they're transparent.
25 We need to understand that they're objective, right?

ED_002528_00039557-00004

1 These studies have to be strong enough to support what
2 could be potentially very expensive and costly
3 regulations, and also regulations that could have
4 extremely high benefits. So it is really important that
5 we get these right, that we get this right, and that
6 these studies be extremely strong.
7 The costs of getting it wrong are just too high.
8 So, as you are aware, in EPA, we get sued quite a bit,
9 and in the Office of Pesticide Programs, we get sued
10 quite a bit. So I don't take this lightly. And so our
11 priorities need to ensure that we follow the rule of law
12 and that we're relying on the strongest scientific
13 evidence to support our decisions.
14 So this is extremely important to the program,
15 and your input on the strength of our studies and our
16 valuations will be critical.
17 Throughout my career, which included working for
18 American businesses and also working for four different
19 Presidential administrations, I think it was Clinton,
20 Bush, Obama and now the Trump administration, I have
21 always worked to make sure that the science and
22 technical assessments that the Government puts out are
23 objective and transparent and sound, and I intend to
24 continue to apply these principles at EPA.
25 There is already a very strong foundation within

ED_002528_00039557-00005

1 the Office of Pesticide Programs. If you look at the
2 guidance documents and the assessments they release,
3 they're probably some of the best in the Government, if
4 not the best. So I look forward to working with Rick
5 and his staff to continue to ensure that the reputation
6 of this program remains as strong as it is. And this is
7 where you all can help with that.
8 I also want to say, it was an honor to be part
9 of the team that made Rick official in his capacity in
10 September. If you haven't heard, Rick is officially the
11 director of our Office of Pesticide Programs now. So
12 that is a -- I think a great thing for all of us.
13 The other part of the regulatory program that's
14 important is where you all come in, because the
15 decisionmaking, again, I cannot stress the importance of
16 stakeholder engagement. So it is through coordination
17 with you, our state regulatory partners, your engagement
18 on the PPDC, that we can really come to a better
19 understanding of what are some complex policy decisions
20 to make sound decisions that are important to all our
21 stakeholders. So again, I don't want to underemphasize
22 the importance of your role.
23 I'm also a stickler for good government. I
24 believe we have responsibility to communicate well in a
25 clear and timely manner. That means we're going to

ED_002528_00039557-00006

1 strive to get information to all of you in advance of
2 our discussions so that you can digest it, so that you
3 can think about it, so that you can be vocal and engage.
4 I'm also a stickler for timelines, so the 2022
5 PRIA deadlines, they stress me quite a bit. I'm sure
6 they stress Rick a little bit. If you saw the draft
7 strategic plan that EPA released last month, there are
8 two strategic measures that are going to help keep our
9 program on track. We want you to help us track them,
10 and these are measures that help us keep our timelines
11 under PRIA and also under FIFRA.
12 And then, finally, the other realism is that we
13 have continuing resource challenges that we have to work
14 with as we get towards this 2022 deadline. So again,
15 this is where the committee comes in to get your
16 feedback to help us on complex issues.
17 What are we going to do about dicamba in 2018?
18 How are we going to approach the synergy issue? These
19 are important things where your thoughtful advice is
20 really needed and it's welcomed by me, it's welcomed by
21 our team, it's welcomed by Rick, it's welcomed by his
22 staff.
23 So I think OPP has put together a very robust
24 agenda for you to help you understand some of our
25 priorities and some of our challenges. There are more

ED_002528_00039557-00007

1 than enough to fill two days.
2 So again, my schedule is going to prevent me
3 from being at the whole meeting today. I will be here a
4 little bit this morning. I hope to come back again
5 tomorrow morning if all goes well, but if I'm not here,
6 I look forward to hearing about how your discussions go,
7 I'm sure I will get updates and briefings.
8 So, just before turning it back to Rick, I just
9 want to once again stress the importance of your
10 engagement and how important it is to us, and at any
11 point in time, I welcome your feedback and feedback from
12 Rick and his team so that we can keep ourselves on a
13 good path to utilize you guys in the most efficient way
14 to inform our decisions.
15 So, thank you all. Again, I appreciate your
16 participation.
17 MR. KEIGWIN: Thank you, Nancy.
18 I also want to introduce Jeff Sands, who is our
19 new ag advisor.
20 MR. SANDS: Good morning, and welcome to all
21 committee members and public participants. My name is
22 Jeff Sands, and I am the agricultural advisor to the
23 administrator. I would like to thank all of you here
24 today for your service to this committee.
25 Cross-functional constructive dialogue such as

ED_002528_00039557-00008

1 the PPDC are critical for meaningful engagement between
2 EPA and all relevant stakeholders. The groups
3 represented at this meeting make for a diverse mix of
4 perspectives and expertise that will serve as an
5 informational platform in the regulatory process. Your
6 collective input into this dialogue on complex policy
7 issues equips us with information needed to make the
8 best decisions in order to protect human health, the
9 environment, and ensure our nation's food security
10 through our actions here at the agency.
11 Your agenda over the next couple of days is
12 quite full. I look forward to hearing all of the
13 outputs from discussions, and again, I'd like to express
14 my appreciation for your efforts in serving on this
15 committee and all accompanying workgroups. Thank you.
16 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Jeff.
17 Kate, did you want to give a couple of remarks?
18 I didn't want to put you on the spot.
19 MS. BENNETT: Hi, Kate Bennett with the Office
20 of Public Engagement. I just wanted to say thanks for
21 the opportunity to sit in on your conversations. I see
22 a lot of familiar faces at the table, and then others
23 that I would like to get to know. We have an open-door
24 policy in the Office of Public Engagement, so we work
25 very heavily with Nancy and Rick and now Jeff, who we're

ED_002528_00039557-00009

1 excited to have on the team, and any way we can be
2 helpful, whether it's here, whether it's with the folks
3 you represent out in the field, we're just eager to
4 learn more and help facilitate stakeholder engagement
5 with the Office of Pesticides, and also with the
6 administrator himself. So, thank you for the
7 opportunity to listen and learn today.
8 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Kate.
9 So, like I was saying earlier, we have a lot of
10 new faces, and so if we could go around the room, maybe
11 start to my right and introduce yourselves.
12 MS. KUNICKIS: I'm Sheryl Kunickis, I'm the
13 director of the Office of Pest Management Policy at
14 USDA.
15 MS. LIANG: Hi, my name is Charlotte Liang, I'm
16 with U.S. Food and Drug Administration Office of Food
17 Safety.
18 MR. HOFFMAN: Eric Hoffman, Deputy Director,
19 Armed Forces Pest Management Board.
20 MR. WHITTINGTON: Andy Whittington with the
21 Mississippi Farm Bureau Federation.
22 MR. PECK: Preston Peck, Policy Director of
23 Toxic Free North Carolina.
24 MS. TROSSBACH: I'm Liza Fleeson Trossbach with
25 the Virginia Department of Agricultural and Consumer

ED_002528_00039557-00010

1 Services, and I'm representing the Association of
2 American Pesticide Control Officials, or AAPCO.
3 MR. REABE: I'm Damon Reabe, president of
4 Dairyland Aviation, a Wisconsin aerial applicator
5 representing the National Agricultural Aviation
6 Association.
7 MR. TAYLOR: Donny Taylor representing the
8 Agricultural Retailers Association.
9 MR. GRAGG: Richard Gragg, Florida A&M
10 University School of the Environment.
11 MS. FIGUEROA: Iris Figueroa, Farmworker
12 Justice.
13 MS. LIEBMAN: Hi, Amy Liebman, I'm the Director
14 of Environmental and Occupational Health, Migrant
15 Clinicians Network.
16 MS. SANSON: Charlotte Sanson, head of
17 regulatory affairs and compliance with Bayer.
18 MR. BENNETT: Steve Bennett with the Consumer
19 Specialty Products Association.
20 MR. GJEVRE: Eric Gjevre, Tribal Pesticide
21 Program Council.
22 MR. LAJOIE: Dominic LaJoie, I'm a potato grower
23 from Maine, I'm representing the National Potato
24 Council.
25 MS. ASMUS: Amy Asmus with Smith Farm Supply

ED_002528_00039557-00011

1 representing the Weed Science Society of America.
2 MR. FREDERICKS: I'm Jim Fredericks with the
3 National Pest Management Association.
4 MR. WAKEM: Good morning, I'm Edward Wakem
5 representing the American Veterinary Medical
6 Association.
7 MS. CALLIES: I'm Rachel Callies, I'm the
8 manager of North American products registration at S.C.
9 Johnson.
10 MR. TUCKER: I'm Tim Tucker, past president of
11 the American Beekeeping Federation, I'm representing all
12 beekeepers, not just those in our organization, and
13 bees, hopefully.
14 MR. COPE: I'm Stan Cope and I'm the immediate
15 past president of the American Mosquito Control
16 Association, so a couple of presidents here. And that's
17 the organization that I'm here representing.
18 MR. HOBBS: Aaron Hobbs of RISE, Responsible
19 Industry for a Sound Environment, a trade association
20 supplying solutions to golf, lawn care, pest control and
21 other markets.
22 MS. McCURDY: Good morning, I'm Leyla McCurdy
23 with the Children's Environmental Health Network.
24 MS. SELVAGGIO: Hi, I'm Sharon Selvaggio with
25 Northwest Center for Alternatives to Pesticides.

ED_002528_00039557-00012

1 MS. WILSON: Good morning. I'm Nina Wilson with
2 Gowan, representing the Biological Products Industry.
3 MR. THOSTENSON: Good morning, my name is Andrew
4 Thostenson, I am a pesticide program specialist with
5 North Dakota State University, and I represent the
6 American Association of Pesticide Safety Educators.
7 MR. McLAURIN: Good morning. My name is Allen
8 McLaurin, I'm actually a cotton farmer in North Carolina
9 and I'm here representing the National Cotton Council.
10 MS. BISHOP: Hi, everyone, I am Pat Bishop with
11 Humane Society International and Humane Society of the
12 United States.
13 MS. BURD: Lori Ann Burd, Center for Biological
14 Diversity representing all life on Earth, but especially
15 endangered species.
16 MS. HARRIOTT: Nichelle Harriott, Science and
17 Regulatory Director, Beyond Pesticides.
18 MS. PALMER: Cynthia Palmer, Director of
19 Pesticides, Science and Regulation, American Bird
20 Conservancy.
21 MR. VROOM: Good morning, I'm Jay Vroom,
22 President, CropLife America, the trade association
23 representing the Agricultural Pesticides and Crop
24 Biotechnology Industry.
25 MR. ALARCON: Good morning, Walter Alarcon, I

ED_002528_00039557-00013

1 work with the SENSOR pesticides programs, we track acute
2 pesticide poisonings and I work for CDC and NIOSH.
3 MR. GORMAN: John Gorman, I'm with EPA Region 2
4 and I'm the chief of Pesticides and Toxic Substances.
5 MR. KEIGWIN: And then I think we have one or
6 two members who are joining us by phone. So if you're a
7 PPDC committee member, would you please introduce
8 yourself.
9 MS. SHULTZ: This is Gina Schultz from U.S. Fish
10 & Wildfire Service. Could you hear me?
11 MR. KEIGWIN: Can you hear us, Gina?
12 MS. SHULTZ: Yeah, I'm sorry, yes, I can hear
13 you.
14 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, great, thanks.
15 And then is Dan Kunkel on the phone?
16 MR. KUNKEL: A lot, and I kind of -- (poor
17 connection).
18 MR. KEIGWIN: Dan is going to be able to join us
19 intermittently. Dan is with the IR4 program based at
20 Rutgers University.
21 (Operator interruption.)
22 MR. KEIGWIN: Let's review the agenda for the
23 next day and a half. As Nancy, Kate and Jeff said, it's
24 a very ambitious agenda, we probably could have put more
25 on here, but we only had a day and a half, but these are

ED_002528_00039557-00014

1 some issues that we as a program could really benefit
2 from the collective input of all of you. So we're going
3 to start the morning with a presentation from Jim
4 McCleary. Jim is from the part of EPA that oversees all
5 of the federal advisory committees for the agency, and
6 because so many of you are new to the PPDC, or maybe
7 haven't been on the PPDC for some time, we thought it
8 would be helpful for Jim to come over and just remind us
9 of all -- all of us about what our roles are as being
10 members of a federal advisory committee.
11 We will then take a break, and then Mike Goodis,
12 the Director of our Registration Division, will lead a
13 session and a report back from the Pollinator Protection
14 Plan Metrics Workgroup that has been working on
15 developing some measures to evaluate the effectiveness
16 of the managed pollinator protection plans, and this
17 will be a topic where we will want to get your input on
18 the feedback from the workgroup and see if you all think
19 that that's a path forward that the agency should be
20 considering.
21 We will then break for lunch, and then in the
22 early afternoon, we're going to give you, again, led by
23 Mike and his staff, an update on what's been happening
24 with dicamba and some recent regulatory changes that
25 we've put in place for the 2018 season. And then we

ED_002528_00039557-00015

1 will have an update on the work that we've been doing to
2 evaluate claims of synergy and how we're incorporating
3 that science into the registration program.
4 After a break, we've sent around to you all in
5 advance a number of one-pagers on some topics that we
6 had heard you all were interested in hearing about.
7 We've reserved about an hour for you all to ask
8 questions about those issues, and if there are others
9 and time permitting we can take those as well.
10 And then we'll end the day with giving you all
11 an update on where things are with the Pesticide
12 Registration Improvement Act, our progress under the
13 current statute, and some of the changes that could take
14 place were Congress to re-authorize the program.
15 And then tomorrow morning is almost exclusively
16 dedicated to getting your all's feedback on the Worker
17 Protection Rule that was promulgated in 2015 and the
18 Certification of Pesticide Applicators Rule that was
19 finalized at the beginning of this year. Many of you
20 were here for the May PPDC meeting and the regulatory
21 reform public meeting that we had a subsequent day, and
22 there were a lot of comments that we received relative
23 to those two rules, and now what we really want to do is
24 get you all to have a dialogue about what we heard and
25 we'll summarize those for you and then see if we have

ED_002528_00039557-00016

1 some consensus advice for moving forward on the
2 implementation of those two rules.
3 And then in the middle of all of that, Arnold
4 Layne, who is Deputy Director for Management here in the
5 Office of Pesticide Programs, will give a brief report
6 out on yesterday's first meeting of the new Public
7 Health Workgroup.
8 So a pretty packed day. In order to do this
9 effectively, particularly for tomorrow, we're going to
10 start at 8:30, not 9:00. So the guards were really
11 moving you all through rather quickly yesterday, so I
12 want to thank Dea and her team for helping to facilitate
13 that. I think that was the fastest we've ever gotten
14 people into the building for a meeting, but that's
15 because you all showed up so early, maybe because you're
16 used to how long it takes to get into our building. So
17 do that again.
18 So a couple of housekeeping things before we get
19 going. PPDC members and members of the public, if you
20 have not signed in at the desk as you came in, please do
21 so that we have a recording of your presence here. Your
22 tent cards, when we open it up, just, you know, put it
23 up on its side so that I know that you want to speak or
24 make a comment.
25 For those of you who have been in this room

ED_002528_00039557-00017

1 before, you know that we do our best with the audio
2 system that we have, so we did do a tech check last
3 night; it was working great. So I have all the
4 confidence that it will continue to work great, but just
5 remember that if you see the red light on your mic',
6 that means you're live. For people on the phone, to
7 hear you and anything that you want to say, your mic'
8 has to be on, otherwise they're not going to be able to
9 pick up the conversation. And then when you're finished
10 speaking, if you could just turn the mic' off.
11 For those of you participating via
12 teleconference, we currently have a global mute in
13 place. We can control the muting and unmuting, so
14 please don't unmute your line unless we ask you to. And
15 then at the end of each day, we will have a 15-minute
16 public comment session. If members of the public are
17 interested in making a comment during those sessions,
18 please sign up at the registration desk out front.
19 And so with that, let me ask Jim to come up.
20 MR. McCLEARY: Good morning, everyone. Thank
21 you for showing up this morning, participating. Let me
22 just grab my notes for a minute, because I can't read
23 that screen from here.
24 Okay. This was an overview of the Federal
25 Advisory Committee Act at EPA, how we implement it here.

ED_002528_00039557-00018

1 The Federal Advisory Committee Act requires us to set up
2 procedures for every agency who has even a single
3 federal advisory committee to uniformly manage them, and
4 this is how we do it here at EPA.
5 First of all, welcome. And this is -- let me
6 see. Dea? How do I advance it? That's okay. Thank
7 you.
8 Okay. Welcome on board. You're all volunteers,
9 and I can't tell you how much we appreciate that here at
10 EPA. We could not afford to buy the type of experience
11 and the points of view that are in the room today, so
12 thank you for that. I know it's a big commitment. And
13 thank you also to the organizations that you represent
14 for giving you time to be here with us today. We're
15 excited that you're here with us and we look forward to
16 hearing your comments and your participation throughout
17 the meeting.
18 The Federal Advisory Committee Act was
19 established in 1972 and it governs the establishment,
20 operation and termination of federal advisory
21 committees. FACA may apply when EPA utilizes and
22 convenes committees to obtain group advice. So if we
23 were going out to find individual advice from any one of
24 you or from any individual around the country, anywhere,
25 we wouldn't need to invoke FACA, but the fact that

ED_002528_00039557-00019

1 you're all here today giving us group advice means that
2 FACA applies, and that's why we've done what we've done
3 by setting up this federal advisory committee.
4 FACA requires that we have a charter. The
5 charter is filed with the Congress of the United States,
6 and it lists the objectives and descriptions and duties
7 of the committee, the period of time for which the
8 committee will do its work, officials to whom the
9 committee reports, and the estimated number of meetings
10 and the costs associated with it.
11 Charters are generally good for two years. We
12 renew the charter for the PPDC every two years, and you
13 are currently fully chartered and up and running.
14 FACA requires specific things about membership.
15 Members, all members of all federal advisory committees
16 throughout EPA serve at the discretion and the pleasure
17 of the administrator. Committees must be fairly
18 balanced for the points of view represented and the
19 functions to be performed. And as you were going around
20 the room today, I noticed that this is a very
21 well-balanced committee. A lot of different points of
22 view are represented here, and that's a great thing for
23 this committee and the EPA.
24 Now, EPA appoints members depending on whether
25 the member is being asked to represent the point of view

ED_002528_00039557-00020

1 of a group, which is a representative member. Everyone
2 here today is a representative member. Or provide the
3 agency with their best independent judgment and
4 expertise, and those are special government employees.
5 Special government employees, or SGEs, are a separate
6 animal from what everyone in here is today. They're
7 actually paid, often times paid for their participation,
8 and they represent their own personal expertise. Many
9 times they're scientists or other specialists in their
10 field.
11 Being a representative member is different, it
12 means that you are representing the point of view for
13 the group that you're representing. FACA also requires
14 public access. We have a healthy number of members of
15 the public here today, and that's a good thing.
16 The transparency that FACA provides allows the
17 members of the public to see the process, to see the
18 work that this committee is doing and thus the work that
19 the agency is doing.
20 We have to publish meetings in the Federal
21 Register. This is a public notice requirement. Meeting
22 notices have to be published in the Federal Register at
23 least 15 days prior to the meeting. And opportunities
24 have to be provided for the public to provide their own
25 comments so that their voice is also heard at the

ED_002528_00039557-00021

1 meetings.
2 Openness and transparency, we've touched on it a
3 little bit. Detailed meeting minutes and committee
4 documents are available to the public, and I know that
5 meeting minutes aren't available yet. They will be --
6 they have to be certified by the committee chair within
7 90 days of this meeting being completed. And the
8 meeting documents have been already published to the
9 website.
10 Requirements apply to all meetings, including
11 face-to-face meetings, teleconference meetings,
12 videoconference meetings, and any other electronic
13 medium that we may come up with in the future to hold
14 federal advisory committee meetings here.
15 Okay. The DFO -- let me tell you, DFO stands
16 for designated federal official. Dea Zimmerman is your
17 DFO, and I have to say she is one of the finest DFOs the
18 EPA has. She's terrific. She is your link to the
19 agency. If you have questions, you should approach her
20 with them. And Dea will reach out to me and to others
21 to find the right answers for you.
22 EPA must designate a federal employee, that's
23 Dea, to be your designated Federal official for each
24 committee. DFOs manage the day-to-day operations of the
25 committee and the DFO must attend every meeting, approve

ED_002528_00039557-00022

1 the agenda, call the meeting to order and adjourn it, if
2 it's determined to be in the public's interest.
3 What about you? What are your roles and
4 responsibilities as a member? We ask you to
5 participate. Nonattendance impacts the efficiency and
6 effectiveness of the entire group. You were asked to be
7 on the committee for a reason, that's because we want to
8 hear your voice.
9 We ask you to study and review the materials in
10 advance. That's the come-prepared-to-class requirement.
11 We ask you -- we do send the materials out in advance
12 and we ask that you review them so that you are prepared
13 to engage fully at the meeting. And then to speak up.
14 We want to hear your views during the course of the
15 meeting.
16 We ask you to represent your interest group or
17 organization and work towards consensus, when
18 appropriate. It's not always possible, but when it is,
19 we ask that you try to reach consensus with your fellow
20 members and we ask you to provide feedback to your
21 chair. The chair provides leadership to the committee
22 and works with the DFO to develop committee agendas,
23 schedule committee activities, coordinate work and
24 obtain consensus.
25 We ask you to collaborate to accomplish the

ED_002528_00039557-00023

1 committee's charge. Serve your appointed term. If you
2 develop a conflict and can't serve, please let your DFO
3 know immediately. If you can't serve your term, it may
4 affect the balance of the committee, so it's possible
5 that the committee wouldn't be able to meet again until
6 your point of view on the committee is reappointed to
7 someone else. And we ask you to have close
8 communications with your DFO.
9 Okay. There are some travel and ethics
10 considerations that you should be aware of to keep
11 everyone out of trouble, and we want to help you do that
12 here. EPA may pay travel and per diem for members on
13 official travel. So all of you here who traveled, I
14 think it's greater than 50 miles from here, are probably
15 on an official travel status, and you've worked with Dea
16 and her staff, her colleagues, to coordinate that
17 travel.
18 We ask you to refrain from any language or
19 activities that could compromise the civility of the
20 committee and maintain an environment that promotes
21 participation of individuals, regardless of race, color,
22 national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or
23 sexual orientation. This is our plays-well-with-others
24 requirement. And if you have children in kindergarten,
25 you've seen that before. And with people on this

ED_002528_00039557-00024

1 committee, I expect no problems with that here.
2 The next one is a big one. Members may not
3 lobby Congress in their capacity as an advisory
4 committee member. We've had some committees where we've
5 had some trouble with this in the past. It is not okay
6 for you to go up to Capitol Hill to meet with your
7 member of Congress or other members of Congress or
8 Congressional staff to lobby them on behalf of this
9 committee. You do not represent the committee to
10 Congress.
11 There is a process by which EPA will communicate
12 with members of Congress and the legislative branch. It
13 is not by individuals going up there.
14 Now, while I say that, by being members of this
15 committee, you don't lose your rights as a citizen. You
16 can still meet with your member of Congress in your own
17 capacity. We call that "on your own time and on your
18 own dime." So please don't leave the meeting today or
19 tomorrow and go up to Capitol Hill while you should be
20 participating in the meeting to meet with your member of
21 Congress, but if you want to meet with your members of
22 Congress or anyone else up there in your own capacity as
23 a private citizen, you are welcome to do that.
24 This can sometimes get a little tricky, so if
25 you have any questions with it, speak to Dea or me and

ED_002528_00039557-00025

1 we will help you navigate these sometimes treacherous
2 waters.
3 EPA employees may not direct or encourage
4 members to contact Congress with concerns of pending
5 legislation, so that means that no one at the front
6 here, myself included, can ask you to go up to Capitol
7 Hill and say, hey, we really need you to speak to this
8 member of Congress about this issue, please do that for
9 us. We can't do that ourselves as Federal employees and
10 you can't do it either as members of the committee.
11 Committees provide advice and/or recommendations
12 directly to EPA, Congress and the President. Your
13 advice here goes right to the OPP staff, I think most
14 staff members are here with us today. This is a
15 dialogue committee, so you don't produce written
16 reports. That's why it's so important for your
17 participation today, to be present, to be engaged and
18 active in the proceedings of this committee.
19 With EPA approval, committees may form
20 subcommittees and gather facts and draft documents to
21 assist the parent committee, and I know that PPDC does
22 utilize subcommittees and workgroups from time to time.
23 Subcommittees must report their findings directly to the
24 parent committee for full deliberation, approval and
25 discussion. So subcommittees can't go directly to the

ED_002528_00039557-00026

1 OPP staff with their recommendations, it has go through
2 PPDC in general.
3 Okay. At EPA, our subcommittees follow the same
4 requirements of FACA, including guidelines for openness,
5 transparency and membership. So a subcommittee at EPA
6 goes through the full membership process, and the same
7 openness and transparency process, the same notice and
8 registering -- notice in the Federal Register that the
9 main committees would do.
10 Committees may also form workgroups to conduct
11 research, perform studies or gather facts. Working
12 groups are small, informal meetings. These are -- we
13 call workgroups here they're for a specific purpose and
14 a limited term. So if there's a specific project that
15 the committee needs done and they want to put a small
16 group of the general committee members to work doing it,
17 we call that a workgroup. Workgroups are not required
18 to follow the same openness requirements, the same
19 notice requirements as committees and subcommittees are.
20 Working groups are also not subject to FACA. I
21 just said that, I'm sorry. Okay.
22 Additional resources for you. Your DFO is your
23 best point of contact for any questions that you have.
24 Dea, as I said before, is terrific, and she'll reach out
25 to me and others to get the answers that you need to do

ED_002528_00039557-00027

1 your jobs here.
2 We provided a link to the Federal Advisory
3 Committee Act in case anyone is interested in reading
4 it. We have attorneys here that do that, so you don't
5 have to if you don't want to.
6 We have also our FACA page. This is the page of
7 my office on the Internet site that will give you some
8 more general information about FACAs at EPA, not just
9 PPDC, but the other FACAs here as well. Our telephone
10 number there for the Federal Advisory Committee
11 Management Division is there. That will give you our
12 general number and they can get you the resources that
13 you need within our office.
14 And that's it. That's the end of my
15 presentation. Again, I would like to thank everyone for
16 your participation at the PPDC, you're making the
17 process better because of it. I can entertain any
18 questions that anyone might have now.
19 Yes?
20 MR. KEIGWIN: Stan, then Cynthia.
21 MR. COPE: Are there any occasions where there's
22 a formal vote by the committee, and if so, is it
23 majority rules or how does that work? Thank you.
24 MR. McCLEARY: Good question. The OPP staff
25 runs the committee meetings. I don't believe that this

ED_002528_00039557-00028

1 committee, the dialogue committee, has any votes. We're
2 here to hear your dialogue and to hear what you have to
3 say and we are looking for everyone's point of view, but
4 this is a committee that does not utilize a voting
5 process.
6 MR. KEIGWIN: Cynthia?
7 MS. PALMER: Thanks. I'm just curious if there
8 are specific metrics or criteria in that distinction
9 between a subcommittee and a working group. I know it's
10 already been an issue in the Public Health Committee
11 with its workgroup. And I'm just wondering, I mean, are
12 there certain numbers? Or I mean you say small, you say
13 limited term, what exactly does that mean?
14 MR. McCLEARY: Okay. I guess there's a slight
15 amount of room for interpretation there. Workgroups
16 cannot continue on indefinitely, like the PPDC continues
17 on. We renew the charter every two years for you.
18 Workgroups can't do that. It has to have a specific
19 purpose and a limited duration, so usually these are
20 research projects or writing projects. PPDC doesn't
21 come up with a written project, so we wouldn't need it
22 for that, but if there was a research project that we
23 needed to occur, that may be reported out at the next
24 meeting, that's when we might utilize a working group
25 for the PPDC, this committee. There is a slight amount

ED_002528_00039557-00029

1 of wiggle room there, I guess, but not a lot.
2 Any other questions?
3 (No response.)
4 MR. McCLEARY: Okay. Well, I will linger
5 through the break in case anyone wants to reach out to
6 me privately, and thank you very much for your time
7 today, and thank you for your service.
8 MR. KEIGWIN: All right. Thanks, Jim.
9 So we are running way ahead of schedule, which
10 is great, so we're not going to take a break. So I'm
11 going to ask Mike Goodis to come up and we'll go just
12 right into the next topic and we'll take a break after
13 that.
14 MR. GOODIS: I'd like to introduce myself, my
15 name is speaker corner. There we go. All right.
16 So, definitely running ahead of schedule.
17 That's good. All right.
18 So, again, my name is Mike Goodis and I'm the
19 Director of Registration Division. It's a pleasure to
20 be here with you this morning. I want to lead a
21 discussion regarding the workgroup, the PPDC workgroup,
22 on Pollinator Protection Plan Metrics. For some of you
23 who may recall, this was put in place a year ago with
24 the goal of writing a recommendation to the full PPDC
25 membership in this meeting, so it's a year term, and the

ED_002528_00039557-00030

1 membership -- and we'll get into some of the details of
2 this later.
3 The workgroup -- and it will be Andy Whittington
4 and Rose Kachadoorian will be making a presentation on
5 the work -- on the workgroup and their progress and
6 their recommendations to the panel. And so -- and
7 that's, as Rick mentioned before, you know, this is a
8 recommendation to the panel for support for our
9 recommendations to the EPA for consideration.
10 So I know we have a lot of new members to the
11 membership here, and so just for a little bit of
12 background on how this all came about, this is, again,
13 regarding pollinator health, and specifically use of
14 pesticides, you know, for controlling various pest
15 issues. A lot of this really started back in 2014 with
16 the President's Executive Order asking for federal
17 agencies to work together to develop a strategy on how
18 we can help improve pollinator health overall.
19 And so that was an effort that was co-chaired by
20 the EPA and USDA, and that strategy was published I
21 think in 2015. But in that, again, federal agencies
22 committed to various actions, and so the EPA, and
23 specifically for EPA, germane to this conversation, was
24 measures to try to restrict products that are known to
25 be toxic to bees under certain conditions for commercial

ED_002528_00039557-00031

1 pollination, but also to work with states and tribes in
2 developing pollinator protection plans. And this was
3 really building on the success of some states,
4 Mississippi, North Dakota, Florida, Colorado and
5 California, where they have led the effort in working
6 with their stakeholders in identifying opportunities for
7 beekeepers and growers to have a better understanding
8 and communicate intended actions regarding pesticide
9 applications and also pollinator activities as well.
10 And so we thought that was a great concept that
11 we wanted to continue to support, and so as part of the
12 EPA's effort, the EPA finalized our mitigation policy
13 regarding acute exposure to bees, and that was completed
14 in January of 2017. That, again, the scope for that
15 work was mainly limiting the -- restricting the use of
16 certain pesticides under conditions where bees are being
17 brought in for commercial pollination services during
18 bloom time. And we acknowledged there was some
19 exceptions for those particular uses.
20 All other uses outside of that scope, again, we
21 were relying on and encouraging states and tribes to
22 develop these pollinator protection plans. And but we
23 also acknowledged that we needed to monitor the progress
24 of those plans and, to some extent, the effectiveness of
25 those plans to see if that was really a good model that

ED_002528_00039557-00032

1 was going to result in some improvement of pollinator
2 health in reducing pesticide exposure to bees.
3 From the very beginning, there were questions
4 like, well, how do you intend on measuring? How do you
5 intend on evaluating whether the plans overall are
6 actually achieving its objective? And at the time we
7 really didn't have a full understanding of how best to
8 do that. And at the same time, too, we didn't want to
9 lock in states and tribes in structuring their plans to
10 just meet whatever the measures were that we were
11 looking at here at the EPA at a national scale.
12 I think what we observed and recognized was a
13 lot of diversity across the country regarding use of
14 bees and the types of crops that are out there. There
15 are some states that are more targeted for commercial
16 pollination, some of the states are more for honey
17 production, some states are maybe neither, there may be
18 more hobby, urban type of pollinator use. And for some
19 states, I think they recognize, too, that maybe their
20 priority in working with their stakeholders were more
21 about habitat and forage development and protection.
22 So we thought really that's why flexibility was
23 important for the states, and in developing those
24 pollinator protection plans and working with their
25 stakeholders. So again, we didn't want to limit, you

ED_002528_00039557-00033

1 know, what the scope of those plans were. Nor did -- we
2 were requiring them. Again, this is all voluntary
3 efforts by the states themselves. And so -- but again,
4 the challenge was how do we look at whether these
5 pollinator protection plans at a national level are
6 actually effective. Are they actually improving, you
7 know, the potential reduction of pesticide exposure to
8 bees, which would help contribute to general pollinator
9 health.
10 And so that's where this came about, about a
11 year ago we felt it would be a great opportunity for
12 PPDC to establish a workgroup and to provide a
13 recommendation to the agency. And so, again, you'll get
14 more information from a report out from the workgroup,
15 but, you know, at this point -- you know, and again, I
16 think the -- just from my observation, too, again, I was
17 the EPA lead for the workgroup during the course of the
18 year. You know, I thought the -- it was great
19 participation from the workgroup members. We met
20 monthly, mostly in conference call and in some cases in
21 person, in conjunction with these meetings, and I think
22 the group is at a place to make a recommendation to the
23 full membership.
24 So with that, I will turn it over to Andy.
25 MR. WHITTINGTON: Thank you. And thanks,

ED_002528_00039557-00034

1 everybody, for being way ahead of schedule, because I
2 was planning on studying this during the break. So this
3 will be a fun adventure for all of us.
4 So, this is going to follow very closely with
5 what we just listened to from the attorney because I
6 think this workgroup did function very much like the
7 workgroup is supposed to. So the workgroup was convened
8 to come up with some process to try and measure the
9 effectiveness of state pollinator plans on a national
10 scale. And that process involved the problem
11 definition, a review of the MP3 plans that had been
12 developed, a look at what a national-level metrics guide
13 would look like, and then looking at what an
14 implementation plan would look like. And then we would
15 come back and present that to you for your feedback.
16 And I'm like him, I can't hardly see the slides to
17 follow you.
18 All right, so the expectation of the workgroup
19 or the charge of the workgroup is to make a
20 recommendation for EPA to use in evaluating the
21 effectiveness of the pollinator protection plans at a
22 national level, and a means to monitor how they're doing
23 overall, a strategy to communicate that effectiveness to
24 the public, and we refer to the public in the broadest
25 sense.

ED_002528_00039557-00035

1 The agency will view the outcomes of this work
2 as a long-term effort and an ongoing effort in looking
3 at trends versus any specific target. Like I said, the
4 workgroup commenced on November 2016, with a deadline of
5 November 2017. So we did have a very specific time
6 frame.
7 I don't necessarily know that the workgroup was
8 small. There were 24 members of the workgroup, but it
9 was over a very broad base of stakeholders. And I'm not
10 going to go through everybody that's involved with this,
11 but you can see it's a very diverse group.
12 So the process was the problem definition and
13 the problem was how do you develop this set of metrics
14 to evaluate these plans, and they are stated tribal
15 plans. Mary Clock-Rust at EPA worked with the tribes
16 to -- and is working on their plan, but I think most of
17 what we've done would be very easily translated to the
18 tribal plans, as well as the states.
19 The plans' purpose is to reduce the exposure of
20 pesticides and developing some mitigation measures to
21 reduce those acute exposures. And then EPA will develop
22 those metrics evaluating the efficacy of the plans
23 nationally.
24 So in the review, and I don't remember the exact
25 number of plans that were reviewed, but it was -- there

ED_002528_00039557-00036

1 were a lot. Most states at this point have completed
2 their MP3, or their pollinator protection plan. We
3 looked at the commonalities between all of those plans
4 and do the state MP3s have some process to identify
5 metrics within those state plans that we could adopt in
6 a national plan.
7 So we identified the metrics that could be used
8 at a national level, we identified specific metrics to
9 recommend to the PPDC, and identified a process for
10 gathering that information for national level
11 evaluation. And then implementation would be to
12 identify process to the states and tribes to get
13 feedback on the metric process, develop strategy to
14 communicate the national-level metrics to the broader
15 public and identify a possible timeline for evaluating
16 the metrics.
17 So of the plans that were reviewed, there were
18 some common themes that were identified. We want to
19 focus on the communication between stakeholders, focus
20 in on education and knowledge between all the groups,
21 pollinator groups, and the cropping community. And then
22 identify whether they identified the best management
23 practices or a set of standard operating procedures.
24 And we looked at the differences, and there were
25 several, and most of those differences were based

ED_002528_00039557-00037

1 basically on the geographic or the regional differences
2 in the pollination use in those states. Some areas are
3 specifically devoted to honey production, some are more
4 geared towards pollination services.
5 Some of the other themes were the -- some of the
6 MP3s were much more comprehensive than some of the
7 others. Some typically just focused on the beekeeper
8 and pesticide user components. And then all the state
9 plans are voluntary and rely heavily on local
10 cooperation between and across stakeholders, and we
11 wanted to look at how people were involving other
12 stakeholders in that process.
13 So we developed this five-step process. We are
14 going to go over steps 1 through 4 today, and step 5
15 will take place post-survey. And those steps are one of
16 the considerations, which is what do we need to look at
17 for a national-level survey; assessment of the
18 categories, which was identifying those categories that
19 were common amongst the state MP3 plans; there will be a
20 survey of the states, of their MP3 plans; and a survey
21 assessment. And then step 5 will come post-survey.
22 So, national-level metrics guide. One of the
23 considerations, we need to have a mechanism to evaluate
24 the effectiveness of these MP3 plans at a national
25 level. We need to have comparable measures across the

ED_002528_00039557-00038

1 states, but we don't want to compare states against each
2 other, we want to compare them against the measures that
3 we've identified. The assessment will be at the
4 national level -- I just said that.
5 The survey tool will be used, and there is a
6 need to have a group to conduct the survey and collect
7 the results and then communicate the effectiveness of
8 the plans to the broader public.
9 And in the assessment categories, these are the
10 categories that we identified that were common amongst
11 the vast majority of the MP3 plans. One is
12 communication, best management practices, standard
13 operating procedures, the involvement of the
14 stakeholders, education, the progress measures or
15 behaviors.
16 And now I will turn this over to Rose, assuming
17 she has gotten on.
18 MS. KACHADOORIAN: Can you hear me? Yes, can
19 you hear me?
20 MR. WHITTINGTON: Rose, we can hear you.
21 MS. KACHADOORIAN: Hello? Great. Great. So
22 I'm Rose Kachadoorian with the Oregon Department of
23 Agriculture, and Mike Goodis and Andy covered a lot of
24 really good information. So what was mentioned was a
25 survey, and I'm going to be talking a bit about the

ED_002528_00039557-00039

1 survey, and then also five assessment categories were
2 provided to you. I'm going to kind of go through those
3 categories, and also provide some information just
4 regarding process. And so on to slide 13, it would be
5 step 3, state MP3 survey.
6 So the workgroup worked with state lead
7 agencies, and these are basically the agencies that are
8 responsible for pesticide regulation on development of a
9 survey. This included your AAPCO rep to the PPDC, Liza
10 Fleeson. And AAPCO, again, stands for the Association
11 of American Pesticide Control Officials. We also worked
12 with the chair of SFIREG, and this stands for the State
13 FIFRA Issues Research and Evaluation Group. And also
14 the chair of AAPCO's pollinator committee, or the
15 co-chair of it, and I'm also a co-chair.
16 We're hoping that this survey that we've
17 developed will also be able to be modified or adapted in
18 some way for tribes and territories, so that was also
19 something that we thought about. It's our intent that
20 EPA receive the information once the states complete the
21 survey and that the responses to the survey will be
22 transparent. And there was a lot of discussion about
23 that, whether it would be transparent or not, but we're
24 public agencies, and basically everything we do is
25 transparent and available to the public. So I think

ED_002528_00039557-00040

1 many states will be really proud as far as what they do
2 with pollinator plans. Plus it will really give an
3 opportunity for a state that's just trying to figure out
4 like, you know, what more can we do, if they're able to
5 look at another state's plan and maybe get some ideas
6 and contact that state and say, you know, how is that
7 working out for you? And so I think that it can really
8 benefit the entire country as a whole.
9 Next slide. Communication was mentioned as one
10 of the assessment categories, and this was really how
11 are states increasing communication between pesticide
12 users and beekeepers. And not only just pesticide
13 users, but let's -- I heard that somebody from the
14 Aerial Applicators Association is there. You know, what
15 do we do in the situation where you have a farmer who
16 has contracted with a beekeeper, how do you get that
17 communication to maybe an aerial applicator that can't
18 see whether bees are foraging, get that information to
19 even somebody who's going to be applying pesticides by
20 ground who maybe is unaware that that grower has bees or
21 maybe the neighbor has bees. So just what is a state
22 doing to kind of facilitate that entire communication
23 process.
24 We also have an assessment category of just best
25 management practices, or standard operating procedures,

ED_002528_00039557-00041

1 and I think a lot of states are really kind of focusing
2 on this and are really strong. You know, what kinds of
3 methods can they use to reduce pesticide exposure, or
4 pollinator exposure to pesticides. Can the states
5 provide a list of their best management practices or
6 standard operating procedures, and in this -- a lot of
7 times these really encompass a lot of aspects.
8 They encompass like the communication, what
9 kinds of pesticide risk might be associated with certain
10 pesticides or might be particular for a particular crop.
11 Let's say a crop when it's in bloom, unfortunately gets
12 maybe a high pest level at that time and needs to have
13 plant protection products applied. And how have they
14 included crop producers, beekeepers, and I think it was
15 Mike that mentioned the pollinator forage and habitat,
16 you know, especially for some states that just have
17 crops planted fence row to fence row, they might be
18 focusing in their pollinator plan of, you know, putting
19 in some more pollinator habitat, and other states who
20 maybe have a lot of pollinator habitat might be focusing
21 more on how to reduce drift to those habitats, whether
22 it's during seed planting or during either a ground or
23 aerial application.
24 Next slide, please. Education. So how are
25 states coordinating, or who's developed the program,

ED_002528_00039557-00042

1 because sometimes it's not actually the state lead
2 agency, but how are they coordinating with other
3 agencies, and these could be other state and federal
4 agencies. I can think in my own agency, the Oregon
5 Department of Ag, that we are working with our
6 Department of Forestry and our Department of
7 Transportation, and other federal agencies, just how are
8 people reaching out, are they working also with their
9 cooperative extension, their university people, are they
10 being brought in.
11 And also, there are a lot of non-governmental
12 organizations out there that are really doing some great
13 work, and is there coordination and collaboration with
14 those entities, and if so, how does that look.
15 Also, on outreach. Is outreach being conducted
16 in how bees are exposed to pesticides, how growers and
17 other pesticide users might select pesticides. Are
18 people being taught about residual toxicity or, you
19 know, which pesticides are systemic and when you might
20 use those and then when you might not use those. And
21 also, pesticide label comprehension, are people being
22 tested like before their training on label
23 comprehension, then do they receive training and then
24 they're retested to see really an increase in their
25 comprehension.

ED_002528_00039557-00043

1 Also just some of the methods that people are
2 using for outreach. Are they just putting something on
3 a website or are they reaching out through radio ads and
4 television? I know for our own agency, we're doing
5 public service announcements on Spanish language TV, and
6 we're going to be doing radio, again, with Spanish
7 language. And just what kinds of educational materials
8 are out there. And again, some states are really doing
9 some innovative things.
10 And another big important aspect of this would
11 be stakeholders. Who's being reached? Is it just
12 agricultural? Are maybe some of the urban applicators
13 being reached? The certified and then non-certified?
14 Are homeowners being reached? Just how -- and not only
15 just reached, but are you sitting down as a state agency
16 or whoever is coordinating the pollinator plan, are they
17 sitting down with them talking to them about their
18 communication, their knowledge level in all of those
19 aspects.
20 And also, you know, we have on this slide yearly
21 stakeholder meetings. There might be some states that
22 have more frequent meetings and other states have less
23 frequent meetings, depending on the stakeholders, but
24 are they kind of revisiting it and kind of keeping it
25 alive? I think none of us want to see a system where,

ED_002528_00039557-00044

1 you know, we go through all of this work, we develop
2 something that's really useful, and then people forget
3 about it in a couple of years. They're like, you know,
4 how are people keeping this alive?
5 Next slide. Progress measures are behavioral
6 changes. Are we seeing a reduction in related verified
7 bee kills? We have verified bee kills on there because
8 -- pesticide-related, because at least in our state,
9 I've talked to other states that we get a lot of calls
10 about bee kills and they're sometimes associated with
11 nutritional stress or disease or some other aspect
12 that's not pesticide-related. And those it's really
13 important to identify that to assist those beekeepers in
14 understanding a little bit more about the factors that
15 can kill bees.
16 Also it can be a little distortion as far as how
17 many bee kills are actually pesticide-related. And we
18 do want to actually capture those that are pesticide and
19 also non-pesticide related.
20 Also, have states developed some potential
21 measures of exposure to bees. Some states I've spoken
22 with have talked about possibly measuring pesticide
23 levels in pollen, just like they would measure pesticide
24 levels in surface water, just to kind of get an idea of
25 what's out there. Are we seeing a certain pesticide at

ED_002528_00039557-00045

1 a higher level than others? Are there some pesticides
2 that might be of concern or of interest; and if so, what
3 kinds of educational programs can we put into place to
4 get those levels down? And then if, you know, you can't
5 get the levels down through education, then to look at
6 other avenues.
7 Also a method -- again, measures or methods to
8 assess pesticide exposure, and also methods to assess
9 maybe how we've increased communication or how effective
10 our educational efforts have been. We also would like
11 in the survey try to get an idea what measures the state
12 is using, because the states, it's not only EPA, but
13 states want to know if they're doing a good job, where
14 are they being effective, and how are they doing that?
15 Are they looking at the national honeybee surveys? Are
16 they conducting their own state surveys, whether it's
17 through the university or the state agency themselves or
18 another entity? Are they seeing an increase in, again,
19 tracking that increased adoption of best management
20 practices and other considerations?
21 Also we have on here the last bullet point,
22 funding for listed measures. There's -- you know, there
23 are many people who want to do a lot of great things
24 that there isn't funding for, but if people are getting
25 funding for certain projects, I think it would be good

ED_002528_00039557-00046

1 to have that reflected and the group thought it would be
2 good to have that reflected in the survey if there were
3 sources of funding and what kinds of projects were being
4 funded that might benefit the nation as a whole.
5 Next slide. So again, and I think both Mike and
6 Andy covered this, that each state had a lot of
7 flexibility in developing their own plan and therefore
8 they're diverse. There was some talk at the beginning
9 of the group about some of our meetings as far as having
10 a rating system where we were comparing one state to the
11 other. And that was actually deemed not really viable
12 because, again, you have states with different levels of
13 resources, but a lot of different types of crops and
14 different types of issues.
15 So if you had a state that was more urban
16 without a lot of commercial beekeepers, they were doing
17 one thing, versus a state that was more about honey
18 production, versus, you know, a state like ours where we
19 have over 220 crops that were doing something different.
20 So a determination was made, and I think it was
21 a good one that really if we were going to convey what
22 was happening nationally, that it was actually more
23 accurate to look at kind of an aggregated assessment of
24 what was going on in pooling those data, and that would
25 kind of normalize that data and kind of give us a more

ED_002528_00039557-00047

1 accurate reflection of what was going on.
2 And so again, the states, even though the
3 results of the survey results will be transparent and
4 available for each state, if EPA is going to do some
5 kind of numerical assessment, that that's something that
6 is not really going to be done on an individual state,
7 it's going to be done for the country as a whole.
8 We are planning on using a survey tool, and I'm
9 going to talk a little bit more about that and kind of
10 the role of the state lead agencies in assisting EPA in
11 getting the information that they need, and again, we
12 have a number of questions that we were thinking about
13 for that survey, and again, looking at the percentage of
14 the tallied results -- responses.
15 Next slide. So again, a little bit about that
16 assessment system, we're looking at total number of
17 responses; for example, let's say 80 percent of the
18 states have a certain kind of communication system, 30
19 percent have something else for some other factor
20 they're measuring. So they're looking at -- we would be
21 looking at the total number of responses. So we have a
22 table here that's -- it's blue on my slide.
23 So, for example, if we're looking at
24 communication, maybe that first question where you have
25 a yes or no response could be for does your state have a

ED_002528_00039557-00048

1 method to increase communication between pesticide users
2 and beekeepers, yes or no. If you answered yes, well,
3 what are you doing? And so the state lead agency or
4 whoever is implementing the pollinator protection plan
5 would indicate all of the different ways that they are
6 increasing communication.
7 Next slide. So we're on to step 5, which is
8 data collection and the results. And so AAPCO is
9 offering to utilize SFIREG to facilitate the
10 distribution of a survey. SFIREG has regional
11 representatives for each EPA regional office. For
12 example, the regional office I'm in, it would be for
13 Oregon, Washington, Idaho and Alaska. And so then the
14 regional SFIREG rep would give those surveys out to each
15 one of the states and kind of birddog it and make sure
16 that those are submitted.
17 This way the state lead agencies who are busy
18 and doing a lot of different things aren't just kind of
19 sent these random surveys and they'll kind of get around
20 to filling it out when they have time. No, this is
21 going to be actually a lot more strategic. And so we're
22 really grateful that SFIREG is kind of stepping up to
23 the plate and has offered to do this.
24 So then the regional SFIREG reps will be turning
25 this information, AAPCO will be assisting with the data

ED_002528_00039557-00049

1 collection. If there are some -- we're thinking about
2 maybe using something like SurveyMonkey, which has some
3 kind of basic stats associated with it. And then we
4 would just provide this information to EPA so they could
5 conduct their assessment. So we would provide the raw
6 data to them and then if the survey tool had any kind of
7 basic statistics, we would also provide that
8 information.
9 Next slide. Oh, next slide is not mine, but let
10 me talk a little bit more about my slide 19, then. It's
11 really our goal that all of this information be
12 available to beekeepers, to pesticide users, to NGOs,
13 and that we'll all be able to learn from this. We're
14 looking -- we're thinking about these periodic types of
15 surveys so we can see how these programs are progressing
16 over time where, you know, I think everybody's hope is
17 that, you know, there are changes over time as our
18 program matures and as you identify new needs or you
19 fulfill kind of holes that were there that things
20 naturally progress.
21 And so the states will be working in conjunction
22 with EPA to identify whether any changes will be needed
23 over time, and again, that will be a very transparent
24 process.
25 So I think it's Andy who has that last slide.

ED_002528_00039557-00050

1 So thank you, and we'll be answering questions after
2 that.
3 MR. WHITTINGTON: Thank you, Rose.
4 So I'd like to say we had a very large committee
5 that worked extensively on this. I probably will not
6 answer Caydee Savinelli's phone calls again for several
7 years, but there has been a lot of thought and a lot of
8 effort put into this. We feel like we've come up with a
9 reasonable and fairly comprehensive way for EPA to begin
10 to take a look at the national metrics for the
11 pollinator plans, and at this time I think we'll take
12 feedback from the committee.
13 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, so let's first see what
14 questions you all have for the workgroup. Let's see,
15 Cynthia, Lori Ann, and Pat.
16 MS. PALMER: Hi, Cynthia Palmer, American Bird
17 Conservancy. When I think of pollinator protection
18 metrics, I think of things like the kill rates for bees,
19 the incidents of dead birds, the state restrictions on
20 the worst pesticides for pollinators, such as
21 neonicotinoids and chlorpyrifos.
22 The efforts, the extent to which states have
23 made an effort to get farmers off the pesticide
24 treadmill and employ sustainable agricultural
25 techniques.

ED_002528_00039557-00051

1 The extent of clean habitat available for
2 pollinators. I'm not sure that filling out a survey --
3 I think it's a worthwhile effort, but I'm not sure that
4 that truly captures the success of the pollinator
5 protection efforts in that state.
6 And I'm also worried about the risks beyond the
7 managed bees. We know that a single seed coated with
8 neonics or chlorpyrifos is enough to kill a songbird,
9 and we know that many native pollinators are at risk as
10 well.
11 So I'm wondering to what extent do these outputs
12 truly capture the effectiveness of the pollinator
13 protection plans, and I'm wondering if we should reframe
14 it more as a survey of communication guidelines, which
15 are worthwhile, but they're not really metrics.
16 Thanks.
17 MR. WHITTINGTON: So, and all of those are
18 significant concerns, but as we were looking at the
19 pollinator protection plans, most of them are designed
20 to mitigate those acute exposures. And they're pretty
21 much limited to that. So I mean, there are other
22 methods that we have that will be utilized through EPA
23 and through FIFRA that will address a lot of the other
24 concerns, especially through risk assessments that are
25 ongoing. But specifically for the pollinator plans,

ED_002528_00039557-00052

1 when you're looking at that one piece of the entire
2 pollinator protection puzzle, I think this will be an
3 effective way to measure what those plans are
4 specifically addressing.
5 I think in the beginning we looked at the
6 pollinator problem as addressing it as how do you eat an
7 elephant, it's one bite at a time, and well this has
8 been several bites at the elephant. But we acknowledge
9 that there are ongoing issues that will have to be
10 addressed at other times, but they may not be
11 specifically addressed by pollinator protection plans.
12 MS. KACHADOORIAN: Hi, this is Rose
13 Kachadoorian. Is it okay if I talk right now? Okay, I
14 will talk.
15 I'm very sensitive to the issue of the native
16 pollinators. They are actually really essential for
17 pollination in a state like ours. And, in fact, we have
18 an education -- we have an entire Oregon bee project,
19 not just a pollinator protection plan, and our agency is
20 out actually monitoring for native bee populations and
21 we're going to be using that, at least in our state, as
22 kind of one of the metrics. It's not something a lot of
23 states can do, but it just happens to be what we can do.
24 And so that information is going to be reflected in our
25 survey results.

ED_002528_00039557-00053

1 We also are traveling across the state and
2 working with different groups to learn how to identify
3 native pollinators, too. So I think that these plans,
4 even though many people are kind of geared towards an
5 acute exposure to the European honeybee, there are a lot
6 of states that are also looking at native pollinators,
7 and that will be captured in these surveys.
8 A lot of the BMPs, also, will help reduce that
9 kind of sublethal, possibly chronic exposure that goes
10 on, or possibly could go on to bees. So I think that
11 these issues will be captured in the survey. But as far
12 as the issue with bird deaths, probably not in the
13 pollinator survey, but I know that state lead agencies
14 report that information to EPA. So that information
15 isn't lost, it is captured, but in another venue.
16 MR. KEIGWIN: So, Lori Ann, Pat, and then
17 Charlotte.
18 MR. GOODIS: A quick interruption. If I could
19 also ask, as I see some of the workgroup members in the
20 audience as well. Ray, I see you. I think Caydee is
21 back there, and there may be some others, too. It might
22 be helpful to -- for -- because this was a group effort
23 and it's really a recommendation from the workgroup.
24 Maybe if we do have a mobile mic', if at times to help
25 answer questions, the upcoming questions, I would

ED_002528_00039557-00054

1 encourage workgroup members to provide their input in
2 response as well. Thank you.
3 MS. BURD: Thanks, Rick. I'm going to echo some
4 of what Cynthia said, at the risk of sounding like a
5 broken record, some of us at every single opportunity
6 are raising our concerns that we keep using honeybees as
7 the metric and there are 4,337 species of solitary bees
8 in North America that have very different modes of
9 exposure and needs than honeybees, and while we care
10 very much about our honeybees, the needs of the solitary
11 bees are not being addressed in this, and in a variety
12 of ways.
13 And what might be an acute exposure for a -- or
14 a nonacute exposure for a honeybee could very much be an
15 acute exposure for a native solitary bee and could
16 result in the loss of an entire group, and so
17 catastrophic losses that we're seeing in those
18 populations.
19 So while I recognize and am happy about, you
20 know, what Rose mentioned, that there are great efforts
21 happening in some states, these metrics don't capture
22 any of them, and they don't establish any guidelines,
23 mechanisms, anything that even addresses them. So it's
24 great that, you know, some of that could get mentioned
25 in the surveys, but it's not built into this, and I'd

ED_002528_00039557-00055

1 like to see that happen.
2 MR. KEIGWIN: So Pat, then Charlotte, then Stan.
3 MS. BISHOP: You know, I sat here listening to
4 this, and I'm still a little confused as to what you're
5 actually surveying and the data that you're collecting.
6 So I'm understanding that there's these plans, and they
7 probably have certain elements in them. So there's an
8 opportunity, I think, to evaluate the plans themselves,
9 do they have the proper elements, communication, so on
10 and so forth.
11 And then there's the issue of implementing the
12 plans, you know, how well is this state implementing it.
13 And then, finally, is it doing anything? Are you seeing
14 results from it?
15 So I'm not quite sure what your survey is doing,
16 and what parts is it surveying? Are you surveying how
17 well the plan was developed? Is it surveying -- are
18 they implementing it? And then, finally, is it
19 surveying what is coming out of the plan? Is it doing
20 what it's supposed to do?
21 So could you just clarify that a little bit for
22 me?
23 MR. WHITTINGTON: I'd say yes to all of that. I
24 do believe that the survey will capture what the -- what
25 the individual states are doing. And I can only speak

ED_002528_00039557-00056

1 on behalf of my state, Mississippi. We do have our
2 annual meetings, we do have constant communication with
3 our beekeepers and our producers. And what you want to
4 see -- what you want to see going forward from the
5 pollinator plans is you're going to notice it in a
6 couple of years. You're going to see a change in
7 behavior, we hope, from the people that you're now
8 communicating with, because this has been an issue
9 for -- in basically the time frame relatively recently
10 between -- it's relatively recent communication that
11 we've had between beekeepers and farmers.
12 So I think we are starting to see that
13 communication and that education take place, and
14 behaviors changing, and the result of that should be a
15 reduced exposure, which is a reduction in the number of
16 bee kills that we see.
17 So I think we start capturing that as what are
18 you doing, and are you implementing what you have laid
19 out in your plan, and then from that, we should start to
20 see at least a reduction in the acute exposures.
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Charlotte, then Stan, then Damon.
22 MS. SANSON: Thank you. I just wanted to say I
23 think it's the -- I think it's worth commending the
24 group for the progress they've made in the past year on
25 coming to consensus. I can see that it's a rather broad

ED_002528_00039557-00057

1 group of folks. And my question, Rick, I think this is
2 maybe something you can answer, because I think we heard
3 earlier that this panel is not a voting body, so after
4 the discussions today on this topic, what is the
5 mechanism for adopting the recommendations by this
6 workgroup?
7 MR. KEIGWIN: So once we're done with the
8 questions, I will pose a question to you all so you can
9 start thinking about it. But it will be something along
10 the lines of, you know, notwithstanding some of the
11 concerns that we heard thus far as we've gone around the
12 table, would it be the PPDC's advice to EPA to as a
13 first step begin pursuing the use of these metrics in
14 evaluating managed pollinator protection plans as we
15 continue to assess risks for pesticides as related to
16 pollinators.
17 So it will be something along those lines, but,
18 you know, this workgroup was set up with a very discrete
19 charge, and I think they've come back with where they
20 can get based upon that charge, and so what the agency
21 will want is advice from the PPDC on whether or not we
22 should be moving forward with the recommendation posed
23 by the workgroup.
24 So Stan, then Damon, then Liza.
25 MR. COPE: Thanks. Stan Cope, American Mosquito

ED_002528_00039557-00058

1 Control Association. Outside of private industry, there
2 are roughly 900 and some tax-based or municipal
3 organizations that do mosquito control. Being new to
4 the group, I don't know if you had any input or if
5 you're going to get any input on your survey from the
6 mosquito control groups, but many of them have
7 long-term, very sophisticated communication and public
8 outreach plans when it comes to pollinators.
9 So I guess my question is, is mosquito control
10 involved in part of this, and if not, would you like
11 them to be?
12 MR. WHITTINGTON: Does the lady in the back of
13 the room want to speak up? Here we go.
14 MS. SAVINELLI: I'm Caydee Savinelli, I work for
15 Syngenta and I helped with this committee, and Andy, you
16 will take my phone calls, whenever you are. Okay?
17 Anyway, just to answer the questions about
18 the -- well, let me just step back for a minute. So the
19 charge of this group is really looking at the plans
20 nationally, so that's really what our charge is. And
21 within the stakeholders as part of the plan, the
22 mosquito boards are part of the stakeholder groups that
23 the states have reached out. So that's part of the
24 metric that is, you know, as you list all the various
25 ones, unfortunately we can't get into all the various

ED_002528_00039557-00059

1 details, but certainly stakeholders are very important
2 in the whole MP3 process within the state, and the
3 mosquito control boards are very important as part of
4 the stakeholders, depending on the state, of course.
5 So that's where it falls in. It's not
6 necessarily the question specifically related to the
7 mosquitos, because we're really trying to look across
8 all of the plans, and as you can imagine, being so
9 diverse, trying to come up with the metrics that make
10 sense across a diversity of plans, and that's why we
11 have those categories, because they seem to be the
12 categories that were most common communication,
13 education, stakeholders was one of the categories.
14 So it is included, but in a different subset of
15 the questions. Oh, yeah, we didn't -- no, mosquito
16 control boards are very important. And keep in mind,
17 too, that within each state, it's really up to the state
18 to engage all of the various stakeholders, and I know in
19 some cases, in some states, the stakeholders didn't feel
20 engaged, so it's really important to go back and we
21 encourage the stakeholders to be engaged.
22 Thank you.
23 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Damon, then Liza, then Jay.
24 MR. REABE: So, as a Wisconsin aerial
25 applicator, we perform insecticide applications to

ED_002528_00039557-00060

1 cranberry crops, and there was a study conducted by the
2 University of Wisconsin that I'll forward to Dea for
3 everyone's review, and what they -- what they were
4 studying was pollinator health at the cranberry
5 production sites, as well as away from those pesticide
6 application sites.
7 And there was a surprise finding in that study
8 where they found that there was greater native bee
9 populations and greater species richness at the
10 application sites than there was away from the
11 application sites.
12 So while this survey doesn't -- may not meet the
13 needs of or the goals or the interests of some of the
14 people in these -- in this room, I think that that's an
15 interesting study that should be forwarded.
16 Also, in regards to the survey work, to the
17 pesti -- or excuse me, the pollinator protection plans,
18 what they do for us as applicators is raise awareness of
19 pollinator habitat in general. Not just honeybee
20 habitat, but also other pollinator habitat, and these
21 plans are effective in communicating those concerns to
22 applicators.
23 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Liza, then Jay, then Sharon.
24 MS. TROSSBACH: Thank you. Again, I represent
25 AAPCO, which is a national association of pesticide

ED_002528_00039557-00061

1 regulatory officials from the 50 states, tribes and
2 territories, and as one of the other members said, I do
3 want to commend the workgroup on their work.
4 This was a very daunting task given the inherent
5 challenges in trying to come up with national metrics
6 for very diverse plans. I think that the proposal that
7 has been put forth does meet that need and does the best
8 it can to allow for the diversity and the flexibility in
9 the plans.
10 While there are many issues related to
11 pollinator protection, I think that this group has done
12 a great job of looking at the Presidential directive.
13 It was very narrow, very focused, gave EPA a very
14 specific -- a very specific directive to reach out to
15 states, tribes and territories to develop voluntary
16 pollinator protection plans which looks at one piece of
17 a very huge puzzle of issues related to pollinators and
18 pollinator health. And I think that they did a good
19 job.
20 I think the fact that this is a long-term
21 evaluation that, you know, many plans are now complete,
22 some are still in process, some are in the beginnings of
23 implementation, but you have to start that data
24 collection, and I think this does a good job. It leaves
25 it as a living document or a living survey that can

ED_002528_00039557-00062

1 evolve over time as plans evolve. And again, I think it
2 allows the states to have that flexibility and that
3 diversity.
4 It was mentioned some states are very -- you
5 know, they focus on honey production and others have a
6 lot of contracted pollinators. Some have hobbyist
7 beekeepers, some have many more commercials. So the
8 ability of states to provide information about what they
9 are doing, the unique things they're doing, there are
10 commonalities. I think the proposal looks at those
11 commonalities as things that were put forth about
12 communication and best management practices and standard
13 operating procedures, but allow states to also provide
14 that additional information.
15 I think states, tribes and territories would be
16 willing to, you know, provide that information, want to
17 provide that information. You know, many states put in
18 a lot of hours and a lot of work. I know in Virginia,
19 this has been an 18-month process that involves a lot of
20 stakeholders advisory committees, a lot of meetings. We
21 want our plan to be successful, we want to protect
22 pollinators.
23 As pesticide regulatory officials, we're not
24 proponents or opponents of the use of pesticides, simply
25 if you're going to use them, use them properly. And

ED_002528_00039557-00063

1 since pesticide use is legal, we have to allow for that,
2 but at the same time, we all support, you know,
3 pollinator protection, and I think that the state plans
4 are a great way to allow states to represent their
5 apiary industry, their cropping systems, the type of
6 pest management and pest control they have, and also
7 protect pollinators.
8 And so on behalf of AAPCO, I support the
9 proposal, I support the approach to the survey, and, you
10 know, again, I just want to commend the workgroup on a
11 very difficult task.
12 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Jay, then Sharon, then
13 Preston.
14 MR. VROOM: Thank you, Rick. Wow, Liza just
15 said what I was going to say, except she said it so much
16 better. I would add that I think this work of this
17 workgroup is an extension of everything that was devised
18 in the President's pollinator protection directive that
19 Liza just mentioned, but it's important, also, to remind
20 everyone that the President, President Obama, empaneled
21 a very comprehensive group of federal agencies and
22 authorities to come together under the co-chairmanship
23 of the deputies from USDA and EPA. And to me,
24 overarchingly, this is a great model for a way to
25 address so many issues that certainly are on today's

ED_002528_00039557-00064

1 PPDC agenda and in future agendas for consideration by
2 this federal advisory committee.
3 The last thing I just wanted to mention is back
4 to Cynthia's original comments, Cynthia, I'm not aware
5 and haven't been able to discover any registered uses of
6 pure chlorpyrifos as a seed treatment, so if you know
7 about that, I would love to talk with you offline.
8 Thanks.
9 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Sharon, then Preston, and
10 then Tim, is your card up? And then I think at that
11 point I want to put the charge back to the group about
12 next steps.
13 So, Sharon?
14 MS. SELVAGGIO: I am Sharon Selvaggio. I wanted
15 to say that I think that the survey instrument will be
16 useful, especially if it is, indeed, periodic and
17 repeated and used for adaptive management, if the states
18 are open to modifying, increasing their efforts through
19 pollinator protection based on the results of the
20 survey, what they find from other states, et cetera,
21 where appropriate.
22 So my questions are primarily about the survey
23 and I have a couple of questions. So, Rose, you
24 mentioned a couple of times in the PowerPoint about the
25 transparency of the survey, and I'm wondering is the

ED_002528_00039557-00065

1 survey draft available now, will the responses be
2 available to the public state by state, or just the
3 aggregated responses.
4 Another question I have is regarding that the
5 issue that Pat brought up about implementation
6 monitoring as opposed to effectiveness monitoring, and
7 so my question is, who in the states would be filling
8 out the survey, and how will they get information from
9 people in their state, whether they be farmers, mosquito
10 control districts, et cetera, about whether, in fact,
11 these recommendations, these voluntary measures that are
12 in the MP3s are being implemented. There was some stuff
13 in here about communication effectiveness, some
14 potential for actual empirical data collection on direct
15 pesticide exposures through pollen measurements, bee
16 kills, et cetera.
17 I'm just wondering, given that the level of
18 intensity of those kinds of measures depends upon
19 funding and all of this is voluntary, I'm a little
20 concerned that there won't be an ability to really test
21 and report upon the effectiveness of these measures in a
22 national way. I certainly think state-by-state
23 information on those will be very useful.
24 I guess my last question, and I'll move on to
25 somebody else here, but is that the pesticide-related

ED_002528_00039557-00066

1 verified bee kills, Rose, you had mentioned that it's
2 hard sometimes to differentiate a pesticide-related bee
3 kill from those that are caused by nutritional issues or
4 disease, and we've seen in the literature that disease
5 and pesticide impacts can be interrelated as well. So
6 I'm wondering how the group is differentiating between
7 disease or pesticide-mediated disease kills, if that is
8 the right way to capture that. Thank you.
9 MS. KACHADOORIAN: This is Rose. As far as
10 differentiating whether it is a pesticide-related bee
11 kill or not, there actually are EPA enforcement
12 guidelines for pesticide investigators and how they
13 should investigate bee kills, and I know at least our
14 state, and I'm sure other states do this also, is that
15 we actually collect the bees and we analyze them for the
16 presence of pesticides and also work with experts from
17 the university to see exactly what the problem is, is it
18 some kind of protozoan, a varroa mite, or nutritional,
19 or is it, indeed, pesticide. I mean, we have had
20 pesticide-related bee kills, as you're aware of.
21 And so there is a whole process designed for
22 that. Let's see, and what were some of your other
23 questions? Oh, as far as assessing. You know, it has
24 always been a challenge, I think, if you talk to anybody
25 who works with extension, and I used to work with

ED_002528_00039557-00067

1 extension for 10 years myself, to know what your -- if
2 you're conveying information, are people assimilating
3 that information, are they understanding it and are they
4 putting it into practice.
5 And so a lot of states, what they do is they'll
6 use even survey, like the people who have attended their
7 classes, like do you understand what we've told you,
8 have you changed your practices from the last time
9 you've been here.
10 And so it's going to have to be a lot of kind of
11 getting back to those particular pesticide users and
12 beekeepers and others to see exactly what practices
13 they've changed and meeting with stakeholder groups to
14 see if there's any kind of change so the survey results
15 are accurate.
16 As far as transparency, you know, we have a lot
17 of AAPCO surveys right on our website, and I -- you
18 know, I'll have to -- I'm president-elect of AAPCO, but
19 I'll talk to our president to see if it is possible to
20 have all of this information in one source so people can
21 go to it. And so if people want to know what's going on
22 in various states, they can.
23 We currently have an Excel spreadsheet on the
24 AAPCO website with the names of all of the contact
25 people who are coordinating their pollinator protection

ED_002528_00039557-00068

1 programs, and some of the components of those programs,
2 and then that information is actually being used by
3 other groups that we're in the process of updating that
4 Excel spreadsheet. In fact, I think it may be yesterday
5 or the day before yesterday, kind of an email was sent
6 out to the state lead agencies saying, you know, have
7 you made any progress, and if so, please update your
8 information so we can have that on AAPCO's website.
9 So that will -- and I imagine that EPA will have
10 information. I don't -- we would have to talk with EPA
11 to see if they would have the state-by-state information
12 on there. Does that answer your question? Maybe
13 somebody else can kind of help chip in here, too.
14 MS. SELVAGGIO: Yes, that helps, thank you.
15 MS. KACHADOORIAN: Um-hmm.
16 MR. KEIGWIN: So Preston, then Tim.
17 MR. PECK: Thank you. And it's good to see a
18 lot of different people in the room that I know.
19 I represent an organization that has multiple
20 initiatives within various programs, some of which
21 relating to pesticides, some of which relating to
22 pollinators and farmworkers as well, so I'll be wearing
23 a couple of different hats while on this committee from
24 our perspective. But I also -- I see a lot of different
25 survey questions, and I'm very new to this, so this is

ED_002528_00039557-00069

1 the first time that I'm kind of going through the
2 survey. So I look forward to talking to other workgroup
3 members about it, but I see different limitations on the
4 survey, and I don't disregard the survey as a useful
5 tool, but I just am bringing up issues on its
6 limitations, such as the related verified bee kills from
7 pesticides are limited by detection of equipment that
8 the state department of ags have.
9 I know in North Carolina, it's relatively -- it
10 can -- it's not as sensitive as it could be, and I have
11 spoken with our state apiarists about that as well.
12 Obviously things like Cynthia and Lori Ann brought up
13 around native pollinators, there's limitations there. I
14 just think that we've seen limitations within surveys in
15 general with bee-informed partnership surveys. You're
16 taking a voluntary BMP and asking people to take a
17 voluntary survey on that. So I would just, you know,
18 caution on how we use the survey.
19 Also, as I do support communication between
20 applicators and beekeepers and other people, but again,
21 within the organization, we've seen various limitations
22 on that. Especially relating to farmworkers, you know,
23 that's one of the key things is, you know, communicate
24 with farmworkers what is going on and where it's going
25 on, and we've seen that that just hasn't worked in the

ED_002528_00039557-00070

1 past and has continued to not work.
2 So I look forward to the discussion tomorrow.
3 So I'm skeptical about how effective communication will
4 be to reduce exposures, to reduction in acute exposures,
5 I think there's a lot of assumptions in there, and a lot
6 of gaps.
7 I had one question for Liza, as far as is the
8 surveying group that will be conducting the surveys
9 independent of AAPCO?
10 MS. TROSSBACH: So, it's SFIREG, right? It's
11 SFIREG, and that is an evaluation group that is under
12 the umbrella of AAPCO. If AAPCO, which is the -- the
13 broader group, they have a group that's SFIREG that does
14 the work of AAPCO, and through that, there are regional
15 representatives. As Rose has said, there's one state
16 lead agency representative from each of the ten regions,
17 and then they are able to provide information to the
18 states. So it's just a mechanism, a framework to be
19 able to get information out to the state lead agencies
20 and collected.
21 Again, in this particular case, that mechanism,
22 that framework, is long-standing and has worked very
23 well in the not only dissemination of information, but
24 the collection of information from state lead agencies,
25 and that was one of the questions that Sharon had

ED_002528_00039557-00071

1 brought up is how -- you know, who's going to respond to
2 that information, it would be the agency that was
3 responsible for the drafting of the particular plan. So
4 it was an offer on behalf of AAPCO to say this is an
5 existing mechanism that has a long history of working to
6 collect information and that we're willing to utilize
7 that just to assist in the collecting of the information
8 and then forward it to EPA.
9 MR. PECK: Thank you. And just one thing along
10 that line, I know that we have received very different
11 information when evaluating state policy based on how
12 outreach is conducted and who conducts it and where
13 they're looking. So you're going to get very different
14 answers.
15 For example, within North Carolina, we looked at
16 best management practices on who to notify when it comes
17 to pesticide application and how far that radius would
18 be, and within that what is our limitation on prior
19 notification. And our state Department of Agriculture
20 did a really good job of reaching out to the state
21 beekeeping association; however, the people that
22 participate in that survey were one group that was
23 surveyed and we in conjunction with many other partner
24 organizations conducted our own survey and got very
25 different answers.

ED_002528_00039557-00072

1 So just to be aware of who you're asking and
2 stakeholder input on how to conduct outreach. Thank
3 you.
4 MR. KEIGWIN: And Tim?
5 MR. TUCKER: Thank you, Rick.
6 First of all, I'd just like to commend the
7 committee that worked on a very daunting task. I
8 thought originally it would be extremely difficult to
9 come up with metrics to really define this program, but
10 I think it's a first good step in the right direction,
11 and anything that we can do to increase dialogue on a
12 national level between the states in evaluating these
13 programs that are working in some states, like
14 California, where they work very effectively for a long
15 time, and improve the communication and awareness, you
16 know, that we were talking about.
17 And I totally disagree, I think that if we can
18 communicate better between applicators and beekeepers
19 and anyone with a perspective in this that wants to
20 protect pollinators of any kind, we have to do a better
21 job of that. We have to find out what's working and
22 what's not. And I think that this does provide us with
23 a -- you know, a measure of assessing that.
24 So I'd just like to thank the committee again,
25 and those that could participate to a greater degree

ED_002528_00039557-00073

1 than I could. My job sometimes limits me to being
2 involved, but I think the industry really feels that
3 communication and dialogue is very important between all
4 parties with our different perspectives. So thank you
5 again.
6 MR. KEIGWIN: Well, Lori Ann's card went up
7 after I said Tim was the last one. So if there's
8 something to add to this quick, because I want to put
9 the charge back to the group.
10 MS. BURD: I have a question to follow up on the
11 comment that chlorpyrifos has not been registered for
12 seed use. I believe it has been registered for seed use
13 not in significant crops like corn, cotton, sorghum,
14 wheat, is that currently the state of chlorpyrifos as a
15 seed treatment? And I figure the experts are here.
16 MR. KEIGWIN: We can certainly confirm it at a
17 break. We don't have it all in our heads. But we'll
18 get back to the group after lunch to confirm that.
19 So I think the way Tim kind of teed things up
20 would probably have been the way that I would have done
21 it, so as a first step in terms of measuring the
22 effectiveness of these plans, does the PPDC support the
23 workgroup's recommendation to begin to employ this
24 survey instrument moving forward as we continue to build
25 upon the dialogue, improving the dialogue with

ED_002528_00039557-00074

1 stakeholders, and as we continue the re-evaluation
2 program? So kind of a thumbs-up type. Sort of neutrals
3 or anyone in defense?
4 MR. WHITTINGTON: There's the broad concepts,
5 and then I think there would still be some fleshing out
6 of the exact wording of what those look like.
7 MR. GOODIS: I'll just add to that, too. You
8 know, I know the group mainly focused on their approach,
9 and I think what was provided in the presentation and
10 sort of the framework of the questions. And so there
11 are some draft questions, but recognizing I didn't want
12 to spend too much time on that until there was an
13 accepting of the general approach, I think that's
14 something that the agency would take a look at those
15 questions too and working with SFIREG and others to
16 make -- probably fine tune those to make sure we're
17 getting the right information for our needs.
18 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. So, thank you to the
19 workgroup. I think we've got a path forward. All
20 right. So now -- good job.
21 (Applause.)
22 MR. KEIGWIN: So now we're running behind, but
23 that's okay. So why don't we come back at 11:15, and
24 what we'll do is we'll start doing part of what's
25 currently session 5, so the questions and answers. So

ED_002528_00039557-00075

1 we'll do a few of those topics between 11:15 and when we
2 break for lunch, and that will give us a little bit more
3 time for some of the afternoon topics. So we'll come
4 back at 11:15. Thanks.
5 (Whereupon, there was a recess in the
6 proceedings.)
7 MR. KEIGWIN: I just want to check to make sure
8 that Gina Schultz is still on the phone.
9 (No response.)
10 MR. KEIGWIN: Yeah, I knew she wasn't feeling
11 well.
12 MS. SHULTZ: Hello. I'm on.
13 MR. KEIGWIN: So, what we'll do for the next 30
14 minutes, so that we can get back on track, and you still
15 have enough time for lunch, is we'll start to do parts
16 of the question and answer session for session 5.
17 So why don't we start with the status of the ESA
18 consultations. For the PPDC members, there should be a
19 one-pager in your packet that summarizes where we are
20 with the current pilot ESA consultations. So let me
21 just quickly see if there are any questions about those.
22 Tim, is your card up for ESA?
23 (No response.)
24 MR. KEIGWIN: So, Sharon, Cynthia, we'll start
25 there.

ED_002528_00039557-00076

1 Sharon?
2 MS. SELVAGGIO: Okay, I've got a couple of
3 questions. In reading this, there was no mention of the
4 resolution of the Dow April letter to withdraw the BE
5 stock that was on the BiOp to modify the settlement
6 agreement, so I'm wondering kind of what happened with
7 that. We were expecting the draft BiOps for
8 chlorpyrifos and the other OPs in May and those haven't
9 come out yet. It says here that once they're released a
10 public comment period is expected before finalization
11 and the due dates. So the finalization is December, so
12 there's not much time left.
13 And then we were expecting the BEs for carbaryl
14 and methomyl I think in May as well, and I don't think
15 it says anything in here on that -- about that.
16 MS. ECHEVERRIA: Thank you. My name Marietta
17 Echeverria, I'm the Director of the Environmental Fate
18 and Effects Division. So thank you for those questions.
19 I will provide as much information as I have, and as I'm
20 able to.
21 So with respect to the letters that we received
22 earlier this year, to my knowledge, there has been no
23 response to those letters. So they were received, we
24 acknowledged the receipt, that request was to withdraw
25 the biological evaluations. Those biological

ED_002528_00039557-00077

1 evaluations have not been withdrawn at this time, so we
2 continue to collaborate with our partners at the
3 services on step 3, which is actually the biological
4 opinions. So we continue to have discussions with them
5 and to give input on those biological opinions as
6 they're being developed. That's what we've been doing.
7 With respect to carbaryl and methomyl, you're
8 correct, we did not meet our May time frame. What we
9 have been doing is considering all of the public inputs
10 that we've gotten in the first three pilots through the
11 stakeholder engagements that we've had, the stakeholder
12 meetings, and through the formal response to comments.
13 And what we've been doing internally, and as
14 we've said all along, was to consider refinements to the
15 process to make it more efficient and to bring in
16 additional refined information earlier in the process.
17 So we've internally been thinking about how to do that,
18 and our hope would be to apply that advanced thinking
19 for carbaryl and methomyl, which are the next two that
20 are currently on the schedule.
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. Cynthia?
22 MS. PALMER: Actually, that addressed both of my
23 questions as well. I had looked at the handout from May
24 3rd, and noted that the language was almost identical to
25 the one that we just received the update with the same

ED_002528_00039557-00078

1 aside from the paragraph included in May about Dow
2 Agrosciences letter. So I think this answers my
3 questions to the extent possible.
4 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. Any other questions on ESA,
5 the update that's in your package? Going once, twice.
6 (No response.)
7 MR. KEIGWIN: All right, so Yu-Ting Guilaran,
8 who is the Director of the Pesticide Re-evaluation
9 Division, will come up. So there are a couple of
10 things -- a couple of one-pagers in your packet, one
11 relative to where we are with progressing towards
12 meeting the October 1st, 2022 registration review
13 schedule in the statute, and then there are some
14 specific chemical-specific updates for three chemicals.
15 So, questions for Yu-Ting?
16 (No response.)
17 MR. KEIGWIN: So, why don't we start first with
18 the general status update for registration review.
19 Any -- so, Cynthia.
20 MS. PALMER: Thank you. So these are impressive
21 large numbers, and I'm just wondering if you're able to
22 tell us what percent of these reviews are receiving a
23 thumbs-up or a thumbs-down from EPA. Are some of these
24 applications sort of not making their way through the
25 process, and do we have metrics on that?

ED_002528_00039557-00079

1 MS. GUILARAN: Thank you, Rick. I'm Yu-Ting
2 Guilaran, the Director of Pesticides Re-Evaluation
3 Division, and just so that I can understand your
4 question a little bit better, what do you mean by thumbs
5 up or down?
6 MS. PALMER: Approval from EPA.
7 MS. GUILARAN: On what exactly are you referring
8 to?
9 MS. PALMER: That we have, for instance, 457
10 conventional pesticides cases making their way through
11 the system, are they all getting a full approval or are
12 they approved with restrictions, do we have metrics on
13 sort of where -- you know, what's the outcome?
14 MS. GUILARAN: Okay. So if you go down a little
15 bit further on the status update. For the conventional,
16 we have about 40 percent remaining on the draft for
17 assessment, and we have proposed already 40 percent of
18 the interim decision, and then finalized another 30-some
19 percent of those. So it was really a mix of whether or
20 not the labels are fine as they are, or there's
21 additional mitigation that we need to put on the labels.
22 In general, for the more recent years, we're
23 trying to work on different efforts such as spray drift
24 reduction as kind of a way to reduce the footprint of
25 pesticide, and also more recently resistant management,

ED_002528_00039557-00080

1 which is another piece that just recently went final are
2 some of the ones that were going to the mitigation. But
3 it's a mix bag of both. And we do have a data --
4 database that's being developed right now for decision
5 capture, and we are anticipating to roll that out
6 probably more toward the beginning of the year.
7 MR. KEIGWIN: That database is being developed
8 in anticipation of re-authorization of PRIA, which
9 would, among other things, have expanded reporting for
10 types of changes that are made as part of registration
11 review.
12 MS. PALMER: Thank you.
13 MR. KEIGWIN: It will be an internal database,
14 but we will be doing as part of our annual reports to
15 Congress on PRIA, should PRIA be re-authorized, then the
16 data would be made available as part of that annual
17 report.
18 Other questions from PPDC members on the general
19 registration review updates?
20 (No response.)
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. Then Yu-Ting also has her
22 team up here for three chemical-specific cases. So why
23 don't we start with the easiest one here, chlorpyrifos.
24 Nichelle?
25 MS. HARRIOTT: So, in your handouts, you have

ED_002528_00039557-00081

1 here, "despite several years of study, EPA has concluded
2 that the science addressed in neurodevelopmental effects
3 remain unresolved, and that further evaluation of the
4 science is warranted to achieve greater certainty as to
5 whether the potential exists for adverse
6 neurodevelopmental effects."
7 Now, in your last Human Health Review, I think
8 it was 2015, the risk assessment that you published
9 seemed pretty clear on the neurodevelopmental health
10 effects regarding chlorpyrifos, and the agency had come
11 up with a proposal to revoke food tolerances as a result
12 of that assessment.
13 Further down in your paragraph here, you then
14 say you are hoping to come to a clearer scientific
15 resolution on those issues, which are the
16 neurodevelopmental issues. What specific issues still
17 need to be resolved when it comes to evaluating the
18 neurodevelopmental effects of chlorpyrifos, given that
19 we have over 30 years of data showing that chlorpyrifos
20 is highly toxic to the children's brains, to
21 neurodevelopmental health, and EPA has over the course
22 of reviewing chlorpyrifos taken action to try to
23 mitigate the health impacts of chlorpyrifos?
24 So, for example, we in 2000, I think you guys
25 said -- you removed indoor residential uses of

ED_002528_00039557-00082

1 chlorpyrifos. We've had buffer zones to mitigate
2 bystander exposures, you've hand a volatilization
3 assessment. So what more needs to be done to give a
4 clearer scientific resolution of these issues?
5 MS. GUILARAN: Thank you for your comment and
6 question on this. So thank you for talking about the
7 history of the different things that we have put
8 forward, and they're indeed just proposal as what EPA
9 was thinking about at the time, and one of the important
10 things about a reg review program is that different from
11 re-registration, with all the transparency in the
12 process, and also soliciting public comment, it's an
13 important step. That's why we have three different
14 phases as we're going -- as each chemical going through
15 reg review, we get public feedback on.
16 So for this particular one, the things that you
17 have talked about, number one, the science has never
18 been -- we went through SAP several times, so it's
19 not -- even though I'm an engineer, I'm not a
20 toxicologist or human health expert on risk assessment,
21 the science is complex. So that's why we have gone
22 through the SAP several times trying to hone in on what
23 are the effects of chlorpyrifos.
24 So the proposal in 2015, also a notice of data
25 availability in 2016, were just what the EPA was

ED_002528_00039557-00083

1 thinking about at the time. We received a lot of
2 comments on both sides, so that's why the science is
3 still unclear on whether or not what we were proposing
4 is really there the path forward for the agency.
5 So that's where things are. We do intend to
6 complete a review by the deadline of 2022.
7 MS. HARRIOTT: I have another question.
8 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay.
9 MS. HARRIOTT: So I would like to know what
10 specifically is unclear. What studies are now needed to
11 resolve these issues? Are there studies that you have
12 identified, that you need to help resolve these issues?
13 MS. FRIEDMAN: Sure. Hi, this is Dana Friedman,
14 I'm also in the Pesticide Re-evaluation Division, I'm a
15 senior regulatory advisor. I wanted to clarify that
16 some of the specific issues are really wrapped up in the
17 incorporation of the epidemiology studies that we do
18 have available to us. We have had a lot of comments
19 from the public, both with regard to the availability of
20 the raw data, that's one of the issues that we've
21 been -- you know, discussed -- have been discussed in
22 public comments a number of times.
23 Some of the issues around the incorporation of
24 epidemiology studies has also come up in a number of
25 SAPs. In our last Revised Human Health Risk Assessment,

ED_002528_00039557-00084

1 I believe it was 2016, I think it was November, we
2 utilized the data in a way that we thought reflected
3 what the SAP had suggested we do in evaluating the
4 report and additional comments that we received from the
5 public, there is still great uncertainty there.
6 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Iris and then Amy.
7 MS. FIGUEROA: Hi. So I just actually -- thank
8 you, Nichelle, for the question, that was a question I
9 was going to ask as well, and just to highlight the
10 vulnerable populations that can be affected by this
11 delay, particularly farmworkers and farmworker children,
12 of course. And five years is, in our view, a very long
13 period of time for potential harm and for the long-term
14 health effects that that could have, that exposure.
15 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Amy, then Leyla, then Lori
16 Ann.
17 MS. LEIBMAN: So, thank you for some of the
18 initial comments, and that echoes a lot of some of our
19 thinking, but the process regarding this is really
20 disturbing, and problematic. And I don't understand how
21 all of the sudden the agency thinks that the science
22 remains unresolved.
23 This is -- this is probably one chemical where
24 we have the most science to underscore the impact that
25 this chemical has on children's brains. And then let's

ED_002528_00039557-00085

1 not forget about workers, because we always forget about
2 workers, but, you know, workers are continually exposed
3 to this chemical.
4 I was just out in Hawaii looking into an
5 incident in January 2016, this year, in California,
6 there has been numerous exposures of workers to this
7 chemical. And all of the sudden, EPA changes the rules
8 of the game. And so what -- I don't understand with the
9 science that's there, the process. And if this is going
10 to be the process, is it money? Is it profits? Is it
11 that we don't care about the population that is going to
12 be impacted?
13 I mean, okay, so we can throw away the workers,
14 they're Latino, they're poor, they don't speak English,
15 and we don't care? I mean, that is the population
16 that's going to be impacted the most by these changes in
17 the game. And it's not acceptable and it's really --
18 it's really upsetting and it's very -- it goes against
19 the mission of what the EPA is all about. And that is
20 to protect human health.
21 And so what is happening here is not that the
22 science is unresolved. We have more science on this
23 issue. And so what happened is that the rules of the
24 game have changed, and this is going to impact a
25 population that puts food on our table and their kids

ED_002528_00039557-00086

1 and the populations that live around them.
2 So that is now on your plate and this is really
3 a very poor -- poorly made, poorly done process, and a
4 very dangerous decision.
5 MR. KEIGWIN: I realize, Richard, you had had
6 your card up sooner, so Richard, if you could go now.
7 MR. GRAGG: Okay, I have two questions. I guess
8 my first one has to do with the going to 2022. So how
9 can the EPA -- how do you intend on revising, updating,
10 or coming up with some new type of evaluation that it
11 took you 30 years to get to, how are you going to do
12 that in five years? So that's my first question.
13 My second question is, you say here that you
14 received a request to remand the biological evaluations.
15 If somebody can explain that. And then you say you have
16 not issued draft biological opinions.
17 MR. KEIGWIN: All right, so let me take the
18 second two first. So as they related to the ESA
19 evaluations, we did receive a request earlier this year
20 to -- it wasn't a remand, it was a request for us to
21 withdraw the biological evaluations for three
22 organophosphates: Chlorpyrifos, diazinon and malathion
23 that we had submitted to the U.S. Fish & Wildfire
24 Service and the National Maritime Fisheries Service in
25 January of this year.

ED_002528_00039557-00087

1 MR. GRAGG: Right.
2 MR. KEIGWIN: That initiated consultation under
3 the Endangered Species Act, so we received requests from
4 external stakeholders to withdraw those biological
5 evaluations. We have not withdrawn those biological
6 evaluations. The biological evaluations are still with
7 the services and we are actively engaged in consultation
8 with the services.
9 The next step will be for the services to
10 provide us with draft biological opinions that we will
11 make available for public comment. We're still working,
12 as Marietta said, with the services in the development
13 of those draft biological opinions. Those are products
14 of the services. These are very complicated evaluations
15 for them to do, the first nation-wide biological
16 opinions that we're doing in tandem with the services.
17 And so that work continues to be ongoing. So there has
18 not been a remand and there has not been a withdrawal of
19 those.
20 MR. GRAGG: Okay.
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay? In terms of the next steps
22 with the human health evaluation. Yu-Ting, do you want
23 to?
24 MS. GUILARAN: So, part of what we're doing
25 right now is going through the comments that we have

ED_002528_00039557-00088

1 received from the 2016 Notice of Data Availability,
2 along with the Revised Human Health Risk Assessment. I
3 was just checking with Dana on how many subsequent
4 comments we received. It's 200, and then the mass mail
5 is more than that.
6 So we're going through the comment process
7 working with the Human Health Effects Division to
8 basically trying to figure out ways to address the
9 comments.
10 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. Did you have a follow-up,
11 Richard?
12 MR. GRAGG: Yeah. So just for my clarification.
13 So EPA goes through a process where you come up with a
14 result or analysis, you put it out for public comment,
15 and so these public comments are -- or these questions
16 have led you to not conclude the human health portion
17 because you got these comments, is that how the process
18 works?
19 MS. GUILARAN: So kind of going back to what I
20 was saying originally, that we -- EPA was attempting to
21 address what the SAP's recommendation was to the agency.
22 So the feedback that we have received, wide ranging from
23 whether or not the agency did address or did not
24 address, and this is how it was insufficient or
25 sufficient, we have on both sides. So that's where

ED_002528_00039557-00089

1 we're trying to go through the information that we
2 received as part of this process through reg review.
3 Trying to see what more modification, if any, we have to
4 make to the science piece of it.
5 MR. GRAGG: I guess I'm going to stop, so it's
6 going to take you five years, you estimate, to get
7 there?
8 MS. GUILARAN: I guess I'm citing the five years
9 because that's the end of the first round of reg review.
10 MR. GRAGG: Um-hmm.
11 MS. GUILARAN: I'll try to do the best I can for
12 you.
13 MR. GRAGG: Thank you very much.
14 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Leyla, then Lori Ann, then
15 Preston.
16 MS. McCURDY: Thank you very much. I'm not
17 going to take too long. I want to say that I concur
18 with the statements made by my colleagues before me,
19 Nichelle, Amy, Iris, and Richard, and I agree with the
20 questions that they posed and I feel like they have not
21 been answered in the way that satisfies me.
22 So I just want to re-emphasize that we at the
23 Children's Environmental Health Network are very
24 concerned that this decision to postpone is putting
25 children in harm's way, and we hope that the process can

ED_002528_00039557-00090

1 be expedited. Thank you.
2 MR. KEIGWIN: Lori Ann, then Preston.
3 MS. BURD: First I want to acknowledge the many
4 EPA employees who put years into working towards the
5 chlorpyrifos ban. I thank you all for the work you did
6 and recognize that this decision was out of your hands,
7 unfortunately.
8 I have a few questions. Number one, as you guys
9 go about this process, are you working with estimates of
10 anticipated poisonings that will occur in the five years
11 that it will take for us to apparently get certainty?
12 That's pretty good numbers, it seems like we should be
13 upfront with them.
14 MS. GUILARAN: So, our -- so we continue to
15 monitor any of the incidents that occur related to all
16 the pesticides that's in the market right now, so that's
17 how we would keep track of the incidents.
18 MS. BURD: Okay. We know there's no such thing
19 as scientific certainty, but we are pretty certain about
20 what chlorpyrifos will do, and as many of my colleagues
21 mentioned, there's abundant research on chlorpyrifos and
22 why this ban would have been well substantiated. I'm
23 wondering if as part of the additional research that you
24 all are looking at and incorporating whether you are
25 studying and monitoring the people that are currently

ED_002528_00039557-00091

1 being poisoned by chlorpyrifos every year as this
2 decision continues. It seems like that would be a very
3 good group for additional research.
4 And also, I guess I'd like to know, you know, a
5 little bit more about the plan of action for the next
6 five years. We're not getting a ton of information here
7 about exactly what will happen in these next five years.
8 MS. GUILARAN: So first I just want to -- if
9 folks are interested in looking at the comments that we
10 have received just the diversity of that and to kind of
11 underscore what we're talking about when we talk about
12 the scientific complexity and uncertainty, I will
13 welcome you to our docket, because they are all
14 available for you to take a look at the issues that we
15 have to grapple with from here on out.
16 So step number one is to look through all the
17 comments and make sure that we understand them, and then
18 to see which of the comments are substantive, that may
19 or may not change our risk assessment. Obviously if
20 it's going to change our risk assessment, that will take
21 HED time to work through that. And at that point, if
22 there is a change, I mean, I'm looking at my boss, but
23 we may have to have another comment period, or -- so I
24 think that's why it's really hard to predict.
25 I think first is just really to wrap our hands

ED_002528_00039557-00092

1 around what's the kind of information that's come in and
2 what we need to do to respond to those comments. And
3 I'm sorry for not being able to provide even more detail
4 at this point, but we did receive a lot of information,
5 and I encourage you to check our dockets.
6 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. Preston, then Donny, then
7 Cynthia.
8 MR. PECK: I will support the comments that have
9 been said thus far so far as the potential exposure over
10 this time period, but I also heard at the beginning of
11 this meeting, and I don't remember who, I believe it was
12 an agency official speaking to the importance of
13 government to have clear and concise messaging when
14 talking to the public. And I think that we've
15 acknowledged that this has caused a great deal of
16 confusion.
17 And we've seen in North Carolina, and the people
18 that I met during the break from North Carolina will
19 probably back me up on this, a great deal of confusion
20 coming from coal ash being spilled into the Dan River,
21 and our Department of Environmental Quality and the
22 Department of Health and Human Services going back and
23 forth, and I'm sure EPA was brought in on this, on
24 levels of hexavalent chromium, so forth and so on. In
25 the mean time, the people of that area are being exposed

ED_002528_00039557-00093

1 and being very confused by the process of whether they
2 can drink their water or not.
3 So just to highlight the lack of clarity on this
4 decision and the impact that that can have on people and
5 the confusion and still distrust within different
6 agencies that not to just focus on the EPA, I think that
7 time and time again I hear not necessarily from people
8 sitting around this table, but people from industry
9 speaking on touting these newer classes of pesticides
10 such as neonics that's safer alternatives to the older
11 class; however, in these same breaths and the same
12 moments, I don't hear much from industry on advocating
13 to get these other chemicals with this much data off the
14 shelves.
15 And so I would encourage industry to speak up in
16 times like these and to acknowledge that there are
17 concerns to be made here and do what you can to help out
18 agency and regulatory officials. So, thank you.
19 MR. KEIGWIN: Donny, then Cynthia.
20 MR. TAYLOR: So, can you all educate the
21 committee on what impact an external deadline has on you
22 performing your work?
23 MR. KEIGWIN: So, let me ask you a clarifying
24 question. We have lots of external deadlines. Do you
25 have specific ones in mind?

ED_002528_00039557-00094

1 MR. TAYLOR: I understand, but you can use this
2 as your case study.
3 MR. KEIGWIN: So if what you're referring to are
4 court-ordered deadlines --
5 MR. TAYLOR: In this particular case, if that's
6 the deadline.
7 MR. KEIGWIN: So in this case, we were under a
8 court order to come to a decision by a certain period of
9 time. I should note that after the agency received the
10 report from the FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel, the
11 agency asked for additional time because of the -- or in
12 light of the advice that we had received in trying to
13 figure out a path forward based upon that advice.
14 While we did get some additional time, we did
15 not get the length of time that we had sought, and so
16 the scientists here in the Office of Pesticide Programs
17 did a yeoman's effort in my personal opinion with the
18 time that they had to revise a risk assessment, seek
19 public comment, understanding that it was the best that
20 we could do with the time that we had, understanding the
21 report as we understood it at the time, and that, you
22 know, one of the values of public comment periods, in
23 general, I'll just pivot to that a little bit, is that
24 as great a job as we do, and I was very thankful and
25 appreciative of the comments that Nancy Beck had earlier

ED_002528_00039557-00095

1 about the strength of this program's assessment. We
2 don't always get it right, and there is great value to
3 us in getting feedback on the assessments that we do.
4 We don't oftentimes get a lot of feedback on the
5 assessments that we do, so 200-plus very substantive
6 comments on an assessment is a lot of information to go
7 through and to make sure that we're making the best
8 decision that we can with the best available science
9 that's before us.
10 MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, because I think under
11 the deadlines that you were given, I think you had to do
12 what you had to do and everybody doesn't understand that
13 science sometimes takes longer than the deadlines that
14 are put in place.
15 MR. KEIGWIN: Cynthia?
16 MS. PALMER: Thank you. First of all, I concur
17 with the comments of Nichelle, Amy, Iris, Richard,
18 Leyla, Lori Ann and Preston, and I would like to state
19 that the science on smoking has likewise been very
20 complex, and yet when you look at the message and the
21 weight of the evidence, it's rather clear-cut that
22 smoking is bad for you. And I think there are
23 parallels.
24 And third, I just had a clarifying question
25 about Dow's requests to remand, because it comes up in

ED_002528_00039557-00096

1 each PPDC update that they have made this request, and
2 you've stated quite clearly that EPA has not done this,
3 they have not granted that request.
4 Is that the same as saying that EPA has rejected
5 that request? Have you turned down Dow's request, or do
6 we still need to be nervous that you might actually say
7 yes? Thanks.
8 MR. KEIGWIN: So we received that request many
9 months ago, and we have not withdrawn the BEs, and I
10 think that's a pretty effective message. I think the
11 fact that we have not withdrawn the BEs, that is the
12 agency's current position.
13 MR. KEIGWIN: Richard, you're -- or Donny,
14 anymore? Cynthia, anymore?
15 (No response.)
16 MR. KEIGWIN: All right. So, I suspect that
17 given that the next two chemicals aren't exactly -- why
18 are you looking at me like that? All right, you all
19 have a choice. We can either -- I will give it to you
20 all. We could either try to get through both
21 glyphosates and the neonics before lunchtime, that is
22 like the -- that's -- let's practice this consensus
23 thing a little bit more this afternoon. I think I heard
24 no, pretty resoundingly. Jay might suggest otherwise, I
25 don't know if that's why your tent card is up.

ED_002528_00039557-00097

1 So, my suggestion based upon the groans in the
2 room was we will break now. I will give Jay a minute to
3 intervene with what he was going to say.
4 MR. VROOM: Just with respect to the suite of
5 pest control available to farmers and other pesticide
6 users, at the intersection of EPA's trying to apply very
7 complex laws like the Endangered Species Act that has
8 been referenced here, written completely separately from
9 the pesticide law, and, frankly, even though the Food
10 Quality Protection Act amended both the Food, Drug and
11 Cosmetic Act and FIFRA in 1996, you still struggle with
12 trying to make sense out of those two laws.
13 And so as an example, conversations here this
14 morning about chlorpyrifos largely pivot around the
15 petition to revoke the tolerances of chlorpyrifos, which
16 is a process that in the pure sense of the two statutes
17 are completely disconnected. And, frankly, doesn't make
18 any sense.
19 And so I just wanted to make the point that
20 farmers and other pest control users have a lot of
21 needs, and if you look at the actual facts of the
22 evolution of the way the agency regulates, especially
23 all of the insecticides that we're talking about
24 principally here, and use patterns that have responded,
25 I think we've seen a tremendous amount of risk avoidance

ED_002528_00039557-00098

1 and mitigation that is a combination of the serious
2 efforts of applying science and very disparate policy
3 framework handed to EPA, and the user community, and
4 everybody else that sits around this table.
5 So I think we ought to pause and celebrate the
6 fact that we have made a lot of progress around risk
7 mitigation in the last 20 years. And that there's a
8 profound commitment that we heard today from EPA to
9 continue to lead with regulatory efforts to apply
10 science as it evolves, and help to also provide a
11 pathway for new, safer products to get to the
12 marketplace. Thanks.
13 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. It is ten minutes to 12:00.
14 Why don't we reconvene at 1:15, plan accordingly to get
15 through security so that we can start right on time, and
16 what we'll start with at 1:15 is the discussion about
17 dicamba.
18 (Whereupon, at 11:50 a.m., a lunch recess was
19 taken.)
20
21
22
23
24
25

ED_002528_00039557-00099

1 AFTERNOON SESSION
2 (1:15 p.m.)
3 MR. KEIGWIN: Just one thing before we move on
4 with the afternoon agenda. It's been brought to the
5 agency's attention that there may be PPDC members that
6 are tweeting out the discussions at today's proceedings,
7 and I've been asked to remind everybody that, as Jim
8 McCleary went through with us this morning, that it's
9 important for all of us to refrain from any language or
10 activities that would compromise the civility of the
11 committee, and at least one PPDC member has brought to
12 my attention their reluctance to speak because of the
13 tweeting. So I would ask and just remind all of us of
14 the role and responsibility that we have in these
15 proceedings, and to act accordingly.
16 So, thank you for that. So this morning we had
17 a very robust conversation, and I would imagine it will
18 get even more so. So I'd like to introduce Reuben
19 Baris, who is the Acting Branch Chief of the Herbicide
20 Branch in the Registration Division, and Dan Kenny, who
21 is the Acting Associate Director of the Registration
22 Division, to give you all an update on a recent decision
23 that we made relative to dicamba.
24 MR. BARIS: Thank you, Rick. And thank you,
25 PPDC members, thanks for the opportunity to present

ED_002528_00039557-00100

1 today on a little window into essentially how my staff
2 and I have spent our last few months. And actually,
3 honestly, many people in this room have spent the last
4 several months investing a whole host of energy into
5 finding workable solutions. This has been an enormous
6 undertaking that represents the efforts of individuals
7 at all levels within the EPA, coordination and
8 cooperation from state lead agencies, university weed
9 scientists, USDA, and the pesticide manufacturers of
10 dicamba products approved for use on dicamba-tolerant
11 soybean and cotton. It is an extremely high-profile and
12 significant situation. It has drawn on the resources of
13 our regulatory partners, focusing attention on
14 investigating incidents and developing practical
15 solutions.
16 The role of these efforts is to minimize
17 off-target movements and reduce instances of crop damage
18 in the 2018 season, while recognizing the importance of
19 these products as a tool for growers to manage weed
20 resistance. It was and continues to be our intent to
21 inform growers in a timely manner, allowing them to make
22 informed choices for seed purchases for the 2018 growing
23 season.
24 The next few slides will walk us through a very
25 high-level synopsis of these issues and provide a

ED_002528_00039557-00101

1 general update on the areas of the labels that were
2 modified for the 2018 growing season.
3 New uses of dicamba for use on dicamba-tolerant
4 soybean and cotton were registered in November/December
5 of 2016. Three products are currently registered.
6 That's Monsanto's XtendiMax with VaporGrip Technology,
7 BASF's Engenia herbicide, and DuPont's FeXapan herbicide
8 with VaporGrip Technology. These are the only products
9 that are registered for over-the-top uses for
10 dicamba-tolerant soybean and cotton.
11 As the 2017 growing season was ramping up in the
12 mid-south, EPA quickly became aware of the rapidly
13 increasing number of crop damage cases alleging
14 off-target movement of dicamba. These incidents of
15 off-field movement were reported to the state
16 departments of agriculture as early as April, after
17 which allegations and investigations were brought to the
18 EPA's attention as early as May, stemming from the
19 Bootheel of Missouri and Arkansas.
20 As the 2017 growing season progressed, recorded
21 incidents rapidly increased in frequency and geographic
22 distribution across the southern states, northern
23 Missouri, and eventually spreading into the midwest and
24 Dakotas.
25 The next few slides are a little bit updated

ED_002528_00039557-00102

1 than the slides that you actually have in your packet,
2 given that when I gave these slides for approval and
3 submissions for you all to actually have printed out and
4 available to you, new information was brought to our
5 attention about finalized numbers and cases. So these
6 will be posted to the PPDC's website, I can get
7 confirmation of that, so they will be available as soon
8 as that happens.
9 So out of the 34 states where dicamba-tolerant
10 soybean and cotton uses were registered, 25 states
11 reported estimates of soybean crop damage. As of
12 October 15th, 2017, 2,708 official cases were reported
13 to the state departments of agriculture, totaling over
14 3.6 million acres of soybeans. These figures only
15 represent the official incidents reported to the state
16 departments of agriculture in May and, in fact,
17 underestimate the extensive crop damage incidents since
18 we are aware that approximately one in five cases were
19 actually reported and documented.
20 Throughout the 2017 season, estimates such as
21 these represented our current understanding of the
22 evolving issue, but as this issue was extremely dynamic
23 and difficult to really get perfect information on, as
24 soon as these figures were gathered and presented or
25 reported, they were actually outdated.

1 The map on this slide and the next were compiled
2 by Dr. Kevin Bradley of the University of Missouri,
3 where he pulled representatives from the state
4 departments of agriculture quantifying the number of
5 formal complaints of soybean crop damage.
6 And then this map estimates the total acreage of
7 soybean damage this year as reported by state extension
8 weed scientists drawing from their involvement directly
9 with growers. While these estimates focus on soybean
10 acreage, we are also aware of cases involving tomatoes,
11 watermelon, cantaloupe, vineyards, pumpkins, vegetables,
12 tobacco, residential gardens, trees and shrubs, and
13 other plants that are sensitive to dicamba.
14 As the issue evolved this year, EPA -- next
15 slide, sorry. As the issue evolved this year, EPA
16 engaged state lead agencies and university weed
17 scientists in a series of conversations gathering
18 information that could help remedy the unacceptable
19 dicamba-related incidents reported in the field. The
20 EPA approached the issue cooperatively with our
21 regulatory partners in affected states and collected
22 information from experts in the field to better inform
23 any potential federal regulatory action.
24 Our objective is to minimize off-target movement
25 and reduce the number of incidents in the 2018 growing

ED_002528_00039557-00104

1 season, but we recognize the utility of the benefit of
2 dicamba-tolerant technology through weed-resistant
3 management. With this in mind, the EPA developed
4 workable solutions with the pesticide manufacturers to
5 amend the pesticide label application directions to
6 address issues that rose to the surface of possible
7 explanations for the unacceptably high number of crop
8 damage incidents.
9 In our discussions, there were five common
10 issues that surfaced in almost every conversation,
11 suggesting the potential root causes of crop damage
12 related to dicamba applications. These were: Physical
13 drift, contamination, temperature inversions, volatility
14 and misuse.
15 In reaching an agreement with Monsanto, BASF,
16 DuPont -- and DuPont on measures to further minimize the
17 potential drift to damaged neighboring crops from the
18 use of dicamba formulations used to control weeds and
19 genetically modified cotton and soybeans, the new use
20 requirements for the use of dicamba will allow growers
21 to make informed choices for seed purchases and weed
22 management for the 2018 growing season.
23 This slide summarizes the major changes to the
24 label for the next growing season; however, the labels
25 have been revised significantly compared to the original

ED_002528_00039557-00105

1 registrations. Namely, there are no longer supplemental
2 labels for the uses on dicamba-tolerant soybeans and
3 cotton. The supplemental labels have been integrated
4 into the main label which the registrants have
5 voluntarily agreed to designate as restricted use,
6 meaning that only certified applicators may purchase and
7 apply these products, which also includes permitting
8 those under the direct supervision of a certified
9 applicator to apply these products.
10 Dicamba-specific training is mandatory for all
11 applicators who intend to apply these products,
12 emphasizing that there may be state-specific
13 requirements for training, and applicators must follow
14 the state requirements before applying.
15 Additional restrictions have been implemented to
16 limit when applications are permitted, reducing the
17 maximum wind speed from 15 miles per hour to ten, and
18 limiting applications of the dicamba between sunrise and
19 sunset.
20 Language was added to enhance directions for
21 sprayer system cleanout in order to prevent
22 cross-contamination, and in an effort to increase
23 awareness of the potential risk of damaging neighboring
24 crops, label directions and documentation was added
25 requiring applicators to identify potential sensitive

ED_002528_00039557-00106

1 crops or plants neighboring the application site to
2 further emphasize the compliance with downwind buffer
3 restrictions.
4 And, lastly, the restricted use pesticide
5 designation on these three products carries with it the
6 requirement for the applicators to keep and maintain
7 certain records regarding the use of these products.
8 Keep in mind that product labels are very different from
9 the labels that the growers may have become accustomed
10 to in the 2017 growing season. It is important for
11 applicators to be trained before applying these products
12 and follow all label directions.
13 All three registrants are undertaking a process
14 to get the labels in the hands of growers in time for
15 the 2018 application season. This effort is intended to
16 appropriately manage product that is currently in the
17 channels of trade and relabel it so growers are using
18 the correct label. While each registrant may have
19 slightly different processes for implementing the new
20 label, the intent is to ensure that applications --
21 applicators and growers have the new label and are
22 following the correct label directions for the upcoming
23 season.
24 EPA will monitor the success of these changes
25 and help inform our decision whether to allow the

ED_002528_00039557-00107

1 continued use of dicamba on dicamba-tolerant soybean and
2 cotton after the 2018 growing season. And I think one
3 of the things that we will hear today that I hope we can
4 enter into the rest of the hour would be looking to the
5 committee to -- and open it up for suggestion and
6 discussions about how best to monitor the success in the
7 2018 season and beyond.
8 Thanks.
9 MR. KEIGWIN: So, questions on that
10 presentation? Andrew, Preston, Charlotte.
11 MR. THOSTENSON: So, my question, basically now
12 we're trying to figure out what success looks like in
13 2018? Would that be a fair assessment of what we're
14 going to try and do over the next few minutes?
15 MR. BARIS: Yes, I think that's one of the
16 objectives, and how best to measure that.
17 MR. THOSTENSON: Okay. So, you know, one of the
18 thoughts that I have in working with applicators, and
19 we've engaged with our Department of Agriculture about
20 what success might look like, and we just threw some
21 ballpark numbers out and said if we have 50 percent of
22 this off-target movement in North Dakota, would that be
23 acceptable in '18 or not? And our department
24 universally said that wasn't acceptable. That would
25 have been a failure.

ED_002528_00039557-00108

1 So then we said, well, maybe 25 percent. Maybe
2 10 percent. So I guess I'm grappling with what the
3 success looked like. I mean, we are going to have
4 problems, it's just a matter of how much problems we'll
5 have.
6 I assume that what has happened with the new
7 labels will mitigate some of it, but how much? And
8 that's what we're grappling with in North Dakota right
9 now is trying to describe what success looks like in
10 2018.
11 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Preston, then Charlotte,
12 then Cynthia.
13 MR. PECK: Thank you for your presentation. I
14 have just a couple of technical questions. With the
15 point on the underestimation of crop or plant damage,
16 the approximately one in five being recorded. How did
17 you derive that estimation?
18 MR. BARIS: That was based on conversations with
19 stakeholders, state lead agencies, university weed
20 scientists. It's not a precise estimate.
21 MR. PECK: Right.
22 MR. BARIS: It's an approximation. It was just
23 really the only information that we have, formally, are
24 the cases reported directly to the state departments of
25 agriculture.

ED_002528_00039557-00109

1 MR. PECK: Yeah, I was just a little curious on
2 the methodology. And then one other question, is the
3 plan with the rollout of the new labels, is this being
4 coupled with any kind of educational efforts on letting
5 people know that there are label changes besides, you
6 know, is EPA working with the state departments of ag on
7 kind of a robust education campaign and awareness
8 building on this?
9 MR. BARIS: I think yes is a fair statement, but
10 there is a mandatory training requirement on the label,
11 and it opens -- it gives a nod to the states that
12 actually do have a specific requirement in their state,
13 and many states implemented that requirement through
14 24(c)s, and the 24(c) labels, in the 2017 season.
15 So the idea was to recognize that some states
16 already do have that requirement in place and may
17 continue that moving forward, but there is an
18 opportunity there for states to decide whether or not
19 they want to implement their own specific requirement.
20 MR. PECK: Thank you.
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Charlotte, then Cynthia, then Jay.
22 MS. SANSON: Thanks, and thanks, Reuben, for the
23 presentation. Preston stole some of my questions, so
24 I'll move on to my next one, although I did have a
25 question on slide 4, as Preston did, approximately one

ED_002528_00039557-00110

1 in five cases, if that is -- if that is an assumption, I
2 think perhaps it would be better to state that as an
3 assumption, rather than approximately, because if that
4 number doesn't have a firm basis to it, maybe it's an
5 assumption.
6 MR. BARIS: That's fair to say. It is an
7 assumption. I mean, it's anecdotal information.
8 MS. SANSON: Yeah, okay.
9 MR. BARIS: It's not an official agency
10 position.
11 MS. SANSON: Okay. And then on slide 5, the one
12 with the map. I see that you have updated it since the
13 version we have, which is fine, but I was curious as to
14 an explanation on the zeros in some of the states. Is
15 that where it's registered but there were -- no, I think
16 it was that one. I think is that where it's registered
17 but there were no official incidents reported? Is that
18 how to interpret that?
19 MR. BARIS: That's correct. The state was
20 polled, dicamba is registered in those states for
21 over-the-top uses, but no official complaints or
22 incident cases were reported in those states.
23 MS. SANSON: Okay, thank you.
24 MR. KEIGWIN: Cynthia, then Jay, then Liza.
25 MS. PALMER: So, this is worrisome in terms of

ED_002528_00039557-00111

1 the volatility and the drift issues with dicamba. I
2 sure hope it works in the next growing season. I'm
3 wondering what steps EPA would be taking to protect the
4 neighboring growers, and what these neighbors can do to
5 become whole. It seems like they will have no choice
6 but to buy dicamba-resistant seeds from Monsanto in the
7 future and we're sort of further along on that
8 treadmill.
9 I'm also wondering if with these label changes,
10 if there is like a Cliff's Notes version or something,
11 for the growers, because like I read that the Monsanto
12 XtendiMax with VaporGrip label is 4,500 words, and if
13 we're adding a few more, I'm hoping that there's a
14 summary version available for farmers. Thanks.
15 MR. KEIGWIN: So, as part of the training that
16 Reuben mentioned, and some of the label changes, there
17 have been -- there has been additional information put
18 on the label relative to what the sensitive crops are.
19 And then the enhanced training that will be provided in
20 many states, as Reuben mentioned, did do fairly
21 extensive training, and in a number of those states, the
22 extent of training perhaps even correlates with some of
23 the states where there were relatively low incidents, or
24 in the case of Georgia, no reported incidents.
25 And so we're trying to build upon the success of

ED_002528_00039557-00112

1 that effort. As Reuben also mentioned, now these
2 products are restricted use, and so there's
3 recordkeeping, and so some of the recordkeeping
4 requirements that have been put in place in effect help
5 to walk the growers through the label, and then they're
6 recording how they have met that label requirement, so
7 we think that that helps to reinforce important parts of
8 the label.
9 Liza -- no, sorry, Jay, then Liza, then Andy.
10 MR. VROOM: Reuben, on slide 4, where you talked
11 about that was revised to 3.6 million acres of soybeans
12 impacted, so this is the composite of the reports you
13 got from the state regulators. Is that right? So it
14 would be an estimate of what they knew or had reported
15 in terms of the field size, right, for each complaint
16 incident?
17 MR. BARIS: So, that's partially correct, it
18 incorporates those figures; however, that 3.6 million
19 acre estimate is actually a poll from university weed
20 scientists extension agents on their best guess at
21 what --
22 MR. VROOM: So it would be a whole field
23 estimate, and in most of the cases, the impacts would
24 have been, you know, near the boundary of the field, so
25 this 3.6 million number estimate would be the total

ED_002528_00039557-00113

1 acreage of fields for which complaints are anticipated
2 or have already been filed.
3 So it's -- the point I wanted to make is it's
4 probably an overstatement of the total acreage, and this
5 is out of I think 22 million acres that were treated
6 this year with over-the-top dicamba applications.
7 MR. BARIS: That's correct, 22 million acres
8 were treated.
9 MR. VROOM: So, again, it's early days. You
10 know, our advice to the agency was to wait until more of
11 the state investigations had been concluded. We
12 understand that some of the states haven't finished 2016
13 investigations yet, but compliments to the agency and
14 the registrants and the grower community for having come
15 together to create a label change landscape for 2018
16 that I think will help put more incentives in place for
17 applicators, whether private or custom applicators, to
18 pay attention, because more recordkeeping is going to be
19 in evidence and we'll know more about, you know, what
20 happened in 2018 than we'll ever know about 2016 and
21 '17.
22 So we're quite supportive of the progress that's
23 been made. Obviously there will be more to be learned,
24 and thank EPA for, you know, being a proactive
25 participant in all of this.

ED_002528_00039557-00114

1 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Liza, then Andy, then
2 Sharon.
3 MS. TROSSBACH: I'd like to just provide some
4 information. There were some questions about the
5 education pesticide applicators, whether they're
6 commercial applicators, private applicators or
7 agricultural producers, in ensuring that they're aware
8 of the changes to the label. As a state lead agency
9 for, you know, for pesticide regulation, I can speak for
10 the entire association and indicate that we believe an
11 educated community is a compliant community, and we
12 stress education all the time.
13 In addition to applicators having to be
14 certified through examination, there's also continuing
15 education or recertification, and one of the things we
16 want to make sure is that applicators understand and
17 know how to use the tools that are in their hands. And
18 so certainly when there's any huge type of change like
19 this, when something is going from being a general use
20 pesticide to restricted use pesticide, and all of the
21 different requirements, and the fact that this is such
22 high-profile, and it is significant, you have growers
23 that have this technology in the field, they need a tool
24 to use to be able to, you know, to make those
25 treatments. We want it to be available, but we want to

1 be able to use it properly.
2 We're certainly -- I know the states that are
3 impacted by this have done a lot of training. It may
4 have been required, it may have not. They're certainly
5 doing that now. And as these changes have just been
6 announced, I think states are working to get that
7 information out to their grower communities to certify
8 those applicators that didn't previously have to be
9 certified.
10 Some is done by the state lead agency directly,
11 some is done through cooperative extension, and Andrew
12 can certainly speak more to that effort. Right now is
13 applicators are going through their continuing education
14 units or recertification courses, so the timing of this
15 is good in that we have these folks that are coming to
16 the table and working with extension. It's very easy
17 for me to work with people who are certified, because I
18 regulate those individuals, but those applicators who
19 didn't have to previously be certified to use dicamba,
20 that's where that relationship with extension is so
21 important, because that grower, the first call they make
22 is to their extension agent.
23 And so I can speak, you know, very emphatically
24 that the state regulatory authorities are working
25 through extension and those frameworks and mechanics

ED_002528_00039557-00116

1 that are already out there to disseminate that
2 information. And so it's certainly -- we're certainly,
3 you know, making every effort to do that starting now,
4 part of the growing season, and then working on how will
5 the training be implemented. You know, is it going to
6 be registrant training? Is it going to be state
7 training? You know, how is it going to be -- how are we
8 going to reach those individuals? And we do this all
9 the time. Dicamba is not the first issue that's come up
10 with pesticides, it won't be the last, certainly, and we
11 do this all the time.
12 And so, you know, I like to think that we do a
13 good job at that. So just to address any of those
14 concerns about the grower group, the applicators not
15 having the information that they need.
16 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Andy, then Sharon, then
17 Richard.
18 MR. WHITTINGTON: Fair to say that we all know
19 that we can't have a year this year next year -- like we
20 had this year next year. We are in Mississippi making
21 significant changes. We were RUP last year, and so the
22 changes that are here are not that significant to the
23 changes that we will have to make. We are going to -- I
24 mean, we require training prior to purchase, rather than
25 prior to application.

ED_002528_00039557-00117

1 I believe our plant board this year is going to
2 recommend that we go restricted use on the generic
3 dicamba products, to try and take that piece of the
4 puzzle out, but as someone who works with people who
5 were both affected and unaffected and the affecter, the
6 conversations that we are having is that we have to
7 be -- we have to do a better job of being stewards of
8 these products if we expect to keep them. And everybody
9 I have talked to is committed to that, and making sure
10 that they're good neighbors.
11 So we appreciate the label changes, we are
12 incorporating them into what we already have, and we
13 look forward to whatever success looks like next year.
14 Oh, and I do want to say that damage -- I'm not
15 sure that's the word I would use, because as harvest has
16 come up, some of it appears to be cosmetic, and I don't
17 know -- are you -- has the agency started getting
18 information on whether it's yield reduction or if it was
19 just cosmetic foliage damage? And is there a
20 difference?
21 MR. BARIS: We're asking for that type of
22 information, we're still continuing to try to wrap our
23 heads around it.
24 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Sharon, then Richard, then
25 Damon.

ED_002528_00039557-00118

1 MS. SELVAGGIO: I was wondering about when you
2 have the slide about impacted crops, at the very end you
3 say trees and shrubs, and so I'm not sure if that means
4 crop trees or if that means native vegetation of
5 non-crop vegetation, or are those any other kind of
6 non-crop vegetation. So my question is has there been
7 any reports of ecological damage, you know, to
8 non-crops, and if so, do you have any quantification of
9 that?
10 MR. BARIS: As Jay was indicating, the
11 investigations are still ongoing, specifically to
12 quantify those acres that are not soybean. So we still
13 don't have an entire picture, but what we were trying to
14 do in this effort was to provide as much information as
15 we could and take appropriate action with the
16 information that we had available to us to inform
17 growers for the 2018 season. So as that information
18 becomes available, we'll certainly use that to inform
19 any future decisions.
20 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Richard, then Damon, then
21 Amy.
22 MR. GRAGG: I was curious as to whether or not
23 is EPA doing -- other than the information they're
24 receiving from the users or people who were impacted, is
25 EPA doing any of its own monitoring?

ED_002528_00039557-00119

1 MR. BARIS: So the state lead agencies are
2 the -- they have primacy when it comes to pesticide
3 enforcement and investigations, so we work cooperatively
4 with the state lead agencies to investigate all cases of
5 incidents and working with them cooperatively to develop
6 those metrics to better evaluate what 2018 will look
7 like.
8 MR. GRAGG: Okay, thanks. And on slide 7, you
9 labeled it Investigations, but I guess my question is,
10 how are you -- what's your criteria for damage and are
11 you looking -- how are you identifying that in other
12 crops or plants?
13 MR. BARIS: We're looking at all of it. I mean,
14 we're trying to gather all that information together and
15 use the best available information to make the most
16 informed decision.
17 MR. KEIGWIN: So, Richard, let me just add on to
18 that. So, some of the initial reports that we got, for
19 example, in non-dicamba-tolerant soybeans, there was a
20 cupping within the plant, and so it was -- it was before
21 the seeds -- the pods started to form. I think that in
22 part was why we got the question we did about how did
23 this impact yield. So when Reuben is talking about
24 investigations, it's starting when the off-target
25 movement began to show some impact on a non-target

ED_002528_00039557-00120

1 plant. That was kind of the premise. And so we're
2 including that, and the numbers that Reuben is citing
3 are coming from that -- those initial reports of
4 potentially some impact.
5 MR. GRAGG: So on -- so you cited the three
6 million acres of soybeans, however that's going to end
7 up actually, like the gentleman raised, what that
8 actually means, but what are your numbers? Do you have
9 numbers on your other crops, other impacted crops?
10 MR. BARIS: That's actually one of the things
11 that we're trying to -- or that we're actually
12 requesting from state lead agencies and those conducting
13 the cases of incidents is to measure what occurred in
14 2017 so that we can better evaluate 2018.
15 MR. GRAGG: And my last question is that if it
16 gets on other crops, is it always going to be some type
17 of physical or visible damage or do we know that or
18 could it get on a crop and not have any visible signs
19 and then it could get into the consumption -- into the
20 people purchasing or utilizing it for food?
21 MR. BARIS: I mean, dicamba has been registered
22 for a number of years and has a number of different uses
23 on it. Namely, it does have residential uses. So
24 different crops show different symptomology, depending
25 on its sensitivity. So I mean, I can -- we can go into

ED_002528_00039557-00121

1 that, but I don't necessarily -- soybeans are the most
2 sensitive plant to our knowledge.
3 MR. GRAGG: All right, thank you.
4 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Amy, and then Andrew, are
5 you coming in for round two? And Nichelle.
6 MS. LIEBMAN: Thank you. This is a really --
7 MR. KEIGWIN: I'm sorry, I skipped Damon. So,
8 Amy then Damon.
9 MS. LIEBMAN: This is a really interesting
10 update on something that's been a little bit out of a
11 John Grisham novel with murder and all sorts of intrigue
12 with this. And I think this has been really helpful.
13 But I wanted to point out that this is a really
14 interesting case study when we get into our discussion
15 tomorrow about how important the label is and how
16 critical it is for people who are applying pesticides to
17 understand the label, and to use it accordingly. And I
18 want to echo what has been said about the importance of
19 education and training, and that we are not going to
20 have safe use, if there is a safe use, of pesticides if
21 people don't understand the label, can't read the label,
22 don't know the label, and are not educated about it.
23 So -- and it's interesting about the -- the
24 impact it's had, because it's affected a crop. And so
25 I'm also curious, you know, in terms of response when it

ED_002528_00039557-00122

1 affects people. So I think the reaction has been great
2 in terms of looking into it, trying to investigate it,
3 understanding what's happening, changing the label, all
4 of these things are really good actions, but I find it
5 intriguing all of this is happening because of crop
6 damage and not -- changes don't happen when we have
7 human -- I'd like to see similar responses and action.
8 And then the other thing I wanted to point out,
9 I think the numbers on that map, on slide 5, are super
10 interesting. And I find it hard to believe about the
11 zeros in Florida and Georgia, and I think it would be
12 helpful for the agency as you move forward to look into
13 what has happened in some of those states in terms of
14 the education, because my guess is, is now that they've
15 done a great job educating -- I mean, I have no idea,
16 but I have a feeling that the states where there has
17 been a lot of outreach and a lot of education, you're
18 probably getting some higher numbers because people are
19 aware of what's going on. So I think the higher number,
20 they're almost an interesting -- could be an interesting
21 impact of the educational efforts.
22 So essentially like if you look at pesticide
23 incident reporting for people in California, versus
24 Texas or Florida, it's always higher in California
25 because they have a better system there. It's not

ED_002528_00039557-00123

1 because there's more incidents happening in California,
2 there's more reported incidents happening in California.
3 So I just think that's something for you guys to
4 investigate and see what's happening and what's at the
5 root of such enormous differences between Georgia and
6 some of the other states.
7 MR. BARIS: Thank you for your comment. I mean,
8 I think the -- there are a lot of factors that go into
9 these numbers, and these are just numbers on a slide.
10 Just because Georgia has a zero and Arkansas has 986, it
11 may be a factor, like you said, of reported incidents or
12 outreach or awareness or anything. There's --
13 topography, geography, proximity, there's so many --
14 there's so many factors that go into whether or not an
15 incident is reported or not. And that's -- those are
16 exactly the things that we're looking into and examining
17 as we move forward.
18 MR. KEIGWIN: I think that -- and point taken,
19 Amy, I think one of the things I would say, I know the
20 Georgia program particularly well, they started training
21 their applicators three years ago, well in advance of
22 the technology being available, so it wasn't just a
23 one-time training, there was some repetition involved,
24 too, and I think at least for myself, as I was going
25 through my academic training, repetition certainly

ED_002528_00039557-00124

1 helped a lot.
2 MS. LEIBMAN: Great, and let's remember that
3 tomorrow when we talk about WPS and the certified
4 applicator training.
5 MR. KEIGWIN: Right. So, with that, Damon, then
6 Andrew, then Nichelle.
7 MR. REABE: Thanks. I also noticed something
8 really interesting on that map that I'd like to bring to
9 the attention. Obviously we're all aware of the fact
10 that aerial application is not an approved method for
11 any of these active ingredients. And when you look at
12 the map and you think back to the time at which these
13 products were to be applied, where those numbers are the
14 highest are correlating with some very, very wet spring.
15 And these growers did not have the tool of aerial
16 application to use to apply this product.
17 And so with that being said, that probably put a
18 lot of ground applicators in a very, very difficult
19 position where the timing of this application needed to
20 be made under less-than-ideal conditions. Aerial
21 application can help with that in that we can make these
22 applications regardless of soil conditions, so when we
23 have these really wet periods, access to this tool to
24 fight weed resistance is available to our producers.
25 And I think had there been access to this tool

ED_002528_00039557-00125

1 by the aerial applicators in Arkansas and the Bootheel
2 of Missouri, these products would have been applied by
3 professionals who are paid very, very well for what they
4 do, clearly understand how to use herbicides properly
5 and under what conditions they have to use them in, and
6 as professionals, really have a -- they have their
7 career to lose if it's done incorrectly.
8 And so the understanding of the training is
9 there because we're dealing with people that are truly
10 professionals with -- that are making a career out of
11 aerial application. So that was one observation that I
12 noticed, and I think that we would clearly see a
13 correlation not only in the number of acres treated, but
14 also under what -- what was the story of the spring
15 regarding soil conditions.
16 In regards to the 3.6 million acres affected,
17 that's approximately 4 percent of all of the soybeans
18 planted in the United States, so had -- if they're truly
19 affected or particularly if they are destroyed, we would
20 see a very significant change in commodity prices
21 associated with that. So that number, I know the
22 intention isn't to inflate the number, but it is -- it
23 is probably a serious overestimation.
24 The other thing that I was really interesting in
25 this presentation was the fact that 22 million acres

ED_002528_00039557-00126

1 were treated with this tool. That's nearly 30 percent
2 of the entire soybean crop. These are not good numbers.
3 This is a very serious problem, but what is not
4 quantified in this presentation is how many applications
5 were done. Thanks.
6 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Andrew, then Nichelle, then
7 Liza.
8 MR. THOSTENSON: Well, as a pesticide trainer,
9 and that's what I've been doing for the past 21 years, I
10 can tell you that I have observed both the Arkansas
11 training and the Georgia training, and they're both very
12 good trainings. You'll notice that Arkansas has 986,
13 even though they had a very good training program, and
14 Georgia had a very good training program, and they had
15 zero.
16 So I tend to believe that good training is good
17 training. But that means that there's something else
18 going on there besides just training in Arkansas.
19 The other question that I have is because I am a
20 trainer, what are the criteria for this mandated
21 training? Do we have a curriculum? Do we have a
22 standard like what we've done in soil fumigation of
23 certain topic areas that need to be covered? I'm just
24 curious what that may or may not be, for the
25 dicamba-specific training.

1 MR. BARIS: Thank you, Andrew. The intent of
2 the label language on the -- in regards to the mandatory
3 training statement, training is required, and then it's
4 a two-part statement after that, giving an
5 acknowledgment to the states that either implemented a
6 training requirement in 2017 season through a 24(c)
7 label requirement that developed that state requirement
8 and developed a state training, say Georgia or Alabama,
9 North Carolina, Arkansas, Mississippi, Louisiana, I
10 could go on.
11 It was an acknowledgment that those requirements
12 could be in place for 2018 as well. But by no means was
13 that to say that a state must develop that training.
14 They have a -- they have the decision to implement a
15 requirement and develop a training, should they choose
16 to; however, that could also open up an opportunity for
17 the state to decide whether or not they take a
18 registrant-provided training.
19 And I think Liza may actually be able to speak a
20 little bit more articulately about the effort that AAPCO
21 is actually going through right now to make that
22 determination across the 34 states that are affected for
23 these registrations of dicamba-tolerant soybean and
24 cotton.
25 So again, that's just the intent of the label

ED_002528_00039557-00128

1 language, and I think we're actively working on that.
2 There is no specific curriculum, but there is work being
3 done to address the requirement.
4 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Nichelle, then Liza, then
5 Lori Ann.
6 MS. HARRIOTT: So pesticide drift is not a new
7 Phenomenon that farmers have had to be facing and that
8 EPA by extension has had to address. And given that
9 risk, we see more genetically modified crops being
10 paired with specific products that are to be used on
11 those genetically modified crops. I just want to urge
12 EPA, in conjunction with collaboration with USDA, to
13 work together to proactively -- and this is me thinking
14 ahead -- to proactively develop a new strategy where we
15 do not in the future see any more of these dicamba-like
16 incidents when it comes to spray drift, given that we
17 know that there are new pesticide products in the
18 pipeline to be used on these type crops.
19 And just going back to an earlier question of
20 what does success look like, EPA in conjunction with
21 USDA need to sit down and evaluate that question. I
22 think it's a very valid question. What does success
23 look like? Are we just trying to reduce incidents from
24 the 986 that we see in Arkansas to, say, 500 incidents?
25 Is that what success is? Is it 200 incidents? Or are

ED_002528_00039557-00129

1 we trying to move away from having farmers face these
2 types of incidents year after year and are we trying to
3 eliminate spray drift?
4 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Liza, then Lori Ann, then
5 Richard.
6 MS. TROSSBACH: Thank you. I will mention
7 briefly this survey, I had planned to do that initially
8 when the question was asked about the crop damage that's
9 not to soybeans or to cotton, and in that -- in the map
10 that you see, that was done by weed scientists asking
11 specifically about soybeans and cotton. And so one of
12 the things that AAPCO, the association has done, is put
13 together a survey to the states, and one of the
14 questions in that survey is, are you able to quantify
15 the non-soybean, non-cotton crop damage and what
16 specifically it is, to try to gather that information.
17 So that survey actually just went out this week
18 to state lead agencies and we're gathering that
19 information to help provide that information to EPA, you
20 know, just so that they know, you know, for their
21 consideration.
22 Also in that survey, we're also asking the
23 states questions about the training requirement. As you
24 heard, there are some states that mandated training
25 already, so they already have training in place. You

ED_002528_00039557-00130

1 have some states, like Virginia, that didn't mandate
2 training, but conducted a lot of training over the last
3 year. And we're one of the states that there were no
4 reports of potential pesticide misuse or damage to the
5 state lead agency, which is my office.
6 And so I like to think there is some
7 correlation, but again, there are so many factors, if
8 you look at Arkansas, it's a cropping system, the amount
9 of acreage, how they're applied. There are so many
10 factors, you know, in that. But to the training, one of
11 the things that we are asking states is just that
12 question, Andrew, is what would it require, you know,
13 what would you want, or what would you require before
14 you would accept registrant training? You know, are
15 there certain components. Does it have to be -- you
16 know, do you want it approved by EPA? Does it have to
17 be certain factors?
18 So there's a lot of that work that's being asked
19 of state lead agencies right now, you know, to get their
20 opinion on and to gather that information. Also are you
21 going to do state training, will you allow registrant
22 training. There's a lot of flexibility for states. For
23 those states that already have training, who have a
24 mandated training program, they may already have
25 training in place. Not that they might change it a

ED_002528_00039557-00131

1 little or amend it, but they already have that in place.
2 Then you have some states who will have to start over,
3 or may have to work from scratch.
4 So I think that information that will be
5 gathered through this survey will kind of be helped,
6 whether it's something that comes out officially from
7 EPA or whether it's a guidance document to state lead
8 agencies to help each other, say this is what we think
9 is important for this type of training, certainly
10 working with extension, our pesticide safety educators,
11 who are those individuals who are experts in that area,
12 we'll be able to pull all that information together so
13 we're ready for the 2018 use season.
14 And there is an urgency, because now, as I
15 mentioned before, is when certification courses and --
16 excuse me, recertification and continuing education
17 happens, and we need to get individuals trained and
18 certified so they're ready to use for 2018, which can be
19 early in some states, you know, in some areas.
20 Just one other thing about the differences in
21 the numbers. I think the statement was made about
22 Florida being zero. Well Florida has very limited use
23 of dicamba. So just as an -- a total amount that's
24 supplied to total amount of acreage is much smaller
25 than, say, Arkansas or some of the other states. So

ED_002528_00039557-00132

1 once again, it's hard to make those comparisons between
2 states because we are so different.
3 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Lori Ann, then Richard.
4 MS. BURD: Hello. Reuben, thank you for your
5 excellent presentation. My question arises in the
6 context of resistance management. We've heard reports
7 that many growers are adopting this technology because
8 they are concerned about drift, and so they're just kind
9 of prophylactically adopting it which, of course, goes
10 against some of the excellent resistance management
11 guidelines that this office has issued, and some of the
12 approach to resistance management that we've all
13 discussed, which, you know, would not involve a lot of
14 prophylactic adoption of these kinds of technologies.
15 And then, of course, subsequent increase in
16 dicamba use that would come from that. I'm wondering if
17 you guys were thinking about this at all from a
18 resistance management perspective.
19 MR. BARIS: There is a five-year check-in point
20 on the registration for resistance management and the
21 registrants are required per the terms on the
22 registration to report cases of resistance that they
23 know of to the agency, and there's mechanisms for that.
24 So we are acutely aware of resistance management, and
25 are keen to take action appropriately as needed.

1 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Richard?
2 MR. GRAGG: Okay, my questions have to do with
3 the -- I guess around success in your maps, but it was
4 just communicated that Florida may be low because they
5 don't use a lot of dicamba, so is that true for the
6 other half of the U.S. as well? The same type of thing,
7 there's not a lot of dicamba used where it's all white?
8 MR. KEIGWIN: So I believe the white states are
9 the states where this technology has not been
10 registered. So this only reflects the use in the states
11 where the over-the-top technology is registered, right?
12 MR. BARIS: The yellow states are the states
13 that actually were reported and polled as part of
14 Dr. Kevin Bradley's survey that have been affected by
15 the issue that we're talking about today.
16 MR. GRAGG: Okay.
17 MR. BARIS: The 25 states are highlighted; 34
18 states actually have registrations that this product is
19 actually registered on.
20 MR. GRAGG: Understood, thank you.
21 MR. BARIS: Some maybe just didn't report, this
22 is the information that we have available to us.
23 MR. GRAGG: So again, on the metric of success,
24 what -- is there a standard of what is an incident or an
25 impact? Because if there is -- you have these various

ED_002528_00039557-00134

1 numbers, is everybody using the same metric to determine
2 that there's an impact? You know, how is the data --
3 how can you rely on the data if it's not uniform?
4 MR. BARIS: I think that -- thank you for the
5 comment. I mean, we're still gathering information,
6 like Andy was mentioning earlier about what the actual
7 impact on yields are. I think harvests are still
8 wrapping up, and so we're still gathering that type of
9 information.
10 So I mean, that's really what -- the yield
11 weights are really what's going to tell us the true
12 story about the measurable impact of dicamba damage,
13 whether it's cosmetic, whether it's growth and
14 reproduction, yield rates will tell the story.
15 MR. GRAGG: Okay. Thank you.
16 MR. BARIS: And we are trying to collect -- and
17 you reminded me that we are trying to collect
18 information on non-soybean impacts, so that's an
19 important point.
20 MR. GRAGG: Thank you.
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, round three? Andrew, are
22 you back up? Oh, I didn't see Amy. He's gone a couple
23 times. Go ahead, Amy.
24 MS. ASMUS: What are you doing when you're
25 looking at the effects of the drift that's different?

ED_002528_00039557-00135

1 When we talk about education of applicators, I think
2 that's very important, but I've got applicators in our
3 area that have been applying dicamba for many, many,
4 many years, and we have never seen this high of
5 incidents of off-target movement. So is there any
6 study? Are you looking at the differences between
7 dicamba use in the past and dicamba use on crops like
8 cotton and soybean where, you know, what's the
9 difference in an application? Because if you tell my
10 applicators they have to be trained in dicamba
11 application, they've been doing that for many years
12 successfully. What is going to be different in this
13 training to actually address the off-target movement on
14 these crops that's different than the crops that we've
15 been using it for many years?
16 MR. BARIS: I mean, you are correct, dicamba has
17 been around for a number of years, and it has a number
18 of different uses. The difference is these uses
19 over-the-top on tolerant soybean and cotton.
20 And so the training will be involved in
21 following explicit label directions to prevent
22 noncompliance and follow the directions that are
23 intended to prevent off-field movement, and the
24 consequences that an applicator could face if they
25 aren't compliant with the label directions.

ED_002528_00039557-00136

1 MS. ASMUS: Can I follow up real quick? So we
2 did extensive training with our applicators before it
3 was applied, and we believe that for the most part, it
4 was very consciously applied, made every effort to apply
5 it according to the label direction, and we still had
6 many off-target movements. So to believe that the
7 applicators are in error for all of this I think is
8 maybe a misunderstanding, and we need to address why it
9 worked and why it didn't work when all applicators
10 followed the label -- not all, the majority of the
11 applicators that I work with, I will quantify that,
12 followed the directions and were as methodical as they
13 could be in the applications, and we still had
14 off-target issues.
15 MR. BARIS: We're not insinuating that by any
16 means that growers did not follow the label. That's not
17 the case. One of the efforts that we tried to undertake
18 in this process has been to tighten the label, make it
19 clearer, integrate the supplemental labels into the main
20 label so that the label is easier to follow in and of
21 itself could provide a Cliff's Note version for itself,
22 because the label then is more integrated and is less
23 contradictory.
24 And these products are more similar than they
25 were in the past, so that training efforts can be done

ED_002528_00039557-00137

1 to teach to the technology as opposed to individual
2 products, and I think that's really an important point
3 that -- as pesticide educators are -- application
4 educators are up in front of a classroom or on farm
5 teaching about the technologies. It's the risks, the
6 benefits, and how to follow the label and specific
7 elements of the label to ensure that these products are
8 used appropriately.
9 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, I want to do a time check so
10 we don't go over. So Lori Ann, are you back in?
11 MS. BURD: No.
12 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, so let's just do the last
13 four that are up. So Andrew, Richard, Amy, and Sharon.
14 MR. THOSTENSON: Well, in an effort to, you
15 know, get a better grasp on the number of acres and the
16 types of damage that our growers were impacted with, we
17 implemented a survey, self-reporting web survey tool
18 that applicators and farmers could go into and report
19 the sorts of problems that they had. Minnesota did the
20 same thing, South Dakota did the same thing.
21 I'm fairly confident that we will probably set
22 that up again for 2018 so that we can, you know, quickly
23 in real time assess what's happening out there. You
24 know, I'd be willing to share that survey tool with you
25 all and the results of the survey that we had this last

ED_002528_00039557-00138

1 year, and it was interesting in that we only had 40
2 formal complaints, but we had over 207 registered issues
3 out there.
4 And interestingly enough, the farmers indicated
5 to us that 50 percent of their fields showed typical
6 physical drift with a gradation of damage across the
7 field. And so we were like, okay, that's good. But the
8 other 50 percent said it was field-wide, with no
9 discernible pattern.
10 And the numbers that we reported in that survey
11 that Dr. Bradley put together incorporated the numbers
12 we received directly from the farmers. So at least for
13 purposes of North Dakota, I think those numbers are
14 pretty reasonable, but certainly as we go into 2018,
15 anything that we could do in real time to monitor what's
16 happening so that if an intervention is necessary,
17 perhaps we would have some ability to do that.
18 MR. KEIGWIN: Richard?
19 MR. GRAGG: She said that she had well-trained
20 people and this drift was still happening, and we said
21 earlier that well-trained people were great applicators
22 and less error. So my question is -- I've got a couple
23 of questions. Is this pesticide used differently for
24 different crops, and is it applied differently for
25 different crops?

ED_002528_00039557-00139

1 MR. BARIS: Yes, there's -- there are -- whether
2 it's a tolerant crop or nontolerant crop, there are
3 specific restrictions in place for the over-the-top uses
4 on tolerant soybean and cotton compared to a
5 non-tolerant cotton or soybean that is, for example,
6 pre-emerging application, or asparagus, or there's
7 specific wind speed restrictions, boom height
8 restrictions, things -- other restrictions for --
9 MR. GRAGG: So then if it's used -- so the
10 labels will tell you for this crop, this is how you do
11 it and for this crop this is how you do it?
12 MR. BARIS: And one of the major changes into
13 this season will be or has been the growers will see on
14 the label that those restrictions apply across the board
15 for all uses on the label. They've been -- the
16 supplemental labels have been integrated into the
17 master -- the main label. So there are no supplemental
18 labels in 2018.
19 MR. GRAGG: Okay, so in terms of monitoring for
20 what we don't want, there's not the ability to put out
21 any type of physical or biosensor to detect the movement
22 of the chemical off the field or where on the field you
23 don't want it to be in terms of realtime monitoring to
24 try to understand why and on what basis the stuff is
25 drifting?

ED_002528_00039557-00140

1 MR. BARIS: So a marker or a tracer or a
2 bioelement would require a formulation change, and that
3 wasn't exactly something that we could address this
4 year. What we did do, with the registrants'
5 cooperation, was to involve a restricted use
6 classification for all three pesticides so that the use
7 of the products could accurately be tracked and records
8 are required to be kept by the applicator so that state
9 lead agencies have the tools that they need to
10 investigate potential incident investigations.
11 In 2017 that was actually one of the pieces of
12 information in cooperation with our regulatory partners
13 that they reported back to us we don't have the tools
14 necessary to enforce or distinguish between labeled use
15 and nonlabel use.
16 And so one of the cases, as I mentioned, for
17 root causes of off-target movement was misuse, that
18 could be using generic products, as Mr. Whittington
19 highlighted, that, you know, they're pursuing applying a
20 restricted use for all dicamba products in Mississippi.
21 But for restricted use of these three products, that at
22 least give the states the tools that they need to
23 distinguish between an approved use and a nonlabeled
24 use. Or misuse.
25 MR. GRAGG: And why would the formula have to be

ED_002528_00039557-00141

1 changed in order for it to be detected with a bio or
2 some type of physical sensor? Why would that require a
3 change in the formulation of the product?
4 MR. BARIS: It's a different ingredient in the
5 formulation, so we have to evaluate -- we evaluate all
6 formulations for all pesticides as part of the
7 registration process. And that would be a change in the
8 formulation by adding an ingredient.
9 MR. GRAGG: Why would you need to add an
10 ingredient in order to detect it?
11 MR. BARIS: I'm not sure I understand the
12 question.
13 MR. KEIGWIN: So I think there might be ways,
14 Richard, to get at your point. One suggestion that had
15 come forward was that some type of an indicator dye be
16 added to the formulation, so I think that's what Reuben
17 was referring to. If what you're talking about is
18 putting some type of a sensor in adjacent areas so
19 that -- you know, at the time that wasn't something that
20 we had really looked at in --
21 MR. GRAGG: But you could do it other than by
22 adding a dye or something to the formula.
23 MR. KEIGWIN: And I think that's the point that
24 you were trying to make, right?
25 MR. GRAGG: Yeah, um-hmm.

ED_002528_00039557-00142

1 MR. KEIGWIN: Is that you could put some type of
2 receptor off-target and see if you got something. You
3 know, there are issues with analytical sensitivity, what
4 would be the best type of receptor being used to do
5 that, is there laboratory capacity available in the
6 states and at EPA to do it. I think these are very good
7 suggestions that as we think about and as we see what
8 happens in '18, do we put some additional things in
9 place if we renew the registration after the 2018 use
10 season. Thank you for that.
11 Amy, and then Sharon.
12 MS. LIEBMAN: I think you've addressed some of
13 what I was asking, because Amy's question was two-part
14 and her point was that in some cases you have a very
15 well-trained, you know, properly used, properly applied
16 pesticide, and what is being done to sort of figure that
17 out. And then it sounds like Richard offered some
18 suggestions, you threw back some suggestions, but I
19 guess could you just clarify what is your plan in terms
20 of trying to figure out this component of the
21 well-trained, well-educated applicator, and there's
22 still this drift happening and crop damage.
23 MR. BARIS: So this effort has really tightened
24 up the label in all aspects that we could possibly
25 tackle in this short amount of time that we had

ED_002528_00039557-00143

1 available to us. Our goal was really to present a
2 decision in a timely manner so that growers had the
3 most -- the best available information so that they
4 could make informed choices for 2018.
5 So the label has been tightened up as much as we
6 possibly could for the 2018 season. And I think we're
7 hearing a lot of really good suggestions this afternoon
8 about how to measure and I think we all need to continue
9 to think about those aspects and as we -- the
10 conversation continues to evolve and throughout the off
11 season or winter seasons, winter months, and into 2018.
12 MR. KEIGWIN: The other thing, Amy, you know,
13 would be to say that we know that there's a lot of
14 really interesting work going on within the Weed Science
15 Society, and a lot of weed scientists across, you know,
16 these states are looking -- are doing some additional
17 work to see what other factors might be involved, what
18 other things might be affecting movement, what other
19 adjacent crops might be more sensitive than had been
20 previously known to be.
21 So I think through the work that the land grant
22 universities are doing in tandem with the Weed Science
23 Society, I think we're going to have a lot more
24 information in 2018 that will help to inform the
25 decision that we would have to make if we were to renew

ED_002528_00039557-00144

1 the registration for the 2019 use season.
2 Sharon?
3 MS. SELVAGGIO: I might be missing something
4 here, but I'm just kind of confused about the
5 volatilization issue. I'm not clear on which of the
6 label changes are meant to address the volatilization
7 issue. And so I'm just wondering, are you confident
8 that your label changes have adequately addressed
9 volatilization as opposed to spray drift?
10 MR. BARIS: The time-of-day restriction was one,
11 the sunrise to sunset was one type of restriction that
12 would -- was aiming at focusing applications when times
13 of day when temperature versions are least likely to
14 occur. There are -- states may have the requirement to
15 further restrict that, depending on their specific
16 variability -- the specific variability or their
17 specific conditions in the state or region.
18 We tightened up the label in almost every other
19 way possible, and 2018 will be a marker for how this
20 technology is working. And I think, as I was just
21 reminded, one additional point is that we added some --
22 with the registrants -- added some additional labeling
23 on all three products about how to identify temperature
24 inversions, how best to identify temperature inversions,
25 and bringing some awareness to growers and applicators

ED_002528_00039557-00145

1 about the risk of applying during a temperature
2 inversion, because a temperature inversion still may
3 occur between sunrise and sunset and how do you identify
4 that to prevent suspension of spray material in the air
5 during those climactic conditions.
6 MR. KEIGWIN: I feel like I have to let you go
7 since I skipped you before, Damon, so go ahead. No, go
8 ahead.
9 MR. REABE: Thanks a lot. I'll make it really
10 brief. Something just occurred to me as we're having
11 this discussion, if there's some way to identify how
12 many of these incidents were associated with the
13 applicator being misinformed as to whether or not the
14 downwind soybeans were, in fact -- had the GMO
15 technology, I believe that when RoundUp first came out,
16 this was a very big problem, growers weren't used to
17 communicating with their neighbors, so that when they
18 hired a commercial applicator to do an application, that
19 applicator didn't -- wasn't aware that it wasn't
20 RoundUp-ready corn downwind.
21 And so I think that would be a pretty critical
22 piece to all of this is almost like a pollinator
23 protection plan, if we're not communicating that, this
24 type of thing is going to continue to happen.
25 MR. BARIS: I'm sorry, I had to turn my mic' on.

1 There's two important elements to that and I think it
2 gets right at the point that you're trying to make is
3 that the buffer descriptions and how the applicator must
4 actually follow those buffer restrictions and
5 identification of sensitive or susceptible crops has
6 been added to the label. And then further to that
7 point, there's two elements on the recordkeeping
8 requirement side that the grower applicator must survey
9 the neighboring sites around the application site and
10 document that they've checked, say, the sensitive crop
11 registry for their state and their situation.
12 So those were intended to increase the awareness
13 element that you're highlighting, and improve the
14 communication between neighbors.
15 MR. REABE: And just going off of, you know,
16 previous experiences with RoundUp, there would be fields
17 that would be originally when that work was done, the
18 idea was to plant RoundUp ready, things changed, and in
19 between time, a different product -- a different product
20 got planted. So more outreach like that I think is
21 good.
22 MR. KEIGWIN: Last comment.
23 MR. THOSTENSONL: My question goes back to the
24 volatility issue. We know that in our Arkansas and
25 Tennessee and Missouri and Purdue is all doing work in

ED_002528_00039557-00147

1 this area evaluating the volatility aspect of these new
2 formulations. What are you looking at from those
3 programs to be able to make assessments moving forward?
4 Are we looking at needing published data in the Weed
5 Science Society of America? What sort of criteria do
6 you need to be able to make decisions about whether or
7 not these products are sufficiently non -- or low
8 volatility moving forward?
9 MR. BARIS: The intent is to use the best
10 available information, and that's the standard we use to
11 evaluate the registrations that are in front of us, the
12 registration applications that are in front of us. We
13 are continuing to cooperate with our partners and
14 university weed scientists like yourself, and others, to
15 ensure that we have the best available information. And
16 they are invited to share with us any information that
17 they have that would inform our decisions. I would be
18 happy to discuss that further.
19 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. That was a very good
20 discussion and lots of good feedback, thank you. As
21 Reuben was mentioning, he and his staff probably spent
22 the majority of the summer working on this, and it was a
23 very extensive collaboration with the states in a very
24 productive way, not only with the state agencies, but
25 with the land grant universities and the registrants as

ED_002528_00039557-00148

1 well. And I think our ability to move as quickly in
2 making label changes I think in part was due to the
3 partnership with the states and the land grants, so we
4 do appreciate that.
5 So thank you, Reuben and Dan.
6 Let's move on to the next topic, which is
7 synergy, and I think Marietta is going to come back up,
8 along with Kimberly Nesci.
9 MS. ECHEVERRIA: Good afternoon. I'm Marietta
10 Echeverria, again, I'm the Director of the Environmental
11 Fate and Effects Division. So for this session, we
12 wanted to provide an update on our evaluation process
13 around claims of synergy, so by just way of very brief
14 background, in 2015, we became aware that pesticide
15 manufacturers were applying for and being granted patent
16 claims that products in combination were having
17 synergistic effects or enhancing efficacy in the field.
18 So this caused us to call into question our approach of
19 evaluating single active ingredients as part of our
20 ecological risk assessment process.
21 So back in May, we gave a brief update on where
22 we were in that learning process, and today we have a
23 more detailed presentation to describe what we're
24 thinking and we will welcome dialogue at the end.
25 So with that, I'm going to introduce Kimberly

1 Nesci, the Deputy Director of the Environmental Fate and
2 Effects Division, to give the presentation.
3 MS. NESCI: Thank you. So in the time I have
4 today, what I'm planning to cover is a little bit of
5 background, a little bit more than what Marietta just
6 gave on why we're doing what we're doing, why we're
7 choosing at this time to focus on patent data
8 specifically, the proposed process that we're following
9 itself, and our next steps. And, of course, we have 30
10 minutes I think at the end for questions.
11 So background. Before we get into the details,
12 I think it's important to ensure that we have a common
13 understanding of the terminology. Synergy, from what I
14 understand, can have multiple definitions and can mean
15 different things to different people, or different
16 groups. So despite the title of this session, we are
17 moving away from the word "synergy," and instead
18 defining the issue that we're proposing to -- the issue
19 that we're proposing to address as greater than additive
20 effects, or GTA effects, or an observed combined effect
21 greater than the sum of the effects of individual
22 chemicals.
23 So historically, EPA has based our ecological
24 risk assessments on the toxicological evaluation of
25 single active ingredients, and we have understood that

ED_002528_00039557-00150

1 toxicological actions between active ingredients that
2 produce significantly greater toxicity than expected is
3 a rare occurrence. The available monitoring data that
4 we have indicates that in a predominant number of cases
5 across the country. The potential toxic risk of
6 contaminants is dominated by one to a few chemicals.
7 And the thresholds that we use to make our risk-based
8 decisions are extremely low probability events, or no
9 probability events, and this suggests that the combined
10 effect of exposure to two pesticides both at no effect
11 levels or at very low probability effect levels can
12 reasonably be considered to be extremely low.
13 In addition, the National Research Council in
14 its 2013 review of OPP's methods for endangered species
15 effects determinations supported the general opinion
16 that synergistic interactions between pesticides are
17 rare, and the council suggested that the agency consider
18 pesticide active ingredient interactions when the best
19 available scientific data evidence supports the
20 quantitative evaluation.
21 So as Marietta mentioned, in 2015, we've
22 discovered a number of cases where pesticide producers
23 have been granted patents for claims that selected
24 mixtures of pesticides produce toxicological effects in
25 excess of expected additive effects, that is claims of

ED_002528_00039557-00151

1 synergistic interactions, or GTA interactions, for
2 effects in specific to pest species, this is enhanced
3 herbicidal, fungicidal or insecticidal effects.
4 Because of this discovery, we have developed a
5 process to, one, obtain and analyze the patent effects
6 of these GTAs -- the claim of GTA effects of these
7 mixtures and determine whether or not these claims and
8 data need to be accounted for in our risk assessments,
9 which I'll be describing in more detail over the next
10 few slides. And it's important to note that the process
11 that we've come up with follows the suggestion by the
12 National Research Council that pesticide interactions be
13 considered to be extensively supported by scientific
14 evidence.
15 So why have we decided to focus on patent data
16 specifically? Again, there are a large number of these
17 patents making GTA claims for pesticide mixtures; the
18 patent data are readily available to the public; the
19 PTO, U.S. Patent & Trademark Office's process is well
20 understood; and the data typically contain information
21 on the mixtures being considered, the conditions of
22 testing, the effects observed and the organisms being
23 evaluated, all of which was needed to determine whether
24 the data warrant changes to our risk assessments. And
25 these data likely represent the most compelling evidence

ED_002528_00039557-00152

1 to support these GTA claims, otherwise they wouldn't be
2 submitted to the Patent & Trademark Office in the first
3 place to support the patent applications.
4 However, there are differences between the
5 standard to receive a patent and standard for use of
6 data to quantitatively evaluate risk. While the U.S.
7 PTO focuses on a determination if a claim is unexpected
8 given existing background information, publications in
9 prior patents, and the Patent & Trademark Office
10 personnel are to give claims their broadest reasonable
11 consideration and interpretation in light of the
12 supporting information. To use this GTA evidence
13 quantitatively to evaluate risk, it must be subject to
14 the standards for the use of other -- of our standards
15 for the use of other toxicological data, that is they
16 must be relevant, supported by empirical data, and that
17 empirical data must meet the agency's standard for data
18 quality.
19 So, does the granting of a patent automatically
20 mean the data are appropriate for ecological risk
21 assessment? I think as I just described, no, the patent
22 review is not equivalent to EPA's data quality criteria.
23 Does that mean patents are never pertinent to ecological
24 risk assessment? And the answer to that is also no.
25 Our experience to date has shown that some patents do

ED_002528_00039557-00153

1 have sufficient information to inform our risk
2 assessments.
3 So with that, I'll get to the process itself.
4 The goals of our proposed process are to document these
5 GTA patent claims and that we've taken these claims into
6 consideration in our decisions and in our assessments;
7 second, to establish a data search and reporting
8 approach so efforts are consistent in scope and that
9 there's a level playing field to establish criteria to
10 narrow these GTA patents to those relevant to agency
11 ecological risk assessments; and to provide a data
12 analysis framework for evaluating the statistical
13 significance of any GTA findings.
14 Ultimately what we're looking to do is to
15 determine whether these patent claims indicate a need to
16 quantitatively or qualitatively change our assessments
17 or decisions. So we're proposing a five-step process.
18 The first is the -- the first step is the identification
19 of granted U.S. patents that make claims of GTA effects;
20 the second is a review of patent relevance to ecological
21 risk assessment, and we've established relevancy
22 criteria that are in the slides here above that I'll go
23 through that will be considered as part of this step.
24 The first criteria is the patent must contain
25 actual data, must contain comparisons of empirical

ED_002528_00039557-00154

1 effects. The second, the patents -- the effects --
2 sorry, the effects are relevant to direct effects on
3 tested taxa. So, for example, a direct measure of death
4 or growth would be applicable to us would be relevant,
5 but a reduction in yield loss or reduction in plant
6 damage as a result of pest control -- a better control
7 of pest populations would not.
8 The tested taxa must be relevant -- the taxa
9 themselves must be relevant to ecological risk
10 assessment; for example, fungi -- for fungicides, of
11 course, we may be seeing synergistic or GTA claims
12 because of enhanced efficacy, but we don't assess
13 effects to fungi, so we -- that would not be -- those
14 types of claims would not be relevant to us. Instead,
15 claims of enhanced insecticidal activity or herbicidal
16 activity would be relevant.
17 The test must be on the chemical considered for
18 regulation, so the actual chemical that we're looking
19 at. And the mixture components tested must be
20 registered in the United States. So some patents
21 consider active ingredients registered in other
22 countries. These aren't relevant to us until such time
23 as they're submitted to us for registration.
24 So, steps 3 and 4 are really obtaining and
25 analyzing the data supporting these relevant patents to

ED_002528_00039557-00155

1 determine -- to see if the effects are statistically
2 significant, and then step 5 is to evaluate that
3 analysis to determine whether the statistically
4 significant observations impact the conclusions of
5 ecological risk assessments, whether the observations
6 can be used to inform quantitative adjustments to the
7 ecological risk assessment or risk mitigation, and
8 whether additional mixture toxicity data may be needed
9 as part of our evaluation process.
10 So this slide doesn't show up all that well, but
11 it is in your packets, and it really just shows a
12 schematic of all the steps I've just described with a
13 little bit more detail. And I'm not going to go through
14 this in a lot of detail here, but we wanted to provide
15 it to you. And it's a useful tool, I think, for more
16 visual learners to see to walk through the process.
17 So what do we do with what we learn? It's
18 important to note that we do not -- we are not
19 evaluating the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office's
20 decision, we are evaluating the data to determine if
21 qualitative or quantitative changes are needed to the
22 ecological risk assessment or if additional studies are
23 needed. If those data -- if additional data are needed,
24 we will obtain that and evaluate it accordingly.
25 In some of the actual cases we have looked at so

ED_002528_00039557-00156

1 far, this additional data has come in the form of
2 guideline studies on formulated products. For data
3 where EPA feels the observations are appropriate
4 technical rigor to support quantitative application,
5 we're going to consider a number of different things.
6 The magnitude of the GTA effects, so whether the
7 quantification of the excess toxicity is large enough to
8 alter our risk conclusions. We will consider any
9 transient observation across treatment levels. We will
10 be considering other lines of evidence associated with
11 the mechanism of action that could inform the
12 interaction assumptions.
13 We'll consider background information on the
14 frequency of observations of effects, interactions and
15 data sets extending beyond the patent reporting data.
16 So companies may have sets of data beyond what is
17 specifically submitted to the Patent & Trademark Office.
18 We will evaluate existing ecological risk
19 assessment findings, and we will look at the tested
20 concentration level and compare that to our expected
21 field exposures, so can the information that we have
22 reliably be extrapolated to field-level exposures.
23 So, and again, it's important to note for the
24 cases while -- that we've evaluated so far, while some
25 have warranted the need for a closer look, or additional

ED_002528_00039557-00157

1 guideline studies, none have ultimately resulted in
2 changes to our risk conclusions.
3 So our next steps. At this time, we're planning
4 to continue to follow this process and collect
5 information on the cases that come before us. We are
6 considering whether to publicly release a memorandum
7 describing this process for formal public comment. And
8 ultimately, we intend to develop a final position on GTA
9 effects of pesticides that would consider public input
10 either through a formal public comment process or
11 through any other public comment process. And, of
12 course, your input here as well, and what we've learned,
13 what we're continuing to learn on the cases that we've
14 evaluated so far.
15 So with that, I would really like to acknowledge
16 the EFED synergy team. They've looked at all the cases
17 we have done so far and they have certainly spent a lot
18 of time using those cases to develop this process. And
19 Ed Odenkirchen, who I think is here today in the back,
20 Rochelle Bohaty, Frank Farruggia, Christine Hartless,
21 and their managers, because they've spent a lot of time
22 to help develop this and to look at the information
23 we're getting. And with that, we'll take questions.
24 MR. KEIGWIN: So I want to keep us on time, so
25 we'll do about maybe ten minutes of questions to get to

ED_002528_00039557-00158

1 the break. So any quick reactions? Noting that we're
2 likely going to take public comment on this and, you
3 know, sharing a fuller memorandum, so what Kimberly has
4 provided is a very high-level overview of our process to
5 date. So, I see Pat, Jay and Preston.
6 MS. BISHOP: Hi, Kimberly. I'm a little
7 confused in that I'm assuming these mixtures have
8 already been registered and gone through toxicological
9 evaluation for human health? Or -- I mean, so there's a
10 patent that says there's a synergistic effect, and
11 that's a claim that's separate from the product already
12 going to EPA and being evaluated, is it not? So then
13 how does it -- I mean, have you looked at these already
14 as far as ecological risk and now you're looking at them
15 again because there's this claim that's been made? I'm
16 not quite understanding that.
17 MS. NESCI: So what we're looking at
18 specifically is the data supporting the patent claim.
19 So the data supporting the patent claim may be for a
20 combination that's in a combination product or it may be
21 for something that's not in a combination product that
22 would be -- that could potentially be applied as a tank
23 mixture.
24 So what we're looking at is unique, is not
25 something that we've seen before, because we typically

1 don't -- don't -- we haven't historically gotten these
2 data as part of our registration packages.
3 MS. BISHOP: So then it's just the data that are
4 new, not necessarily that the product is something you
5 haven't -- it hasn't come across your desk yet as a
6 formulation of some sort?
7 MS. ECHEVERRIA: That's correct. So we would
8 have evaluated the formulation and the registration
9 process, but the patent claims are for unique
10 combinations like in-tank mixes.
11 MS. BISHOP: Okay.
12 MS. ECHEVERRIA: So we don't evaluate a tank
13 mix, which is a way that growers combat resistance
14 management and also make efficient applications of
15 pesticides. So that is where we're seeing a lot of the
16 claims.
17 MS. BISHOP: So you said that additional studies
18 might be needed, would that entail any kind of new
19 animal studies do you think, or more like efficacy type
20 testing?
21 MS. ECHEVERRIA: So in the cases we've evaluated
22 so far, where we have gone to guideline testing, it has
23 been for plants, so guideline plant testing of base in a
24 formulated product which informed the decision.
25 MS. BISHOP: Okay, great, thanks.

ED_002528_00039557-00160

1 MR. KEIGWIN: Jay and then Preston.
2 MR. VROOM: So I wanted to compliment all the
3 staff and in particular you called out Ed for leading in
4 this area, I remember like it was yesterday, it was the
5 day before Thanksgiving two years ago that I learned of
6 this, and what you've assimilated and the interaction
7 you've had with our industry to result in this much
8 progress is nothing short of amazing.
9 I think it's important to also note that quite a
10 number of these synergy patents have been filed
11 prospectively and granted but maybe not used in the
12 marketplace. And some of them are marketing defensive
13 strategies that have no implication with regard to the
14 use of pesticide combinations. In fact, they may
15 prevent pesticide combinations.
16 And then lastly, some of them actually do result
17 in reduction of total pesticide uses because of the
18 synergistic effects that may be already noted in the
19 marketplace. So there are a lot of permutations of this
20 that have nothing to do with increased risk, and some of
21 them actually result in reduced risk.
22 MR. KEIGWIN: Preston?
23 MR. PECK: Thank you. I have -- well I just
24 wanted to say thank you for the flow chart, that was the
25 slide that was very helpful as far as trying to lay that

ED_002528_00039557-00161

1 out and processing a lot of it, and I don't really have
2 any comments on it, but it is much -- I'm a visual
3 person, so it's very helpful.
4 But I wanted to ask one quick question about --
5 it was on slide -- I want to say maybe 4 or 5, depending
6 on if you count the title one. It said there are a
7 large number of U.S. patents making GTA effect claims.
8 Do you have an idea of what large -- just kind of a
9 definition of large? Like what -- about how many? I'm
10 just curious.
11 MS. ECHEVERRIA: Well, we have received a
12 petition from the Center for Biological Diversity, and I
13 believe that the number claimed in that petition was 186
14 or so. Does that sound -- okay. So the number that was
15 reported in the petition I believe was 186 claims, but
16 maybe that's not extensive, but it's not the complete
17 universe, perhaps, but that's the information that we
18 have.
19 MR. PECK: Okay, and then did I hear you right,
20 and I may have misheard, but something like the ones
21 that may claim GTA but only a small amount actually do?
22 Is that what you said? Or did I mishear that?
23 MS. NESCI: So I think of the ones that claim
24 GTA, I think that there are a small amount that we've
25 discovered to be relevant to ecological -- to our

ED_002528_00039557-00162

1 ecological risk assessment.
2 MR. PECK: Okay. Thank you.
3 MR. KEIGWIN: Sharon?
4 MS. SELVAGGIO: I have a couple of comments and
5 questions. One of them is, with your characterization
6 of GTA effects being rare, after our last meeting in
7 May, I think that was in the last summary that we --
8 when we went over this, and I went and I looked for
9 that, and I did not find that anywhere in that document.
10 So I'm really curious about maybe it happened, you know,
11 in a meeting, I'm not sure, but I just don't see that
12 kind of conclusion in that document. I know the
13 organophosphates have definitely been found in the
14 literature to be synergistic greater than additive, and
15 so anyway, I'm just really curious about that, that use
16 of the term "rare."
17 My second question is about the process, and I
18 guess I'm thinking about this like Venn diagram, but --
19 so what happens if somebody has submitted, say, a
20 formulation that combines two herbicides, and in their
21 patent application, they have tested that on plants,
22 certain plants, but there's no data for insects and
23 fish, say. If you find that for plants, in fact, the
24 data looks legitimate, it meets all your data quality
25 criteria and all of that kind of stuff, would you then

ED_002528_00039557-00163

1 go out to the registrants and say, we want more data
2 because it looks like there is a potential synergy on
3 some taxa, therefore we want to see if this is also
4 synergistic to potential non-target insects and fish and
5 mammals?
6 And what about if you don't find evidence of
7 synergy, but, in fact, it may happen in the field for
8 these things that no data was presented to the Patent
9 Office? I don't know if that makes sense, but it's sort
10 of like outside the Venn diagram circles in my mind.
11 Okay.
12 MS. NESCI: So on your first one, I do have the
13 citation, so I can get that to you and we can send you a
14 highlighted link that shows where our conclusions are
15 coming from, so we'll take care of that.
16 On the second one, we are not intending to
17 extend beyond the species for the -- that -- the species
18 on which the data are based that we get in front of us
19 for the GTA claims.
20 MS. ECHEVERRIA: Yeah, I would just add, we
21 would not make the assumption that any interaction was
22 conserved across taxa, that would not be an appropriate
23 scientific assumption. And so we were really focusing
24 on where we do have evidence that -- and what that
25 evidence tells us and how that impacts the risk

ED_002528_00039557-00164

1 assessment.
2 So to assume that greater interaction for plants
3 would also come up with insects is not supported,
4 understanding the mode of action and how these
5 interactions work from the biology and the toxicology.
6 MS. SELVAGGIO: So you wouldn't ask for
7 additional data, then, in order to fill in the gaps?
8 MS. ECHEVERRIA: Unless we had compelling
9 evidence to make us concerned. So we do evaluate the
10 open literature as part of our routine process, so if
11 there's any information in the open literature or if
12 there's anything that we know about the potential
13 mechanism of interaction that's occurring that would
14 lead us to have a concern, then we would have broad
15 authority to request an additional study, but not as a
16 routine matter.
17 So unless we have that evidence or we have the
18 other scientific rationale to make that determination,
19 we would not be doing it across the board.
20 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. And Damon will be our last
21 comment.
22 MR. REABE: Thanks. Question, is there going to
23 be any modifications to the risk assessment process to
24 account for the multiple passes that would be required
25 if the product as a combined mixture doesn't meet risk

ED_002528_00039557-00165

1 assessment, what the risk would be then from making,
2 say, two or three applications to control the same pests
3 when you separate out those products? Is the risk
4 assessment methodology, is that going to get factored in
5 then?
6 MS. NESCI: So, no, we aren't intending at this
7 point to make any changes to our risk assessment
8 methodology. We're instead adding the process that I've
9 described to date on top of that to look at the patent
10 data to see if there's any need to get additional data
11 or to change our risk assessment conclusions.
12 MR. REABE: Would the EPA consider changing it
13 because it might create additional risk by having to
14 make these separate applications? Right? I mean, we
15 can imagine how now that we have --
16 MS. NESCI: So I think I understand what you're
17 getting at. So in terms of tank mixes, there are some
18 benefits to tank mixes and related to the ecological
19 impact of passes across the field and, of course,
20 resistance development and those sorts of things.
21 So we are not -- I don't think there's any plan
22 to quantitatively consider that, but certainly as part
23 of the FIFRA evaluation process, we do consider risks
24 and benefits, so --
25 MR. REABE: That might be -- because there may

ED_002528_00039557-00166

1 be some unintended consequences that may come from this.
2 Thank you.
3 MS. NESCI: Yeah. Thank you.
4 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. Thank you for that. So we
5 are now back on time. So let's reconvene at 3:15 and
6 we'll -- I guess we'll pick up with glyphosate. So,
7 thanks.
8 (Whereupon, there was a recess in the
9 proceedings.)
10 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, so we're going to pick up
11 where we left off from this morning, and so I believe we
12 were -- so Yu-Ting is back, and she has reinforcements.
13 So I guess we'll first address glyphosate. Thank you.
14 So, there's a one-page update in your folders regarding
15 where we are the glyphosate re-evaluation.
16 Oh, sorry, but before we get to glyphosate, so
17 we just got a notice from our building management that
18 there are some cars illegally parked in the spaces
19 reserved for hybrid cars that need charging. So if you
20 inadvertently parked your car in a charging station
21 spot, your car is about to be towed.
22 All right, Yu-Ting is pulling it up. They
23 usually provide us license plate numbers. You know, if
24 you drag it out. All right, so the first one looks like
25 a black Honda with a Maryland tag 9DJJ22. No, but it's

ED_002528_00039557-00167

1 parked -- it's actually not only that, it's actually
2 parked in an illegal spot. So how do I advance it? Oh,
3 right here?
4 Yeah, but it's parked illegally, too. Virginia
5 tags -- it's not plugged in -- BMW, ZTZ8207. Apparently
6 that's an OPP car, never mind. Oh, and then there's
7 another BMW, a black BMW with no front tag. So that's
8 probably a Virginia car. All right, well, good luck. I
9 can't stall you out anymore.
10 So any questions on the glyphosate update that
11 we provided in the folders? Jay?
12 MR. VROOM: So I just wanted to observe that of
13 the three categories of active ingredients that were
14 listed under 5C, this one probably is the one that has
15 the most global reach. The other two are more confined
16 to U.S. regulatory focus, and we are supportive and
17 complimentary of the agency's work in this space, both
18 domestically and internationally, and I think that the
19 work that you began in 2009 with regard to the
20 re-evaluation of the product is moving forward and we
21 look forward to the next risk assessment.
22 MR. KEIGWIN: Other questions/comments on
23 glyphosate?
24 (No response.)
25 MR. KEIGWIN: So the next one we have is the

ED_002528_00039557-00168

1 neonicotinoids and the status update there.
2 (No response.)
3 MR. KEIGWIN: No comment? Cynthia?
4 MS. PALMER: Is there something missing where it
5 says -- the bullet right in the middle, "Potential
6 on-field risk from some use patterns, includes foliar
7 uses," it doesn't say if it's low or high, I assume
8 that's a high. I'm using the website version. Is
9 there -- the sentence is just dropped off.
10 MR. ANDERSON: I'm Neil Anderson from the
11 Pesticide Re-evaluation Division. And no, there isn't
12 missing words there. That's simply how we meant to
13 present it.
14 MS. PALMER: Okay. And then for later on it
15 mentions "draft benefits assessments." Is -- can we
16 look forward to the benefit assessment for treated corn
17 seeds? Is that part of it?
18 MR. ANDERSON: Those -- that will not be one of
19 the assessments that's being -- benefits assessments
20 that's being released for public review here in the very
21 near future. It's possible that some benefits work on
22 corn and perhaps the treated seed element for corn will
23 be done at some time in the future, as we move closer to
24 the planned activity in mid-2018, when we expect to
25 release the proposed interim decision. So there will

ED_002528_00039557-00169

1 probably be a fair amount of benefits documents at that
2 time.
3 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. If there's nothing else on
4 the neonics? Thanks, Neil and Dana and Eugene.
5 The next one we have in your package is an
6 update on where we are with acute animal testing
7 alternatives. Dr. Anna Lowit is here if there are
8 questions on that effort. And I thought I saw Garland
9 [phonetic] around at one point, too.
10 Sorry, Pat.
11 MS. BISHOP: I have two things. I have a
12 comment that this is some really great work that's going
13 on that OPP as well as NICEATM exam, you know, I think
14 you're making some really excellent progress here on
15 this issue. And my only question, and I think I forgot
16 to ask you yesterday, Anna, is the fact that the final
17 dermal tox waiver came out. There was also a draft, I
18 think, about a year or a year and a half ago. Have you
19 received any requests for waivers on this yet?
20 DR. LOWIT: So, yes, that document did go
21 final just November of last year, so it is final, and we
22 have received a relatively small number. You have to
23 remember, there's a lag time that's sort of built in
24 here, and generally companies will have done the studies
25 that they would submit to us one, two, three, even four

ED_002528_00039557-00170

1 years in advance of them submitting to us.
2 So there's a time by which the policy will
3 have been finalized, and companies will already have in
4 existence their in vivo studies. So although the number
5 that we're seeing is relatively small, over the next
6 year to two years it should incrementally start to
7 increase.
8 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. Anyone else for that one?
9 (No response.)
10 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, thanks. So the next one
11 we have is resistance management. Wynne -- so Wynne
12 Miller and Bill Chism and Nikal Mallampalli and maybe
13 Skee Jones, too, are coming up. So we just finalized
14 two pesticide registration notices after taking public
15 comment. And the paper outlines our path forward for
16 implementing those two notices. Comments? Questions?
17 Cynthia.
18 MS. PALMER: Thank you. I just had two
19 questions. One, I may show my ignorance, it says no new
20 herbicide mechanism of action has been developed in the
21 last 30 years. I'm curious why not.
22 And, second, in the very last line of the
23 memo, it says that herbicide products labeled for use by
24 the general consumer, such as residential products, are
25 not included in this development of herbicide resistance

ED_002528_00039557-00171

1 measures for end-use products. So I'm wondering why are
2 the consumer uses not part of that.
3 MR. CHISM: Thank you. I'm Bill Chism from
4 the Biological and Economic Analysis Division. We
5 presented the PRN before, we've gotten some really great
6 feedback from some of the groups here, and I wanted to
7 thank everybody.
8 The first question, why no new mode of action
9 in the last 30 years, I'm totally not competent to
10 answer that. Finding and discovering a new mode of
11 action is kind of an art, kind of luck, kind of a whole
12 bunch of mergers and different things, and if it doesn't
13 happen, it just doesn't happen. So I think possibly the
14 registrants could help you with that. I don't know.
15 But your second question is why didn't we
16 include homeowner products. When we look at -- and
17 there's a really nice website that looks at all the
18 herbicide-resistant weeds worldwide -- when we look at
19 use sites, homeowner sites don't come up very often, and
20 we thought the things we were asking were pretty
21 technical, would be very difficult, and we thought the
22 risk of resistance was very low.
23 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Andrew.
24 MR. THOSTENSON: I notice most of the work
25 that's been done more recently in the herbicide arena.

ED_002528_00039557-00172

1 Unfortunately this year in North Dakota and Minnesota we
2 are suffering some very significant reverses in both
3 fungicide and insecticide resistance. One of them will
4 result in a dramatic increase in the amount of
5 chlorpyrifos we use to control soybean aphids in our
6 state because our conventional pyrethroids have
7 demonstrated significant failure to control these
8 soybean aphids.
9 So I'm wondering what sorts of plans you all
10 have to really start grappling with that on the same
11 level that you have been with the herbicides.
12 MS. MALLAMPALLI: My name is Mikal
13 Mallampalli. I work with Bill in the same division.
14 And the labeling PRN right now, the labeling PR notice
15 addresses the insecticides. Then it -- our intention is
16 to develop internal policy documents to help make sure
17 that staff include that guidance in registration review
18 and new registration actions.
19 We aren't at this time proposing to ask for
20 the additional detail, product stewardship of the type
21 that the herbicide PRN talks about at this point, but
22 going forward, we might explore incorporating that into
23 the insecticides and fungicides.
24 Now, as far as giving you other tools to -- of
25 new modes of action to combat resistance that's already

ED_002528_00039557-00173

1 going on, I mean, that faces the same situation as
2 herbicide modes of action as new discoveries go. We --
3 the registrants do that, so I don't know if that helps
4 answer it.
5 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Jay.
6 MR. VROOM: Yeah, so, I would guess that maybe
7 with respect to the kind of insecticide resistance that
8 you're describing in a market like yours for soybeans
9 there are other modes of action, newer chemistries that
10 haven't been labeled for soybeans because it's a fairly
11 unusual event for most or a lot of the soybean crop that
12 needed insecticide treatments at all.
13 And, so, as you discover those kinds of
14 challenges, if you're in communication with the
15 industry, particularly those that have other modes of
16 action registered for other crops, I'm sure they'll be a
17 receptive audience to talk about those kinds of
18 opportunities.
19 With respect to the fact that there's been
20 nothing discovered and brought to market in terms of a
21 clearly new mode of action, it's because all the
22 easy-to-discover things have been discovered, but that
23 doesn't mean that companies aren't continuing to invest
24 in discovery research, looking for that next new
25 broad-acre application mode of action. There have been

ED_002528_00039557-00174

1 a few that have been discovered and brought in the '90s,
2 all the way up through potential registration, and
3 denied because of risk effects that were determined to
4 be unacceptable based on the standard in the law.
5 And, lastly, there have been analogs of
6 original modes of action that do change the performance
7 and environmental and effectiveness benefits. So I
8 think you need to look a little closer at some of the
9 rediscoveries and slight changes in molecules that have
10 been accomplished for things like I know metolachor went
11 through a process like that and actually qualified for a
12 new patent on a new analog of an original molecule.
13 So I think there is continuous innovation. It
14 may not look like the blockbusters of the past, but
15 continuous improvement is certainly a commitment for the
16 members of CropLife, and I'm sure that we look forward
17 to working with a lot of other stakeholders in that
18 regard.
19 MR. KEIGWIN: Any other comments on the
20 resistance management work? Charlotte.
21 MS. SANSON: Yeah, so, I know a lot of
22 comments were submitted on this, and I guess one of the
23 concerns that I have has to do with what you might call
24 false reporting and how you're going to manage through
25 that. For example, if, you know, a 682 is submitted

ED_002528_00039557-00175

1 because of suspected resistance but then the testing is
2 done to indicate, oh, it really actually is not
3 resistant, how do you go back and correct the record, if
4 that makes sense.
5 MR. CHISM: No, that's a great question. For
6 the herbicide/pesticide registration notice, we ask for
7 reporting of suspected resistance and also reporting of
8 confirmed. And our intention is that -- excuse me -- in
9 a couple instances, it took five years to confirm
10 resistance. And, so, we would like to be able to get
11 that information out to the user community that we're
12 not sure yet, but we potentially have resistance here.
13 And the intent is always to get the confirmation. But
14 in some cases, it takes a number of years. And we look
15 at that as a golden opportunity. That's when it's only
16 a few acres impacted. We can maybe have a real chance
17 to control these pests.
18 MR. KEIGWIN: All right. Thank you.
19 So the next update we had was dealing with
20 some labeling issues. So Michelle Arling and Patricia
21 Parrott are going to come up to answer any questions you
22 have about web-distributed label or the SmartLabel
23 efforts.
24 All right, so Preston, then Jim.
25 Charlotte, I don't know if you're up for this

ED_002528_00039557-00176

1 one. Is your tent up for...okay. So Preston, then Jim.
2 MR. PECK: Thank you. So this project is also
3 -- it's not only for registrants but also for
4 applicators as well to access information regarding a
5 label; is that correct? The Smart Label project?
6 MS. PARROTT: For the Smart Label project,
7 ultimately it will be made available to the public as a,
8 you know, structured data information. At this time,
9 we're just finishing up the builder. We have the label
10 information coming in in a structured format. The
11 actual label as they're printed, all that flexibility
12 will remain there.
13 Eventually, it will be made in a searchable
14 database to the public. That's going to be a little
15 while down the road. I think preliminarily the early
16 adopters were -- didn't want the information made public
17 until everyone was there, thinking that it would give
18 some kind of advantage or disadvantage to them,
19 market-wise, to be able to search their labels to find
20 (inaudible) or something. So to make it an even playing
21 field eventually it will be level.
22 But, ultimately, it could supplement what --
23 for the applicators and things what is envisioned with
24 the web-distributed labeling where you would go for
25 specific application on a crop and get that information,

ED_002528_00039557-00177

1 but for now, web-distributed labeling will do that.
2 MR. PECK: Okay. Is there -- a followup
3 question. Is there anything being done to proactively
4 think about various languages, access from various
5 languages?
6 MS. PARROTT: At this time, we have -- we have
7 it in English, and then we do have our sections that we
8 have our Spanish labeling pilot that has been going on
9 for certain phrases that are in Spanish as far -- that's
10 as far as we've gotten right now.
11 MR. PECK: Okay. Well, I just -- upon reading
12 it, but just at first glance, I don't know too much
13 about it. It looks like a fantastic opportunity to
14 address that issue that I know is of great concern of
15 many people that not only work with Spanish-speaking but
16 indigenous-speaking communities, Haitian-Creole as well,
17 just seems like if that's the future, then that's a
18 great opportunity to do it right.
19 MS. PARROTT: Good point. Thank you.
20 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Jim, then Cynthia.
21 MR. FREDERICKS: Thanks, and I just first of
22 all just want to commend the agency on their efforts to
23 try to make labels more clear, simpler, modernize
24 labels, because from an applicator's point of view,
25 labels can be a real bear sometimes. And ensuring that

ED_002528_00039557-00178

1 folks are reading the label and following the label is
2 critical. And, so, you know, we appreciate that and we
3 obviously believe that, you know, smart labeling and
4 web-distributed labeling can -- you know, is a means to
5 that end. And we look forward to it.
6 One of the things that stood out in the note
7 was that I guess the PRNs from 2014 and as of October of
8 this year, there's still no -- there's no approved
9 product labels for web-distributed labeling. So my
10 question is is that because of a lack of applicants or
11 applications for that, or is that due to some sort of,
12 you know, a hangup in the system.
13 MS. ARLING: Thanks, Jim. I'm Michelle Arling
14 from the Office of Pesticide Programs, and I worked on
15 the web-distributed labeling, basically since its
16 inception. We've had a lot of conversations with
17 registrants that have expressed an interest in
18 web-distributed labeling, but for various reasons, no
19 one has jumped at the gun to rush in to be the first
20 applicant.
21 So I think part of it is waiting for smart
22 labeling to get fully implemented so that registrants do
23 have those structured, searchable databases that then
24 they could use to develop web-distributed labeling and
25 make it available to users. And then there's the

ED_002528_00039557-00179

1 hesitance to be the first one to try anything new. So
2 it's not a lack of EPA's approving applications. We
3 just haven't gotten any in.
4 MR. FREDERICKS: For the record, I wasn't
5 accusing you of that.
6 MS. ARLING: No, no, that's okay.
7 MR. FREDERICKS: I was -- I was really just
8 curious.
9 MS. ARLING: Yes.
10 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Cynthia, then Aaron, then
11 Charlotte.
12 MS. PALMER: So I'm pleased that one of the
13 expected benefits would be quicker implementation of
14 public health and environmental protective measures, and
15 that makes me think about incident reporting. And I'm
16 just wondering whether if this new electronic system
17 might be combined with the electronic portal and
18 database on incident reporting and the great work
19 started by Rich Dumas and Melissa Panger.
20 MS. PARROTT: The way that this is being smart
21 labeled and ultimately web-distributed labeling is the
22 first step in a fully integrated digital system for the
23 agency. So the SmartLabel and the e-CSF -- electronic
24 composition statement of formulation -- are going to be
25 launched through the portal, needless to say at the same

ED_002528_00039557-00180

1 time, sometime in 2018. And the back-end database is
2 being built to accommodate both of those in the hopes to
3 integrate all of our reporting systems. And I think the
4 vision right now is to use the CDX portal as the way to
5 get information exchange into the agency from
6 registrants and others. So ultimately I think that is
7 the vision.
8 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Aaron, then Charlotte.
9 MR. HOBBS: Great. Thank you. So, first, I
10 know a lot of good work has gone into the SmartLabel
11 pilot, work by the agency, as well as work by members of
12 the registrant community. And while that work has been
13 diligent, I am aware that there's a lot of work that
14 remains for that to really be show-ready, and that as I
15 understand it that program is far from complete. And
16 with it being far from complete, that probably puts a
17 little damper on the ability to do web-distributed
18 labeling.
19 So could you speak a little bit to -- a little
20 more details about how we get from a very well executed
21 pilot and then bridge that with what can be a
22 significant gap between a successful pilot and a
23 ready-to-use program.
24 MS. PARROTT: So right now we are finishing up
25 -- or we got the contract and we're finishing up with

ED_002528_00039557-00181

1 the input that we got from the third phase of the pilot.
2 We are going to engage our pilot participants one more
3 time before we roll out the builder. All of the
4 information so far has been made publicly available
5 through the website. We also have a mailbox for
6 comments. So we will still anticipate having it out for
7 voluntary use in the next year.
8 There will be a learning curve, and I think
9 some people -- you know, those that have been
10 participating and asking questions along have an idea of
11 what it will look like. We have built out the builder
12 to greater extent than originally I think we thought we
13 were. It has taken some extra time, but I think that
14 the effort that's gone into it has been well worth it to
15 give a product that we'll be pleased with.
16 Now, as far as, like, the full implementation
17 and vision, yes, it's going to be a work in progress,
18 and this will be a first phase to getting it perfected,
19 but we do hope to have it launched for voluntary use in
20 the next year. Does that answer your question?
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Charlotte.
22 MS. SANSON: So following up on the SmartLabel
23 pilot, and then just a suggestion that perhaps looking
24 at a pilot that would -- that would -- that would focus
25 on the different types of labels, like, you know,

ED_002528_00039557-00182

1 conventionals verus antimicrobials and, you know,
2 biological consumer labels, because all those type of
3 labels are fairly different from one another. So maybe
4 segregating the pilot in those areas, and maybe you can
5 speak to that if you've already considered that. I have
6 other questions, too, but I'll let you answer that one
7 first.
8 MS. PARROTT: Yes, we did. So when we
9 initiated it in the summer of 2014, we solicited
10 partners from the different registrants to represent
11 kind of a cross-section of the industry, so
12 conventionals for ag products, also lawn and garden,
13 microbial and biochemical in the agriculture and in the
14 mosquito and larvicide products, antimicrobial
15 pesticides for hospital disinfectants, wood
16 preservatives, and pool products. And so all those are
17 represented.
18 MS. SANSON: Do we look at a separate pilot
19 for each of those types or --
20 MS. PARROTT: No, we're doing it together, so
21 the idea was that we would have one -- one builder and
22 one set of requirements, but then you could go to the
23 areas that pertain to your specific products, and you
24 could hide the rest. So rather than have separate areas
25 for separate registrants, have it all in one place.

ED_002528_00039557-00183

1 MS. SANSON: Okay. And I'd like to respond to
2 the question on implementation with the web-distributed
3 labeling. And I think maybe there are still some
4 implementation concerns with that, and I think we'd like
5 to know the status of where the states are in terms of
6 acceptance of web-distributed labeling because I've
7 heard enforcement -- concerns with enforcement and
8 having one -- you know, be easier if there was one
9 website for the states to go to rather than, you know,
10 several individual ones. So I'm -- if Liza or, I don't
11 know who can answer that, but it would be helpful to
12 know.
13 MR. KEIGWIN: Liza, if you've got an answer.
14 MS. TROSSBACH: Sure, sure. State lead
15 agencies have been aware of this effort, you know, since
16 the getgo. And some of our concerns from the very
17 beginning, one was the availability of the information
18 to users, so our concern was that while I think we all
19 certainly support the availability of information via
20 the website, we were concerned that it still needed to
21 be provided to the user on the container. You know,
22 there are many areas where there's not ready access to
23 the internet or to something like that. So that was one
24 concern or one thing that we wanted addressed.
25 Another was with web-distributed labeling and

ED_002528_00039557-00184

1 having certain versions that would be good for a certain
2 period of time and with that back-door access for state
3 lead agencies if there were enforcement situations, if
4 we had to do an inspection or investigation to be able
5 to determine what label was enforced or, you know, in
6 place at that particular time. So that was another.
7 I think that states certainly support this
8 idea of making labels more easy to read. I mean, some
9 of your labels are huge, and there is some -- I think
10 there is some validity in an applicator only having to
11 read what they need to read, so if you're applying to --
12 I'll just use corn as an example, you get the
13 information for corn. But from a state lead agency
14 perspective, are you getting all the information
15 including corn versus just corn. So are you still
16 getting all the use directions, you're still getting all
17 of the environmental hazards and those types of things.
18 So I think states will -- are willing to
19 accept web-distributed labeling, as long as that
20 information is available to any user, whether it's on
21 the container or via the web, as long as it's available
22 to them.
23 MS. ARLING: And just from EPA's perspective,
24 we have engaged the states throughout the process, and
25 we do plan to work really closely with states once we do

ED_002528_00039557-00185

1 get applications in to make sure that everyone's
2 comfortable with the way that we're proposing to issue a
3 web-distributed labeling.
4 MS. SANSON: Okay, great. I appreciate all
5 the feedback. And then just one more, and that has to
6 do with supplemental labels and if you can clarify the
7 process for supplemental labels via web-distributed
8 labeling if you've thought about that.
9 MS. ARLING: So I think right now they're
10 separate processes, and because web-distributed labeling
11 is right now a fully voluntary process, they'll stay
12 separate. The hope is that we can move away from
13 supplemental labels and have updated labeling provided
14 via web updates that are linked to the container of the
15 product.
16 MR. KEIGWIN: Anything else on the labeling
17 efforts?
18 (No response.)
19 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. Thanks.
20 And then there was cannabis. Nicole Zinn.
21 You don't want in on that one, Aaron?
22 Nina does.
23 MS. WILSON: I have a question for a friend of
24 mine.
25 (Laughter.)

ED_002528_00039557-00186

1 MS. WILSON: Actually since you know that
2 biological products are often exempt, but not always,
3 from tolerances, and I understand the distinction
4 between a 25(b) and it's 24(c) for an exempt product,
5 but I'd be interested in a little bit of that discussion
6 about how that -- those statements came about.
7 MS. ZINN: So EPA does not register 25(b)
8 products, so 25(b) products are not prohibited from
9 having -- we don't evaluate them, we don't register them
10 -- so they're not prohibited from having cannabis on the
11 label or being used for cannabis. However, we do
12 register products that are tolerance-exempt in the
13 Biological and Pesticide Pollution Prevention Division
14 or other divisions, and so that is where, you know, it
15 will become a federal action to register that product
16 and approve it. And because cannabis is a federally
17 illegal crop, that is where we start to have some
18 difficulty.
19 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay.
20 MS. PALMER: So maybe this is the obvious
21 question, but since no one else is asking it, so since
22 EPA disapproves of the special local needs registration,
23 so where does this leave cannabis production? Does it
24 all go organic, or do they now use the product
25 illegally? Or I'm not sure where this leads us.

ED_002528_00039557-00187

1 MS. ZINN: Okay, so there -- the states have
2 legalized cannabis within their states. And there are a
3 variety of things that are being done within the states.
4 First of all, 25(b)s, as I mentioned, are not
5 prohibited. So I think some growers are using 25(b)
6 products. We are aware that some states have developed
7 lists of products that are not -- they do not consider
8 to be illegal to use. And each state has different
9 criteria for those lists, and they would be on like a
10 state website.
11 We know that some of these lists exist, but we
12 have not reviewed those lists. And I think those are
13 the two primary ways that people are using pesticides.
14 And then I think you're probably right, there are other
15 cases where growers are probably using things that are
16 not legal.
17 MR. KEIGWIN: All right, Preston.
18 MR. PECK: You kind of touched on my question,
19 and I just want clarity. So if someone were to use a
20 product on, like, starting industrial hemp projects in
21 North Carolina and they use a product that isn't 25(b),
22 would that be an off-label use of that product?
23 MS. ZINN: In most cases, yes.
24 MR. PECK: And, so, therefore, would the state
25 lead agency have to step in or would that be EPA? I'm

ED_002528_00039557-00188

1 trying to wrap my head around this --
2 MS. ZINN: I'm sorry, I'm trying to understand
3 what you're asking.
4 MR. PECK: So I'm asking if someone were to
5 use a product in an industrial hemp operation or somehow
6 this product that's not for cannabis was to be used,
7 that would be an off-label use, and would the state
8 department of ag, or in North Carolina's case, the North
9 Carolina State Department of Agriculture, step in and
10 say you've committed a label violation?
11 MS. ZINN: Yes. Usually yes.
12 MR. KEIGWIN: So the states have primacy for
13 use violations.
14 MS. ZINN: Yes.
15 MR. PECK: Right, so that would be the state,
16 okay.
17 MS. ZINN: Yes.
18 MR. PECK: Thank you.
19 MR. KEIGWIN: Anyone else?
20 (No response.)
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Do you want to run before...
22 That's the easiest Nicole has ever had to do
23 on this topic. So, all right, thanks.
24 Okay, so, our last topic for the day is an
25 update on PRIA. So Steve Schaible, who is our newly

ED_002528_00039557-00189

1 appointed PRIA coordinator for the Office of Pesticide
2 Programs will come up and give us an update.
3 MR. SCHAIBLE: Good afternoon, everyone. So
4 I'm going to talk a little about PRIA, and currently we
5 are under PRIA 3 still. The PRIA 3 expiration date was
6 September 30th, but the continuing resolution extended
7 it through December 8th. And, so, we'll talk about sort
8 of PRIA as it currently exists, as well as the effort to
9 reauthorize PRIA that is ongoing. And then after that
10 I'll just be talking about some of the metrics,
11 performance metrics for the last fiscal year for PRIA.
12 Okay, so PRIA 4 is the reauthorization
13 legislation that is currently gone through Congress. As
14 I said before, PRIA 3 had an expiration date of
15 September; that passed. It was extended by the
16 continuing resolution. So as far as PRIA 4 goes, the
17 bill that was -- the EPA assisted in the development of
18 with the PRIA coalition was for a seven-year
19 reauthorization, and that version was passed by the
20 House of Representatives by unanimous consent back in
21 March.
22 It then went on to the Senate, and the Senate
23 amended that bill to be a three-year extension of the
24 PRIA authority. And that passed out of committee in
25 June. That bill is awaiting vote by the full Senate at

ED_002528_00039557-00190

1 this point in time.
2 If that bill was passed by the Senate, that
3 amended bill would need to go back to the House to
4 reconcile the differences between those two bills. And
5 at that point in time it would proceed to the President
6 for signature.
7 So we can talk about, then, what are the
8 provisions of that bill. I just want to go through
9 quickly on this because I want to spend more time
10 focusing on PRIA 3 and our accomplishments. But very
11 quickly, if that bill were to go through and be passed
12 into law, there are -- the maintenance fee authority
13 would be extended, and there are some wrinkles to that.
14 Currently, it's at $27.8 million per year for
15 collections for maintenance fees. The proposal is to
16 raise that to $31 million per year.
17 Likewise, currently EPA is not able to average
18 across years, so if we undercollect or overcollect
19 within a given year, we can't offset that in the years
20 advancing. You just sort of take what you got that
21 year. We have a formula where we attempt to estimate
22 what the fee for registrants should be, and it's taking
23 into account, you know, the number of products that are
24 currently registered, you know, how many small business
25 waivers we anticipate might be submitted, and sometimes

ED_002528_00039557-00191

1 that formula doesn't end up with the outcomes that we
2 project.
3 So PRIA 4 would allow averaging across years
4 to account for that over or undercollection within the
5 authorization period. Likewise, PRIA 4 has some
6 language which eliminates a longstanding provision from
7 FIFRA that requires for every maintenance dollar which
8 is spent, an appropriated dollar must first be spent.
9 And over time under PRIA 3, we've seen our appropriated
10 dollars get smaller and smaller, and that has had an
11 impact on our ability to spend maintenance fee dollars.
12 And, so, there's a provision in PRIA 4 which removes
13 that constraint.
14 Continuing with maintenance fees, in PRIA 3,
15 currently there is an IT set-aside that allows for
16 activities -- specified activities for EPA to use
17 maintenance fee dollars towards. I think one of the big
18 ones is developing a tracking system where applicants
19 can be looking at their applications as they move
20 through the agency, but there's others as well.
21 There's endangered species database
22 development; there's conditional registration; the
23 ability to look at sort of how EPA is receiving and
24 reviewing data that were required under conditional
25 registration.

ED_002528_00039557-00192

1 That IT set-aside is going to be replaced with
2 a new set-aside, at $500,000 per year. And, so, again,
3 there's a seven-year version and a three-year version.
4 And, so, depending on what version you end up with, that
5 protects your overall dollars that are collected and put
6 towards that.
7 But that set-aside is developed and finalized
8 rulemaking and guidance for product performance data
9 requirements for certain invertebrate pests of
10 significant public importance. So these are public
11 health pests. And, likewise, it establishes a mandatory
12 schedule for the EPA to develop the guidance and then
13 the rulemaking on that guidance as needed for those
14 pests.
15 It also creates a separate set-aside of
16 $500,000 per year for good laboratory practices
17 inspections. And these funds would be collected under
18 PRIA and would be then shared with our Office of
19 Enforcement and Compliance Assurance, hire additional
20 inspectors -- inspectors to conduct those inspections.
21 Okay, and now I'm going to move on to the PRIA
22 registration service piece side of PRIA 4. PRIA 4
23 extends the existing set-asides for worker protection,
24 partnership grants, and pesticide safety education
25 programs and further emphasizes that those activities

ED_002528_00039557-00193

1 shall focus on fieldworker populations in the United
2 States. It also directs EPA to look for opportunities
3 to streamline review processes for new chemicals and new
4 use applications and to provide feedback to applicants
5 during that process.
6 And, so, this is overall when new uses and new
7 chemicals, in particular, tend to -- our decisions tend
8 to occur in time frames that are longer than the
9 mandated time frames under PRIA. And there's a lot of
10 reasons for that, and we will be looking at ways in
11 which we can expedite our review for those types of
12 applications.
13 As with PRIA 3, PRIA 4 has reporting
14 requirements and it extends the existing requirements
15 and expands upon them. So reg review reporting
16 requirements currently have a lot more to do with your
17 preliminary work plans and sort of the beginning stages
18 of reg review. PRIA 4 has language that starts
19 reporting out on some of the later stages of reg review
20 and what is our performance for those cases further down
21 the road.
22 It talks about we have to report on meeting
23 mandatory schedules and developing those efficacy
24 guidelines I spoke of earlier. There's time frames that
25 are specified, and those time frames differ between the

ED_002528_00039557-00194

1 two different versions, but EPA is to complete those
2 activities in certain time frames, and we'll be
3 reporting out on that and our progress in doing that.
4 The progress and the review and approval of
5 the new pesticides to control vector-borne public health
6 use -- to control the pests that vector public health
7 diseases in the United States. And this includes
8 territories and military bases globally.
9 There's another requirement for, again, the
10 number of GLP inspections which are conducted. There is
11 a new category for design for the environment amendments
12 to labels, and we will be reporting out on how many of
13 those we approve, and then the existing requirement for
14 worker protection partnership grants and pesticide
15 safety education, how those funds are being used.
16 But additionally to that, there's also
17 language on reporting out on the effectiveness of those
18 activities and EPA's engagement with stakeholders around
19 those activities.
20 Okay, so, PRIA 3 has currently 189 fee
21 categories. There was an effort going into PRIA 4 to
22 look at where we could consolidate categories, eliminate
23 categories, and then, of course, we also added
24 categories because that's what usually happens. So we
25 went from 189 up to 212, and I just want to hit on some

ED_002528_00039557-00195

1 of the highlights around these.
2 In general, there is an effort to better align
3 fees and time frames with increasing increments of
4 activities received and work done. And, so, for the
5 inert ingredients, we lowered time frames, raised time
6 frames, increased and decreased fees. The inert
7 ingredient categories were new to PRIA 3. I think
8 having five years under our belt we have a much better
9 understanding of what are the time frames and resources
10 that go into those types of reviews. And I think that
11 the proposed changes to those fees and time frames
12 reflect that, that knowledge that we've gained.
13 For the efficacy data and public health
14 efficacy data and review, these are disinfectants, these
15 are antimicrobials where there's organisms involved.
16 These are public health pests and bio-pesticide in the
17 conventional realm. We've created new categories where
18 if you're asking for additional organisms and additional
19 target public health pests that there are differing
20 categories. Increase in categories are incremental
21 increases in categories and/or fees as your number of
22 pests or organisms get higher.
23 There was a desire expressed for a category to
24 provide incentive for U.S. harmonization of existing
25 tolerances with international MRLs, CODEX MRLs. And,

ED_002528_00039557-00196

1 so, amended an existing category, the R292 category, to
2 allow for a one-time -- you know, any tolerances -- U.S.
3 tolerances that existed that were not in align with
4 MRLs, you can come in under that category and harmonize
5 all of your tolerances for your chemical.
6 There was an OIG audit of the conventional
7 reduced risk program a while ago and found that there
8 needed to be additional incentive provided for
9 participation in that program. And one of the
10 recommendations from our OIG was to provide a fee
11 differential in addition to the time frame differential
12 for reduced risk actions. And, so, the new -- the
13 pending legislation provides an incentive by increasing
14 the fee amounts for new chemical and new use categories
15 where there's an analogous reduced risk category. And
16 that would be a 20 percent increase.
17 There are new categories to better align
18 antimicrobial categories to be consistent with the Part
19 158W revisions that happened a few years ago, and in
20 that realm, there are much fewer categories under PRIA 4
21 than there were under PRIA 3. There was consolidation
22 there. There's new PIP categories being added, and PIP
23 is a plant-incorporated pesticide, I believe. So
24 there's new PIP categories.
25 On the inert front, there were no categories

ED_002528_00039557-00197

1 for safeners, and safeners are inert ingredients, but
2 the data set required for safeners resembles much more
3 so a new active ingredient. And we were finding that we
4 were not able to complete those applications in near the
5 time frame specified under the existing categories, nor
6 were we getting money that any -- in any way aligned
7 with the work that we were putting into this. There's a
8 whole slew of safener categories that are being
9 proposed.
10 And, then, finally, in Table 19, which is the
11 miscellaneous table, there are a number of new proposed
12 categories requested by stakeholders. One is for
13 non-FIFRA determinations. These are device
14 determinations, treated article exemptions, minimum risk
15 determinations. These are activities that currently
16 exist outside of PRIA but for which I don't -- my
17 understanding there isn't a set time frame. And I think
18 there was a desire that for a fee there could be a time
19 frame for that type of product being produced by the
20 EPA.
21 Again, I mentioned before, there's design for
22 the environment amendments where for a pesticide product
23 you can amend your label for the design -- for the
24 environments for pesticide product logo. And, finally,
25 this last one, there's a conditional ruling on

ED_002528_00039557-00198

1 pre-application substantial similarity findings. And,
2 so, right now, if you have a new product that you're
3 claiming to be me-too or substantially similar to
4 another product, you submit your application, it goes to
5 the similarity clinic, at the front end of the process,
6 as part of our preliminary technical screen review, and
7 if it's found to not be substantially similar, you get
8 another bite at that apple. And if you don't come up
9 with another product, then it gets kicked out under the
10 screen.
11 And, so, I think in the registrant community,
12 there was a desire of some to be able to know up-front
13 whether or not the agency was inclined to think that
14 there was a favorable argument to be made around
15 similarity. That gives you greater certain when you
16 submit the application itself of a time frame for an EPA
17 decision.
18 In terms of fees collected in Fiscal Year '17,
19 on the PRIA side, we collected $18.265 million. This is
20 higher than we have in the previous few years. And on
21 the maintenance fee side, we collected $27.99 million,
22 and so $27.8 is our target, that's what we were shooting
23 for. So as you can see, sometimes you collect slightly
24 over and under, and, again, there's not a way that we
25 can know until we actually receive all the small

ED_002528_00039557-00199

1 business waivers, weigh in on them, and receive the
2 fees.
3 Okay, moving on to some of the summary
4 statistics. So I apologize if these are a little small,
5 but so light blue bars are for the number of submitted
6 primary applications, so this is what came in in the
7 last fiscal year. The yellow bars are the number of
8 completed decisions. And these would be primary and
9 secondary decisions. And, so, primary/secondary, just
10 to quickly summarize that, you can submit an
11 application, for instance, for a new chemical or a new
12 use, and there might be a technical product, there might
13 be multiple amendments to end-use products, there might
14 be new products.
15 As long as they're related to each other and
16 share data, they're -- the primary is -- one of them is
17 assigned the primary decision, and the others are the
18 tag-alongs or the secondary. And, so, if you're looking
19 at more accurately what are the number of packages that
20 we receive for a certain request in the use of a new
21 chemical, new product, or otherwise, primary decisions
22 are a more accurate way to count that.
23 And then, finally, the dark blue bar is the
24 number of completed decisions that involved a negotiated
25 due date for the decision. And, so, starting with the

ED_002528_00039557-00200

1 antimicrobials division, we received 300 primary
2 applications in the past year. We completed 338
3 decisions; 282 of those were the primary decisions; and
4 there were 26 of those 338 decisions that involved a
5 negotiation of the due date.
6 For biopesticides, there were 148 decisions
7 received; 163 primary/secondary were completed; 145 of
8 those were primary decisions; and 22 of those 163
9 involved a negotiation of the due date -- one or more
10 negotiations, actually.
11 For conventionals, there were 880 decisions
12 received; 937 decisions were completed, of which 746
13 were primary decisions; and 197 of those 937 were
14 negotiated.
15 For inerts, 55 were received; 42 were
16 completed; and those 42 were all primary decisions; and
17 16 of the 42 involved a negotiation. And just going
18 back to PRIA 4 and adjusting the time frames, I think
19 this is an example of how under PRIA 3 we set some time
20 frames and in some cases they didn't end up being the
21 right amount of time for the work that we were doing.
22 Finally, for the miscellaneous categories, and
23 the bulk of these are going to be gold seal letter
24 requests, there were 562 miscellaneous applications
25 received; 544 were completed; and those 544 were all

ED_002528_00039557-00201

1 primary decisions as well, there were no secondary
2 decisions; and there were no negotiations of the due
3 date for any of those miscellaneous categories.
4 In addition to gold seals, those can also
5 include actions that had to go to HSRB or SAP, new
6 product applications that span the regulatory divisions
7 that had a BPPD element and an RD element. Extension of
8 exclusive use requests were also included in the
9 miscellaneous category.
10 Okay, this next slide speaks about -- it's
11 sort of the different way of presenting information from
12 the previous slide about a negotiated due date. And it
13 gives you a historical perspective. So you can see back
14 -- and it goes back to 2010, and at that point, for
15 antimicrobials we had 35 percent of our completions
16 involved negotiations. For biopesticides, it was 62
17 percent. For conventionals, it was 26 percent.
18 And as you go down through here, this year,
19 you can see we have done exceptionally well on all of
20 our divisions. For antimicrobials, there were 26 of the
21 338 that involved a negotiation. That's 7.7 percent of
22 the completions. For biopesticides, the number was 13.5
23 percent. For conventionals, it was 21 percent;
24 miscellaneous, again, had no negotiations. And for
25 inert, it was 38.1 percent. So this was in terms of

ED_002528_00039557-00202

1 performance around a negotiated due dates, this was a
2 good year for OPP staff in terms of completing these
3 actions.
4 The next slide has to do with late completions
5 or inversely on-time completion rate. For
6 antimicrobials, there was one late completion of all of
7 their actions this last year. For biopesticides, there
8 were two late completions. Conventionals had 12; inerts
9 had two; and there was one late completion on the
10 miscellaneous front. So the range there, I think, were
11 all, you know, above 95 percent, and most of them were
12 at 99 percent or above. So, again, this was a good year
13 compared to our previous years. And I think the last
14 two or three years we've been showing improvement. So
15 this is a good news story for the staff at OPP as well.
16 In the PRIA quarterly stakeholder meetings, a
17 couple of years ago, the request was made to start
18 reporting out on some activities that are non-PRIA but
19 are also of great importance to the community that's
20 submitting applications. And, so, I want to talk a
21 little bit about the non-PRIA fast-track amendments and
22 notifications. For the office, OPP completed 2,302
23 fast-track amendments this last year. At fiscal year's
24 end, there were 1,048 amendments pending. And 521 of
25 those were in backlog status, and for fast-tracks,

ED_002528_00039557-00203

1 that's greater than 90 days.
2 For notifications, OPP completed 2,787
3 notifications in FY17. At the year's end, there were
4 622 notifications pending, and 463 of those were in
5 backlog status, which is greater than 30 days for
6 notifications.
7 Okay, this next slide has to do with our
8 effort to transition to receiving applications
9 electronically. So a while back, we just received
10 things in paper, and then we moved to the point where we
11 were getting things on CD or DVD. And then in 2015, the
12 pesticide submission portal was put out there and made
13 live, and there's been -- there was an update to that, a
14 Phase 2 of the portal that expanded the capability, and
15 then there's going to be a Phase 3 as well. I think
16 some elements in it are already live. It's in stages
17 right now.
18 But I just wanted to talk about sort of the
19 number of submissions we received and what the breakout
20 of those submissions is, paper or CD versus portal. And
21 I think I -- for time's sake, I don't think I'll go
22 through individually. I'll just go through the total,
23 but we received over 12,000 total submissions for the
24 year. 6,500 of those were in paper. 115 of those were
25 on CD or DVD. And 5,705 of those were through the

ED_002528_00039557-00204

1 portal. And, so, the percentages are 53 percent, 1
2 percent, and 46 percent.
3 If you look within the divisions, I think you
4 can see that, you know, antimicrobial applicants are
5 leading the way in terms of submitting electronically
6 and through the portal, but I think everybody is showing
7 progress when we look at sort of the -- when the portal
8 first went live and how the progress we've been making,
9 there has been incremental progress over time,
10 definitely moving away from the CDs and DVDs and moving
11 towards the portal, and the paper submissions have been
12 going down as well.
13 In September, the ability to submit gold seal
14 letters through the portal was implemented, and I think
15 that given the number of gold seals that we get, I think
16 that will -- the next time we report out on this, I
17 think there will be a significant change in these
18 numbers reflecting that the gold seals are coming in
19 through the portal -- or can come in through the portal
20 now. And we encourage you as the registrant community
21 to be submitting those through the portal as well.
22 As I mentioned earlier in this slide, there is
23 a set-aside under PRIA 3 for worker protection
24 activities, and I just wanted to give a quick summary
25 for FY17 and 18 how those grants were awarded. So for

ED_002528_00039557-00205

1 the first grant for worker protection activities is to
2 the Association of Farmworker Opportunity, or AFOP.
3 That's the national farmworker training program, and
4 it's a cooperative agreement for $500,000.
5 AFOP is responsible for developing and
6 administering a pesticide safety training program to
7 support the national network of pesticide safety
8 trainers, providing pesticide worker safety training to
9 migrant and seasonal farmworkers and to their families.
10 And the second grant under the general worker
11 protection is to the Pesticide Educational Resources
12 Collaborative, or PERC. And this is through UC-Davis
13 and the Oregon State Cooperative Agreement. That's,
14 again, for $500,000. This cooperative agreement will
15 develop or coordinate the development of pesticide
16 educational material. An advisory board and EPA will
17 help in setting national priorities.
18 The PERC will use subject matter experts and
19 production professionals. And it focuses on WPS
20 materials -- or will focus on WPS materials in its first
21 year because of the urgent need for training materials
22 with the newly updated regulation. PERC will focus on
23 the certification and training materials in its second
24 year in response to the anticipated changes in
25 categories and needs nationwide.

ED_002528_00039557-00206

1 And the next slide talks about some of the
2 current projects for which that grant money is being
3 applied. And I think for the sake of time I won't go
4 through them individually.
5 Okay, there is also a $500,000 set-aside of
6 PRIA Funds for pesticide safety education program
7 activities, and that went to NPIC, the National
8 Pesticide Information Center. This cooperative
9 agreement facilitates informed decision-making about
10 pesticides and supports the protection of human health
11 and the environment by serving as a bilingual factual
12 source of information for professionals and public
13 audiences on public-related issues.
14 And, lastly, there is a pesticide education
15 program set-aside that went to the eXtension Foundation.
16 This was previously granted, but the grantee did not
17 accept the award. And, so, there was a two-year lag
18 time for that to be re-competed and a new grantee to be
19 awarded. So this is $1,500,000 of money.
20 This establishes a pesticide safety education
21 funds management program to help support state
22 cooperative extension programs, conduct their certified
23 pesticide applicator training activities. And, again,
24 this is the current-year PRIA funds of $500,000 and then
25 the two previous years of unexpended funds.

ED_002528_00039557-00207

1 These are the PRIA points of contact within
2 the Office of Pesticide Programs. So if you have any
3 questions, do feel free to contact the divisional
4 representative, and that's Andrew Bryceland in BPPD;
5 Diane Isbell in AD; RD, Ashwasi Balan [phonetic] is
6 serving in that capacity informally, so you can contact
7 her or you can contact me as well. And at the office
8 level, you're free to contact me.
9 That's it. Are there any questions around
10 PRIA?
11 MR. KEIGWIN: Jay.
12 MR. VROOM: So early in the presentation you
13 referred to the GLP program. Separate from this,
14 there's reports that GLP is being moved out of OECA.
15 Any reports on where it is? Is the truck lost coming
16 across the river?
17 MR. KEIGWIN: So the GLP program currently
18 remains in the Office of Enforcement and Compliance
19 Assurance. In the last administration, there had been
20 plans to transfer those functions to another office
21 within the Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution
22 Prevention. That move has been put on hold for now
23 while we onboard the new team and they can make some
24 choices on things like that. So for now, all the good
25 laboratory practice program activities are continuing to

ED_002528_00039557-00208

1 be run out of OECA.
2 MR. VROOM: Some years ago, we experienced a
3 government shutdown, and PRIA fees got put into a
4 purgatory account. I think it was $800,000. Is that
5 money still in purgatory?
6 MR. SCHAIBLE: It is.
7 MR. VROOM: And it will require the
8 appropriations committees to free it?
9 MR. KEIGWIN: We would need to check with our
10 appropriations law attorneys to get you an answer to
11 that one.
12 MR. VROOM: Thanks.
13 MR. KEIGWIN: Iris?
14 MS. FIGUEROA: Thank you. Just a quick
15 question on the worker protection activities. If you
16 could just give a little bit more detail on sort of the
17 worker voice in that and to what extent workers will be
18 involved, especially in the development of these
19 materials that are listed.
20 MR. KEANEY: The program we have has an
21 advisory board, and it's available for worker advocates
22 to be participating in that and then guide the
23 particular products that are developed over the course
24 of the -- of the cooperative agreement.
25 MR. KEIGWIN: Andrew.

ED_002528_00039557-00209

1 MR. THOSTENSON: Yeah, I would just add that
2 they've created a number of rather high-quality
3 materials that are already available, including a
4 how-to-comply manual, a variety of different posters and
5 websites, videos for training workers and handlers,
6 how-to-train-the-trainer manual. They've been very
7 productive, at least in the agriculture arena that I
8 work in.
9 MR. KEANEY: The AFOP grant, as well, has
10 produced new training flip charts with upgraded graphics
11 and responding to comments we've gotten from folks that
12 have been trained and the trainers as to the
13 effectiveness of the graphics. So we've made
14 adjustments -- or AFOP's made adjustments there and it's
15 very, very -- a very graphically intense presentation,
16 along with the scripting of the training.
17 MR. KEIGWIN: Any other questions? Jay.
18 MR. VROOM: So with PRIA only extended and not
19 reauthorized, what does that do to the money flow to
20 AFOP and PERC?
21 MR. KEANEY: It obviously presents a problem.
22 MR. VROOM: Thank you.
23 MR. KEIGWIN: Amy?
24 MS. LEIBMAN: I just want to encourage the EPA
25 in terms of the cooperative agreements. I think that,

ED_002528_00039557-00210

1 you know, PERC has done a lot of work, and they have
2 tried to -- they have an advisory board, but there's
3 still a feeling among the farmworker advocate community
4 that involvement of workers in the testing of these
5 products and how they're used and their effectiveness
6 still needs some work, and how they, you know, use their
7 funds to gather that information and evaluate it. We
8 would like to see a stronger voice from EPA in the
9 guidance that it gives to its grantees about the worker
10 involvement.
11 MR. KEANEY: All the grants and cooperative
12 agreements, not -- but there's a distinction between a
13 straight-out grant and a cooperative agreement. And,
14 so, there are -- there is interaction from EPA with the
15 -- with the grantees, but obviously we aren't in a
16 position to strongly dictate all that they will do.
17 It's a cooperative agreement, as I said.
18 MS. LEIBMAN: I understand that, but you can
19 design requests for proposals and how you design the
20 cooperative agreement proposals to encourage that and
21 score on that.
22 MR. KEIGWIN: Other comments, questions?
23 (No response.)
24 MR. KEIGWIN: Seeing no tent cards going up,
25 thanks, Steve. Thanks, Kevin.

ED_002528_00039557-00211

1 So we had one person sign up for public
2 comment, so Cindy Smith from Gowan.
3 MS. SMITH: Thank you, Rick. And I just want
4 to share, after listening to the comments this morning
5 on chlorpyrifos I really feel compelled to share maybe
6 the other opinion. So as strongly as I think people
7 feel that the administrator made the wrong decision in
8 denying the petition, I think there are a significant
9 number of people who think the administrator made the
10 right decision for the science side of it.
11 And, so, the frustration, I think, that many
12 of you expressed today is the same frustration that many
13 of us in the registrant and user community felt back in
14 December of 2014 when the human health risk assessment
15 was released and the epi-data, which have been available
16 since 2007, but for legitimate reasons was rejected by
17 EPA for use in the way that it was used in the 2014
18 human health risk assessment was suddenly being used.
19 And, so, I think it isn't a simple issue. It
20 is a complex issue. And I would like to pose that it
21 isn't just about chlorpyrifos. I think it's really
22 about epi-data and use of epi-data. And, so, I think to
23 Nichelle's question about what science needs to be
24 looked at, I believe the answer is that it is -- what's
25 the appropriate use of these specific epi-data.

1 So not all epi-data is the same, right? Some
2 of it is conducted for certain reasons, some for others.
3 In some cases, the data are available and in some cases
4 they aren't. In some cases, they're good exposure
5 metrics. In other cases, there's not. There's epi-data
6 that has been done with exposure to OPs that doesn't
7 show these neurodevelopmental effects. So how do you
8 weigh that in? So I think that's one question that
9 probably deserves some legitimate continued
10 conversation.
11 And then I think the second area is that once
12 you determine that that epidemiology data may be
13 appropriate for use, how do you integrate that with the
14 animal and toxicity -- the animal and human toxicity
15 data that exists for many of these chemicals. So I
16 think it was said that, you know, chlorpyrifos has been
17 used for over 30 years. Many OPs have been used for
18 over 30 years. I would agree. I think, Amy, it was
19 your statement that there's a lot of data that has been
20 generated on these products.
21 And I would say that the available animal and
22 human toxicological data supports that regulating under
23 cholinesterase inhibition is protective. And, so, I
24 think those to me are the two areas that really do
25 warrant some further science review. What are the right

ED_002528_00039557-00213

1 criteria to say that epidemiology data should be used,
2 and once you determine it's usable, how do you integrate
3 it with all that available animal toxicology data that
4 is required to be generated under specific conditions
5 that looks at those exposure metrics and other things
6 that are important?
7 And I guess that the last thing I would say
8 is, you know, I've been in the registrant community for
9 over 20 years. I've dealt with EPA staff on the
10 registration of products through I don't know how many
11 administrations. And I've had products approved; I've
12 had products denied. But I will say that every single
13 staff person that I've dealt with has put first and
14 foremost the protection of human health, and I think
15 particularly the protection of infants and children, and
16 I would say concern about workers.
17 So I'm troubled at the implication that that
18 may not be what's driving their decisions because when I
19 agree with their decisions and when I disagree with
20 their decisions, I have always found them to be based in
21 what they believe the data says is protective of humans
22 and the environment.
23 MR. KEIGWIN: That concludes our day. So
24 thank you all for the very productive discussions today.
25 I think we made some good progress, and we really

ED_002528_00039557-00214

1 appreciate your input. Just a reminder that tomorrow we
2 are starting at 8:30, and I expect an even more lively
3 and robust discussion on the two rules.
4 So have a good evening, and we'll see you
5 tomorrow. Thanks.
6 (Whereupon, the committee meeting was
7 adjourned.)
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

ED_002528_00039557-00215

1 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPTIONIST
2
3 I, Sally Jo Quade, do hereby certify that the
4 foregoing transcription was reduced to typewriting via
5 audiotapes provided to me; that I am neither counsel
6 for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to
7 the action in which these proceedings were transcribed;
8 that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or
9 counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially
10 or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.
11
12
13
14
15 SALLY JO QUADE, CERT
16 Transcriptionist
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

In the Matter of:

United States Environmental Protection Agency

November 1, 2017
Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee Meeting

Condensed Transcript with Word Index

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

1

UNITED STATES
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

PESTICIDE PROGRAM DIALOGUE
COMMITTEE MEETING

DAY ONE - NOVEMBER 1, 2017

Conference Center - Lobby Level
2777 Crystal Drive
One Potomac Yard South
Arlington, Virginia 22202

2

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. KEIGWIN: Is this on? Now it is. Okay. So, we want to welcome you all to the new PPDC, Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee. I see a number of familiar faces, and some new faces around the table as well. So thank you all for joining us.

To kick things off this morning, I first want to introduce Dr. Nancy Beck, who is the Deputy Assistant Administrator for the Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention.

DR. BECK: Great. Good morning. How is everyone? All right. Nice to see you all here. I especially want to welcome the new members of our committee. Stepping up and volunteering is, you know, an awesome thing that public citizens can do, so I appreciate all the time you're going to take, because your engagement will really help us.

I encourage you all to be active and to be very vocal, because the more vocal you are, the better our outcomes will be in the end. And I look forward to the introductions and meeting you all over the next two days.

I also want to welcome members of the public that are here today. Your constructive input is also extremely important to us. It is through your feedback

3

that we're going to learn, we're going to grow, and we're going to ensure that we're putting forth the best regulations to protect public health and the environment, and to also ensure that we're maximizing the benefits of pesticides to ensure appropriate food security, which is very important.

I also want to introduce some other key members of our new team. To the right is Kate Bennett. If you haven't met her yet, she is from our Office of Public Engagement and she has been spending most of her summer with the agricultural community. After me you'll hear a little bit from Jeff Sands, who is our new agricultural advisor working in the Administrator's Office. And I also want to introduce Charlotte Bertrand. There we go. Charlotte is our new acting principal deputy assistant administrator. We stole her from OLEM, because she has a really strong background in risk assessment and program management, so she is an incredible asset to our team. So, thank you, Charlotte.

I'll just give you a little bit about my background, so you can understand where I'm coming from. I came to EPA in May with about 20 years of applied public health experience. I worked at the Washington State Department of Health, so I have a little bit of a northwest bias, and I came to D.C. to be a fellow in the

4

Office of Research and Development, where I worked on looking at how we can incorporate human susceptibility and variability into hazard assessments.

And then after about two years I went to the Office of Management and Budget, where I finally became an official government employee, and I spent about 10 years in the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs. And this was really an eye-opening and amazing experience to be a career staffer on the White House grounds.

One of the many things I learned about is that there's lots of different types of science, right? So there's what I'll call exploratory scientific research, which helps us look at new ideas and hypotheses and helps us view where we should put our future research dollars. This is extremely important research, and I don't want anyone to think that I underestimate its value.

But the other type of research is the scientific research that's robust enough to support a regulation, and this is extremely important research. In these studies, we have to look at them a little bit differently. We need to ensure that they are sound methodology, we need to ensure that they're transparent. We need to understand that they're objective, right?

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

5

1 These studies have to be strong enough to support what
2 could be potentially very expensive and costly
3 regulations, and also regulations that could have
4 extremely high benefits. So it is really important that
5 we get these right, that we get this right, and that
6 these studies be extremely strong.
7 The costs of getting it wrong are just too high.
8 So, as you are aware, in EPA, we get sued quite a bit,
9 and in the Office of Pesticide Programs, we get sued
10 quite a bit. So I don't take this lightly. And so our
11 priorities need to ensure that we follow the rule of law
12 and that we're relying on the strongest scientific
13 evidence to support our decisions.
14 So this is extremely important to the program,
15 and your input on the strength of our studies and our
16 valuations will be critical.
17 Throughout my career, which included working for
18 American businesses and also working for four different
19 Presidential administrations, I think it was Clinton,
20 Bush, Obama and now the Trump administration, I have
21 always worked to make sure that the science and
22 technical assessments that the Government puts out are
23 objective and transparent and sound, and I intend to
24 continue to apply these principles at EPA.
25 There is already a very strong foundation within

6

1 the Office of Pesticide Programs. If you look at the
2 guidance documents and the assessments they release,
3 they're probably some of the best in the Government, if
4 not the best. So I look forward to working with Rick
5 and his staff to continue to ensure that the reputation
6 of this program remains as strong as it is. And this is
7 where you all can help with that.
8 I also want to say, it was an honor to be part
9 of the team that made Rick official in his capacity in
10 September. If you haven't heard, Rick is officially the
11 director of our Office of Pesticide Programs now. So
12 that is a -- I think a great thing for all of us.
13 The other part of the regulatory program that's
14 important is where you all come in, because the
15 decisionmaking, again, I cannot stress the importance of
16 stakeholder engagement. So it is through coordination
17 with you, our state regulatory partners, your engagement
18 on the PPDC, that we can really come to a better
19 understanding of what are some complex policy decisions
20 to make sound decisions that are important to all our
21 stakeholders. So again, I don't want to underemphasize
22 the importance of your role.
23 I'm also a stickler for good government. I
24 believe we have responsibility to communicate well in a
25 clear and timely manner. That means we're going to

7

1 strive to get information to all of you in advance of
2 our discussions so that you can digest it, so that you
3 can think about it, so that you can be vocal and engage.
4 I'm also a stickler for timelines, so the 2022
5 PRIA deadlines, they stress me quite a bit. I'm sure
6 they stress Rick a little bit. If you saw the draft
7 strategic plan that EPA released last month, there are
8 two strategic measures that are going to help keep our
9 program on track. We want you to help us track them,
10 and these are measures that help us keep our timelines
11 under PRIA and also under FIFRA.
12 And then, finally, the other realism is that we
13 have continuing resource challenges that we have to work
14 with as we get towards this 2022 deadline. So again,
15 this is where the committee comes in to get your
16 feedback to help us on complex issues.
17 What are we going to do about dicamba in 2018?
18 How are we going to approach the synergy issue? These
19 are important things where your thoughtful advice is
20 really needed and it's welcomed by me, it's welcomed by
21 our team, it's welcomed by Rick, it's welcomed by his
22 staff.
23 So I think OPP has put together a very robust
24 agenda for you to help you understand some of our
25 priorities and some of our challenges. There are more

8

1 than enough to fill two days.
2 So again, my schedule is going to prevent me
3 from being at the whole meeting today. I will be here a
4 little bit this morning. I hope to come back again
5 tomorrow morning if all goes well, but if I'm not here,
6 I look forward to hearing about how your discussions go,
7 I'm sure I will get updates and briefings.
8 So, just before turning it back to Rick, I just
9 want to once again stress the importance of your
10 engagement and how important it is to us, and at any
11 point in time, I welcome your feedback and feedback from
12 Rick and his team so that we can keep ourselves on a
13 good path to utilize you guys in the most efficient way
14 to inform our decisions.
15 So, thank you all. Again, I appreciate your
16 participation.
17 MR. KEIGWIN: Thank you, Nancy.
18 I also want to introduce Jeff Sands, who is our
19 new ag advisor.
20 MR. SANDS: Good morning, and welcome to all
21 committee members and public participants. My name is
22 Jeff Sands, and I am the agricultural advisor to the
23 administrator. I would like to thank all of you here
24 today for your service to this committee.
25 Cross-functional constructive dialogue such as

9

1 the PPDC are critical for meaningful engagement between
2 EPA and all relevant stakeholders. The groups
3 represented at this meeting make for a diverse mix of
4 perspectives and expertise that will serve as an
5 informational platform in the regulatory process. Your
6 collective input into this dialogue on complex policy
7 issues equips us with information needed to make the
8 best decisions in order to protect human health, the
9 environment, and ensure our nation's food security
10 through our actions here at the agency.
11 Your agenda over the next couple of days is
12 quite full. I look forward to hearing all of the
13 outputs from discussions, and again, I'd like to express
14 my appreciation for your efforts in serving on this
15 committee and all accompanying workgroups. Thank you.
16 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Jeff.
17 Kate, did you want to give a couple of remarks?
18 I didn't want to put you on the spot.
19 MS. BENNETT: Hi, Kate Bennett with the Office
20 of Public Engagement. I just wanted to say thanks for
21 the opportunity to sit in on your conversations. I see
22 a lot of familiar faces at the table, and then others
23 that I would like to get to know. We have an open-door
24 policy in the Office of Public Engagement, so we work
25 very heavily with Nancy and Rick and now Jeff, who we're

10

1 excited to have on the team, and any way we can be
2 helpful, whether it's here, whether it's with the folks
3 you represent out in the field, we're just eager to
4 learn more and help facilitate stakeholder engagement
5 with the Office of Pesticides, and also with the
6 administrator himself. So, thank you for the
7 opportunity to listen and learn today.
8 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Kate.
9 So, like I was saying earlier, we have a lot of
10 new faces, and so if we could go around the room, maybe
11 start to my right and introduce yourselves.
12 MS. KUNICKIS: I'm Sheryl Kunickis, I'm the
13 director of the Office of Pest Management Policy at
14 USDA.
15 MS. LIANG: Hi, my name is Charlotte Liang, I'm
16 with U.S. Food and Drug Administration Office of Food
17 Safety.
18 MR. HOFFMAN: Eric Hoffman, Deputy Director,
19 Armed Forces Pest Management Board.
20 MR. WHITTINGTON: Andy Whittington with the
21 Mississippi Farm Bureau Federation.
22 MR. PECK: Preston Peck, Policy Director of
23 Toxic Free North Carolina.
24 MS. TROSSBACH: I'm Liza Fleeson Trossbach with
25 the Virginia Department of Agricultural and Consumer

11

1 Services, and I'm representing the Association of
2 American Pesticide Control Officials, or AAPCO.
3 MR. REABE: I'm Damon Reabe, president of
4 Dairyland Aviation, a Wisconsin aerial applicator
5 representing the National Agricultural Aviation
6 Association.
7 MR. TAYLOR: Donny Taylor representing the
8 Agricultural Retailers Association.
9 MR. GRAGG: Richard Gragg, Florida A&M
10 University School of the Environment.
11 MS. FIGUEROA: Iris Figueroa, Farmworker
12 Justice.
13 MS. LIEBMAN: Hi, Amy Liebman, I'm the Director
14 of Environmental and Occupational Health, Migrant
15 Clinicians Network.
16 MS. SANSON: Charlotte Sanson, head of
17 regulatory affairs and compliance with Bayer.
18 MR. BENNETT: Steve Bennett with the Consumer
19 Specialty Products Association.
20 MR. GJEVRE: Eric Gjevre, Tribal Pesticide
21 Program Council.
22 MR. LAJOIE: Dominic LaJoie, I'm a potato grower
23 from Maine, I'm representing the National Potato
24 Council.
25 MS. ASMUS: Amy Asmus with Smith Farm Supply

12

1 representing the Weed Science Society of America.
2 MR. FREDERICKS: I'm Jim Fredericks with the
3 National Pest Management Association.
4 MR. WAKEM: Good morning, I'm Edward Wakem
5 representing the American Veterinary Medical
6 Association.
7 MS. CALLIES: I'm Rachel Callies, I'm the
8 manager of North American products registration at S.C.
9 Johnson.
10 MR. TUCKER: I'm Tim Tucker, past president of
11 the American Beekeeping Federation, I'm representing all
12 beekeepers, not just those in our organization, and
13 bees, hopefully.
14 MR. COPE: I'm Stan Cope and I'm the immediate
15 past president of the American Mosquito Control
16 Association, so a couple of presidents here. And that's
17 the organization that I'm here representing.
18 MR. HOBBS: Aaron Hobbs of RISE, Responsible
19 Industry for a Sound Environment, a trade association
20 supplying solutions to golf, lawn care, pest control and
21 other markets.
22 MS. McCURDY: Good morning, I'm Leyla McCurdy
23 with the Children's Environmental Health Network.
24 MS. SELVAGGIO: Hi, I'm Sharon Selvaggio with
25 Northwest Center for Alternatives to Pesticides.

13

1 MS. WILSON: Good morning. I'm Nina Wilson with
2 Gowan, representing the Biological Products Industry.
3 MR. THOSTENSON: Good morning, my name is Andrew
4 Thostenson, I am a pesticide program specialist with
5 North Dakota State University, and I represent the
6 American Association of Pesticide Safety Educators.
7 MR. McLAURIN: Good morning. My name is Allen
8 McLaurin, I'm actually a cotton farmer in North Carolina
9 and I'm here representing the National Cotton Council.
10 MS. BISHOP: Hi, everyone, I am Pat Bishop with
11 Humane Society International and Humane Society of the
12 United States.
13 MS. BURD: Lori Ann Burd, Center for Biological
14 Diversity representing all life on Earth, but especially
15 endangered species.
16 MS. HARRIOTT: Nichelle Harriott, Science and
17 Regulatory Director, Beyond Pesticides.
18 MS. PALMER: Cynthia Palmer, Director of
19 Pesticides, Science and Regulation, American Bird
20 Conservancy.
21 MR. VROOM: Good morning, I'm Jay Vroom,
22 President, CropLife America, the trade association
23 representing the Agricultural Pesticides and Crop
24 Biotechnology Industry.
25 MR. ALARCON: Good morning, Walter Alarcon, I

14

1 work with the SENSOR pesticides programs, we track acute
2 pesticide poisonings and I work for CDC and NIOSH.
3 MR. GORMAN: John Gorman, I'm with EPA Region 2
4 and I'm the chief of Pesticides and Toxic Substances.
5 MR. KEIGWIN: And then I think we have one or
6 two members who are joining us by phone. So if you're a
7 PPDC committee member, would you please introduce
8 yourself.
9 MS. SHULTZ: This is Gina Schultz from U.S. Fish
10 & Wildfire Service. Could you hear me?
11 MR. KEIGWIN: Can you hear us, Gina?
12 MS. SHULTZ: Yeah, I'm sorry, yes, I can hear
13 you.
14 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, great, thanks.
15 And then is Dan Kunkel on the phone?
16 MR. KUNKEL: A lot, and I kind of -- (poor
17 connection).
18 MR. KEIGWIN: Dan is going to be able to join us
19 intermittently. Dan is with the IR4 program based at
20 Rutgers University.
21 (Operator interruption.)
22 MR. KEIGWIN: Let's review the agenda for the
23 next day and a half. As Nancy, Kate and Jeff said, it's
24 a very ambitious agenda, we probably could have put more
25 on here, but we only had a day and a half, but these are

15

1 some issues that we as a program could really benefit
2 from the collective input of all of you. So we're going
3 to start the morning with a presentation from Jim
4 McCleary. Jim is from the part of EPA that oversees all
5 of the federal advisory committees for the agency, and
6 because so many of you are new to the PPDC, or maybe
7 haven't been on the PPDC for some time, we thought it
8 would be helpful for Jim to come over and just remind us
9 of all -- all of us about what our roles are as being
10 members of a federal advisory committee.
11 We will then take a break, and then Mike Goodis,
12 the Director of our Registration Division, will lead a
13 session and a report back from the Pollinator Protection
14 Plan Metrics Workgroup that has been working on
15 developing some measures to evaluate the effectiveness
16 of the managed pollinator protection plans, and this
17 will be a topic where we will want to get your input on
18 the feedback from the workgroup and see if you all think
19 that that's a path forward that the agency should be
20 considering.
21 We will then break for lunch, and then in the
22 early afternoon, we're going to give you, again, led by
23 Mike and his staff, an update on what's been happening
24 with dicamba and some recent regulatory changes that
25 we've put in place for the 2018 season. And then we

16

1 will have an update on the work that we've been doing to
2 evaluate claims of synergy and how we're incorporating
3 that science into the registration program.
4 After a break, we've sent around to you all in
5 advance a number of one-pagers on some topics that we
6 had heard you all were interested in hearing about.
7 We've reserved about an hour for you all to ask
8 questions about those issues, and if there are others
9 and time permitting we can take those as well.
10 And then we'll end the day with giving you all
11 an update on where things are with the Pesticide
12 Registration Improvement Act, our progress under the
13 current statute, and some of the changes that could take
14 place were Congress to re-authorize the program.
15 And then tomorrow morning is almost exclusively
16 dedicated to getting your all's feedback on the Worker
17 Protection Rule that was promulgated in 2015 and the
18 Certification of Pesticide Applicators Rule that was
19 finalized at the beginning of this year. Many of you
20 were here for the May PPDC meeting and the regulatory
21 reform public meeting that we had a subsequent day, and
22 there were a lot of comments that we received relative
23 to those two rules, and now what we really want to do is
24 get you all to have a dialogue about what we heard and
25 we'll summarize those for you and then see if we have

17

1 some consensus advice for moving forward on the
2 implementation of those two rules.
3 And then in the middle of all of that, Arnold
4 Layne, who is Deputy Director for Management here in the
5 Office of Pesticide Programs, will give a brief report
6 out on yesterday's first meeting of the new Public
7 Health Workgroup.
8 So a pretty packed day. In order to do this
9 effectively, particularly for tomorrow, we're going to
10 start at 8:30, not 9:00. So the guards were really
11 moving you all through rather quickly yesterday, so I
12 want to thank Dea and her team for helping to facilitate
13 that. I think that was the fastest we've ever gotten
14 people into the building for a meeting, but that's
15 because you all showed up so early, maybe because you're
16 used to how long it takes to get into our building. So
17 do that again.
18 So a couple of housekeeping things before we get
19 going. PPDC members and members of the public, if you
20 have not signed in at the desk as you came in, please do
21 so that we have a recording of your presence here. Your
22 tent cards, when we open it up, just, you know, put it
23 up on its side so that I know that you want to speak or
24 make a comment.
25 For those of you who have been in this room

18

1 before, you know that we do our best with the audio
2 system that we have, so we did do a tech check last
3 night; it was working great. So I have all the
4 confidence that it will continue to work great, but just
5 remember that if you see the red light on your mic',
6 that means you're live. For people on the phone, to
7 hear you and anything that you want to say, your mic'
8 has to be on, otherwise they're not going to be able to
9 pick up the conversation. And then when you're finished
10 speaking, if you could just turn the mic' off.
11 For those of you participating via
12 teleconference, we currently have a global mute in
13 place. We can control the muting and unmuting, so
14 please don't unmute your line unless we ask you to. And
15 then at the end of each day, we will have a 15-minute
16 public comment session. If members of the public are
17 interested in making a comment during those sessions,
18 please sign up at the registration desk out front.
19 And so with that, let me ask Jim to come up.
20 MR. McCLEARY: Good morning, everyone. Thank
21 you for showing up this morning, participating. Let me
22 just grab my notes for a minute, because I can't read
23 that screen from here.
24 Okay. This was an overview of the Federal
25 Advisory Committee Act at EPA, how we implement it here.

19

1 The Federal Advisory Committee Act requires us to set up
2 procedures for every agency who has even a single
3 federal advisory committee to uniformly manage them, and
4 this is how we do it here at EPA.
5 First of all, welcome. And this is -- let me
6 see. Dea? How do I advance it? That's okay. Thank
7 you.
8 Okay. Welcome on board. You're all volunteers,
9 and I can't tell you how much we appreciate that here at
10 EPA. We could not afford to buy the type of experience
11 and the points of view that are in the room today, so
12 thank you for that. I know it's a big commitment. And
13 thank you also to the organizations that you represent
14 for giving you time to be here with us today. We're
15 excited that you're here with us and we look forward to
16 hearing your comments and your participation throughout
17 the meeting.
18 The Federal Advisory Committee Act was
19 established in 1972 and it governs the establishment,
20 operation and termination of federal advisory
21 committees. FACA may apply when EPA utilizes and
22 convenes committees to obtain group advice. So if we
23 were going out to find individual advice from any one of
24 you or from any individual around the country, anywhere,
25 we wouldn't need to invoke FACA, but the fact that

20

1 you're all here today giving us group advice means that
2 FACA applies, and that's why we've done what we've done
3 by setting up this federal advisory committee.
4 FACA requires that we have a charter. The
5 charter is filed with the Congress of the United States,
6 and it lists the objectives and descriptions and duties
7 of the committee, the period of time for which the
8 committee will do its work, officials to whom the
9 committee reports, and the estimated number of meetings
10 and the costs associated with it.
11 Charters are generally good for two years. We
12 renew the charter for the PPDC every two years, and you
13 are currently fully chartered and up and running.
14 FACA requires specific things about membership.
15 Members, all members of all federal advisory committees
16 throughout EPA serve at the discretion and the pleasure
17 of the administrator. Committees must be fairly
18 balanced for the points of view represented and the
19 functions to be performed. And as you were going around
20 the room today, I noticed that this is a very
21 well-balanced committee. A lot of different points of
22 view are represented here, and that's a great thing for
23 this committee and the EPA.
24 Now, EPA appoints members depending on whether
25 the member is being asked to represent the point of view

21

1 of a group, which is a representative member. Everyone
2 here today is a representative member. Or provide the
3 agency with their best independent judgment and
4 expertise, and those are special government employees.
5 Special government employees, or SGEs, are a separate
6 animal from what everyone in here is today. They're
7 actually paid, often times paid for their participation,
8 and they represent their own personal expertise. Many
9 times they're scientists or other specialists in their
10 field.
11 Being a representative member is different, it
12 means that you are representing the point of view for
13 the group that you're representing. FACA also requires
14 public access. We have a healthy number of members of
15 the public here today, and that's a good thing.
16 The transparency that FACA provides allows the
17 members of the public to see the process, to see the
18 work that this committee is doing and thus the work that
19 the agency is doing.
20 We have to publish meetings in the Federal
21 Register. This is a public notice requirement. Meeting
22 notices have to be published in the Federal Register at
23 least 15 days prior to the meeting. And opportunities
24 have to be provided for the public to provide their own
25 comments so that their voice is also heard at the

22

1 meetings.
2 Openness and transparency, we've touched on it a
3 little bit. Detailed meeting minutes and committee
4 documents are available to the public, and I know that
5 meeting minutes aren't available yet. They will be --
6 they have to be certified by the committee chair within
7 90 days of this meeting being completed. And the
8 meeting documents have been already published to the
9 website.
10 Requirements apply to all meetings, including
11 face-to-face meetings, teleconference meetings,
12 videoconference meetings, and any other electronic
13 medium that we may come up with in the future to hold
14 federal advisory committee meetings here.
15 Okay. The DFO -- let me tell you, DFO stands
16 for designated federal official. Dea Zimmerman is your
17 DFO, and I have to say she is one of the finest DFOs the
18 EPA has. She's terrific. She is your link to the
19 agency. If you have questions, you should approach her
20 with them. And Dea will reach out to me and to others
21 to find the right answers for you.
22 EPA must designate a federal employee, that's
23 Dea, to be your designated Federal official for each
24 committee. DFOs manage the day-to-day operations of the
25 committee and the DFO must attend every meeting, approve

23

1 the agenda, call the meeting to order and adjourn it, if
2 it's determined to be in the public's interest.
3 What about you? What are your roles and
4 responsibilities as a member? We ask you to
5 participate. Nonattendance impacts the efficiency and
6 effectiveness of the entire group. You were asked to be
7 on the committee for a reason, that's because we want to
8 hear your voice.
9 We ask you to study and review the materials in
10 advance. That's the come-prepared-to-class requirement.
11 We ask you -- we do send the materials out in advance
12 and we ask that you review them so that you are prepared
13 to engage fully at the meeting. And then to speak up.
14 We want to hear your views during the course of the
15 meeting.
16 We ask you to represent your interest group or
17 organization and work towards consensus, when
18 appropriate. It's not always possible, but when it is,
19 we ask that you try to reach consensus with your fellow
20 members and we ask you to provide feedback to your
21 chair. The chair provides leadership to the committee
22 and works with the DFO to develop committee agendas,
23 schedule committee activities, coordinate work and
24 obtain consensus.
25 We ask you to collaborate to accomplish the

24

1 committee's charge. Serve your appointed term. If you
2 develop a conflict and can't serve, please let your DFO
3 know immediately. If you can't serve your term, it may
4 affect the balance of the committee, so it's possible
5 that the committee wouldn't be able to meet again until
6 your point of view on the committee is reappointed to
7 someone else. And we ask you to have close
8 communications with your DFO.
9 Okay. There are some travel and ethics
10 considerations that you should be aware of to keep
11 everyone out of trouble, and we want to help you do that
12 here. EPA may pay travel and per diem for members on
13 official travel. So all of you here who traveled, I
14 think it's greater than 50 miles from here, are probably
15 on an official travel status, and you've worked with Dea
16 and her staff, her colleagues, to coordinate that
17 travel.
18 We ask you to refrain from any language or
19 activities that could compromise the civility of the
20 committee and maintain an environment that promotes
21 participation of individuals, regardless of race, color,
22 national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or
23 sexual orientation. This is our plays-well-with-others
24 requirement. And if you have children in kindergarten,
25 you've seen that before. And with people on this

25

1 committee, I expect no problems with that here.
2 The next one is a big one. Members may not
3 lobby Congress in their capacity as an advisory
4 committee member. We've had some committees where we've
5 had some trouble with this in the past. It is not okay
6 for you to go up to Capitol Hill to meet with your
7 member of Congress or other members of Congress or
8 Congressional staff to lobby them on behalf of this
9 committee. You do not represent the committee to
10 Congress.
11 There is a process by which EPA will communicate
12 with members of Congress and the legislative branch. It
13 is not by individuals going up there.
14 Now, while I say that, by being members of this
15 committee, you don't lose your rights as a citizen. You
16 can still meet with your member of Congress in your own
17 capacity. We call that "on your own time and on your
18 own dime." So please don't leave the meeting today or
19 tomorrow and go up to Capitol Hill while you should be
20 participating in the meeting to meet with your member of
21 Congress, but if you want to meet with your members of
22 Congress or anyone else up there in your own capacity as
23 a private citizen, you are welcome to do that.
24 This can sometimes get a little tricky, so if
25 you have any questions with it, speak to Dea or me and

26

1 we will help you navigate these sometimes treacherous
2 waters.
3 EPA employees may not direct or encourage
4 members to contact Congress with concerns of pending
5 legislation, so that means that no one at the front
6 here, myself included, can ask you to go up to Capitol
7 Hill and say, hey, we really need you to speak to this
8 member of Congress about this issue, please do that for
9 us. We can't do that ourselves as Federal employees and
10 you can't do it either as members of the committee.
11 Committees provide advice and/or recommendations
12 directly to EPA, Congress and the President. Your
13 advice here goes right to the OPP staff, I think most
14 staff members are here with us today. This is a
15 dialogue committee, so you don't produce written
16 reports. That's why it's so important for your
17 participation today, to be present, to be engaged and
18 active in the proceedings of this committee.
19 With EPA approval, committees may form
20 subcommittees and gather facts and draft documents to
21 assist the parent committee, and I know that PPDC does
22 utilize subcommittees and workgroups from time to time.
23 Subcommittees must report their findings directly to the
24 parent committee for full deliberation, approval and
25 discussion. So subcommittees can't go directly to the

27

1 OPP staff with their recommendations, it has go through
2 PPDC in general.
3 Okay. At EPA, our subcommittees follow the same
4 requirements of FACA, including guidelines for openness,
5 transparency and membership. So a subcommittee at EPA
6 goes through the full membership process, and the same
7 openness and transparency process, the same notice and
8 registering -- notice in the Federal Register that the
9 main committees would do.
10 Committees may also form workgroups to conduct
11 research, perform studies or gather facts. Working
12 groups are small, informal meetings. These are -- we
13 call workgroups here they're for a specific purpose and
14 a limited term. So if there's a specific project that
15 the committee needs done and they want to put a small
16 group of the general committee members to work doing it,
17 we call that a workgroup. Workgroups are not required
18 to follow the same openness requirements, the same
19 notice requirements as committees and subcommittees are.
20 Working groups are also not subject to FACA. I
21 just said that, I'm sorry. Okay.
22 Additional resources for you. Your DFO is your
23 best point of contact for any questions that you have.
24 Dea, as I said before, is terrific, and she'll reach out
25 to me and others to get the answers that you need to do

28

1 your jobs here.
2 We provided a link to the Federal Advisory
3 Committee Act in case anyone is interested in reading
4 it. We have attorneys here that do that, so you don't
5 have to if you don't want to.
6 We have also our FACA page. This is the page of
7 my office on the Internet site that will give you some
8 more general information about FACAs at EPA, not just
9 PPDC, but the other FACAs here as well. Our telephone
10 number there for the Federal Advisory Committee
11 Management Division is there. That will give you our
12 general number and they can get you the resources that
13 you need within our office.
14 And that's it. That's the end of my
15 presentation. Again, I would like to thank everyone for
16 your participation at the PPDC, you're making the
17 process better because of it. I can entertain any
18 questions that anyone might have now.
19 Yes?
20 MR. KEIGWIN: Stan, then Cynthia.
21 MR. COPE: Are there any occasions where there's
22 a formal vote by the committee, and if so, is it
23 majority rules or how does that work? Thank you.
24 MR. McCLEARY: Good question. The OPP staff
25 runs the committee meetings. I don't believe that this

29

1 committee, the dialogue committee, has any votes. We're
2 here to hear your dialogue and to hear what you have to
3 say and we are looking for everyone's point of view, but
4 this is a committee that does not utilize a voting
5 process.
6 MR. KEIGWIN: Cynthia?
7 MS. PALMER: Thanks. I'm just curious if there
8 are specific metrics or criteria in that distinction
9 between a subcommittee and a working group. I know it's
10 already been an issue in the Public Health Committee
11 with its workgroup. And I'm just wondering, I mean, are
12 there certain numbers? Or I mean you say small, you say
13 limited term, what exactly does that mean?
14 MR. McCLEARY: Okay. I guess there's a slight
15 amount of room for interpretation there. Workgroups
16 cannot continue on indefinitely, like the PPDC continues
17 on. We renew the charter every two years for you.
18 Workgroups can't do that. It has to have a specific
19 purpose and a limited duration, so usually these are
20 research projects or writing projects. PPDC doesn't
21 come up with a written project, so we wouldn't need it
22 for that, but if there was a research project that we
23 needed to occur, that may be reported out at the next
24 meeting, that's when we might utilize a working group
25 for the PPDC, this committee. There is a slight amount

30

1 of wiggle room there, I guess, but not a lot.
2 Any other questions?
3 (No response.)
4 MR. McCLEARY: Okay. Well, I will linger
5 through the break in case anyone wants to reach out to
6 me privately, and thank you very much for your time
7 today, and thank you for your service.
8 MR. KEIGWIN: All right. Thanks, Jim.
9 So we are running way ahead of schedule, which
10 is great, so we're not going to take a break. So I'm
11 going to ask Mike Goodis to come up and we'll go just
12 right into the next topic and we'll take a break after
13 that.
14 MR. GOODIS: I'd like to introduce myself, my
15 name is speaker corner. There we go. All right.
16 So, definitely running ahead of schedule.
17 That's good. All right.
18 So, again, my name is Mike Goodis and I'm the
19 Director of Registration Division. It's a pleasure to
20 be here with you this morning. I want to lead a
21 discussion regarding the workgroup, the PPDC workgroup,
22 on Pollinator Protection Plan Metrics. For some of you
23 who may recall, this was put in place a year ago with
24 the goal of writing a recommendation to the full PPDC
25 membership in this meeting, so it's a year term, and the

31

1 membership -- and we'll get into some of the details of
2 this later.
3 The workgroup -- and it will be Andy Whittington
4 and Rose Kachadoorian will be making a presentation on
5 the work -- on the workgroup and their progress and
6 their recommendations to the panel. And so -- and
7 that's, as Rick mentioned before, you know, this is a
8 recommendation to the panel for support for our
9 recommendations to the EPA for consideration.
10 So I know we have a lot of new members to the
11 membership here, and so just for a little bit of
12 background on how this all came about, this is, again,
13 regarding pollinator health, and specifically use of
14 pesticides, you know, for controlling various pest
15 issues. A lot of this really started back in 2014 with
16 the President's Executive Order asking for federal
17 agencies to work together to develop a strategy on how
18 we can help improve pollinator health overall.
19 And so that was an effort that was co-chaired by
20 the EPA and USDA, and that strategy was published I
21 think in 2015. But in that, again, federal agencies
22 committed to various actions, and so the EPA, and
23 specifically for EPA, germane to this conversation, was
24 measures to try to restrict products that are known to
25 be toxic to bees under certain conditions for commercial

32

1 pollination, but also to work with states and tribes in
2 developing pollinator protection plans. And this was
3 really building on the success of some states,
4 Mississippi, North Dakota, Florida, Colorado and
5 California, where they have led the effort in working
6 with their stakeholders in identifying opportunities for
7 beekeepers and growers to have a better understanding
8 and communicate intended actions regarding pesticide
9 applications and also pollinator activities as well.
10 And so we thought that was a great concept that
11 we wanted to continue to support, and so as part of the
12 EPA's effort, the EPA finalized our mitigation policy
13 regarding acute exposure to bees, and that was completed
14 in January of 2017. That, again, the scope for that
15 work was mainly limiting the -- restricting the use of
16 certain pesticides under conditions where bees are being
17 brought in for commercial pollination services during
18 bloom time. And we acknowledged there was some
19 exceptions for those particular uses.
20 All other uses outside of that scope, again, we
21 were relying on and encouraging states and tribes to
22 develop these pollinator protection plans. And but we
23 also acknowledged that we needed to monitor the progress
24 of those plans and, to some extent, the effectiveness of
25 those plans to see if that was really a good model that

33

1 was going to result in some improvement of pollinator
2 health in reducing pesticide exposure to bees.
3 From the very beginning, there were questions
4 like, well, how do you intend on measuring? How do you
5 intend on evaluating whether the plans overall are
6 actually achieving its objective? And at the time we
7 really didn't have a full understanding of how best to
8 do that. And at the same time, too, we didn't want to
9 lock in states and tribes in structuring their plans to
10 just meet whatever the measures were that we were
11 looking at here at the EPA at a national scale.
12 I think what we observed and recognized was a
13 lot of diversity across the country regarding use of
14 bees and the types of crops that are out there. There
15 are some states that are more targeted for commercial
16 pollination, some of the states are more for honey
17 production, some states are maybe neither, there may be
18 more hobby, urban type of pollinator use. And for some
19 states, I think they recognize, too, that maybe their
20 priority in working with their stakeholders were more
21 about habitat and forage development and protection.
22 So we thought really that's why flexibility was
23 important for the states, and in developing those
24 pollinator protection plans and working with their
25 stakeholders. So again, we didn't want to limit, you

34

1 know, what the scope of those plans were. Nor did -- we
2 were requiring them. Again, this is all voluntary
3 efforts by the states themselves. And so -- but again,
4 the challenge was how do we look at whether these
5 pollinator protection plans at a national level are
6 actually effective. Are they actually improving, you
7 know, the potential reduction of pesticide exposure to
8 bees, which would help contribute to general pollinator
9 health.
10 And so that's where this came about, about a
11 year ago we felt it would be a great opportunity for
12 PPDC to establish a workgroup and to provide a
13 recommendation to the agency. And so, again, you'll get
14 more information from a report out from the workgroup,
15 but, you know, at this point -- you know, and again, I
16 think the -- just from my observation, too, again, I was
17 the EPA lead for the workgroup during the course of the
18 year. You know, I thought the -- it was great
19 participation from the workgroup members. We met
20 monthly, mostly in conference call and in some cases in
21 person, in conjunction with these meetings, and I think
22 the group is at a place to make a recommendation to the
23 full membership.
24 So with that, I will turn it over to Andy.
25 MR. WHITTINGTON: Thank you. And thanks,

35

1 everybody, for being way ahead of schedule, because I
2 was planning on studying this during the break. So this
3 will be a fun adventure for all of us.
4 So, this is going to follow very closely with
5 what we just listened to from the attorney because I
6 think this workgroup did function very much like the
7 workgroup is supposed to. So the workgroup was convened
8 to come up with some process to try and measure the
9 effectiveness of state pollinator plans on a national
10 scale. And that process involved the problem
11 definition, a review of the MP3 plans that had been
12 developed, a look at what a national-level metrics guide
13 would look like, and then looking at what an
14 implementation plan would look like. And then we would
15 come back and present that to you for your feedback.
16 And I'm like him, I can't hardly see the slides to
17 follow you.
18 All right, so the expectation of the workgroup
19 or the charge of the workgroup is to make a
20 recommendation for EPA to use in evaluating the
21 effectiveness of the pollinator protection plans at a
22 national level, and a means to monitor how they're doing
23 overall, a strategy to communicate that effectiveness to
24 the public, and we refer to the public in the broadest
25 sense.

36

1 The agency will view the outcomes of this work
2 as a long-term effort and an ongoing effort in looking
3 at trends versus any specific target. Like I said, the
4 workgroup commenced on November 2016, with a deadline of
5 November 2017. So we did have a very specific time
6 frame.
7 I don't necessarily know that the workgroup was
8 small. There were 24 members of the workgroup, but it
9 was over a very broad base of stakeholders. And I'm not
10 going to go through everybody that's involved with this,
11 but you can see it's a very diverse group.
12 So the process was the problem definition and
13 the problem was how do you develop this set of metrics
14 to evaluate these plans, and they are stated tribal
15 plans. Mary Clock-Rust at EPA worked with the tribes
16 to -- and is working on their plan, but I think most of
17 what we've done would be very easily translated to the
18 tribal plans, as well as the states.
19 The plans' purpose is to reduce the exposure of
20 pesticides and developing some mitigation measures to
21 reduce those acute exposures. And then EPA will develop
22 those metrics evaluating the efficacy of the plans
23 nationally.
24 So in the review, and I don't remember the exact
25 number of plans that were reviewed, but it was -- there

37

1 were a lot. Most states at this point have completed
2 their MP3, or their pollinator protection plan. We
3 looked at the commonalities between all of those plans
4 and do the state MP3s have some process to identify
5 metrics within those state plans that we could adopt in
6 a national plan.
7 So we identified the metrics that could be used
8 at a national level, we identified specific metrics to
9 recommend to the PPDC, and identified a process for
10 gathering that information for national level
11 evaluation. And then implementation would be to
12 identify process to the states and tribes to get
13 feedback on the metric process, develop strategy to
14 communicate the national-level metrics to the broader
15 public and identify a possible timeline for evaluating
16 the metrics.
17 So of the plans that were reviewed, there were
18 some common themes that were identified. We want to
19 focus on the communication between stakeholders, focus
20 in on education and knowledge between all the groups,
21 pollinator groups, and the cropping community. And then
22 identify whether they identified the best management
23 practices or a set of standard operating procedures.
24 And we looked at the differences, and there were
25 several, and most of those differences were based

38

1 basically on the geographic or the regional differences
2 in the pollination use in those states. Some areas are
3 specifically devoted to honey production, some are more
4 geared towards pollination services.
5 Some of the other themes were the -- some of the
6 MP3s were much more comprehensive than some of the
7 others. Some typically just focused on the beekeeper
8 and pesticide user components. And then all the state
9 plans are voluntary and rely heavily on local
10 cooperation between and across stakeholders, and we
11 wanted to look at how people were involving other
12 stakeholders in that process.
13 So we developed this five-step process. We are
14 going to go over steps 1 through 4 today, and step 5
15 will take place post-survey. And those steps are one of
16 the considerations, which is what do we need to look at
17 for a national-level survey; assessment of the
18 categories, which was identifying those categories that
19 were common amongst the state MP3 plans; there will be a
20 survey of the states, of their MP3 plans; and a survey
21 assessment. And then step 5 will come post-survey.
22 So, national-level metrics guide. One of the
23 considerations, we need to have a mechanism to evaluate
24 the effectiveness of these MP3 plans at a national
25 level. We need to have comparable measures across the

39

1 states, but we don't want to compare states against each
2 other, we want to compare them against the measures that
3 we've identified. The assessment will be at the
4 national level -- I just said that.
5 The survey tool will be used, and there is a
6 need to have a group to conduct the survey and collect
7 the results and then communicate the effectiveness of
8 the plans to the broader public.
9 And in the assessment categories, these are the
10 categories that we identified that were common amongst
11 the vast majority of the MP3 plans. One is
12 communication, best management practices, standard
13 operating procedures, the involvement of the
14 stakeholders, education, the progress measures or
15 behaviors.
16 And now I will turn this over to Rose, assuming
17 she has gotten on.
18 MS. KACHADOORIAN: Can you hear me? Yes, can
19 you hear me?
20 MR. WHITTINGTON: Rose, we can hear you.
21 MS. KACHADOORIAN: Hello? Great. Great. So
22 I'm Rose Kachadoorian with the Oregon Department of
23 Agriculture, and Mike Goodis and Andy covered a lot of
24 really good information. So what was mentioned was a
25 survey, and I'm going to be talking a bit about the

40

1 survey, and then also five assessment categories were
2 provided to you. I'm going to kind of go through those
3 categories, and also provide some information just
4 regarding process. And so on to slide 13, it would be
5 step 3, state MP3 survey.
6 So the workgroup worked with state lead
7 agencies, and these are basically the agencies that are
8 responsible for pesticide regulation on development of a
9 survey. This included your AAPCO rep to the PPDC, Liza
10 Fleeson. And AAPCO, again, stands for the Association
11 of American Pesticide Control Officials. We also worked
12 with the chair of SFIREG, and this stands for the State
13 FIFRA Issues Research and Evaluation Group. And also
14 the chair of AAPCO's pollinator committee, or the
15 co-chair of it, and I'm also a co-chair.
16 We're hoping that this survey that we've
17 developed will also be able to be modified or adapted in
18 some way for tribes and territories, so that was also
19 something that we thought about. It's our intent that
20 EPA receive the information once the states complete the
21 survey and that the responses to the survey will be
22 transparent. And there was a lot of discussion about
23 that, whether it would be transparent or not, but we're
24 public agencies, and basically everything we do is
25 transparent and available to the public. So I think

41

1 many states will be really proud as far as what they do
2 with pollinator plans. Plus it will really give an
3 opportunity for a state that's just trying to figure out
4 like, you know, what more can we do, if they're able to
5 look at another state's plan and maybe get some ideas
6 and contact that state and say, you know, how is that
7 working out for you? And so I think that it can really
8 benefit the entire country as a whole.
9 Next slide. Communication was mentioned as one
10 of the assessment categories, and this was really how
11 are states increasing communication between pesticide
12 users and beekeepers. And not only just pesticide
13 users, but let's -- I heard that somebody from the
14 Aerial Applicators Association is there. You know, what
15 do we do in the situation where you have a farmer who
16 has contracted with a beekeeper, how do you get that
17 communication to maybe an aerial applicator that can't
18 see whether bees are foraging, get that information to
19 even somebody who's going to be applying pesticides by
20 ground who maybe is unaware that that grower has bees or
21 maybe the neighbor has bees. So just what is a state
22 doing to kind of facilitate that entire communication
23 process.
24 We also have an assessment category of just best
25 management practices, or standard operating procedures,

42

1 and I think a lot of states are really kind of focusing
2 on this and are really strong. You know, what kinds of
3 methods can they use to reduce pesticide exposure, or
4 pollinator exposure to pesticides. Can the states
5 provide a list of their best management practices or
6 standard operating procedures, and in this -- a lot of
7 times these really encompass a lot of aspects.
8 They encompass like the communication, what
9 kinds of pesticide risk might be associated with certain
10 pesticides or might be particular for a particular crop.
11 Let's say a crop when it's in bloom, unfortunately gets
12 maybe a high pest level at that time and needs to have
13 plant protection products applied. And how have they
14 included crop producers, beekeepers, and I think it was
15 Mike that mentioned the pollinator forage and habitat,
16 you know, especially for some states that just have
17 crops planted fence row to fence row, they might be
18 focusing in their pollinator plan of, you know, putting
19 in some more pollinator habitat, and other states who
20 maybe have a lot of pollinator habitat might be focusing
21 more on how to reduce drift to those habitats, whether
22 it's during seed planting or during either a ground or
23 aerial application.
24 Next slide, please. Education. So how are
25 states coordinating, or who's developed the program,

43

1 because sometimes it's not actually the state lead
2 agency, but how are they coordinating with other
3 agencies, and these could be other state and federal
4 agencies. I can think in my own agency, the Oregon
5 Department of Ag, that we are working with our
6 Department of Forestry and our Department of
7 Transportation, and other federal agencies, just how are
8 people reaching out, are they working also with their
9 cooperative extension, their university people, are they
10 being brought in.
11 And also, there are a lot of non-governmental
12 organizations out there that are really doing some great
13 work, and is there coordination and collaboration with
14 those entities, and if so, how does that look.
15 Also, on outreach. Is outreach being conducted
16 in how bees are exposed to pesticides, how growers and
17 other pesticide users might select pesticides. Are
18 people being taught about residual toxicity or, you
19 know, which pesticides are systemic and when you might
20 use those and then when you might not use those. And
21 also, pesticide label comprehension, are people being
22 tested like before their training on label
23 comprehension, then do they receive training and then
24 they're retested to see really an increase in their
25 comprehension.

44

1 Also just some of the methods that people are
2 using for outreach. Are they just putting something on
3 a website or are they reaching out through radio ads and
4 television? I know for our own agency, we're doing
5 public service announcements on Spanish language TV, and
6 we're going to be doing radio, again, with Spanish
7 language. And just what kinds of educational materials
8 are out there. And again, some states are really doing
9 some innovative things.
10 And another big important aspect of this would
11 be stakeholders. Who's being reached? Is it just
12 agricultural? Are maybe some of the urban applicators
13 being reached? The certified and then non-certified?
14 Are homeowners being reached? Just how -- and not only
15 just reached, but are you sitting down as a state agency
16 or whoever is coordinating the pollinator plan, are they
17 sitting down with them talking to them about their
18 communication, their knowledge level in all of those
19 aspects.
20 And also, you know, we have on this slide yearly
21 stakeholder meetings. There might be some states that
22 have more frequent meetings and other states have less
23 frequent meetings, depending on the stakeholders, but
24 are they kind of revisiting it and kind of keeping it
25 alive? I think none of us want to see a system where,

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

45

1 you know, we go through all of this work, we develop
2 something that's really useful, and then people forget
3 about it in a couple of years. They're like, you know,
4 how are people keeping this alive?
5 Next slide. Progress measures are behavioral
6 changes. Are we seeing a reduction in related verified
7 bee kills? We have verified bee kills on there because
8 -- pesticide-related, because at least in our state,
9 I've talked to other states that we get a lot of calls
10 about bee kills and they're sometimes associated with
11 nutritional stress or disease or some other aspect
12 that's not pesticide-related. And those it's really
13 important to identify that to assist those beekeepers in
14 understanding a little bit more about the factors that
15 can kill bees.
16 Also it can be a little distortion as far as how
17 many bee kills are actually pesticide-related. And we
18 do want to actually capture those that are pesticide and
19 also non-pesticide related.
20 Also, have states developed some potential
21 measures of exposure to bees. Some states I've spoken
22 with have talked about possibly measuring pesticide
23 levels in pollen, just like they would measure pesticide
24 levels in surface water, just to kind of get an idea of
25 what's out there. Are we seeing a certain pesticide at

46

1 a higher level than others? Are there some pesticides
2 that might be of concern or of interest; and if so, what
3 kinds of educational programs can we put into place to
4 get those levels down? And then if, you know, you can't
5 get the levels down through education, then to look at
6 other avenues.
7 Also a method -- again, measures or methods to
8 assess pesticide exposure, and also methods to assess
9 maybe how we've increased communication or how effective
10 our educational efforts have been. We also would like
11 in the survey try to get an idea what measures the state
12 is using, because the states, it's not only EPA, but
13 states want to know if they're doing a good job, where
14 are they being effective, and how are they doing that?
15 Are they looking at the national honeybee surveys? Are
16 they conducting their own state surveys, whether it's
17 through the university or the state agency themselves or
18 another entity? Are they seeing an increase in, again,
19 tracking that increased adoption of best management
20 practices and other considerations?
21 Also we have on here the last bullet point,
22 funding for listed measures. There's -- you know, there
23 are many people who want to do a lot of great things
24 that there isn't funding for, but if people are getting
25 funding for certain projects, I think it would be good

47

1 to have that reflected and the group thought it would be
2 good to have that reflected in the survey if there were
3 sources of funding and what kinds of projects were being
4 funded that might benefit the nation as a whole.
5 Next slide. So again, and I think both Mike and
6 Andy covered this, that each state had a lot of
7 flexibility in developing their own plan and therefore
8 they're diverse. There was some talk at the beginning
9 of the group about some of our meetings as far as having
10 a rating system where we were comparing one state to the
11 other. And that was actually deemed not really viable
12 because, again, you have states with different levels of
13 resources, but a lot of different types of crops and
14 different types of issues.
15 So if you had a state that was more urban
16 without a lot of commercial beekeepers, they were doing
17 one thing, versus a state that was more about honey
18 production, versus, you know, a state like ours where we
19 have over 220 crops that were doing something different.
20 So a determination was made, and I think it was
21 a good one that really if we were going to convey what
22 was happening nationally, that it was actually more
23 accurate to look at kind of an aggregated assessment of
24 what was going on in pooling those data, and that would
25 kind of normalize that data and kind of give us a more

48

1 accurate reflection of what was going on.
2 And so again, the states, even though the
3 results of the survey results will be transparent and
4 available for each state, if EPA is going to do some
5 kind of numerical assessment, that that's something that
6 is not really going to be done on an individual state,
7 it's going to be done for the country as a whole.
8 We are planning on using a survey tool, and I'm
9 going to talk a little bit more about that and kind of
10 the role of the state lead agencies in assisting EPA in
11 getting the information that they need, and again, we
12 have a number of questions that we were thinking about
13 for that survey, and again, looking at the percentage of
14 the tallied results -- responses.
15 Next slide. So again, a little bit about that
16 assessment system, we're looking at total number of
17 responses; for example, let's say 80 percent of the
18 states have a certain kind of communication system, 30
19 percent have something else for some other factor
20 they're measuring. So they're looking at -- we would be
21 looking at the total number of responses. So we have a
22 table here that's -- it's blue on my slide.
23 So, for example, if we're looking at
24 communication, maybe that first question where you have
25 a yes or no response could be for does your state have a

49

1 method to increase communication between pesticide users
2 and beekeepers, yes or no. If you answered yes, well,
3 what are you doing? And so the state lead agency or
4 whoever is implementing the pollinator protection plan
5 would indicate all of the different ways that they are
6 increasing communication.
7 Next slide. So we're on to step 5, which is
8 data collection and the results. And so AAPCO is
9 offering to utilize SFIREG to facilitate the
10 distribution of a survey. SFIREG has regional
11 representatives for each EPA regional office. For
12 example, the regional office I'm in, it would be for
13 Oregon, Washington, Idaho and Alaska. And so then the
14 regional SFIREG rep would give those surveys out to each
15 one of the states and kind of birddog it and make sure
16 that those are submitted.
17 This way the state lead agencies who are busy
18 and doing a lot of different things aren't just kind of
19 sent these random surveys and they'll kind of get around
20 to filling it out when they have time. No, this is
21 going to be actually a lot more strategic. And so we're
22 really grateful that SFIREG is kind of stepping up to
23 the plate and has offered to do this.
24 So then the regional SFIREG reps will be turning
25 this information, AAPCO will be assisting with the data

50

1 collection. If there are some -- we're thinking about
2 maybe using something like SurveyMonkey, which has some
3 kind of basic stats associated with it. And then we
4 would just provide this information to EPA so they could
5 conduct their assessment. So we would provide the raw
6 data to them and then if the survey tool had any kind of
7 basic statistics, we would also provide that
8 information.
9 Next slide. Oh, next slide is not mine, but let
10 me talk a little bit more about my slide 19, then. It's
11 really our goal that all of this information be
12 available to beekeepers, to pesticide users, to NGOs,
13 and that we'll all be able to learn from this. We're
14 looking -- we're thinking about these periodic types of
15 surveys so we can see how these programs are progressing
16 over time where, you know, I think everybody's hope is
17 that, you know, there are changes over time as our
18 program matures and as you identify new needs or you
19 fulfill kind of holes that were there that things
20 naturally progress.
21 And so the states will be working in conjunction
22 with EPA to identify whether any changes will be needed
23 over time, and again, that will be a very transparent
24 process.
25 So I think it's Andy who has that last slide.

51

1 So thank you, and we'll be answering questions after
2 that.
3 MR. WHITTINGTON: Thank you, Rose.
4 So I'd like to say we had a very large committee
5 that worked extensively on this. I probably will not
6 answer Caydee Savinelli's phone calls again for several
7 years, but there has been a lot of thought and a lot of
8 effort put into this. We feel like we've come up with a
9 reasonable and fairly comprehensive way for EPA to begin
10 to take a look at the national metrics for the
11 pollinator plans, and at this time I think we'll take
12 feedback from the committee.
13 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, so let's first see what
14 questions you all have for the workgroup. Let's see,
15 Cynthia, Lori Ann, and Pat.
16 MS. PALMER: Hi, Cynthia Palmer, American Bird
17 Conservancy. When I think of pollinator protection
18 metrics, I think of things like the kill rates for bees,
19 the incidents of dead birds, the state restrictions on
20 the worst pesticides for pollinators, such as
21 neonicotinoids and chlorpyrifos.
22 The efforts, the extent to which states have
23 made an effort to get farmers off the pesticide
24 treadmill and employ sustainable agricultural
25 techniques.

52

1 The extent of clean habitat available for
2 pollinators. I'm not sure that filling out a survey --
3 I think it's a worthwhile effort, but I'm not sure that
4 that truly captures the success of the pollinator
5 protection efforts in that state.
6 And I'm also worried about the risks beyond the
7 managed bees. We know that a single seed coated with
8 neonics or chlorpyrifos is enough to kill a songbird,
9 and we know that many native pollinators are at risk as
10 well.
11 So I'm wondering to what extent do these outputs
12 truly capture the effectiveness of the pollinator
13 protection plans, and I'm wondering if we should reframe
14 it more as a survey of communication guidelines, which
15 are worthwhile, but they're not really metrics.
16 Thanks.
17 MR. WHITTINGTON: So, and all of those are
18 significant concerns, but as we were looking at the
19 pollinator protection plans, most of them are designed
20 to mitigate those acute exposures. And they're pretty
21 much limited to that. So I mean, there are other
22 methods that we have that will be utilized through EPA
23 and through FIFRA that will address a lot of the other
24 concerns, especially through risk assessments that are
25 ongoing. But specifically for the pollinator plans,

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

53

1 when you're looking at that one piece of the entire
2 pollinator protection puzzle, I think this will be an
3 effective way to measure what those plans are
4 specifically addressing.
5 I think in the beginning we looked at the
6 pollinator problem as addressing it as how do you eat an
7 elephant, it's one bite at a time, and well this has
8 been several bites at the elephant. But we acknowledge
9 that there are ongoing issues that will have to be
10 addressed at other times, but they may not be
11 specifically addressed by pollinator protection plans.
12 MS. KACHADOORIAN: Hi, this is Rose
13 Kachadoorian. Is it okay if I talk right now? Okay, I
14 will talk.
15 I'm very sensitive to the issue of the native
16 pollinators. They are actually really essential for
17 pollination in a state like ours. And, in fact, we have
18 an education -- we have an entire Oregon bee project,
19 not just a pollinator protection plan, and our agency is
20 out actually monitoring for native bee populations and
21 we're going to be using that, at least in our state, as
22 kind of one of the metrics. It's not something a lot of
23 states can do, but it just happens to be what we can do.
24 And so that information is going to be reflected in our
25 survey results.

54

1 We also are traveling across the state and
2 working with different groups to learn how to identify
3 native pollinators, too. So I think that these plans,
4 even though many people are kind of geared towards an
5 acute exposure to the European honeybee, there are a lot
6 of states that are also looking at native pollinators,
7 and that will be captured in these surveys.
8 A lot of the BMPs, also, will help reduce that
9 kind of sublethal, possibly chronic exposure that goes
10 on, or possibly could go on to bees. So I think that
11 these issues will be captured in the survey. But as far
12 as the issue with bird deaths, probably not in the
13 pollinator survey, but I know that state lead agencies
14 report that information to EPA. So that information
15 isn't lost, it is captured, but in another venue.
16 MR. KEIGWIN: So, Lori Ann, Pat, and then
17 Charlotte.
18 MR. GOODIS: A quick interruption. If I could
19 also ask, as I see some of the workgroup members in the
20 audience as well. Ray, I see you. I think Caydee is
21 back there, and there may be some others, too. It might
22 be helpful to -- for -- because this was a group effort
23 and it's really a recommendation from the workgroup.
24 Maybe if we do have a mobile mic', if at times to help
25 answer questions, the upcoming questions, I would

55

1 encourage workgroup members to provide their input in
2 response as well. Thank you.
3 MS. BURD: Thanks, Rick. I'm going to echo some
4 of what Cynthia said, at the risk of sounding like a
5 broken record, some of us at every single opportunity
6 are raising our concerns that we keep using honeybees as
7 the metric and there are 4,337 species of solitary bees
8 in North America that have very different modes of
9 exposure and needs than honeybees, and while we care
10 very much about our honeybees, the needs of the solitary
11 bees are not being addressed in this, and in a variety
12 of ways.
13 And what might be an acute exposure for a -- or
14 a nonacute exposure for a honeybee could very much be an
15 acute exposure for a native solitary bee and could
16 result in the loss of an entire group, and so
17 catastrophic losses that we're seeing in those
18 populations.
19 So while I recognize and am happy about, you
20 know, what Rose mentioned, that there are great efforts
21 happening in some states, these metrics don't capture
22 any of them, and they don't establish any guidelines,
23 mechanisms, anything that even addresses them. So it's
24 great that, you know, some of that could get mentioned
25 in the surveys, but it's not built into this, and I'd

56

1 like to see that happen.
2 MR. KEIGWIN: So Pat, then Charlotte, then Stan.
3 MS. BISHOP: You know, I sat here listening to
4 this, and I'm still a little confused as to what you're
5 actually surveying and the data that you're collecting.
6 So I'm understanding that there's these plans, and they
7 probably have certain elements in them. So there's an
8 opportunity, I think, to evaluate the plans themselves,
9 do they have the proper elements, communication, so on
10 and so forth.
11 And then there's the issue of implementing the
12 plans, you know, how well is this state implementing it.
13 And then, finally, is it doing anything? Are you seeing
14 results from it?
15 So I'm not quite sure what your survey is doing,
16 and what parts is it surveying? Are you surveying how
17 well the plan was developed? Is it surveying -- are
18 they implementing it? And then, finally, is it
19 surveying what is coming out of the plan? Is it doing
20 what it's supposed to do?
21 So could you just clarify that a little bit for
22 me?
23 MR. WHITTINGTON: I'd say yes to all of that. I
24 do believe that the survey will capture what the -- what
25 the individual states are doing. And I can only speak

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

57

1 on behalf of my state, Mississippi. We do have our
2 annual meetings, we do have constant communication with
3 our beekeepers and our producers. And what you want to
4 see -- what you want to see going forward from the
5 pollinator plans is you're going to notice it in a
6 couple of years. You're going to see a change in
7 behavior, we hope, from the people that you're now
8 communicating with, because this has been an issue
9 for -- in basically the time frame relatively recently
10 between -- it's relatively recent communication that
11 we've had between beekeepers and farmers.
12 So I think we are starting to see that
13 communication and that education take place, and
14 behaviors changing, and the result of that should be a
15 reduced exposure, which is a reduction in the number of
16 bee kills that we see.
17 So I think we start capturing that as what are
18 you doing, and are you implementing what you have laid
19 out in your plan, and then from that, we should start to
20 see at least a reduction in the acute exposures.
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Charlotte, then Stan, then Damon.
22 MS. SANSON: Thank you. I just wanted to say I
23 think it's the -- I think it's worth commending the
24 group for the progress they've made in the past year on
25 coming to consensus. I can see that it's a rather broad

58

1 group of folks. And my question, Rick, I think this is
2 maybe something you can answer, because I think we heard
3 earlier that this panel is not a voting body, so after
4 the discussions today on this topic, what is the
5 mechanism for adopting the recommendations by this
6 workgroup?
7 MR. KEIGWIN: So once we're done with the
8 questions, I will pose a question to you all so you can
9 start thinking about it. But it will be something along
10 the lines of, you know, notwithstanding some of the
11 concerns that we heard thus far as we've gone around the
12 table, would it be the PPDC's advice to EPA to as a
13 first step begin pursuing the use of these metrics in
14 evaluating managed pollinator protection plans as we
15 continue to assess risks for pesticides as related to
16 pollinators.
17 So it will be something along those lines, but,
18 you know, this workgroup was set up with a very discrete
19 charge, and I think they've come back with where they
20 can get based upon that charge, and so what the agency
21 will want is advice from the PPDC on whether or not we
22 should be moving forward with the recommendation posed
23 by the workgroup.
24 So Stan, then Damon, then Liza.
25 MR. COPE: Thanks. Stan Cope, American Mosquito

59

1 Control Association. Outside of private industry, there
2 are roughly 900 and some tax-based or municipal
3 organizations that do mosquito control. Being new to
4 the group, I don't know if you had any input or if
5 you're going to get any input on your survey from the
6 mosquito control groups, but many of them have
7 long-term, very sophisticated communication and public
8 outreach plans when it comes to pollinators.
9 So I guess my question is, is mosquito control
10 involved in part of this, and if not, would you like
11 them to be?
12 MR. WHITTINGTON: Does the lady in the back of
13 the room want to speak up? Here we go.
14 MS. SAVINELLI: I'm Caydee Savinelli, I work for
15 Syngenta and I helped with this committee, and Andy, you
16 will take my phone calls, whenever you are. Okay?
17 Anyway, just to answer the questions about
18 the -- well, let me just step back for a minute. So the
19 charge of this group is really looking at the plans
20 nationally, so that's really what our charge is. And
21 within the stakeholders as part of the plan, the
22 mosquito boards are part of the stakeholder groups that
23 the states have reached out. So that's part of the
24 metric that is, you know, as you list all the various
25 ones, unfortunately we can't get into all the various

60

1 details, but certainly stakeholders are very important
2 in the whole MP3 process within the state, and the
3 mosquito control boards are very important as part of
4 the stakeholders, depending on the state, of course.
5 So that's where it falls in. It's not
6 necessarily the question specifically related to the
7 mosquitos, because we're really trying to look across
8 all of the plans, and as you can imagine, being so
9 diverse, trying to come up with the metrics that make
10 sense across a diversity of plans, and that's why we
11 have those categories, because they seem to be the
12 categories that were most common communication,
13 education, stakeholders was one of the categories.
14 So it is included, but in a different subset of
15 the questions. Oh, yeah, we didn't -- no, mosquito
16 control boards are very important. And keep in mind,
17 too, that within each state, it's really up to the state
18 to engage all of the various stakeholders, and I know in
19 some cases, in some states, the stakeholders didn't feel
20 engaged, so it's really important to go back and we
21 encourage the stakeholders to be engaged.
22 Thank you.
23 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Damon, then Liza, then Jay.
24 MR. REABE: So, as a Wisconsin aerial
25 applicator, we perform insecticide applications to

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

61

1 cranberry crops, and there was a study conducted by the
2 University of Wisconsin that I'll forward to Dea for
3 everyone's review, and what they -- what they were
4 studying was pollinator health at the cranberry
5 production sites, as well as away from those pesticide
6 application sites.
7 And there was a surprise finding in that study
8 where they found that there was greater native bee
9 populations and greater species richness at the
10 application sites than there was away from the
11 application sites.
12 So while this survey doesn't -- may not meet the
13 needs of or the goals or the interests of some of the
14 people in these -- in this room, I think that that's an
15 interesting study that should be forwarded.
16 Also, in regards to the survey work, to the
17 pesti -- or excuse me, the pollinator protection plans,
18 what they do for us as applicators is raise awareness of
19 pollinator habitat in general. Not just honeybee
20 habitat, but also other pollinator habitat, and these
21 plans are effective in communicating those concerns to
22 applicators.
23 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Liza, then Jay, then Sharon.
24 MS. TROSSBACH: Thank you. Again, I represent
25 AAPCO, which is a national association of pesticide

62

1 regulatory officials from the 50 states, tribes and
2 territories, and as one of the other members said, I do
3 want to commend the workgroup on their work.
4 This was a very daunting task given the inherent
5 challenges in trying to come up with national metrics
6 for very diverse plans. I think that the proposal that
7 has been put forth does meet that need and does the best
8 it can to allow for the diversity and the flexibility in
9 the plans.
10 While there are many issues related to
11 pollinator protection, I think that this group has done
12 a great job of looking at the Presidential directive.
13 It was very narrow, very focused, gave EPA a very
14 specific -- a very specific directive to reach out to
15 states, tribes and territories to develop voluntary
16 pollinator protection plans which looks at one piece of
17 a very huge puzzle of issues related to pollinators and
18 pollinator health. And I think that they did a good
19 job.
20 I think the fact that this is a long-term
21 evaluation that, you know, many plans are now complete,
22 some are still in process, some are in the beginnings of
23 implementation, but you have to start that data
24 collection, and I think this does a good job. It leaves
25 it as a living document or a living survey that can

63

1 evolve over time as plans evolve. And again, I think it
2 allows the states to have that flexibility and that
3 diversity.
4 It was mentioned some states are very -- you
5 know, they focus on honey production and others have a
6 lot of contracted pollinators. Some have hobbyist
7 beekeepers, some have many more commercials. So the
8 ability of states to provide information about what they
9 are doing, the unique things they're doing, there are
10 commonalities. I think the proposal looks at those
11 commonalities as things that were put forth about
12 communication and best management practices and standard
13 operating procedures, but allow states to also provide
14 that additional information.
15 I think states, tribes and territories would be
16 willing to, you know, provide that information, want to
17 provide that information. You know, many states put in
18 a lot of hours and a lot of work. I know in Virginia,
19 this has been an 18-month process that involves a lot of
20 stakeholders advisory committees, a lot of meetings. We
21 want our plan to be successful, we want to protect
22 pollinators.
23 As pesticide regulatory officials, we're not
24 proponents or opponents of the use of pesticides, simply
25 if you're going to use them, use them properly. And

64

1 since pesticide use is legal, we have to allow for that,
2 but at the same time, we all support, you know,
3 pollinator protection, and I think that the state plans
4 are a great way to allow states to represent their
5 apiary industry, their cropping systems, the type of
6 pest management and pest control they have, and also
7 protect pollinators.
8 And so on behalf of AAPCO, I support the
9 proposal, I support the approach to the survey, and, you
10 know, again, I just want to commend the workgroup on a
11 very difficult task.
12 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Jay, then Sharon, then
13 Preston.
14 MR. VROOM: Thank you, Rick. Wow, Liza just
15 said what I was going to say, except she said it so much
16 better. I would add that I think this work of this
17 workgroup is an extension of everything that was devised
18 in the President's pollinator protection directive that
19 Liza just mentioned, but it's important, also, to remind
20 everyone that the President, President Obama, empaneled
21 a very comprehensive group of federal agencies and
22 authorities to come together under the co-chairmanship
23 of the deputies from USDA and EPA. And to me,
24 overarchingly, this is a great model for a way to
25 address so many issues that certainly are on today's

65

1 PPDC agenda and in future agendas for consideration by
2 this federal advisory committee.
3 The last thing I just wanted to mention is back
4 to Cynthia's original comments, Cynthia, I'm not aware
5 and haven't been able to discover any registered uses of
6 pure chlorpyrifos as a seed treatment, so if you know
7 about that, I would love to talk with you offline.
8 Thanks.
9 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Sharon, then Preston, and
10 then Tim, is your card up? And then I think at that
11 point I want to put the charge back to the group about
12 next steps.
13 So, Sharon?
14 MS. SELVAGGIO: I am Sharon Selvaggio. I wanted
15 to say that I think that the survey instrument will be
16 useful, especially if it is, indeed, periodic and
17 repeated and used for adaptive management, if the states
18 are open to modifying, increasing their efforts through
19 pollinator protection based on the results of the
20 survey, what they find from other states, et cetera,
21 where appropriate.
22 So my questions are primarily about the survey
23 and I have a couple of questions. So, Rose, you
24 mentioned a couple of times in the PowerPoint about the
25 transparency of the survey, and I'm wondering is the

66

1 survey draft available now, will the responses be
2 available to the public state by state, or just the
3 aggregated responses.
4 Another question I have is regarding that the
5 issue that Pat brought up about implementation
6 monitoring as opposed to effectiveness monitoring, and
7 so my question is, who in the states would be filling
8 out the survey, and how will they get information from
9 people in their state, whether they be farmers, mosquito
10 control districts, et cetera, about whether, in fact,
11 these recommendations, these voluntary measures that are
12 in the MP3s are being implemented. There was some stuff
13 in here about communication effectiveness, some
14 potential for actual empirical data collection on direct
15 pesticide exposures through pollen measurements, bee
16 kills, et cetera.
17 I'm just wondering, given that the level of
18 intensity of those kinds of measures depends upon
19 funding and all of this is voluntary, I'm a little
20 concerned that there won't be an ability to really test
21 and report upon the effectiveness of these measures in a
22 national way. I certainly think state-by-state
23 information on those will be very useful.
24 I guess my last question, and I'll move on to
25 somebody else here, but is that the pesticide-related

67

1 verified bee kills, Rose, you had mentioned that it's
2 hard sometimes to differentiate a pesticide-related bee
3 kill from those that are caused by nutritional issues or
4 disease, and we've seen in the literature that disease
5 and pesticide impacts can be interrelated as well. So
6 I'm wondering how the group is differentiating between
7 disease or pesticide-mediated disease kills, if that is
8 the right way to capture that. Thank you.
9 MS. KACHADOORIAN: This is Rose. As far as
10 differentiating whether it is a pesticide-related bee
11 kill or not, there actually are EPA enforcement
12 guidelines for pesticide investigators and how they
13 should investigate bee kills, and I know at least our
14 state, and I'm sure other states do this also, is that
15 we actually collect the bees and we analyze them for the
16 presence of pesticides and also work with experts from
17 the university to see exactly what the problem is, is it
18 some kind of protozoan, a varroa mite, or nutritional,
19 or is it, indeed, pesticide. I mean, we have had
20 pesticide-related bee kills, as you're aware of.
21 And so there is a whole process designed for
22 that. Let's see, and what were some of your other
23 questions? Oh, as far as assessing. You know, it has
24 always been a challenge, I think, if you talk to anybody
25 who works with extension, and I used to work with

68

1 extension for 10 years myself, to know what your -- if
2 you're conveying information, are people assimilating
3 that information, are they understanding it and are they
4 putting it into practice.
5 And so a lot of states, what they do is they'll
6 use even survey, like the people who have attended their
7 classes, like do you understand what we've told you,
8 have you changed your practices from the last time
9 you've been here.
10 And so it's going to have to be a lot of kind of
11 getting back to those particular pesticide users and
12 beekeepers and others to see exactly what practices
13 they've changed and meeting with stakeholder groups to
14 see if there's any kind of change so the survey results
15 are accurate.
16 As far as transparency, you know, we have a lot
17 of AAPCO surveys right on our website, and I -- you
18 know, I'll have to -- I'm president-elect of AAPCO, but
19 I'll talk to our president to see if it is possible to
20 have all of this information in one source so people can
21 go to it. And so if people want to know what's going on
22 in various states, they can.
23 We currently have an Excel spreadsheet on the
24 AAPCO website with the names of all of the contact
25 people who are coordinating their pollinator protection

69

1 programs, and some of the components of those programs,
2 and then that information is actually being used by
3 other groups that we're in the process of updating that
4 Excel spreadsheet. In fact, I think it may be yesterday
5 or the day before yesterday, kind of an email was sent
6 out to the state lead agencies saying, you know, have
7 you made any progress, and if so, please update your
8 information so we can have that on AAPCO's website.
9 So that will -- and I imagine that EPA will have
10 information. I don't -- we would have to talk with EPA
11 to see if they would have the state-by-state information
12 on there. Does that answer your question? Maybe
13 somebody else can kind of help chip in here, too.
14 MS. SELVAGGIO: Yes, that helps, thank you.
15 MS. KACHADOORIAN: Um-hmm.
16 MR. KEIGWIN: So Preston, then Tim.
17 MR. PECK: Thank you. And it's good to see a
18 lot of different people in the room that I know.
19 I represent an organization that has multiple
20 initiatives within various programs, some of which
21 relating to pesticides, some of which relating to
22 pollinators and farmworkers as well, so I'll be wearing
23 a couple of different hats while on this committee from
24 our perspective. But I also -- I see a lot of different
25 survey questions, and I'm very new to this, so this is

70

1 the first time that I'm kind of going through the
2 survey. So I look forward to talking to other workgroup
3 members about it, but I see different limitations on the
4 survey, and I don't disregard the survey as a useful
5 tool, but I just am bringing up issues on its
6 limitations, such as the related verified bee kills from
7 pesticides are limited by detection of equipment that
8 the state department of ags have.
9 I know in North Carolina, it's relatively -- it
10 can -- it's not as sensitive as it could be, and I have
11 spoken with our state apiarists about that as well.
12 Obviously things like Cynthia and Lori Ann brought up
13 around native pollinators, there's limitations there. I
14 just think that we've seen limitations within surveys in
15 general with bee-informed partnership surveys. You're
16 taking a voluntary BMP and asking people to take a
17 voluntary survey on that. So I would just, you know,
18 caution on how we use the survey.
19 Also, as I do support communication between
20 applicators and beekeepers and other people, but again,
21 within the organization, we've seen various limitations
22 on that. Especially relating to farmworkers, you know,
23 that's one of the key things is, you know, communicate
24 with farmworkers what is going on and where it's going
25 on, and we've seen that that just hasn't worked in the

71

1 past and has continued to not work.
2 So I look forward to the discussion tomorrow.
3 So I'm skeptical about how effective communication will
4 be to reduce exposures, to reduction in acute exposures,
5 I think there's a lot of assumptions in there, and a lot
6 of gaps.
7 I had one question for Liza, as far as is the
8 surveying group that will be conducting the surveys
9 independent of AAPCO?
10 MS. TROSSBACH: So, it's SFIREG, right? It's
11 SFIREG, and that is an evaluation group that is under
12 the umbrella of AAPCO. If AAPCO, which is the -- the
13 broader group, they have a group that's SFIREG that does
14 the work of AAPCO, and through that, there are regional
15 representatives. As Rose has said, there's one state
16 lead agency representative from each of the ten regions,
17 and then they are able to provide information to the
18 states. So it's just a mechanism, a framework to be
19 able to get information out to the state lead agencies
20 and collected.
21 Again, in this particular case, that mechanism,
22 that framework, is long-standing and has worked very
23 well in the not only dissemination of information, but
24 the collection of information from state lead agencies,
25 and that was one of the questions that Sharon had

72

1 brought up is how -- you know, who's going to respond to
2 that information, it would be the agency that was
3 responsible for the drafting of the particular plan. So
4 it was an offer on behalf of AAPCO to say this is an
5 existing mechanism that has a long history of working to
6 collect information and that we're willing to utilize
7 that just to assist in the collecting of the information
8 and then forward it to EPA.
9 MR. PECK: Thank you. And just one thing along
10 that line, I know that we have received very different
11 information when evaluating state policy based on how
12 outreach is conducted and who conducts it and where
13 they're looking. So you're going to get very different
14 answers.
15 For example, within North Carolina, we looked at
16 best management practices on who to notify when it comes
17 to pesticide application and how far that radius would
18 be, and within that what is our limitation on prior
19 notification. And our state Department of Agriculture
20 did a really good job of reaching out to the state
21 beekeeping association; however, the people that
22 participate in that survey were one group that was
23 surveyed and we in conjunction with many other partner
24 organizations conducted our own survey and got very
25 different answers.

73

1 So just to be aware of who you're asking and
2 stakeholder input on how to conduct outreach. Thank
3 you.
4 MR. KEIGWIN: And Tim?
5 MR. TUCKER: Thank you, Rick.
6 First of all, I'd just like to commend the
7 committee that worked on a very daunting task. I
8 thought originally it would be extremely difficult to
9 come up with metrics to really define this program, but
10 I think it's a first good step in the right direction,
11 and anything that we can do to increase dialogue on a
12 national level between the states in evaluating these
13 programs that are working in some states, like
14 California, where they work very effectively for a long
15 time, and improve the communication and awareness, you
16 know, that we were talking about.
17 And I totally disagree, I think that if we can
18 communicate better between applicators and beekeepers
19 and anyone with a perspective in this that wants to
20 protect pollinators of any kind, we have to do a better
21 job of that. We have to find out what's working and
22 what's not. And I think that this does provide us with
23 a -- you know, a measure of assessing that.
24 So I'd just like to thank the committee again,
25 and those that could participate to a greater degree

74

1 than I could. My job sometimes limits me to being
2 involved, but I think the industry really feels that
3 communication and dialogue is very important between all
4 parties with our different perspectives. So thank you
5 again.
6 MR. KEIGWIN: Well, Lori Ann's card went up
7 after I said Tim was the last one. So if there's
8 something to add to this quick, because I want to put
9 the charge back to the group.
10 MS. BURD: I have a question to follow up on the
11 comment that chlorpyrifos has not been registered for
12 seed use. I believe it has been registered for seed use
13 not in significant crops like corn, cotton, sorghum,
14 wheat, is that currently the state of chlorpyrifos as a
15 seed treatment? And I figure the experts are here.
16 MR. KEIGWIN: We can certainly confirm it at a
17 break. We don't have it all in our heads. But we'll
18 get back to the group after lunch to confirm that.
19 So I think the way Tim kind of teed things up
20 would probably have been the way that I would have done
21 it, so as a first step in terms of measuring the
22 effectiveness of these plans, does the PPDC support the
23 workgroup's recommendation to begin to employ this
24 survey instrument moving forward as we continue to build
25 upon the dialogue, improving the dialogue with

75

1 stakeholders, and as we continue the re-evaluation
2 program? So kind of a thumbs-up type. Sort of neutrals
3 or anyone in defense?
4 MR. WHITTINGTON: There's the broad concepts,
5 and then I think there would still be some fleshing out
6 of the exact wording of what those look like.
7 MR. GOODIS: I'll just add to that, too. You
8 know, I know the group mainly focused on their approach,
9 and I think what was provided in the presentation and
10 sort of the framework of the questions. And so there
11 are some draft questions, but recognizing I didn't want
12 to spend too much time on that until there was an
13 accepting of the general approach, I think that's
14 something that the agency would take a look at those
15 questions too and working with SFIREG and others to
16 make -- probably fine tune those to make sure we're
17 getting the right information for our needs.
18 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. So, thank you to the
19 workgroup. I think we've got a path forward. All
20 right. So now -- good job.
21 (Applause.)
22 MR. KEIGWIN: So now we're running behind, but
23 that's okay. So why don't we come back at 11:15, and
24 what we'll do is we'll start doing part of what's
25 currently session 5, so the questions and answers. So

76

1 we'll do a few of those topics between 11:15 and when we
2 break for lunch, and that will give us a little bit more
3 time for some of the afternoon topics. So we'll come
4 back at 11:15. Thanks.
5 (Whereupon, there was a recess in the
6 proceedings.)
7 MR. KEIGWIN: I just want to check to make sure
8 that Gina Schultz is still on the phone.
9 (No response.)
10 MR. KEIGWIN: Yeah, I knew she wasn't feeling
11 well.
12 MS. SHULTZ: Hello. I'm on.
13 MR. KEIGWIN: So, what we'll do for the next 30
14 minutes, so that we can get back on track, and you still
15 have enough time for lunch, is we'll start to do parts
16 of the question and answer session for session 5.
17 So why don't we start with the status of the ESA
18 consultations. For the PPDC members, there should be a
19 one-pager in your packet that summarizes where we are
20 with the current pilot ESA consultations. So let me
21 just quickly see if there are any questions about those.
22 Tim, is your card up for ESA?
23 (No response.)
24 MR. KEIGWIN: So, Sharon, Cynthia, we'll start
25 there.

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

77

1 Sharon?
2 MS. SELVAGGIO: Okay, I've got a couple of
3 questions. In reading this, there was no mention of the
4 resolution of the Dow April letter to withdraw the BE
5 stock that was on the BiOp to modify the settlement
6 agreement, so I'm wondering kind of what happened with
7 that. We were expecting the draft BiOps for
8 chlorpyrifos and the other OPs in May and those haven't
9 come out yet. It says here that once they're released a
10 public comment period is expected before finalization
11 and the due dates. So the finalization is December, so
12 there's not much time left.
13 And then we were expecting the BEs for carbaryl
14 and methomyl I think in May as well, and I don't think
15 it says anything in here on that -- about that.
16 MS. ECHEVERRIA: Thank you. My name Marietta
17 Echeverria, I'm the Director of the Environmental Fate
18 and Effects Division. So thank you for those questions.
19 I will provide as much information as I have, and as I'm
20 able to.
21 So with respect to the letters that we received
22 earlier this year, to my knowledge, there has been no
23 response to those letters. So they were received, we
24 acknowledged the receipt, that request was to withdraw
25 the biological evaluations. Those biological

78

1 evaluations have not been withdrawn at this time, so we
2 continue to collaborate with our partners at the
3 services on step 3, which is actually the biological
4 opinions. So we continue to have discussions with them
5 and to give input on those biological opinions as
6 they're being developed. That's what we've been doing.
7 With respect to carbaryl and methomyl, you're
8 correct, we did not meet our May time frame. What we
9 have been doing is considering all of the public inputs
10 that we've gotten in the first three pilots through the
11 stakeholder engagements that we've had, the stakeholder
12 meetings, and through the formal response to comments.
13 And what we've been doing internally, and as
14 we've said all along, was to consider refinements to the
15 process to make it more efficient and to bring in
16 additional refined information earlier in the process.
17 So we've internally been thinking about how to do that,
18 and our hope would be to apply that advanced thinking
19 for carbaryl and methomyl, which are the next two that
20 are currently on the schedule.
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. Cynthia?
22 MS. PALMER: Actually, that addressed both of my
23 questions as well. I had looked at the handout from May
24 3rd, and noted that the language was almost identical to
25 the one that we just received the update with the same

79

1 aside from the paragraph included in May about Dow
2 Agrosciences letter. So I think this answers my
3 questions to the extent possible.
4 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. Any other questions on ESA,
5 the update that's in your package? Going once, twice.
6 (No response.)
7 MR. KEIGWIN: All right, so Yu-Ting Guilaran,
8 who is the Director of the Pesticide Re-evaluation
9 Division, will come up. So there are a couple of
10 things -- a couple of one-pagers in your packet, one
11 relative to where we are with progressing towards
12 meeting the October 1st, 2022 registration review
13 schedule in the statute, and then there are some
14 specific chemical-specific updates for three chemicals.
15 So, questions for Yu-Ting?
16 (No response.)
17 MR. KEIGWIN: So, why don't we start first with
18 the general status update for registration review.
19 Any -- so, Cynthia.
20 MS. PALMER: Thank you. So these are impressive
21 large numbers, and I'm just wondering if you're able to
22 tell us what percent of these reviews are receiving a
23 thumbs-up or a thumbs-down from EPA. Are some of these
24 applications sort of not making their way through the
25 process, and do we have metrics on that?

80

1 MS. GUILARAN: Thank you, Rick. I'm Yu-Ting
2 Guilaran, the Director of Pesticides Re-Evaluation
3 Division, and just so that I can understand your
4 question a little bit better, what do you mean by thumbs
5 up or down?
6 MS. PALMER: Approval from EPA.
7 MS. GUILARAN: On what exactly are you referring
8 to?
9 MS. PALMER: That we have, for instance, 457
10 conventional pesticides cases making their way through
11 the system, are they all getting a full approval or are
12 they approved with restrictions, do we have metrics on
13 sort of where -- you know, what's the outcome?
14 MS. GUILARAN: Okay. So if you go down a little
15 bit further on the status update. For the conventional,
16 we have about 40 percent remaining on the draft for
17 assessment, and we have proposed already 40 percent of
18 the interim decision, and then finalized another 30-some
19 percent of those. So it was really a mix of whether or
20 not the labels are fine as they are, or there's
21 additional mitigation that we need to put on the labels.
22 In general, for the more recent years, we're
23 trying to work on different efforts such as spray drift
24 reduction as kind of a way to reduce the footprint of
25 pesticide, and also more recently resistant management,

81

1 which is another piece that just recently went final are
2 some of the ones that were going to the mitigation. But
3 it's a mix bag of both. And we do have a data --
4 database that's being developed right now for decision
5 capture, and we are anticipating to roll that out
6 probably more toward the beginning of the year.
7 MR. KEIGWIN: That database is being developed
8 in anticipation of re-authorization of PRIA, which
9 would, among other things, have expanded reporting for
10 types of changes that are made as part of registration
11 review.
12 MS. PALMER: Thank you.
13 MR. KEIGWIN: It will be an internal database,
14 but we will be doing as part of our annual reports to
15 Congress on PRIA, should PRIA be re-authorized, then the
16 data would be made available as part of that annual
17 report.
18 Other questions from PPDC members on the general
19 registration review updates?
20 (No response.)
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. Then Yu-Ting also has her
22 team up here for three chemical-specific cases. So why
23 don't we start with the easiest one here, chlorpyrifos.
24 Nichelle?
25 MS. HARRIOTT: So, in your handouts, you have

82

1 here, "despite several years of study, EPA has concluded
2 that the science addressed in neurodevelopmental effects
3 remain unresolved, and that further evaluation of the
4 science is warranted to achieve greater certainty as to
5 whether the potential exists for adverse
6 neurodevelopmental effects."
7 Now, in your last Human Health Review, I think
8 it was 2015, the risk assessment that you published
9 seemed pretty clear on the neurodevelopmental health
10 effects regarding chlorpyrifos, and the agency had come
11 up with a proposal to revoke food tolerances as a result
12 of that assessment.
13 Further down in your paragraph here, you then
14 say you are hoping to come to a clearer scientific
15 resolution on those issues, which are the
16 neurodevelopmental issues. What specific issues still
17 need to be resolved when it comes to evaluating the
18 neurodevelopmental effects of chlorpyrifos, given that
19 we have over 30 years of data showing that chlorpyrifos
20 is highly toxic to the children's brains, to
21 neurodevelopmental health, and EPA has over the course
22 of reviewing chlorpyrifos taken action to try to
23 mitigate the health impacts of chlorpyrifos?
24 So, for example, we in 2000, I think you guys
25 said -- you removed indoor residential uses of

83

1 chlorpyrifos. We've had buffer zones to mitigate
2 bystander exposures, you've hand a volatilization
3 assessment. So what more needs to be done to give a
4 clearer scientific resolution of these issues?
5 MS. GUILARAN: Thank you for your comment and
6 question on this. So thank you for talking about the
7 history of the different things that we have put
8 forward, and they're indeed just proposal as what EPA
9 was thinking about at the time, and one of the important
10 things about a reg review program is that different from
11 re-registration, with all the transparency in the
12 process, and also soliciting public comment, it's an
13 important step. That's why we have three different
14 phases as we're going -- as each chemical going through
15 reg review, we get public feedback on.
16 So for this particular one, the things that you
17 have talked about, number one, the science has never
18 been -- we went through SAP several times, so it's
19 not -- even though I'm an engineer, I'm not a
20 toxicologist or human health expert on risk assessment,
21 the science is complex. So that's why we have gone
22 through the SAP several times trying to hone in on what
23 are the effects of chlorpyrifos.
24 So the proposal in 2015, also a notice of data
25 availability in 2016, were just what the EPA was

84

1 thinking about at the time. We received a lot of
2 comments on both sides, so that's why the science is
3 still unclear on whether or not what we were proposing
4 is really there the path forward for the agency.
5 So that's where things are. We do intend to
6 complete a review by the deadline of 2022.
7 MS. HARRIOTT: I have another question.
8 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay.
9 MS. HARRIOTT: So I would like to know what
10 specifically is unclear. What studies are now needed to
11 resolve these issues? Are there studies that you have
12 identified, that you need to help resolve these issues?
13 MS. FRIEDMAN: Sure. Hi, this is Dana Friedman,
14 I'm also in the Pesticide Re-evaluation Division, I'm a
15 senior regulatory advisor. I wanted to clarify that
16 some of the specific issues are really wrapped up in the
17 incorporation of the epidemiology studies that we do
18 have available to us. We have had a lot of comments
19 from the public, both with regard to the availability of
20 the raw data, that's one of the issues that we've
21 been -- you know, discussed -- have been discussed in
22 public comments a number of times.
23 Some of the issues around the incorporation of
24 epidemiology studies has also come up in a number of
25 SAPs. In our last Revised Human Health Risk Assessment,

85

1 I believe it was 2016, I think it was November, we
2 utilized the data in a way that we thought reflected
3 what the SAP had suggested we do in evaluating the
4 report and additional comments that we received from the
5 public, there is still great uncertainty there.
6 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Iris and then Amy.
7 MS. FIGUEROA: Hi. So I just actually -- thank
8 you, Nichelle, for the question, that was a question I
9 was going to ask as well, and just to highlight the
10 vulnerable populations that can be affected by this
11 delay, particularly farmworkers and farmworker children,
12 of course. And five years is, in our view, a very long
13 period of time for potential harm and for the long-term
14 health effects that that could have, that exposure.
15 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Amy, then Leyla, then Lori
16 Ann.
17 MS. LEIBMAN: So, thank you for some of the
18 initial comments, and that echoes a lot of some of our
19 thinking, but the process regarding this is really
20 disturbing, and problematic. And I don't understand how
21 all of the sudden the agency thinks that the science
22 remains unresolved.
23 This is -- this is probably one chemical where
24 we have the most science to underscore the impact that
25 this chemical has on children's brains. And then let's

86

1 not forget about workers, because we always forget about
2 workers, but, you know, workers are continually exposed
3 to this chemical.
4 I was just out in Hawaii looking into an
5 incident in January 2016, this year, in California,
6 there has been numerous exposures of workers to this
7 chemical. And all of the sudden, EPA changes the rules
8 of the game. And so what -- I don't understand with the
9 science that's there, the process. And if this is going
10 to be the process, is it money? Is it profits? Is it
11 that we don't care about the population that is going to
12 be impacted?
13 I mean, okay, so we can throw away the workers,
14 they're Latino, they're poor, they don't speak English,
15 and we don't care? I mean, that is the population
16 that's going to be impacted the most by these changes in
17 the game. And it's not acceptable and it's really --
18 it's really upsetting and it's very -- it goes against
19 the mission of what the EPA is all about. And that is
20 to protect human health.
21 And so what is happening here is not that the
22 science is unresolved. We have more science on this
23 issue. And so what happened is that the rules of the
24 game have changed, and this is going to impact a
25 population that puts food on our table and their kids

87

1 and the populations that live around them.
2 So that is now on your plate and this is really
3 a very poor -- poorly made, poorly done process, and a
4 very dangerous decision.
5 MR. KEIGWIN: I realize, Richard, you had had
6 your card up sooner, so Richard, if you could go now.
7 MR. GRAGG: Okay, I have two questions. I guess
8 my first one has to do with the going to 2022. So how
9 can the EPA -- how do you intend on revising, updating,
10 or coming up with some new type of evaluation that it
11 took you 30 years to get to, how are you going to do
12 that in five years? So that's my first question.
13 My second question is, you say here that you
14 received a request to remand the biological evaluations.
15 If somebody can explain that. And then you say you have
16 not issued draft biological opinions.
17 MR. KEIGWIN: All right, so let me take the
18 second two first. So as they related to the ESA
19 evaluations, we did receive a request earlier this year
20 to -- it wasn't a remand, it was a request for us to
21 withdraw the biological evaluations for three
22 organophosphates: Chlorpyrifos, diazinon and malathion
23 that we had submitted to the U.S. Fish & Wildfire
24 Service and the National Maritime Fisheries Service in
25 January of this year.

88

1 MR. GRAGG: Right.
2 MR. KEIGWIN: That initiated consultation under
3 the Endangered Species Act, so we received requests from
4 external stakeholders to withdraw those biological
5 evaluations. We have not withdrawn those biological
6 evaluations. The biological evaluations are still with
7 the services and we are actively engaged in consultation
8 with the services.
9 The next step will be for the services to
10 provide us with draft biological opinions that we will
11 make available for public comment. We're still working,
12 as Marietta said, with the services in the development
13 of those draft biological opinions. Those are products
14 of the services. These are very complicated evaluations
15 for them to do, the first nation-wide biological
16 opinions that we're doing in tandem with the services.
17 And so that work continues to be ongoing. So there has
18 not been a remand and there has not been a withdrawal of
19 those.
20 MR. GRAGG: Okay.
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay? In terms of the next steps
22 with the human health evaluation. Yu-Ting, do you want
23 to?
24 MS. GUILARAN: So, part of what we're doing
25 right now is going through the comments that we have

89

1 received from the 2016 Notice of Data Availability,
2 along with the Revised Human Health Risk Assessment. I
3 was just checking with Dana on how many subsequent
4 comments we received. It's 200, and then the mass mail
5 is more than that.
6 So we're going through the comment process
7 working with the Human Health Effects Division to
8 basically trying to figure out ways to address the
9 comments.
10 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. Did you have a follow-up,
11 Richard?
12 MR. GRAGG: Yeah. So just for my clarification.
13 So EPA goes through a process where you come up with a
14 result or analysis, you put it out for public comment,
15 and so these public comments are -- or these questions
16 have led you to not conclude the human health portion
17 because you got these comments, is that how the process
18 works?
19 MS. GUILARAN: So kind of going back to what I
20 was saying originally, that we -- EPA was attempting to
21 address what the SAP's recommendation was to the agency.
22 So the feedback that we have received, wide ranging from
23 whether or not the agency did address or did not
24 address, and this is how it was insufficient or
25 sufficient, we have on both sides. So that's where

90

1 we're trying to go through the information that we
2 received as part of this process through reg review.
3 Trying to see what more modification, if any, we have to
4 make to the science piece of it.
5 MR. GRAGG: I guess I'm going to stop, so it's
6 going to take you five years, you estimate, to get
7 there?
8 MS. GUILARAN: I guess I'm citing the five years
9 because that's the end of the first round of reg review.
10 MR. GRAGG: Um-hmm.
11 MS. GUILARAN: I'll try to do the best I can for
12 you.
13 MR. GRAGG: Thank you very much.
14 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Leyla, then Lori Ann, then
15 Preston.
16 MS. McCURDY: Thank you very much. I'm not
17 going to take too long. I want to say that I concur
18 with the statements made by my colleagues before me,
19 Nichelle, Amy, Iris, and Richard, and I agree with the
20 questions that they posed and I feel like they have not
21 been answered in the way that satisfies me.
22 So I just want to re-emphasize that we at the
23 Children's Environmental Health Network are very
24 concerned that this decision to postpone is putting
25 children in harm's way, and we hope that the process can

91

1 be expedited. Thank you.
2 MR. KEIGWIN: Lori Ann, then Preston.
3 MS. BURD: First I want to acknowledge the many
4 EPA employees who put years into working towards the
5 chlorpyrifos ban. I thank you all for the work you did
6 and recognize that this decision was out of your hands,
7 unfortunately.
8 I have a few questions. Number one, as you guys
9 go about this process, are you working with estimates of
10 anticipated poisonings that will occur in the five years
11 that it will take for us to apparently get certainty?
12 That's pretty good numbers, it seems like we should be
13 upfront with them.
14 MS. GUILARAN: So, our -- so we continue to
15 monitor any of the incidents that occur related to all
16 the pesticides that's in the market right now, so that's
17 how we would keep track of the incidents.
18 MS. BURD: Okay. We know there's no such thing
19 as scientific certainty, but we are pretty certain about
20 what chlorpyrifos will do, and as many of my colleagues
21 mentioned, there's abundant research on chlorpyrifos and
22 why this ban would have been well substantiated. I'm
23 wondering if as part of the additional research that you
24 all are looking at and incorporating whether you are
25 studying and monitoring the people that are currently

92

1 being poisoned by chlorpyrifos every year as this
2 decision continues. It seems like that would be a very
3 good group for additional research.
4 And also, I guess I'd like to know, you know, a
5 little bit more about the plan of action for the next
6 five years. We're not getting a ton of information here
7 about exactly what will happen in these next five years.
8 MS. GUILARAN: So first I just want to -- if
9 folks are interested in looking at the comments that we
10 have received just the diversity of that and to kind of
11 underscore what we're talking about when we talk about
12 the scientific complexity and uncertainty, I will
13 welcome you to our docket, because they are all
14 available for you to take a look at the issues that we
15 have to grapple with from here on out.
16 So step number one is to look through all the
17 comments and make sure that we understand them, and then
18 to see which of the comments are substantive, that may
19 or may not change our risk assessment. Obviously if
20 it's going to change our risk assessment, that will take
21 HED time to work through that. And at that point, if
22 there is a change, I mean, I'm looking at my boss, but
23 we may have to have another comment period, or -- so I
24 think that's why it's really hard to predict.
25 I think first is just really to wrap our hands

93

1 around what's the kind of information that's come in and
2 what we need to do to respond to those comments. And
3 I'm sorry for not being able to provide even more detail
4 at this point, but we did receive a lot of information,
5 and I encourage you to check our dockets.
6 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. Preston, then Donny, then
7 Cynthia.
8 MR. PECK: I will support the comments that have
9 been said thus far so far as the potential exposure over
10 this time period, but I also heard at the beginning of
11 this meeting, and I don't remember who, I believe it was
12 an agency official speaking to the importance of
13 government to have clear and concise messaging when
14 talking to the public. And I think that we've
15 acknowledged that this has caused a great deal of
16 confusion.
17 And we've seen in North Carolina, and the people
18 that I met during the break from North Carolina will
19 probably back me up on this, a great deal of confusion
20 coming from coal ash being spilled into the Dan River,
21 and our Department of Environmental Quality and the
22 Department of Health and Human Services going back and
23 forth, and I'm sure EPA was brought in on this, on
24 levels of hexavalent chromium, so forth and so on. In
25 the mean time, the people of that area are being exposed

94

1 and being very confused by the process of whether they
2 can drink their water or not.
3 So just to highlight the lack of clarity on this
4 decision and the impact that that can have on people and
5 the confusion and still distrust within different
6 agencies that not to just focus on the EPA, I think that
7 time and time again I hear not necessarily from people
8 sitting around this table, but people from industry
9 speaking on touting these newer classes of pesticides
10 such as neonics that's safer alternatives to the older
11 class; however, in these same breaths and the same
12 moments, I don't hear much from industry on advocating
13 to get these other chemicals with this much data off the
14 shelves.
15 And so I would encourage industry to speak up in
16 times like these and to acknowledge that there are
17 concerns to be made here and do what you can to help out
18 agency and regulatory officials. So, thank you.
19 MR. KEIGWIN: Donny, then Cynthia.
20 MR. TAYLOR: So, can you all educate the
21 committee on what impact an external deadline has on you
22 performing your work?
23 MR. KEIGWIN: So, let me ask you a clarifying
24 question. We have lots of external deadlines. Do you
25 have specific ones in mind?

95

1 MR. TAYLOR: I understand, but you can use this
2 as your case study.
3 MR. KEIGWIN: So if what you're referring to are
4 court-ordered deadlines --
5 MR. TAYLOR: In this particular case, if that's
6 the deadline.
7 MR. KEIGWIN: So in this case, we were under a
8 court order to come to a decision by a certain period of
9 time. I should note that after the agency received the
10 report from the FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel, the
11 agency asked for additional time because of the -- or in
12 light of the advice that we had received in trying to
13 figure out a path forward based upon that advice.
14 While we did get some additional time, we did
15 not get the length of time that we had sought, and so
16 the scientists here in the Office of Pesticide Programs
17 did a yeoman's effort in my personal opinion with the
18 time that they had to revise a risk assessment, seek
19 public comment, understanding that it was the best that
20 we could do with the time that we had, understanding the
21 report as we understood it at the time, and that, you
22 know, one of the values of public comment periods, in
23 general, I'll just pivot to that a little bit, is that
24 as great a job as we do, and I was very thankful and
25 appreciative of the comments that Nancy Beck had earlier

96

1 about the strength of this program's assessment. We
2 don't always get it right, and there is great value to
3 us in getting feedback on the assessments that we do.
4 We don't oftentimes get a lot of feedback on the
5 assessments that we do, so 200-plus very substantive
6 comments on an assessment is a lot of information to go
7 through and to make sure that we're making the best
8 decision that we can with the best available science
9 that's before us.
10 MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, because I think under
11 the deadlines that you were given, I think you had to do
12 what you had to do and everybody doesn't understand that
13 science sometimes takes longer than the deadlines that
14 are put in place.
15 MR. KEIGWIN: Cynthia?
16 MS. PALMER: Thank you. First of all, I concur
17 with the comments of Nichelle, Amy, Iris, Richard,
18 Leyla, Lori Ann and Preston, and I would like to state
19 that the science on smoking has likewise been very
20 complex, and yet when you look at the message and the
21 weight of the evidence, it's rather clear-cut that
22 smoking is bad for you. And I think there are
23 parallels.
24 And third, I just had a clarifying question
25 about Dow's requests to remand, because it comes up in

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

97

1 each PPDC update that they have made this request, and
2 you've stated quite clearly that EPA has not done this,
3 they have not granted that request.
4 Is that the same as saying that EPA has rejected
5 that request? Have you turned down Dow's request, or do
6 we still need to be nervous that you might actually say
7 yes? Thanks.
8 MR. KEIGWIN: So we received that request many
9 months ago, and we have not withdrawn the BEs, and I
10 think that's a pretty effective message. I think the
11 fact that we have not withdrawn the BEs, that is the
12 agency's current position.
13 MR. KEIGWIN: Richard, you're -- or Donny,
14 anymore? Cynthia, anymore?
15 (No response.)
16 MR. KEIGWIN: All right. So, I suspect that
17 given that the next two chemicals aren't exactly -- why
18 are you looking at me like that? All right, you all
19 have a choice. We can either -- I will give it to you
20 all. We could either try to get through both
21 glyphosates and the neonics before lunchtime, that is
22 like the -- that's -- let's practice this consensus
23 thing a little bit more this afternoon. I think I heard
24 no, pretty resoundingly. Jay might suggest otherwise, I
25 don't know if that's why your tent card is up.

98

1 So, my suggestion based upon the groans in the
2 room was we will break now. I will give Jay a minute to
3 intervene with what he was going to say.
4 MR. VROOM: Just with respect to the suite of
5 pest control available to farmers and other pesticide
6 users, at the intersection of EPA's trying to apply very
7 complex laws like the Endangered Species Act that has
8 been referenced here, written completely separately from
9 the pesticide law, and, frankly, even though the Food
10 Quality Protection Act amended both the Food, Drug and
11 Cosmetic Act and FIFRA in 1996, you still struggle with
12 trying to make sense out of those two laws.
13 And so as an example, conversations here this
14 morning about chlorpyrifos largely pivot around the
15 petition to revoke the tolerances of chlorpyrifos, which
16 is a process that in the pure sense of the two statutes
17 are completely disconnected. And, frankly, doesn't make
18 any sense.
19 And so I just wanted to make the point that
20 farmers and other pest control users have a lot of
21 needs, and if you look at the actual facts of the
22 evolution of the way the agency regulates, especially
23 all of the insecticides that we're talking about
24 principally here, and use patterns that have responded,
25 I think we've seen a tremendous amount of risk avoidance

99

1 and mitigation that is a combination of the serious
2 efforts of applying science and very disparate policy
3 framework handed to EPA, and the user community, and
4 everybody else that sits around this table.
5 So I think we ought to pause and celebrate the
6 fact that we have made a lot of progress around risk
7 mitigation in the last 20 years. And that there's a
8 profound commitment that we heard today from EPA to
9 continue to lead with regulatory efforts to apply
10 science as it evolves, and help to also provide a
11 pathway for new, safer products to get to the
12 marketplace. Thanks.
13 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. It is ten minutes to 12:00.
14 Why don't we reconvene at 1:15, plan accordingly to get
15 through security so that we can start right on time, and
16 what we'll start with at 1:15 is the discussion about
17 dicamba.
18 (Whereupon, at 11:50 a.m., a lunch recess was
19 taken.)
20
21
22
23
24
25

100

1 AFTERNOON SESSION
2 (1:15 p.m.)
3 MR. KEIGWIN: Just one thing before we move on
4 with the afternoon agenda. It's been brought to the
5 agency's attention that there may be PPDC members that
6 are tweeting out the discussions at today's proceedings,
7 and I've been asked to remind everybody that, as Jim
8 McCleary went through with us this morning, that it's
9 important for all of us to refrain from any language or
10 activities that would compromise the civility of the
11 committee, and at least one PPDC member has brought to
12 my attention their reluctance to speak because of the
13 tweeting. So I would ask and just remind all of us of
14 the role and responsibility that we have in these
15 proceedings, and to act accordingly.
16 So, thank you for that. So this morning we had
17 a very robust conversation, and I would imagine it will
18 get even more so. So I'd like to introduce Reuben
19 Baris, who is the Acting Branch Chief of the Herbicide
20 Branch in the Registration Division, and Dan Kenny, who
21 is the Acting Associate Director of the Registration
22 Division, to give you all an update on a recent decision
23 that we made relative to dicamba.
24 MR. BARIS: Thank you, Rick. And thank you,
25 PPDC members, thanks for the opportunity to present

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

101

1 today on a little window into essentially how my staff
2 and I have spent our last few months. And actually,
3 honestly, many people in this room have spent the last
4 several months investing a whole host of energy into
5 finding workable solutions. This has been an enormous
6 undertaking that represents the efforts of individuals
7 at all levels within the EPA, coordination and
8 cooperation from state lead agencies, university weed
9 scientists, USDA, and the pesticide manufacturers of
10 dicamba products approved for use on dicamba-tolerant
11 soybean and cotton. It is an extremely high-profile and
12 significant situation. It has drawn on the resources of
13 our regulatory partners, focusing attention on
14 investigating incidents and developing practical
15 solutions.
16 The role of these efforts is to minimize
17 off-target movements and reduce instances of crop damage
18 in the 2018 season, while recognizing the importance of
19 these products as a tool for growers to manage weed
20 resistance. It was and continues to be our intent to
21 inform growers in a timely manner, allowing them to make
22 informed choices for seed purchases for the 2018 growing
23 season.
24 The next few slides will walk us through a very
25 high-level synopsis of these issues and provide a

102

1 general update on the areas of the labels that were
2 modified for the 2018 growing season.
3 New uses of dicamba for use on dicamba-tolerant
4 soybean and cotton were registered in November/December
5 of 2016. Three products are currently registered.
6 That's Monsanto's XtendiMax with VaporGrip Technology,
7 BASF's Engenia herbicide, and DuPont's FeXapan herbicide
8 with VaporGrip Technology. These are the only products
9 that are registered for over-the-top uses for
10 dicamba-tolerant soybean and cotton.
11 As the 2017 growing season was ramping up in the
12 mid-south, EPA quickly became aware of the rapidly
13 increasing number of crop damage cases alleging
14 off-target movement of dicamba. These incidents of
15 off-field movement were reported to the state
16 departments of agriculture as early as April, after
17 which allegations and investigations were brought to the
18 EPA's attention as early as May, stemming from the
19 Bootheel of Missouri and Arkansas.
20 As the 2017 growing season progressed, recorded
21 incidents rapidly increased in frequency and geographic
22 distribution across the southern states, northern
23 Missouri, and eventually spreading into the midwest and
24 Dakotas.
25 The next few slides are a little bit updated

103

1 than the slides that you actually have in your packet,
2 given that when I gave these slides for approval and
3 submissions for you all to actually have printed out and
4 available to you, new information was brought to our
5 attention about finalized numbers and cases. So these
6 will be posted to the PPDC's website, I can get
7 confirmation of that, so they will be available as soon
8 as that happens.
9 So out of the 34 states where dicamba-tolerant
10 soybean and cotton uses were registered, 25 states
11 reported estimates of soybean crop damage. As of
12 October 15th, 2017, 2,708 official cases were reported
13 to the state departments of agriculture, totaling over
14 3.6 million acres of soybeans. These figures only
15 represent the official incidents reported to the state
16 departments of agriculture in May and, in fact,
17 underestimate the extensive crop damage incidents since
18 we are aware that approximately one in five cases were
19 actually reported and documented.
20 Throughout the 2017 season, estimates such as
21 these represented our current understanding of the
22 evolving issue, but as this issue was extremely dynamic
23 and difficult to really get perfect information on, as
24 soon as these figures were gathered and presented or
25 reported, they were actually outdated.

104

1 The map on this slide and the next were compiled
2 by Dr. Kevin Bradley of the University of Missouri,
3 where he pulled representatives from the state
4 departments of agriculture quantifying the number of
5 formal complaints of soybean crop damage.
6 And then this map estimates the total acreage of
7 soybean damage this year as reported by state extension
8 weed scientists drawing from their involvement directly
9 with growers. While these estimates focus on soybean
10 acreage, we are also aware of cases involving tomatoes,
11 watermelon, cantaloupe, vineyards, pumpkins, vegetables,
12 tobacco, residential gardens, trees and shrubs, and
13 other plants that are sensitive to dicamba.
14 As the issue evolved this year, EPA -- next
15 slide, sorry. As the issue evolved this year, EPA
16 engaged state lead agencies and university weed
17 scientists in a series of conversations gathering
18 information that could help remedy the unacceptable
19 dicamba-related incidents reported in the field. The
20 EPA approached the issue cooperatively with our
21 regulatory partners in affected states and collected
22 information from experts in the field to better inform
23 any potential federal regulatory action.
24 Our objective is to minimize off-target movement
25 and reduce the number of incidents in the 2018 growing

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

105

1 season, but we recognize the utility of the benefit of
2 dicamba-tolerant technology through weed-resistant
3 management. With this in mind, the EPA developed
4 workable solutions with the pesticide manufacturers to
5 amend the pesticide label application directions to
6 address issues that rose to the surface of possible
7 explanations for the unacceptably high number of crop
8 damage incidents.
9 In our discussions, there were five common
10 issues that surfaced in almost every conversation,
11 suggesting the potential root causes of crop damage
12 related to dicamba applications. These were: Physical
13 drift, contamination, temperature inversions, volatility
14 and misuse.
15 In reaching an agreement with Monsanto, BASF,
16 DuPont -- and DuPont on measures to further minimize the
17 potential drift to damaged neighboring crops from the
18 use of dicamba formulations used to control weeds and
19 genetically modified cotton and soybeans, the new use
20 requirements for the use of dicamba will allow growers
21 to make informed choices for seed purchases and weed
22 management for the 2018 growing season.
23 This slide summarizes the major changes to the
24 label for the next growing season; however, the labels
25 have been revised significantly compared to the original

106

1 registrations. Namely, there are no longer supplemental
2 labels for the uses on dicamba-tolerant soybeans and
3 cotton. The supplemental labels have been integrated
4 into the main label which the registrants have
5 voluntarily agreed to designate as restricted use,
6 meaning that only certified applicators may purchase and
7 apply these products, which also includes permitting
8 those under the direct supervision of a certified
9 applicator to apply these products.
10 Dicamba-specific training is mandatory for all
11 applicators who intend to apply these products,
12 emphasizing that there may be state-specific
13 requirements for training, and applicators must follow
14 the state requirements before applying.
15 Additional restrictions have been implemented to
16 limit when applications are permitted, reducing the
17 maximum wind speed from 15 miles per hour to ten, and
18 limiting applications of the dicamba between sunrise and
19 sunset.
20 Language was added to enhance directions for
21 sprayer system cleanout in order to prevent
22 cross-contamination, and in an effort to increase
23 awareness of the potential risk of damaging neighboring
24 crops, label directions and documentation was added
25 requiring applicators to identify potential sensitive

107

1 crops or plants neighboring the application site to
2 further emphasize the compliance with downwind buffer
3 restrictions.
4 And, lastly, the restricted use pesticide
5 designation on these three products carries with it the
6 requirement for the applicators to keep and maintain
7 certain records regarding the use of these products.
8 Keep in mind that product labels are very different from
9 the labels that the growers may have become accustomed
10 to in the 2017 growing season. It is important for
11 applicators to be trained before applying these products
12 and follow all label directions.
13 All three registrants are undertaking a process
14 to get the labels in the hands of growers in time for
15 the 2018 application season. This effort is intended to
16 appropriately manage product that is currently in the
17 channels of trade and relabel it so growers are using
18 the correct label. While each registrant may have
19 slightly different processes for implementing the new
20 label, the intent is to ensure that applications --
21 applicators and growers have the new label and are
22 following the correct label directions for the upcoming
23 season.
24 EPA will monitor the success of these changes
25 and help inform our decision whether to allow the

108

1 continued use of dicamba on dicamba-tolerant soybean and
2 cotton after the 2018 growing season. And I think one
3 of the things that we will hear today that I hope we can
4 enter into the rest of the hour would be looking to the
5 committee to -- and open it up for suggestion and
6 discussions about how best to monitor the success in the
7 2018 season and beyond.
8 Thanks.
9 MR. KEIGWIN: So, questions on that
10 presentation? Andrew, Preston, Charlotte.
11 MR. THOSTENSON: So, my question, basically now
12 we're trying to figure out what success looks like in
13 2018? Would that be a fair assessment of what we're
14 going to try and do over the next few minutes?
15 MR. BARIS: Yes, I think that's one of the
16 objectives, and how best to measure that.
17 MR. THOSTENSON: Okay. So, you know, one of the
18 thoughts that I have in working with applicators, and
19 we've engaged with our Department of Agriculture about
20 what success might look like, and we just threw some
21 ballpark numbers out and said if we have 50 percent of
22 this off-target movement in North Dakota, would that be
23 acceptable in '18 or not? And our department
24 universally said that wasn't acceptable. That would
25 have been a failure.

109

1 So then we said, well, maybe 25 percent. Maybe
2 10 percent. So I guess I'm grappling with what the
3 success looked like. I mean, we are going to have
4 problems, it's just a matter of how much problems we'll
5 have.
6 I assume that what has happened with the new
7 labels will mitigate some of it, but how much? And
8 that's what we're grappling with in North Dakota right
9 now is trying to describe what success looks like in
10 2018.
11 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Preston, then Charlotte,
12 then Cynthia.
13 MR. PECK: Thank you for your presentation. I
14 have just a couple of technical questions. With the
15 point on the underestimation of crop or plant damage,
16 the approximately one in five being recorded. How did
17 you derive that estimation?
18 MR. BARIS: That was based on conversations with
19 stakeholders, state lead agencies, university weed
20 scientists. It's not a precise estimate.
21 MR. PECK: Right.
22 MR. BARIS: It's an approximation. It was just
23 really the only information that we have, formally, are
24 the cases reported directly to the state departments of
25 agriculture.

110

1 MR. PECK: Yeah, I was just a little curious on
2 the methodology. And then one other question, is the
3 plan with the rollout of the new labels, is this being
4 coupled with any kind of educational efforts on letting
5 people know that there are label changes besides, you
6 know, is EPA working with the state departments of ag on
7 kind of a robust education campaign and awareness
8 building on this?
9 MR. BARIS: I think yes is a fair statement, but
10 there is a mandatory training requirement on the label,
11 and it opens -- it gives a nod to the states that
12 actually do have a specific requirement in their state,
13 and many states implemented that requirement through
14 24(c)s, and the 24(c) labels, in the 2017 season.
15 So the idea was to recognize that some states
16 already do have that requirement in place and may
17 continue that moving forward, but there is an
18 opportunity there for states to decide whether or not
19 they want to implement their own specific requirement.
20 MR. PECK: Thank you.
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Charlotte, then Cynthia, then Jay.
22 MS. SANSON: Thanks, and thanks, Reuben, for the
23 presentation. Preston stole some of my questions, so
24 I'll move on to my next one, although I did have a
25 question on slide 4, as Preston did, approximately one

111

1 in five cases, if that is -- if that is an assumption, I
2 think perhaps it would be better to state that as an
3 assumption, rather than approximately, because if that
4 number doesn't have a firm basis to it, maybe it's an
5 assumption.
6 MR. BARIS: That's fair to say. It is an
7 assumption. I mean, it's anecdotal information.
8 MS. SANSON: Yeah, okay.
9 MR. BARIS: It's not an official agency
10 position.
11 MS. SANSON: Okay. And then on slide 5, the one
12 with the map. I see that you have updated it since the
13 version we have, which is fine, but I was curious as to
14 an explanation on the zeros in some of the states. Is
15 that where it's registered but there were -- no, I think
16 it was that one. I think is that where it's registered
17 but there were no official incidents reported? Is that
18 how to interpret that?
19 MR. BARIS: That's correct. The state was
20 polled, dicamba is registered in those states for
21 over-the-top uses, but no official complaints or
22 incident cases were reported in those states.
23 MS. SANSON: Okay, thank you.
24 MR. KEIGWIN: Cynthia, then Jay, then Liza.
25 MS. PALMER: So, this is worrisome in terms of

112

1 the volatility and the drift issues with dicamba. I
2 sure hope it works in the next growing season. I'm
3 wondering what steps EPA would be taking to protect the
4 neighboring growers, and what these neighbors can do to
5 become whole. It seems like they will have no choice
6 but to buy dicamba-resistant seeds from Monsanto in the
7 future and we're sort of further along on that
8 treadmill.
9 I'm also wondering if with these label changes,
10 if there is like a Cliff's Notes version or something,
11 for the growers, because like I read that the Monsanto
12 XtendiMax with VaporGrip label is 4,500 words, and if
13 we're adding a few more, I'm hoping that there's a
14 summary version available for farmers. Thanks.
15 MR. KEIGWIN: So, as part of the training that
16 Reuben mentioned, and some of the label changes, there
17 have been -- there has been additional information put
18 on the label relative to what the sensitive crops are.
19 And then the enhanced training that will be provided in
20 many states, as Reuben mentioned, did do fairly
21 extensive training, and in a number of those states, the
22 extent of training perhaps even correlates with some of
23 the states where there were relatively low incidents, or
24 in the case of Georgia, no reported incidents.
25 And so we're trying to build upon the success of

113

1 that effort. As Reuben also mentioned, now these
2 products are restricted use, and so there's
3 recordkeeping, and so some of the recordkeeping
4 requirements that have been put in place in effect help
5 to walk the growers through the label, and then they're
6 recording how they have met that label requirement, so
7 we think that that helps to reinforce important parts of
8 the label.
9 Liza -- no, sorry, Jay, then Liza, then Andy.
10 MR. VROOM: Reuben, on slide 4, where you talked
11 about that was revised to 3.6 million acres of soybeans
12 impacted, so this is the composite of the reports you
13 got from the state regulators. Is that right? So it
14 would be an estimate of what they knew or had reported
15 in terms of the field size, right, for each complaint
16 incident?
17 MR. BARIS: So, that's partially correct, it
18 incorporates those figures; however, that 3.6 million
19 acre estimate is actually a poll from university weed
20 scientists extension agents on their best guess at
21 what --
22 MR. VROOM: So it would be a whole field
23 estimate, and in most of the cases, the impacts would
24 have been, you know, near the boundary of the field, so
25 this 3.6 million number estimate would be the total

114

1 acreage of fields for which complaints are anticipated
2 or have already been filed.
3 So it's -- the point I wanted to make is it's
4 probably an overstatement of the total acreage, and this
5 is out of I think 22 million acres that were treated
6 this year with over-the-top dicamba applications.
7 MR. BARIS: That's correct, 22 million acres
8 were treated.
9 MR. VROOM: So, again, it's early days. You
10 know, our advice to the agency was to wait until more of
11 the state investigations had been concluded. We
12 understand that some of the states haven't finished 2016
13 investigations yet, but compliments to the agency and
14 the registrants and the grower community for having come
15 together to create a label change landscape for 2018
16 that I think will help put more incentives in place for
17 applicators, whether private or custom applicators, to
18 pay attention, because more recordkeeping is going to be
19 in evidence and we'll know more about, you know, what
20 happened in 2018 than we'll ever know about 2016 and
21 '17.
22 So we're quite supportive of the progress that's
23 been made. Obviously there will be more to be learned,
24 and thank EPA for, you know, being a proactive
25 participant in all of this.

115

1 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Liza, then Andy, then
2 Sharon.
3 MS. TROSSBACH: I'd like to just provide some
4 information. There were some questions about the
5 education pesticide applicators, whether they're
6 commercial applicators, private applicators or
7 agricultural producers, in ensuring that they're aware
8 of the changes to the label. As a state lead agency
9 for, you know, for pesticide regulation, I can speak for
10 the entire association and indicate that we believe an
11 educated community is a compliant community, and we
12 stress education all the time.
13 In addition to applicators having to be
14 certified through examination, there's also continuing
15 education or recertification, and one of the things we
16 want to make sure is that applicators understand and
17 know how to use the tools that are in their hands. And
18 so certainly when there's any huge type of change like
19 this, when something is going from being a general use
20 pesticide to restricted use pesticide, and all of the
21 different requirements, and the fact that this is such
22 high-profile, and it is significant, you have growers
23 that have this technology in the field, they need a tool
24 to use to be able to, you know, to make those
25 treatments. We want it to be available, but we want to

116

1 be able to use it properly.
2 We're certainly -- I know the states that are
3 impacted by this have done a lot of training. It may
4 have been required, it may have not. They're certainly
5 doing that now. And as these changes have just been
6 announced, I think states are working to get that
7 information out to their grower communities to certify
8 those applicators that didn't previously have to be
9 certified.
10 Some is done by the state lead agency directly,
11 some is done through cooperative extension, and Andrew
12 can certainly speak more to that effort. Right now is
13 applicators are going through their continuing education
14 units or recertification courses, so the timing of this
15 is good in that we have these folks that are coming to
16 the table and working with extension. It's very easy
17 for me to work with people who are certified, because I
18 regulate those individuals, but those applicators who
19 didn't have to previously be certified to use dicamba,
20 that's where that relationship with extension is so
21 important, because that grower, the first call they make
22 is to their extension agent.
23 And so I can speak, you know, very emphatically
24 that the state regulatory authorities are working
25 through extension and those frameworks and mechanics

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

117

1 that are already out there to disseminate that
2 information. And so it's certainly -- we're certainly,
3 you know, making every effort to do that starting now,
4 part of the growing season, and then working on how will
5 the training be implemented. You know, is it going to
6 be registrant training? Is it going to be state
7 training? You know, how is it going to be -- how are we
8 going to reach those individuals? And we do this all
9 the time. Dicamba is not the first issue that's come up
10 with pesticides, it won't be the last, certainly, and we
11 do this all the time.
12 And so, you know, I like to think that we do a
13 good job at that. So just to address any of those
14 concerns about the grower group, the applicators not
15 having the information that they need.
16 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Andy, then Sharon, then
17 Richard.
18 MR. WHITTINGTON: Fair to say that we all know
19 that we can't have a year this year next year -- like we
20 had this year next year. We are in Mississippi making
21 significant changes. We were RUP last year, and so the
22 changes that are here are not that significant to the
23 changes that we will have to make. We are going to -- I
24 mean, we require training prior to purchase, rather than
25 prior to application.

118

1 I believe our plant board this year is going to
2 recommend that we go restricted use on the generic
3 dicamba products, to try and take that piece of the
4 puzzle out, but as someone who works with people who
5 were both affected and unaffected and the affecter, the
6 conversations that we are having is that we have to
7 be -- we have to do a better job of being stewards of
8 these products if we expect to keep them. And everybody
9 I have talked to is committed to that, and making sure
10 that they're good neighbors.
11 So we appreciate the label changes, we are
12 incorporating them into what we already have, and we
13 look forward to whatever success looks like next year.
14 Oh, and I do want to say that damage -- I'm not
15 sure that's the word I would use, because as harvest has
16 come up, some of it appears to be cosmetic, and I don't
17 know -- are you -- has the agency started getting
18 information on whether it's yield reduction or if it was
19 just cosmetic foliage damage? And is there a
20 difference?
21 MR. BARIS: We're asking for that type of
22 information, we're still continuing to try to wrap our
23 heads around it.
24 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Sharon, then Richard, then
25 Damon.

119

1 MS. SELVAGGIO: I was wondering about when you
2 have the slide about impacted crops, at the very end you
3 say trees and shrubs, and so I'm not sure if that means
4 crop trees or if that means native vegetation of
5 non-crop vegetation, or are those any other kind of
6 non-crop vegetation. So my question is has there been
7 any reports of ecological damage, you know, to
8 non-crops, and if so, do you have any quantification of
9 that?
10 MR. BARIS: As Jay was indicating, the
11 investigations are still ongoing, specifically to
12 quantify those acres that are not soybean. So we still
13 don't have an entire picture, but what we were trying to
14 do in this effort was to provide as much information as
15 we could and take appropriate action with the
16 information that we had available to us to inform
17 growers for the 2018 season. So as that information
18 becomes available, we'll certainly use that to inform
19 any future decisions.
20 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Richard, then Damon, then
21 Amy.
22 MR. GRAGG: I was curious as to whether or not
23 is EPA doing -- other than the information they're
24 receiving from the users or people who were impacted, is
25 EPA doing any of its own monitoring?

120

1 MR. BARIS: So the state lead agencies are
2 the -- they have primacy when it comes to pesticide
3 enforcement and investigations, so we work cooperatively
4 with the state lead agencies to investigate all cases of
5 incidents and working with them cooperatively to develop
6 those metrics to better evaluate what 2018 will look
7 like.
8 MR. GRAGG: Okay, thanks. And on slide 7, you
9 labeled it Investigations, but I guess my question is,
10 how are you -- what's your criteria for damage and are
11 you looking -- how are you identifying that in other
12 crops or plants?
13 MR. BARIS: We're looking at all of it. I mean,
14 we're trying to gather all that information together and
15 use the best available information to make the most
16 informed decision.
17 MR. KEIGWIN: So, Richard, let me just add on to
18 that. So, some of the initial reports that we got, for
19 example, in non-dicamba-tolerant soybeans, there was a
20 cupping within the plant, and so it was -- it was before
21 the seeds -- the pods started to form. I think that in
22 part was why we got the question we did about how did
23 this impact yield. So when Reuben is talking about
24 investigations, it's starting when the off-target
25 movement began to show some impact on a non-target

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

121

1 plant. That was kind of the premise. And so we're
2 including that, and the numbers that Reuben is citing
3 are coming from that -- those initial reports of
4 potentially some impact.
5 MR. GRAGG: So on -- so you cited the three
6 million acres of soybeans, however that's going to end
7 up actually, like the gentleman raised, what that
8 actually means, but what are your numbers? Do you have
9 numbers on your other crops, other impacted crops?
10 MR. BARIS: That's actually one of the things
11 that we're trying to -- or that we're actually
12 requesting from state lead agencies and those conducting
13 the cases of incidents is to measure what occurred in
14 2017 so that we can better evaluate 2018.
15 MR. GRAGG: And my last question is that if it
16 gets on other crops, is it always going to be some type
17 of physical or visible damage or do we know that or
18 could it get on a crop and not have any visible signs
19 and then it could get into the consumption -- into the
20 people purchasing or utilizing it for food?
21 MR. BARIS: I mean, dicamba has been registered
22 for a number of years and has a number of different uses
23 on it. Namely, it does have residential uses. So
24 different crops show different symptomology, depending
25 on its sensitivity. So I mean, I can -- we can go into

122

1 that, but I don't necessarily -- soybeans are the most
2 sensitive plant to our knowledge.
3 MR. GRAGG: All right, thank you.
4 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Amy, and then Andrew, are
5 you coming in for round two? And Nichelle.
6 MS. LIEBMAN: Thank you. This is a really --
7 MR. KEIGWIN: I'm sorry, I skipped Damon. So,
8 Amy then Damon.
9 MS. LIEBMAN: This is a really interesting
10 update on something that's been a little bit out of a
11 John Grisham novel with murder and all sorts of intrigue
12 with this. And I think this has been really helpful.
13 But I wanted to point out that this is a really
14 interesting case study when we get into our discussion
15 tomorrow about how important the label is and how
16 critical it is for people who are applying pesticides to
17 understand the label, and to use it accordingly. And I
18 want to echo what has been said about the importance of
19 education and training, and that we are not going to
20 have safe use, if there is a safe use, of pesticides if
21 people don't understand the label, can't read the label,
22 don't know the label, and are not educated about it.
23 So -- and it's interesting about the -- the
24 impact it's had, because it's affected a crop. And so
25 I'm also curious, you know, in terms of response when it

123

1 affects people. So I think the reaction has been great
2 in terms of looking into it, trying to investigate it,
3 understanding what's happening, changing the label, all
4 of these things are really good actions, but I find it
5 intriguing all of this is happening because of crop
6 damage and not -- changes don't happen when we have
7 human -- I'd like to see similar responses and action.
8 And then the other thing I wanted to point out,
9 I think the numbers on that map, on slide 5, are super
10 interesting. And I find it hard to believe about the
11 zeros in Florida and Georgia, and I think it would be
12 helpful for the agency as you move forward to look into
13 what has happened in some of those states in terms of
14 the education, because my guess is, is now that they've
15 done a great job educating -- I mean, I have no idea,
16 but I have a feeling that the states where there has
17 been a lot of outreach and a lot of education, you're
18 probably getting some higher numbers because people are
19 aware of what's going on. So I think the higher number,
20 they're almost an interesting -- could be an interesting
21 impact of the educational efforts.
22 So essentially like if you look at pesticide
23 incident reporting for people in California, versus
24 Texas or Florida, it's always higher in California
25 because they have a better system there. It's not

124

1 because there's more incidents happening in California,
2 there's more reported incidents happening in California.
3 So I just think that's something for you guys to
4 investigate and see what's happening and what's at the
5 root of such enormous differences between Georgia and
6 some of the other states.
7 MR. BARIS: Thank you for your comment. I mean,
8 I think the -- there are a lot of factors that go into
9 these numbers, and these are just numbers on a slide.
10 Just because Georgia has a zero and Arkansas has 986, it
11 may be a factor, like you said, of reported incidents or
12 outreach or awareness or anything. There's --
13 topography, geography, proximity, there's so many --
14 there's so many factors that go into whether or not an
15 incident is reported or not. And that's -- those are
16 exactly the things that we're looking into and examining
17 as we move forward.
18 MR. KEIGWIN: I think that -- and point taken,
19 Amy, I think one of the things I would say, I know the
20 Georgia program particularly well, they started training
21 their applicators three years ago, well in advance of
22 the technology being available, so it wasn't just a
23 one-time training, there was some repetition involved,
24 too, and I think at least for myself, as I was going
25 through my academic training, repetition certainly

125

1 helped a lot.
2 MS. LEIBMAN: Great, and let's remember that
3 tomorrow when we talk about WPS and the certified
4 applicator training.
5 MR. KEIGWIN: Right. So, with that, Damon, then
6 Andrew, then Nichelle.
7 MR. REABE: Thanks. I also noticed something
8 really interesting on that map that I'd like to bring to
9 the attention. Obviously we're all aware of the fact
10 that aerial application is not an approved method for
11 any of these active ingredients. And when you look at
12 the map and you think back to the time at which these
13 products were to be applied, where those numbers are the
14 highest are correlating with some very, very wet spring.
15 And these growers did not have the tool of aerial
16 application to use to apply this product.
17 And so with that being said, that probably put a
18 lot of ground applicators in a very, very difficult
19 position where the timing of this application needed to
20 be made under less-than-ideal conditions. Aerial
21 application can help with that in that we can make these
22 applications regardless of soil conditions, so when we
23 have these really wet periods, access to this tool to
24 fight weed resistance is available to our producers.
25 And I think had there been access to this tool

126

1 by the aerial applicators in Arkansas and the Bootheel
2 of Missouri, these products would have been applied by
3 professionals who are paid very, very well for what they
4 do, clearly understand how to use herbicides properly
5 and under what conditions they have to use them in, and
6 as professionals, really have a -- they have their
7 career to lose if it's done incorrectly.
8 And so the understanding of the training is
9 there because we're dealing with people that are truly
10 professionals with -- that are making a career out of
11 aerial application. So that was one observation that I
12 noticed, and I think that we would clearly see a
13 correlation not only in the number of acres treated, but
14 also under what -- what was the story of the spring
15 regarding soil conditions.
16 In regards to the 3.6 million acres affected,
17 that's approximately 4 percent of all of the soybeans
18 planted in the United States, so had -- if they're truly
19 affected or particularly if they are destroyed, we would
20 see a very significant change in commodity prices
21 associated with that. So that number, I know the
22 intention isn't to inflate the number, but it is -- it
23 is probably a serious overestimation.
24 The other thing that I was really interesting in
25 this presentation was the fact that 22 million acres

127

1 were treated with this tool. That's nearly 30 percent
2 of the entire soybean crop. These are not good numbers.
3 This is a very serious problem, but what is not
4 quantified in this presentation is how many applications
5 were done. Thanks.
6 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Andrew, then Nichelle, then
7 Liza.
8 MR. THOSTENSON: Well, as a pesticide trainer,
9 and that's what I've been doing for the past 21 years, I
10 can tell you that I have observed both the Arkansas
11 training and the Georgia training, and they're both very
12 good trainings. You'll notice that Arkansas has 986,
13 even though they had a very good training program, and
14 Georgia had a very good training program, and they had
15 zero.
16 So I tend to believe that good training is good
17 training. But that means that there's something else
18 going on there besides just training in Arkansas.
19 The other question that I have is because I am a
20 trainer, what are the criteria for this mandated
21 training? Do we have a curriculum? Do we have a
22 standard like what we've done in soil fumigation of
23 certain topic areas that need to be covered? I'm just
24 curious what that may or may not be, for the
25 dicamba-specific training.

128

1 MR. BARIS: Thank you, Andrew. The intent of
2 the label language on the -- in regards to the mandatory
3 training statement, training is required, and then it's
4 a two-part statement after that, giving an
5 acknowledgment to the states that either implemented a
6 training requirement in 2017 season through a 24(c)
7 label requirement that developed that state requirement
8 and developed a state training, say Georgia or Alabama,
9 North Carolina, Arkansas, Mississippi, Louisiana, I
10 could go on.
11 It was an acknowledgment that those requirements
12 could be in place for 2018 as well. But by no means was
13 that to say that a state must develop that training.
14 They have a -- they have the decision to implement a
15 requirement and develop a training, should they choose
16 to; however, that could also open up an opportunity for
17 the state to decide whether or not they take a
18 registrant-provided training.
19 And I think Liza may actually be able to speak a
20 little bit more articulately about the effort that AAPCO
21 is actually going through right now to make that
22 determination across the 34 states that are affected for
23 these registrations of dicamba-tolerant soybean and
24 cotton.
25 So again, that's just the intent of the label

129

1 language, and I think we're actively working on that.
2 There is no specific curriculum, but there is work being
3 done to address the requirement.
4 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Nichelle, then Liza, then
5 Lori Ann.
6 MS. HARRIOTT: So pesticide drift is not a new
7 Phenomenon that farmers have had to be facing and that
8 EPA by extension has had to address. And given that
9 risk, we see more genetically modified crops being
10 paired with specific products that are to be used on
11 those genetically modified crops. I just want to urge
12 EPA, in conjunction with collaboration with USDA, to
13 work together to proactively -- and this is me thinking
14 ahead -- to proactively develop a new strategy where we
15 do not in the future see any more of these dicamba-like
16 incidents when it comes to spray drift, given that we
17 know that there are new pesticide products in the
18 pipeline to be used on these type crops.
19 And just going back to an earlier question of
20 what does success look like, EPA in conjunction with
21 USDA need to sit down and evaluate that question. I
22 think it's a very valid question. What does success
23 look like? Are we just trying to reduce incidents from
24 the 986 that we see in Arkansas to, say, 500 incidents?
25 Is that what success is? Is it 200 incidents? Or are

130

1 we trying to move away from having farmers face these
2 types of incidents year after year and are we trying to
3 eliminate spray drift?
4 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Liza, then Lori Ann, then
5 Richard.
6 MS. TROSSBACH: Thank you. I will mention
7 briefly this survey, I had planned to do that initially
8 when the question was asked about the crop damage that's
9 not to soybeans or to cotton, and in that -- in the map
10 that you see, that was done by weed scientists asking
11 specifically about soybeans and cotton. And so one of
12 the things that AAPCO, the association has done, is put
13 together a survey to the states, and one of the
14 questions in that survey is, are you able to quantify
15 the non-soybean, non-cotton crop damage and what
16 specifically it is, to try to gather that information.
17 So that survey actually just went out this week
18 to state lead agencies and we're gathering that
19 information to help provide that information to EPA, you
20 know, just so that they know, you know, for their
21 consideration.
22 Also in that survey, we're also asking the
23 states questions about the training requirement. As you
24 heard, there are some states that mandated training
25 already, so they already have training in place. You

131

1 have some states, like Virginia, that didn't mandate
2 training, but conducted a lot of training over the last
3 year. And we're one of the states that there were no
4 reports of potential pesticide misuse or damage to the
5 state lead agency, which is my office.
6 And so I like to think there is some
7 correlation, but again, there are so many factors, if
8 you look at Arkansas, it's a cropping system, the amount
9 of acreage, how they're applied. There are so many
10 factors, you know, in that. But to the training, one of
11 the things that we are asking states is just that
12 question, Andrew, is what would it require, you know,
13 what would you want, or what would you require before
14 you would accept registrant training? You know, are
15 there certain components. Does it have to be -- you
16 know, do you want it approved by EPA? Does it have to
17 be certain factors?
18 So there's a lot of that work that's being asked
19 of state lead agencies right now, you know, to get their
20 opinion on and to gather that information. Also are you
21 going to do state training, will you allow registrant
22 training. There's a lot of flexibility for states. For
23 those states that already have training, who have a
24 mandated training program, they may already have
25 training in place. Not that they might change it a

132

1 little or amend it, but they already have that in place.
2 Then you have some states who will have to start over,
3 or may have to work from scratch.
4 So I think that information that will be
5 gathered through this survey will kind of be helped,
6 whether it's something that comes out officially from
7 EPA or whether it's a guidance document to state lead
8 agencies to help each other, say this is what we think
9 is important for this type of training, certainly
10 working with extension, our pesticide safety educators,
11 who are those individuals who are experts in that area,
12 we'll be able to pull all that information together so
13 we're ready for the 2018 use season.
14 And there is an urgency, because now, as I
15 mentioned before, is when certification courses and --
16 excuse me, recertification and continuing education
17 happens, and we need to get individuals trained and
18 certified so they're ready to use for 2018, which can be
19 early in some states, you know, in some areas.
20 Just one other thing about the differences in
21 the numbers. I think the statement was made about
22 Florida being zero. Well Florida has very limited use
23 of dicamba. So just as an -- a total amount that's
24 supplied to total amount of acreage is much smaller
25 than, say, Arkansas or some of the other states. So

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

133

1 once again, it's hard to make those comparisons between
2 states because we are so different.
3 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Lori Ann, then Richard.
4 MS. BURD: Hello. Reuben, thank you for your
5 excellent presentation. My question arises in the
6 context of resistance management. We've heard reports
7 that many growers are adopting this technology because
8 they are concerned about drift, and so they're just kind
9 of prophylactically adopting it which, of course, goes
10 against some of the excellent resistance management
11 guidelines that this office has issued, and some of the
12 approach to resistance management that we've all
13 discussed, which, you know, would not involve a lot of
14 prophylactic adoption of these kinds of technologies.
15 And then, of course, subsequent increase in
16 dicamba use that would come from that. I'm wondering if
17 you guys were thinking about this at all from a
18 resistance management perspective.
19 MR. BARIS: There is a five-year check-in point
20 on the registration for resistance management and the
21 registrants are required per the terms on the
22 registration to report cases of resistance that they
23 know of to the agency, and there's mechanisms for that.
24 So we are acutely aware of resistance management, and
25 are keen to take action appropriately as needed.

134

1 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Richard?
2 MR. GRAGG: Okay, my questions have to do with
3 the -- I guess around success in your maps, but it was
4 just communicated that Florida may be low because they
5 don't use a lot of dicamba, so is that true for the
6 other half of the U.S. as well? The same type of thing,
7 there's not a lot of dicamba used where it's all white?
8 MR. KEIGWIN: So I believe the white states are
9 the states where this technology has not been
10 registered. So this only reflects the use in the states
11 where the over-the-top technology is registered, right?
12 MR. BARIS: The yellow states are the states
13 that actually were reported and polled as part of
14 Dr. Kevin Bradley's survey that have been affected by
15 the issue that we're talking about today.
16 MR. GRAGG: Okay.
17 MR. BARIS: The 25 states are highlighted; 34
18 states actually have registrations that this product is
19 actually registered on.
20 MR. GRAGG: Understood, thank you.
21 MR. BARIS: Some maybe just didn't report, this
22 is the information that we have available to us.
23 MR. GRAGG: So again, on the metric of success,
24 what -- is there a standard of what is an incident or an
25 impact? Because if there is -- you have these various

135

1 numbers, is everybody using the same metric to determine
2 that there's an impact? You know, how is the data --
3 how can you rely on the data if it's not uniform?
4 MR. BARIS: I think that -- thank you for the
5 comment. I mean, we're still gathering information,
6 like Andy was mentioning earlier about what the actual
7 impact on yields are. I think harvests are still
8 wrapping up, and so we're still gathering that type of
9 information.
10 So I mean, that's really what -- the yield
11 weights are really what's going to tell us the true
12 story about the measurable impact of dicamba damage,
13 whether it's cosmetic, whether it's growth and
14 reproduction, yield rates will tell the story.
15 MR. GRAGG: Okay. Thank you.
16 MR. BARIS: And we are trying to collect -- and
17 you reminded me that we are trying to collect
18 information on non-soybean impacts, so that's an
19 important point.
20 MR. GRAGG: Thank you.
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, round three? Andrew, are
22 you back up? Oh, I didn't see Amy. He's gone a couple
23 times. Go ahead, Amy.
24 MS. ASMUS: What are you doing when you're
25 looking at the effects of the drift that's different?

136

1 When we talk about education of applicators, I think
2 that's very important, but I've got applicators in our
3 area that have been applying dicamba for many, many,
4 many years, and we have never seen this high of
5 incidents of off-target movement. So is there any
6 study? Are you looking at the differences between
7 dicamba use in the past and dicamba use on crops like
8 cotton and soybean where, you know, what's the
9 difference in an application? Because if you tell my
10 applicators they have to be trained in dicamba
11 application, they've been doing that for many years
12 successfully. What is going to be different in this
13 training to actually address the off-target movement on
14 these crops that's different than the crops that we've
15 been using it for many years?
16 MR. BARIS: I mean, you are correct, dicamba has
17 been around for a number of years, and it has a number
18 of different uses. The difference is these uses
19 over-the-top on tolerant soybean and cotton.
20 And so the training will be involved in
21 following explicit label directions to prevent
22 noncompliance and follow the directions that are
23 intended to prevent off-field movement, and the
24 consequences that an applicator could face if they
25 aren't compliant with the label directions.

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

137

1 MS. ASMUS: Can I follow up real quick? So we
2 did extensive training with our applicators before it
3 was applied, and we believe that for the most part, it
4 was very consciously applied, made every effort to apply
5 it according to the label direction, and we still had
6 many off-target movements. So to believe that the
7 applicators are in error for all of this I think is
8 maybe a misunderstanding, and we need to address why it
9 worked and why it didn't work when all applicators
10 followed the label -- not all, the majority of the
11 applicators that I work with, I will quantify that,
12 followed the directions and were as methodical as they
13 could be in the applications, and we still had
14 off-target issues.
15 MR. BARIS: We're not insinuating that by any
16 means that growers did not follow the label. That's not
17 the case. One of the efforts that we tried to undertake
18 in this process has been to tighten the label, make it
19 clearer, integrate the supplemental labels into the main
20 label so that the label is easier to follow in and of
21 itself could provide a Cliff's Note version for itself,
22 because the label then is more integrated and is less
23 contradictory.
24 And these products are more similar than they
25 were in the past, so that training efforts can be done

138

1 to teach to the technology as opposed to individual
2 products, and I think that's really an important point
3 that -- as pesticide educators are -- application
4 educators are up in front of a classroom or on farm
5 teaching about the technologies. It's the risks, the
6 benefits, and how to follow the label and specific
7 elements of the label to ensure that these products are
8 used appropriately.
9 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, I want to do a time check so
10 we don't go over. So Lori Ann, are you back in?
11 MS. BURD: No.
12 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, so let's just do the last
13 four that are up. So Andrew, Richard, Amy, and Sharon.
14 MR. THOSTENSON: Well, in an effort to, you
15 know, get a better grasp on the number of acres and the
16 types of damage that our growers were impacted with, we
17 implemented a survey, self-reporting web survey tool
18 that applicators and farmers could go into and report
19 the sorts of problems that they had. Minnesota did the
20 same thing, South Dakota did the same thing.
21 I'm fairly confident that we will probably set
22 that up again for 2018 so that we can, you know, quickly
23 in real time assess what's happening out there. You
24 know, I'd be willing to share that survey tool with you
25 all and the results of the survey that we had this last

139

1 year, and it was interesting in that we only had 40
2 formal complaints, but we had over 207 registered issues
3 out there.
4 And interestingly enough, the farmers indicated
5 to us that 50 percent of their fields showed typical
6 physical drift with a gradation of damage across the
7 field. And so we were like, okay, that's good. But the
8 other 50 percent said it was field-wide, with no
9 discernible pattern.
10 And the numbers that we reported in that survey
11 that Dr. Bradley put together incorporated the numbers
12 we received directly from the farmers. So at least for
13 purposes of North Dakota, I think those numbers are
14 pretty reasonable, but certainly as we go into 2018,
15 anything that we could do in real time to monitor what's
16 happening so that if an intervention is necessary,
17 perhaps we would have some ability to do that.
18 MR. KEIGWIN: Richard?
19 MR. GRAGG: She said that she had well-trained
20 people and this drift was still happening, and we said
21 earlier that well-trained people were great applicators
22 and less error. So my question is -- I've got a couple
23 of questions. Is this pesticide used differently for
24 different crops, and is it applied differently for
25 different crops?

140

1 MR. BARIS: Yes, there's -- there are -- whether
2 it's a tolerant crop or nontolerant crop, there are
3 specific restrictions in place for the over-the-top uses
4 on tolerant soybean and cotton compared to a
5 non-tolerant cotton or soybean that is, for example,
6 pre-emerging application, or asparagus, or there's
7 specific wind speed restrictions, boom height
8 restrictions, things -- other restrictions for --
9 MR. GRAGG: So then if it's used -- so the
10 labels will tell you for this crop, this is how you do
11 it and for this crop this is how you do it?
12 MR. BARIS: And one of the major changes into
13 this season will be or has been the growers will see on
14 the label that those restrictions apply across the board
15 for all uses on the label. They've been -- the
16 supplemental labels have been integrated into the
17 master -- the main label. So there are no supplemental
18 labels in 2018.
19 MR. GRAGG: Okay, so in terms of monitoring for
20 what we don't want, there's not the ability to put out
21 any type of physical or biosensor to detect the movement
22 of the chemical off the field or where on the field you
23 don't want it to be in terms of realtime monitoring to
24 try to understand why and on what basis the stuff is
25 drifting?

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

141

1 MR. BARIS: So a marker or a tracer or a
2 bioelement would require a formulation change, and that
3 wasn't exactly something that we could address this
4 year. What we did do, with the registrants'
5 cooperation, was to involve a restricted use
6 classification for all three pesticides so that the use
7 of the products could accurately be tracked and records
8 are required to be kept by the applicator so that state
9 lead agencies have the tools that they need to
10 investigate potential incident investigations.
11 In 2017 that was actually one of the pieces of
12 information in cooperation with our regulatory partners
13 that they reported back to us we don't have the tools
14 necessary to enforce or distinguish between labeled use
15 and nonlabel use.
16 And so one of the cases, as I mentioned, for
17 root causes of off-target movement was misuse, that
18 could be using generic products, as Mr. Whittington
19 highlighted, that, you know, they're pursuing applying a
20 restricted use for all dicamba products in Mississippi.
21 But for restricted use of these three products, that at
22 least give the states the tools that they need to
23 distinguish between an approved use and a nonlabeled
24 use. Or misuse.
25 MR. GRAGG: And why would the formula have to be

142

1 changed in order for it to be detected with a bio or
2 some type of physical sensor? Why would that require a
3 change in the formulation of the product?
4 MR. BARIS: It's a different ingredient in the
5 formulation, so we have to evaluate -- we evaluate all
6 formulations for all pesticides as part of the
7 registration process. And that would be a change in the
8 formulation by adding an ingredient.
9 MR. GRAGG: Why would you need to add an
10 ingredient in order to detect it?
11 MR. BARIS: I'm not sure I understand the
12 question.
13 MR. KEIGWIN: So I think there might be ways,
14 Richard, to get at your point. One suggestion that had
15 come forward was that some type of an indicator dye be
16 added to the formulation, so I think that's what Reuben
17 was referring to. If what you're talking about is
18 putting some type of a sensor in adjacent areas so
19 that -- you know, at the time that wasn't something that
20 we had really looked at in --
21 MR. GRAGG: But you could do it other than by
22 adding a dye or something to the formula.
23 MR. KEIGWIN: And I think that's the point that
24 you were trying to make, right?
25 MR. GRAGG: Yeah, um-hmm.

143

1 MR. KEIGWIN: Is that you could put some type of
2 receptor off-target and see if you got something. You
3 know, there are issues with analytical sensitivity, what
4 would be the best type of receptor being used to do
5 that, is there laboratory capacity available in the
6 states and at EPA to do it. I think these are very good
7 suggestions that as we think about and as we see what
8 happens in '18, do we put some additional things in
9 place if we renew the registration after the 2018 use
10 season. Thank you for that.
11 Amy, and then Sharon.
12 MS. LIEBMAN: I think you've addressed some of
13 what I was asking, because Amy's question was two-part
14 and her point was that in some cases you have a very
15 well-trained, you know, properly used, properly applied
16 pesticide, and what is being done to sort of figure that
17 out. And then it sounds like Richard offered some
18 suggestions, you threw back some suggestions, but I
19 guess could you just clarify what is your plan in terms
20 of trying to figure out this component of the
21 well-trained, well-educated applicator, and there's
22 still this drift happening and crop damage.
23 MR. BARIS: So this effort has really tightened
24 up the label in all aspects that we could possibly
25 tackle in this short amount of time that we had

144

1 available to us. Our goal was really to present a
2 decision in a timely manner so that growers had the
3 most -- the best available information so that they
4 could make informed choices for 2018.
5 So the label has been tightened up as much as we
6 possibly could for the 2018 season. And I think we're
7 hearing a lot of really good suggestions this afternoon
8 about how to measure and I think we all need to continue
9 to think about those aspects and as we -- the
10 conversation continues to evolve and throughout the off
11 season or winter seasons, winter months, and into 2018.
12 MR. KEIGWIN: The other thing, Amy, you know,
13 would be to say that we know that there's a lot of
14 really interesting work going on within the Weed Science
15 Society, and a lot of weed scientists across, you know,
16 these states are looking -- are doing some additional
17 work to see what other factors might be involved, what
18 other things might be affecting movement, what other
19 adjacent crops might be more sensitive than had been
20 previously known to be.
21 So I think through the work that the land grant
22 universities are doing in tandem with the Weed Science
23 Society, I think we're going to have a lot more
24 information in 2018 that will help to inform the
25 decision that we would have to make if we were to renew

145

1 the registration for the 2019 use season.
2 Sharon?
3 MS. SELVAGGIO: I might be missing something
4 here, but I'm just kind of confused about the
5 volatilization issue. I'm not clear on which of the
6 label changes are meant to address the volatilization
7 issue. And so I'm just wondering, are you confident
8 that your label changes have adequately addressed
9 volatilization as opposed to spray drift?
10 MR. BARIS: The time-of-day restriction was one,
11 the sunrise to sunset was one type of restriction that
12 would -- was aiming at focusing applications when times
13 of day when temperature versions are least likely to
14 occur. There are -- states may have the requirement to
15 further restrict that, depending on their specific
16 variability -- the specific variability or their
17 specific conditions in the state or region.
18 We tightened up the label in almost every other
19 way possible, and 2018 will be a marker for how this
20 technology is working. And I think, as I was just
21 reminded, one additional point is that we added some --
22 with the registrants -- added some additional labeling
23 on all three products about how to identify temperature
24 inversions, how best to identify temperature inversions,
25 and bringing some awareness to growers and applicators

146

1 about the risk of applying during a temperature
2 inversion, because a temperature inversion still may
3 occur between sunrise and sunset and how do you identify
4 that to prevent suspension of spray material in the air
5 during those climactic conditions.
6 MR. KEIGWIN: I feel like I have to let you go
7 since I skipped you before, Damon, so go ahead. No, go
8 ahead.
9 MR. REABE: Thanks a lot. I'll make it really
10 brief. Something just occurred to me as we're having
11 this discussion, if there's some way to identify how
12 many of these incidents were associated with the
13 applicator being misinformed as to whether or not the
14 downwind soybeans were, in fact -- had the GMO
15 technology, I believe that when RoundUp first came out,
16 this was a very big problem, growers weren't used to
17 communicating with their neighbors, so that when they
18 hired a commercial applicator to do an application, that
19 applicator didn't -- wasn't aware that it wasn't
20 RoundUp-ready corn downwind.
21 And so I think that would be a pretty critical
22 piece to all of this is almost like a pollinator
23 protection plan, if we're not communicating that, this
24 type of thing is going to continue to happen.
25 MR. BARIS: I'm sorry, I had to turn my mic' on.

147

1 There's two important elements to that and I think it
2 gets right at the point that you're trying to make is
3 that the buffer descriptions and how the applicator must
4 actually follow those buffer restrictions and
5 identification of sensitive or susceptible crops has
6 been added to the label. And then further to that
7 point, there's two elements on the recordkeeping
8 requirement side that the grower applicator must survey
9 the neighboring sites around the application site and
10 document that they've checked, say, the sensitive crop
11 registry for their state and their situation.
12 So those were intended to increase the awareness
13 element that you're highlighting, and improve the
14 communication between neighbors.
15 MR. REABE: And just going off of, you know,
16 previous experiences with RoundUp, there would be fields
17 that would be originally when that work was done, the
18 idea was to plant RoundUp ready, things changed, and in
19 between time, a different product -- a different product
20 got planted. So more outreach like that I think is
21 good.
22 MR. KEIGWIN: Last comment.
23 MR. THOSTENSONL: My question goes back to the
24 volatility issue. We know that in our Arkansas and
25 Tennessee and Missouri and Purdue is all doing work in

148

1 this area evaluating the volatility aspect of these new
2 formulations. What are you looking at from those
3 programs to be able to make assessments moving forward?
4 Are we looking at needing published data in the Weed
5 Science Society of America? What sort of criteria do
6 you need to be able to make decisions about whether or
7 not these products are sufficiently non -- or low
8 volatility moving forward?
9 MR. BARIS: The intent is to use the best
10 available information, and that's the standard we use to
11 evaluate the registrations that are in front of us, the
12 registration applications that are in front of us. We
13 are continuing to cooperate with our partners and
14 university weed scientists like yourself, and others, to
15 ensure that we have the best available information. And
16 they are invited to share with us any information that
17 they have that would inform our decisions. I would be
18 happy to discuss that further.
19 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. That was a very good
20 discussion and lots of good feedback, thank you. As
21 Reuben was mentioning, he and his staff probably spent
22 the majority of the summer working on this, and it was a
23 very extensive collaboration with the states in a very
24 productive way, not only with the state agencies, but
25 with the land grant universities and the registrants as

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

149

1 well. And I think our ability to move as quickly in
2 making label changes I think in part was due to the
3 partnership with the states and the land grants, so we
4 do appreciate that.
5 So thank you, Reuben and Dan.
6 Let's move on to the next topic, which is
7 synergy, and I think Marietta is going to come back up,
8 along with Kimberly Nesci.
9 MS. ECHEVERRIA: Good afternoon. I'm Marietta
10 Echeverria, again, I'm the Director of the Environmental
11 Fate and Effects Division. So for this session, we
12 wanted to provide an update on our evaluation process
13 around claims of synergy, so by just way of very brief
14 background, in 2015, we became aware that pesticide
15 manufacturers were applying for and being granted patent
16 claims that products in combination were having
17 synergistic effects or enhancing efficacy in the field.
18 So this caused us to call into question our approach of
19 evaluating single active ingredients as part of our
20 ecological risk assessment process.
21 So back in May, we gave a brief update on where
22 we were in that learning process, and today we have a
23 more detailed presentation to describe what we're
24 thinking and we will welcome dialogue at the end.
25 So with that, I'm going to introduce Kimberly

150

1 Nesci, the Deputy Director of the Environmental Fate and
2 Effects Division, to give the presentation.
3 MS. NESCI: Thank you. So in the time I have
4 today, what I'm planning to cover is a little bit of
5 background, a little bit more than what Marietta just
6 gave on why we're doing what we're doing, why we're
7 choosing at this time to focus on patent data
8 specifically, the proposed process that we're following
9 itself, and our next steps. And, of course, we have 30
10 minutes I think at the end for questions.
11 So background. Before we get into the details,
12 I think it's important to ensure that we have a common
13 understanding of the terminology. Synergy, from what I
14 understand, can have multiple definitions and can mean
15 different things to different people, or different
16 groups. So despite the title of this session, we are
17 moving away from the word "synergy," and instead
18 defining the issue that we're proposing to -- the issue
19 that we're proposing to address as greater than additive
20 effects, or GTA effects, or an observed combined effect
21 greater than the sum of the effects of individual
22 chemicals.
23 So historically, EPA has based our ecological
24 risk assessments on the toxicological evaluation of
25 single active ingredients, and we have understood that

151

1 toxicological actions between active ingredients that
2 produce significantly greater toxicity than expected is
3 a rare occurrence. The available monitoring data that
4 we have indicates that in a predominant number of cases
5 across the country. The potential toxic risk of
6 contaminants is dominated by one to a few chemicals.
7 And the thresholds that we use to make our risk-based
8 decisions are extremely low probability events, or no
9 probability events, and this suggests that the combined
10 effect of exposure to two pesticides both at no effect
11 levels or at very low probability effect levels can
12 reasonably be considered to be extremely low.
13 In addition, the National Research Council in
14 its 2013 review of OPP's methods for endangered species
15 effects determinations supported the general opinion
16 that synergistic interactions between pesticides are
17 rare, and the council suggested that the agency consider
18 pesticide active ingredient interactions when the best
19 available scientific data evidence supports the
20 quantitative evaluation.
21 So as Marietta mentioned, in 2015, we've
22 discovered a number of cases where pesticide producers
23 have been granted patents for claims that selected
24 mixtures of pesticides produce toxicological effects in
25 excess of expected additive effects, that is claims of

152

1 synergistic interactions, or GTA interactions, for
2 effects in specific to pest species, this is enhanced
3 herbicidal, fungicidal or insecticidal effects.
4 Because of this discovery, we have developed a
5 process to, one, obtain and analyze the patent effects
6 of these GTAs -- the claim of GTA effects of these
7 mixtures and determine whether or not these claims and
8 data need to be accounted for in our risk assessments,
9 which I'll be describing in more detail over the next
10 few slides. And it's important to note that the process
11 that we've come up with follows the suggestion by the
12 National Research Council that pesticide interactions be
13 considered to be extensively supported by scientific
14 evidence.
15 So why have we decided to focus on patent data
16 specifically? Again, there are a large number of these
17 patents making GTA claims for pesticide mixtures; the
18 patent data are readily available to the public; the
19 PTO, U.S. Patent & Trademark Office's process is well
20 understood; and the data typically contain information
21 on the mixtures being considered, the conditions of
22 testing, the effects observed and the organisms being
23 evaluated, all of which was needed to determine whether
24 the data warrant changes to our risk assessments. And
25 these data likely represent the most compelling evidence

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

153

1 to support these GTA claims, otherwise they wouldn't be
2 submitted to the Patent & Trademark Office in the first
3 place to support the patent applications.
4 However, there are differences between the
5 standard to receive a patent and standard for use of
6 data to quantitatively evaluate risk. While the U.S.
7 PTO focuses on a determination if a claim is unexpected
8 given existing background information, publications in
9 prior patents, and the Patent & Trademark Office
10 personnel are to give claims their broadest reasonable
11 consideration and interpretation in light of the
12 supporting information. To use this GTA evidence
13 quantitatively to evaluate risk, it must be subject to
14 the standards for the use of other -- of our standards
15 for the use of other toxicological data, that is they
16 must be relevant, supported by empirical data, and that
17 empirical data must meet the agency's standard for data
18 quality.
19 So, does the granting of a patent automatically
20 mean the data are appropriate for ecological risk
21 assessment? I think as I just described, no, the patent
22 review is not equivalent to EPA's data quality criteria.
23 Does that mean patents are never pertinent to ecological
24 risk assessment? And the answer to that is also no.
25 Our experience to date has shown that some patents do

154

1 have sufficient information to inform our risk
2 assessments.
3 So with that, I'll get to the process itself.
4 The goals of our proposed process are to document these
5 GTA patent claims and that we've taken these claims into
6 consideration in our decisions and in our assessments;
7 second, to establish a data search and reporting
8 approach so efforts are consistent in scope and that
9 there's a level playing field to establish criteria to
10 narrow these GTA patents to those relevant to agency
11 ecological risk assessments; and to provide a data
12 analysis framework for evaluating the statistical
13 significance of any GTA findings.
14 Ultimately what we're looking to do is to
15 determine whether these patent claims indicate a need to
16 quantitatively or qualitatively change our assessments
17 or decisions. So we're proposing a five-step process.
18 The first is the -- the first step is the identification
19 of granted U.S. patents that make claims of GTA effects;
20 the second is a review of patent relevance to ecological
21 risk assessment, and we've established relevancy
22 criteria that are in the slides here above that I'll go
23 through that will be considered as part of this step.
24 The first criteria is the patent must contain
25 actual data, must contain comparisons of empirical

155

1 effects. The second, the patents -- the effects --
2 sorry, the effects are relevant to direct effects on
3 tested taxa. So, for example, a direct measure of death
4 or growth would be applicable to us would be relevant,
5 but a reduction in yield loss or reduction in plant
6 damage as a result of pest control -- a better control
7 of pest populations would not.
8 The tested taxa must be relevant -- the taxa
9 themselves must be relevant to ecological risk
10 assessment; for example, fungi -- for fungicides, of
11 course, we may be seeing synergistic or GTA claims
12 because of enhanced efficacy, but we don't assess
13 effects to fungi, so we -- that would not be -- those
14 types of claims would not be relevant to us. Instead,
15 claims of enhanced insecticidal activity or herbicidal
16 activity would be relevant.
17 The test must be on the chemical considered for
18 regulation, so the actual chemical that we're looking
19 at. And the mixture components tested must be
20 registered in the United States. So some patents
21 consider active ingredients registered in other
22 countries. These aren't relevant to us until such time
23 as they're submitted to us for registration.
24 So, steps 3 and 4 are really obtaining and
25 analyzing the data supporting these relevant patents to

156

1 determine -- to see if the effects are statistically
2 significant, and then step 5 is to evaluate that
3 analysis to determine whether the statistically
4 significant observations impact the conclusions of
5 ecological risk assessments, whether the observations
6 can be used to inform quantitative adjustments to the
7 ecological risk assessment or risk mitigation, and
8 whether additional mixture toxicity data may be needed
9 as part of our evaluation process.
10 So this slide doesn't show up all that well, but
11 it is in your packets, and it really just shows a
12 schematic of all the steps I've just described with a
13 little bit more detail. And I'm not going to go through
14 this in a lot of detail here, but we wanted to provide
15 it to you. And it's a useful tool, I think, for more
16 visual learners to see to walk through the process.
17 So what do we do with what we learn? It's
18 important to note that we do not -- we are not
19 evaluating the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office's
20 decision, we are evaluating the data to determine if
21 qualitative or quantitative changes are needed to the
22 ecological risk assessment or if additional studies are
23 needed. If those data -- if additional data are needed,
24 we will obtain that and evaluate it accordingly.
25 In some of the actual cases we have looked at so

157

1 far, this additional data has come in the form of
2 guideline studies on formulated products. For data
3 where EPA feels the observations are appropriate
4 technical rigor to support quantitative application,
5 we're going to consider a number of different things.
6 The magnitude of the GTA effects, so whether the
7 quantification of the excess toxicity is large enough to
8 alter our risk conclusions. We will consider any
9 transient observation across treatment levels. We will
10 be considering other lines of evidence associated with
11 the mechanism of action that could inform the
12 interaction assumptions.
13 We'll consider background information on the
14 frequency of observations of effects, interactions and
15 data sets extending beyond the patent reporting data.
16 So companies may have sets of data beyond what is
17 specifically submitted to the Patent & Trademark Office.
18 We will evaluate existing ecological risk
19 assessment findings, and we will look at the tested
20 concentration level and compare that to our expected
21 field exposures, so can the information that we have
22 reliably be extrapolated to field-level exposures.
23 So, and again, it's important to note for the
24 cases while -- that we've evaluated so far, while some
25 have warranted the need for a closer look, or additional

158

1 guideline studies, none have ultimately resulted in
2 changes to our risk conclusions.
3 So our next steps. At this time, we're planning
4 to continue to follow this process and collect
5 information on the cases that come before us. We are
6 considering whether to publicly release a memorandum
7 describing this process for formal public comment. And
8 ultimately, we intend to develop a final position on GTA
9 effects of pesticides that would consider public input
10 either through a formal public comment process or
11 through any other public comment process. And, of
12 course, your input here as well, and what we've learned,
13 what we're continuing to learn on the cases that we've
14 evaluated so far.
15 So with that, I would really like to acknowledge
16 the EFED synergy team. They've looked at all the cases
17 we have done so far and they have certainly spent a lot
18 of time using those cases to develop this process. And
19 Ed Odenkirchen, who I think is here today in the back,
20 Rochelle Bohaty, Frank Farruggia, Christine Hartless,
21 and their managers, because they've spent a lot of time
22 to help develop this and to look at the information
23 we're getting. And with that, we'll take questions.
24 MR. KEIGWIN: So I want to keep us on time, so
25 we'll do about maybe ten minutes of questions to get to

159

1 the break. So any quick reactions? Noting that we're
2 likely going to take public comment on this and, you
3 know, sharing a fuller memorandum, so what Kimberly has
4 provided is a very high-level overview of our process to
5 date. So, I see Pat, Jay and Preston.
6 MS. BISHOP: Hi, Kimberly. I'm a little
7 confused in that I'm assuming these mixtures have
8 already been registered and gone through toxicological
9 evaluation for human health? Or -- I mean, so there's a
10 patent that says there's a synergistic effect, and
11 that's a claim that's separate from the product already
12 going to EPA and being evaluated, is it not? So then
13 how does it -- I mean, have you looked at these already
14 as far as ecological risk and now you're looking at them
15 again because there's this claim that's been made? I'm
16 not quite understanding that.
17 MS. NESCI: So what we're looking at
18 specifically is the data supporting the patent claim.
19 So the data supporting the patent claim may be for a
20 combination that's in a combination product or it may be
21 for something that's not in a combination product that
22 would be -- that could potentially be applied as a tank
23 mixture.
24 So what we're looking at is unique, is not
25 something that we've seen before, because we typically

160

1 don't -- don't -- we haven't historically gotten these
2 data as part of our registration packages.
3 MS. BISHOP: So then it's just the data that are
4 new, not necessarily that the product is something you
5 haven't -- it hasn't come across your desk yet as a
6 formulation of some sort?
7 MS. ECHEVERRIA: That's correct. So we would
8 have evaluated the formulation and the registration
9 process, but the patent claims are for unique
10 combinations like in-tank mixes.
11 MS. BISHOP: Okay.
12 MS. ECHEVERRIA: So we don't evaluate a tank
13 mix, which is a way that growers combat resistance
14 management and also make efficient applications of
15 pesticides. So that is where we're seeing a lot of the
16 claims.
17 MS. BISHOP: So you said that additional studies
18 might be needed, would that entail any kind of new
19 animal studies do you think, or more like efficacy type
20 testing?
21 MS. ECHEVERRIA: So in the cases we've evaluated
22 so far, where we have gone to guideline testing, it has
23 been for plants, so guideline plant testing of base in a
24 formulated product which informed the decision.
25 MS. BISHOP: Okay, great, thanks.

161

1 MR. KEIGWIN: Jay and then Preston.
2 MR. VROOM: So I wanted to compliment all the
3 staff and in particular you called out Ed for leading in
4 this area, I remember like it was yesterday, it was the
5 day before Thanksgiving two years ago that I learned of
6 this, and what you've assimilated and the interaction
7 you've had with our industry to result in this much
8 progress is nothing short of amazing.
9 I think it's important to also note that quite a
10 number of these synergy patents have been filed
11 prospectively and granted but maybe not used in the
12 marketplace. And some of them are marketing defensive
13 strategies that have no implication with regard to the
14 use of pesticide combinations. In fact, they may
15 prevent pesticide combinations.
16 And then lastly, some of them actually do result
17 in reduction of total pesticide uses because of the
18 synergistic effects that may be already noted in the
19 marketplace. So there are a lot of permutations of this
20 that have nothing to do with increased risk, and some of
21 them actually result in reduced risk.
22 MR. KEIGWIN: Preston?
23 MR. PECK: Thank you. I have -- well I just
24 wanted to say thank you for the flow chart, that was the
25 slide that was very helpful as far as trying to lay that

162

1 out and processing a lot of it, and I don't really have
2 any comments on it, but it is much -- I'm a visual
3 person, so it's very helpful.
4 But I wanted to ask one quick question about --
5 it was on slide -- I want to say maybe 4 or 5, depending
6 on if you count the title one. It said there are a
7 large number of U.S. patents making GTA effect claims.
8 Do you have an idea of what large -- just kind of a
9 definition of large? Like what -- about how many? I'm
10 just curious.
11 MS. ECHEVERRIA: Well, we have received a
12 petition from the Center for Biological Diversity, and I
13 believe that the number claimed in that petition was 186
14 or so. Does that sound -- okay. So the number that was
15 reported in the petition I believe was 186 claims, but
16 maybe that's not extensive, but it's not the complete
17 universe, perhaps, but that's the information that we
18 have.
19 MR. PECK: Okay, and then did I hear you right,
20 and I may have misheard, but something like the ones
21 that may claim GTA but only a small amount actually do?
22 Is that what you said? Or did I mishear that?
23 MS. NESCI: So I think of the ones that claim
24 GTA, I think that there are a small amount that we've
25 discovered to be relevant to ecological -- to our

163

1 ecological risk assessment.
2 MR. PECK: Okay. Thank you.
3 MR. KEIGWIN: Sharon?
4 MS. SELVAGGIO: I have a couple of comments and
5 questions. One of them is, with your characterization
6 of GTA effects being rare, after our last meeting in
7 May, I think that was in the last summary that we --
8 when we went over this, and I went and I looked for
9 that, and I did not find that anywhere in that document.
10 So I'm really curious about maybe it happened, you know,
11 in a meeting, I'm not sure, but I just don't see that
12 kind of conclusion in that document. I know the
13 organophosphates have definitely been found in the
14 literature to be synergistic greater than additive, and
15 so anyway, I'm just really curious about that, that use
16 of the term "rare."
17 My second question is about the process, and I
18 guess I'm thinking about this like Venn diagram, but --
19 so what happens if somebody has submitted, say, a
20 formulation that combines two herbicides, and in their
21 patent application, they have tested that on plants,
22 certain plants, but there's no data for insects and
23 fish, say. If you find that for plants, in fact, the
24 data looks legitimate, it meets all your data quality
25 criteria and all of that kind of stuff, would you then

164

1 go out to the registrants and say, we want more data
2 because it looks like there is a potential synergy on
3 some taxa, therefore we want to see if this is also
4 synergistic to potential non-target insects and fish and
5 mammals?
6 And what about if you don't find evidence of
7 synergy, but, in fact, it may happen in the field for
8 these things that no data was presented to the Patent
9 Office? I don't know if that makes sense, but it's sort
10 of like outside the Venn diagram circles in my mind.
11 Okay.
12 MS. NESCI: So on your first one, I do have the
13 citation, so I can get that to you and we can send you a
14 highlighted link that shows where our conclusions are
15 coming from, so we'll take care of that.
16 On the second one, we are not intending to
17 extend beyond the species for the -- that -- the species
18 on which the data are based that we get in front of us
19 for the GTA claims.
20 MS. ECHEVERRIA: Yeah, I would just add, we
21 would not make the assumption that any interaction was
22 conserved across taxa, that would not be an appropriate
23 scientific assumption. And so we were really focusing
24 on where we do have evidence that -- and what that
25 evidence tells us and how that impacts the risk

165

1 assessment.
2 So to assume that greater interaction for plants
3 would also come up with insects is not supported,
4 understanding the mode of action and how these
5 interactions work from the biology and the toxicology.
6 MS. SELVAGGIO: So you wouldn't ask for
7 additional data, then, in order to fill in the gaps?
8 MS. ECHEVERRIA: Unless we had compelling
9 evidence to make us concerned. So we do evaluate the
10 open literature as part of our routine process, so if
11 there's any information in the open literature or if
12 there's anything that we know about the potential
13 mechanism of interaction that's occurring that would
14 lead us to have a concern, then we would have broad
15 authority to request an additional study, but not as a
16 routine matter.
17 So unless we have that evidence or we have the
18 other scientific rationale to make that determination,
19 we would not be doing it across the board.
20 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. And Damon will be our last
21 comment.
22 MR. REABE: Thanks. Question, is there going to
23 be any modifications to the risk assessment process to
24 account for the multiple passes that would be required
25 if the product as a combined mixture doesn't meet risk

166

1 assessment, what the risk would be then from making,
2 say, two or three applications to control the same pests
3 when you separate out those products? Is the risk
4 assessment methodology, is that going to get factored in
5 then?
6 MS. NESCI: So, no, we aren't intending at this
7 point to make any changes to our risk assessment
8 methodology. We're instead adding the process that I've
9 described to date on top of that to look at the patent
10 data to see if there's any need to get additional data
11 or to change our risk assessment conclusions.
12 MR. REABE: Would the EPA consider changing it
13 because it might create additional risk by having to
14 make these separate applications? Right? I mean, we
15 can imagine how now that we have --
16 MS. NESCI: So I think I understand what you're
17 getting at. So in terms of tank mixes, there are some
18 benefits to tank mixes and related to the ecological
19 impact of passes across the field and, of course,
20 resistance development and those sorts of things.
21 So we are not -- I don't think there's any plan
22 to quantitatively consider that, but certainly as part
23 of the FIFRA evaluation process, we do consider risks
24 and benefits, so --
25 MR. REABE: That might be -- because there may

167

1 be some unintended consequences that may come from this.
2 Thank you.
3 MS. NESCI: Yeah. Thank you.
4 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. Thank you for that. So we
5 are now back on time. So let's reconvene at 3:15 and
6 we'll -- I guess we'll pick up with glyphosate. So,
7 thanks.
8 (Whereupon, there was a recess in the
9 proceedings.)
10 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, so we're going to pick up
11 where we left off from this morning, and so I believe we
12 were -- so Yu-Ting is back, and she has reinforcements.
13 So I guess we'll first address glyphosate. Thank you.
14 So, there's a one-page update in your folders regarding
15 where we are the glyphosate re-evaluation.
16 Oh, sorry, but before we get to glyphosate, so
17 we just got a notice from our building management that
18 there are some cars illegally parked in the spaces
19 reserved for hybrid cars that need charging. So if you
20 inadvertently parked your car in a charging station
21 spot, your car is about to be towed.
22 All right, Yu-Ting is pulling it up. They
23 usually provide us license plate numbers. You know, if
24 you drag it out. All right, so the first one looks like
25 a black Honda with a Maryland tag 9DJJ22. No, but it's

168

1 parked -- it's actually not only that, it's actually
2 parked in an illegal spot. So how do I advance it? Oh,
3 right here?
4 Yeah, but it's parked illegally, too. Virginia
5 tags -- it's not plugged in -- BMW, ZTZ8207. Apparently
6 that's an OPP car, never mind. Oh, and then there's
7 another BMW, a black BMW with no front tag. So that's
8 probably a Virginia car. All right, well, good luck. I
9 can't stall you out anymore.
10 So any questions on the glyphosate update that
11 we provided in the folders? Jay?
12 MR. VROOM: So I just wanted to observe that of
13 the three categories of active ingredients that were
14 listed under 5C, this one probably is the one that has
15 the most global reach. The other two are more confined
16 to U.S. regulatory focus, and we are supportive and
17 complimentary of the agency's work in this space, both
18 domestically and internationally, and I think that the
19 work that you began in 2009 with regard to the
20 re-evaluation of the product is moving forward and we
21 look forward to the next risk assessment.
22 MR. KEIGWIN: Other questions/comments on
23 glyphosate?
24 (No response.)
25 MR. KEIGWIN: So the next one we have is the

169

1 neonicotinoids and the status update there.
2 (No response.)
3 MR. KEIGWIN: No comment? Cynthia?
4 MS. PALMER: Is there something missing where it
5 says -- the bullet right in the middle, "Potential
6 on-field risk from some use patterns, includes foliar
7 uses," it doesn't say if it's low or high, I assume
8 that's a high. I'm using the website version. Is
9 there -- the sentence is just dropped off.
10 MR. ANDERSON: I'm Neil Anderson from the
11 Pesticide Re-evaluation Division. And no, there isn't
12 missing words there. That's simply how we meant to
13 present it.
14 MS. PALMER: Okay. And then for later on it
15 mentions "draft benefits assessments." Is -- can we
16 look forward to the benefit assessment for treated corn
17 seeds? Is that part of it?
18 MR. ANDERSON: Those -- that will not be one of
19 the assessments that's being -- benefits assessments
20 that's being released for public review here in the very
21 near future. It's possible that some benefits work on
22 corn and perhaps the treated seed element for corn will
23 be done at some time in the future, as we move closer to
24 the planned activity in mid-2018, when we expect to
25 release the proposed interim decision. So there will

170

1 probably be a fair amount of benefits documents at that
2 time.
3 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. If there's nothing else on
4 the neonics? Thanks, Neil and Dana and Eugene.
5 The next one we have in your package is an
6 update on where we are with acute animal testing
7 alternatives. Dr. Anna Lowit is here if there are
8 questions on that effort. And I thought I saw Garland
9 [phonetic] around at one point, too.
10 Sorry, Pat.
11 MS. BISHOP: I have two things. I have a
12 comment that this is some really great work that's going
13 on that OPP as well as NICEATM exam, you know, I think
14 you're making some really excellent progress here on
15 this issue. And my only question, and I think I forgot
16 to ask you yesterday, Anna, is the fact that the final
17 dermal tox waiver came out. There was also a draft, I
18 think, about a year or a year and a half ago. Have you
19 received any requests for waivers on this yet?
20 DR. LOWIT: So, yes, that document did go
21 final just November of last year, so it is final, and we
22 have received a relatively small number. You have to
23 remember, there's a lag time that's sort of built in
24 here, and generally companies will have done the studies
25 that they would submit to us one, two, three, even four

171

1 years in advance of them submitting to us.
2 So there's a time by which the policy will
3 have been finalized, and companies will already have in
4 existence their in vivo studies. So although the number
5 that we're seeing is relatively small, over the next
6 year to two years it should incrementally start to
7 increase.
8 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. Anyone else for that one?
9 (No response.)
10 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, thanks. So the next one
11 we have is resistance management. Wynne -- so Wynne
12 Miller and Bill Chism and Nikal Mallampalli and maybe
13 Skee Jones, too, are coming up. So we just finalized
14 two pesticide registration notices after taking public
15 comment. And the paper outlines our path forward for
16 implementing those two notices. Comments? Questions?
17 Cynthia.
18 MS. PALMER: Thank you. I just had two
19 questions. One, I may show my ignorance, it says no new
20 herbicide mechanism of action has been developed in the
21 last 30 years. I'm curious why not.
22 And, second, in the very last line of the
23 memo, it says that herbicide products labeled for use by
24 the general consumer, such as residential products, are
25 not included in this development of herbicide resistance

172

1 measures for end-use products. So I'm wondering why are
2 the consumer uses not part of that.
3 MR. CHISM: Thank you. I'm Bill Chism from
4 the Biological and Economic Analysis Division. We
5 presented the PRN before, we've gotten some really great
6 feedback from some of the groups here, and I wanted to
7 thank everybody.
8 The first question, why no new mode of action
9 in the last 30 years, I'm totally not competent to
10 answer that. Finding and discovering a new mode of
11 action is kind of an art, kind of luck, kind of a whole
12 bunch of mergers and different things, and if it doesn't
13 happen, it just doesn't happen. So I think possibly the
14 registrants could help you with that. I don't know.
15 But your second question is why didn't we
16 include homeowner products. When we look at -- and
17 there's a really nice website that looks at all the
18 herbicide-resistant weeds worldwide -- when we look at
19 use sites, homeowner sites don't come up very often, and
20 we thought the things we were asking were pretty
21 technical, would be very difficult, and we thought the
22 risk of resistance was very low.
23 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Andrew.
24 MR. THOSTENSON: I notice most of the work
25 that's been done more recently in the herbicide arena.

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

173

1 Unfortunately this year in North Dakota and Minnesota we
2 are suffering some very significant reverses in both
3 fungicide and insecticide resistance. One of them will
4 result in a dramatic increase in the amount of
5 chlorpyrifos we use to control soybean aphids in our
6 state because our conventional pyrethroids have
7 demonstrated significant failure to control these
8 soybean aphids.
9 So I'm wondering what sorts of plans you all
10 have to really start grappling with that on the same
11 level that you have been with the herbicides.
12 MS. MALLAMPALLI: My name is Mikal
13 Mallampalli. I work with Bill in the same division.
14 And the labeling PRN right now, the labeling PR notice
15 addresses the insecticides. Then it -- our intention is
16 to develop internal policy documents to help make sure
17 that staff include that guidance in registration review
18 and new registration actions.
19 We aren't at this time proposing to ask for
20 the additional detail, product stewardship of the type
21 that the herbicide PRN talks about at this point, but
22 going forward, we might explore incorporating that into
23 the insecticides and fungicides.
24 Now, as far as giving you other tools to -- of
25 new modes of action to combat resistance that's already

174

1 going on, I mean, that faces the same situation as
2 herbicide modes of action as new discoveries go. We --
3 the registrants do that, so I don't know if that helps
4 answer it.
5 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Jay.
6 MR. VROOM: Yeah, so, I would guess that maybe
7 with respect to the kind of insecticide resistance that
8 you're describing in a market like yours for soybeans
9 there are other modes of action, newer chemistries that
10 haven't been labeled for soybeans because it's a fairly
11 unusual event for most or a lot of the soybean crop that
12 needed insecticide treatments at all.
13 And, so, as you discover those kinds of
14 challenges, if you're in communication with the
15 industry, particularly those that have other modes of
16 action registered for other crops, I'm sure they'll be a
17 receptive audience to talk about those kinds of
18 opportunities.
19 With respect to the fact that there's been
20 nothing discovered and brought to market in terms of a
21 clearly new mode of action, it's because all the
22 easy-to-discover things have been discovered, but that
23 doesn't mean that companies aren't continuing to invest
24 in discovery research, looking for that next new
25 broad-acre application mode of action. There have been

175

1 a few that have been discovered and brought in the '90s,
2 all the way up through potential registration, and
3 denied because of risk effects that were determined to
4 be unacceptable based on the standard in the law.
5 And, lastly, there have been analogs of
6 original modes of action that do change the performance
7 and environmental and effectiveness benefits. So I
8 think you need to look a little closer at some of the
9 rediscoveries and slight changes in molecules that have
10 been accomplished for things like I know metolachor went
11 through a process like that and actually qualified for a
12 new patent on a new analog of an original molecule.
13 So I think there is continuous innovation. It
14 may not look like the blockbusters of the past, but
15 continuous improvement is certainly a commitment for the
16 members of CropLife, and I'm sure that we look forward
17 to working with a lot of other stakeholders in that
18 regard.
19 MR. KEIGWIN: Any other comments on the
20 resistance management work? Charlotte.
21 MS. SANSON: Yeah, so, I know a lot of
22 comments were submitted on this, and I guess one of the
23 concerns that I have has to do with what you might call
24 false reporting and how you're going to manage through
25 that. For example, if, you know, a 682 is submitted

176

1 because of suspected resistance but then the testing is
2 done to indicate, oh, it really actually is not
3 resistant, how do you go back and correct the record, if
4 that makes sense.
5 MR. CHISM: No, that's a great question. For
6 the herbicide/pesticide registration notice, we ask for
7 reporting of suspected resistance and also reporting of
8 confirmed. And our intention is that -- excuse me -- in
9 a couple instances, it took five years to confirm
10 resistance. And, so, we would like to be able to get
11 that information out to the user community that we're
12 not sure yet, but we potentially have resistance here.
13 And the intent is always to get the confirmation. But
14 in some cases, it takes a number of years. And we look
15 at that as a golden opportunity. That's when it's only
16 a few acres impacted. We can maybe have a real chance
17 to control these pests.
18 MR. KEIGWIN: All right. Thank you.
19 So the next update we had was dealing with
20 some labeling issues. So Michelle Arling and Patricia
21 Parrott are going to come up to answer any questions you
22 have about web-distributed label or the SmartLabel
23 efforts.
24 All right, so Preston, then Jim.
25 Charlotte, I don't know if you're up for this

177

1 one. Is your tent up for...okay. So Preston, then Jim.
2 MR. PECK: Thank you. So this project is also
3 -- it's not only for registrants but also for
4 applicators as well to access information regarding a
5 label; is that correct? The Smart Label project?
6 MS. PARROTT: For the Smart Label project,
7 ultimately it will be made available to the public as a,
8 you know, structured data information. At this time,
9 we're just finishing up the builder. We have the label
10 information coming in in a structured format. The
11 actual label as they're printed, all that flexibility
12 will remain there.
13 Eventually, it will be made in a searchable
14 database to the public. That's going to be a little
15 while down the road. I think preliminarily the early
16 adopters were -- didn't want the information made public
17 until everyone was there, thinking that it would give
18 some kind of advantage or disadvantage to them,
19 market-wise, to be able to search their labels to find
20 (inaudible) or something. So to make it an even playing
21 field eventually it will be level.
22 But, ultimately, it could supplement what --
23 for the applicators and things what is envisioned with
24 the web-distributed labeling where you would go for
25 specific application on a crop and get that information,

178

1 but for now, web-distributed labeling will do that.
2 MR. PECK: Okay. Is there -- a followup
3 question. Is there anything being done to proactively
4 think about various languages, access from various
5 languages?
6 MS. PARROTT: At this time, we have -- we have
7 it in English, and then we do have our sections that we
8 have our Spanish labeling pilot that has been going on
9 for certain phrases that are in Spanish as far -- that's
10 as far as we've gotten right now.
11 MR. PECK: Okay. Well, I just -- upon reading
12 it, but just at first glance, I don't know too much
13 about it. It looks like a fantastic opportunity to
14 address that issue that I know is of great concern of
15 many people that not only work with Spanish-speaking but
16 indigenous-speaking communities, Haitian-Creole as well,
17 just seems like if that's the future, then that's a
18 great opportunity to do it right.
19 MS. PARROTT: Good point. Thank you.
20 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Jim, then Cynthia.
21 MR. FREDERICKS: Thanks, and I just first of
22 all just want to commend the agency on their efforts to
23 try to make labels more clear, simpler, modernize
24 labels, because from an applicator's point of view,
25 labels can be a real bear sometimes. And ensuring that

179

1 folks are reading the label and following the label is
2 critical. And, so, you know, we appreciate that and we
3 obviously believe that, you know, smart labeling and
4 web-distributed labeling can -- you know, is a means to
5 that end. And we look forward to it.
6 One of the things that stood out in the note
7 was that I guess the PRNs from 2014 and as of October of
8 this year, there's still no -- there's no approved
9 product labels for web-distributed labeling. So my
10 question is is that because of a lack of applicants or
11 applications for that, or is that due to some sort of,
12 you know, a hangup in the system.
13 MS. ARLING: Thanks, Jim. I'm Michelle Arling
14 from the Office of Pesticide Programs, and I worked on
15 the web-distributed labeling, basically since its
16 inception. We've had a lot of conversations with
17 registrants that have expressed an interest in
18 web-distributed labeling, but for various reasons, no
19 one has jumped at the gun to rush in to be the first
20 applicant.
21 So I think part of it is waiting for smart
22 labeling to get fully implemented so that registrants do
23 have those structured, searchable databases that then
24 they could use to develop web-distributed labeling and
25 make it available to users. And then there's the

180

1 hesitance to be the first one to try anything new. So
2 it's not a lack of EPA's approving applications. We
3 just haven't gotten any in.
4 MR. FREDERICKS: For the record, I wasn't
5 accusing you of that.
6 MS. ARLING: No, no, that's okay.
7 MR. FREDERICKS: I was -- I was really just
8 curious.
9 MS. ARLING: Yes.
10 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Cynthia, then Aaron, then
11 Charlotte.
12 MS. PALMER: So I'm pleased that one of the
13 expected benefits would be quicker implementation of
14 public health and environmental protective measures, and
15 that makes me think about incident reporting. And I'm
16 just wondering whether if this new electronic system
17 might be combined with the electronic portal and
18 database on incident reporting and the great work
19 started by Rich Dumas and Melissa Panger.
20 MS. PARROTT: The way that this is being smart
21 labeled and ultimately web-distributed labeling is the
22 first step in a fully integrated digital system for the
23 agency. So the SmartLabel and the e-CSF -- electronic
24 composition statement of formulation -- are going to be
25 launched through the portal, needless to say at the same

181

1 time, sometime in 2018. And the back-end database is
2 being built to accommodate both of those in the hopes to
3 integrate all of our reporting systems. And I think the
4 vision right now is to use the CDX portal as the way to
5 get information exchange into the agency from
6 registrants and others. So ultimately I think that is
7 the vision.
8 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Aaron, then Charlotte.
9 MR. HOBBS: Great. Thank you. So, first, I
10 know a lot of good work has gone into the SmartLabel
11 pilot, work by the agency, as well as work by members of
12 the registrant community. And while that work has been
13 diligent, I am aware that there's a lot of work that
14 remains for that to really be show-ready, and that as I
15 understand it that program is far from complete. And
16 with it being far from complete, that probably puts a
17 little damper on the ability to do web-distributed
18 labeling.
19 So could you speak a little bit to -- a little
20 more details about how we get from a very well executed
21 pilot and then bridge that with what can be a
22 significant gap between a successful pilot and a
23 ready-to-use program.
24 MS. PARROTT: So right now we are finishing up
25 -- or we got the contract and we're finishing up with

182

1 the input that we got from the third phase of the pilot.
2 We are going to engage our pilot participants one more
3 time before we roll out the builder. All of the
4 information so far has been made publicly available
5 through the website. We also have a mailbox for
6 comments. So we will still anticipate having it out for
7 voluntary use in the next year.
8 There will be a learning curve, and I think
9 some people -- you know, those that have been
10 participating and asking questions along have an idea of
11 what it will look like. We have built out the builder
12 to greater extent than originally I think we thought we
13 were. It has taken some extra time, but I think that
14 the effort that's gone into it has been well worth it to
15 give a product that we'll be pleased with.
16 Now, as far as, like, the full implementation
17 and vision, yes, it's going to be a work in progress,
18 and this will be a first phase to getting it perfected,
19 but we do hope to have it launched for voluntary use in
20 the next year. Does that answer your question?
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Charlotte.
22 MS. SANSON: So following up on the SmartLabel
23 pilot, and then just a suggestion that perhaps looking
24 at a pilot that would -- that would -- that would focus
25 on the different types of labels, like, you know,

183

1 conventionals verus antimicrobials and, you know,
2 biological consumer labels, because all those type of
3 labels are fairly different from one another. So maybe
4 segregating the pilot in those areas, and maybe you can
5 speak to that if you've already considered that. I have
6 other questions, too, but I'll let you answer that one
7 first.
8 MS. PARROTT: Yes, we did. So when we
9 initiated it in the summer of 2014, we solicited
10 partners from the different registrants to represent
11 kind of a cross-section of the industry, so
12 conventionals for ag products, also lawn and garden,
13 microbial and biochemical in the agriculture and in the
14 mosquito and larvicide products, antimicrobial
15 pesticides for hospital disinfectants, wood
16 preservatives, and pool products. And so all those are
17 represented.
18 MS. SANSON: Do we look at a separate pilot
19 for each of those types or --
20 MS. PARROTT: No, we're doing it together, so
21 the idea was that we would have one -- one builder and
22 one set of requirements, but then you could go to the
23 areas that pertain to your specific products, and you
24 could hide the rest. So rather than have separate areas
25 for separate registrants, have it all in one place.

184

1 MS. SANSON: Okay. And I'd like to respond to
2 the question on implementation with the web-distributed
3 labeling. And I think maybe there are still some
4 implementation concerns with that, and I think we'd like
5 to know the status of where the states are in terms of
6 acceptance of web-distributed labeling because I've
7 heard enforcement -- concerns with enforcement and
8 having one -- you know, be easier if there was one
9 website for the states to go to rather than, you know,
10 several individual ones. So I'm -- if Liza or, I don't
11 know who can answer that, but it would be helpful to
12 know.
13 MR. KEIGWIN: Liza, if you've got an answer.
14 MS. TROSSBACH: Sure, sure. State lead
15 agencies have been aware of this effort, you know, since
16 the getgo. And some of our concerns from the very
17 beginning, one was the availability of the information
18 to users, so our concern was that while I think we all
19 certainly support the availability of information via
20 the website, we were concerned that it still needed to
21 be provided to the user on the container. You know,
22 there are many areas where there's not ready access to
23 the internet or to something like that. So that was one
24 concern or one thing that we wanted addressed.
25 Another was with web-distributed labeling and

185

1 having certain versions that would be good for a certain
2 period of time and with that back-door access for state
3 lead agencies if there were enforcement situations, if
4 we had to do an inspection or investigation to be able
5 to determine what label was enforced or, you know, in
6 place at that particular time. So that was another.
7 I think that states certainly support this
8 idea of making labels more easy to read. I mean, some
9 of your labels are huge, and there is some -- I think
10 there is some validity in an applicator only having to
11 read what they need to read, so if you're applying to --
12 I'll just use corn as an example, you get the
13 information for corn. But from a state lead agency
14 perspective, are you getting all the information
15 including corn versus just corn. So are you still
16 getting all the use directions, you're still getting all
17 of the environmental hazards and those types of things.
18 So I think states will -- are willing to
19 accept web-distributed labeling, as long as that
20 information is available to any user, whether it's on
21 the container or via the web, as long as it's available
22 to them.
23 MS. ARLING: And just from EPA's perspective,
24 we have engaged the states throughout the process, and
25 we do plan to work really closely with states once we do

186

1 get applications in to make sure that everyone's
2 comfortable with the way that we're proposing to issue a
3 web-distributed labeling.
4 MS. SANSON: Okay, great. I appreciate all
5 the feedback. And then just one more, and that has to
6 do with supplemental labels and if you can clarify the
7 process for supplemental labels via web-distributed
8 labeling if you've thought about that.
9 MS. ARLING: So I think right now they're
10 separate processes, and because web-distributed labeling
11 is right now a fully voluntary process, they'll stay
12 separate. The hope is that we can move away from
13 supplemental labels and have updated labeling provided
14 via web updates that are linked to the container of the
15 product.
16 MR. KEIGWIN: Anything else on the labeling
17 efforts?
18 (No response.)
19 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. Thanks.
20 And then there was cannabis. Nicole Zinn.
21 You don't want in on that one, Aaron?
22 Nina does.
23 MS. WILSON: I have a question for a friend of
24 mine.
25 (Laughter.)

187

1 MS. WILSON: Actually since you know that
2 biological products are often exempt, but not always,
3 from tolerances, and I understand the distinction
4 between a 25(b) and it's 24(c) for an exempt product,
5 but I'd be interested in a little bit of that discussion
6 about how that -- those statements came about.
7 MS. ZINN: So EPA does not register 25(b)
8 products, so 25(b) products are not prohibited from
9 having -- we don't evaluate them, we don't register them
10 -- so they're not prohibited from having cannabis on the
11 label or being used for cannabis. However, we do
12 register products that are tolerance-exempt in the
13 Biological and Pesticide Pollution Prevention Division
14 or other divisions, and so that is where, you know, it
15 will become a federal action to register that product
16 and approve it. And because cannabis is a federally
17 illegal crop, that is where we start to have some
18 difficulty.
19 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay.
20 MS. PALMER: So maybe this is the obvious
21 question, but since no one else is asking it, so since
22 EPA disapproves of the special local needs registration,
23 so where does this leave cannabis production? Does it
24 all go organic, or do they now use the product
25 illegally? Or I'm not sure where this leads us.

188

1 MS. ZINN: Okay, so there -- the states have
2 legalized cannabis within their states. And there are a
3 variety of things that are being done within the states.
4 First of all, 25(b)s, as I mentioned, are not
5 prohibited. So I think some growers are using 25(b)
6 products. We are aware that some states have developed
7 lists of products that are not -- they do not consider
8 to be illegal to use. And each state has different
9 criteria for those lists, and they would be on like a
10 state website.
11 We know that some of these lists exist, but we
12 have not reviewed those lists. And I think those are
13 the two primary ways that people are using pesticides.
14 And then I think you're probably right, there are other
15 cases where growers are probably using things that are
16 not legal.
17 MR. KEIGWIN: All right, Preston.
18 MR. PECK: You kind of touched on my question,
19 and I just want clarity. So if someone were to use a
20 product on, like, starting industrial hemp projects in
21 North Carolina and they use a product that isn't 25(b),
22 would that be an off-label use of that product?
23 MS. ZINN: In most cases, yes.
24 MR. PECK: And, so, therefore, would the state
25 lead agency have to step in or would that be EPA? I'm

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

189

1 trying to wrap my head around this --
2 MS. ZINN: I'm sorry, I'm trying to understand
3 what you're asking.
4 MR. PECK: So I'm asking if someone were to
5 use a product in an industrial hemp operation or somehow
6 this product that's not for cannabis was to be used,
7 that would be an off-label use, and would the state
8 department of ag, or in North Carolina's case, the North
9 Carolina State Department of Agriculture, step in and
10 say you've committed a label violation?
11 MS. ZINN: Yes. Usually yes.
12 MR. KEIGWIN: So the states have primacy for
13 use violations.
14 MS. ZINN: Yes.
15 MR. PECK: Right, so that would be the state,
16 okay.
17 MS. ZINN: Yes.
18 MR. PECK: Thank you.
19 MR. KEIGWIN: Anyone else?
20 (No response.)
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Do you want to run before...
22 That's the easiest Nicole has ever had to do
23 on this topic. So, all right, thanks.
24 Okay, so, our last topic for the day is an
25 update on PRIA. So Steve Schaible, who is our newly

190

1 appointed PRIA coordinator for the Office of Pesticide
2 Programs will come up and give us an update.
3 MR. SCHAIBLE: Good afternoon, everyone. So
4 I'm going to talk a little about PRIA, and currently we
5 are under PRIA 3 still. The PRIA 3 expiration date was
6 September 30th, but the continuing resolution extended
7 it through December 8th. And, so, we'll talk about sort
8 of PRIA as it currently exists, as well as the effort to
9 reauthorize PRIA that is ongoing. And then after that
10 I'll just be talking about some of the metrics,
11 performance metrics for the last fiscal year for PRIA.
12 Okay, so PRIA 4 is the reauthorization
13 legislation that is currently gone through Congress. As
14 I said before, PRIA 3 had an expiration date of
15 September; that passed. It was extended by the
16 continuing resolution. So as far as PRIA 4 goes, the
17 bill that was -- the EPA assisted in the development of
18 with the PRIA coalition was for a seven-year
19 reauthorization, and that version was passed by the
20 House of Representatives by unanimous consent back in
21 March.
22 It then went on to the Senate, and the Senate
23 amended that bill to be a three-year extension of the
24 PRIA authority. And that passed out of committee in
25 June. That bill is awaiting vote by the full Senate at

191

1 this point in time.
2 If that bill was passed by the Senate, that
3 amended bill would need to go back to the House to
4 reconcile the differences between those two bills. And
5 at that point in time it would proceed to the President
6 for signature.
7 So we can talk about, then, what are the
8 provisions of that bill. I just want to go through
9 quickly on this because I want to spend more time
10 focusing on PRIA 3 and our accomplishments. But very
11 quickly, if that bill were to go through and be passed
12 into law, there are -- the maintenance fee authority
13 would be extended, and there are some wrinkles to that.
14 Currently, it's at $27.8 million per year for
15 collections for maintenance fees. The proposal is to
16 raise that to $31 million per year.
17 Likewise, currently EPA is not able to average
18 across years, so if we undercollect or overcollect
19 within a given year, we can't offset that in the years
20 advancing. You just sort of take what you got that
21 year. We have a formula where we attempt to estimate
22 what the fee for registrants should be, and it's taking
23 into account, you know, the number of products that are
24 currently registered, you know, how many small business
25 waivers we anticipate might be submitted, and sometimes

192

1 that formula doesn't end up with the outcomes that we
2 project.
3 So PRIA 4 would allow averaging across years
4 to account for that over or undercollection within the
5 authorization period. Likewise, PRIA 4 has some
6 language which eliminates a longstanding provision from
7 FIFRA that requires for every maintenance dollar which
8 is spent, an appropriated dollar must first be spent.
9 And over time under PRIA 3, we've seen our appropriated
10 dollars get smaller and smaller, and that has had an
11 impact on our ability to spend maintenance fee dollars.
12 And, so, there's a provision in PRIA 4 which removes
13 that constraint.
14 Continuing with maintenance fees, in PRIA 3,
15 currently there is an IT set-aside that allows for
16 activities -- specified activities for EPA to use
17 maintenance fee dollars towards. I think one of the big
18 ones is developing a tracking system where applicants
19 can be looking at their applications as they move
20 through the agency, but there's others as well.
21 There's endangered species database
22 development; there's conditional registration; the
23 ability to look at sort of how EPA is receiving and
24 reviewing data that were required under conditional
25 registration.

193

1 That IT set-aside is going to be replaced with
2 a new set-aside, at $500,000 per year. And, so, again,
3 there's a seven-year version and a three-year version.
4 And, so, depending on what version you end up with, that
5 protects your overall dollars that are collected and put
6 towards that.
7 But that set-aside is developed and finalized
8 rulemaking and guidance for product performance data
9 requirements for certain invertebrate pests of
10 significant public importance. So these are public
11 health pests. And, likewise, it establishes a mandatory
12 schedule for the EPA to develop the guidance and then
13 the rulemaking on that guidance as needed for those
14 pests.
15 It also creates a separate set-aside of
16 $500,000 per year for good laboratory practices
17 inspections. And these funds would be collected under
18 PRIA and would be then shared with our Office of
19 Enforcement and Compliance Assurance, hire additional
20 inspectors -- inspectors to conduct those inspections.
21 Okay, and now I'm going to move on to the PRIA
22 registration service piece side of PRIA 4. PRIA 4
23 extends the existing set-asides for worker protection,
24 partnership grants, and pesticide safety education
25 programs and further emphasizes that those activities

194

1 shall focus on fieldworker populations in the United
2 States. It also directs EPA to look for opportunities
3 to streamline review processes for new chemicals and new
4 use applications and to provide feedback to applicants
5 during that process.
6 And, so, this is overall when new uses and new
7 chemicals, in particular, tend to -- our decisions tend
8 to occur in time frames that are longer than the
9 mandated time frames under PRIA. And there's a lot of
10 reasons for that, and we will be looking at ways in
11 which we can expedite our review for those types of
12 applications.
13 As with PRIA 3, PRIA 4 has reporting
14 requirements and it extends the existing requirements
15 and expands upon them. So reg review reporting
16 requirements currently have a lot more to do with your
17 preliminary work plans and sort of the beginning stages
18 of reg review. PRIA 4 has language that starts
19 reporting out on some of the later stages of reg review
20 and what is our performance for those cases further down
21 the road.
22 It talks about we have to report on meeting
23 mandatory schedules and developing those efficacy
24 guidelines I spoke of earlier. There's time frames that
25 are specified, and those time frames differ between the

195

1 two different versions, but EPA is to complete those
2 activities in certain time frames, and we'll be
3 reporting out on that and our progress in doing that.
4 The progress and the review and approval of
5 the new pesticides to control vector-borne public health
6 use -- to control the pests that vector public health
7 diseases in the United States. And this includes
8 territories and military bases globally.
9 There's another requirement for, again, the
10 number of GLP inspections which are conducted. There is
11 a new category for design for the environment amendments
12 to labels, and we will be reporting out on how many of
13 those we approve, and then the existing requirement for
14 worker protection partnership grants and pesticide
15 safety education, how those funds are being used.
16 But additionally to that, there's also
17 language on reporting out on the effectiveness of those
18 activities and EPA's engagement with stakeholders around
19 those activities.
20 Okay, so, PRIA 3 has currently 189 fee
21 categories. There was an effort going into PRIA 4 to
22 look at where we could consolidate categories, eliminate
23 categories, and then, of course, we also added
24 categories because that's what usually happens. So we
25 went from 189 up to 212, and I just want to hit on some

196

1 of the highlights around these.
2 In general, there is an effort to better align
3 fees and time frames with increasing increments of
4 activities received and work done. And, so, for the
5 inert ingredients, we lowered time frames, raised time
6 frames, increased and decreased fees. The inert
7 ingredient categories were new to PRIA 3. I think
8 having five years under our belt we have a much better
9 understanding of what are the time frames and resources
10 that go into those types of reviews. And I think that
11 the proposed changes to those fees and time frames
12 reflect that, that knowledge that we've gained.
13 For the efficacy data and public health
14 efficacy data and review, these are disinfectants, these
15 are antimicrobials where there's organisms involved.
16 These are public health pests and bio-pesticide in the
17 conventional realm. We've created new categories where
18 if you're asking for additional organisms and additional
19 target public health pests that there are differing
20 categories. Increase in categories are incremental
21 increases in categories and/or fees as your number of
22 pests or organisms get higher.
23 There was a desire expressed for a category to
24 provide incentive for U.S. harmonization of existing
25 tolerances with international MRLs, CODEX MRLs. And,

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

197

1 so, amended an existing category, the R292 category, to
2 allow for a one-time -- you know, any tolerances -- U.S.
3 tolerances that existed that were not in align with
4 MRLs, you can come in under that category and harmonize
5 all of your tolerances for your chemical.
6 There was an OIG audit of the conventional
7 reduced risk program a while ago and found that there
8 needed to be additional incentive provided for
9 participation in that program. And one of the
10 recommendations from our OIG was to provide a fee
11 differential in addition to the time frame differential
12 for reduced risk actions. And, so, the new -- the
13 pending legislation provides an incentive by increasing
14 the fee amounts for new chemical and new use categories
15 where there's an analogous reduced risk category. And
16 that would be a 20 percent increase.
17 There are new categories to better align
18 antimicrobial categories to be consistent with the Part
19 158W revisions that happened a few years ago, and in
20 that realm, there are much fewer categories under PRIA 4
21 than there were under PRIA 3. There was consolidation
22 there. There's new PIP categories being added, and PIP
23 is a plant-incorporated pesticide, I believe. So
24 there's new PIP categories.
25 On the inert front, there were no categories

198

1 for safeners, and safeners are inert ingredients, but
2 the data set required for safeners resembles much more
3 so a new active ingredient. And we were finding that we
4 were not able to complete those applications in near the
5 time frame specified under the existing categories, nor
6 were we getting money that any -- in any way aligned
7 with the work that we were putting into this. There's a
8 whole slew of safener categories that are being
9 proposed.
10 And, then, finally, in Table 19, which is the
11 miscellaneous table, there are a number of new proposed
12 categories requested by stakeholders. One is for
13 non-FIFRA determinations. These are device
14 determinations, treated article exemptions, minimum risk
15 determinations. These are activities that currently
16 exist outside of PRIA but for which I don't -- my
17 understanding there isn't a set time frame. And I think
18 there was a desire that for a fee there could be a time
19 frame for that type of product being produced by the
20 EPA.
21 Again, I mentioned before, there's design for
22 the environment amendments where for a pesticide product
23 you can amend your label for the design -- for the
24 environments for pesticide product logo. And, finally,
25 this last one, there's a conditional ruling on

199

1 pre-application substantial similarity findings. And,
2 so, right now, if you have a new product that you're
3 claiming to be me-too or substantially similar to
4 another product, you submit your application, it goes to
5 the similarity clinic, at the front end of the process,
6 as part of our preliminary technical screen review, and
7 if it's found to not be substantially similar, you get
8 another bite at that apple. And if you don't come up
9 with another product, then it gets kicked out under the
10 screen.
11 And, so, I think in the registrant community,
12 there was a desire of some to be able to know up-front
13 whether or not the agency was inclined to think that
14 there was a favorable argument to be made around
15 similarity. That gives you greater certain when you
16 submit the application itself of a time frame for an EPA
17 decision.
18 In terms of fees collected in Fiscal Year '17,
19 on the PRIA side, we collected $18.265 million. This is
20 higher than we have in the previous few years. And on
21 the maintenance fee side, we collected $27.99 million,
22 and so $27.8 is our target, that's what we were shooting
23 for. So as you can see, sometimes you collect slightly
24 over and under, and, again, there's not a way that we
25 can know until we actually receive all the small

200

1 business waivers, weigh in on them, and receive the
2 fees.
3 Okay, moving on to some of the summary
4 statistics. So I apologize if these are a little small,
5 but so light blue bars are for the number of submitted
6 primary applications, so this is what came in in the
7 last fiscal year. The yellow bars are the number of
8 completed decisions. And these would be primary and
9 secondary decisions. And, so, primary/secondary, just
10 to quickly summarize that, you can submit an
11 application, for instance, for a new chemical or a new
12 use, and there might be a technical product, there might
13 be multiple amendments to end-use products, there might
14 be new products.
15 As long as they're related to each other and
16 share data, they're -- the primary is -- one of them is
17 assigned the primary decision, and the others are the
18 tag-alongs or the secondary. And, so, if you're looking
19 at more accurately what are the number of packages that
20 we receive for a certain request in the use of a new
21 chemical, new product, or otherwise, primary decisions
22 are a more accurate way to count that.
23 And then, finally, the dark blue bar is the
24 number of completed decisions that involved a negotiated
25 due date for the decision. And, so, starting with the

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

201

1 antimicrobials division, we received 300 primary
2 applications in the past year. We completed 338
3 decisions; 282 of those were the primary decisions; and
4 there were 26 of those 338 decisions that involved a
5 negotiation of the due date.
6 For biopesticides, there were 148 decisions
7 received; 163 primary/secondary were completed; 145 of
8 those were primary decisions; and 22 of those 163
9 involved a negotiation of the due date -- one or more
10 negotiations, actually.
11 For conventionals, there were 880 decisions
12 received; 937 decisions were completed, of which 746
13 were primary decisions; and 197 of those 937 were
14 negotiated.
15 For inerts, 55 were received; 42 were
16 completed; and those 42 were all primary decisions; and
17 16 of the 42 involved a negotiation. And just going
18 back to PRIA 4 and adjusting the time frames, I think
19 this is an example of how under PRIA 3 we set some time
20 frames and in some cases they didn't end up being the
21 right amount of time for the work that we were doing.
22 Finally, for the miscellaneous categories, and
23 the bulk of these are going to be gold seal letter
24 requests, there were 562 miscellaneous applications
25 received; 544 were completed; and those 544 were all

202

1 primary decisions as well, there were no secondary
2 decisions; and there were no negotiations of the due
3 date for any of those miscellaneous categories.
4 In addition to gold seals, those can also
5 include actions that had to go to HSRB or SAP, new
6 product applications that span the regulatory divisions
7 that had a BPPD element and an RD element. Extension of
8 exclusive use requests were also included in the
9 miscellaneous category.
10 Okay, this next slide speaks about -- it's
11 sort of the different way of presenting information from
12 the previous slide about a negotiated due date. And it
13 gives you a historical perspective. So you can see back
14 -- and it goes back to 2010, and at that point, for
15 antimicrobials we had 35 percent of our completions
16 involved negotiations. For biopesticides, it was 62
17 percent. For conventionals, it was 26 percent.
18 And as you go down through here, this year,
19 you can see we have done exceptionally well on all of
20 our divisions. For antimicrobials, there were 26 of the
21 338 that involved a negotiation. That's 7.7 percent of
22 the completions. For biopesticides, the number was 13.5
23 percent. For conventionals, it was 21 percent;
24 miscellaneous, again, had no negotiations. And for
25 inert, it was 38.1 percent. So this was in terms of

203

1 performance around a negotiated due dates, this was a
2 good year for OPP staff in terms of completing these
3 actions.
4 The next slide has to do with late completions
5 or inversely on-time completion rate. For
6 antimicrobials, there was one late completion of all of
7 their actions this last year. For biopesticides, there
8 were two late completions. Conventionals had 12; inerts
9 had two; and there was one late completion on the
10 miscellaneous front. So the range there, I think, were
11 all, you know, above 95 percent, and most of them were
12 at 99 percent or above. So, again, this was a good year
13 compared to our previous years. And I think the last
14 two or three years we've been showing improvement. So
15 this is a good news story for the staff at OPP as well.
16 In the PRIA quarterly stakeholder meetings, a
17 couple of years ago, the request was made to start
18 reporting out on some activities that are non-PRIA but
19 are also of great importance to the community that's
20 submitting applications. And, so, I want to talk a
21 little bit about the non-PRIA fast-track amendments and
22 notifications. For the office, OPP completed 2,302
23 fast-track amendments this last year. At fiscal year's
24 end, there were 1,048 amendments pending. And 521 of
25 those were in backlog status, and for fast-tracks,

204

1 that's greater than 90 days.
2 For notifications, OPP completed 2,787
3 notifications in FY17. At the year's end, there were
4 622 notifications pending, and 463 of those were in
5 backlog status, which is greater than 30 days for
6 notifications.
7 Okay, this next slide has to do with our
8 effort to transition to receiving applications
9 electronically. So a while back, we just received
10 things in paper, and then we moved to the point where we
11 were getting things on CD or DVD. And then in 2015, the
12 pesticide submission portal was put out there and made
13 live, and there's been -- there was an update to that, a
14 Phase 2 of the portal that expanded the capability, and
15 then there's going to be a Phase 3 as well. I think
16 some elements in it are already live. It's in stages
17 right now.
18 But I just wanted to talk about sort of the
19 number of submissions we received and what the breakout
20 of those submissions is, paper or CD versus portal. And
21 I think I -- for time's sake, I don't think I'll go
22 through individually. I'll just go through the total,
23 but we received over 12,000 total submissions for the
24 year. 6,500 of those were in paper. 115 of those were
25 on CD or DVD. And 5,705 of those were through the

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

205

1 portal. And, so, the percentages are 53 percent, 1
2 percent, and 46 percent.
3 If you look within the divisions, I think you
4 can see that, you know, antimicrobial applicants are
5 leading the way in terms of submitting electronically
6 and through the portal, but I think everybody is showing
7 progress when we look at sort of the -- when the portal
8 first went live and how the progress we've been making,
9 there has been incremental progress over time,
10 definitely moving away from the CDs and DVDs and moving
11 towards the portal, and the paper submissions have been
12 going down as well.
13 In September, the ability to submit gold seal
14 letters through the portal was implemented, and I think
15 that given the number of gold seals that we get, I think
16 that will -- the next time we report out on this, I
17 think there will be a significant change in these
18 numbers reflecting that the gold seals are coming in
19 through the portal -- or can come in through the portal
20 now. And we encourage you as the registrant community
21 to be submitting those through the portal as well.
22 As I mentioned earlier in this slide, there is
23 a set-aside under PRIA 3 for worker protection
24 activities, and I just wanted to give a quick summary
25 for FY17 and 18 how those grants were awarded. So for

206

1 the first grant for worker protection activities is to
2 the Association of Farmworker Opportunity, or AFOP.
3 That's the national farmworker training program, and
4 it's a cooperative agreement for $500,000.
5 AFOP is responsible for developing and
6 administering a pesticide safety training program to
7 support the national network of pesticide safety
8 trainers, providing pesticide worker safety training to
9 migrant and seasonal farmworkers and to their families.
10 And the second grant under the general worker
11 protection is to the Pesticide Educational Resources
12 Collaborative, or PERC. And this is through UC-Davis
13 and the Oregon State Cooperative Agreement. That's,
14 again, for $500,000. This cooperative agreement will
15 develop or coordinate the development of pesticide
16 educational material. An advisory board and EPA will
17 help in setting national priorities.
18 The PERC will use subject matter experts and
19 production professionals. And it focuses on WPS
20 materials -- or will focus on WPS materials in its first
21 year because of the urgent need for training materials
22 with the newly updated regulation. PERC will focus on
23 the certification and training materials in its second
24 year in response to the anticipated changes in
25 categories and needs nationwide.

207

1 And the next slide talks about some of the
2 current projects for which that grant money is being
3 applied. And I think for the sake of time I won't go
4 through them individually.
5 Okay, there is also a $500,000 set-aside of
6 PRIA Funds for pesticide safety education program
7 activities, and that went to NPIC, the National
8 Pesticide Information Center. This cooperative
9 agreement facilitates informed decision-making about
10 pesticides and supports the protection of human health
11 and the environment by serving as a bilingual factual
12 source of information for professionals and public
13 audiences on public-related issues.
14 And, lastly, there is a pesticide education
15 program set-aside that went to the eXtension Foundation.
16 This was previously granted, but the grantee did not
17 accept the award. And, so, there was a two-year lag
18 time for that to be re-competed and a new grantee to be
19 awarded. So this is $1,500,000 of money.
20 This establishes a pesticide safety education
21 funds management program to help support state
22 cooperative extension programs, conduct their certified
23 pesticide applicator training activities. And, again,
24 this is the current-year PRIA funds of $500,000 and then
25 the two previous years of unexpended funds.

208

1 These are the PRIA points of contact within
2 the Office of Pesticide Programs. So if you have any
3 questions, do feel free to contact the divisional
4 representative, and that's Andrew Bryceland in BPPD;
5 Diane Isbell in AD; RD, Ashwasi Balan [phonetic] is
6 serving in that capacity informally, so you can contact
7 her or you can contact me as well. And at the office
8 level, you're free to contact me.
9 That's it. Are there any questions around
10 PRIA?
11 MR. KEIGWIN: Jay.
12 MR. VROOM: So early in the presentation you
13 referred to the GLP program. Separate from this,
14 there's reports that GLP is being moved out of OECA.
15 Any reports on where it is? Is the truck lost coming
16 across the river?
17 MR. KEIGWIN: So the GLP program currently
18 remains in the Office of Enforcement and Compliance
19 Assurance. In the last administration, there had been
20 plans to transfer those functions to another office
21 within the Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution
22 Prevention. That move has been put on hold for now
23 while we onboard the new team and they can make some
24 choices on things like that. So for now, all the good
25 laboratory practice program activities are continuing to

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

209

1 be run out of OECA.
2 MR. VROOM: Some years ago, we experienced a
3 government shutdown, and PRIA fees got put into a
4 purgatory account. I think it was $800,000. Is that
5 money still in purgatory?
6 MR. SCHAIBLE: It is.
7 MR. VROOM: And it will require the
8 appropriations committees to free it?
9 MR. KEIGWIN: We would need to check with our
10 appropriations law attorneys to get you an answer to
11 that one.
12 MR. VROOM: Thanks.
13 MR. KEIGWIN: Iris?
14 MS. FIGUEROA: Thank you. Just a quick
15 question on the worker protection activities. If you
16 could just give a little bit more detail on sort of the
17 worker voice in that and to what extent workers will be
18 involved, especially in the development of these
19 materials that are listed.
20 MR. KEANEY: The program we have has an
21 advisory board, and it's available for worker advocates
22 to be participating in that and then guide the
23 particular products that are developed over the course
24 of the -- of the cooperative agreement.
25 MR. KEIGWIN: Andrew.

210

1 MR. THOSTENSON: Yeah, I would just add that
2 they've created a number of rather high-quality
3 materials that are already available, including a
4 how-to-comply manual, a variety of different posters and
5 websites, videos for training workers and handlers,
6 how-to-train-the-trainer manual. They've been very
7 productive, at least in the agriculture arena that I
8 work in.
9 MR. KEANEY: The AFOP grant, as well, has
10 produced new training flip charts with upgraded graphics
11 and responding to comments we've gotten from folks that
12 have been trained and the trainers as to the
13 effectiveness of the graphics. So we've made
14 adjustments -- or AFOP's made adjustments there and it's
15 very, very -- a very graphically intense presentation,
16 along with the scripting of the training.
17 MR. KEIGWIN: Any other questions? Jay.
18 MR. VROOM: So with PRIA only extended and not
19 reauthorized, what does that do to the money flow to
20 AFOP and PERC?
21 MR. KEANEY: It obviously presents a problem.
22 MR. VROOM: Thank you.
23 MR. KEIGWIN: Amy?
24 MS. LEIBMAN: I just want to encourage the EPA
25 in terms of the cooperative agreements. I think that,

211

1 you know, PERC has done a lot of work, and they have
2 tried to -- they have an advisory board, but there's
3 still a feeling among the farmworker advocate community
4 that involvement of workers in the testing of these
5 products and how they're used and their effectiveness
6 still needs some work, and how they, you know, use their
7 funds to gather that information and evaluate it. We
8 would like to see a stronger voice from EPA in the
9 guidance that it gives to its grantees about the worker
10 involvement.
11 MR. KEANEY: All the grants and cooperative
12 agreements, not -- but there's a distinction between a
13 straight-out grant and a cooperative agreement. And,
14 so, there are -- there is interaction from EPA with the
15 -- with the grantees, but obviously we aren't in a
16 position to strongly dictate all that they will do.
17 It's a cooperative agreement, as I said.
18 MS. LEIBMAN: I understand that, but you can
19 design requests for proposals and how you design the
20 cooperative agreement proposals to encourage that and
21 score on that.
22 MR. KEIGWIN: Other comments, questions?
23 (No response.)
24 MR. KEIGWIN: Seeing no tent cards going up,
25 thanks, Steve. Thanks, Kevin.

212

1 So we had one person sign up for public
2 comment, so Cindy Smith from Gowan.
3 MS. SMITH: Thank you, Rick. And I just want
4 to share, after listening to the comments this morning
5 on chlorpyrifos I really feel compelled to share maybe
6 the other opinion. So as strongly as I think people
7 feel that the administrator made the wrong decision in
8 denying the petition, I think there are a significant
9 number of people who think the administrator made the
10 right decision for the science side of it.
11 And, so, the frustration, I think, that many
12 of you expressed today is the same frustration that many
13 of us in the registrant and user community felt back in
14 December of 2014 when the human health risk assessment
15 was released and the epi-data, which have been available
16 since 2007, but for legitimate reasons was rejected by
17 EPA for use in the way that it was used in the 2014
18 human health risk assessment was suddenly being used.
19 And, so, I think it isn't a simple issue. It
20 is a complex issue. And I would like to pose that it
21 isn't just about chlorpyrifos. I think it's really
22 about epi-data and use of epi-data. And, so, I think to
23 Nichelle's question about what science needs to be
24 looked at, I believe the answer is that it is -- what's
25 the appropriate use of these specific epi-data.

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

213

1 So not all epi-data is the same, right? Some
2 of it is conducted for certain reasons, some for others.
3 In some cases, the data are available and in some cases
4 they aren't. In some cases, they're good exposure
5 metrics. In other cases, there's not. There's epi-data
6 that has been done with exposure to OPs that doesn't
7 show these neurodevelopmental effects. So how do you
8 weigh that in? So I think that's one question that
9 probably deserves some legitimate continued
10 conversation.
11 And then I think the second area is that once
12 you determine that that epidemiology data may be
13 appropriate for use, how do you integrate that with the
14 animal and toxicity -- the animal and human toxicity
15 data that exists for many of these chemicals. So I
16 think it was said that, you know, chlorpyrifos has been
17 used for over 30 years. Many OPs have been used for
18 over 30 years. I would agree. I think, Amy, it was
19 your statement that there's a lot of data that has been
20 generated on these products.
21 And I would say that the available animal and
22 human toxicological data supports that regulating under
23 cholinesterase inhibition is protective. And, so, I
24 think those to me are the two areas that really do
25 warrant some further science review. What are the right

214

1 criteria to say that epidemiology data should be used,
2 and once you determine it's usable, how do you integrate
3 it with all that available animal toxicology data that
4 is required to be generated under specific conditions
5 that looks at those exposure metrics and other things
6 that are important?
7 And I guess that the last thing I would say
8 is, you know, I've been in the registrant community for
9 over 20 years. I've dealt with EPA staff on the
10 registration of products through I don't know how many
11 administrations. And I've had products approved; I've
12 had products denied. But I will say that every single
13 staff person that I've dealt with has put first and
14 foremost the protection of human health, and I think
15 particularly the protection of infants and children, and
16 I would say concern about workers.
17 So I'm troubled at the implication that that
18 may not be what's driving their decisions because when I
19 agree with their decisions and when I disagree with
20 their decisions, I have always found them to be based in
21 what they believe the data says is protective of humans
22 and the environment.
23 MR. KEIGWIN: That concludes our day. So
24 thank you all for the very productive discussions today.
25 I think we made some good progress, and we really

215

1 appreciate your input. Just a reminder that tomorrow we
2 are starting at 8:30, and I expect an even more lively
3 and robust discussion on the two rules.
4 So have a good evening, and we'll see you
5 tomorrow. Thanks.
6 (Whereupon, the committee meeting was
7 adjourned.)
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

216

1 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPTIONIST
2
3 I, Sally Jo Quade, do hereby certify that the
4 foregoing transcription was reduced to typewriting via
5 audiotapes provided to me; that I am neither counsel
6 for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to
7 the action in which these proceedings were transcribed;
8 that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or
9 counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially
10 or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.
11
12
13
14
15 SALLY JO QUADE, CERT
16 Transcriptionist
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A
A&M 11:9
a.m 99:18
AAPCO 11:2 40:9 40:10 49:8,25 61:25 64:8 68:17 68:18,24 71:9,12 71:12,14 72:4 128:20 130:12
AAPCO's 40:14 69:8
Aaron 12:18 180:10 181:8 186:21
ability 63:8 66:20 139:17 140:20 149:1 181:17 192:11,23 205:13
able 14:18 18:8 24:5 40:17 41:4 50:13 65:5 71:17,19 77:20 79:21 93:3 115:24 116:1 128:19 130:14 132:12 148:3,6 176:10 177:19 185:4 191:17 198:4 199:12
abundant 91:21
academic 124:25
accept 131:14 185:19 207:17
acceptable 86:17 108:23,24
acceptance 184:6
accepting 75:13
access 21:14 125:23 125:25 177:4 178:4 184:22 185:2
accommodate 181:2
accompanying 9:15
accomplish 23:25
accomplished 175:10
accomplishments 191:10
account 165:24 191:23 192:4 209:4
accounted 152:8
accurate 47:23 48:1 68:15 200:22
accurately 141:7 200:19
accusing 180:5
accustomed 107:9
achieve 82:4
achieving 33:6
acknowledge 53:8 91:3 94:16 158:15
acknowledged 32:18,23 77:24 93:15
acknowledgment 128:5,11
acre 113:19
acreage 104:6,10 114:1,4 131:9 132:24
acres 103:14 113:11 114:5,7 119:12 121:6 126:13,16 126:25 138:15 176:16
act 16:12 18:25 19:1 19:18 28:3 88:3 98:7,10,11 100:15
acting 3:15 100:19 100:21
action 82:22 92:5 104:23 119:15 123:7 133:25 157:11 165:4 171:20 172:8,11 173:25 174:2,9,16 174:21,25 175:6 187:15 216:7,10
actions 9:10 31:22 32:8 123:4 151:1 173:18 197:12 202:5 203:3,7
active 2:18 26:18 125:11 149:19 150:25 151:1,18 155:21 168:13 198:3
actively 88:7 129:1
activities 23:23 24:19 32:9 100:10 192:16,16 193:25 195:2,18,19 196:4 198:15 203:18 205:24 206:1 207:7,23 208:25 209:15
activity 155:15,16 169:24
actual 66:14 98:21 135:6 154:25 155:18 156:25 177:11
acute 14:1 32:13 36:21 52:20 54:5 55:13,15 57:20 71:4 170:6
acutely 133:24
AD 208:5
adapted 40:17
adaptive 65:17
add 64:16 74:8 75:7 120:17 142:9 164:20 210:1
added 106:20,24 142:16 145:21,22 147:6 195:23 197:22
adding 112:13 142:8 142:22 166:8
addition 115:13 151:13 197:11 202:4
additional 27:22 63:14 78:16 80:21 85:4 91:23 92:3 95:11,14 106:15 112:17 143:8 144:16 145:21,22 156:8,22,23 157:1 157:25 160:17 165:7,15 166:10 166:13 173:20 193:19 196:18,18 197:8
additionally 195:16
additive 150:19 151:25 163:14
address 52:23 64:25 89:8,21,23,24 105:6 117:13 129:3,8 136:13 137:8 141:3 145:6 150:19 167:13 178:14
addressed 53:10,11 55:11 78:22 82:2 143:12 145:8 184:24
addresses 55:23 173:15
addressing 53:4,6
adequately 145:8
adjacent 142:18 144:19
adjourn 23:1
adjourned 215:7
adjusting 201:18
adjustments 156:6 210:14,14
administering 206:6
administration 5:20 10:16 208:19
administrations 5:19 214:11
administrator 2:9 3:16 8:23 10:6 20:17 212:7,9
Administrator's 3:13
adopt 37:5
adopters 177:16
adopting 58:5 133:7 133:9
adoption 46:19 133:14
ads 44:3
advance 7:1 16:5 19:6 23:10,11 124:21 168:2 171:1
advanced 78:18
advancing 191:20
advantage 177:18
adventure 35:3
adverse 82:5
advice 7:19 17:1 19:22,23 20:1 26:11,13 58:12,21 95:12,13 114:10
advisor 3:13 8:19,22 84:15
advisory 15:5,10 18:25 19:1,3,18,20 20:3,15 22:14 25:3 28:2,10 63:20 65:2 95:10 206:16 209:21 211:2
advocate 211:3
advocates 209:21
advocating 94:12
aerial 11:4 41:14,17 42:23 60:24 125:10,15,20 126:1,11
affairs 4:8 11:17
affect 24:4
affecter 118:5
afford 19:10
AFOP 206:2,5 210:9 210:20
AFOP's 210:14
afternoon 15:22 76:3 97:23 100:1,4 144:7 149:9 190:3
ag 8:19 43:5 110:6 183:12 189:8
age 24:22
agencies 31:17,21 40:7,7,24 43:3,4,7 48:10 49:17 54:13 64:21 69:6 71:19 71:24 94:6 101:8 104:16 109:19 120:1,4 121:12 130:18 131:19

132:8 141:9 148:24 184:15 185:3
agency 1:6 9:10 15:5 15:19 19:2 21:3,19 22:19 34:13 36:1 43:2,4 44:4,15 46:17 49:3 53:19 58:20 71:16 72:2 75:14 82:10 84:4 85:21 89:21,23 93:12 94:18 95:9 95:11 98:22 111:9 114:10,13 115:8 116:10 118:17 123:12 131:5 133:23 151:17 154:10 178:22 180:23 181:5,11 185:13 188:25 192:20 199:13
agency's 97:12 100:5 153:17 168:17
agenda 7:24 9:11 14:22,24 23:1 65:1 100:4
agendas 23:22 65:1
agent 116:22
agents 113:20
aggregated 47:23 66:3
ago 30:23 34:11 97:9 124:21 161:5 170:18 197:7,19 203:17 209:2
agree 90:19 213:18 214:19
agreed 106:5
agreement 77:6 105:15 206:4,13 206:14 207:9 209:24 211:13,17 211:20
agreements 210:25 211:12
agricultural 3:11,12 8:22 10:25 11:5,8 13:23 44:12 51:24 115:7
agriculture 39:23 72:19 102:16 103:13,16 104:4 108:19 109:25 183:13 189:9 210:7
Agrosciences 79:2
ags 70:8
ahead 30:9,16 35:1 129:14 135:23 146:7,8
aiming 145:12
air 146:4
Alabama 128:8
Alarcon 13:25,25
Alaska 49:13
align 196:2 197:3,17
aligned 198:6
alive 44:25 45:4
all's 16:16
allegations 102:17
alleging 102:13
Allen 13:7
allow 62:8 63:13 64:1,4 105:20 107:25 131:21 192:3 197:2
allowing 101:21
allows 21:16 63:2 192:15
alter 157:8
alternatives 12:25 94:10 170:7
amazing 4:8 161:8
ambitious 14:24
amend 105:5 132:1 198:23
amended 98:10 190:23 191:3 197:1
amendments 195:11 198:22 200:13 203:21,23,24
America 12:1 13:22 55:8 148:5
American 5:18 11:2 12:5,8,11,15 13:6 13:19 40:11 51:16 58:25
amount 29:15,25 98:25 131:8 132:23,24 143:25 162:21,24 170:1 173:4 201:21
amounts 197:14
Amy 11:13,25 85:6 85:15 90:19 96:17 119:21 122:4,8 124:19 135:22,23 138:13 143:11 144:12 210:23 213:18
Amy's 143:13
analog 175:12
analogous 197:15
analogs 175:5
analysis 89:14 154:12 156:3 172:4
analytical 143:3
analyze 67:15 152:5
analyzing 155:25
and/or 26:11 196:21
Anderson 169:10,10 169:18
Andrew 13:3 108:10 116:11 122:4 125:6 127:6 128:1 131:12 135:21 138:13 172:23 208:4 209:25
Andy 10:20 31:3 34:24 39:23 47:6 50:25 59:15 113:9 115:1 117:16 135:6
anecdotal 111:7
animal 21:6 160:19 170:6 213:14,14 213:21 214:3
Ann 13:13 51:15 54:16 70:12 85:16 90:14 91:2 96:18 129:5 130:4 133:3 138:10
Ann's 74:6
Anna 170:7,16
announced 116:6
announcements 44:5
annual 57:2 81:14 81:16
answer 51:6 54:25 58:2 59:17 69:12 76:16 153:24 172:10 174:4 176:21 182:20 183:6 184:11,13 209:10 212:24
answered 49:2 90:21
answering 51:1
answers 22:21 27:25 72:14,25 75:25 79:2
anticipate 182:6 191:25
anticipated 91:10 114:1 206:24
anticipating 81:5
anticipation 81:8
antimicrobial 183:14 197:18 205:4
antimicrobials 183:1 196:15 201:1 202:15,20 203:6
anybody 67:24
anymore 97:14,14 168:9
anyway 59:17 163:15
aphids 173:5,8
apiarists 70:11
apiary 64:5
apologize 200:4
apparently 91:11 168:5
appears 118:16
Applause 75:21
apple 199:8
applicable 155:4
applicant 179:20
applicants 179:10 192:18 194:4 205:4
application 42:23 61:6,10,11 72:17 105:5 107:1,15 117:25 125:10,16 125:19,21 126:11 136:9,11 138:3 140:6 146:18 147:9 157:4 163:21 174:25 177:25 199:4,16 200:11
applications 32:9 60:25 79:24 105:12 106:16,18 107:20 114:6 125:22 127:4 137:13 145:12 148:12 153:3 160:14 166:2,14 179:11 180:2 186:1 192:19 194:4,12 198:4 200:6 201:2,24 202:6 203:20 204:8
applicator 11:4 41:17 60:25 106:9 125:4 136:24 141:8 143:21 146:13,18,19 147:3,8 185:10 207:23
applicator's 178:24
applicators 16:18 41:14 44:12 61:18 61:22 70:20 73:18 106:6,11,13,25 107:6,11,21

108:18 114:17,17 115:5,6,6,13,16 116:8,13,18 117:14 124:21 125:18 126:1 136:1,2,10 137:2,7 137:9,11 138:18 139:21 145:25 177:4,23
applied 3:22 42:13 125:13 126:2 131:9 137:3,4 139:24 143:15 159:22 207:3
applies 20:2
apply 5:24 19:21 22:10 78:18 98:6 99:9 106:7,9,11 125:16 137:4 140:14
applying 41:19 99:2 106:14 107:11 122:16 136:3 141:19 146:1 149:15 185:11
appointed 24:1 190:1
appoints 20:24
appreciate 2:16 8:15 19:9 118:11 149:4 179:2 186:4 215:1
appreciation 9:14
appreciative 95:25
approach 7:18 22:19 64:9 75:8,13 133:12 149:18 154:8
approached 104:20
appropriate 3:5 23:18 65:21 119:15 153:20 157:3 164:22 212:25 213:13
appropriated 192:8 192:9
appropriately 107:16 133:25 138:8
appropriations 209:8,10
approval 26:19,24 80:6,11 103:2 195:4
approve 22:25 187:16 195:13
approved 80:12 101:10 125:10 131:16 141:23 179:8 214:11
approving 180:2
approximately 103:18 109:16 110:25 111:3 126:17
approximation 109:22
April 77:4 102:16
area 93:25 132:11 136:3 148:1 161:4 213:11
areas 38:2 102:1 127:23 132:19 142:18 183:4,23 183:24 184:22 213:24
arena 172:25 210:7
argument 199:14
arises 133:5
Arkansas 102:19 124:10 126:1 127:10,12,18 128:9 129:24 131:8 132:25 147:24
Arling 176:20 179:13,13 180:6,9 185:23 186:9
Arlington 1:19
Armed 10:19
Arnold 17:3
art 172:11
article 198:14
articulately 128:20
ash 93:20
Ashwasi 208:5
aside 79:1
asked 20:25 23:6 95:11 100:7 130:8 131:18
asking 31:16 70:16 73:1 118:21 130:10,22 131:11 143:13 172:20 182:10 187:21 189:3,4 196:18
Asmus 11:25,25 135:24 137:1
asparagus 140:6
aspect 44:10 45:11 148:1
aspects 42:7 44:19 143:24 144:9
assess 46:8,8 58:15 138:23 155:12
assessing 67:23 73:23
assessment 3:17 38:17,21 39:3,9 40:1 41:10,24 47:23 48:5,16 50:5 80:17 82:8,12 83:3 83:20 84:25 89:2 92:19,20 95:18 96:1,6 108:13 149:20 153:21,24 154:21 155:10 156:7,22 157:19 163:1 165:1,23 166:1,4,7,11 168:21 169:16 212:14,18
assessments 4:3 5:22 6:2 52:24 96:3,5 148:3 150:24 152:8,24 154:2,6,11,16 156:5 169:15,19 169:19
asset 3:18
assigned 200:17
assimilated 161:6
assimilating 68:2
assist 26:21 45:13 72:7
assistant 2:8 3:15
assisted 190:17
assisting 48:10 49:25
Associate 100:21
associated 20:10 42:9 45:10 50:3 126:21 146:12 157:10
association 11:1,6,8 11:19 12:3,6,16,19 13:6,22 40:10 41:14 59:1 61:25 72:21 115:10 130:12 206:2
assume 109:6 165:2 169:7
assuming 39:16 159:7
assumption 111:1,3 111:5,7 164:21,23
assumptions 71:5 157:12
Assurance 193:19 208:19
attempt 191:21
attempting 89:20
attend 22:25
attended 68:6
attention 100:5,12 101:13 102:18 103:5 114:18 125:9
attorney 35:5 216:8
attorneys 28:4 209:10
audience 54:20 174:17
audiences 207:13
audio 18:1
audiotapes 216:5
audit 197:6
authorities 64:22 116:24
authority 165:15 190:24 191:12
authorization 192:5
automatically 153:19
availability 83:25 84:19 89:1 184:17 184:19
available 22:4,5 40:25 48:4 50:12 52:1 66:1,2 81:16 84:18 88:11 92:14 96:8 98:5 103:4,7 112:14 115:25 119:16,18 120:15 124:22 125:24 134:22 143:5 144:1,3 148:10,15 151:3,19 152:18 177:7 179:25 182:4 185:20,21 209:21 210:3 212:15 213:3,21 214:3
avenues 46:6
average 191:17
averaging 192:3
Aviation 11:4,5
avoidance 98:25
awaiting 190:25
award 207:17
awarded 205:25 207:19
aware 5:8 24:10 65:4 67:20 73:1 102:12 103:18 104:10 115:7 123:19 125:9 133:24 146:19 149:14 181:13 184:15 188:6
awareness 61:18 73:15 106:23 110:7 124:12 145:25 147:12
awesome 2:15

B

back 8:4,8 15:13 31:15 35:15 54:21 58:19 59:12,18 60:20 65:3,11 68:11 74:9,18 75:23 76:4,14 89:19 93:19,22 125:12 129:19 135:22 138:10 141:13 143:18 147:23 149:7,21 158:19 167:5,12 176:3 190:20 191:3 201:18 202:13,14 204:9 212:13
back-door 185:2
back-end 181:1
background 3:17,21 31:12 149:14 150:5,11 153:8 157:13
backlog 203:25 204:5
bad 96:22
bag 81:3
Balan 208:5
balance 24:4
balanced 20:18
ballpark 108:21
ban 91:5,22
bar 200:23
Baris 100:19,24 108:15 109:18,22 110:9 111:6,9,19 113:17 114:7 118:21 119:10 120:1,13 121:10 121:21 124:7 128:1 133:19 134:12,17,21 135:4,16 136:16 137:15 140:1,12 141:1 142:4,11 143:23 145:10 146:25 148:9
bars 200:5,7
base 36:9 160:23
based 14:19 37:25 58:20 65:19 72:11 95:13 98:1 109:18 150:23 164:18 175:4 214:20
bases 195:8
BASF 105:15
BASF's 102:7
basic 50:3,7
basically 38:1 40:7 40:24 57:9 89:8 108:11 179:15
basis 111:4 140:24
Bayer 11:17
bear 178:25
Beck 2:8,11 95:25
bee 45:7,7,10,17 53:18,20 55:15 57:16 61:8 66:15 67:1,2,10,13,20 70:6
bee-informed 70:15
beekeeper 38:7 41:16
beekeepers 12:12 32:7 41:12 42:14 45:13 47:16 49:2 50:12 57:3,11 63:7 68:12 70:20 73:18
beekeeping 12:11 72:21
bees 12:13 31:25 32:13,16 33:2,14 34:8 41:18,20,21 43:16 45:15,21 51:18 52:7 54:10 55:7,11 67:15
began 120:25 168:19
beginning 16:19 33:3 47:8 53:5 81:6 93:10 184:17 194:17
beginnings 62:22
behalf 25:8 57:1 64:8 72:4
behavior 57:7
behavioral 45:5
behaviors 39:15 57:14
believe 6:24 28:25 56:24 74:12 85:1 93:11 115:10 118:1 123:10 127:16 134:8 137:3,6 146:15 162:13,15 167:11 179:3 197:23 212:24 214:21
belt 196:8
benefit 15:1 41:8 47:4 105:1 169:16
benefits 3:5 5:4 138:6 166:18,24 169:15,19,21 170:1 175:7 180:13
Bennett 3:8 9:19,19 11:18,18
Bertrand 3:14
BEs 77:13 97:9,11
best 3:2 6:3,4 9:8 18:1 21:3 27:23 33:7 37:22 39:12 41:24 42:5 46:19 62:7 63:12 72:16 90:11 95:19 96:7,8 108:6,16 113:20 120:15 143:4 144:3 145:24 148:9,15 151:18
better 2:19 6:18 28:17 32:7 64:16 73:18,20 80:4 104:22 111:2 118:7 120:6 121:14 123:25 138:15 155:6 196:2,8 197:17
beyond 13:17 52:6 108:7 157:15,16 164:17
bias 3:25
big 19:12 25:2 44:10 146:16 192:17
bilingual 207:11
bill 171:12 172:3 173:13 190:17,23 190:25 191:2,3,8 191:11
bills 191:4
bio 142:1
bio-pesticide 196:16
biochemical 183:13
bioelement 141:2
biological 13:2,13 77:25,25 78:3,5 87:14,16,21 88:4,5 88:6,10,13,15 162:12 172:4 183:2 187:2,13
biology 165:5
BiOp 77:5
biopesticides 201:6 202:16,22 203:7
BiOps 77:7
biosensor 140:21
Biotechnology 13:24
bird 13:19 51:16 54:12
birddog 49:15
birds 51:19
Bishop 13:10,10 56:3 159:6 160:3 160:11,17,25 170:11
bit 3:12,20,24 4:22 5:8,10 7:5,6 8:4 22:3 31:11 39:25 45:14 48:9,15 50:10 56:21 76:2 80:4,15 92:5 95:23 97:23 102:25 122:10 128:20 150:4,5 156:13 181:19 187:5 203:21 209:16
bite 53:7 199:8
bites 53:8
black 167:25 168:7
blockbusters 175:14
bloom 32:18 42:11
blue 48:22 200:5,23
BMP 70:16
BMPs 54:8
BMW 168:5,7,7
board 10:19 19:8 118:1 140:14 165:19 206:16 209:21 211:2
boards 59:22 60:3 60:16
body 58:3
Bohaty 158:20
boom 140:7
Bootheel 102:19 126:1
boss 92:22
boundary 113:24
BPPD 202:7 208:4
Bradley 104:2 139:11
Bradley's 134:14
brains 82:20 85:25
branch 25:12 100:19,20
break 15:11,21 16:4 30:5,10,12 35:2 74:17 76:2 93:18 98:2 159:1
breakout 204:19
breaths 94:11
bridge 181:21
brief 17:5 146:10 149:13,21
briefings 8:7
briefly 130:7
bring 78:15 125:8
bringing 70:5 145:25
broad 36:9 57:25 75:4 165:14
broad-acre 174:25
broader 37:14 39:8

71:13
broadest 35:24 153:10
broken 55:5
brought 32:17 43:10 66:5 70:12 72:1 93:23 100:4,11 102:17 103:4 174:20 175:1
Bryceland 208:4
Budget 4:5
buffer 83:1 107:2 147:3,4
build 74:24 112:25
builder 177:9 182:3 182:11 183:21
building 17:14,16 32:3 110:8 167:17
built 55:25 170:23 181:2 182:11
bulk 201:23
bullet 46:21 169:5
bunch 172:12
Burd 13:13,13 55:3 74:10 91:3,18 133:4 138:11
Bureau 10:21
Bush 5:20
business 191:24 200:1
businesses 5:18
busy 49:17
buy 19:10 112:6
bystander 83:2

C

C 2:1
California 32:5 73:14 86:5 123:23 123:24 124:1,2
call 4:13 23:1 25:17 27:13,17 34:20 116:21 149:18 175:23
called 161:3
Callies 12:7,7
calls 45:9 51:6 59:16
campaign 110:7
cannabis 186:20 187:10,11,16,23 188:2 189:6
cantaloupe 104:11
capability 204:14
capacity 6:9 25:3,17 25:22 143:5 208:6
Capitol 25:6,19 26:6
capture 45:18 52:12 55:21 56:24 67:8 81:5
captured 54:7,11,15
captures 52:4
capturing 57:17
car 167:20,21 168:6 168:8
carbaryl 77:13 78:7 78:19
card 65:10 74:6 76:22 87:6 97:25
cards 17:22 211:24
care 12:20 55:9 86:11,15 164:15
career 4:9 5:17 126:7,10
Carolina 10:23 13:8 70:9 72:15 93:17 93:18 128:9 188:21 189:9
Carolina's 189:8
carries 107:5
cars 167:18,19
case 28:3 30:5 71:21 95:2,5,7 112:24 122:14 137:17 189:8
cases 34:20 60:19 80:10 81:22 102:13 103:5,12 103:18 104:10 109:24 111:1,22 113:23 120:4 121:13 133:22 141:16 143:14 151:4,22 156:25 157:24 158:5,13 158:16,18 160:21 176:14 188:15,23 194:20 201:20 213:3,3,4,5
catastrophic 55:17
categories 38:18,18 39:9,10 40:1,3 41:10 60:11,12,13 168:13 195:21,22 195:23,24 196:7 196:17,20,20,21 197:14,17,18,20 197:22,24,25 198:5,8,12 201:22 202:3 206:25
category 41:24 195:11 196:23 197:1,1,4,15 202:9
caused 67:3 93:15 149:18
causes 105:11 141:17
caution 70:18
Caydee 51:6 54:20 59:14
CD 204:11,20,25
CDC 14:2
CDs 205:10
CDX 181:4
celebrate 99:5
Center 1:16 12:25 13:13 162:12 207:8
CERT 216:15
certain 29:12 31:25 32:16 42:9 45:25 46:25 48:18 56:7 91:19 95:8 107:7 127:23 131:15,17 163:22 178:9 185:1,1 193:9 195:2 199:15 200:20 213:2
certainly 60:1 64:25 66:22 74:16 115:18 116:2,4,12 117:2,2,10 119:18 124:25 132:9 139:14 158:17 166:22 175:15 184:19 185:7
certainty 82:4 91:11 91:19
CERTIFICATE 216:1
certification 16:18 132:15 206:23
certified 22:6 44:13 106:6,8 115:14 116:9,17,19 125:3 132:18 207:22
certify 116:7 216:3
cetera 65:20 66:10 66:16
chair 22:6 23:21,21 40:12,14
challenge 34:4 67:24
challenges 7:13,25 62:5 174:14
chance 176:16
change 57:6 68:14 92:19,20,22 114:15 115:18 126:20 131:25 141:2 142:3,7 154:16 166:11 175:6 205:17
changed 68:8,13 86:24 142:1 147:18
changes 15:24 16:13 45:6 50:17,22 81:10 86:7,16 105:23 107:24 110:5 112:9,16 115:8 116:5 117:21,22,23 118:11 123:6 140:12 145:6,8 149:2 152:24 156:21 158:2 166:7 175:9 196:11 206:24
changing 57:14 123:3 166:12
channels 107:17
characterization 163:5
charge 24:1 35:19 58:19,20 59:19,20 65:11 74:9
charging 167:19,20
Charlotte 3:14,15 3:19 10:15 11:16 54:17 56:2 57:21 108:10 109:11 110:21 175:20 176:25 180:11 181:8 182:21
chart 161:24
charter 20:4,5,12 29:17
chartered 20:13
Charters 20:11
charts 210:10
check 18:2 76:7 93:5 138:9 209:9
check-in 133:19
checked 147:10
checking 89:3
chemical 2:9 83:14 85:23,25 86:3,7 140:22 155:17,18 197:5,14 200:11 200:21 208:21
chemical-specific 79:14 81:22
chemicals 79:14 94:13 97:17 150:22 151:6 194:3,7 213:15
chemistries 174:9
chief 14:4 100:19
children 24:24 85:11 90:25 214:15
children's 12:23 82:20 85:25 90:23
chip 69:13
Chism 171:12 172:3

172:3 176:5
chlorpyrifos 51:21 52:8 65:6 74:11,14 77:8 81:23 82:10 82:18,19,22,23 83:1,23 87:22 91:5 91:20,21 92:1 98:14,15 173:5 212:5,21 213:16
choice 97:19 112:5
choices 101:22 105:21 144:4 208:24
cholinesterase 213:23
choose 128:15
choosing 150:7
Christine 158:20
chromium 93:24
chronic 54:9
Cindy 212:2
circles 164:10
citation 164:13
cited 121:5
citing 90:8 121:2
citizen 25:15,23
citizens 2:15
civility 24:19 100:10
claim 152:6 153:7 159:11,15,18,19 162:21,23
claimed 162:13
claiming 199:3
claims 16:2 149:13 149:16 151:23,25 152:7,17 153:1,10 154:5,5,15,19 155:11,14,15 160:9,16 162:7,15 164:19
clarification 89:12
clarify 56:21 84:15 143:19 186:6
clarifying 94:23 96:24
clarity 94:3 188:19
class 94:11
classes 68:7 94:9
classification 141:6
classroom 138:4
clean 52:1
cleanout 106:21
clear 6:25 82:9 93:13 145:5 178:23
clear-cut 96:21
clearer 82:14 83:4 137:19
clearly 97:2 126:4 126:12 174:21
Cliff's 112:10 137:21
climactic 146:5
clinic 199:5
Clinicians 11:15
Clinton 5:19
Clock-Rust 36:15
close 24:7
closely 35:4 185:25
closer 157:25 169:23 175:8
co-chair 40:15,15
co-chaired 31:19
co-chairmanship 64:22
coal 93:20
coalition 190:18
coated 52:7
CODEX 196:25
collaborate 23:25 78:2
collaboration 43:13 129:12 148:23
Collaborative 206:12
colleagues 24:16 90:18 91:20
collect 39:6 67:15 72:6 135:16,17 158:4 199:23
collected 71:20 104:21 193:5,17 199:18,19,21
collecting 56:5 72:7
collection 49:8 50:1 62:24 66:14 71:24
collections 191:15
collective 9:6 15:2
color 24:21
Colorado 32:4
combat 160:13 173:25
combination 99:1 149:16 159:20,20 159:21
combinations 160:10 161:14,15
combined 150:20 151:9 165:25 180:17
combines 163:20
come 6:14,18 8:4 15:8 18:19 22:13 29:21 30:11 35:8 35:15 38:21 51:8 58:19 60:9 62:5 64:22 73:9 75:23 76:3 77:9 79:9 82:10,14 84:24 89:13 93:1 95:8 114:14 117:9 118:16 133:16 142:15 149:7 152:11 157:1 158:5 160:5 165:3 167:1 172:19 176:21 190:2 197:4 199:8 205:19
come-prepared-to... 23:10
comes 7:15 59:8 72:16 82:17 96:25 120:2 129:16 132:6
comfortable 186:2
coming 3:21 56:19 57:25 87:10 93:20 116:15 121:3 122:5 164:15 171:13 177:10 205:18 208:15
commenced 36:4
commend 62:3 64:10 73:6 178:22
commending 57:23
comment 17:24 18:16,17 74:11 77:10 83:5,12 88:11 89:6,14 92:23 95:19,22 124:7 135:5 147:22 158:7,10 158:11 159:2 165:21 169:3 170:12 171:15 212:2
comments 16:22 19:16 21:25 65:4 78:12 84:2,18,22 85:4,18 88:25 89:4 89:9,15,17 92:9,17 92:18 93:2,8 95:25 96:6,17 162:2 163:4 171:16 175:19,22 182:6 210:11 211:22 212:4
commercial 31:25 32:17 33:15 47:16 115:6 146:18
commercials 63:7
commitment 19:12 99:8 175:15
committed 31:22 118:9 189:10
committee 1:10 2:4 2:14 7:15 8:21,24 9:15 14:7 15:10 18:25 19:1,3,18 20:3,7,8,9,21,23 21:18 22:3,6,14,24 22:25 23:7,21,22 23:23 24:4,5,6,20 25:1,4,9,9,15 26:10,15,18,21,24 27:15,16 28:3,10 28:22,25 29:1,1,4 29:10,25 40:14 51:4,12 59:15 65:2 69:23 73:7,24 94:21 100:11 108:5 190:24 215:6
committee's 24:1
committees 15:5 19:21,22 20:15,17 25:4 26:11,19 27:9 27:10,19 63:20 209:8
commodity 126:20
common 37:18 38:19 39:10 60:12 105:9 150:12
commonalities 37:3 63:10,11
communicate 6:24 25:11 32:8 35:23 37:14 39:7 70:23 73:18
communicated 134:4
communicating 57:8 61:21 146:17 146:23
communication 37:19 39:12 41:9 41:11,17,22 42:8 44:18 46:9 48:18 48:24 49:1,6 52:14 56:9 57:2,10,13 59:7 60:12 63:12 66:13 70:19 71:3 73:15 74:3 147:14 174:14
communications 24:8
communities 116:7 178:16
community 3:11 37:21 99:3 114:14 115:11,11 176:11 181:12 199:11 203:19 205:20 211:3 212:13

214:8
companies 157:16 170:24 171:3 174:23
comparable 38:25
compare 39:1,2 157:20
compared 105:25 140:4 203:13
comparing 47:10
comparisons 133:1 154:25
compelled 212:5
compelling 152:25 165:8
competent 172:9
compiled 104:1
complaint 113:15
complaints 104:5 111:21 114:1 139:2
complete 40:20 62:21 84:6 162:16 181:15,16 195:1 198:4
completed 22:7 32:13 37:1 200:8 200:24 201:2,7,12 201:16,25 203:22 204:2
completely 98:8,17
completing 203:2
completion 203:5,6 203:9
completions 202:15 202:22 203:4,8
complex 6:19 7:16 9:6 83:21 96:20 98:7 212:20
complexity 92:12
compliance 11:17 107:2 193:19 208:18
compliant 115:11 136:25
complicated 88:14
compliment 161:2
complimentary 168:17
compliments 114:13
component 143:20
components 38:8 69:1 131:15 155:19
composite 113:12
composition 180:24
comprehension 43:21,23,25
comprehensive 38:6 51:9 64:21
compromise 24:19 100:10
concentration 157:20
concept 32:10
concepts 75:4
concern 46:2 165:14 178:14 184:18,24 214:16
concerned 66:20 90:24 133:8 165:9 184:20
concerns 26:4 52:18 52:24 55:6 58:11 61:21 94:17 117:14 175:23 184:4,7,16
concise 93:13
conclude 89:16
concluded 82:1 114:11
concludes 214:23
conclusion 163:12
conclusions 156:4 157:8 158:2 164:14 166:11
concur 90:17 96:16
conditional 192:22 192:24 198:25
conditions 31:25 32:16 125:20,22 126:5,15 145:17 146:5 152:21 214:4
conduct 27:10 39:6 50:5 73:2 193:20 207:22
conducted 43:15 61:1 72:12,24 131:2 195:10 213:2
conducting 46:16 71:8 121:12
conducts 72:12
conference 1:16 34:20
confidence 18:4
confident 138:21 145:7
confined 168:15
confirm 74:16,18 176:9
confirmation 103:7 176:13
confirmed 176:8
conflict 24:2
confused 56:4 94:1 145:4 159:7
confusion 93:16,19 94:5
Congress 16:14 20:5 25:3,7,7,10,12,16 25:21,22 26:4,8,12 81:15 190:13
Congressional 25:8
conjunction 34:21 50:21 72:23 129:12,20
connection 14:17
consciously 137:4
consensus 17:1 23:17,19,24 57:25 97:22
consent 190:20
consequences 136:24 167:1
Conservancy 13:20 51:17
conserved 164:22
consider 78:14 151:17 155:21 157:5,8,13 158:9 166:12,22,23 188:7
consideration 31:9 65:1 130:21 153:11 154:6
considerations 24:10 38:16,23 46:20
considered 151:12 152:13,21 154:23 155:17 183:5
considering 15:20 78:9 157:10 158:6
consistent 154:8 197:18
consolidate 195:22
consolidation 197:21
constant 57:2
constraint 192:13
constructive 2:24 8:25
consultation 88:2,7
consultations 76:18 76:20
consumer 10:25 11:18 171:24 172:2 183:2
consumption 121:19
contact 26:4 27:23 41:6 68:24 208:1,3 208:6,7,8
contain 152:20 154:24,25
container 184:21 185:21 186:14
contaminants 151:6
contamination 105:13
context 133:6
continually 86:2
continue 5:24 6:5 18:4 29:16 32:11 58:15 74:24 75:1 78:2,4 91:14 99:9 110:17 144:8 146:24 158:4
continued 71:1 108:1 213:9
continues 29:16 88:17 92:2 101:20 144:10
continuing 7:13 115:14 116:13 118:22 132:16 148:13 158:13 174:23 190:6,16 192:14 208:25
continuous 175:13 175:15
contract 181:25
contracted 41:16 63:6
contradictory 137:23
contribute 34:8
control 11:2 12:15 12:20 18:13 40:11 59:1,3,6,9 60:3,16 64:6 66:10 98:5,20 105:18 155:6,6 166:2 173:5,7 176:17 195:5,6
controlling 31:14
convened 35:7
convenes 19:22
conventional 80:10 80:15 173:6 196:17 197:6
conventionals 183:1 183:12 201:11 202:17,23 203:8
conversation 18:9 31:23 100:17 105:10 144:10 213:10
conversations 9:21 98:13 104:17 109:18 118:6 179:16
convey 47:21
conveying 68:2
cooperate 148:13

cooperation 38:10 101:8 141:5,12
cooperative 43:9 116:11 206:4,13 206:14 207:8,22 209:24 210:25 211:11,13,17,20
cooperatively 104:20 120:3,5
coordinate 23:23 24:16 206:15
coordinating 42:25 43:2 44:16 68:25
coordination 6:16 43:13 101:7
coordinator 190:1
Cope 12:14,14 28:21 58:25,25
corn 74:13 146:20 169:16,22,22 185:12,13,15,15
corner 30:15
correct 78:8 107:18 107:22 111:19 113:17 114:7 136:16 160:7 176:3 177:5
correlates 112:22
correlating 125:14
correlation 126:13 131:7
cosmetic 98:11 118:16,19 135:13
costly 5:2
costs 5:7 20:10
cotton 13:8,9 74:13 101:11 102:4,10 103:10 105:19 106:3 108:2 128:24 130:9,11 136:8,19 140:4,5
council 11:21,24 13:9 151:13,17 152:12
counsel 216:5,9
count 162:6 200:22
countries 155:22
country 19:24 33:13 41:8 48:7 151:5
couple 9:11,17 12:16 17:18 45:3 57:6 65:23,24 69:23 77:2 79:9,10 109:14 135:22 139:22 163:4 176:9 203:17
coupled 110:4
course 23:14 34:17 60:4 82:21 85:12 133:9,15 150:9 155:11 158:12 166:19 195:23 209:23
courses 116:14 132:15
court 95:8
court-ordered 95:4
cover 150:4
covered 39:23 47:6 127:23
cranberry 61:1,4
create 114:15 166:13
created 196:17 210:2
creates 193:15
criteria 29:8 120:10 127:20 148:5 153:22 154:9,22 154:24 163:25 188:9 214:1
critical 5:16 9:1 122:16 146:21 179:2
crop 13:23 42:10,11 42:14 101:17 102:13 103:11,17 104:5 105:7,11 109:15 119:4 121:18 122:24 123:5 127:2 130:8 130:15 140:2,2,10 140:11 143:22 147:10 174:11 177:25 187:17
CropLife 13:22 175:16
cropping 37:21 64:5 131:8
crops 33:14 42:17 47:13,19 61:1 74:13 105:17 106:24 107:1 112:18 119:2 120:12 121:9,9,16 121:24 129:9,11 129:18 136:7,14 136:14 139:24,25 144:19 147:5 174:16
cross-contaminati... 106:22
Cross-functional 8:25
cross-section 183:11
Crystal 1:17
cupping 120:20
curious 29:7 110:1 111:13 119:22 122:25 127:24 162:10 163:10,15 171:21 180:8
current 16:13 76:20 97:12 103:21 207:2
current-year 207:24
currently 18:12 20:13 68:23 74:14 75:25 78:20 91:25 102:5 107:16 190:4,8,13 191:14 191:17,24 192:15 194:16 195:20 198:15 208:17
curriculum 127:21 129:2
curve 182:8
custom 114:17
Cynthia 13:18 28:20 29:6 51:15,16 55:4 65:4 70:12 76:24 78:21 79:19 93:7 94:19 96:15 97:14 109:12 110:21 111:24 169:3 171:17 178:20 180:10
Cynthia's 65:4

D

D 2:1
D.C 3:25
Dairyland 11:4
Dakota 13:5 32:4 108:22 109:8 138:20 139:13 173:1
Dakotas 102:24
damage 101:17 102:13 103:11,17 104:5,7 105:8,11 109:15 118:14,19 119:7 120:10 121:17 123:6 130:8,15 131:4 135:12 138:16 139:6 143:22 155:6
damaged 105:17
damaging 106:23
Damon 11:3 57:21 58:24 60:23 118:25 119:20 122:7,8 125:5 146:7 165:20
damper 181:17
Dan 14:15,18,19 93:20 100:20 149:5
Dana 84:13 89:3 170:4
dangerous 87:4
dark 200:23
data 47:24,25 49:8 49:25 50:6 56:5 62:23 66:14 81:3 81:16 82:19 83:24 84:20 85:2 89:1 94:13 135:2,3 148:4 150:7 151:3 151:19 152:8,15 152:18,20,24,25 153:6,15,16,17,17 153:20,22 154:7 154:11,25 155:25 156:8,20,23,23 157:1,2,15,15,16 159:18,19 160:2,3 163:22,24,24 164:1,8,18 165:7 166:10,10 177:8 192:24 193:8 196:13,14 198:2 200:16 213:3,12 213:15,19,22 214:1,3,21
database 81:4,7,13 177:14 180:18 181:1 192:21
databases 179:23
date 153:25 159:5 166:9 190:5,14 200:25 201:5,9 202:3,12
dates 77:11 203:1
daunting 62:4 73:7
day 1:13 14:23,25 16:10,21 17:8 18:15 69:5 145:13 161:5 189:24 214:23
day-to-day 22:24
days 2:22 8:1 9:11 21:23 22:7 114:9 204:1,5
Dea 17:12 19:6 22:16,20,23 24:15 25:25 27:24 61:2
dead 51:19
deadline 7:14 36:4 84:6 94:21 95:6
deadlines 7:5 94:24 95:4 96:11,13
deal 93:15,19
dealing 126:9

176:19
dealt 214:9,13
death 155:3
deaths 54:12
December 77:11 190:7 212:14
decide 110:18 128:17
decided 152:15
decision 80:18 81:4 87:4 90:24 91:6 92:2 94:4 95:8 96:8 100:22 107:25 120:16 128:14 144:2,25 156:20 160:24 169:25 199:17 200:17,25 212:7 212:10
decision-making 207:9
decisionmaking 6:15
decisions 5:13 6:19 6:20 8:14 9:8 119:19 148:6,17 151:8 154:6,17 194:7 200:8,9,21 200:24 201:3,3,4,6 201:8,11,12,13,16 202:1,2 214:18,19 214:20
decreased 196:6
dedicated 16:16
deemed 47:11
defense 75:3
defensive 161:12
define 73:9
defining 150:18
definitely 30:16 163:13 205:10
definition 35:11 36:12 162:9
definitions 150:14
degree 73:25
delay 85:11
deliberation 26:24
demonstrated 173:7
denied 175:3 214:12
denying 212:8
department 3:24 10:25 39:22 43:5,6 43:6 70:8 72:19 93:21,22 108:19 108:23 189:8,9
departments 102:16 103:13,16 104:4 109:24 110:6
depending 20:24 44:23 60:4 121:24 145:15 162:5 193:4
depends 66:18
deputies 64:23
deputy 2:8 3:15 10:18 17:4 150:1
derive 109:17
dermal 170:17
describe 109:9 149:23
described 153:21 156:12 166:9
describing 152:9 158:7 174:8
descriptions 20:6 147:3
deserves 213:9
design 195:11 198:21,23 211:19 211:19
designate 22:22 106:5
designated 22:16,23
designation 107:5
designed 52:19 67:21
desire 196:23 198:18 199:12
desk 17:20 18:18 160:5
despite 82:1 150:16
destroyed 126:19
detail 93:3 152:9 156:13,14 173:20 209:16
detailed 22:3 149:23
details 31:1 60:1 150:11 181:20
detect 140:21 142:10
detected 142:1
detection 70:7
determination 47:20 128:22 153:7 165:18
determinations 151:15 198:13,14 198:15
determine 135:1 152:7,23 154:15 156:1,3,20 185:5 213:12 214:2
determined 23:2 175:3
develop 23:22 24:2 31:17 32:22 36:13 36:21 37:13 45:1 62:15 120:5 128:13,15 129:14 158:8,18,22 173:16 179:24 193:12 206:15
developed 35:12 38:13 40:17 42:25 45:20 56:17 78:6 81:4,7 105:3 128:7 128:8 152:4 171:20 188:6 193:7 209:23
developing 15:15 32:2 33:23 36:20 47:7 101:14 192:18 194:23 206:5
development 4:1 33:21 40:8 88:12 166:20 171:25 190:17 192:22 206:15 209:18
device 198:13
devised 64:17
devoted 38:3
DFO 22:15,15,17,25 23:22 24:2,8 27:22
DFOs 22:17,24
diagram 163:18 164:10
dialogue 1:9 2:4 8:25 9:6 16:24 26:15 29:1,2 73:11 74:3,25,25 149:24
Diane 208:5
diazinon 87:22
dicamba 7:17 15:24 99:17 100:23 101:10 102:3,14 104:13 105:12,18 105:20 106:18 108:1 111:20 112:1 114:6 116:19 117:9 118:3 121:21 132:23 133:16 134:5,7 135:12 136:3,7,7,10,16 141:20
dicamba-like 129:15
dicamba-related 104:19
dicamba-resistant 112:6
dicamba-specific 106:10 127:25
dicamba-tolerant 101:10 102:3,10 103:9 105:2 106:2 108:1 128:23
dictate 211:16
diem 24:12
differ 194:25
difference 118:20 136:9,18
differences 37:24,25 38:1 124:5 132:20 136:6 153:4 191:4
different 4:12 5:18 20:21 21:11 47:12 47:13,14,19 49:5 49:18 54:2 55:8 60:14 69:18,23,24 70:3 72:10,13,25 74:4 80:23 83:7,10 83:13 94:5 107:8 107:19 115:21 121:22,24,24 133:2 135:25 136:12,14,18 139:24,25 142:4 147:19,19 150:15 150:15,15 157:5 172:12 182:25 183:3,10 188:8 195:1 202:11 210:4
differential 197:11 197:11
differentiate 67:2
differentiating 67:6 67:10
differently 4:23 139:23,24
differing 196:19
difficult 64:11 73:8 103:23 125:18 172:21
difficulty 187:18
digest 7:2
digital 180:22
diligent 181:13
dime 25:18
direct 26:3 66:14 106:8 155:2,3
direction 73:10 137:5
directions 105:5 106:20,24 107:12 107:22 136:21,22 136:25 137:12 185:16
directive 62:12,14 64:18
directly 26:12,23,25 104:8 109:24 116:10 139:12

director 6:11 10:13 10:18,22 11:13 13:17,18 15:12 17:4 30:19 77:17 79:8 80:2 100:21 149:10 150:1
directs 194:2
disability 24:22
disadvantage 177:18
disagree 73:17 214:19
disapproves 187:22
discernible 139:9
disconnected 98:17
discover 65:5 174:13
discovered 151:22 162:25 174:20,22 175:1
discoveries 174:2
discovering 172:10
discovery 152:4 174:24
discrete 58:18
discretion 20:16
discuss 148:18
discussed 84:21,21 133:13
discussion 26:25 30:21 40:22 71:2 99:16 122:14 146:11 148:20 187:5 215:3
discussions 7:2 8:6 9:13 58:4 78:4 100:6 105:9 108:6 214:24
disease 45:11 67:4,4 67:7,7
diseases 195:7
disinfectants 183:15 196:14
disparate 99:2
disregard 70:4
disseminate 117:1
dissemination 71:23
distinction 29:8 187:3 211:12
distinguish 141:14 141:23
distortion 45:16
distribution 49:10 102:22
districts 66:10
distrust 94:5
disturbing 85:20
diverse 9:3 36:11 47:8 60:9 62:6
diversity 13:14 33:13 60:10 62:8 63:3 92:10 162:12
division 15:12 28:11 30:19 77:18 79:9 80:3 84:14 89:7 100:20,22 149:11 150:2 169:11 172:4 173:13 187:13 201:1
divisional 208:3
divisions 187:14 202:6,20 205:3
docket 92:13
dockets 93:5
document 62:25 132:7 147:10 154:4 163:9,12 170:20
documentation 106:24
documented 103:19
documents 6:2 22:4 22:8 26:20 170:1 173:16
doing 16:1 21:18,19 27:16 35:22 41:22 43:12 44:4,6,8 46:13,14 47:16,19 49:3,18 56:13,15 56:19,25 57:18 63:9,9 75:24 78:6 78:9,13 81:14 88:16,24 116:5 119:23,25 127:9 135:24 136:11 144:16,22 147:25 150:6,6 165:19 183:20 195:3 201:21
dollar 192:7,8
dollars 4:16 192:10 192:11,17 193:5
domestically 168:18
dominated 151:6
Dominic 11:22
Donny 11:7 93:6 94:19 97:13
Dow 77:4 79:1
Dow's 96:25 97:5
downwind 107:2 146:14,20
Dr 2:8,11 104:2 134:14 139:11 170:7,20
draft 7:6 26:20 66:1 75:11 77:7 80:16 87:16 88:10,13 169:15 170:17
drafting 72:3
drag 167:24
dramatic 173:4
drawing 104:8
drawn 101:12
drift 42:21 80:23 105:13,17 112:1 129:6,16 130:3 133:8 135:25 139:6,20 143:22 145:9
drifting 140:25
drink 94:2
Drive 1:17
driving 214:18
dropped 169:9
Drug 10:16 98:10
due 77:11 149:2 179:11 200:25 201:5,9 202:2,12 203:1
Dumas 180:19
DuPont 105:16,16
DuPont's 102:7
duration 29:19
duties 20:6
DVD 204:11,25
DVDs 205:10
dye 142:15,22
dynamic 103:22

E

E 2:1,1
e-CSF 180:23
eager 10:3
earlier 10:9 58:3 77:22 78:16 87:19 95:25 129:19 135:6 139:21 194:24 205:22
early 15:22 17:15 102:16,18 114:9 132:19 177:15 208:12
Earth 13:14
easier 137:20 184:8
easiest 81:23 189:22
easily 36:17
easy 116:16 185:8
easy-to-discover 174:22
eat 53:6
Echeverria 77:16,17 149:9,10 160:7,12 160:21 162:11 164:20 165:8
echo 55:3 122:18
echoes 85:18
ecological 119:7 149:20 150:23 153:20,23 154:11 154:20 155:9 156:5,7,22 157:18 159:14 162:25 163:1 166:18
Economic 172:4
Ed 158:19 161:3
educate 94:20
educated 115:11 122:22
educating 123:15
education 37:20 39:14 42:24 46:5 53:18 57:13 60:13 110:7 115:5,12,15 116:13 122:19 123:14,17 132:16 136:1 193:24 195:15 207:6,14 207:20
educational 44:7 46:3,10 110:4 123:21 206:11,16
educators 13:6 132:10 138:3,4
Edward 12:4
EFED 158:16
effect 113:4 150:20 151:10,10,11 159:10 162:7
effective 34:6 46:9 46:14 53:3 61:21 71:3 97:10
effectively 17:9 73:14
effectiveness 15:15 23:6 32:24 35:9,21 35:23 38:24 39:7 52:12 66:6,13,21 74:22 175:7 195:17 210:13 211:5
effects 77:18 82:2,6 82:10,18 83:23 85:14 89:7 135:25 149:11,17 150:2 150:20,20,21 151:15,24,25 152:2,3,5,6,22 154:19 155:1,1,2,2 155:13 156:1 157:6,14 158:9 161:18 163:6 175:3 213:7
efficacy 36:22 149:17 155:12 160:19 194:23

196:13,14
efficiency 23:5
efficient 8:13 78:15 160:14
effort 31:19 32:5,12 36:2,2 51:8,23 52:3 54:22 95:17 106:22 107:15 113:1 116:12 117:3 119:14 128:20 137:4 138:14 143:23 170:8 182:14 184:15 190:8 195:21 196:2 204:8
efforts 9:14 34:3 46:10 51:22 52:5 55:20 65:18 80:23 99:2,9 101:6,16 110:4 123:21 137:17,25 154:8 176:23 178:22 186:17
either 26:10 42:22 97:19,20 128:5 158:10
electronic 22:12 180:16,17,23
electronically 204:9 205:5
element 147:13 169:22 202:7,7
elements 56:7,9 138:7 147:1,7 204:16
elephant 53:7,8
eliminate 130:3 195:22
eliminates 192:6
email 69:5
empaneled 64:20
emphasize 107:2
emphasizes 193:25
emphasizing 106:12
emphatically 116:23
empirical 66:14
153:16,17 154:25
employ 51:24 74:23
employed 216:6,9
employee 4:6 22:22 216:8
employees 21:4,5 26:3,9 91:4
encompass 42:7,8
encourage 2:18 26:3 55:1 60:21 93:5 94:15 205:20 210:24 211:20
encouraging 32:21
end-use 172:1 200:13
endangered 13:15 88:3 98:7 151:14 192:21
energy 101:4
enforce 141:14
enforced 185:5
enforcement 67:11 120:3 184:7,7 185:3 193:19 208:18
engage 7:3 23:13 60:18 182:2
engaged 26:17 60:20,21 88:7 104:16 108:19 185:24
engagement 2:17 3:10 6:16,17 8:10 9:1,20,24 10:4 195:18
engagements 78:11
Engenia 102:7
engineer 83:19
English 86:14 178:7
enhance 106:20
enhanced 112:19 152:2 155:12,15
enhancing 149:17
enormous 101:5 124:5
ensure 3:2,4,5 4:23 4:24 5:11 6:5 9:9
107:20 138:7 148:15 150:12
ensuring 115:7 178:25
entail 160:18
enter 108:4
entertain 28:17
entire 23:6 41:8,22 53:1,18 55:16 115:10 119:13 127:2
entities 43:14
entity 46:18
environment 3:4 9:9 11:10 12:19 24:20 195:11 198:22 207:11 214:22
environmental 1:6 11:14 12:23 77:17 90:23 93:21 149:10 150:1 175:7 180:14 185:17
environments 198:24
envisioned 177:23
EPA 3:22 5:8,24 7:7 9:2 14:3 15:4 18:25 19:4,10,21 20:16,23,24 22:18 22:22 24:12 25:11 26:3,12,19 27:3,5 28:8 31:9,20,22,23 32:12 33:11 34:17 35:20 36:15,21 40:20 46:12 48:4 48:10 49:11 50:4 50:22 51:9 52:22 54:14 58:12 62:13 64:23 67:11 69:9 69:10 72:8 79:23 80:6 82:1,21 83:8 83:25 86:7,19 87:9 89:13,20 91:4 93:23 94:6 97:2,4 99:3,8 101:7 102:12 104:14,15
104:20 105:3 107:24 110:6 112:3 114:24 119:23,25 129:8 129:12,20 130:19 131:16 132:7 143:6 150:23 157:3 159:12 166:12 187:7,22 188:25 190:17 191:17 192:16,23 193:12 194:2 195:1 198:20 199:16 206:16 210:24 211:8,14 212:17 214:9
EPA's 32:12 98:6 102:18 153:22
EPA's 180:2 185:23 195:18
epi-data 212:15,22 212:22,25 213:1,5
epidemiology 84:17 84:24 213:12 214:1
equipment 70:7
equips 9:7
equivalent 153:22
Eric 10:18 11:20
error 137:7 139:22
ESA 76:17,20,22 79:4 87:18
especially 2:13 13:14 42:16 52:24 65:16 70:22 98:22 209:18
essential 53:16
essentially 101:1 123:22
establish 34:12 55:22 154:7,9
established 19:19 154:21
establishes 193:11 207:20
establishment 19:19
estimate 90:6
109:20 113:14,19 113:23,25 191:21
estimated 20:9
estimates 91:9 103:11,20 104:6,9
estimation 109:17
et 65:20 66:10,16
ethics 24:9
Eugene 170:4
European 54:5
evaluate 15:15 16:2 36:14 38:23 56:8 120:6 121:14 129:21 142:5,5 148:11 153:6,13 156:2,24 157:18 160:12 165:9 187:9 211:7
evaluated 152:23 157:24 158:14 159:12 160:8,21
evaluating 33:5 35:20 36:22 37:15 58:14 72:11 73:12 82:17 85:3 148:1 149:19 154:12 156:19,20
evaluation 37:11 40:13 62:21 71:11 82:3 87:10 88:22 149:12 150:24 151:20 156:9 159:9 166:23
evaluations 77:25 78:1 87:14,19,21 88:5,6,6,14
evening 215:4
event 174:11
events 151:8,9
eventually 102:23 177:13,21
everybody 35:1 36:10 96:12 99:4 100:7 118:8 135:1 172:7 205:6
everybody's 50:16
everyone's 29:3

61:3
everyone's 186:1
evidence 5:13 96:21 114:19 151:19 152:14,25 153:12 157:10 164:6,24 164:25 165:9,17
evolution 98:22
evolve 63:1,1 144:10
evolved 104:14,15
evolves 99:10
evolving 103:22
exact 36:24 75:6
exactly 29:13 67:17 68:12 80:7 92:7 97:17 124:16 141:3
exam 170:13
examination 115:14
examining 124:16
example 48:17,23 49:12 72:15 82:24 98:13 120:19 140:5 155:3,10 175:25 185:12 201:19
Excel 68:23 69:4
excellent 133:5,10 170:14
exceptionally 202:19
exceptions 32:19
excess 151:25 157:7
exchange 181:5
excited 10:1 19:15
exclusive 202:8
exclusively 16:15
excuse 61:17 132:16 176:8
executed 181:20
Executive 31:16
exempt 187:2,4
exemptions 198:14
exist 188:11 198:16
existed 197:3
existence 171:4
existing 72:5 153:8 157:18 193:23 194:14 195:13 196:24 197:1 198:5
exists 82:5 190:8 213:15
expanded 81:9 204:14
expands 194:15
expect 25:1 118:8 169:24 215:2
expectation 35:18
expected 77:10 151:2,25 157:20 180:13
expecting 77:7,13
expedite 194:11
expedited 91:1
expensive 5:2
experience 3:23 4:9 19:10 153:25
experienced 209:2
experiences 147:16
expert 83:20
expertise 9:4 21:4,8
experts 67:16 74:15 104:22 132:11 206:18
expiration 190:5,14
explain 87:15
explanation 111:14
explanations 105:7
explicit 136:21
exploratory 4:13
explore 173:22
exposed 43:16 86:2 93:25
exposure 32:13 33:2 34:7 36:19 42:3,4 45:21 46:8 54:5,9 55:9,13,14,15 57:15 85:14 93:9 151:10 213:4,6 214:5
exposures 36:21 52:20 57:20 66:15 71:4,4 83:2 86:6 157:21,22
express 9:13
expressed 179:17 196:23 212:12
extend 164:17
extended 190:6,15 191:13 210:18
extending 157:15
extends 193:23 194:14
extension 43:9 64:17 67:25 68:1 104:7 113:20 116:11,16,20,22 116:25 129:8 132:10 190:23 202:7 207:15,22
extensive 103:17 112:21 137:2 148:23 162:16
extensively 51:5 152:13
extent 32:24 51:22 52:1,11 79:3 112:22 182:12 209:17
external 88:4 94:21 94:24
extra 182:13
extrapolated 157:22
extremely 2:25 4:16 4:21 5:4,6,14 73:8 101:11 103:22 151:8,12
eye-opening 4:8

F

FACA 19:21,25 20:2,4,14 21:13,16 27:4,20 28:6
FACAs 28:8,9
face 130:1 136:24
face-to-face 22:11
faces 2:5,5 9:22 10:10 174:1
facilitate 10:4 17:12 41:22 49:9
facilitates 207:9
facing 129:7
fact 19:25 53:17 62:20 66:10 69:4 97:11 99:6 103:16 115:21 125:9 126:25 146:14 161:14 163:23 164:7 170:16 174:19
factor 48:19 124:11
factored 166:4
factors 45:14 124:8 124:14 131:7,10 131:17 144:17
facts 26:20 27:11 98:21
factual 207:11
failure 108:25 173:7
fair 108:13 110:9 111:6 117:18 170:1
fairly 20:17 51:9 112:20 138:21 174:10 183:3
falls 60:5
false 175:24
familiar 2:5 9:22
families 206:9
fantastic 178:13
far 41:1 45:16 47:9 54:11 58:11 67:9 67:23 68:16 71:7 72:17 93:9,9 157:1 157:24 158:14,17 159:14 160:22 161:25 173:24 178:9,10 181:15 181:16 182:4,16 190:16
farm 10:21 11:25 138:4
farmer 13:8 41:15
farmers 51:23 57:11 66:9 98:5,20 112:14 129:7 130:1 138:18 139:4,12
farmworker 11:11 85:11 206:2,3 211:3
farmworkers 69:22 70:22,24 85:11 206:9
Farruggia 158:20
fast-track 203:21,23
fast-tracks 203:25
fastest 17:13
Fate 77:17 149:11 150:1
favorable 199:14
federal 15:5,10 18:24 19:1,3,18,20 20:3,15 21:20,22 22:14,16,22,23 26:9 27:8 28:2,10 31:16,21 43:3,7 64:21 65:2 104:23 187:15
federally 187:16
Federation 10:21 12:11
fee 191:12,22 192:11 192:17 195:20 197:10,14 198:18 199:21
feedback 2:25 7:16 8:11,11 15:18 16:16 23:20 35:15 37:13 51:12 83:15 89:22 96:3,4 148:20 172:6 186:5 194:4
feel 51:8 60:19 90:20 146:6 208:3 212:5,7
feeling 76:10 123:16 211:3
feels 74:2 157:3
fees 191:15 192:14 196:3,6,11,21 199:18 200:2 209:3
fellow 3:25 23:19

felt 34:11 212:13
fence 42:17,17
fewer 197:20
FeXapan 102:7
field 10:3 21:10 104:19,22 113:15 113:22,24 115:23 139:7 140:22,22 149:17 154:9 157:21 164:7 166:19 177:21
field-level 157:22
field-wide 139:8
fields 114:1 139:5 147:16
fieldworker 194:1
FIFRA 7:11 40:13 52:23 95:10 98:11 166:23 192:7
fight 125:24
Figueroa 11:11,11 85:7 209:14
figure 41:3 74:15 89:8 95:13 108:12 143:16,20
figures 103:14,24 113:18
filed 20:5 114:2 161:10
fill 8:1 165:7
filling 49:20 52:2 66:7
final 81:1 158:8 170:16,21,21
finalization 77:10 77:11
finalized 16:19 32:12 80:18 103:5 171:3,13 193:7
finally 4:5 7:12 56:13,18 198:10 198:24 200:23 201:22
financially 216:9
find 19:23 22:21 65:20 73:21 123:4 123:10 163:9,23 164:6 177:19
finding 61:7 101:5 172:10 198:3
findings 26:23 154:13 157:19 199:1
fine 75:16 80:20 111:13
finest 22:17
finished 18:9 114:12
finishing 177:9 181:24,25
firm 111:4
first 2:7 17:6 19:5 48:24 51:13 58:13 70:1 73:6,10 74:21 78:10 79:17 87:8 87:12,18 88:15 90:9 91:3 92:8,25 96:16 116:21 117:9 146:15 153:2 154:18,18 154:24 164:12 167:13,24 172:8 178:12,21 179:19 180:1,22 181:9 182:18 183:7 188:4 192:8 205:8 206:1,20 214:13
fiscal 190:11 199:18 200:7 203:23
fish 14:9 87:23 163:23 164:4
Fisheries 87:24
five 40:1 85:12 87:12 90:6,8 91:10 92:6,7 103:18 105:9 109:16 111:1 176:9 196:8
five-step 38:13 154:17
five-year 133:19
Fleeson 10:24 40:10
fleshing 75:5
flexibility 33:22 47:7 62:8 63:2 131:22 177:11
flip 210:10
Florida 11:9 32:4 123:11,24 132:22 132:22 134:4
flow 161:24 210:19
focus 37:19,19 63:5 94:6 104:9 150:7 152:15 168:16 182:24 194:1 206:20,22
focused 38:7 62:13 75:8
focuses 153:7 206:19
focusing 42:1,18,20 101:13 145:12 164:23 191:10
folders 167:14 168:11
foliage 118:19
foliar 169:6
folks 10:2 58:1 92:9 116:15 179:1 210:11
follow 5:11 27:3,18 35:4,17 74:10 106:13 107:12 136:22 137:1,16 137:20 138:6 147:4 158:4
follow-up 89:10
followed 137:10,12
following 107:22 136:21 150:8 179:1 182:22
follows 152:11
followup 178:2
food 3:5 9:9 10:16 10:16 82:11 86:25 98:9,10 121:20
footprint 80:24
forage 33:21 42:15
foraging 41:18
Forces 10:19
foregoing 216:4
foremost 214:14
Forestry 43:6
forget 45:2 86:1,1
forgot 170:15
form 26:19 27:10 120:21 157:1
formal 28:22 78:12 104:5 139:2 158:7 158:10
formally 109:23
format 177:10
formula 141:25 142:22 191:21 192:1
formulated 157:2 160:24
formulation 141:2 142:3,5,8,16 160:6 160:8 163:20 180:24
formulations 105:18 142:6 148:2
forth 3:2 56:10 62:7 63:11 93:23,24
forward 2:20 6:4 8:6 9:12 15:19 17:1 19:15 57:4 58:22 61:2 70:2 71:2 72:8 74:24 75:19 83:8 84:4 95:13 110:17 118:13 123:12 124:17 142:15 148:3,8 168:20,21 169:16 171:15 173:22 175:16 179:5
forwarded 61:15
found 61:8 163:13 197:7 199:7 214:20
foundation 5:25 207:15
four 5:18 138:13 170:25
frame 36:6 57:9 78:8 197:11 198:5 198:17,19 199:16
frames 194:8,9,24 194:25 195:2 196:3,5,6,9,11 201:18,20
framework 71:18 71:22 75:10 99:3 154:12
frameworks 116:25
Frank 158:20
frankly 98:9,17
Fredericks 12:2,2 178:21 180:4,7
free 10:23 208:3,8 209:8
frequency 102:21 157:14
frequent 44:22,23
Friedman 84:13,13
friend 186:23
front 18:18 26:5 138:4 148:11,12 164:18 168:7 197:25 199:5 203:10
frustration 212:11 212:12
fulfill 50:19
full 9:12 26:24 27:6 30:24 33:7 34:23 80:11 182:16 190:25
fuller 159:3
fully 20:13 23:13 179:22 180:22 186:11
fumigation 127:22
fun 35:3
function 35:6
functions 20:19 208:20
funded 47:4
funding 46:22,24,25 47:3 66:19
funds 193:17 195:15 207:6,21,24,25 211:7
fungi 155:10,13
fungicidal 152:3

fungicide 173:3
fungicides 155:10 173:23
further 80:15 82:3 82:13 105:16 107:2 112:7 145:15 147:6 148:18 193:25 194:20 213:25
future 4:15 22:13 65:1 112:7 119:19 129:15 169:21,23 178:17
FY17 204:3 205:25

G

G 2:1
gained 196:12
game 86:8,17,24
gap 181:22
gaps 71:6 165:7
garden 183:12
gardens 104:12
Garland 170:8
gather 26:20 27:11 120:14 130:16 131:20 211:7
gathered 103:24 132:5
gathering 37:10 104:17 130:18 135:5,8
geared 38:4 54:4
general 27:2,16 28:8 28:12 34:8 61:19 70:15 75:13 79:18 80:22 81:18 95:23 102:1 115:19 151:15 171:24 196:2 206:10
generally 20:11 170:24
generated 213:20 214:4
generic 118:2 141:18
genetically 105:19 129:9,11
gentleman 121:7
geographic 38:1 102:21
geography 124:13
Georgia 112:24 123:11 124:5,10 124:20 127:11,14 128:8
germane 31:23
getgo 184:16
getting 5:7 16:16 46:24 48:11 68:11 75:17 80:11 92:6 96:3 118:17 123:18 158:23 166:17 182:18 185:14,16,16 198:6 204:11
Gina 14:9,11 76:8
give 3:20 9:17 15:22 17:5 28:7,11 41:2 47:25 49:14 76:2 78:5 83:3 97:19 98:2 100:22 141:22 150:2 153:10 177:17 182:15 190:2 205:24 209:16
given 62:4 66:17 82:18 96:11 97:17 103:2 129:8,16 153:8 191:19 205:15
gives 110:11 199:15 202:13 211:9
giving 16:10 19:14 20:1 128:4 173:24
Gjevre 11:20,20
glance 178:12
global 18:12 168:15
globally 195:8
GLP 195:10 208:13 208:14,17
glyphosate 167:6,13 167:15,16 168:10 168:23
glyphosates 97:21
GMO 146:14
go 3:14 8:6 10:10 25:6,19 26:6,25 27:1 30:11,15 36:10 38:14 40:2 45:1 54:10 59:13 60:20 68:21 80:14 87:6 90:1 91:9 96:6 118:2 121:25 124:8,14 128:10 135:23 138:10,18 139:14 146:6,7,7 154:22 156:13 164:1 170:20 174:2 176:3 177:24 183:22 184:9 187:24 191:3,8,11 196:10 202:5,18 204:21 204:22 207:3
goal 30:24 50:11 144:1
goals 61:13 154:4
goes 8:5 26:13 27:6 54:9 86:18 89:13 133:9 147:23 190:16 199:4 202:14
going 2:16 3:1,1,2 6:25 7:8,17,18 8:2 14:18 15:2,22 17:9 17:19 18:8 19:23 20:19 25:13 30:10 30:11 33:1 35:4 36:10 38:14 39:25 40:2 41:19 44:6 47:21,24 48:1,4,6 48:7,9 49:21 53:21 53:24 55:3 57:4,5 57:6 59:5 63:25 64:15 68:10,21 70:1,24,24 72:1,13 79:5 81:2 83:14,14 85:9 86:9,11,16,24 87:8,11 88:25 89:6 89:19 90:5,6,17 92:20 93:22 98:3 108:14 109:3 114:18 115:19 116:13 117:5,6,7,8 117:23 118:1 121:6,16 122:19 123:19 124:24 127:18 128:21 129:19 131:21 135:11 136:12 144:14,23 146:24 147:15 149:7,25 156:13 157:5 159:2,12 165:22 166:4 167:10 170:12 173:22 174:1 175:24 176:21 177:14 178:8 180:24 182:2,17 190:4 193:1,21 195:21 201:17,23 204:15 205:12 211:24
gold 201:23 202:4 205:13,15,18
golden 176:15
golf 12:20
good 2:11 6:23 8:13 8:20 12:4,22 13:1 13:3,7,21,25 18:20 20:11 21:15 28:24 30:17 32:25 39:24 46:13,25 47:2,21 62:18,24 69:17 72:20 73:10 75:20 91:12 92:3 116:15 117:13 118:10 123:4 127:2,12,13 127:14,16,16 139:7 143:6 144:7 147:21 148:19,20 149:9 168:8 178:19 181:10 185:1 190:3 193:16 203:2,12 203:15 208:24 213:4 214:25 215:4
Goodis 15:11 30:11 30:14,18 39:23 54:18 75:7
Gorman 14:3,3
gotten 17:13 39:17 78:10 160:1 172:5 178:10 180:3 210:11
government 4:6 5:22 6:3,23 21:4,5 93:13 209:3
governs 19:19
Gowan 13:2 212:2
grab 18:22
gradation 139:6
Gragg 11:9,9 87:7 88:1,20 89:12 90:5 90:10,13 119:22 120:8 121:5,15 122:3 134:2,16,20 134:23 135:15,20 139:19 140:9,19 141:25 142:9,21 142:25
grant 144:21 148:25 206:1,10 207:2 210:9 211:13
granted 97:3 149:15 151:23 154:19 161:11 207:16
grantee 207:16,18
grantees 211:9,15
granting 153:19
grants 149:3 193:24 195:14 205:25 211:11
graphically 210:15
graphics 210:10,13
grapple 92:15
grappling 109:2,8 173:10
grasp 138:15
grateful 49:22
great 2:11 6:12 14:14 18:3,4 20:22 30:10 32:10 34:11

34:18 39:21,21 43:12 46:23 55:20 55:24 62:12 64:4 64:24 85:5 93:15 93:19 95:24 96:2 123:1,15 125:2 139:21 160:25 170:12 172:5 176:5 178:14,18 180:18 181:9 186:4 203:19
greater 24:14 61:8,9 73:25 82:4 150:19 150:21 151:2 163:14 165:2 182:12 199:15 204:1,5
Grisham 122:11
groans 98:1
ground 41:20 42:22 125:18
grounds 4:10
group 19:22 20:1 21:1,13 23:6,16 27:16 29:9,24 34:22 36:11 39:6 40:13 47:1,9 54:22 55:16 57:24 58:1 59:4,19 62:11 64:21 65:11 67:6 71:8,11,13,13 72:22 74:9,18 75:8 92:3 117:14
groups 9:2 27:12,20 37:20,21 54:2 59:6 59:22 68:13 69:3 150:16 172:6
grow 3:1
grower 11:22 41:20 114:14 116:7,21 117:14 147:8
growers 32:7 43:16 101:19,21 104:9 105:20 107:9,14 107:17,21 112:4 112:11 113:5 115:22 119:17 125:15 133:7 137:16 138:16 140:13 144:2 145:25 146:16 160:13 188:5,15
growing 101:22 102:2,11,20 104:25 105:22,24 107:10 108:2 112:2 117:4
growth 135:13 155:4
GTA 150:20 152:1,6 152:17 153:1,12 154:5,10,13,19 155:11 157:6 158:8 162:7,21,24 163:6 164:19
GTAs 152:6
guards 17:10
guess 29:14 30:1 59:9 66:24 87:7 90:5,8 92:4 109:2 113:20 120:9 123:14 134:3 143:19 163:18 167:6,13 174:6 175:22 179:7 214:7
guidance 6:2 132:7 173:17 193:8,12 193:13 211:9
guide 35:12 38:22 209:22
guideline 157:2 158:1 160:22,23
guidelines 27:4 52:14 55:22 67:12 133:11 194:24
Guilaran 79:7 80:1 80:2,7,14 83:5 88:24 89:19 90:8 90:11 91:14 92:8
gun 179:19
guys 8:13 82:24 91:8 124:3 133:17

H

habitat 33:21 42:15 42:19,20 52:1 61:19,20,20
habitats 42:21
Haitian-Creole 178:16
half 14:23,25 134:6 170:18
hand 83:2
handed 99:3
handlers 210:5
handout 78:23
handouts 81:25
hands 91:6 92:25 107:14 115:17
hangup 179:12
happen 56:1 92:7 123:6 146:24 164:7 172:13,13
happened 77:6 86:23 109:6 114:20 123:13 163:10 197:19
happening 15:23 47:22 55:21 86:21 123:3,5 124:1,2,4 138:23 139:16,20 143:22
happens 53:23 103:8 132:17 143:8 163:19 195:24
happy 55:19 148:18
hard 67:2 92:24 123:10 133:1
harm 85:13
harm's 90:25
harmonization 196:24
harmonize 197:4
Harriott 13:16,16 81:25 84:7,9 129:6
Hartless 158:20
harvest 118:15
harvests 135:7
hats 69:23
Hawaii 86:4
hazard 4:3
hazards 185:17
head 11:16 189:1
heads 74:17 118:23
health 3:3,23,24 9:8 11:14 12:23 17:7 29:10 31:13,18 33:2 34:9 61:4 62:18 82:7,9,21,23 83:20 84:25 85:14 86:20 88:22 89:2,7 89:16 90:23 93:22 159:9 180:14 193:11 195:5,6 196:13,16,19 207:10 212:14,18 214:14
healthy 21:14
hear 3:11 14:10,11 14:12 18:7 23:8,14 29:2,2 39:18,19,20 94:7,12 108:3 162:19
heard 6:10 16:6,24 21:25 41:13 58:2 58:11 93:10 97:23 99:8 130:24 133:6 184:7
hearing 8:6 9:12 16:6 19:16 144:7
heavily 9:25 38:9
HED 92:21
height 140:7
Hello 39:21 76:12 133:4
help 2:17 6:7 7:8,9 7:10,16,24 10:4 24:11 26:1 31:18 34:8 54:8,24 69:13 84:12 94:17 99:10 104:18 107:25 113:4 114:16 125:21 130:19 132:8 144:24 158:22 172:14 173:16 206:17 207:21
helped 59:15 125:1 132:5
helpful 10:2 15:8 54:22 122:12 123:12 161:25 162:3 184:11
helping 17:12
helps 4:14,15 69:14 113:7 174:3
hemp 188:20 189:5
herbicidal 152:3 155:15
herbicide 100:19 102:7,7 171:20,23 171:25 172:25 173:21 174:2
herbicide-resistant 172:18
herbicide/pesticide 176:6
herbicides 126:4 163:20 173:11
hereto 216:9
hesitance 180:1
hexavalent 93:24
hey 26:7
Hi 9:19 10:15 11:13 12:24 13:10 51:16 53:12 84:13 85:7 159:6
hide 183:24
high 5:4,7 42:12 105:7 136:4 169:7 169:8
high-level 101:25 159:4
high-profile 101:11 115:22
high-quality 210:2
higher 46:1 123:18 123:19,24 196:22 199:20
highest 125:14
highlight 85:9 94:3
highlighted 134:17

141:19 164:14
highlighting 147:13
highlights 196:1
highly 82:20
Hill 25:6,19 26:7
hire 193:19
hired 146:18
historical 202:13
historically 150:23 160:1
history 72:5 83:7
hit 195:25
Hobbs 12:18,18 181:9
hobby 33:18
hobbyist 63:6
Hoffman 10:18,18
hold 22:13 208:22
holes 50:19
homeowner 172:16 172:19
homeowners 44:14
Honda 167:25
hone 83:22
honestly 101:3
honey 33:16 38:3 47:17 63:5
honeybee 46:15 54:5 55:14 61:19
honeybees 55:6,9,10
honor 6:8
hope 8:4 50:16 57:7 78:18 90:25 108:3 112:2 182:19 186:12
hopefully 12:13
hopes 181:2
hoping 40:16 82:14 112:13
hospital 183:15
host 101:4
hour 16:7 106:17 108:4
hours 63:18
House 4:9 190:20 191:3
housekeeping 17:18
how-to-comply 210:4
how-to-train-the-t... 210:6
HSRB 202:5
huge 62:17 115:18 185:9
human 4:2 9:8 82:7 83:20 84:25 86:20 88:22 89:2,7,16 93:22 123:7 159:9 207:10 212:14,18 213:14,22 214:14
Humane 13:11,11
humans 214:21
hybrid 167:19
hypotheses 4:14

I

I'm 175:16 179:13 180:12,15 184:10 187:25 188:25 189:2,2,4 190:4 193:21 214:17
Idaho 49:13
idea 45:24 46:11 110:15 123:15 147:18 162:8 182:10 183:21 185:8
ideas 4:14 41:5
identical 78:24
identification 147:5 154:18
identified 37:7,8,9 37:18,22 39:3,10 84:12
identify 37:4,12,15 37:22 45:13 50:18 50:22 54:2 106:25 145:23,24 146:3 146:11
identifying 32:6 38:18 120:11
ignorance 171:19
illegal 168:2 187:17 188:8
illegally 167:18 168:4 187:25
imagine 60:8 69:9 100:17 166:15
immediate 12:14
immediately 24:3
impact 85:24 86:24 94:4,21 120:23,25 121:4 122:24 123:21 134:25 135:2,7,12 156:4 166:19 192:11
impacted 86:12,16 113:12 116:3 119:2,24 121:9 138:16 176:16
impacts 23:5 67:5 82:23 113:23 135:18 164:25
implement 18:25 110:19 128:14
implementation 17:2 35:14 37:11 62:23 66:5 180:13 182:16 184:2,4
implemented 66:12 106:15 110:13 117:5 128:5 138:17 179:22 205:14
implementing 49:4 56:11,12,18 57:18 107:19 171:16
implication 161:13 214:17
importance 6:15,22 8:9 93:12 101:18 122:18 193:10 203:19
important 2:25 3:6 4:16,21 5:4,14 6:14,20 7:19 8:10 26:16 33:23 44:10 45:13 60:1,3,16,20 64:19 74:3 83:9,13 100:9 107:10 113:7 116:21 122:15 132:9 135:19 136:2 138:2 147:1 150:12 152:10 156:18 157:23 161:9 214:6
impressive 79:20
improve 31:18 73:15 147:13
improvement 16:12 33:1 175:15 203:14
improving 34:6 74:25
in-tank 160:10
inadvertently 167:20
inaudible 177:20
incentive 196:24 197:8,13
incentives 114:16
inception 179:16
incident 86:5 111:22 113:16 123:23 124:15 134:24 141:10 180:15,18
incidents 51:19 91:15,17 101:14 102:14,21 103:15 103:17 104:19,25 105:8 111:17 112:23,24 120:5 121:13 124:1,2,11 129:16,23,24,25 130:2 136:5 146:12
inclined 199:13
include 172:16 173:17 202:5
included 5:17 26:6 40:9 42:14 60:14 79:1 171:25 202:8
includes 106:7 169:6 195:7
including 22:10 27:4 121:2 185:15 210:3
incorporate 4:2
incorporated 139:11
incorporates 113:18
incorporating 16:2 91:24 118:12 173:22
incorporation 84:17 84:23
incorrectly 126:7
increase 43:24 46:18 49:1 73:11 106:22 133:15 147:12 171:7 173:4 196:20 197:16
increased 46:9,19 102:21 161:20 196:6
increases 196:21
increasing 41:11 49:6 65:18 102:13 196:3 197:13
incredible 3:18
incremental 196:20 205:9
incrementally 171:6
increments 196:3
indefinitely 29:16
independent 21:3 71:9
indicate 49:5 115:10 154:15 176:2
indicated 139:4
indicates 151:4
indicating 119:10
indicator 142:15
indigenous-speaki... 178:16
individual 19:23,24 48:6 56:25 138:1 150:21 184:10
individually 204:22 207:4
individuals 24:21 25:13 101:6 116:18 117:8

132:11,17
indoor 82:25
industrial 188:20 189:5
industry 12:19 13:2 13:24 59:1 64:5 74:2 94:8,12,15 161:7 174:15 183:11
inert 196:5,6 197:25 198:1 202:25
inerts 201:15 203:8
infants 214:15
inflate 126:22
inform 8:14 101:21 104:22 107:25 119:16,18 144:24 148:17 154:1 156:6 157:11
informal 27:12
informally 208:6
information 4:7 7:1 9:7 28:8 34:14 37:10 39:24 40:3 40:20 41:18 48:11 49:25 50:4,8,11 53:24 54:14,14 63:8,14,16,17 66:8 66:23 68:2,3,20 69:2,8,10,11 71:17 71:19,23,24 72:2,6 72:7,11 75:17 77:19 78:16 90:1 92:6 93:1,4 96:6 103:4,23 104:18 104:22 109:23 111:7 112:17 115:4 116:7 117:2 117:15 118:18,22 119:14,16,17,23 120:14,15 130:16 130:19,19 131:20 132:4,12 134:22 135:5,9,18 141:12 144:3,24 148:10 148:15,16 152:20 153:8,12 154:1 157:13,21 158:5 158:22 162:17 165:11 176:11 177:4,8,10,16,25 181:5 182:4 184:17,19 185:13 185:14,20 202:11 207:8,12 211:7
informational 9:5
informed 101:22 105:21 120:16 144:4 160:24 207:9
ingredient 142:4,8 142:10 151:18 196:7 198:3
ingredients 125:11 149:19 150:25 151:1 155:21 168:13 196:5 198:1
inherent 62:4
inhibition 213:23
initial 85:18 120:18 121:3
initially 130:7
initiated 88:2 183:9
initiatives 69:20
innovation 175:13
innovative 44:9
input 2:24 5:15 9:6 15:2,17 55:1 59:4 59:5 73:2 78:5 158:9,12 182:1 215:1
inputs 78:9
insecticidal 152:3 155:15
insecticide 60:25 173:3 174:7,12
insecticides 98:23 173:15,23
insects 163:22 164:4 165:3
insinuating 137:15
inspection 185:4
inspections 193:17 193:20 195:10
inspectors 193:20 193:20
instance 80:9 200:11
instances 101:17 176:9
instrument 65:15 74:24
insufficient 89:24
integrate 137:19 181:3 213:13 214:2
integrated 106:3 137:22 140:16 180:22
intend 5:23 33:4,5 84:5 87:9 106:11 158:8
intended 32:8 107:15 136:23 147:12
intending 164:16 166:6
intense 210:15
intensity 66:18
intent 40:19 101:20 107:20 128:1,25 148:9 176:13
intention 126:22 173:15 176:8
interaction 157:12 161:6 164:21 165:2,13 211:14
interactions 151:16 151:18 152:1,1,12 157:14 165:5
interest 23:2,16 46:2 179:17
interested 16:6 18:17 28:3 92:9 187:5 216:10
interesting 61:15 122:9,14,23 123:10,20,20 125:8 126:24 139:1 144:14
interestingly 139:4
interests 61:13
interim 80:18 169:25
intermittently 14:19
internal 81:13 173:16
internally 78:13,17
international 13:11 196:25
internationally 168:18
internet 28:7 184:23
interpret 111:18
interpretation 29:15 153:11
interrelated 67:5
interruption 14:21 54:18
intersection 98:6
intervene 98:3
intervention 139:16
intrigue 122:11
intriguing 123:5
introduce 2:8 3:7,14 8:18 10:11 14:7 30:14 100:18 149:25
introductions 2:21
inversely 203:5
inversion 146:2,2
inversions 105:13 145:24,24
invertebrate 193:9
invest 174:23
investigate 67:13 120:4 123:2 124:4 141:10
investigating 101:14
investigation 185:4
investigations 102:17 114:11,13 119:11 120:3,9,24 141:10
investigators 67:12
investing 101:4
invited 148:16
invoke 19:25
involve 133:13 141:5
involved 35:10 36:10 59:10 74:2 124:23 136:20 144:17 196:15 200:24 201:4,9,17 202:16,21 209:18
involvement 39:13 104:8 211:4,10
involves 63:19
involving 38:11 104:10
IR4 14:19
Iris 11:11 85:6 90:19 96:17 209:13
Isbell 208:5
issue 7:18 26:8 29:10 53:15 54:12 56:11 57:8 66:5 86:23 103:22,22 104:14,15,20 117:9 134:15 145:5,7 147:24 150:18,18 170:15 178:14 186:2 212:19,20
issued 87:16 133:11
issues 7:16 9:7 15:1 16:8 31:15 40:13 47:14 53:9 54:11 62:10,17 64:25 67:3 70:5 82:15,16 82:16 83:4 84:11 84:12,16,20,23 92:14 101:25 105:6,10 112:1 137:14 139:2 143:3 176:20 207:13
it's 174:10,21 176:15 177:3 180:2 182:17 185:20,21 187:4 191:14,22 199:7

202:10 204:16 206:4 209:21 210:14 211:17 212:21 214:2

J

January 32:14 86:5 87:25
Jay 13:21 60:23 61:23 64:12 97:24 98:2 110:21 111:24 113:9 119:10 159:5 161:1 168:11 174:5 208:11 210:17
Jeff 3:12 8:18,22 9:16,25 14:23
Jim 12:2 15:3,4,8 18:19 30:8 100:7 176:24 177:1 178:20 179:13
Jo 216:3,15
job 46:13 62:12,19 62:24 72:20 73:21 74:1 75:20 95:24 117:13 118:7 123:15
jobs 28:1
John 14:3 122:11
Johnson 12:9
join 14:18
joining 2:6 14:6
Jones 171:13
judgment 21:3
jumped 179:19
June 190:25
Justice 11:12

K

Kachadoorian 31:4 39:18,21,22 53:12 53:13 67:9 69:15
Kate 3:8 9:17,19 10:8 14:23
KEANEY 209:20 210:9,21 211:11
keen 133:25
keep 7:8,10 8:12 24:10 55:6 60:16 91:17 107:6,8 118:8 158:24
keeping 44:24 45:4
KEIGWIN 2:2 8:17 9:16 10:8 14:5,11 14:14,18,22 28:20 29:6 30:8 51:13 54:16 56:2 57:21 58:7 60:23 61:23 64:12 65:9 69:16 73:4 74:6,16 75:18 75:22 76:7,10,13 76:24 78:21 79:4,7 79:17 81:7,13,21 84:8 85:6,15 87:5 87:17 88:2,21 89:10 90:14 91:2 93:6 94:19,23 95:3 95:7 96:15 97:8,13 97:16 99:13 100:3 108:9 109:11 110:21 111:24 112:15 115:1 117:16 118:24 119:20 120:17 122:4,7 124:18 125:5 127:6 129:4 130:4 133:3 134:1 134:8 135:21 138:9,12 139:18 142:13,23 143:1 144:12 146:6 147:22 148:19 158:24 161:1,22 163:3 165:20 167:4,10 168:22 168:25 169:3 170:3 171:8,10 172:23 174:5 175:19 176:18 178:20 180:10 181:8 182:21 184:13 186:16,19 187:19 188:17 189:12,19,21 208:11,17 209:9 209:13,25 210:17 210:23 211:22,24 214:23
Kenny 100:20
kept 141:8
Kevin 104:2 134:14 211:25
key 3:7 70:23
kick 2:7
kicked 199:9
kids 86:25
kill 45:15 51:18 52:8 67:3,11
kills 45:7,7,10,17 57:16 66:16 67:1,7 67:13,20 70:6
Kimberly 149:8,25 159:3,6
kind 14:16 40:2 41:22 42:1 44:24 44:24 45:24 47:23 47:25,25 48:5,9,18 49:15,18,19,22 50:3,6,19 53:22 54:4,9 67:18 68:10 68:14 69:5,13 70:1 73:20 74:19 75:2 77:6 80:24 89:19 92:10 93:1 110:4,7 119:5 121:1 132:5 133:8 145:4 160:18 162:8 163:12,25 172:11 172:11,11 174:7 177:18 183:11 188:18
kindergarten 24:24
kinds 42:2,9 44:7 46:3 47:3 66:18 133:14 174:13,17
knew 76:10 113:14
know 2:14 9:23 17:22,23 18:1 19:12 22:4 24:3 26:21 29:9 31:7,10 31:14 34:1,7,15,15 34:18 36:7 41:4,6 41:14 42:2,16,18 43:19 44:4,20 45:1 45:3 46:4,13,22 47:18 50:16,17 52:7,9 54:13 55:20 55:24 56:3,12 58:10,18 59:4,24 60:18 62:21 63:5 63:16,17,18 64:2 64:10 65:6 67:13 67:23 68:1,16,18 68:21 69:6,18 70:9 70:17,22,23 72:1 72:10 73:16,23 75:8,8 80:13 84:9 84:21 86:2 91:18 92:4,4 95:22 97:25 108:17 110:5,6 113:24 114:10,19 114:19,20,24 115:9,17,24 116:2 116:23 117:3,5,7 117:12,18 118:17 119:7 121:17 122:22,25 124:19 126:21 129:17 130:20,20,20 131:10,12,14,16 131:19 132:19 133:13,23 135:2 136:8 138:15,22 138:24 141:19 142:19 143:3,15 144:12,13,15 147:15,24 159:3 163:10,12 164:9 165:12 167:23 170:13 172:14 174:3 175:10,21 175:25 176:25 177:8 178:12,14 179:2,3,4,12 181:10 182:9,25 183:1 184:5,8,9,11 184:12,15,21 185:5 187:1,14 188:11 191:23,24 197:2 199:12,25 203:11 205:4 211:1,6 213:16 214:8,10
knowledge 37:20 44:18 77:22 122:2 196:12
known 31:24 144:20
Kunickis 10:12,12
Kunkel 14:15,16

L

label 43:21,22 105:5 105:24 106:4,24 107:12,18,20,21 107:22 110:5,10 112:9,12,16,18 113:5,6,8 114:15 115:8 118:11 122:15,17,21,21 122:22 123:3 128:2,7,25 136:21 136:25 137:5,10 137:16,18,20,20 137:22 138:6,7 140:14,15,17 143:24 144:5 145:6,8,18 147:6 149:2 176:22 177:5,5,6,9,11 179:1,1 185:5 187:11 189:10 198:23
labeled 120:9 141:14 171:23 174:10 180:21
labeling 145:22 173:14,14 176:20 177:24 178:1,8 179:3,4,9,15,18,22 179:24 180:21 181:18 184:3,6,25 185:19 186:3,8,10 186:13,16
labels 80:20,21

102:1 105:24 106:2,3 107:8,9,14 109:7 110:3,14 137:19 140:10,16 140:18 177:19 178:23,24,25 179:9 182:25 183:2,3 185:8,9 186:6,7,13 195:12
laboratory 143:5 193:16 208:25
lack 94:3 179:10 180:2
lady 59:12
lag 170:23 207:17
laid 57:18
LaJoie 11:22,22
land 144:21 148:25 149:3
landscape 114:15
language 24:18 44:5 44:7 78:24 100:9 106:20 128:2 129:1 192:6 194:18 195:17
languages 178:4,5
large 51:4 79:21 152:16 157:7 162:7,8,9
largely 98:14
larvicide 183:14
lastly 107:4 161:16 175:5 207:14
late 203:4,6,8,9
Latino 86:14
Laughter 186:25
launched 180:25 182:19
law 5:11 98:9 175:4 191:12 209:10
lawn 12:20 183:12
laws 98:7,12
lay 161:25
Layne 17:4
lead 15:12 30:20 34:17 40:6 43:1 48:10 49:3,17 54:13 69:6 71:16 71:19,24 99:9 101:8 104:16 109:19 115:8 116:10 120:1,4 121:12 130:18 131:5,19 132:7 141:9 165:14 184:14 185:3,13 188:25
leadership 23:21
leading 161:3 205:5
leads 187:25
learn 3:1 10:4,7 50:13 54:2 156:17 158:13
learned 4:11 114:23 158:12 161:5
learners 156:16
learning 149:22 182:8
leave 25:18 187:23
leaves 62:24
led 15:22 32:5 89:16
left 77:12 167:11
legal 64:1 188:16
legalized 188:2
legislation 26:5 190:13 197:13
legislative 25:12
legitimate 163:24 212:16 213:9
LEIBMAN 85:17 125:2 210:24 211:18
length 95:15
less-than-ideal 125:20
let's 14:22 41:13 42:11 48:17 51:13 51:14 67:22 85:25 97:22 125:2 138:12 149:6 167:5
letter 77:4 79:2 201:23
letters 77:21,23 205:14
letting 110:4
level 1:16 34:5 35:22 37:8,10 38:25 39:4 42:12 44:18 46:1 66:17 73:12 154:9 157:20 173:11 177:21 208:8
levels 45:23,24 46:4 46:5 47:12 93:24 101:7 151:11,11 157:9
Leyla 12:22 85:15 90:14 96:18
Liang 10:15,15
license 167:23
Liebman 11:13,13 122:6,9 143:12
life 13:14
light 18:5 95:12 153:11 200:5
lightly 5:10
likewise 96:19 191:17 192:5 193:11
limit 33:25 106:16
limitation 72:18
limitations 70:3,6 70:13,14,21
limited 27:14 29:13 29:19 52:21 70:7 132:22
limiting 32:15 106:18
limits 74:1
line 18:14 72:10 171:22
lines 58:10,17 157:10
linger 30:4
link 22:18 28:2 164:14
linked 186:14
list 42:5 59:24
listed 46:22 168:14 209:19
listen 10:7
listened 35:5
listening 56:3 212:4
lists 20:6 188:7,9,11 188:12
literature 67:4 163:14 165:10,11
little 3:12,20,24 4:22 7:6 8:4 22:3 25:24 31:11 45:14,16 48:9,15 50:10 56:4 56:21 66:19 76:2 80:4,14 92:5 95:23 97:23 101:1 102:25 110:1 122:10 128:20 132:1 150:4,5 156:13 159:6 175:8 177:14 181:17,19,19 187:5 190:4 200:4 203:21 209:16
live 18:6 87:1 204:13,16 205:8
lively 215:2
living 62:25,25
Liza 10:24 40:9 58:24 60:23 61:23 64:14,19 71:7 111:24 113:9,9 115:1 127:7 128:19 129:4 130:4 184:10,13
lobby 1:16 25:3,8
local 38:9 187:22
lock 33:9
logo 198:24
long 17:16 72:5 73:14 85:12 90:17 185:19,21 200:15
long-standing 71:22
long-term 36:2 59:7 62:20 85:13
longer 96:13 106:1 194:8
longstanding 192:6
look 2:20 4:14,22 6:1,4 8:6 9:12 19:15 34:4 35:12 35:13,14 38:11,16 41:5 43:14 46:5 47:23 51:10 60:7 70:2 71:2 75:6,14 92:14,16 96:20 98:21 108:20 118:13 120:6 123:12,22 125:11 129:20,23 131:8 157:19,25 158:22 166:9 168:21 169:16 172:16,18 175:8,14,16 176:14 179:5 182:11 183:18 192:23 194:2 195:22 205:3,7
looked 37:3,24 53:5 72:15 78:23 109:3 142:20 156:25 158:16 159:13 163:8 212:24
looking 4:2 29:3 33:11 35:13 36:2 46:15 48:13,16,20 48:21,23 50:14 52:18 53:1 54:6 59:19 62:12 72:13 86:4 91:24 92:9,22 97:18 108:4 120:11,13 123:2 124:16 135:25 136:6 144:16 148:2,4 154:14 155:18 159:14,17 159:24 174:24 182:23 192:19 194:10 200:18
looks 62:16 63:10 108:12 109:9 118:13 163:24 164:2 167:24 172:17 178:13 214:5
Lori 13:13 51:15 54:16 70:12 74:6

85:15 90:14 91:2 96:18 129:5 130:4 133:3 138:10
lose 25:15 126:7
loss 55:16 155:5
losses 55:17
lost 54:15 208:15
lot 9:22 10:9 14:16 16:22 20:21 30:1 31:10,15 33:13 37:1 39:23 40:22 42:1,6,7,20 43:11 45:9 46:23 47:6,13 47:16 49:18,21 51:7,7 52:23 53:22 54:5,8 63:6,18,18 63:19,20 68:5,10 68:16 69:18,24 71:5,5 84:1,18 85:18 93:4 96:4,6 98:20 99:6 116:3 123:17,17 124:8 125:1,18 131:2,18 131:22 133:13 134:5,7 144:7,13 144:15,23 146:9 156:14 158:17,21 160:15 161:19 162:1 174:11 175:17,21 179:16 181:10,13 194:9 194:16 211:1 213:19
lots 4:12 94:24 148:20
Louisiana 128:9
love 65:7
low 112:23 134:4 148:7 151:8,11,12 169:7 172:22
lowered 196:5
Lowit 170:7,20
luck 168:8 172:11
lunch 15:21 74:18 76:2,15 99:18
lunchtime 97:21

M

magnitude 157:6
mail 89:4
mailbox 182:5
main 27:9 106:4 137:19 140:17
Maine 11:23
maintain 24:20 107:6
maintenance 191:12 191:15 192:7,11 192:14,17 199:21
major 105:23 140:12
majority 28:23 39:11 137:10 148:22
making 18:17 28:16 31:4 79:24 80:10 96:7 117:3,20 118:9 126:10 149:2 152:17 162:7 166:1 170:14 185:8 205:8
malathion 87:22
Mallampalli 171:12 173:12,13
mammals 164:5
manage 19:3 22:24 101:19 107:16 175:24
managed 15:16 52:7 58:14
management 3:18 4:5 10:13,19 12:3 17:4 28:11 37:22 39:12 41:25 42:5 46:19 63:12 64:6 65:17 72:16 80:25 105:3,22 133:6,10 133:12,18,20,24 160:14 167:17 171:11 175:20 207:21
manager 12:8
managers 158:21
mandate 131:1
mandated 127:20 130:24 131:24 194:9
mandatory 106:10 110:10 128:2 193:11 194:23
manner 6:25 101:21 144:2
manual 210:4,6
manufacturers 101:9 105:4 149:15
map 104:1,6 111:12 123:9 125:8,12 130:9
maps 134:3
March 190:21
Marietta 77:16 88:12 149:7,9 150:5 151:21
Maritime 87:24
marker 141:1 145:19
market 91:16 174:8 174:20
market-wise 177:19
marketing 161:12
marketplace 99:12 161:12,19
markets 12:21
Mary 36:15
Maryland 167:25
mass 89:4
master 140:17
material 146:4 206:16
materials 23:9,11 44:7 206:20,20,21 206:23 209:19 210:3
matter 109:4 165:16 206:18
matures 50:18
maximizing 3:4
maximum 106:17
McCleary 15:4 18:20 28:24 29:14 30:4 100:8
McCURDY 12:22 12:22 90:16
McLAURIN 13:7,8
me-too 199:3
mean 29:11,12,13 52:21 67:19 80:4 86:13,15 92:22 93:25 109:3 111:7 117:24 120:13 121:21,25 123:15 124:7 135:5,10 136:16 150:14 153:20,23 159:9 159:13 166:14 174:1,23 185:8
meaning 106:6
meaningful 9:1
means 6:25 18:6 20:1 21:12 26:5 35:22 119:3,4 121:8 127:17 128:12 137:16 179:4
meant 145:6 169:12
measurable 135:12
measure 35:8 45:23 53:3 73:23 108:16 121:13 144:8 155:3
measurements 66:15
measures 7:8,10 15:15 31:24 33:10 36:20 38:25 39:2 39:14 45:5,21 46:7 46:11,22 66:11,18 66:21 105:16 172:1 180:14
measuring 33:4 45:22 48:20 74:21
mechanics 116:25
mechanism 38:23 58:5 71:18,21 72:5 157:11 165:13 171:20
mechanisms 55:23 133:23
Medical 12:5
medium 22:13
meet 24:5 25:6,16 25:20,21 33:10 61:12 62:7 78:8 153:17 165:25
meeting 1:10 2:21 8:3 9:3 16:20,21 17:6,14 19:17 21:21,23 22:3,5,7 22:8,25 23:1,13,15 25:18,20 29:24 30:25 68:13 79:12 93:11 163:6,11 194:22 215:6
meetings 20:9 21:20 22:1,10,11,11,12 22:14 27:12 28:25 34:21 44:21,22,23 47:9 57:2 63:20 78:12 203:16
meets 163:24
Melissa 180:19
member 14:7 20:25 21:1,2,11 23:4 25:4,7,16,20 26:8 100:11
members 2:13,23 3:7 8:21 14:6 15:10 17:19,19 18:16 20:15,15,24 21:14,17 23:20 24:12 25:2,7,12,14 25:21 26:4,10,14 27:16 31:10 34:19 36:8 54:19 55:1 62:2 70:3 76:18 81:18 100:5,25 175:16 181:11
membership 20:14 27:5,6 30:25 31:1 31:11 34:23
memo 171:23
memorandum

158:6 159:3
mention 65:3 77:3 130:6
mentioned 31:7 39:24 41:9 42:15 55:20,24 63:4 64:19 65:24 67:1 91:21 112:16,20 113:1 132:15 141:16 151:21 188:4 198:21 205:22
mentioning 135:6 148:21
mentions 169:15
mergers 172:12
message 96:20 97:10
messaging 93:13
met 3:9 34:19 93:18 113:6
method 46:7 49:1 125:10
methodical 137:12
methodology 4:24 110:2 166:4,8
methods 42:3 44:1 46:7,8 52:22 151:14
methomyl 77:14 78:7,19
metolachor 175:10
metric 37:13 55:7 59:24 134:23 135:1
metrics 15:14 29:8 30:22 35:12 36:13 36:22 37:5,7,8,14 37:16 38:22 51:10 51:18 52:15 53:22 55:21 58:13 60:9 62:5 73:9 79:25 80:12 120:6 190:10,11 213:5 214:5
mic' 18:5,7,10 54:24 146:25
Michelle 176:20 179:13
microbial 183:13
mid-2018 169:24
mid-south 102:12
middle 17:3 169:5
midwest 102:23
migrant 11:14 206:9
Mikal 173:12
Mike 15:11,23 30:11 30:18 39:23 42:15 47:5
miles 24:14 106:17
military 195:8
Miller 171:12
million 103:14 113:11,18,25 114:5,7 121:6 126:16,25 191:14 191:16 199:19,21
mind 60:16 94:25 105:3 107:8 164:10 168:6
mine 50:9 186:24
minimize 101:16 104:24 105:16
minimum 198:14
Minnesota 138:19 173:1
minute 18:22 59:18 98:2
minutes 22:3,5 76:14 99:13 108:14 150:10 158:25
miscellaneous 198:11 201:22,24 202:3,9,24 203:10
mishear 162:22
misheard 162:20
misinformed 146:13
missing 145:3 169:4 169:12
mission 86:19
Mississippi 10:21 32:4 57:1 117:20 128:9 141:20
Missouri 102:19,23 104:2 126:2 147:25
misunderstanding 137:8
misuse 105:14 131:4 141:17,24
mite 67:18
mitigate 52:20 82:23 83:1 109:7
mitigation 32:12 36:20 80:21 81:2 99:1,7 156:7
mix 9:3 80:19 81:3 160:13
mixes 160:10 166:17 166:18
mixture 155:19 156:8 159:23 165:25
mixtures 151:24 152:7,17,21 159:7
mobile 54:24
mode 165:4 172:8 172:10 174:21,25
model 32:25 64:24
modernize 178:23
modes 55:8 173:25 174:2,9,15 175:6
modification 90:3
modifications 165:23
modified 40:17 102:2 105:19 129:9,11
modify 77:5
modifying 65:18
molecule 175:12
molecules 175:9
moments 94:12
money 86:10 198:6 207:2,19 209:5 210:19
monitor 32:23 35:22 91:15 107:24 108:6 139:15
monitoring 53:20 66:6,6 91:25 119:25 140:19,23 151:3
Monsanto 105:15 112:6,11
Monsanto's 102:6
month 7:7
monthly 34:20
months 97:9 101:2,4 144:11
morning 2:7,11 8:4 8:5,20 12:4,22 13:1,3,7,21,25 15:3 16:15 18:20 18:21 30:20 98:14 100:8,16 167:11 212:4
mosquito 12:15 58:25 59:3,6,9,22 60:3,15 66:9 183:14
mosquitos 60:7
move 66:24 100:3 110:24 123:12 124:17 130:1 149:1,6 169:23 186:12 192:19 193:21 208:22
moved 204:10 208:14
movement 102:14 102:15 104:24 108:22 120:25 136:5,13,23 140:21 141:17 144:18
movements 101:17 137:6
moving 17:1,11 58:22 74:24 110:17 148:3,8 150:17 168:20 200:3 205:10,10
MP3 35:11 37:2 38:19,20,24 39:11 40:5 60:2
MP3s 37:4 38:6 66:12
MRLs 196:25,25 197:4
multiple 69:19 150:14 165:24 200:13
municipal 59:2
murder 122:11
mute 18:12
muting 18:13

N

N 2:1
name 8:21 10:15 13:3,7 30:15,18 77:16 173:12
names 68:24
Nancy 2:8 8:17 9:25 14:23 95:25
narrow 62:13 154:10
nation 47:4
nation's 9:9
nation-wide 88:15
national 11:5,23 12:3 13:9 24:22 33:11 34:5 35:9,22 37:6,8,10 38:24 39:4 46:15 51:10 61:25 62:5 66:22 73:12 87:24 151:13 152:12 206:3,7,17 207:7
national-level 35:12 37:14 38:17,22
nationally 36:23 47:22 59:20
nationwide 206:25
native 52:9 53:15,20 54:3,6 55:15 61:8 70:13 119:4
naturally 50:20
navigate 26:1
near 113:24 169:21 198:4
nearly 127:1
necessarily 36:7

160:4
necessary 139:16 141:14
need 4:23,24,25 5:11 19:25 26:7 27:25 28:13 29:21 38:16,23,25 39:6 48:11 62:7 80:21 82:17 84:12 93:2 97:6 115:23 117:15 127:23 129:21 132:17 137:8 141:9,22 142:9 144:8 148:6 152:8 154:15 157:25 166:10 167:19 175:8 185:11 191:3 206:21 209:9
needed 7:20 9:7 29:23 32:23 50:22 84:10 125:19 133:25 152:23 156:8,21,23,23 160:18 174:12 184:20 193:13 197:8
needing 148:4
needless 180:25
needs 27:15 42:12 50:18 55:9,10 61:13 75:17 83:3 98:21 187:22 206:25 211:6 212:23
negotiated 200:24 201:14 202:12 203:1
negotiation 201:5,9 201:17 202:21
negotiations 201:10 202:2,16,24
neighbor 41:21
neighboring 105:17 106:23 107:1 112:4 147:9
neighbors 112:4 118:10 146:17 147:14
Neil 169:10 170:4
neither 33:17 216:5
neonicotinoids 51:21 169:1
neonics 52:8 94:10 97:21 170:4
nervous 97:6
Nesci 149:8 150:1,3 159:17 162:23 164:12 166:6,16 167:3
network 11:15 12:23 90:23 206:7
neurodevelopmen... 82:2,6,9,16,18,21 213:7
neutrals 75:2
never 83:17 136:4 153:23 168:6
new 2:3,5,13 3:8,12 3:15 4:14 8:19 10:10 15:6 17:6 31:10 50:18 59:3 69:25 87:10 99:11 102:3 103:4 105:19 107:19,21 109:6 110:3 129:6 129:14,17 148:1 160:4,18 171:19 172:8,10 173:18 173:25 174:2,21 174:24 175:12,12 180:1,16 193:2 194:3,3,6,6 195:5 195:11 196:7,17 197:12,14,14,17 197:22,24 198:3 198:11 199:2 200:11,11,14,20 200:21 202:5 207:18 208:23 210:10
newer 94:9 174:9
newly 189:25 206:22
news 203:15
NGOs 50:12
nice 2:12 172:17
NICEATM 170:13
Nichelle 13:16 81:24 85:8 90:19 96:17 122:5 125:6 127:6 129:4
Nichelle's 212:23
Nicole 186:20 189:22
night 18:3
Nikal 171:12
Nina 13:1 186:22
NIOSH 14:2
nod 110:11
non 148:7
non-certified 44:13
non-cotton 130:15
non-crop 119:5,6
non-crops 119:8
non-dicamba-tole... 120:19
non-FIFRA 198:13
non-governmental 43:11
non-pesticide 45:19
non-PRIA 203:18 203:21
non-soybean 130:15 135:18
non-target 120:25 164:4
non-tolerant 140:5
nonacute 55:14
Nonattendance 23:5
noncompliance 136:22
nonlabel 141:15
nonlabeled 141:23
nontolerant 140:2
normalize 47:25
North 10:23 12:8 13:5,8 32:4 55:8 70:9 72:15 93:17 93:18 108:22 109:8 128:9 139:13 173:1 188:21 189:8,8
northern 102:22
northwest 3:25 12:25
note 95:9 137:21 152:10 156:18 157:23 161:9 179:6
noted 78:24 161:18
notes 18:22 112:10
notice 21:21 27:7,8 27:19 57:5 83:24 89:1 127:12 167:17 172:24 173:14 176:6
noticed 20:20 125:7 126:12
notices 21:22 171:14 171:16
notification 72:19
notifications 203:22 204:2,3,4,6
notify 72:16
Noting 159:1
notwithstanding 58:10
novel 122:11
November 1:13 36:4 36:5 85:1 170:21
November/Decem... 102:4
NPIC 207:7
number 2:4 16:5 20:9 21:14 28:10 28:12 36:25 48:12 48:16,21 57:15 83:17 84:22,24 91:8 92:16 102:13 104:4,25 105:7 111:4 112:21 113:25 121:22,22 123:19 126:13,21 126:22 136:17,17 138:15 151:4,22 152:16 157:5 161:10 162:7,13 162:14 170:22 171:4 176:14 191:23 195:10 196:21 198:11 200:5,7,19,24 202:22 204:19 205:15 210:2 212:9
numbers 29:12 79:21 91:12 103:5 108:21 121:2,8,9 123:9,18 124:9,9 125:13 127:2 132:21 135:1 139:10,11,13 167:23 205:18
numerical 48:5
numerous 86:6
nutritional 45:11 67:3,18

O

O 2:1
Obama 5:20 64:20
objective 4:25 5:23 33:6 104:24
objectives 20:6 108:16
observation 34:16 126:11 157:9
observations 156:4 156:5 157:3,14
observe 168:12
observed 33:12 127:10 150:20 152:22
obtain 19:22 23:24 152:5 156:24
obtaining 155:24
obvious 187:20
obviously 70:12 92:19 114:23 125:9 179:3 210:21 211:15
occasions 28:21
Occupational 11:14
occur 29:23 91:10

91:15 145:14 146:3 194:8
occurred 121:13 146:10
occurrence 151:3
occurring 165:13
October 79:12 103:12 179:7
Odenkirchen 158:19
OECA 208:14 209:1
off-field 102:15 136:23
off-label 188:22 189:7
off-target 101:17 102:14 104:24 108:22 120:24 136:5,13 137:6,14 141:17 143:2
offer 72:4
offered 49:23 143:17
offering 49:9
office 2:9 3:9,13 4:1 4:5,7 5:9 6:1,11 9:19,24 10:5,13,16 17:5 28:7,13 49:11 49:12 95:16 131:5 133:11 153:2,9 157:17 164:9 179:14 190:1 193:18 203:22 208:2,7,18,20,21
Office's 152:19 156:19
official 4:6 6:9 22:16 22:23 24:13,15 93:12 103:12,15 111:9,17,21
officially 6:10 132:6
officials 11:2 20:8 40:11 62:1 63:23 94:18
offline 65:7
offset 191:19
oftentimes 96:4
oh 50:9 60:15 67:23 118:14 135:22 167:16 168:2,6 176:2
OIG 197:6,10
okay 2:2 14:14 18:24 19:6,8 22:15 24:9 25:5 27:3,21 29:14 30:4 51:13 53:13,13 59:16 60:23 61:23 64:12 65:9 75:18,23 77:2 78:21 79:4 80:14 81:21 84:8 85:6,15 86:13 87:7 88:20 88:21 89:10 90:14 91:18 93:6 99:13 108:17 109:11 111:8,11,23 115:1 117:16 118:24 119:20 120:8 122:4 127:6 129:4 130:4 133:3 134:1 134:2,16 135:15 135:21 138:9,12 139:7 140:19 148:19 160:11,25 162:14,19 163:2 164:11 165:20 167:4,10 169:14 170:3 171:8,10 172:23 174:5 177:1 178:2,11,20 180:6,10 181:8 184:1 186:4,19 187:19 188:1 189:16,24 190:12 193:21 195:20 200:3 202:10 204:7 207:5
older 94:10
OLEM 3:16
on-field 169:6
on-time 203:5
onboard 208:23
once 8:9 40:20 58:7 77:9 79:5 133:1 185:25 213:11 214:2
one-page 167:14
one-pager 76:19
one-pagers 16:5 79:10
one-time 124:23 197:2
ones 59:25 81:2 94:25 162:20,23 184:10 192:18
ongoing 36:2 52:25 53:9 88:17 119:11 190:9
open 17:22 65:18 108:5 128:16 165:10,11
open-door 9:23
openness 22:2 27:4 27:7,18
opens 110:11
operating 37:23 39:13 41:25 42:6 63:13
operation 19:20 189:5
operations 22:24
Operator 14:21
opinion 95:17 131:20 151:15 212:6
opinions 78:4,5 87:16 88:10,13,16
OPP 7:23 26:13 27:1 28:24 168:6 170:13 203:2,15 203:22 204:2
OPP's 151:14
opponents 63:24
opportunities 21:23 32:6 174:18 194:2
opportunity 9:21 10:7 34:11 41:3 55:5 56:8 100:25 110:18 128:16 176:15 178:13,18 206:2
opposed 66:6 138:1 145:9
OPs 77:8 213:6,17
order 9:8 17:8 23:1 31:16 95:8 106:21 142:1,10 165:7
Oregon 39:22 43:4 49:13 53:18 206:13
organic 187:24
organisms 152:22 196:15,18,22
organization 12:12 12:17 23:17 69:19 70:21
organizations 19:13 43:12 59:3 72:24
organophosphates 87:22 163:13
orientation 24:23
origin 24:22
original 65:4 105:25 175:6,12
originally 73:8 89:20 147:17 182:12
ought 99:5
outcome 80:13 216:10
outcomes 2:20 36:1 192:1
outdated 103:25
outlines 171:15
outputs 9:13 52:11
outreach 43:15,15 44:2 59:8 72:12 73:2 123:17 124:12 147:20
outside 32:20 59:1 164:10 198:16
over-the-top 102:9 111:21 114:6 134:11 136:19 140:3
overall 31:18 33:5 35:23 193:5 194:6
overarchingly 64:24
overcollect 191:18
overestimation 126:23
oversees 15:4
overstatement 114:4
overview 18:24 159:4

P

P 2:1
p.m 100:2
package 79:5 170:5
packages 160:2 200:19
packed 17:8
packet 76:19 79:10 103:1
packets 156:11
page 28:6,6
paid 21:7,7 126:3
paired 129:10
Palmer 13:18,18 29:7 51:16,16 78:22 79:20 80:6,9 81:12 96:16 111:25 169:4,14 171:18 180:12 187:20
panel 31:6,8 58:3 95:10
Panger 180:19
paper 171:15 204:10,20,24 205:11
paragraph 79:1 82:13
parallels 96:23
parent 26:21,24
parked 167:18,20 168:1,2,4
Parrott 176:21 177:6 178:6,19 180:20 181:24 183:8,20
part 6:8,13 15:4 32:11 59:10,21,22

59:23 60:3 75:24 81:10,14,16 88:24 90:2 91:23 112:15 117:4 120:22 134:13 137:3 142:6 149:2,19 154:23 156:9 160:2 165:10 166:22 169:17 172:2 179:21 197:18 199:6
partially 113:17
participant 114:25
participants 8:21 182:2
participate 23:5 72:22 73:25
participating 18:11 18:21 25:20 182:10 209:22
participation 8:16 19:16 21:7 24:21 26:17 28:16 34:19 197:9
particular 32:19 42:10,10 68:11 71:21 72:3 83:16 95:5 161:3 185:6 194:7 209:23
particularly 17:9 85:11 124:20 126:19 174:15 214:15
parties 74:4 216:6,9
partner 72:23
partners 6:17 78:2 101:13 104:21 141:12 148:13 183:10
partnership 70:15 149:3 193:24 195:14
parts 56:16 76:15 113:7
passed 190:15,19,24 191:2,11
passes 165:24 166:19
Pat 13:10 51:15 54:16 56:2 66:5 159:5 170:10
patent 149:15 150:7 152:5,15,18,19 153:2,3,5,9,19,21 154:5,15,20,24 156:19 157:15,17 159:10,18,19 160:9 163:21 164:8 166:9 175:12
patents 151:23 152:17 153:9,23 153:25 154:10,19 155:1,20,25 161:10 162:7
path 8:13 15:19 75:19 84:4 95:13 171:15
pathway 99:11
Patricia 176:20
pattern 139:9
patterns 98:24 169:6
pause 99:5
pay 24:12 114:18
Peck 10:22,22 69:17 72:9 93:8 109:13 109:21 110:1,20 161:23 162:19 163:2 177:2 178:2 178:11 188:18,24 189:4,15,18
pending 26:4 197:13 203:24 204:4
people 17:14 18:6 24:25 38:11 43:8,9 43:18,21 44:1 45:2 45:4 46:23,24 54:4 57:7 61:14 66:9 68:2,6,20,21,25 69:18 70:16,20 72:21 91:25 93:17 93:25 94:4,7,8 101:3 110:5 116:17 118:4 119:24 121:20 122:16,21 123:1 123:18,23 126:9 139:20,21 150:15 178:15 182:9 188:13 212:6,9
PERC 206:12,18,22 210:20 211:1
percent 48:17,19 79:22 80:16,17,19 108:21 109:1,2 126:17 127:1 139:5,8 197:16 202:15,17,17,21 202:23,23,25 203:11,12 205:1,2 205:2
percentage 48:13
percentages 205:1
perfect 103:23
perfected 182:18
perform 27:11 60:25
performance 175:6 190:11 193:8 194:20 203:1
performed 20:19
performing 94:22
period 20:7 77:10 85:13 92:23 93:10 95:8 185:2 192:5
periodic 50:14 65:16
periods 95:22 125:23
permitted 106:16
permitting 16:9 106:7
permutations 161:19
person 34:21 162:3 212:1 214:13
personal 21:8 95:17
personnel 153:10
perspective 69:24 73:19 133:18 185:14,23 202:13
perspectives 9:4 74:4
pertain 183:23
pertinent 153:23
pest 10:13,19 12:3 12:20 31:14 42:12 64:6,6 98:5,20 152:2 155:6,7
pesti 61:17
pesticide 1:9 2:4 5:9 6:1,11 11:2,20 13:4,6 14:2 16:11 16:18 17:5 32:8 33:2 34:7 38:8 40:8,11 41:11,12 42:3,9 43:17,21 45:18,22,23,25 46:8 49:1 50:12 51:23 61:5,25 63:23 64:1 66:15 67:5,12,19 68:11 72:17 79:8 80:25 84:14 95:16 98:5,9 101:9 105:4,5 107:4 115:5,9,20 115:20 120:2 123:22 127:8 129:6,17 131:4 132:10 138:3 139:23 143:16 149:14 151:18,22 152:12,17 161:14 161:15,17 169:11 171:14 179:14 187:13 190:1 193:24 195:14 197:23 198:22,24 204:12 206:6,7,8 206:11,15 207:6,8 207:14,20,23 208:2
pesticide-mediated 67:7
pesticide-related 45:8,12,17 66:25 67:2,10,20
pesticides 3:5 10:5 12:25 13:17,19,23 14:1,4 31:14 32:16 36:20 41:19 42:4 42:10 43:16,17,19 46:1 51:20 58:15 63:24 67:16 69:21 70:7 80:2,10 91:16 94:9 117:10 122:16,20 141:6 142:6 151:10,16 151:24 158:9 160:15 183:15 188:13 195:5 207:10
pests 166:2 176:17 193:9,11,14 195:6 196:16,19,22
petition 98:15 162:12,13,15 212:8
phase 182:1,18 204:14,15
phases 83:14
Phenomenon 129:7
phone 14:6,15 18:6 51:6 59:16 76:8
phonetic 170:9 208:5
phrases 178:9
physical 105:12 121:17 139:6 140:21 142:2
pick 18:9 167:6,10
picture 119:13
piece 53:1 62:16 81:1 90:4 118:3 146:22 193:22
pieces 141:11
pilot 76:20 178:8 181:11,21,22 182:1,2,23,24 183:4,18
pilots 78:10
PIP 197:22,22,24
pipeline 129:18
pivot 95:23 98:14

place 15:25 16:14 18:13 30:23 34:22 38:15 46:3 57:13 96:14 110:16 113:4 114:16 128:12 130:25 131:25 132:1 140:3 143:9 153:3 183:25 185:6
plan 7:7 15:14 30:22 35:14 36:16 37:2,6 41:5 42:18 44:16 47:7 49:4 53:19 56:17,19 57:19 59:21 63:21 72:3 92:5 99:14 110:3 143:19 146:23 166:21 185:25
planned 130:7 169:24
planning 35:2 48:8 150:4 158:3
plans 15:16 32:2,22 32:24,25 33:5,9,24 34:1,5 35:9,11,21 36:14,15,18,22,25 37:3,5,17 38:9,19 38:20,24 39:8,11 41:2 51:11 52:13 52:19,25 53:3,11 54:3 56:6,8,12 57:5 58:14 59:8,19 60:8,10 61:17,21 62:6,9,16,21 63:1 64:3 74:22 173:9 194:17 208:20
plans' 36:19
plant 42:13 109:15 118:1 120:20 121:1 122:2 147:18 155:5 160:23
plant-incorporated 197:23
planted 42:17 126:18 147:20
planting 42:22
plants 104:13 107:1 120:12 160:23 163:21,22,23 165:2
plate 49:23 87:2 167:23
platform 9:5
playing 154:9 177:20
plays-well-with-ot... 24:23
please 14:7 17:20 18:14,18 24:2 25:18 26:8 42:24 69:7
pleased 180:12 182:15
pleasure 20:16 30:19
plugged 168:5
Plus 41:2
pods 120:21
point 8:11 20:25 21:12 24:6 27:23 29:3 34:15 37:1 46:21 65:11 92:21 93:4 98:19 109:15 114:3 122:13 123:8 124:18 133:19 135:19 138:2 142:14,23 143:14 145:21 147:2,7 166:7 170:9 173:21 178:19,24 191:1,5 202:14 204:10
points 19:11 20:18 20:21 208:1
poisoned 92:1
poisonings 14:2 91:10
policy 6:19 9:6,24 10:13,22 32:12 72:11 99:2 171:2 173:16
poll 113:19
polled 111:20 134:13
pollen 45:23 66:15
pollination 32:1,17 33:16 38:2,4 53:17
pollinator 15:13,16 30:22 31:13,18 32:2,9,22 33:1,18 33:24 34:5,8 35:9 35:21 37:2,21 40:14 41:2 42:4,15 42:18,19,20 44:16 49:4 51:11,17 52:4 52:12,19,25 53:2,6 53:11,19 54:13 57:5 58:14 61:4,17 61:19,20 62:11,16 62:18 64:3,18 65:19 68:25 146:22
pollinators 51:20 52:2,9 53:16 54:3 54:6 58:16 59:8 62:17 63:6,22 64:7 69:22 70:13 73:20
Pollution 2:10 187:13 208:21
pool 183:16
pooling 47:24
poor 14:16 86:14 87:3
poorly 87:3,3
population 86:11,15 86:25
populations 53:20 55:18 61:9 85:10 87:1 155:7 194:1
portal 180:17,25 181:4 204:12,14 204:20 205:1,6,7 205:11,14,19,19 205:21
portion 89:16
pose 58:8 212:20
posed 58:22 90:20
position 97:12 111:10 125:19 158:8 211:16
possible 23:18 24:4 37:15 68:19 79:3 105:6 145:19 169:21
possibly 45:22 54:9 54:10 143:24 144:6 172:13
post-survey 38:15 38:21
posted 103:6
posters 210:4
postpone 90:24
potato 11:22,23
potential 34:7 45:20 66:14 82:5 85:13 93:9 104:23 105:11,17 106:23 106:25 131:4 141:10 151:5 164:2,4 165:12 169:5 175:2
potentially 5:2 121:4 159:22 176:12
Potomac 1:18
PowerPoint 65:24
PPDC 2:3 6:18 9:1 14:7 15:6,7 16:20 17:19 20:12 26:21 27:2 28:9,16 29:16 29:20,25 30:21,24 34:12 37:9 40:9 58:21 65:1 74:22 76:18 81:18 97:1 100:5,11,25
PPDC's 58:12 103:6
PR 173:14
practical 101:14
practice 68:4 97:22 208:25
practices 37:23 39:12 41:25 42:5 46:20 63:12 68:8 68:12 72:16 193:16
pre-application 199:1
pre-emerging 140:6
precise 109:20
predict 92:24
predominant 151:4
preliminarily 177:15
preliminary 194:17 199:6
premise 121:1
prepared 23:12
presence 17:21 67:16
present 26:17 35:15 100:25 144:1 169:13
presentation 15:3 28:15 31:4 75:9 108:10 109:13 110:23 126:25 127:4 133:5 149:23 150:2 208:12 210:15
presented 103:24 164:8 172:5
presenting 202:11
presents 210:21
preservatives 183:16
president 11:3 12:10,15 13:22 26:12 64:20,20 68:19 191:5
President's 31:16 64:18
president-elect 68:18
Presidential 5:19 62:12
presidents 12:16
Preston 10:22 64:13 65:9 69:16 90:15 91:2 93:6 96:18 108:10 109:11 110:23,25 159:5 161:1,22 176:24 177:1 188:17
pretty 17:8 52:20

82:9 91:12,19 97:10,24 139:14 146:21 172:20
prevent 8:2 106:21 136:21,23 146:4 161:15
Prevention 2:10 187:13 208:22
previous 147:16 199:20 202:12 203:13 207:25
previously 116:8,19 144:20 207:16
PRIA 7:5,11 81:8,15 81:15 189:25 190:1,4,5,5,8,9,11 190:12,14,16,18 190:24 191:10 192:3,5,9,12,14 193:18,21,22,22 194:9,13,13,18 195:20,21 196:7 197:20,21 198:16 199:19 201:18,19 203:16 205:23 207:6,24 208:1,10 209:3 210:18
prices 126:20
primacy 120:2 189:12
primarily 65:22
primary 188:13 200:6,8,16,17,21 201:1,3,8,13,16 202:1
primary/secondary 200:9 201:7
principal 3:15
principally 98:24
principles 5:24
printed 103:3 177:11
prior 21:23 72:18 117:24,25 153:9
priorities 5:11 7:25 206:17
priority 33:20
private 25:23 59:1 114:17 115:6
privately 30:6
PRN 172:5 173:14 173:21
PRNs 179:7
proactive 114:24
proactively 129:13 129:14 178:3
probability 151:8,9 151:11
probably 6:3 14:24 24:14 51:5 54:12 56:7 74:20 75:16 81:6 85:23 93:19 114:4 123:18 125:17 126:23 138:21 148:21 168:8,14 170:1 181:16 188:14,15 213:9
problem 35:10 36:12,13 53:6 67:17 127:3 146:16 210:21
problematic 85:20
problems 25:1 109:4,4 138:19
procedures 19:2 37:23 39:13 41:25 42:6 63:13
proceed 191:5
proceedings 26:18 76:6 100:6,15 167:9 216:7
process 9:5 21:17 25:11 27:6,7 28:17 29:5 35:8,10 36:12 37:4,9,12,13 38:12 38:13 40:4 41:23 50:24 60:2 62:22 63:19 67:21 69:3 78:15,16 79:25 83:12 85:19 86:9 86:10 87:3 89:6,13 89:17 90:2,25 91:9 94:1 98:16 107:13 137:18 142:7 149:12,20,22 150:8 152:5,10,19 154:3,4,17 156:9 156:16 158:4,7,10 158:11,18 159:4 160:9 163:17 165:10,23 166:8 166:23 175:11 185:24 186:7,11 194:5 199:5
processes 107:19 186:10 194:3
processing 162:1
produce 26:15 151:2,24
produced 198:19 210:10
producers 42:14 57:3 115:7 125:24 151:22
product 107:8,16 125:16 134:18 142:3 147:19,19 159:11,20,21 160:4,24 165:25 168:20 173:20 179:9 182:15 186:15 187:4,15 187:24 188:20,21 188:22 189:5,6 193:8 198:19,22 198:24 199:2,4,9 200:12,21 202:6
production 33:17 38:3 47:18 61:5 63:5 187:23 206:19
productive 148:24 210:7 214:24
products 11:19 12:8 13:2 31:24 42:13 88:13 99:11 101:10,19 102:5,8 106:7,9,11 107:5,7 107:11 113:2 118:3,8 125:13 126:2 129:10,17 137:24 138:2,7 141:7,18,20,21 145:23 148:7 149:16 157:2 166:3 171:23,24 172:1,16 183:12 183:14,16,23 187:2,8,8,12 188:6 188:7 191:23 200:13,14 209:23 211:5 213:20 214:10,11,12
professionals 126:3 126:6,10 206:19 207:12
profits 86:10
profound 99:8
program 1:9 2:4 3:18 5:14 6:6,13 7:9 11:21 13:4 14:19 15:1 16:3,14 42:25 50:18 73:9 75:2 83:10 124:20 127:13,14 131:24 181:15,23 197:7,9 206:3,6 207:6,15 207:21 208:13,17 208:25 209:20
program's 96:1
programs 5:9 6:1,11 14:1 17:5 46:3 50:15 69:1,1,20 73:13 95:16 148:3 179:14 190:2 193:25 207:22 208:2
progress 16:12 31:5 32:23 39:14 45:5 50:20 57:24 69:7 99:6 114:22 161:8 170:14 182:17 195:3,4 205:7,8,9 214:25
progressed 102:20
progressing 50:15 79:11
prohibited 187:8,10 188:5
project 27:14 29:21 29:22 53:18 177:2 177:5,6 192:2
projects 29:20,20 46:25 47:3 188:20 207:2
promotes 24:20
promulgated 16:17
proper 56:9
properly 63:25 116:1 126:4 143:15,15
prophylactic 133:14
prophylactically 133:9
proponents 63:24
proposal 62:6 63:10 64:9 82:11 83:8,24 191:15
proposals 211:19,20
proposed 80:17 150:8 154:4 169:25 196:11 198:9,11
proposing 84:3 150:18,19 154:17 173:19 186:2
prospectively 161:11
protect 3:3 9:8 63:21 64:7 73:20 86:20 112:3
protection 1:6 15:13 15:16 16:17 30:22 32:2,22 33:21,24 34:5 35:21 37:2 42:13 49:4 51:17 52:5,13,19 53:2,11 53:19 58:14 61:17 62:11,16 64:3,18 65:19 68:25 98:10 146:23 193:23 195:14 205:23 206:1,11 207:10 209:15 214:14,15

protective 180:14 213:23 214:21
protects 193:5
protozoan 67:18
proud 41:1
provide 21:2,24 23:20 26:11 34:12 40:3 42:5 50:4,5,7 55:1 63:8,13,16,17 71:17 73:22 77:19 88:10 93:3 99:10 101:25 115:3 119:14 130:19 137:21 149:12 154:11 156:14 167:23 194:4 196:24 197:10
provided 21:24 28:2 40:2 75:9 112:19 159:4 168:11 184:21 186:13 197:8 216:5
provides 21:16 23:21 197:13
providing 206:8
provision 192:6,12
provisions 191:8
proximity 124:13
PTO 152:19 153:7
public 2:15,23 3:3,9 3:23 8:21 9:20,24 16:21 17:6,19 18:16,16 21:14,15 21:17,21,24 22:4 29:10 35:24,24 37:15 39:8 40:24 40:25 44:5 59:7 66:2 77:10 78:9 83:12,15 84:19,22 85:5 88:11 89:14 89:15 93:14 95:19 95:22 152:18 158:7,9,10,11 159:2 169:20 171:14 177:7,14 177:16 180:14 193:10,10 195:5,6 196:13,16,19 207:12 212:1
public's 23:2
public-related 207:13
publications 153:8
publicly 158:6 182:4
publish 21:20
published 21:22 22:8 31:20 82:8 148:4
pull 132:12
pulled 104:3
pulling 167:22
pumpkins 104:11
purchase 106:6 117:24
purchases 101:22 105:21
purchasing 121:20
Purdue 147:25
pure 65:6 98:16
purgatory 209:4,5
purpose 27:13 29:19 36:19
purposes 139:13
pursuing 58:13 141:19
put 4:15 7:23 9:18 14:24 15:25 17:22 27:15 30:23 46:3 51:8 62:7 63:11,17 65:11 74:8 80:21 83:7 89:14 91:4 96:14 112:17 113:4 114:16 125:17 130:12 139:11 140:20 143:1,8 193:5 204:12 208:22 209:3 214:13
puts 5:22 86:25 181:16
putting 3:2 42:18 44:2 68:4 90:24 142:18 198:7
puzzle 53:2 62:17 118:4
pyrethroids 173:6

Q

Quade 216:3,15
qualified 175:11
qualitative 156:21
qualitatively 154:16
quality 93:21 98:10 153:18,22 163:24
quantification 119:8 157:7
quantified 127:4
quantify 119:12 130:14 137:11
quantifying 104:4
quantitative 151:20 156:6,21 157:4
quantitatively 153:6 153:13 154:16 166:22
quarterly 203:16
question 28:24 48:24 58:1,8 59:9 60:6 66:4,7,24 69:12 71:7 74:10 76:16 80:4 83:6 84:7 85:8,8 87:12 87:13 94:24 96:24 108:11 110:2,25 119:6 120:9,22 121:15 127:19 129:19,21,22 130:8 131:12 133:5 139:22 142:12 143:13 147:23 149:18 162:4 163:17 165:22 170:15 172:8,15 176:5 178:3 179:10 182:20 184:2 186:23 187:21 188:18 209:15 212:23 213:8
questions 16:8 22:19 25:25 27:23 28:18 30:2 33:3 48:12 51:1,14 54:25,25 58:8 59:17 60:15 65:22 65:23 67:23 69:25 71:25 75:10,11,15 75:25 76:21 77:3 77:18 78:23 79:3,4 79:15 81:18 87:7 89:15 90:20 91:8 108:9 109:14 110:23 115:4 130:14,23 134:2 139:23 150:10 158:23,25 163:5 168:10 170:8 171:16,19 176:21 182:10 183:6 208:3,9 210:17 211:22
questions/comme... 168:22
quick 54:18 74:8 137:1 159:1 162:4 205:24 209:14
quicker 180:13
quickly 17:11 76:21 102:12 138:22 149:1 191:9,11 200:10
quite 5:8,10 7:5 9:12 56:15 97:2 114:22 159:16 161:9

R

R 2:1
R292 197:1
race 24:21
Rachel 12:7
radio 44:3,6
radius 72:17
raise 61:18 191:16
raised 121:7 196:5
raising 55:6
ramping 102:11
random 49:19
range 203:10
ranging 89:22
rapidly 102:12,21
rare 151:3,17 163:6 163:16
rate 203:5
rates 51:18 135:14
rating 47:10
rationale 165:18
raw 50:5 84:20
Ray 54:20
RD 202:7 208:5
re-authorization 81:8
re-authorize 16:14
re-authorized 81:15
re-competed 207:18
re-emphasize 90:22
re-evaluation 75:1 79:8 80:2 84:14 167:15 168:20 169:11
re-registration 83:11
Reabe 11:3,3 60:24 125:7 146:9 147:15 165:22 166:12,25
reach 22:20 23:19 27:24 30:5 62:14 117:8 168:15
reached 44:11,13,14 44:15 59:23
reaching 43:8 44:3 72:20 105:15
reaction 123:1
reactions 159:1
read 18:22 112:11 122:21 185:8,11 185:11
readily 152:18
reading 28:3 77:3 178:11 179:1
ready 132:13,18 147:18 184:22
ready-to-use 181:23
real 137:1 138:23 139:15 176:16

178:25
realism 7:12
realize 87:5
really 2:17 3:17 4:8 5:4 6:18 7:20 15:1 16:23 17:10 26:7 31:15 32:3,25 33:7 33:22 39:24 41:1,2 41:7,10 42:1,2,7 43:12,24 44:8 45:2 45:12 47:11,21 48:6 49:22 50:11 52:15 53:16 54:23 59:19,20 60:7,17 60:20 66:20 72:20 73:9 74:2 80:19 84:4,16 85:19 86:17,18 87:2 92:24,25 103:23 109:23 122:6,9,12 122:13 123:4 125:8,23 126:6,24 135:10,11 138:2 142:20 143:23 144:1,7,14 146:9 155:24 156:11 158:15 162:1 163:10,15 164:23 170:12,14 172:5 172:17 173:10 176:2 180:7 181:14 185:25 212:5,21 213:24 214:25
realm 196:17 197:20
realtime 140:23
reappointed 24:6
reason 23:7
reasonable 51:9 139:14 153:10
reasonably 151:12
reasons 179:18 194:10 212:16 213:2
reauthorization 190:12,19
reauthorize 190:9
reauthorized 210:19
recall 30:23
receipt 77:24
receive 40:20 43:23 87:19 93:4 153:5 199:25 200:1,20
received 16:22 72:10 77:21,23 78:25 84:1 85:4 87:14 88:3 89:1,4 89:22 90:2 92:10 95:9,12 97:8 139:12 162:11 170:19,22 196:4 201:1,7,12,15,25 204:9,19,23
receiving 79:22 119:24 192:23 204:8
receptive 174:17
receptor 143:2,4
recertification 115:15 116:14 132:16
recess 76:5 99:18 167:8
recognize 33:19 55:19 91:6 105:1 110:15
recognized 33:12
recognizing 75:11 101:18
recommend 37:9 118:2
recommendation 30:24 31:8 34:13 34:22 35:20 54:23 58:22 74:23 89:21
recommendations 26:11 27:1 31:6,9 58:5 66:11 197:10
reconcile 191:4
reconvene 99:14 167:5
record 55:5 176:3 180:4
recorded 102:20 109:16
recording 17:21 113:6
recordkeeping 113:3,3 114:18 147:7
records 107:7 141:7
red 18:5
rediscoveries 175:9
reduce 36:19,21 42:3,21 54:8 71:4 80:24 101:17 104:25 129:23
reduced 57:15 161:21 197:7,12 197:15 216:4
reducing 33:2 106:16
reduction 34:7 45:6 57:15,20 71:4 80:24 118:18 155:5,5 161:17
refer 35:24
referenced 98:8
referred 208:13
referring 80:7 95:3 142:17
refined 78:16
refinements 78:14
reflect 196:12
reflected 47:1,2 53:24 85:2
reflecting 205:18
reflection 48:1
reflects 134:10
reform 16:21
refrain 24:18 100:9
reframe 52:13
reg 83:10,15 90:2,9 194:15,18,19
regard 84:19 161:13 168:19 175:18
regarding 30:21 31:13 32:8,13 33:13 40:4 66:4 82:10 85:19 107:7 126:15 167:14 177:4
regardless 24:21 125:22
regards 61:16 126:16 128:2
region 14:3 145:17
regional 38:1 49:10 49:11,12,14,24 71:14
regions 71:16
register 21:21,22 27:8 187:7,9,12,15
registered 65:5 74:11,12 102:4,5,9 103:10 111:15,16 111:20 121:21 134:10,11,19 139:2 155:20,21 159:8 174:16 191:24
registering 27:8
registrant 107:18 117:6 131:14,21 181:12 199:11 205:20 212:13 214:8
registrant-provided 128:18
registrants 106:4 107:13 114:14 133:21 145:22 148:25 164:1 172:14 174:3 177:3 179:17,22 181:6 183:10,25 191:22
registrants' 141:4
registration 12:8 15:12 16:3,12 18:18 30:19 79:12 79:18 81:10,19 100:20,21 133:20 133:22 142:7 143:9 145:1 148:12 155:23 160:2,8 171:14 173:17,18 175:2 176:6 187:22 192:22,25 193:22 214:10
registrations 106:1 128:23 134:18 148:11
registry 147:11
regulate 116:18
regulates 98:22
regulating 213:22
regulation 4:20 13:19 40:8 115:9 155:18 206:22
regulations 3:3 5:3 5:3
regulators 113:13
regulatory 4:7 6:13 6:17 9:5 11:17 13:17 15:24 16:20 62:1 63:23 84:15 94:18 99:9 101:13 104:21,23 116:24 141:12 168:16 202:6
reinforce 113:7
reinforcements 167:12
rejected 97:4 212:16
relabel 107:17
related 45:6,19 58:15 60:6 62:10 62:17 70:6 87:18 91:15 105:12 166:18 200:15 216:6
relating 69:21,21 70:22
relationship 116:20
relative 16:22 79:11 100:23 112:18 216:8
relatively 57:9,10 70:9 112:23 170:22 171:5
release 6:2 158:6 169:25

released 7:7 77:9 169:20 212:15
relevance 154:20
relevancy 154:21
relevant 9:2 153:16 154:10 155:2,4,8,9 155:14,16,22,25 162:25
reliably 157:22
religion 24:22
reluctance 100:12
rely 38:9 135:3
relying 5:12 32:21
remain 82:3 177:12
remaining 80:16
remains 6:6 85:22 181:14 208:18
remand 87:14,20 88:18 96:25
remarks 9:17
remedy 104:18
remember 18:5 36:24 93:11 125:2 161:4 170:23
remind 15:8 64:19 100:7,13
reminded 135:17 145:21
reminder 215:1
removed 82:25
removes 192:12
renew 20:12 29:17 143:9 144:25
rep 40:9 49:14
repeated 65:17
repetition 124:23,25
replaced 193:1
report 15:13 17:5 26:23 34:14 54:14 66:21 81:17 85:4 95:10,21 133:22 134:21 138:18 194:22 205:16
reported 29:23 102:15 103:11,12 103:15,19,25 104:7,19 109:24 111:17,22 112:24 113:14 124:2,11 124:15 134:13 139:10 141:13 162:15
reporting 81:9 123:23 154:7 157:15 175:24 176:7,7 180:15,18 181:3 194:13,15 194:19 195:3,12 195:17 203:18
reports 20:9 26:16 81:14 113:12 119:7 120:18 121:3 131:4 133:6 208:14,15
represent 10:3 13:5 19:13 20:25 21:8 23:16 25:9 61:24 64:4 69:19 103:15 152:25 183:10
representative 21:1 21:2,11 71:16 208:4
representatives 49:11 71:15 104:3 190:20
represented 9:3 20:18,22 103:21 183:17
representing 11:1,5 11:7,23 12:1,5,11 12:17 13:2,9,14,23 21:12,13
represents 101:6
reproduction 135:14
reps 49:24
reputation 6:5
request 77:24 87:14 87:19,20 97:1,3,5 97:5,8 165:15 200:20 203:17
requested 198:12
requesting 121:12
requests 88:3 96:25 170:19 201:24 202:8 211:19
require 117:24 131:12,13 141:2 142:2 209:7
required 27:17 116:4 128:3 133:21 141:8 165:24 192:24 198:2 214:4
requirement 21:21 23:10 24:24 107:6 110:10,12,13,16 110:19 113:6 128:6,7,7,15 129:3 130:23 145:14 147:8 195:9,13
requirements 22:10 27:4,18,19 105:20 106:13,14 113:4 115:21 128:11 183:22 193:9 194:14,14,16
requires 19:1 20:4 20:14 21:13 192:7
requiring 34:2 106:25
research 4:1,13,15 4:16,19,20,21 27:11 29:20,22 40:13 91:21,23 92:3 151:13 152:12 174:24
resembles 198:2
reserved 16:7 167:19
residential 82:25 104:12 121:23 171:24
residual 43:18
resistance 101:20 125:24 133:6,10 133:12,18,20,22 133:24 160:13 166:20 171:11,25 172:22 173:3,25 174:7 175:20 176:1,7,10,12
resistant 80:25 176:3
resolution 77:4 82:15 83:4 190:6 190:16
resolve 84:11,12
resolved 82:17
resoundingly 97:24
resource 7:13
resources 27:22 28:12 47:13 101:12 196:9 206:11
respect 77:21 78:7 98:4 174:7,19
respond 72:1 93:2 184:1
responded 98:24
responding 210:11
response 30:3 48:25 55:2 76:9,23 77:23 78:12 79:6,16 81:20 97:15 122:25 168:24 169:2 171:9 186:18 189:20 206:24 211:23
responses 40:21 48:14,17,21 66:1,3 123:7
responsibilities 23:4
responsibility 6:24 100:14
responsible 12:18 40:8 72:3 206:5
rest 108:4 183:24
restrict 31:24 145:15
restricted 106:5 107:4 113:2 115:20 118:2 141:5,20,21
restricting 32:15
restriction 145:10 145:11
restrictions 51:19 80:12 106:15 107:3 140:3,7,8,8 140:14 147:4
result 33:1 55:16 57:14 82:11 89:14 155:6 161:7,16,21 173:4
resulted 158:1
results 39:7 48:3,3 48:14 49:8 53:25 56:14 65:19 68:14 138:25
Retailers 11:8
retested 43:24
Reuben 100:18 110:22 112:16,20 113:1,10 120:23 121:2 133:4 142:16 148:21 149:5
reverses 173:2
review 14:22 23:9 23:12 35:11 36:24 61:3 79:12,18 81:11,19 82:7 83:10,15 84:6 90:2 90:9 151:14 153:22 154:20 169:20 173:17 194:3,11,15,18,19 195:4 196:14 199:6 213:25
reviewed 36:25 37:17 188:12
reviewing 82:22 192:24
reviews 79:22 196:10
revise 95:18
revised 84:25 89:2 105:25 113:11
revising 87:9
revisions 197:19
revisiting 44:24
revoke 82:11 98:15
Rich 180:19
Richard 11:9 87:5,6

89:11 90:19 96:17 97:13 117:17 118:24 119:20 120:17 130:5 133:3 134:1 138:13 139:18 142:14 143:17
richness 61:9
Rick 6:4,9,10 7:6,21 8:8,12 9:25 31:7 55:3 58:1 64:14 73:5 80:1 100:24 212:3
right 2:12 3:8 4:12 4:25 5:5,5 10:11 22:21 26:13 30:8 30:12,15,17 35:18 53:13 67:8 68:17 71:10 73:10 75:17 75:20 79:7 81:4 87:17 88:1,25 91:16 96:2 97:16 97:18 99:15 109:8 109:21 113:13,15 116:12 122:3 125:5 128:21 131:19 134:11 142:24 147:2 162:19 166:14 167:22,24 168:3,8 169:5 173:14 176:18,24 178:10 178:18 181:4,24 186:9,11 188:14 188:17 189:15,23 199:2 201:21 204:17 212:10 213:1,25
rights 25:15
rigor 157:4
RISE 12:18
risk 3:17 42:9 52:9 52:24 55:4 82:8 83:20 84:25 89:2 92:19,20 95:18 98:25 99:6 106:23 129:9 146:1 149:20 150:24 151:5 152:8,24 153:6,13,20,24 154:1,11,21 155:9 156:5,7,7,22 157:8 157:18 158:2 159:14 161:20,21 163:1 164:25 165:23,25 166:1,3 166:7,11,13 168:21 169:6 172:22 175:3 197:7,12,15 198:14 212:14,18
risk-based 151:7
risks 52:6 58:15 138:5 166:23
river 93:20 208:16
road 177:15 194:21
robust 4:20 7:23 100:17 110:7 215:3
Rochelle 158:20
role 6:22 48:10 100:14 101:16
roles 15:9 23:3
roll 81:5 182:3
rollout 110:3
room 10:10 17:25 19:11 20:20 29:15 30:1 59:13 61:14 69:18 98:2 101:3
root 105:11 124:5 141:17
rose 31:4 39:16,20 39:22 51:3 53:12 55:20 65:23 67:1,9 71:15 105:6
roughly 59:2
round 90:9 122:5 135:21
RoundUp 146:15 147:16,18
RoundUp-ready 146:20
routine 165:10,16
row 42:17,17
rule 5:11 16:17,18
rulemaking 193:8 193:13
rules 16:23 17:2 28:23 86:7,23 215:3
ruling 198:25
run 189:21 209:1
running 20:13 30:9 30:16 75:22
runs 28:25
RUP 117:21
rush 179:19
Rutgers 14:20

S

S 2:1
S.C 12:8
safe 122:20,20
safener 198:8
safeners 198:1,1,2
safer 94:10 99:11
safety 2:9 10:17 13:6 132:10 193:24 195:15 206:6,7,8 207:6,20 208:21
sake 204:21 207:3
Sally 216:3,15
Sands 3:12 8:18,20 8:22
Sanson 11:16,16 57:22 110:22 111:8,11,23 175:21 182:22 183:18 184:1 186:4
SAP 83:18,22 85:3 202:5
SAP's 89:21
SAPs 84:25
sat 56:3
satisfies 90:21
Savinelli 59:14,14
Savinelli's 51:6
saw 7:6 170:8
saying 10:9 69:6 89:20 97:4
says 77:9,15 159:10 169:5 171:19,23 214:21
scale 33:11 35:10
Schaible 189:25 190:3 209:6
schedule 8:2 23:23 30:9,16 35:1 78:20 79:13 193:12
schedules 194:23
schematic 156:12
School 11:10
Schultz 14:9 76:8
science 4:12 5:21 12:1 13:16,19 16:3 82:2,4 83:17,21 84:2 85:21,24 86:9 86:22,22 90:4 96:8 96:13,19 99:2,10 144:14,22 148:5 212:10,23 213:25
scientific 4:13,19 5:12 82:14 83:4 91:19 92:12 95:10 151:19 152:13 164:23 165:18
scientists 21:9 95:16 101:9 104:8,17 109:20 113:20 130:10 144:15 148:14
scope 32:14,20 34:1 154:8
score 211:21
scratch 132:3
screen 18:23 199:6 199:10
scripting 210:16
seal 201:23 205:13
seals 202:4 205:15 205:18
search 154:7 177:19
searchable 177:13 179:23
season 15:25 101:18 101:23 102:2,11 102:20 103:20 105:1,22,24 107:10,15,23 108:2,7 110:14 112:2 117:4 119:17 128:6 132:13 140:13 143:10 144:6,11 145:1
seasonal 206:9
seasons 144:11
second 87:13,18 154:7,20 155:1 163:17 164:16 171:22 172:15 206:10,23 213:11
secondary 200:9,18 202:1
sections 178:7
security 3:6 9:9 99:15
see 2:4,12 9:21 15:18 16:25 18:5 19:6 21:17,17 32:25 35:16 36:11 41:18 43:24 44:25 50:15 51:13,14 54:19,20 56:1 57:4 57:4,6,12,16,20,25 67:17,22 68:12,14 68:19 69:11,17,24 70:3 76:21 90:3 92:18 111:12 123:7 124:4 126:12,20 129:9 129:15,24 130:10 135:22 140:13 143:2,7 144:17 156:1,16 159:5 163:11 164:3 166:10 199:23 202:13,19 205:4 211:8 215:4
seed 42:22 52:7 65:6 74:12,12,15 101:22 105:21 169:22

seeds 112:6 120:21 169:17
seeing 45:6,25 46:18 55:17 56:13 155:11 160:15 171:5 211:24
seek 95:18
seen 24:25 67:4 70:14,21,25 93:17 98:25 136:4 159:25 192:9
segregating 183:4
select 43:17
selected 151:23
self-reporting 138:17
Selvaggio 12:24,24 65:14,14 69:14 77:2 119:1 145:3 163:4 165:6
Senate 190:22,22,25 191:2
send 23:11 164:13
senior 84:15
sense 35:25 60:10 98:12,16,18 164:9 176:4
sensitive 53:15 70:10 104:13 106:25 112:18 122:2 144:19 147:5,10
sensitivity 121:25 143:3
sensor 14:1 142:2,18
sent 16:4 49:19 69:5
sentence 169:9
separate 21:5 159:11 166:3,14 183:18,24,25 186:10,12 193:15 208:13
separately 98:8
September 6:10 190:6,15 205:13
series 104:17
serious 99:1 126:23 127:3
serve 9:4 20:16 24:1 24:2,3
service 8:24 14:10 30:7 44:5 87:24,24 193:22
services 11:1 32:17 38:4 78:3 88:7,8,9 88:12,14,16 93:22
serving 9:14 207:11 208:6
session 15:13 18:16 75:25 76:16,16 100:1 149:11 150:16
sessions 18:17
set 19:1 36:13 37:23 58:18 138:21 183:22 198:2,17 201:19
set-aside 192:15 193:1,2,7,15 205:23 207:5,15
set-asides 193:23
sets 157:15,16
setting 20:3 206:17
settlement 77:5
seven-year 190:18 193:3
sex 24:22
sexual 24:23
SFIREG 40:12 49:9 49:10,14,22,24 71:10,11,13 75:15
SGEs 21:5
share 138:24 148:16 200:16 212:4,5
shared 193:18
sharing 159:3
Sharon 12:24 61:23 64:12 65:9,13,14 71:25 76:24 77:1 115:2 117:16 118:24 138:13 143:11 145:2 163:3
she'll 27:24
shelves 94:14
Sheryl 10:12
shooting 199:22
short 143:25 161:8
show 120:25 121:24 156:10 171:19 213:7
show-ready 181:14
showed 17:15 139:5
showing 18:21 82:19 203:14 205:6
shown 153:25
shows 156:11 164:14
shrubs 104:12 119:3
SHULTZ 14:9,12 76:12
shutdown 209:3
side 17:23 147:8 193:22 199:19,21 212:10
sides 84:2 89:25
sign 18:18 212:1
signature 191:6
signed 17:20
significance 154:13
significant 52:18 74:13 101:12 115:22 117:21,22 126:20 156:2,4 173:2,7 181:22 193:10 205:17 212:8
significantly 105:25 151:2
signs 121:18
similar 123:7 137:24 199:3,7
similarity 199:1,5 199:15
simple 212:19
simpler 178:23
simply 63:24 169:12
single 19:2 52:7 55:5 149:19 150:25 214:12
sit 9:21 129:21
site 28:7 107:1 147:9
sites 61:5,6,10,11 147:9 172:19,19
sits 99:4
sitting 44:15,17 94:8
situation 41:15 101:12 147:11 174:1
situations 185:3
size 113:15
Skee 171:13
skeptical 71:3
skipped 122:7 146:7
slew 198:8
slide 40:4 41:9 42:24 44:20 45:5 47:5 48:15,22 49:7 50:9 50:9,10,25 104:1 104:15 105:23 110:25 111:11 113:10 119:2 120:8 123:9 124:9 156:10 161:25 162:5 202:10,12 203:4 204:7 205:22 207:1
slides 35:16 101:24 102:25 103:1,2 152:10 154:22
slight 29:14,25 175:9
slightly 107:19 199:23
small 27:12,15 29:12 36:8 162:21 162:24 170:22 171:5 191:24 199:25 200:4
smaller 132:24 192:10,10
smart 177:5,6 179:3 179:21 180:20
SmartLabel 176:22 180:23 181:10 182:22
Smith 11:25 212:2,3
smoking 96:19,22
Society 12:1 13:11 13:11 144:15,23 148:5
soil 125:22 126:15 127:22
solicited 183:9
soliciting 83:12
solitary 55:7,10,15
solutions 12:20 101:5,15 105:4
somebody 41:13,19 66:25 69:13 87:15 163:19
songbird 52:8
soon 103:7,24
sooner 87:6
sophisticated 59:7
sorghum 74:13
sorry 14:12 27:21 93:3 104:15 113:9 122:7 146:25 155:2 167:16 170:10 189:2
sort 75:2,10 79:24 80:13 112:7 143:16 148:5 160:6 164:9 170:23 179:11 190:7 191:20 192:23 194:17 202:11 204:18 205:7 209:16
sorts 122:11 138:19 166:20 173:9
sought 95:15
sound 4:23 5:23 6:20 12:19 162:14
sounding 55:4
sounds 143:17
source 68:20 207:12
sources 47:3
South 1:18 138:20
southern 102:22
soybean 101:11 102:4,10 103:10 103:11 104:5,7,9

108:1 119:12 127:2 128:23 136:8,19 140:4,5 173:5,8 174:11
soybeans 103:14 105:19 106:2 113:11 120:19 121:6 122:1 126:17 130:9,11 146:14 174:8,10
space 168:17
spaces 167:18
span 202:6
Spanish 44:5,6 178:8,9
Spanish-speaking 178:15
speak 17:23 23:13 25:25 26:7 56:25 59:13 86:14 94:15 100:12 115:9 116:12,23 128:19 181:19 183:5
speaker 30:15
speaking 18:10 93:12 94:9
speaks 202:10
special 21:4,5 187:22
specialist 13:4
specialists 21:9
Specialty 11:19
species 13:15 55:7 61:9 88:3 98:7 151:14 152:2 164:17,17 192:21
specific 20:14 27:13 27:14 29:8,18 36:3 36:5 37:8 62:14,14 79:14 82:16 84:16 94:25 110:12,19 129:2,10 138:6 140:3,7 145:15,16 145:17 152:2 177:25 183:23 212:25 214:4
specifically 31:13,23 38:3 52:25 53:4,11 60:6 84:10 119:11 130:11,16 150:8 152:16 157:17 159:18
specified 192:16 194:25 198:5
speed 106:17 140:7
spend 75:12 191:9 192:11
spending 3:10
spent 4:6 101:2,3 148:21 158:17,21 192:8,8
spilled 93:20
spoke 194:24
spoken 45:21 70:11
spot 9:18 167:21 168:2
spray 80:23 129:16 130:3 145:9 146:4
sprayer 106:21
spreading 102:23
spreadsheet 68:23 69:4
spring 125:14 126:14
staff 6:5 7:22 15:23 24:16 25:8 26:13 26:14 27:1 28:24 101:1 148:21 161:3 173:17 203:2,15 214:9,13
staffer 4:9
stages 194:17,19 204:16
stakeholder 6:16 10:4 44:21 59:22 68:13 73:2 78:11 78:11 203:16
stakeholders 6:21 9:2 32:6 33:20,25 36:9 37:19 38:10 38:12 39:14 44:11 44:23 59:21 60:1,4 60:13,18,19,21 63:20 75:1 88:4 109:19 175:17 195:18 198:12
stall 168:9
Stan 12:14 28:20 56:2 57:21 58:24 58:25
standard 37:23 39:12 41:25 42:6 63:12 127:22 134:24 148:10 153:5,5,17 175:4
standards 153:14,14
stands 22:15 40:10 40:12
start 10:11 15:3 17:10 57:17,19 58:9 62:23 75:24 76:15,17,24 79:17 81:23 99:15,16 132:2 171:6 173:10 187:17 203:17
started 31:15 118:17 120:21 124:20 180:19
starting 57:12 117:3 120:24 188:20 200:25 215:2
starts 194:18
state 3:24 6:17 13:5 35:9 37:4,5 38:8 38:19 40:5,6,12 41:3,6,21 43:1,3 44:15 45:8 46:11 46:16,17 47:6,10 47:15,17,18 48:4,6 48:10,25 49:3,17 51:19 52:5 53:17 53:21 54:1,13 56:12 57:1 60:2,4 60:17,17 64:3 66:2 66:2,9 67:14 69:6 70:8,11 71:15,19 71:24 72:11,19,20 74:14 96:18 101:8 102:15 103:13,15 104:3,7,16 106:14 109:19,24 110:6 110:12 111:2,19 113:13 114:11 115:8 116:10,24 117:6 120:1,4 121:12 128:7,8,13 128:17 130:18 131:5,19,21 132:7 141:8 145:17 147:11 148:24 173:6 184:14 185:2,13 188:8,10 188:24 189:7,9,15 206:13 207:21
state's 41:5
state-by-state 66:22 69:11
state-specific 106:12
stated 36:14 97:2
statement 110:9 128:3,4 132:21 180:24 213:19
statements 90:18 187:6
states 1:5 13:12 20:5 32:1,3,21 33:9,15 33:16,17,19,23 34:3 36:18 37:1,12 38:2,20 39:1,1 40:20 41:1,11 42:1 42:4,16,19,25 44:8 44:21,22 45:9,20 45:21 46:12,13 47:12 48:2,18 49:15 50:21 51:22 53:23 54:6 55:21 56:25 59:23 60:19 62:1,15 63:2,4,8 63:13,15,17 64:4 65:17,20 66:7 67:14 68:5,22 71:18 73:12,13 102:22 103:9,10 104:21 110:11,13 110:15,18 111:14 111:20,22 112:20 112:21,23 114:12 116:2,6 123:13,16 124:6 126:18 128:5,22 130:13 130:23,24 131:1,3 131:11,22,23 132:2,19,25 133:2 134:8,9,10,12,12 134:17,18 141:22 143:6 144:16 145:14 148:23 149:3 155:20 184:5,9 185:7,18 185:24,25 188:1,2 188:3,6 189:12 194:2 195:7
station 167:20
statistical 154:12
statistically 156:1,3
statistics 50:7 200:4
stats 50:3
status 24:15 76:17 79:18 80:15 169:1 184:5 203:25 204:5
statute 16:13 79:13
statutes 98:16
stay 186:11
stemming 102:18
step 38:14,21 40:5 49:7 58:13 59:18 73:10 74:21 78:3 83:13 88:9 92:16 154:18,23 156:2 180:22 188:25 189:9
stepping 2:14 49:22
steps 38:14,15 65:12 88:21 112:3 150:9 155:24 156:12 158:3
Steve 11:18 189:25 211:25
stewards 118:7
stewardship 173:20
stickler 6:23 7:4
stock 77:5
stole 3:16 110:23

stood 179:6
stop 90:5
story 126:14 135:12 135:14 203:15
straight-out 211:13
strategic 7:7,8 49:21
strategies 161:13
strategy 31:17,20 35:23 37:13 129:14
streamline 194:3
strength 5:15 96:1
stress 6:15 7:5,6 8:9 45:11 115:12
strive 7:1
strong 3:17 5:1,6,25 6:6 42:2
stronger 211:8
strongest 5:12
strongly 211:16 212:6
structured 177:8,10 179:23
structuring 33:9
struggle 98:11
studies 4:22 5:1,6,15 27:11 84:10,11,17 84:24 156:22 157:2 158:1 160:17,19 170:24 171:4
study 23:9 61:1,7,15 82:1 95:2 122:14 136:6 165:15
studying 35:2 61:4 91:25
stuff 66:12 140:24 163:25
subcommittee 27:5 29:9
subcommittees 26:20,22,23,25 27:3,19
subject 27:20 153:13 206:18
sublethal 54:9
submission 204:12
submissions 103:3 204:19,20,23 205:11
submit 170:25 199:4 199:16 200:10 205:13
submitted 49:16 87:23 153:2 155:23 157:17 163:19 175:22,25 191:25 200:5
submitting 171:1 203:20 205:5,21
subsequent 16:21 89:3 133:15
subset 60:14
Substances 14:4
substantial 199:1
substantially 199:3 199:7
substantiated 91:22
substantive 92:18 96:5
success 32:3 52:4 107:24 108:6,12 108:20 109:3,9 112:25 118:13 129:20,22,25 134:3,23
successful 63:21 181:22
successfully 136:12
sudden 85:21 86:7
suddenly 212:18
sued 5:8,9
suffering 173:2
sufficient 89:25 154:1
sufficiently 148:7
suggest 97:24
suggested 85:3 151:17
suggesting 105:11
suggestion 98:1 108:5 142:14 152:11 182:23
suggestions 143:7 143:18,18 144:7
suggests 151:9
suite 98:4
sum 150:21
summarize 16:25 200:10
summarizes 76:19 105:23
summary 112:14 163:7 200:3 205:24
summer 3:10 148:22 183:9
sunrise 106:18 145:11 146:3
sunset 106:19 145:11 146:3
super 123:9
supervision 106:8
supplement 177:22
supplemental 106:1 106:3 137:19 140:16,17 186:6,7 186:13
supplied 132:24
Supply 11:25
supplying 12:20
support 4:20 5:1,13 31:8 32:11 64:2,8 64:9 70:19 74:22 93:8 153:1,3 157:4 184:19 185:7 206:7 207:21
supported 151:15 152:13 153:16 165:3
supporting 153:12 155:25 159:18,19
supportive 114:22 168:16
supports 151:19 207:10 213:22
supposed 35:7 56:20
sure 5:21 7:5 8:7 49:15 52:2,3 56:15 67:14 75:16 76:7 84:13 92:17 93:23 96:7 112:2 115:16 118:9,15 119:3 142:11 163:11 173:16 174:16 175:16 176:12 184:14,14 186:1 187:25
surface 45:24 105:6
surfaced 105:10
surprise 61:7
survey 38:17,20,20 39:5,6,25 40:1,5,9 40:16,21,21 46:11 47:2 48:3,8,13 49:10 50:6 52:2,14 53:25 54:11,13 56:15,24 59:5 61:12,16 62:25 64:9 65:15,20,22 65:25 66:1,8 68:6 68:14 69:25 70:2,4 70:4,17,18 72:22 72:24 74:24 130:7 130:13,14,17,22 132:5 134:14 138:17,17,24,25 139:10 147:8
surveyed 72:23
surveying 56:5,16 56:16,17,19 71:8
SurveyMonkey 50:2
surveys 46:15,16 49:14,19 50:15 54:7 55:25 68:17 70:14,15 71:8
susceptibility 4:2
susceptible 147:5
suspect 97:16
suspected 176:1,7
suspension 146:4
sustainable 51:24
symptomology 121:24
synergistic 149:17 151:16 152:1 155:11 159:10 161:18 163:14 164:4
synergy 7:18 16:2 149:7,13 150:13 150:17 158:16 161:10 164:2,7
Syngenta 59:15
synopsis 101:25
system 18:2 44:25 47:10 48:16,18 80:11 106:21 123:25 131:8 179:12 180:16,22 192:18
systemic 43:19
systems 64:5 181:3

T

table 2:5 9:22 48:22 58:12 86:25 94:8 99:4 116:16 198:10,11
tackle 143:25
tag 167:25 168:7
tag-alongs 200:18
tags 168:5
take 2:16 5:10 15:11 16:9,13 30:10,12 38:15 51:10,11 57:13 59:16 70:16 75:14 87:17 90:6 90:17 91:11 92:14 92:20 118:3 119:15 128:17 133:25 158:23 159:2 164:15 191:20
taken 82:22 99:19 124:18 154:5 182:13
takes 17:16 96:13 176:14
talk 47:8 48:9 50:10 53:13,14 65:7 67:24 68:19 69:10 92:11 125:3 136:1 174:17 190:4,7 191:7 203:20

204:18
talked 45:9,22 83:17 113:10 118:9
talking 39:25 44:17 70:2 73:16 83:6 92:11 93:14 98:23 120:23 134:15 142:17 190:10
talks 173:21 194:22 207:1
tallied 48:14
tandem 88:16 144:22
tank 159:22 160:12 166:17,18
target 36:3 196:19 199:22
targeted 33:15
task 62:4 64:11 73:7
taught 43:18
tax-based 59:2
taxa 155:3,8,8 164:3 164:22
Taylor 11:7,7 94:20 95:1,5 96:10
teach 138:1
teaching 138:5
team 3:8,19 6:9 7:21 8:12 10:1 17:12 81:22 158:16 208:23
tech 18:2
technical 5:22 109:14 157:4 172:21 199:6 200:12
techniques 51:25
technologies 133:14 138:5
technology 102:6,8 105:2 115:23 124:22 133:7 134:9,11 138:1 145:20 146:15
teed 74:19
teleconference 18:12 22:11
telephone 28:9
television 44:4
tell 19:9 22:15 79:22 127:10 135:11,14 136:9 140:10
tells 164:25
temperature 105:13 145:13,23,24 146:1,2
ten 71:16 99:13 106:17 158:25
tend 127:16 194:7,7
Tennessee 147:25
tent 17:22 97:25 177:1 211:24
term 24:1,3 27:14 29:13 30:25 163:16
termination 19:20
terminology 150:13
terms 74:21 88:21 111:25 113:15 122:25 123:2,13 133:21 140:19,23 143:19 166:17 174:20 184:5 199:18 202:25 203:2 205:5 210:25
terrific 22:18 27:24
territories 40:18 62:2,15 63:15 195:8
test 66:20 155:17
tested 43:22 155:3,8 155:19 157:19 163:21
testing 152:22 160:20,22,23 170:6 176:1 211:4
Texas 123:24
thank 2:6 3:19 8:15 8:17,23 9:15 10:6 17:12 18:20 19:6 19:12,13 28:15,23 30:6,7 34:25 51:1 51:3 55:2 57:22 60:22 61:24 64:14 67:8 69:14,17 72:9 73:2,5,24 74:4 75:18 77:16,18 79:20 80:1 81:12 83:5,6 85:7,17 90:13,16 91:1,5 94:18 96:10,16 100:16,24,24 109:13 110:20 111:23 114:24 122:3,6 124:7 128:1 130:6 133:4 134:20 135:4,15 135:20 143:10 148:20 149:5 150:3 161:23,24 163:2 167:2,3,4,13 171:18 172:3,7 176:18 177:2 178:19 181:9 189:18 209:14 210:22 212:3 214:24
thankful 95:24
thanks 9:16,20 10:8 14:14 29:7 30:8 34:25 52:16 55:3 58:25 65:8 76:4 97:7 99:12 100:25 108:8 110:22,22 112:14 120:8 125:7 127:5 146:9 160:25 165:22 167:7 170:4 171:10 178:21 179:13 186:19 189:23 209:12 211:25,25 215:5
Thanksgiving 161:5
that's 170:12,23 172:25 173:25 176:5,15 177:14 178:9,17,17 180:6 182:14 189:6,22 195:24 199:22 202:21 203:19 204:1 206:3,13 208:4,9 213:8
themes 37:18 38:5
there's 170:3,23 171:2 172:17 174:19 179:8,8,25 181:13 184:22 192:12,20,21,22 193:3 194:9,24 195:9,16 196:15 197:15,22,24 198:7,21,25 199:24 204:13,15 208:14 211:2,12 213:5,5,19
thing 2:15 6:12 20:22 21:15 47:17 65:3 72:9 91:18 97:23 100:3 123:8 126:24 132:20 134:6 138:20,20 144:12 146:24 184:24 214:7
things 2:7 4:11 7:19 16:11 17:18 20:14 44:9 46:23 49:18 50:19 51:18 63:9 63:11 70:12,23 74:19 79:10 81:9 83:7,10,16 84:5 108:3 115:15 121:10 123:4 124:16,19 130:12 131:11 140:8 143:8 144:18 147:18 150:15 157:5 164:8 166:20 170:11 172:12,20 174:22 175:10 177:23 179:6 185:17 188:3,15 204:10 204:11 208:24 214:5
think 4:17 5:19 6:12 7:3,23 14:5 15:18 17:13 24:14 26:13 31:21 33:12,19 34:16,21 35:6 36:16 40:25 41:7 42:1,14 43:4 44:25 46:25 47:5,20 50:16,25 51:11,17 51:18 52:3 53:2,5 54:3,10,20 56:8 57:12,17,23,23 58:1,2,19 61:14 62:6,11,18,20,24 63:1,10,15 64:3,16 65:10,15 66:22 67:24 69:4 70:14 71:5 73:10,17,22 74:2,19 75:5,9,13 75:19 77:14,14 79:2 82:7,24 85:1 92:24,25 93:14 94:6 96:10,11,22 97:10,10,23 98:25 99:5 108:2,15 110:9 111:2,15,16 113:7 114:5,16 116:6 117:12 120:21 122:12 123:1,9,11,19 124:3,8,18,19,24 125:12,25 126:12 128:19 129:1,22 131:6 132:4,8,21 135:4,7 136:1 137:7 138:2 139:13 142:13,16 142:23 143:6,7,12 144:6,8,9,21,23 145:20 146:21 147:1,20 149:1,2,7 150:10,12 153:21 156:15 158:19 160:19 161:9 162:23,24 163:7 166:16,21 168:18 170:13,15,18 172:13 175:8,13 177:15 178:4 179:21 180:15

181:3,6 182:8,12 182:13 184:3,4,18 185:7,9,18 186:9 188:5,12,14 192:17 196:7,10 198:17 199:11,13 201:18 203:10,13 204:15,21,21 205:3,6,14,15,17 207:3 209:4 210:25 212:6,8,9 212:11,19,21,22 213:8,11,16,18,24 214:14,25
thinking 48:12 50:1 50:14 58:9 78:17 78:18 83:9 84:1 85:19 129:13 133:17 149:24 163:18 177:17
thinks 85:21
third 96:24 182:1
Thostenson 13:3,4 108:11,17 127:8 138:14 172:24 210:1
THOSTENSONL 147:23
thought 15:7 32:10 33:22 34:18 40:19 47:1 51:7 73:8 85:2 170:8 172:20 172:21 182:12 186:8
thoughtful 7:19
thoughts 108:18
three 78:10 79:14 81:22 83:13 87:21 102:5 107:5,13 121:5 124:21 135:21 141:6,21 145:23 166:2 168:13 170:25 203:14
three-year 190:23 193:3
thresholds 151:7
threw 108:20 143:18
throw 86:13
thumbs 80:4
thumbs-down 79:23
thumbs-up 75:2 79:23
tighten 137:18
tightened 143:23 144:5 145:18
Tim 12:10 65:10 69:16 73:4 74:7,19 76:22
time 2:16 8:11 15:7 16:9 19:14 20:7 25:17 26:22,22 30:6 32:18 33:6,8 36:5 42:12 49:20 50:16,17,23 51:11 53:7 57:9 63:1 64:2 68:8 70:1 73:15 75:12 76:3 76:15 77:12 78:1,8 83:9 84:1 85:13 92:21 93:10,25 94:7,7 95:9,11,14 95:15,18,20,21 99:15 107:14 115:12 117:9,11 125:12 138:9,23 139:15 142:19 143:25 147:19 150:3,7 155:22 158:3,18,21,24 167:5 169:23 170:2,23 171:2 173:19 177:8 178:6 181:1 182:3 182:13 185:2,6 191:1,5,9 192:9 194:8,9,24,25 195:2 196:3,5,5,9 196:11 197:11 198:5,17,18 199:16 201:18,19 201:21 205:9,16 207:3,18
time-of-day 145:10
time's 204:21
timeline 37:15
timelines 7:4,10
timely 6:25 101:21 144:2
times 21:7,9 42:7 53:10 54:24 65:24 83:18,22 84:22 94:16 135:23 145:12
timing 116:14 125:19
title 150:16 162:6
tobacco 104:12
today 2:24 8:3,24 10:7 19:11,14 20:1 20:20 21:2,6,15 25:18 26:14,17 30:7 38:14 58:4 99:8 101:1 108:3 134:15 149:22 150:4 158:19 212:12 214:24
today's 64:25 100:6
told 68:7
tolerance-exempt 187:12
tolerances 82:11 98:15 187:3 196:25 197:2,3,5
tolerant 136:19 140:2,4
tomatoes 104:10
tomorrow 8:5 16:15 17:9 25:19 71:2 122:15 125:3 215:1,5
ton 92:6
tool 39:5 48:8 50:6 70:5 101:19 115:23 125:15,23 125:25 127:1 138:17,24 156:15
tools 115:17 141:9 141:13,22 173:24
top 166:9
topic 15:17 30:12 58:4 127:23 149:6 189:23,24
topics 16:5 76:1,3
topography 124:13
total 48:16,21 104:6 113:25 114:4 132:23,24 161:17 204:22,23
totaling 103:13
totally 73:17 172:9
touched 22:2 188:18
touting 94:9
towed 167:21
tox 170:17
toxic 10:23 14:4 31:25 82:20 151:5
toxicity 43:18 151:2 156:8 157:7 213:14,14
toxicological 150:24 151:1,24 153:15 159:8 213:22
toxicologist 83:20
toxicology 165:5 214:3
tracer 141:1
track 7:9,9 14:1 76:14 91:17
tracked 141:7
tracking 46:19 192:18
trade 12:19 13:22 107:17
Trademark 152:19 153:2,9 156:19 157:17
trained 107:11 132:17 136:10 210:12
trainer 127:8,20
trainers 206:8 210:12
training 43:22,23 106:10,13 110:10 112:15,19,21,22 116:3 117:5,6,7,24 122:19 124:20,23 124:25 125:4 126:8 127:11,11 127:13,14,16,17 127:18,21,25 128:3,3,6,8,13,15 128:18 130:23,24 130:25 131:2,2,10 131:14,21,22,23 131:24,25 132:9 136:13,20 137:2 137:25 206:3,6,8 206:21,23 207:23 210:5,10,16
trainings 127:12
transcribed 216:7
transcription 216:4
Transcriptionist 216:1,16
transfer 208:20
transient 157:9
transition 204:8
translated 36:17
transparency 21:16 22:2 27:5,7 65:25 68:16 83:11
transparent 4:24 5:23 40:22,23,25 48:3 50:23
Transportation 43:7
travel 24:9,12,13,15 24:17
traveled 24:13
traveling 54:1
treacherous 26:1
treadmill 51:24 112:8
treated 114:5,8 126:13 127:1 169:16,22 198:14
treatment 65:6 74:15 157:9
treatments 115:25 174:12
trees 104:12 119:3,4
tremendous 98:25

trends 36:3
tribal 11:20 36:14 36:18
tribes 32:1,21 33:9 36:15 37:12 40:18 62:1,15 63:15
tricky 25:24
tried 137:17 211:2
Trossbach 10:24,24 61:24 71:10 115:3 130:6 184:14
trouble 24:11 25:5
troubled 214:17
truck 208:15
true 134:5 135:11
truly 52:4,12 126:9 126:18
Trump 5:20
try 23:19 31:24 35:8 46:11 82:22 90:11 97:20 108:14 118:3,22 130:16 140:24 178:23 180:1
trying 41:3 60:7,9 62:5 80:23 83:22 89:8 90:1,3 95:12 98:6,12 108:12 109:9 112:25 119:13 120:14 121:11 123:2 129:23 130:1,2 135:16,17 142:24 143:20 147:2 161:25 189:1,2
Tucker 12:10,10 73:5
tune 75:16
turn 18:10 34:24 39:16 146:25
turned 97:5
turning 8:8 49:24
TV 44:5
tweeting 100:6,13
twice 79:5
two 2:21 4:4 7:8 8:1 14:6 16:23 17:2 20:11,12 29:17 78:19 87:7,18 97:17 98:12,16 122:5 147:1,7 151:10 161:5 163:20 166:2 168:15 170:11,25 171:6,14,16,18 188:13 191:4 195:1 203:8,9,14 207:25 213:24 215:3
two-part 128:4 143:13
two-year 207:17
type 4:19 19:10 33:18 64:5 75:2 87:10 115:18 118:21 121:16 129:18 132:9 134:6 135:8 140:21 142:2,15 142:18 143:1,4 145:11 146:24 160:19 173:20 183:2 198:19
types 4:12 33:14 47:13,14 50:14 81:10 130:2 138:16 155:14 182:25 183:19 185:17 194:11 196:10
typewriting 216:4
typical 139:5
typically 38:7 152:20 159:25

U

U.S 10:16 14:9 87:23 134:6 152:19 153:6 154:19 156:19 162:7 168:16 196:24 197:2
UC-Davis 206:12
ultimately 154:14 158:1,8 177:7,22 180:21 181:6
um-hmm 69:15 90:10 142:25
umbrella 71:12
unacceptable 104:18 175:4
unacceptably 105:7
unaffected 118:5
unanimous 190:20
unaware 41:20
uncertainty 85:5 92:12
unclear 84:3,10
undercollect 191:18
undercollection 192:4
underemphasize 6:21
underestimate 4:17 103:17
underestimation 109:15
underscore 85:24 92:11
understand 3:21 4:25 7:24 68:7 80:3 85:20 86:8 92:17 95:1 96:12 114:12 115:16 122:17,21 126:4 140:24 142:11 150:14 166:16 181:15 187:3 189:2 211:18
understanding 6:19 32:7 33:7 45:14 56:6 68:3 95:19,20 103:21 123:3 126:8 150:13 159:16 165:4 196:9 198:17
understood 95:21 134:20 150:25 152:20
undertake 137:17
undertaking 101:6 107:13
unexpected 153:7
unexpended 207:25
unfortunately 42:11 59:25 91:7 173:1
uniform 135:3
uniformly 19:3
unintended 167:1
unique 63:9 159:24 160:9
United 1:5 13:12 20:5 126:18 155:20 194:1 195:7
units 116:14
universally 108:24
universe 162:17
universities 144:22 148:25
university 11:10 13:5 14:20 43:9 46:17 61:2 67:17 101:8 104:2,16 109:19 113:19 148:14
unmute 18:14
unmuting 18:13
unresolved 82:3 85:22 86:22
unusual 174:11
up-front 199:12
upcoming 54:25 107:22
update 15:23 16:1 16:11 69:7 78:25 79:5,18 80:15 97:1 100:22 102:1 122:10 149:12,21 167:14 168:10 169:1 170:6 176:19 189:25 190:2 204:13
updated 102:25 111:12 186:13 206:22
updates 8:7 79:14 81:19 186:14
updating 69:3 87:9
upfront 91:13
upgraded 210:10
upsetting 86:18
urban 33:18 44:12 47:15
urge 129:11
urgency 132:14
urgent 206:21
usable 214:2
USDA 10:14 31:20 64:23 101:9 129:12,21
use 31:13 32:15 33:13,18 35:20 38:2 42:3 43:20,20 58:13 63:24,25,25 64:1 68:6 70:18 74:12,12 95:1 98:24 101:10 102:3 105:18,19 105:20 106:5 107:4,7 108:1 113:2 115:17,19 115:20,24 116:1 116:19 118:2,15 119:18 120:15 122:17,20,20 125:16 126:4,5 132:13,18,22 133:16 134:5,10 136:7,7 141:5,6,14 141:15,20,21,23 141:24 143:9 145:1 148:9,10 151:7 153:5,12,14 153:15 161:14 163:15 169:6 171:23 172:19 173:5 179:24 181:4 182:7,19 185:12,16 187:24 188:8,19,21,22 189:5,7,13 192:16 194:4 195:6 197:14 200:12,20 202:8 206:18

211:6 212:17,22 212:25 213:13
useful 45:2 65:16 66:23 70:4 156:15
user 38:8 99:3 176:11 184:21 185:20 212:13
users 41:12,13 43:17 49:1 50:12 68:11 98:6,20 119:24 179:25 184:18
uses 32:19,20 65:5 82:25 102:3,9 103:10 106:2 111:21 121:22,23 136:18,18 140:3 140:15 161:17 169:7 172:2 194:6
usually 29:19 167:23 189:11 195:24
utility 105:1
utilize 8:13 26:22 29:4,24 49:9 72:6
utilized 52:22 85:2
utilizes 19:21
utilizing 121:20

V

valid 129:22
validity 185:10
valuations 5:16
value 4:18 96:2
values 95:22
VaporGrip 102:6,8 112:12
variability 4:3 145:16,16
variety 55:11 188:3 210:4
various 31:14,22 59:24,25 60:18 68:22 69:20 70:21 134:25 178:4,4 179:18
varroa 67:18
vast 39:11
vector 195:6
vector-borne 195:5
vegetables 104:11
vegetation 119:4,5,6
Venn 163:18 164:10
venue 54:15
verified 45:6,7 67:1 70:6
version 111:13 112:10,14 137:21 169:8 190:19 193:3,3,4
versions 145:13 185:1 195:1
versus 36:3 47:17,18 123:23 185:15 204:20
verus 183:1
Veterinary 12:5
viable 47:11
videoconference 22:12
videos 210:5
view 4:15 19:11 20:18,22,25 21:12 24:6 29:3 36:1 85:12 178:24
views 23:14
vineyards 104:11
violation 189:10
violations 189:13
Virginia 1:19 10:25 63:18 131:1 168:4 168:8
visible 121:17,18
vision 181:4,7 182:17
visual 156:16 162:2
vivo 171:4
vocal 2:19,19 7:3
voice 21:25 23:8 209:17 211:8
volatility 105:13 112:1 147:24 148:1,8
volatilization 83:2 145:5,6,9
voluntarily 106:5
voluntary 34:2 38:9 62:15 66:11,19 70:16,17 182:7,19 186:11
volunteering 2:14
volunteers 19:8
vote 28:22 190:25
votes 29:1
voting 29:4 58:3
Vroom 13:21,21 64:14 98:4 113:10 113:22 114:9 161:2 168:12 174:6 208:12 209:2,7,12 210:18 210:22
vulnerable 85:10

W

wait 114:10
waiting 179:21
waiver 170:17
waivers 170:19 191:25 200:1
Wakem 12:4,4
walk 101:24 113:5 156:16
Walter 13:25
want 2:3,7,13,23 3:7 3:14 4:17 6:8,21 7:9 8:9,18 9:17,18 15:17 16:23 17:12 17:23 18:7 23:7,14 24:11 25:21 27:15 28:5 30:20 33:8,25 37:18 39:1,2 44:25 45:18 46:13,23 57:3,4 58:21 59:13 62:3 63:16,21,21 64:10 65:11 68:21 74:8 75:11 76:7 88:22 90:17,22 91:3 92:8 110:19 115:16,25,25 118:14 122:18 129:11 131:13,16 138:9 140:20,23 158:24 162:5 164:1,3 177:16 178:22 186:21 188:19 189:21 191:8,9 195:25 203:20 210:24 212:3
wanted 9:20 32:11 38:11 57:22 65:3 65:14 84:15 98:19 114:3 122:13 123:8 149:12 156:14 161:2,24 162:4 168:12 172:6 184:24 204:18 205:24
wants 30:5 73:19
warrant 152:24 213:25
warranted 82:4 157:25
Washington 3:23 49:13
wasn't 76:10 87:20 108:24 124:22 141:3 142:19 146:19,19 180:4
water 45:24 94:2
watermelon 104:11
waters 26:2
way 8:13 10:1 30:9 35:1 40:18 49:17 51:9 53:3 64:4,24 66:22 67:8 74:19 74:20 79:24 80:10 80:24 85:2 90:21 90:25 98:22 145:19 146:11 148:24 149:13 160:13 175:2 180:20 181:4 186:2 198:6 199:24 200:22 202:11 205:5 212:17
ways 49:5 55:12 89:8 142:13 188:13 194:10
we'll 16:10,25 30:11 30:12 31:1 50:13 51:1,11 74:17 75:24,24 76:1,3,13 76:15,24 99:16 109:4 114:19,20 119:18 132:12 157:13 158:23,25 164:15 167:6,6,13 182:15 190:7 195:2 215:4
we're 3:1,1,2,2,4 5:12 6:25 9:25 10:3 15:2,22 16:2 17:9 19:14 29:1 30:10 40:16,23 44:4,6 48:16,23 49:7,21 50:1,13,14 53:21 55:17 58:7 60:7 63:23 69:3 72:6 75:16,22 80:22 83:14 88:11 88:16,24 89:6 90:1 92:6,11 96:7 98:23 108:12,13 109:8 112:7,13,25 114:22 116:2 117:2 118:21,22 120:13,14 121:1 121:11,11 124:16 125:9 126:9 129:1 130:18,22 131:3 132:13 134:15 135:5,8 137:15 144:6,23 146:10 146:23 149:23 150:6,6,6,8,18,19 154:14,17 155:18 157:5 158:3,13,23 159:1,17,24 160:15 166:8 167:10 171:5 176:11 177:9 181:25 183:20 186:2

we've 15:25 16:1,4,7 17:13 20:2,2 22:2 25:4,4 36:17 39:3 40:16 46:9 51:8 57:11 58:11 67:4 68:7 70:14,21,25 75:19 78:6,10,11 78:13,14,17 83:1 84:20 93:14,17 98:25 108:19 127:22 133:6,12 136:14 151:21 152:11 154:5,21 157:24 158:12,13 159:25 160:21 162:24 172:5 178:10 179:16 192:9 196:12,17 203:14 205:8 210:11,13
wearing 69:22
web 138:17 185:21 186:14
web-distributed 176:22 177:24 178:1 179:4,9,15 179:18,24 180:21 181:17 184:2,6,25 185:19 186:3,7,10
website 22:9 44:3 68:17,24 69:8 103:6 169:8 172:17 182:5 184:9,20 188:10
websites 210:5
weed 12:1 101:8,19 104:8,16 105:21 109:19 113:19 125:24 130:10 144:14,15,22 148:4,14
weed-resistant 105:2
weeds 105:18 172:18
week 130:17
weigh 200:1 213:8
weight 96:21
weights 135:11
welcome 2:3,13,23 8:11,20 19:5,8 25:23 92:13 149:24
welcomed 7:20,20 7:21,21
well-balanced 20:21
well-educated 143:21
well-trained 139:19 139:21 143:15,21
went 4:4 74:6 81:1 83:18 100:8 130:17 163:8,8 175:10 190:22 195:25 205:8 207:7,15
weren't 146:16
wet 125:14,23
what's 212:24 214:18
wheat 74:14
white 4:9 134:7,8
Whittington 10:20 10:20 31:3 34:25 39:20 51:3 52:17 56:23 59:12 75:4 117:18 141:18
wide 89:22
wiggle 30:1
Wildfire 14:10 87:23
willing 63:16 72:6 138:24 185:18
Wilson 13:1,1 186:23 187:1
wind 106:17 140:7
window 101:1
winter 144:11,11
Wisconsin 11:4 60:24 61:2
withdraw 77:4,24 87:21 88:4
withdrawal 88:18
withdrawn 78:1 88:5 97:9,11
wondering 29:11 52:11,13 65:25 66:17 67:6 77:6 79:21 91:23 112:3 112:9 119:1 133:16 145:7 172:1 173:9 180:16
wood 183:15
word 118:15 150:17
wording 75:6
words 112:12 169:12
work 7:13 9:24 14:1 14:2 16:1 18:4 20:8 21:18,18 23:17,23 27:16 28:23 31:5,17 32:1 32:15 36:1 43:13 45:1 59:14 61:16 62:3 63:18 64:16 67:16,25 71:1,14 73:14 80:23 88:17 91:5 92:21 94:22 116:17 120:3 129:2,13 131:18 132:3 137:9,11 144:14,17,21 147:17,25 165:5 168:17,19 169:21 170:12 172:24 173:13 175:20 178:15 180:18 181:10,11,11,12 181:13 182:17 185:25 194:17 196:4 198:7 201:21 210:8 211:1,6
workable 101:5 105:4
worked 3:23 4:1 5:21 24:15 36:15 40:6,11 51:5 70:25 71:22 73:7 137:9 179:14
worker 16:16 193:23 195:14 205:23 206:1,8,10 209:15,17,21 211:9
workers 86:1,2,2,6 86:13 209:17 210:5 211:4 214:16
workgroup 15:14 15:18 17:7 27:17 29:11 30:21,21 31:3,5 34:12,14,17 34:19 35:6,7,7,18 35:19 36:4,7,8 40:6 51:14 54:19 54:23 55:1 58:6,18 58:23 62:3 64:10 64:17 70:2 75:19
workgroup's 74:23
workgroups 9:15 26:22 27:10,13,17 29:15,18
working 3:13 5:17 5:18 6:4 15:14 18:3 27:11,20 29:9 29:24 32:5 33:20 33:24 36:16 41:7 43:5,8 50:21 54:2 72:5 73:13,21 75:15 88:11 89:7 91:4,9 108:18 110:6 116:6,16,24 117:4 120:5 129:1 132:10 145:20 148:22 175:17
works 23:22 67:25 89:18 112:2 118:4
worldwide 172:18
worried 52:6
worrisome 111:25
worst 51:20
worth 57:23 182:14
worthwhile 52:3,15
wouldn't 19:25 24:5 29:21 153:1 165:6
Wow 64:14
WPS 125:3 206:19 206:20
wrap 92:25 118:22 189:1
wrapped 84:16
wrapping 135:8
wrinkles 191:13
writing 29:20 30:24
written 26:15 29:21 98:8
wrong 5:7 212:7
Wynne 171:11,11

X

XtendiMax 102:6 112:12

Y

Yard 1:18
yeah 14:12 60:15 76:10 89:12 110:1 111:8 142:25 164:20 167:3 168:4 174:6 175:21 210:1
year 16:19 30:23,25 34:11,18 57:24 77:22 81:6 86:5 87:19,25 92:1 104:7,14,15 114:6 117:19,19,19,20 117:20,21 118:1 118:13 130:2,2 131:3 139:1 141:4 170:18,18,21 171:6 173:1 179:8 182:7,20 190:11 191:14,16,19,21 193:2,16 199:18 200:7 201:2 202:18 203:2,7,12 203:23 204:24 206:21,24
year's 203:23 204:3
yearly 44:20
years 3:22 4:4,7 20:11,12 29:17

45:3 51:7 57:6 68:1 80:22 82:1,19 85:12 87:11,12 90:6,8 91:4,10 92:6,7 99:7 121:22 124:21 127:9 136:4,11,15,17 161:5 171:1,6,21 172:9 176:9,14 191:18,19 192:3 196:8 197:19 199:20 203:13,14 203:17 207:25 209:2 213:17,18 214:9
yellow 134:12 200:7
yeoman's 95:17
yesterday 17:11 69:4,5 161:4 170:16
yesterday's 17:6
yield 118:18 120:23 135:10,14 155:5
yields 135:7
you're 170:14 174:8 174:14 175:24 176:25 185:11,16 188:14 189:3 196:18 199:2 200:18 208:8
Yu-Ting 79:7,15 80:1 81:21 88:22 167:12,22

Z

zero 124:10 127:15 132:22
zeros 111:14 123:11
Zimmerman 22:16
Zinn 186:20 187:7 188:1,23 189:2,11 189:14,17
zones 83:1
ZTZ8207 168:5

0

1

1 1:13 38:14 205:1
1,048 203:24
1,500,000 207:19
1:15 99:14,16 100:2
10 4:6 68:1 109:2
11:15 75:23 76:1,4
11:50 99:18
115 204:24
12 203:8
12,000 204:23
12:00 99:13
13 40:4
13.5 202:22
145 201:7
148 201:6
15 21:23 106:17
15-minute 18:15
158W 197:19
15th 103:12
16 201:17
163 201:7,8
17 114:21 199:18
18 108:23 143:8 205:25
18-month 63:19
18.265 199:19
186 162:13,15
189 195:20,25
19 50:10 198:10
197 201:13
1972 19:19
1996 98:11
1st 79:12

2

2 14:3 204:14
2,302 203:22
2,708 103:12
2,787 204:2
20 3:22 99:7 197:16 214:9
200 89:4 129:25
200-plus 96:5
2000 82:24
2007 212:16
2009 168:19
2010 202:14
2013 151:14
2014 31:15 179:7 183:9 212:14,17
2015 16:17 31:21 82:8 83:24 149:14 151:21 204:11
2016 36:4 83:25 85:1 86:5 89:1 102:5 114:12,20
2017 1:13 32:14 36:5 102:11,20 103:12,20 107:10 110:14 121:14 128:6 141:11
2018 7:17 15:25 101:18,22 102:2 104:25 105:22 107:15 108:2,7,13 109:10 114:15,20 119:17 120:6 121:14 128:12 132:13,18 138:22 139:14 140:18 143:9 144:4,6,11 144:24 145:19 181:1
2019 145:1
2022 7:4,14 79:12 84:6 87:8
207 139:2
21 127:9 202:23
212 195:25
22 114:5,7 126:25 201:8
220 47:19
22202 1:19
24 36:8
24(c) 110:14 128:6 187:4
24(c)s 110:14
25 103:10 109:1 134:17
25(b) 187:4,7,8 188:5,21
25(b)s 188:4
26 201:4 202:17,20
27.8 191:14 199:22
27.99 199:21
2777 1:17
282 201:3

3

3 40:5 78:3 155:24 190:5,5,14 191:10 192:9,14 194:13 195:20 196:7 197:21 201:19 204:15 205:23
3.6 103:14 113:11 113:18,25 126:16
3:15 167:5
30 48:18 76:13 82:19 87:11 127:1 150:9 171:21 172:9 204:5 213:17,18
30-some 80:18
300 201:1
30th 190:6
31 191:16
338 201:2,4 202:21
34 103:9 128:22 134:17
35 202:15
38.1 202:25
3rd 78:24

4

4 38:14 110:25 113:10 126:17 155:24 162:5 190:12,16 192:3,5 192:12 193:22,22 194:13,18 195:21 197:20 201:18
4,337 55:7
4,500 112:12
40 80:16,17 139:1
42 201:15,16,17
457 80:9
46 205:2
463 204:4

5

5 38:14,21 49:7 75:25 76:16 111:11 123:9 156:2 162:5
5,705 204:25
50 24:14 62:1 108:21 139:5,8
500 129:24
500,000 193:2,16 206:4,14 207:5,24
521 203:24
53 205:1
544 201:25,25
55 201:15
562 201:24
5C 168:14

6

6,500 204:24
62 202:16
622 204:4
682 175:25

7

7 120:8
7.7 202:21
746 201:12

8

8:30 17:10 215:2
80 48:17
800,000 209:4
880 201:11
8th 190:7

9

9:00 17:10
90 22:7 204:1
900 59:2
90s 175:1
937 201:12,13
95 203:11
986 124:10 127:12 129:24
99 203:12
9DJJ22 167:25

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES
6 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
7
8
9 PESTICIDE PROGRAM DIALOGUE
10 COMMITTEE MEETING
11
12
13 DAY TWO - NOVEMBER 2, 2017
14
15
16
17
18 Conference Center - Lobby Level
19 2777 Crystal Drive
20 One Potomac Yard South
21 Arlington, VA 22202
22
23
24
25

1 P R O C E E D I N G S
2 - - - - -
3 MR. KEIGWIN: Good morning. I hope you all
4 had a very good evening. I want to thank you all
5 again for the discussion yesterday. We found it to be
6 very helpful in advancing a number of issues. All
7 last night, I was thinking about how to kick off this
8 morning's meeting and then chatting with Leyla
9 earlier, I'm just going to steal her line, and so I'm
10 supposed to say welcome to the Kevin Keaney Show. So
11 there was another line that I said I wouldn't say, and
12 I won't say it. But today -- today is a very
13 important discussion, and that's why we are dedicating
14 the morning to it.
15 As you know, the last several years, the
16 staff in Kevin Keaney's branch, working across the
17 stakeholder community and at one time even using a
18 subgroup of this committee, worked on developing
19 proposals and draft regulations for how to improve the
20 worker protection standard and to advance the
21 certification and training program. And yeoman effort
22 by his staff and a number of people around this table,
23 and, you know, really across the stakeholder
24 community, giving us some very important input as we
25 promulgated those regulations over the last couple of

ED_002528_00039559-00002

1 years.
2 That being said, obviously whenever we
3 finalize a regulation, questions arise, ideas for
4 possible modifications to those regulations can arise.
5 And for those of you that were here at the May PPDC
6 meeting as part of the regulatory reform public
7 meeting, we heard a number of comments from, again,
8 across the stakeholder community about these two
9 rules, the importance of these rules, some ideas for
10 potential modification, some reasons why the rules
11 should remain as they are.
12 So what we wanted to spend this morning
13 doing is beginning a conversation about those two
14 rules. Kevin will walk you through the feedback that
15 we heard from the last PPDC meeting and the regulatory
16 reform public meeting. And what we really hope to get
17 is dialogue amongst all of you for, one, better
18 helping to understand the perspectives that we heard
19 and raised and presented during the regulatory reform
20 public meeting, but hopefully getting beyond that and
21 talking about solutions for perhaps some of the issues
22 that have arisen as part of those public comments and
23 finding ways that as a group you all can give us
24 advice for moving forward that reflect the input of
25 everyone around this table.

ED_002528_00039559-00003

1 So, at times, I think it will be intense
2 today. That's okay. I just ask that we all be
3 respectful of each other's positions and opinions and
4 know that our goal coming out of this is to try to
5 find or begin to find some workable solutions to
6 moving forward with both of these rules.
7 So we're going to start the morning with the
8 worker protection standard. We've got roughly -- a
9 little bit over an hour and a half, and then Arnold
10 Layne will come in and give you all an update on the
11 first meeting of the new public health workgroup under
12 the PPDC. We'll then take a break, and then we'll
13 spend about the next hour on the certification and
14 training rule. And then we've got some housekeeping
15 and preparations for our next meeting.
16 So why don't we get into the meat of today.
17 Let me -- Kevin was here yesterday. Kevin really
18 needs no introduction, but I'll just turn things over
19 to him.
20 MR. KEANEY: Well, Rick called it the Kevin
21 Keaney Show. I prefer to call it the show and tell.
22 I'll show, and you folks can tell, and to begin, to
23 begin.
24 To begin, as Rick said, there was -- there
25 was quite a bit of feedback on the reg reform session

ED_002528_00039559-00004

1 after the last meeting of PPDC, the half-day second
2 meeting, second day. And the topics that came out of
3 that are what we're going to be discussing today. And
4 relative to the agriculture worker protection
5 regulation, there's going to be a focus on discussion
6 on the applicator exclusion zone, the designated
7 representative provision, and the minimum age
8 provision.
9 And you have material giving you some basic
10 descriptions, definitions, and a comparison table of
11 the provisions of the worker protection regulation.
12 The second session would be certification, the
13 applicator certification regulation, which is
14 proposed. The ag worker protection regulation is
15 final.
16 And in that, there will be the discussion
17 of minimum age, a different perspective on minimum
18 age relative to applicators as opposed to the minimum
19 age in ag worker protection, focusing on handlers
20 entering -- entering treated fields early. And I'll
21 give you some perspective on the variety of grants
22 and cooperative agreements that we have to support
23 these -- the necessary activities related to
24 implementing and effectively bringing into reality in
25 the field, at least, of these regulations, so grants

ED_002528_00039559-00005

1 that are substantially supported by PRIA funds.
2 Any regulation that we write in Washington
3 -- and it's a great deal of communication and
4 implementation support before it becomes a reality in
5 the field. And we engaged in really -- in both
6 regulations a very extensive period of outreach and
7 communication. Rick alluded to the prior then --
8 prior to the regulation going final, exchanges we had,
9 but when worker protection did go final, we did
10 conduct pretty extensive outreach and communication
11 and training.
12 Obviously, we -- as you can see by this
13 screen, we devoted a great deal of effort to educating
14 and training the EPA staff and the state regulatory
15 staffs. We had very focused presentations and face-
16 to-face sessions and meetings and webinars with a
17 variety of stakeholder associations. And we engaged a
18 number of our grantees in focusing their activities
19 and developing materials that would help support the
20 implementation of this regulation -- of both
21 regulations, but primarily the worker protection
22 regulation.
23 And we did a lot of safety -- basic safety
24 training with our grantees and with our -- with our
25 staff and with regional staffs. So the compliance

ED_002528_00039559-00006

1 dates for the regulation have changed. And one of the
2 rationales for the change was a petition we received
3 from the National Association of State Departments of
4 Agriculture, Farm Bureau, and the third -- there was a
5 third member there. Do you recall, Rick?
6 Anyway, there were three -- there are three
7 stakeholder groups that petitioned to change the
8 implementation date. And their rationale was that EPA
9 had not allowed enough time for the states to prepare
10 their -- their folks, stakeholders, and the
11 communities for the regulation. And they asserted
12 that we had violated FIFRA provisions and -- and other
13 -- other regulatory or statutory provisions.
14 And that was received at the end of the last
15 Administration, and the response was negative, and the
16 response denied the fact that the -- the assertion
17 that we had violated FIFRA provisions and statutory
18 provisions and was silent on the time needed to
19 prepare the states to effectively implement the
20 regulation.
21 Early in the -- in the -- in this
22 Administration, as you can see on this screen, there
23 was a repeat submission by the National Association of
24 State Departments of Agriculture alone focusing alone
25 on the argument that there wasn't enough time to

ED_002528_00039559-00007

1 prepare the states and the materials. The compliance
2 assistance materials weren't -- weren't adequate. We
3 hadn't developed enough of them at that time.
4 And we granted -- we agreed with that
5 petition to extend the implementation of all the
6 revised provisions of the worker protection regulation
7 until there was guidance and training materials
8 completed and to allow the states enough time to train
9 their constituents. Officially, that requires a
10 regulatory action.
11 We mentioned that in the response to the
12 petition. And there's a need for a Federal Register
13 notice to be issued to change that compliance date
14 from 18 to something else, from January 2018 to
15 something else. That hasn't been issued yet, so the
16 initial compliance date is still two thousand --
17 January of 2018. That's the argument, that the
18 training materials and compliance materials weren't
19 adequate.
20 The next screen is some of the productions
21 -- the production of a grant -- a substantial grant we
22 have with Oregon State and California-Davis to produce
23 these materials necessary for training, necessary for
24 compliance assistance and so forth relative to the
25 regulation.

ED_002528_00039559-00008

1 This is a -- this is really a partial list.
2 If you get on this very -- it's a very deep website,
3 that if you want to get onto that and to see all
4 that's now available and see what is still being
5 worked on to be available soon, it's pretty
6 impressive. And they are instituting -- or they have
7 instituted a clearinghouse for all of this material so
8 that it's available for anyone who wants to download
9 it and use it, and a number of -- or folks obviously
10 are taking advantage of that. So it's a very rich
11 website and a very productive collaborative agreement
12 we have with the University of California-Davis and
13 Oregon State.
14 And that speaks to the argument that there
15 need to be -- there needs to be adequate material out
16 there for effective implementation. This is a time
17 line that might be useful for you. And it shows that
18 the date of the revised regulation when it became
19 final, when it was published in the Federal Register,
20 and then the compliance point for when most of the
21 requirements are in place except for any new content
22 that needs to be expressed in training materials and
23 for the safety poster to be available and for a
24 adequate understanding of the applicator exclusion
25 zone to take place.

ED_002528_00039559-00009

1 So -- and then that leads to the date for
2 full compliance in -- on January 2nd, 2018. So all
3 the new content of the safety display and the
4 responsibility for handlers to -- to acknowledge and
5 comply with the applicator exclusion zone would be in
6 place then. There is an important note there on that
7 screen that compliance with the new content and the
8 worker and handler training will be required six
9 months after EPA publishes the Federal Register notice
10 about the training materials being available. That
11 still has to occur.
12 So there are two things that have to occur
13 to change that compliance date -- the issuance in the
14 Federal Register specifying what the new compliance
15 date would be and then the issuance of a Federal
16 Register notice alerting folks that the training
17 material -- the training materials needed are
18 available and how -- how they can be gotten, where
19 they are.
20 Some of you that are -- were members last
21 spring of PPDC remember the focus of the second day of
22 that meeting on the regulatory reform agenda. There
23 is an executive order on regulatory reform focusing on
24 relooking at a variety of regulations. And comments
25 were solicited at that meeting, and there were a

ED_002528_00039559-00010

1 number of comments. It's probably the most raucous
2 PPDC meeting I've ever been at, but you don't usually
3 get hisses and boos and claps, but feel free to clap
4 after this presentation, but it didn't happen -- it
5 didn't happen in May last year.
6 So we did have this outreach and received
7 the comments and -- and sorted the comments into the
8 focus areas that we thought were appropriate and --
9 and the comments and recommendations are currently
10 being considered and, you know, the -- what we're
11 going to be discussing today is an indication of that.
12 But any substantive changes that have to be made to
13 the worker protection will require a separate
14 rulemaking process apart from -- it's quite different
15 than anything focused on the changing of the
16 compliance date.
17 Substantive changes require a different --
18 not -- it's a rulemaking, but it's a different type of
19 rulemaking we'd have to go through to do that. So
20 some of that may come out of -- we'll get guidance on
21 what that may be from this meeting, so we expect a
22 substantial engagement on these three issues --
23 minimum age, designated representative, and the
24 applicator exclusion zone.
25 You have a fact sheet on the applicator

ED_002528_00039559-00011

1 exclusion zone and you have some skimpy definitions of
2 each of those -- each of those items in the handout
3 you've got. So that's a rough outline that leads us
4 to the more substantial part of what we're here today
5 for, and that is the discussion of those -- of those
6 provisions, and the -- any guidance you might have as
7 to how they can be managed in the field or any
8 alternatives you might propose for us to try to attain
9 similar ends and through different means, that's what
10 we'd be interested in hearing.
11 All right, hold your applause.
12 (Applause.)
13 MR. KEANEY: Thank you very much.
14 MR. KEIGWIN: That might be the first time
15 there has been clapping at an EPA presentation at a
16 PPDC meeting.
17 MR. KEANEY: I'm shameless in soliciting.
18 MR. KEIGWIN: So on the one-page handout
19 that's in your packet, we have two charge questions
20 for the committee relative to the worker protection
21 standard, the first being what challenges do you
22 anticipate with implementing these requirements, and
23 then the second one being consistent with EPA's
24 mandate to protect public health and the environment,
25 what alternatives would you propose to address the

ED_002528_00039559-00012

1 concerns on which these requirements focus.
2 So we can take each charge question. So I
3 wanted to get some input from you all. Do we want to
4 walk through each of these three provisions and answer
5 each question? That might be -- and we'll kind of
6 circle back each time. Does that -- would that work
7 for folks around the table? Okay, so why don't we
8 start with the minimum age one and open it up to the
9 group. What challenges do you all anticipate with
10 implementing the minimum age provision as currently in
11 the regulations?
12 Iris? Amy? We'll start there.
13 MS. FIGUEROA: Thank you. Good morning.
14 Farmworker Justice, along with many other
15 organizations, participated in the process that led up
16 to the revision of the rule, including the three
17 provisions that we're going to be discussing today.
18 And, so, I just first of all wanted to thank the EPA
19 for all the work that went into that process. And I
20 also just want to reiterate our position about why
21 these protections, including the minimum age
22 protection, are so important.
23 So we believe that minors should not be
24 handling pesticides because their bodies are still
25 developing. It can have long-term health effects.

ED_002528_00039559-00013

1 They may have different levels of maturity, different
2 abilities to follow safety precautions. And in spite
3 of these concerns, the current rule has limits on this
4 minimum age protection. So there's exception for
5 family members, and it only applies to hired workers,
6 so we feel that some of the challenges that might be
7 discussed here may already be taken into account in
8 those exceptions that are already present in the rule.
9 MR. KEIGWIN: Amy, then Leyla, then Preston.
10 MS. LEIBMAN: Thanks, Kevin. That was a
11 good start to your show today, but I don't think that
12 either you or Rick really stressed the amount of work
13 that went into this, the amount of resources that the
14 EPA has spent and the time. So I have some gray hair
15 now, but I didn't in 2001 when I began to work on the
16 revision of the worker protection standard. That's
17 when I entered the show.
18 It was going on prior to that, the efforts
19 within the EPA, to begin to revise the worker
20 protection standard with the idea of protecting
21 farmworkers who are hired to help put food on our
22 tables. So that's been -- it's been going on a long
23 time.
24 I have been engaged in the stakeholder
25 process. I have sat across the table from industry.

ED_002528_00039559-00014

1 I have sat across the table from farmers. I have
2 sat across the table from the EPA. And I have been a
3 part of the formal workgroup. I have been involved
4 every -- every step of the way, and the EPA has worked
5 really hard to achieve their mission in protecting
6 workers.
7 It's an odd place for EPA because this is a
8 form of exceptionalism in which the agricultural
9 worker and the protection of this worker is put under
10 the responsibility of the EPA. That's not a usual
11 position for EPA. Usually the Occupational Safety &
12 Health Administration has that responsibility. We
13 tried to get it out of EPA because there's lots of
14 challenges, but it was ruled that EPA is, indeed,
15 responsible for protecting workers.
16 So in that light, the move to look at the
17 minimum age and make a minimum age part of the worker
18 protection standard and, what, 18? I think that's a
19 really important move. And, so, the challenge -- I'm
20 confused about the challenges that this would impose
21 since every other industry out there has rules that
22 they must comply with in order to protect young
23 workers.
24 So I actually have teenage boys, and, you
25 know, I had -- I can judge the time of this time frame

ED_002528_00039559-00015

1 because the one teenage boy was a baby when we started
2 this process. He's now 16. And both those boys work
3 on farms. It's a great opportunity for my two sons.
4 They learn about work ethic. They learn how to show
5 up on time. They learn about the hard work of
6 farming. And I'm so proud of them.
7 But at 16, they did not have and do not have
8 the cognitive ability to be applying pesticides or
9 understanding what it is to be working or how to
10 protect themselves properly. And I think many of us
11 have teenagers in this room or have -- are familiar
12 with teenagers, and this is what we're talking about.
13 And in light of yesterday's conversations as
14 well, when talking about all the challenges that went
15 on with one pesticide and the soybeans, I don't
16 understand why there should be any confusion that the
17 need for an 18-year-old versus a 16-year-old is
18 important.
19 So we should keep the minimum age at 18,
20 and, again, I repeat that we have come to this table.
21 It has been a consensus process. We have -- we have
22 gone back and forth on this, so to move this, to
23 challenge this idea that someone younger than 18
24 should be exposed to pesticides and who's hired -- I
25 want to repeat -- who's hired. Okay, we're not

ED_002528_00039559-00016

1 talking about if it's my decision for my own kid on a
2 farm. I'm talking about if you hire someone.
3 So I'm confused that this is -- this is an
4 issue, and I feel that given that every other industry
5 is able to comply with this idea that an 18-year-old
6 is a limit in terms of their involvement with
7 pesticides, I don't understand what the problem would
8 be here.
9 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Leyla, then Preston,
10 then Andrew.
11 MS. MCCURDY: Thank you. You know, from my
12 perspective and Children's Environmental Health
13 Network's perspective, it's, you know, a given that we
14 should be protecting children younger than 18, at
15 minimum. That is basically -- you know, I think as
16 responsible adults, that's the least we can do to
17 protect our children, so for me that's a no-brainer.
18 And I'm going to take it to the next level.
19 So thank you very much, Amy, for your
20 comments. And, actually, I definitely intended to
21 start by applauding EPA for their efforts, at least
22 I've been involved as far back as Amy, and I've seen
23 all the hard work that Kevin and his staff has put
24 behind this and the support that they have gotten, you
25 know, up the ranks to move this forward. So I want to

1 applaud you for all that work, and also I want to
2 applaud the stakeholders.
3 As Amy said, many, many people participated
4 in this process, and -- and we are at a place where we
5 have made some improvements. But, again, as I said,
6 I'm going to take it to the next level, assuming that,
7 you know, this will be embraced, that, you know, hired
8 workers, you know, below the age of 18 will be
9 protected by this. I don't know what the challenges
10 may be, but let's figure it out.
11 So my next level is this -- the exclusion
12 piece. I'm not obviously suggesting -- I'm not that
13 naive -- I'm not going to suggest at this stage that
14 we should -- we should try to change the rules, but I
15 feel like, you know, EPA's mission is to protect
16 public health, and a big piece of that is, you know,
17 children. And, so, I would encourage EPA to think
18 beyond the regulation, and I know this always happens,
19 that, you know, continue doing the voluntary -- to
20 educate families, you know, farm-owner families, since
21 they are excluded, that they need to also protect
22 children.
23 And there is the third thing we should --
24 another issue, so if we can just look at this in the
25 broader sense as I know EPA always does, but let's

ED_002528_00039559-00018

1 continue to go beyond this regulation and try to
2 protect all children. Thank you.
3 MR. KEIGWIN: And we'll get to the other
4 provisions, too. I think for this conversation we
5 want to focus on the minimum age, but thank you,
6 Leyla.
7 So next I have Preston, Andrew, and then
8 Damon.
9 MR. PECK: Thank you. I am -- I have not
10 been doing this work as long as some of the others
11 that are sitting at the table. I concur with what
12 they've said thus far, but I know our organization
13 that's 31 this year has been involved in this work for
14 quite some time. And [audio glitch] input into the
15 revision and the different rules. And being educated
16 --
17 MR. KEIGWIN: Preston, can you bring your
18 mic a little bit closer.
19 MR. PECK: Being -- there you go. Being
20 educated by former employees at Toxic Free and see
21 about their experiences with these focus groups, one
22 of the shining things that came through were that
23 farmworkers, when discussing these issues and what was
24 important to them, there was disagreement among some
25 things, but they were all in agreement that children

ED_002528_00039559-00019

1 should not be handling pesticides because they're
2 inherently dangerous. So that is something that the
3 people that are most affected by these rules can all
4 agree upon and should be enforced.
5 I was privy this past summer during outreach
6 to some photo-voice projects that Toxic Free NC worked
7 on with -- in conjunction with Student Action with
8 farmworkers. And one of the interviews that we had, a
9 girl -- a young adult from Washington had grown up
10 picking apples with her father, who is also an apple
11 farmworker. And she recalled one incident when she
12 was younger that a pesticide spray was coming by, and
13 she herself got sprayed during that process.
14 But her concern was not so much about
15 herself but about the woman that was next to her that
16 was pregnant and the impact that that would have on
17 that child and any children that are exposed to
18 pesticides and how awful that is. So I think this is
19 a very real concern that things really happen, and
20 it's something that we hear about, and I think that it
21 is a responsibility of those that choose to engage in
22 agricultural production to protect their workers.
23 Just like any industry it's their
24 responsibility, and a minimum age is a very, I think,
25 small step but important step that we need to take to

ED_002528_00039559-00020

1 protect people as these pesticides -- I hear so many
2 people from industry discuss how they're a tool in a
3 farmer's toolbox. Well, tools come with
4 responsibility, and many of our tools that we use come
5 with age requirements and education requirements. So
6 I think if we are going to use these as tools then
7 they need to be thought of from a regulatory sense as
8 tools.
9 I did have one question -- I have a couple
10 questions about the time line, but I don't want to
11 detract -- distract from this conversation. So I
12 don't know if you want to deal with that later.
13 MR. KEIGWIN: We can do them real quick
14 because if you're having those questions, then others
15 around the table might.
16 MR. PECK: Okay. On the delay in the
17 Federal Register, why has there been such a delay on
18 putting this in the Federal Register as far as the
19 date change?
20 MR. KEIGWIN: So we do have to -- it's a
21 rulemaking that we have to undertake, and there's a
22 process under FIFRA for promulgating rules, even
23 changes to the date. So there's an internal process
24 that has to take place, and then there are additional
25 requirements that the statute requires before the

ED_002528_00039559-00021

1 public comment period begins.
2 MR. PECK: Okay. Is that a typical -- six
3 or seven months is typical?
4 MR. KEIGWIN: There's a process that
5 involves going to review by the Office of Management &
6 Budget, so those -- there's a number of administrative
7 steps that are involved in it.
8 MR. PECK: Okay. And I don't -- you know,
9 just one quick comment about the NASDA petition, too.
10 I heard Amy and Leyla talking about how they've been
11 working on this since 2001. I think it's a
12 responsibility of the Departments of Agriculture --
13 State Departments of Agriculture and growers, but this
14 is nothing new. This was known to be coming down the
15 pipeline, and I think it's a responsibility to adjust.
16 So I just find it a little -- I'm a little
17 skeptical about the actual -- that we weren't able to
18 prepare ourselves for implementation and effectiveness
19 of this. This is something that you should be
20 thinking about coming down the pipeline and should
21 prepare accordingly. Thank you.
22 MR. KEIGWIN: So Andrew, then Damon, then
23 Liza.
24 MR. THOSTENSON: My organization, the
25 American Association of Pesticide Safety Educators, of

ED_002528_00039559-00022

1 course, is tasked with educating people about the use
2 of pesticides. So the thing that was most important
3 in our mind was do we have the tools to be able to
4 accomplish whatever the regulatory requirement is. I
5 would have to say a year ago and probably even as late
6 as May that I would agree that we didn't have
7 everything in place that we needed to be able to
8 accomplish that task.
9 Since that time, I've seen a variety of
10 materials that have been released through the PERC
11 process and through other agencies, and I think that
12 many of my colleagues would agree that we do have the
13 necessary tools to do the training at this stage.
14 And, so, that's comforting to me.
15 My big concern, and I think my association's
16 concern, and I think I could speak for Liza, although
17 she'll speak for herself and her organization, is we
18 are about to embark on a new training season. We will
19 be engaged with thousands of applicators and farmers
20 and ranchers across this country this coming winter.
21 It would be extraordinarily useful if we could go to
22 those people and give them some sense of where are we
23 at with the regulation, what is being enforced, what
24 isn't being enforced.
25 Those sorts of questions are going to come

ED_002528_00039559-00023

1 up. Right now, I don't have any good clear answers
2 for them, other than to say that we're in some kind of
3 compliance assistance mode, which for the average,
4 normal pesticide applicator out there is not very good
5 guidance.
6 So our concern at this stage lies on clarity
7 and not necessarily on whether or not those training
8 tools are in place. I'm becoming more convinced that
9 those materials are now available and that we could
10 train.
11 A couple of other items, at least on a more
12 personal scale, my son became a certified pesticide
13 applicator in January, and when he became 18, he
14 applied pesticides for summers to help pay for college
15 for six years running. My daughter worked in the Weed
16 Science Research Program at North Dakota State
17 University for two years doing handler-related tasks
18 as well as worker tasks.
19 Of course, they're all above average, and
20 they're very smart children. That's what we say in
21 Minnesota and North Dakota. But I hate to always
22 agree with other people in the room, but I'm not so
23 certain that they were capable of understanding or
24 appreciating the level of seriousness with which they
25 needed to conduct themselves with those pesticides

1 before they were 18 years old.
2 So, you know, my bias is towards the 18-
3 year-old limit, though I am very cognitive of people
4 in the industry who have very difficult problems with
5 sourcing labor to help them in their enterprises, but
6 when we start talking about actually handling
7 pesticides, it requires a certain level of maturity
8 that I'm not sure somebody under the age of 18 has the
9 capacity for.
10 So that's my spiel, and I'm sticking to it.
11 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Damon, then Liza, then
12 Cynthia.
13 MR. REABE: So in regards to the age
14 requirement, if I -- I want to make sure I understand
15 this correctly, though. The minimum age requirement
16 would not apply to family members if they're private
17 applicators. Is that correct?
18 MR. KEANEY: This is the worker protection
19 regulation. Yes, so the minimum age is for handlers
20 that -- and it does have the exception for, you know,
21 a wide range of family relationships, yeah.
22 MR. REABE: And, so, yeah, and that's where
23 my question comes. Aerial application businesses are
24 in general family-owned, but we're commercial
25 applicators. And, so, my question is does it only

1 apply to -- the minimum age exemption, does that only
2 apply to family members in the private setting, or
3 would that apply to aerial applicators that are --
4 MR. KEANEY: You're commingling the
5 certification regulation and the worker protection
6 regulation. The worker protection regulation is
7 speaking about handlers, and ...
8 MR. REABE: It says here on the agricultural
9 worker protection final rule, you know, minimum age,
10 and it has the 18-year-old minimum age, and then it
11 goes on to say members of the owner's immediate family
12 are exempt. Does that include owners of aerial
13 application businesses?
14 MR. KEANEY: Hey, Nancy, for folks on the
15 phone, can you come up to a mic or Dea will bring you
16 a mic? Thanks.
17 MS. FITZ: Good morning. This is Nancy
18 Fitz. In WPS, the exemption is only for immediate
19 families of agricultural employers, so the farmers,
20 growers. It does not apply to commercial businesses.
21 MR. REABE: Okay. So would there be any
22 consideration for furthering that exemption to -- and
23 a little background. I grew up, of course, at an
24 aerial application company that my grandfather
25 started. I was mixing and loading at a very young

ED_002528_00039559-00026

1 age, very young age. I was a human flagger at a very
2 young age. It was a great place to grow up and learn
3 work ethic. And, so, we were -- we were properly
4 trained prior to any training being available.
5 At that time, a lot of this was upon
6 ourselves to figure out, and so we did that with a lot
7 of success. And I left the family business, was a
8 corporate pilot for 15 years, and one of the reasons
9 why I wanted to come back to the industry was to be
10 able to have my children help me out at my business
11 and give them the same opportunities that we had, and
12 I think I share that -- aerial application is a very
13 unique industry in that we are commercial applicators
14 but usually we're very, very small businesses that
15 operate much like small farms.
16 And, so, I'm just interested in possibly
17 pursuing that form of an exemption.
18 MR. KEANEY: That would be -- that would be
19 appropriate if you look at the table -- the discussion
20 on certification, the applicator certification
21 regulation and the table there that gives you the
22 spread of 18, 16 across states and so forth in various
23 categories. So you're then -- once you're certified,
24 it's then legal, is what you're saying?
25 MR. REABE: No, I'm saying you're still

1 confusing the worker protection regulation with the
2 applicator certification regulation.
3 MR. REABE: Okay.
4 MR. KEANEY: And, so, when we get to that,
5 it would be much more appropriate to discuss --
6 MR. REABE: Okay.
7 MR. KEANEY: -- to discuss that.
8 MR. REABE: Thank you.
9 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Liza, then Cynthia.
10 Amy, I see your card. Okay.
11 Liza, go ahead.
12 MS. TROSSBACH: On behalf of AAPCO and the
13 state tribal and territorial pesticides control
14 officials, we do support the minimum age of 18 for
15 workers and handlers. We absolutely support enhanced
16 protections for anybody working with pesticides.
17 I will echo what Andrew had indicated, that
18 our concerns with the implementation were the
19 availability of materials, which were not available
20 when -- as early as we would have liked it. You know,
21 it took a little bit sooner, and in fact -- or the
22 fact that part of the implementation of WPS was the
23 commitment by EPA to have those materials available to
24 states were dependent upon those materials being
25 available. So, hence, that was our comments regarding

ED_002528_00039559-00028

1 the delayed implementation of that.
2 And I would also echo that the concerns of
3 state agencies is kind of the limbo we're in regarding
4 the actual implementation date of the requirement.
5 States are proceeding and doing education based on the
6 requirements that went into effect in 2017 and are
7 preparing for those that are effective January 2018,
8 but because of the limbo, we're not really sure what
9 to tell our agriculture producers and our applicators.
10 But, again, we do support the minimum age requirement.
11 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Cynthia, then Amy.
12 MS. PALMER: Thank you. I'd like to support
13 the others in this room who have spoken because we're
14 -- it seems like we're very close to a consensus. I
15 would like to thank Kevin and others for persevering.
16 Thanks to EPA for 20 years of hard work on this issue.
17 Children are vulnerable, their brains and their
18 reproductive systems, their nervous systems and so
19 forth. I would not want my 12- and 16-year-olds to be
20 handling pesticides.
21 I'm just a little concerned about the
22 questions that were being asked. They seem completely
23 lopsided. We're asking about challenges of
24 implementing this rule? It seems to me so basic to be
25 protecting children from chemicals. A civilized

ED_002528_00039559-00029

1 country protects its children in the 21st Century.
2 Thank you.
3 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Amy.
4 MS. LEIBMAN: Great. So I'm really pleased
5 to hear that some of the folks that are doing the
6 training and some of the state lead agencies are
7 getting comfortable with the materials that are
8 available, but on Slide -- on Slide 7, you talk about
9 compliance with the new content and worker and
10 handling training will be required six months after
11 EPA publishes the Federal Register notice about the
12 training materials being available.
13 I'd like to encourage you, particularly with
14 the comments that we're hearing today, to get that out
15 there and let people know that these materials are
16 available. And what are your plans for that?
17 MR. KEANEY: Yes, we'll survey what's
18 available and prepare that -- prepare that action or
19 that notice, rather.
20 MS. LEIBMAN: Do you know when?
21 MR. KEANEY: No.
22 MS. LEIBMAN: Okay, so, we're waiting on
23 you.
24 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Pat.
25 MS. BISHOP: You know, I'm certainly not as

ED_002528_00039559-00030

1 knowledgeable about this issue as many of the folks
2 around the table here, but I was just wondering how is
3 this going to -- this rule going to be enforced and
4 what are the penalties if it's not complied with.
5 MR. KEIGWIN: The program is delegated to
6 state regulatory agencies as you -- as you heard from
7 Liza, that they have the responsibility of
8 implementing and enforcing. And it's enforced via
9 pesticide labels. There's a provision on certain
10 labels that use of -- chemicals used in agriculture
11 that is called an agricultural use box that specifies
12 you be in compliance with -- and it specifies
13 particularly certain health and safety provisions, but
14 then alludes -- says "and other provisions of the
15 worker protection regulation." So it's a use
16 violation that would happen if they're not complying
17 with the regulation.
18 And penalties -- penalties vary from state
19 to state as to what -- what the penalty would be for a
20 use violation. And usually they're triggered --
21 inspections are triggered by tips and complaints.
22 MS. BISHOP: Okay, so, it would -- I mean,
23 so, somebody could conceivably avoid or not comply and
24 not be caught if they weren't under inspection or
25 something like that.

1 MR. KEANEY: Yes, and Liza can speak to the
2 scarcity of resources at state levels for that type of
3 activity.
4 MS. TROSSBACH: I'll just echo what Kevin
5 indicated. Your state lead agencies do conduct
6 routine inspections and use observations, as well as
7 investigate any tips, complaints, or reports.
8 Obviously we have thousands of applicators.
9 I can use Virginia as an example. We have 7,000
10 private applicators, all of which have the potential
11 to have workers and handlers. And then there are
12 those that do not require certification, because
13 they're not using restricted-use products, but we do
14 make an attempt to do that. And we do follow up on
15 all of those tips, complaints, and reports.
16 Just like with any type of applications,
17 there is that possibility that pesticides are being
18 misused, and we will not know unless we are observing
19 them or getting a tip, complaint, or report. But
20 primacy does follow the state, and the states have
21 different enforce response policies. Some -- and
22 different authorities. Some states have civil penalty
23 action, which is a monetary action. Some states have
24 the ability to suspend or revoke or modify a
25 certification or a license. So it all depends on that

ED_002528_00039559-00032

1 specific state and their laws and regulations.
2 MR. KEIGWIN: I wanted to -- we've heard a
3 lot of perspectives. Other than Damon from the
4 applicator community side, I don't think we've heard
5 much from the user community side. And I wanted to
6 see if folks around the table who represent that side
7 of the pesticide space to offer any comments they
8 might have.
9 So, Allen?
10 MR. MCLAURIN: Thank you. I agree with
11 everything said. I cannot think of an instance in our
12 area or as a farmer where we would have anyone
13 working, unless it's a family operation, would have
14 anyone under the age of 18 (inaudible). So I think,
15 you know, as far as a private family, you know, like
16 Damon's situation, everything else, as a farmer with
17 his children working, that's the only exception I see
18 where anyone -- because we can't have them operating
19 equipment until they're at least 18 anyway or on the
20 farm.
21 No, what I was saying is as a farmer, we
22 would not have anyone under 18 working on the farm,
23 unless it's a family member, and that applies to
24 family farms. And I was a corporate farm, but very
25 unusual that we would have children working on the

ED_002528_00039559-00033

1 farm in any case. So I really think it's -- I don't
2 disagree with the 18 minimum age requirement.
3 MR. WHITTINGTON: And, yeah, my
4 understanding is we're fine with the 18 -- age 18
5 requirement with the family exemptions, the minimum
6 age of 18 for hired workers.
7 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Donnie and then Amy.
8 MR. TAYLOR: So I was a farmworker starting
9 at the age of seven in a tobacco field. At that time,
10 I didn't know the term "farmworker." I knew the term
11 "family." So you did what the family told you to do.
12 So this kind of turned out that way.
13 The only thing that we have from a
14 retailer's perspective is the labor pool in rural
15 America is very, very limited. And, oftentimes,
16 you're only dealing with families that have some
17 connection to agriculture. They were born and raised
18 on a farm, and sometimes connections and sometimes
19 experience on a farm level. So with private
20 businesses that are in the retail and application
21 side, we would like to have an opportunity for that
22 family extension as well, because it is a family
23 business, just like the farm is. So...
24 For the task here for handling, I assume the
25 same thing in mixer/loader because that's a similar

ED_002528_00039559-00034

1 comparison, mixer/loader/handler. That makes
2 perfectly good sense out in the marketplace, I think.
3 Would I let someone younger than that do that, yes, if
4 I trained them, I would, but I would have to be the
5 one to train them. I wouldn't depend on someone else
6 to do that.
7 And then for early entry, I think most of
8 our producer-growers try to do the no entry until the
9 deadline is over, unless in some emergency situation.
10 So we try to apply to that reentry statement as close
11 as possible.
12 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Amy.
13 MS. ASMUS: My background is that I do own a
14 family-owned ag retailer, and I'm the mother of three
15 healthy twenty-something-year-olds. But one thing you
16 have to understand, I have no objection to the minimum
17 age because when we work in ag retail and when we work
18 in farming, you have to understand that the workers
19 that we use are our children, are our neighbors, are
20 our community members. And we love and care for them
21 as much as you may love and care for my child just
22 because it's a child.
23 And we do train them, and we do protect them
24 because our workers, especially in rural ag, are a big
25 asset of our business, and it's very important to us

ED_002528_00039559-00035

1 that we protect them and that we train them to use the
2 products that we use, the tools that we use
3 effectively. And 18 is not an age that I would object
4 to. I think it's reasonable.
5 It's kind of a "duh" in my mind that
6 somebody like the EPA would have to set a minimum age
7 requirement because as assets of our communities and
8 assets of our business, as an ag retailer, we do
9 protect them, and we do train them, and we do handle
10 our pesticides as safely as we can.
11 MR. KEIGWIN: So is that as close to
12 consensus? I have not heard an alternative point of
13 view expressed. If there is one and you're willing to
14 speak up, now would be the time.
15 (No response.)
16 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay.
17 (Mild applause.)
18 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, so maybe we'll have as
19 much success with the next one. Let's see. So why
20 don't we move on to the designated representative
21 provision. Kevin, do you want to just give folks a
22 brief background on what this provision is intended to
23 do?
24 MR. KEANEY: The ag employer is required to
25 provide pesticide application information and safety

1 data sheets to be available for and accessed by
2 workers. And they're -- the worker population is
3 predominantly Hispanic and so it prevents -- it
4 presents challenges, age and, you know, concerns about
5 retaliation and so forth.
6 And, so, what the designated representative
7 provision is designed to help alleviate those
8 concerns, that someone is -- there's an educational
9 challenge, a language challenge, or just a concern for
10 jeopardizing your job by expressing interest in what
11 you may have been exposed to or you will be exposed
12 to. And that can be relieved by having a designated
13 representative gain that information for you.
14 And there is always the requirement that it
15 has to be -- that has to be provided to a medical --
16 medical personnel if the worker or handler requests it
17 because they feel they've been -- they've been exposed
18 and their health has been compromised. But general
19 accessing -- access to the information is a
20 requirement but specifically who gets that is tried to
21 be coped with and the designated representative, as I
22 said, to deal with issues of language or fear of
23 retaliation.
24 And a number of states have -- a number of
25 large -- large ag states have had similar provisions

ED_002528_00039559-00037

1 and haven't found problems with that provision.
2 MR. KEIGWIN: So same questions as last
3 time. Andy, are you in on this one? Are you -- so
4 Andy, then Iris, then Amy.
5 MR. WHITTINGTON: Yea, it says the
6 information and safety data sheets to a designated
7 representative under certain circumstances. Okay,
8 could you say what those -- what those additional
9 circumstances are?
10 MR. KEANEY: There are provisions -- there
11 are provisions in the regulation that describe, you
12 know, the information that the designated
13 representative would have to provide the employer
14 to -- to validly get that information. So there is
15 attempts to put some boundaries on what the designated
16 rep has to show to justify as getting that
17 information, and which it's --
18 MR. WHITTINGTON: And are there attempts for
19 what that information may be used for? The medical is
20 obvious, but I'm trying to understand what the other
21 circumstances would be.
22 MR. KEANEY: Well, I think what we want to
23 have discussed today is what conditions do you think
24 could be applied as constraining conditions as far as
25 what that information -- if there's concern for how

ED_002528_00039559-00038

1 that information would be used, then how can we
2 provide constraints to relieve those concerns.
3 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Iris, then Amy.
4 MS. FIGUEROA: So I just want to speak to
5 sort of the context of who farmworkers are and the
6 challenges they face. And hopefully this will answer
7 also some of the questions about what other
8 circumstances or what other types of representatives
9 might be involved.
10 So farmworkers are among the most
11 economically and educationally disadvantaged groups of
12 people in the country. As you mentioned, a lot of
13 them don't have English as a primary language. They
14 may be traveling. They may be in a different state or
15 even country to where they were exposed to the
16 pesticide as they're trying to deal with the impact of
17 that and what that might entail.
18 So, for example, we know, you know, just to
19 give you an example of a worker who was exposed to
20 pesticide, was sent back to his home country, which
21 was Mexico, was from a very small town, it was -- he
22 had to move heaven and earth just to get to a doctor
23 in Mexico. And then he had to try and get this
24 information for his medical treatment while being in
25 Mexico. So, you know, sort of the practical

ED_002528_00039559-00039

1 challenges that that presents.
2 So for a worker to have the opportunity to
3 designate someone that they trust, you know, to give
4 them, you know, that explicit authority and allow them
5 to help them to get crucial information, not just for
6 medical treatment but, for example, for a workers
7 compensation claim or some other situation is really
8 very important.
9 You also alluded to the fact that many
10 states and -- well, various states, including
11 California, Oregon, Washington, Texas, and Florida to
12 be specific, have similar provisions and have had them
13 for a while without any reports, you know, of abuse of
14 this provision. And that's not surprising to me
15 because working with farmworkers, what we have is
16 exactly the opposite problem, which is that workers
17 are very hesitant to report any incidents. They're
18 very hesitant to seek treatment. And, so, I think
19 it's really important that we have this provision and
20 that we make it easier for them, not harder for them,
21 to report pesticide incidents and to get the treatment
22 and other type of relief that they need.
23 MR. KEIGWIN: Amy, then Preston.
24 Andy, I don't know if you're back.
25 Oh, okay, Amy.

ED_002528_00039559-00040

1 MS. LEIBMAN: Thanks, Iris. I think that's
2 a really good start to helping us understand some of
3 the realities in this field and what farmworkers go
4 through. But I also wanted to just take a moment
5 again on this point and remind everybody about the
6 process leading up to the actual rule and that there
7 were a number of items that dealt with stronger
8 protections for the worker that were left off the
9 table in the spirit of developing a consensus-driven
10 rule that could be applied.
11 So in our opinion, the worker protection
12 standard is an important step forward, but there were
13 protections that are still needed. And, so, this
14 designated representative one is something that the
15 worker protection standard tried to look at against
16 what is happening in other industries, how are other
17 workers protected. And this is -- this is common in
18 other industry, and this is also common, as we talked
19 about, in the agricultural industry in other states.
20 But I think that's a really important
21 context for us to remember as we're thinking about
22 this provision. And then I do want to underscore just
23 even the challenges of a medical provider getting this
24 information. And, so, although that's in the rule and
25 everyone always says, oh, well, the medical provider

ED_002528_00039559-00041

1 can get it if they need it, there are plenty of
2 challenges, and it does have to do with the
3 vulnerability of the population that we're talking
4 about.
5 We're talking about, by and large, hired
6 workers that aren't from here, that largely do not
7 speak English, and they're here to work. They don't
8 want to cause any problems, but in some cases, they
9 need to know what they've been exposed to. And in
10 some cases, they may be hesitant to even seek clinical
11 care because they don't want to lose any time from
12 work. And, so, sometimes you do need a designated
13 representative to assist in getting this information.
14 So I want to just again remember sort of the
15 context that this is being put into the WPS, remember
16 what is happening in other industries, think about our
17 hired farmworker population, and this is really an
18 important step forward, and there already are
19 restrictions even within the WPS that make it less of
20 a protection for our farmworkers than for other
21 workers in other industries. And that right there is
22 really problematic.
23 So I want to make sure that we -- we keep
24 this and we keep this as strong as possible in
25 thinking about how to protect workers who are putting

1 food on our table.
2 MR. KEIGWIN: Preston.
3 MR. PECK: Yeah, I concur with everything
4 that's been said thus far. But also I know that from
5 groups and networks and coalitions that I work with
6 that advocate with farmworkers and deal with
7 farmworkers either in organizing or medical or, you
8 know, legal aid, all of these things, this is a very
9 complicated rule and complicated process, even for
10 people that are familiar with it and even if English
11 is their first language and primary language.
12 And I think that we do have a responsibility
13 as people that eat the food that these people -- that
14 agricultural workers put on our table to protect them
15 and protect the agricultural system. And I think that
16 we all have rights in this room to hire, you know,
17 legal representation if we choose to do so. And I
18 think agricultural workers, especially given the
19 different challenges that they face, either
20 economically or communication-wise, whatever it may
21 be, should have the same right to choose someone, not
22 necessarily even legal representation, but choose
23 someone of their own volition to go about and get
24 information on what they have been exposed to because
25 these chemicals are inherently dangerous and, by

ED_002528_00039559-00043

1 definition, designed to kill.
2 So I think that that's important that they
3 have access to that information. And I think this is
4 really a matter of access. Thank you.
5 MR. KEIGWIN: Nichelle, then Liza.
6 MS. HARRIOTT: So hearing the previous
7 comments got me thinking about who appoints this
8 designated representative, and given that Kevin
9 mentioned there are concerns about retaliation, it
10 would seem that this representative needs to be
11 independent of the employer. So my question is who
12 would be the person to appoint this designated
13 official.
14 MR. KEANEY: It would be the worker, as
15 someone here mentioned, someone they trust to serve
16 their needs by getting that information. So they
17 would -- the worker would designate -- the worker
18 would pick the designee -- would designate a
19 representative.
20 MS. HARRIOTT: So the workers on this one
21 particular farm would get together and appoint this
22 person?
23 MR. KEANEY: No, no. The process is up to
24 the worker, obviously. It's an individual --
25 individual worker getting an individual.

1 MS. HARRIOTT: Oh, it's a worker, a
2 farmworker who is also the designated representative?
3 MR. KEANEY: Not necessarily, not
4 necessarily. An individual farmworker would pick
5 someone they trust, and that person would be the
6 designated representative to get the information.
7 MS. HARRIOTT: Well, does each farmworker
8 have a designated representative?
9 MR. KEANEY: No. It's a specific -- it's
10 specific to an incident. If a person feels that
11 they've been infected by pesticides and want
12 information on that pesticide, they have a right to
13 get it. If they have constraints from language or
14 other constraints, then they can designate someone
15 that they trust to get that information for them.
16 I sense I haven't answered your question.
17 MR. KEIGWIN: Liza.
18 MS. TROSSBACH: One of the challenges that
19 pesticide regulatory officials face is language
20 barriers. While there are some states where you will
21 have a state regulatory authority which has the
22 ability to, you know, interact with individuals who
23 don't have English as a primary language, many don't.
24 Those resources aren't available, although we may try
25 to find them and we may be able to find some language

ED_002528_00039559-00045

1 line type services, you know, that can assist.
2 So I think from a regulatory perspective and
3 wanting to ensure that workers and handlers and all
4 pesticide users are receiving the protections, you
5 know, we support the designated representative. I
6 think that -- unfortunately, I think many times state
7 lead agencies don't get reports because of many issues
8 -- retaliation, et cetera -- but also because of the
9 language barrier. And while we try to meet that, we
10 want to make sure that if there are concerns and
11 instances and reports that we get them so we can do
12 our investigations and we can ensure that the
13 protections are in place and workers and handlers are
14 being protected.
15 So from that perspective, we certainly
16 support the, you know, designated representative. You
17 know, I can understand where there may be some
18 concerns or questions about how that will be
19 implemented on the actual farm, you know, for the
20 producer certainly, and those are issues that, you
21 know, they can address. But from our perspective, if
22 this will assist in us hearing these reports or us
23 being able to assist and get that medical information
24 or do that, you know, we would certainly support that.
25 MR. KEIGWIN: Jay.

1 MR. VROOM: Thanks. So it's my
2 understanding that there have been some concerns from
3 one or more farm organizations expressed to the EPA
4 staff about how the specific implementation definition
5 of who may claim to be a designated representative and
6 whether there's any potential ill intent from that
7 individual who may not know anything about the
8 farmworkers that are placed on the farm. Have you
9 gotten those specific questions from any agricultural
10 farm organizations, and are they in writing? Is that
11 something that we could understand better?
12 MR. KEANEY: We did get comments that --
13 generally addressing what you're describing, you know,
14 putting the information to use that's to the
15 disadvantage of the farm. And as I mentioned earlier,
16 it might be useful here to just -- if you want to
17 offer things that can be applied as verification, as
18 constraints on the use of this information and so
19 forth, there are those things in the regulation, but
20 perhaps they need to be bolstered in some fashion.
21 MR. VROOM: Yeah, it was my understanding
22 that there were specific suggestions that have been
23 made, and I didn't know whether they've been provided
24 to you in writing from those farm organizations or
25 not, but it seems to me that there's close to

1 universal consensus that you're hearing from around
2 this table that this is a good idea for the
3 advancement of safety compliance. But maybe just a
4 few little details around definition as who can
5 qualify as a designated representative could close
6 this deal and allow you to move forward.
7 MR. KEANEY: Yes, we can look into that and
8 obviously look into how the states that have worked
9 with that provision and found it not an issue manage
10 that aspect.
11 MR. VROOM: So, Liza, is that something that
12 AAPCO and NASDA could help -- you know, come to the
13 table with? Because I think you've got members that
14 have that kind of experience.
15 MS. TROSSBACH: Absolutely.
16 MR. VROOM: Maybe some definitions, yeah.
17 MS. TROSSBACH: Absolutely. I think
18 absolutely more than happy to assist with that.
19 MR. VROOM: My sense is that this has been
20 the biggest lightning rod in this at the close and,
21 you know, if it really is a matter of a few words or
22 definitions with regard to a federal regulation that
23 would define who could be deemed to be a legitimate
24 designated representative, I think this could be taken
25 off the table.

ED_002528_00039559-00048

1 MR. KEIGWIN: Iris.
2 MS. FIGUEROA: So just to follow up on that,
3 just to clarify it -- and correct me if I'm wrong,
4 there's a lot of elements of the rule, but my
5 understanding is the rule has a requirement that there
6 be an explicit authorization from the worker, first of
7 all. And, second, my understanding is that the
8 information is essentially what pesticides the worker
9 was exposed to. I mean, we're not talking about, you
10 know, trade secrets here or some sort of corporate
11 espionage or I don't know what is the scenario that
12 people are envisioning.
13 So, you know, just the language of ill
14 intent, I'm really having a hard time. Knowing
15 farmworker advocates, you know, I'm really having a
16 hard time envisioning that scenario of someone who
17 tries to get at a farmer by just requesting basic
18 information about pesticide exposure, information
19 which, you know, the employer is supposed to be
20 posting in a lot of cases anyway. So I might be
21 missing something, but I just wanted to clarify that.
22 MR. VROOM: So, you know, in addition to my
23 day job, I happen to be part of a family farming
24 operation, and I can tell you that there's a lot of
25 competition among farmers. And, so, it would not be

ED_002528_00039559-00049

1 unusual for this to be something that could be used as
2 an asset for ill intent from one farmer to another.
3 And, so, again, I'm not talking about anything that
4 would be of concern to you as I understand your role
5 or those who have -- all of us have an interest in
6 protecting farmworkers -- it is the kind of
7 information that can be attached to this sort of
8 information that could be advantageous to competing
9 farming interests.
10 So I think that has a lot to do with, again,
11 very minute details that I think could be resolved
12 here. I'm not attacking you, understand, right? I'm
13 trying to say that there's very little space left
14 between whoever's on either side of this issue that
15 can be resolved. And let's get there instead of
16 spending another hour talking around the margins of
17 this. If we could get the principals around the table
18 in a small workgroup, I don't think it would take half
19 an hour to resolve this. Thank you.
20 MR. KEIGWIN: So Donnie and then Amy.
21 MR. TAYLOR: I agree, just a definition.
22 The circumstances just need to be well-defined that we
23 can talk about. I do worry about trust. There are
24 people that will do some unethical things to gain
25 trust, and that concerns me. Make sure we protect

ED_002528_00039559-00050

1 them from that side as well.
2 And then the success of the states, I never
3 really thought about this. It's an issue that's
4 better handled at the state level.
5 MR. KEIGWIN: Amy.
6 MS. LEIBMAN: I just want to underscore
7 again we don't think any of this is personal. But I
8 do -- I am a little bit concerned about the -- I want
9 us to sort of think again about who we're talking
10 about in terms of who needs the designated
11 representative. This person has worked really hard to
12 get to this country to just work, okay? And the risks
13 and challenges that this person has gone through in
14 order to be able to work on a farm are incredible.
15 So then we have a population who is
16 desperate for work. They're economically
17 disadvantaged; often don't speak the language. They
18 want to keep their job. And they are not going to
19 want to do anything that would possibly put themselves
20 at risk for losing their job.
21 So this idea that they would get somebody
22 to, like, you know, get a pesticide trade secret and
23 then pass it on to another farmer is a little
24 farfetched given the farmworker population that we're
25 talking about that desperately, desperately wants to

ED_002528_00039559-00051

1 work. And it's our responsibility to help that worker
2 be protected. And, so, this is again -- it's in other
3 regs for other industries. It's working in other
4 states. And, so, there is -- you know, there is
5 specifics in the actual rule.
6 So I'm not -- again, I'm not really quite
7 sure what the issue is, but I really want us to
8 remember who we're talking about and who needs to work
9 and who needs our protection when we're thinking about
10 the distrust issue.
11 MR. KEIGWIN: Andrew.
12 MR. THOSTENSON: Well, you know, I work with
13 pesticide applicators. I work with farmers and
14 ranchers. They're very independent-minded. The idea
15 of somebody coming onto their property and demanding
16 some sort of records without any kind of credentials
17 or means of demonstrating whether or not they're
18 reliable or not ambulance chasers or those sorts of
19 things are -- well, it's just -- it goes contrary to
20 their way of life and thinking.
21 Having said that, though, they are also
22 concerned about the welfare of the people that work
23 for them. And, so, I think Jay probably has this
24 thing right. I think that if we can adequately define
25 the circumstances in which this representative would

ED_002528_00039559-00052

1 be able to get these sorts of -- this sort of
2 information then I think that this issue goes away.
3 So, you know, just wanting to add some
4 context as to why there may be sensitivity in the
5 farming and ranching community.
6 MS. LEIBMAN: Kevin, can you just clarify
7 for us, because I think this would solve the problem
8 and some of the issues that you're bringing up, is
9 that it's my understanding that in response to the
10 comments during the comment period that EPA actually
11 further constrained this particular point so that it
12 would be very clear that whoever is coming onto the
13 properties to ask for this information that it's very
14 clear. So, Kevin, please clarify that for us.
15 MR. KEANEY: Yes, I agree, and -- but it
16 still seems to be an issue of concern, so...
17 MR. KEIGWIN: Nancy may have --
18 MS. FITZ: Yeah, this is Nancy Fitz. Amy's
19 right. The proposed designated representative, there
20 were no constraints. Anybody could walk onto an
21 establishment and say I'm Kathy's designated
22 representative, please share the application
23 information and safety data sheets. We got a lot of
24 concerns and comments about that, so the final rule
25 does require that the request from the designated

ED_002528_00039559-00053

1 representative has to be in writing.
2 It can't be verbally. It has to identify
3 the worker/handler who they're representing. It has
4 to identify the specific information they're looking
5 for, so what -- when the worker was there, what they
6 were doing, and the specific information they want.
7 And it has to have a written statement from the
8 worker/handler, signed, designating that person,
9 identifying their name.
10 So I guess I'm really -- Jay and others, I'm
11 interested in what other constrains you guys think are
12 necessary to make that legit.
13 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. Amy, then Lori Ann,
14 then Preston.
15 Andrew, were you still in, or had you not --
16 okay.
17 MS. ASMUS: I just want to point out that we
18 are not unrealizing of the plight of some farmworkers,
19 but you need to understand that the farmworker
20 population is not defined by the subset of migrant
21 workers that come into the U.S. to work. And, so,
22 while we understand that they need to have access to
23 their information and they need to have a
24 representative, if they don't -- if they have those
25 language barriers. We deal with farmworkers that are

ED_002528_00039559-00054

1 not disadvantaged migrant workers, and that may or may
2 not use this clause as an advantage to get what we've
3 talked about are growers -- and they are trade
4 secrets. Growers do weed management, insect
5 management, plant nutrition management in the best way
6 they think they are, and they are competitive with
7 their neighbor.
8 And, so, we are not asking for the
9 limitations to take away from any of those
10 farmworkers. We just want to make sure along with the
11 list that Nancy put that possibly you have the intent
12 of the designated user and what their intent to use
13 that information is, not just from the farmworker but
14 an intent of who they are and what their position is
15 and how they intend to use the information that they
16 have to benefit that worker.
17 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Lori Ann, then Preston,
18 then Nichelle.
19 MS. BURD: I, like many around this table,
20 echo the concerns for the workers in recognizing that
21 this is designed to protect people who don't have the
22 ability to get this information themselves after an
23 incident has occurred where they're sick and they need
24 the information. And it seems to me deeply cynical
25 and unnerving to, like, take this to the most extreme

ED_002528_00039559-00055

1 places we're talking about, that this will be
2 routinely used by farmers against their neighbors to
3 gain unfair advantages.
4 We're talking about sick people wanting
5 information for their doctors. And I just really have
6 concerns about making it harder for people who are
7 vulnerable and are sick to find someone who can help
8 them get this basic information. And I hope that in
9 developing all of this we don't take it to the most
10 cynical scenario possible.
11 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Preston, then Nichelle,
12 then Helen.
13 MR. PECK: I had a question, Kathy, for
14 their efforts. Kathy? When they developed the
15 specificities around it, wasn't it also -- I thought I
16 remembered some provision that caused a concern within
17 the farmworker community about being able to -- having
18 to designate which field the worker was working in at
19 the time. Is that correct?
20 MR. KEIGWIN: So, Nancy, can you clarify?
21 MR. PECK: Nancy, sorry.
22 MS. FITZ: So the ag employers are only
23 required to provide the information that had to be
24 posted when that worker was -- worker/handler was at
25 the establishment. So you do kind of have to narrow

ED_002528_00039559-00056

1 down when they were working and where they were -- or
2 at which -- if there are different establishments to
3 be able to identify the information that they have
4 access to. And it is consistent because that would be
5 -- those would have been the pesticides they might
6 have been exposed to.
7 MR. PECK: But wasn't there -- and there's a
8 time frame in which the worker could give, like a two-
9 year time frame or something like that?
10 MS. FITZ: Yeah, well, the employers are
11 only required to keep the records for two years, so
12 that's as far back as you could go.
13 MR. PECK: I think the concern that was
14 brought up was around the nature of movement with
15 farmworkers and farmworkers being, you know, the
16 migrant farmworker being in a farm -- foreign land and
17 not knowing -- I mean, I know farmworkers in North
18 Carolina that may be -- you know, they get here, the
19 growers -- they go through the growers association.
20 The growers association puts them on a bus and sends
21 them to a farm and they don't know where they are. So
22 that can cause problems, and I just want to talk --
23 you know, elevate that issue.
24 And I -- you know, I hear what Amy has
25 brought up and what Jay brought up around, you know,

ED_002528_00039559-00057

1 issues that it's a very competitive business, just
2 like any other business may be, but I just want to
3 keep harping on that these chemicals are dangerous and
4 that it's a responsibility. You enter into this
5 business knowing that you have a responsibility to
6 protect your workers.
7 And just like any other business, workers
8 have a right to know what they were exposed to, so
9 that they can provide adequate information to their
10 medical officials, so then if any problems arise, they
11 can get that, or if any legal issues happen, then
12 their attorneys can get that information. And how
13 they do that, I think we've addressed that with -- in
14 writing and making sure that the worker's properly
15 being represented, which is also a protection measure.
16 Thank you.
17 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. Nichelle, then Allen,
18 then Andy.
19 MS. HARRIOTT: So after hearing the
20 discussion, I go back to my original question about
21 who designates this designated representative. It
22 seems to me from hearing some of the conversation
23 today that this person would need to be someone who is
24 a neutral entity.
25 This person would be -- needs to be

ED_002528_00039559-00058

1 appointed by someone who is a neutral entity. This
2 person needs to be able to talk to the farmer about
3 what is being used to have access to the information
4 that the farmer needs to provide and also needs to be
5 trusted by the farmworker. This person also needs to
6 be versed in the information that he or she is being
7 tasked with trying to make into the farmworker, so
8 this person needs to be able to explain safety data
9 sheets, for example, and be able to be available to
10 access information for medical personnel when
11 necessary.
12 So back to my original question, I know you
13 have said that this person is appointed by the
14 farmworker, but it seems to me that there needs --
15 this person needs to be someone that both the farmer
16 and farmworker could agree on to be the in-between
17 person between these two groups.
18 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, so I'm going to take the
19 last cards that are up because in talking to Kevin I
20 think -- I think we have heard something that we want
21 to pose to all you, but I want to make sure that we
22 hear from the remaining cards up.
23 So, Allen, then Andy, then Amy.
24 MR. MCLAURIN: Amy, let me ask you a
25 question, and I'll try and -- I do not disagree at all

ED_002528_00039559-00059

1 with the representative. I think it's important that
2 farmworkers have an access to what information they
3 may need. The way we handle it, being in North
4 Carolina, and I'm sure the rest of the states, is if
5 there is a complaint that a neighbor has a complaint,
6 they report it to the pesticide board and within a
7 matter of a day or hours we'll have a call and they'll
8 come by and see us.
9 Is there any way that we can just funnel
10 this through the pesticide division of the states and
11 let them -- let the designated representative and that
12 way the farmer wouldn't even have to know who the
13 complainant was or anything. You just run it through
14 the pesticide division. It would simplify everything,
15 and we trust the pesticide people who come on our
16 farms wanting information. I just throw that out for
17 fair (inaudible).
18 MS. LEIBMAN: I think there's like -- and
19 I'm a little bit confused by your question because it
20 seems like you gave the example of, like, a neighbor
21 wanting to know what was being used.
22 MR. MCLAURIN: Well, no, if someone has the
23 complaint of something that was sprayed or they think
24 it may have harmed them or they want to know -- they
25 report us to the pesticide division and they call us

ED_002528_00039559-00060

1 and they come get the information. In other words,
2 some way we got to be able to trust these people
3 coming to us, that they're --
4 MS. LEIBMAN: So your scenario is a good one
5 as to a completely different scenario than I think
6 what we're talking about, so I think it would be good,
7 again, just to have clarity because a complaint by a
8 neighbor would be handled by -- it's just a whole
9 different set of circumstances. And, really, what
10 we're after here is about the worker.
11 And, also, guys, this is information that in
12 all other parts of the worker protection standard this
13 -- the workers actually have access to it. Like so
14 that we're not saying, like, you know, farmers are
15 giving them. So if you -- like, an unscrupulous
16 neighbor kid who is working on your farm and he wants
17 to steal that information, they can do that. So, you
18 know, maybe you want your kids to, you know, sign a
19 no-compete clause, but this is -- this is not -- this
20 is not what we're talking about.
21 This is really about -- this is information
22 that the workers -- that for safety reasons all have
23 access to it, but sometimes, you know, because there's
24 language barriers, because there's vulnerabilities, I
25 mean, these people, again, they want to work. They

ED_002528_00039559-00061

1 don't want to cause any problems.
2 And, so, in situations where they need that
3 information, just like in other industries, they
4 should have the right to be able to ask a third-party
5 representative to please ask the farmer what was used,
6 what were they exposed to. And, again, it's
7 information that, you know, with, you know, maybe a
8 higher level of education, maybe with the command of
9 the English language, all those things might be
10 easier, or maybe without fear of being fired because,
11 you know, there's an antiretaliation rule -- or
12 there's an antiretaliation language that was left out
13 of the original WPS.
14 I just want to remind everyone of that. But
15 this is -- this is something really that the worker
16 can get this information. It's just that in many
17 cases because of who this worker is, they're not going
18 to be able to. So if there are concerns about
19 information being spread to other farms or the
20 competition there, that largely isn't going to come
21 from the hired farmworker. And then that's a whole
22 other legal issue that farmers who hire educated,
23 English-speaking workers might want to look into if
24 that's something that they're scared about.
25 MR. KEANEY: Okay, Andy.

ED_002528_00039559-00062

1 MR. WHITTINGTON: Well, I think we're
2 narrowing it down and that everybody -- everybody is
3 of the opinion that the farmworker needs access to
4 this information, especially for immediate medical --
5 immediate medical conditions or conditions that he's
6 been exposed to. He could possibly need it for some
7 legal action at some point that he would need to have
8 his attorney have that information or, you know,
9 worker comp claim at some point.
10 I think the concern is outside of those
11 people who are required to hold that information
12 confidential what would be the other circumstances
13 that they would need that information and what could
14 the designated representative do with that information
15 outside of his representation of that individual
16 worker.
17 So I think if we can narrow that down or
18 eliminate that, that would be -- I think we're done
19 with this section and we can move on.
20 MR. KEIGWIN: All right. So thank you all
21 for that. I heard two recommendations on this issue
22 coming forward. And, so, I just want to see if I
23 captured it correctly. I think there seems to be
24 general, widespread support across our committee that
25 workers should be able to have access to this

ED_002528_00039559-00063

1 information.
2 What I heard were two recommended paths
3 forward. One -- and we will take these back. One
4 would be to form a very short-term workgroup to help
5 to work through some of the varied types of issues
6 that Andy and Allen from a user perspective were
7 mentioning. I'll throw Jay in, too, as being part of
8 a family farm operation, mindful of the worker needs
9 that have been expressed by many around the table as
10 well to try to see what types of further clarification
11 might be necessary.
12 And then the second thing that I heard,
13 which might -- the second one might help to inform the
14 first one -- is to enlist AAPCO in looking into those
15 circumstances in states that already have a provision
16 like this or similar to this to find out just kind of
17 operationally how this provision has been utilized and
18 what, if any, concerns have come up in workers being
19 able to avail themselves of a similar type of
20 provision.
21 Does that reflect what people heard around
22 the table?
23 (No response.)
24 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. So we will take that
25 back. So we are at 10:05. This has been a great

ED_002528_00039559-00064

1 discussion. We still have one more aspect of the
2 worker protection standard that we were going to
3 discuss before the break. These have been very robust
4 discussions. I don't know if people want to take a
5 quick break now. I'm seeing some nods. So could we
6 come back at 10:20, no later than that, and we'll pick
7 up with AEZ at that point. All right, thanks.
8 (Brief recess.)
9 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, so we've got one last
10 topic that we wanted to cover today regarding worker
11 protection standard that is the application exclusion
12 zone. I think I said -- I did it right this time,
13 Nancy? So, Kevin, can you help kick this one off?
14 MR. KEANEY: Well, pesticide labels have
15 basic provisions saying don't spray people. And it's
16 kind of straightforward. Perhaps the provision in the
17 worker protection, the application exclusion zone was
18 trying -- it was trying to give ways in which work
19 would not have to be stopped during application in
20 order to prevent spraying people.
21 But I think what we're concerned with here
22 is the challenge, the complexity of the application
23 exclusion zone provision or the fact that there's
24 already a provision labeling that says don't spray
25 people, or does it create challenges for enforcement

ED_002528_00039559-00065

1 since you have to be present as an inspector to
2 witness violation of the provisions of the application
3 exclusion zone? Those are all questions that I think
4 would be helpful to discuss.
5 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. So Damon, Iris, Amy.
6 All right, Damon.
7 MR. REABE: Just a clarification, does the
8 application exclusion zone -- in aerial application,
9 we're using spotters that are trained by our -- by our
10 company. They travel to the field, and they observe
11 the application and they carry two-way radio
12 communication so that they can communicate with the
13 pilot. And they're observing where the spray is
14 landing and then communicating that back to the pilot.
15 So in an application exclusion zone as --
16 would a -- would a person that's trained and wearing
17 PPE be allowed in the application exclusion zone or
18 not?
19 MR. KEANEY: If you follow the -- if you
20 look at the fact sheet that's provided there, it's --
21 it's admittedly about ground application and then
22 having a sort of a bubble of protection around the
23 application -- applicator equipment that would allow
24 people in, as long as they weren't within that --
25 within that bubble.

ED_002528_00039559-00066

1 MR. REABE: So, but being -- is it possible
2 to be within the bubble with PPE donned?
3 MR. KEIGWIN: Nancy, do you want to clarify?
4 MS. FITZ: Yeah, I'd love to jump in. Yes,
5 the -- and a handler who is properly trained and
6 equipped and involved with the application is allowed
7 to be in the bubble.
8 MR. REABE: Thank you.
9 MR. KEIGWIN: Iris, then Amy.
10 MS. FIGUEROA: Thank you. So just generally
11 and briefly, we just want to reiterate, we think this
12 is an important protection. One of the leading causes
13 of pesticide poisoning for farmworkers is actually
14 exposure from nearby or adjacent fields, so this is,
15 as you expressed, just trying to get at preventing
16 some of that harm beyond what may be in the label an
17 insert of having explicit and practical measures that
18 can be taken to help prevent that harm, not just for
19 the workers, but also for bystanders who may be
20 affected.
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Amy, then Andy.
22 MS. LEIBMAN: Thank you. I just wanted to
23 echo some of that, and that really I think that it's
24 important to look at the intent of what the worker
25 protection standard is trying to do in terms of

1 minimizing the exposure of the worker to pesticides.
2 And it's basically just trying to keep -- keep workers
3 away, and it might have a big word -- application
4 exclusion zone -- but in essence it's something that's
5 pretty important that's looking at how can we make
6 sure -- how can we minimize workers' exposure.
7 So in terms of, you know, the challenges, it
8 is consistent with your mission, and, you know, I have
9 lots of ideas if you want to go further than what's in
10 the WPS, if you want to strengthen this part. I'm
11 happy to chat with you about that, but in terms of
12 what you're trying to do here, it's a good first step
13 in terms of trying to keep the worker protected.
14 MR. KEIGWIN: Andy, then Sharon, then Liza.
15 MR. WHITTINGTON: So agree that we need to
16 keep this stuff off of -- nobody wants to spray
17 people. And I don't come from an area with a lot --
18 large migrant worker population, so I'm thinking of
19 this in terms of explaining it to my farmers who don't
20 have a lot of workers in any particular area, and it's
21 with the difference between the onsite obligations
22 versus the offsite -- outside of the facility
23 boundaries. And the question that I have been asked
24 is a car coming down a highway, if you're spraying the
25 end of the field, a car coming down the end of the

1 highway, do you cease application at that point until
2 it moves out of the area. I mean, that's one.
3 Obviously, if a person is walking down the
4 highway, I would advise them to cease application
5 until that person is gone, but that was one of the
6 things when it came up about the houses that are next-
7 door, you know, not owned by the facility but a
8 neighboring house, if the people are inside, do you
9 have to cease application within the hundred feet, or
10 do you have to wait until they're not home?
11 There's -- so those are the two instances
12 that my farmers have asked me for clarification on, is
13 the automobiles on a highway and if you have to cease
14 application for people or if they're -- obviously if
15 they come outside of the house, they would cease
16 application, but if they're inside the house while
17 you're making the application, do you have to cease
18 application until they're not home.
19 MR. KEANEY: Nancy, I'd like you to respond
20 to it just as a result.
21 MS. FITZ: Thanks, Kevin. So the rule
22 itself says if any person -- worker or other person --
23 other than a trained and equipped handler involved
24 with the application is in the AEZ, the handler has to
25 suspend the application. The information -- so if

ED_002528_00039559-00069

1 there's some -- so that would say if somebody's in
2 that car, if somebody's in the house, if somebody's
3 walking down, they would have to suspend.
4 What we heard from the states right when
5 this came out was, well, when can they start up again.
6 And the rules does -- does not address that. And, so,
7 the handout that Kevin provided with the AEZ
8 interpretation says if that car's coming down or they
9 think somebody's in the house, they have to suspend,
10 but then if they can assess the situation, assure that
11 they can continue the application without contacting
12 that person, then they can resume.
13 So in theory, if the wind's blowing the
14 other direction or they can be sure they're not going
15 to contact the person in the car or in the house, then
16 they can continue. You did get to some areas where we
17 do need to kind of provide some clarification in terms
18 of what exactly is contact in this -- with the car and
19 the house, and that's one of the things on our to-do
20 list yet is to provide some clarification on that.
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Sharon, then Liza.
22 MS. SELVAGGIO: I want to say that with
23 regard to this AEZ, the 100 feet already seems quite
24 minimal for aerial air-blast fumigation, smoke, mist,
25 et cetera. We know that drift, especially for those

ED_002528_00039559-00070

1 kinds of applications, can extend far beyond that. So
2 we definitely are not in favor of weakening the size
3 of the AEZ at all.
4 The other thing that concerns us is that
5 we've become aware that some -- some producers are
6 apparently interested in interpreting this provision
7 to allow sheltering in place for migrant housing,
8 labor housing that is onsite or adjacent to some of
9 the agricultural areas. And we're very concerned
10 about that. We don't think that that is a fair
11 interpretation of what this rule was meant to address.
12 We do recognize the difficulties in
13 implementing this when there is housing especially and
14 when night applications might take place, but we
15 believe that, you know, the intent of this particular
16 provision really needs to be upheld because we're not
17 just talking workers now, but we're talking the
18 workers' children, the workers' family, and other
19 people who, you know, could potentially be affected
20 that are -- the intent of this provision is to protect
21 those other people who might be quite vulnerable,
22 untrained, young, sick, you know. So we don't want to
23 see any weakening of this particular provision.
24 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Liza, then Dominic, then
25 Tim.

1 MS. TROSSBACH: Again, as I had mentioned in
2 our previous discussion, pesticide regulatory
3 officials certainly support protections of
4 workers/handlers/bystanders, you know, any persons
5 involved. I think with the application exclusion
6 zone, I think it is for some kind of a difficult
7 concept because it's a moving target as the
8 application moves, but I think that's a matter of
9 outreach and education, so applicators understand
10 that, and I think the guidance that's been provided by
11 the EPA will assist and that there may be further
12 guidance needed, just so we can make sure, you know,
13 that individuals, you know, do particularly understand
14 that.
15 I think that there was a question or a
16 comment about the enforceability of this and does a
17 state lead agency or a regulatory official need to be
18 onsite. As I had mentioned earlier, we do routine
19 inspections and use observations, so there may be the
20 opportunities that we're actually onsite during these
21 applications, but if we were to get a tip, some kind
22 of report, we would handle it like we do any
23 investigation at that time, which would include, you
24 know, interviewing the complainant, interviewing the
25 respondent, which may be the agriculture producer, you

ED_002528_00039559-00072

1 know, applicator, you know, handlers, you know,
2 workers to gather as much information, looking at
3 records, et cetera, to try to determine if, in fact,
4 those provisions were met. So we would handle that as
5 we do any other type of tip, complaint, or report
6 regarding a potential pesticide misuse.
7 So it's having your regulators educated,
8 having your industry regulated, and then -- or excuse
9 me, educated, and then being able to go out and do
10 those investigations if needed.
11 MR. KEIGWIN: Dominic, then Tim, then
12 Andrew.
13 MR. LAJOIE: Thank you. I just want to
14 share one of the challenges on my farm. I do all of
15 the applications on our crops, and it's actually ATV
16 riders or all-terrain vehicles that have access to the
17 public roads around our farms, and all these public
18 roads are dirt roads, but it's access to the public.
19 And a lot of times, I don't see them before they show
20 up into my exclusion zone.
21 So whether they show up behind me, and so I
22 immediately stop application, but a lot of times I'm
23 probably in violation with this rule. Some of these
24 ATV riders are educated enough to know that if they
25 see me, they'll stop and wait. A lot of these are

ED_002528_00039559-00073

1 young kids riding around on the trails. You know,
2 they're just -- they don't understand.
3 But I guess it's going to be a challenge for
4 me to really keep that exclusion zone without knowing
5 when somebody's going to pop up behind me. That's
6 just one challenge of people in that zone.
7 MR. KEIGWIN: Tim, then Andrew.
8 MR. TUCKER: I don't see anything in the
9 notes regarding this, about the considerations of the
10 different materials that might be being applied, you
11 know, whether it's a pesticide or herbicide. And
12 anything that's stating, you know, maybe a time limit
13 for this AEZ, you know, because it seems to me, having
14 been in the pest control industry for 18 years, that
15 we're not only trying to keep it off people when we
16 spray but trying to minimize their exposure maybe even
17 for a certain amount of time.
18 So I think my questions would be -- and I
19 have a concern, too, like Sharon does for the hundred-
20 foot limitation seems very, very minor and very small.
21 But what is the time -- was there any consideration
22 given to the difference in materials or time, and then
23 is there any kind of communication that goes on
24 between the applicators and the harvesters and growers
25 much like we have drift watch where the pickers or

ED_002528_00039559-00074

1 growers, harvesters are notifying aerial applicators
2 of where they would be harvesting, you know, on
3 certain days to minimize exposure.
4 So are there any -- are there any guidelines
5 for communication as well as these time
6 considerations, how long you should be out of the
7 area?
8 MR. KEANEY: There are the -- excuse me.
9 There are things that are product-specific, obviously,
10 as far as the -- that requires notice of workers, and
11 then there are also the product-specific restrictions
12 on entry based on toxicity of the product, obviously,
13 after application.
14 MR. KEIGWIN: Andrew?
15 MR. THOSTENSON: I believe the AEZ -- and
16 Nancy can help me with this -- the AEZ -- the buffer
17 expires as soon as the application is completed. It
18 goes along -- you know, when you're -- you have to
19 think of it as an invisible bubble around you. When
20 you're going down the field and you're spraying, you
21 know, I'm not going to have people in that area. But
22 as soon as I get further down the field, then that
23 area that I just sprayed is different. It's no longer
24 in an AEZ. It may be under an REI, which is a
25 different animal in general, restricted entry period.

ED_002528_00039559-00075

1 Does that help you with that?
2 Nancy, am I correct on that? Okay. Boy,
3 scary.
4 You know, I've been training pesticide
5 applicators for 21 years. And the first time I saw
6 this AEZ thing, I thought it was some kind of weird
7 construct that only EPA could come up with. And I
8 thought that it would be very difficult to explain to
9 my applicators. And one applicator explained it all
10 to me in a very short sentence: we don't spray
11 people, okay? So if that's the prime directive, then
12 this whole AEZ thing is not really that big of a deal.
13 We don't spray people. We spray pests.
14 And, so, the AEZ thing seems to me in my experience
15 with my applicators to be a tool to reinforce that
16 notion that we don't spray people. And, so, you know,
17 my early reservations to this particular rule have
18 kind of melted away. As long as it's properly
19 explained, and when the farmer or an applicator
20 explains to me in response we don't spray people, and
21 that's the answer to the AEZ, then it all makes sense.
22 So that's my spiel.
23 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Richard.
24 MR. GRAGG: Okay, so the -- I'm just
25 thinking about the discussion about the drift and then

ED_002528_00039559-00076

1 the minimum age discussion as well. And I'm not clear
2 -- I get what you just said, you don't spray people,
3 but I don't -- I'm not clear how this 100 feet -- what
4 it's really accomplishing. I'm thinking, okay, you're
5 in a plane and you're putting out the pesticide,
6 where's the AEZ on that?
7 MS. FITZ: So the AEZ is basically
8 assistance around the application equipment that moves
9 with the application equipment. So in addition to
10 don't spray people, what it says is if someone's near
11 the application equipment, stop and then the ag
12 employers have to make sure workers are not near the
13 application equipment. So if I'm -- the application
14 equipment, I'm going to stick my arms out, this is the
15 AEZ, as soon as I'm past it's gone. We're trying to
16 keep people out of this area right there.
17 MR. GRAGG: So this only applies to certain
18 types of applications or equipment?
19 MS. FITZ: It applies to different -- it
20 applies to most kinds of application equipment. The
21 distance may be different. It's 100 feet for aerial,
22 air-blast, fumigants, although fumigants tends to be
23 superceded by labels. And if it's a fine or smaller
24 droplet size. Otherwise, they're ground applications,
25 medium droplet-sized, unless you're really, really

1 close to the ground, it's 25 feet.
2 MR. GRAGG: So I --
3 MS. FITZ: And it only applies -- it only
4 exists during the application itself.
5 MR. GRAGG: So I just want to go back to his
6 point. Mine's a little different. If you have
7 different types of material that you're applying, then
8 how does one uniform distance apply to all these
9 different types of chemicals that may react with the
10 air or whatever. They're different, so they're going
11 to have different reactions or dispersion, whatever
12 you want to call it.
13 MS. FITZ: So the dispersion really is
14 probably related more to droplet size than anything,
15 as opposed to what -- what the chemistry is, so that's
16 why we accounted for the droplet size. We did think
17 about toxicity, but, frankly, it's confusing enough.
18 Adding toxicity would make it even more difficult to
19 explain and understand.
20 And let's keep in mind, we're not saying
21 there's any pesticide actually being applied in the
22 application exclusion zone. This is -- if this is my
23 target area, we're just saying not every single drop
24 lands exactly where you want it. And if it doesn't,
25 it's probably going to be in this area closest to the

ED_002528_00039559-00078

1 application equipment. So it's an extra precaution to
2 help people make sure they comply with the do-not-
3 contact requirement.
4 MR. KEIGWIN: Andrew, then Damon.
5 MR. THOSTENSON: Yeah, the -- you know, my
6 friend over here, this aerial applicator, he knows
7 that on a windy day he's going to spray so that that
8 pesticide drifts down into the location that he wants.
9 So he's going to offset that particular spray
10 application. He knows or she knows roughly where that
11 spray droplet's going to go. And you also know that
12 if there's a person in that area, you're going to hit
13 them and you know that you're going to be held liable
14 with the state lead agency if you hit that person.
15 So I do understand the notion that this AEZ
16 thing may be a much bigger deal than it really is, but
17 we already hold aerial applicators or any other
18 applicator responsible for an exposure event,
19 regardless. So, again, it seems to me it's mostly a
20 tool. I'm not sure it's a rule that's a gotcha rule.
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Damon, then Liza.
22 MR. REABE: I think just to answer your
23 question, Richard, the spray drift task force, when
24 they did all the work to develop the ag drift model,
25 what they found was that the chemistries that were

ED_002528_00039559-00079

1 getting mixed with the water, there was no significant
2 -- there was no difference in the properties as far as
3 downwind dispersion. So when you asked the question
4 about -- I think, if I understand your question
5 correctly, you were asking about one product might
6 drift more than another, and that's not the case.
7 And really to kind of echo what Andrew's
8 saying and when we looked at this, this is -- this
9 is putting in writing a best-management practice.
10 When -- as -- whether you're an aerial applicator or a
11 ground applicator, when there are people downwind, we
12 suspend the application, and there's a lot of
13 variables that are associated with how far they're
14 downwind, what is the wind speed, you know, what is
15 the application hype going to be at that time.
16 There's just a very large number of
17 variables that we're taking into consideration while
18 making these applications. And suspending an
19 application because there's people present downwind is
20 -- I spend more time circling than spraying. I mean,
21 that's a true statement. I'm not saying that to be
22 smart about it. That's what we do. We -- and, so, I
23 hope that provides a little bit of comfort for those
24 that are wondering how this works. It's easy for an
25 applicator to understand the concept, and it's easy

ED_002528_00039559-00080

1 for an applicator to comply with.
2 MR. KEIGWIN: Liza.
3 MS. TROSSBACH: From a pesticide regulatory
4 perspective, obviously when -- if -- when we're doing
5 any type of inspections or investigations to ensure
6 compliance with the label requirements, we'll look at
7 the compliance at the AEZ, but that does not preclude
8 any other part of the label from being enforceable and
9 having to meet that. So while an applicator may meet
10 an AEZ requirement, if there is drift, that's a
11 completely different issue and it will be looked at
12 separately. So the totality of the application, so
13 the concerns about drift, you're right, certain
14 products, you know, may be apt to drift more, certain
15 types of applications may be more subject to drift.
16 We would still look at the drift component, along with
17 the AEZ.
18 So that kind of takes into account some of
19 those concerns about it's only specific to AEZ is
20 based on the type of application and the droplet size,
21 but other parts of the label focus on the chemistry of
22 that product, and that's why there may be -- you know,
23 the language about drift or buffer zones or other
24 things. So we have to look at it as one part of a
25 label and what has to be done to apply it correctly

ED_002528_00039559-00081

1 and labeling.
2 MR. KEIGWIN: So I think what Kevin and I
3 have heard from this discussion is that some
4 additional guidance could be useful and that there may
5 be some additional scenarios that -- in the guidance
6 that we've developed to date could be further enhanced
7 and that there's a role that education programs can
8 play in helping to better explain what this provision
9 is meant to be. And does that reflect what -- did
10 this end of the table hear what was happening around
11 the rest of table?
12 Damon?
13 MR. REABE: When you're talking about
14 additional guidance, you know, this is ultimately
15 labeling, which is guidance for the applicator,
16 correct?
17 MR. KEIGWIN: It could be label language.
18 It could also be interpretive guidance that we provide
19 to state agencies to -- up on our website to be
20 included in continuing education programs for
21 certification.
22 MR. REABE: Sure. Okay, well, from -- as a
23 -- from the aerial application community, it's -- it
24 is very clear for whatever that's worth.
25 MR. KEIGWIN: Any other comments before we

ED_002528_00039559-00082

1 close this one out?
2 (No response.)
3 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. Thank you all very
4 much. So I'm going to invite Arnold Layne, the Deputy
5 Director for OPP for Management, as well as Susan
6 Jennings, who is our Public Health Officer for the
7 Office of Pesticide Programs, to come up and give us a
8 brief update on the first meeting of the new public
9 health workgroup.
10 MR. LAYNE: Good morning, everyone. I'm
11 Arnold Layne. I'm Deputy Office Director, the Office
12 of Pesticide Programs. So at the last PPDC meeting,
13 there was a lot of talk about forming a public health
14 workgroup under the auspices of the pesticide program
15 dialogue committee. And the impetus for doing such
16 was the fact that we were in the height of the Zika
17 crisis, national crisis, and then the growing public
18 health crises, whether they're natural or manmade,
19 including hurricanes and emergent pathogens.
20 And many PPDC members suggested and
21 requested that we form a public health workgroup to
22 deal with some of the issues related to public health.
23 And, so, on Tuesday, October 31st, Halloween, we held
24 our first kickoff meeting, which was an organizing
25 meeting. And it was open to the members of the

ED_002528_00039559-00083

1 workgroup only because of the fact it was an
2 organizational meeting.
3 And our goal was to define the mission and
4 determine the goals of the workgroup. So just to give
5 you a sense of the diversity of the workgroup, there
6 are 21 members representing registrants, both
7 conventional, biological and antimicrobial pesticides,
8 public health groups, academicians, NGOs and other
9 associations, as well as federal partners, including
10 CDC and NIOSH, the Armed Forces Pest Management Board,
11 as well as our own EPA regional offices.
12 And, so, we were, in the short time that we
13 had, quite ambitious and -- but successful in
14 hammering out a mission statement, and that mission
15 statement should appear on the slides in one second.
16 Oh, I have the clicker. Thank you.
17 So you probably can't read it, but I will
18 read it to you. The workgroup -- the mission
19 statement is intentionally broad, and it reads as
20 follows: The public health workgroup formed under the
21 auspices of the EPA Pesticide Program Dialogue
22 Committee will focus on policy, advice, information,
23 and recommendations regarding pest management methods
24 that control public health pests. The workgroup will
25 provide recommendations to the PPDC for consideration

ED_002528_00039559-00084

1 and sharing with the U.S. Environmental Protection
2 Agency.
3 The group then, once we codified our
4 mission, we then delved into the most difficult area,
5 and that was coming up with areas of focus. And at
6 first we had a plethora of just a long list of
7 suggestions of topic areas. And, so, one of the
8 workgroup members was successful in seeing major
9 headlines and some of the topics could meld together.
10 And, so, we decided to go with three focus areas or
11 three headline areas.
12 The first one, which is pretty overarching,
13 is communications. So in that regard, the
14 discussions focused around how might the agency
15 better communicate the risks and values of public
16 health pest interventions, what should the agency be
17 communicating, how and to whom, how can we improve
18 communications, particularly around technical topics,
19 focus on communicating the role that pesticides play
20 in maintaining and ensuring the high standards of
21 public health enjoyed in the United States.
22 The next focus area was national emergency
23 response plan. So the objective there would be to
24 develop an action plan or a standard operating
25 procedure. Likely you've heard the terminology SOP,

1 standard operating procedure, to help respond to
2 natural or manmade disasters. And in that vein, what
3 can the agency do to prepare for emergency public
4 health tests and diseases and to public health
5 emergencies that are a result of natural or manmade
6 disasters?
7 Public health emergencies sometimes test the
8 agency's ability to respond quickly and easily. By
9 anticipating some frequent needs during emergencies,
10 EPA could be a more effective partner for recovery
11 such as creating an SOP or action plan tailored to
12 different scenarios or environments after being
13 impacted by a natural or a manmade disaster, defining
14 suitable tactics for insect disease vector control.
15 An example of a manmade disaster was actually in 2001,
16 which was the Anthrax attacks. EPA supported this
17 incident, but there may be a need to improve our
18 ability to respond to bio attacks in general. So that
19 was the second focus area or headline area.
20 And the last one is resistance management.
21 And the objective there is to further define and
22 elevate the agency's role in public health pest
23 resistance prevention and response. And along those
24 lines, the agency -- or the workgroup, with the
25 support of the PPDC, could do a number of things --

ED_002528_00039559-00086

1 develop a plan to understand and prevent resistance to
2 treatments such as using predictive modeling and data
3 analytics and proper use of pesticides, evaluate
4 resistance impacts on emergency response.
5 The group would like to focus on resistance
6 management for public health pests, similar to what's
7 been done for herbicides. We want to educate efforts
8 supporting the need to prevent and minimize further
9 development of resistance in pest populations; and,
10 lastly, evaluate expeditious means to clear or approve
11 new pesticides to encounter or counter resistant pest
12 threats when public health risks arise.
13 So our next meeting, which we have not
14 scheduled yet, but will very shortly, will allow us to
15 narrow our focus and add more specificity to these
16 three headlines. Before I end, I do want to thank the
17 workgroup members for their productive meeting. We
18 didn't have a lot of time, but we got a lot
19 accomplished in that short span of time.
20 I also want to thank them for their time,
21 talent, and their commitment to this extremely
22 important topic. And with that, I think I covered
23 this in five minutes.
24 MR. KEIGWIN: You did. Thank you.
25 MR. LAYNE: The agenda called for it.

1 MR. KEIGWIN: So are there any quick
2 questions or comments for Arnold? Aaron and then
3 Liza.
4 MR. HOBBS: Thank you. So I have a couple
5 of questions about process and membership. So being
6 new to the PPDC in an official capacity at this
7 meeting, not right now probably, but if we could get
8 some more clarity about how this workgroup was spun
9 up. As I heard it right now, it sounds like let's
10 create a workgroup, and then we'll decide what we're
11 going to do later. It seems a little backwards to me,
12 but, again, I'm new. Maybe that's normal to bring
13 clarity to the mission after the workgroup is created.
14 So I'd like just some more clarity around process for
15 -- so that as we move forward together we understand
16 exactly how to be engaged and what the proper order
17 for that is.
18 But then also membership, given that there
19 are a significant number of new members, myself
20 included, that are extremely interested in anything
21 that relates to public health pesticides, I would call
22 that that membership be reopened and that especially
23 those that are new to the table have the opportunity
24 to serve on the workgroup.
25 MR. LAYNE: Okay, so, as I mentioned, the

ED_002528_00039559-00088

1 impetus for going forward with the workgroup was the
2 fact that we were dealing with a national crisis of
3 Zika. And then came the hurricanes and such. And the
4 PPDC at that time felt that it was important for us to
5 have a side workgroup to focus on public health issues
6 and bring -- as I mentioned, the role of the workgroup
7 is to bring issues to the PPDC for consideration. So
8 the fact that you're on the PPDC will mean that
9 anything that we discuss any recommendations that we
10 bring forward, this entire body will have an
11 opportunity to weigh in on it.
12 And, so, we did open up a call for
13 membership. We got overwhelming response, and as you
14 may know, in order for a workgroup to be successful --
15 and we have a time limit -- we have a year in which to
16 work. In order for any workgroup to be really
17 successful, the membership needs to be as tight as
18 possible. And, so, I would -- I take your
19 recommendation to reopen, but we went through an
20 exhaustive process to get the workgroup where we are.
21 We have now formed and gelled. We went
22 through the storming phase on Halloween, and we're in
23 the process of moving forward. I'm not certain
24 opening up membership -- we had to turn away some
25 folks, and that will cause a lot of angst, and I don't

ED_002528_00039559-00089

1 think that's a productive approach to take in
2 reopening membership.
3 Again, as this body, we are reporting to
4 you, and you will have an opportunity to weigh in on
5 anything that we bring forward for your consideration.
6 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, I'm just going to take
7 the remaining cards up, plus Jim Fredericks before
8 I -- you just got in.
9 MR. LAYNE: I'm sorry, Rick.
10 MR. KEIGWIN: Yeah.
11 MR. LAYNE: I just want to add one thing.
12 Going forward, as I mentioned, the workgroup meetings
13 are open. And, so, if you would like to attend those
14 meetings, you're more than welcome to attend those
15 meetings. But there will be open meetings, but the
16 workgroup will -- the Public Health Workgroup will be
17 setting the agenda, will be having the dialogue, and
18 depending upon the workgroup's recommendations, we
19 will determine how we will deal with people who attend
20 from the public.
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Liza, then Jay, then
22 Cynthia.
23 MS. TROSSBACH: Thank you. I want to just
24 say that -- I have a comment and question. The
25 comment is I think it's absolutely appropriate to have

ED_002528_00039559-00090

1 -- that the Public Health Workgroup, I think, the
2 experience that state lead agencies, tribes and
3 territories experience and are experiencing with Zika
4 and, of course, the most recent, you know, national
5 disasters. I think it's absolutely appropriate, and I
6 think there are a lot of issues to be addressed.
7 I particularly am happy with the -- you
8 know, with the national emergency response plan. I
9 think that will help states and tribes and territories
10 to understand what their role is. Obviously as we
11 regulate pesticides, we are brought into a number of
12 those situations, so it would be very helpful to us to
13 understand or to get some guidance on what our roles
14 may be, particularly the role of pesticides in public
15 health situations. You know, I think that's fantastic
16 and, of course, the resistance management.
17 I do have just one question. When we're
18 talking about public health pests, because the group
19 is -- you know, it's broad -- the mission is broad,
20 does that include only those pests that are identified
21 as public health pests, or could it be, you know,
22 anything beyond that? You know, that may come up.
23 And, so, I just want to make sure that it could be,
24 you know, that it is broad or is it just specific to
25 those listed.

1 MR. LAYNE: Well, we actually -- thank you,
2 first of all. We got into a conversation about some
3 of the nuisance pests. And remind me where we ended
4 up on those. I think there are -- we will consider
5 those as we move forward, if I'm -- if I remember
6 correctly. And in particular, we were talking about
7 biting mosquitoes that may not vector disease. So --
8 but, yes, I think it will include all kinds of pests.
9 MR. KEIGWIN: Jay, then Cynthia, then Lori
10 Ann.
11 MR. VROOM: So I've talked with a couple of
12 representatives in the workgroup and am impressed with
13 the quality of the work that you've done so far and
14 the agenda that you put together, so congratulations.
15 I think resistance management is important,
16 and I'm glad to see that that's a highlight and focal
17 point and would ask you to keep in mind that quite
18 often agricultural resistance management concerns very
19 much overlap with those in the public health
20 application sector, and I'm sure that the staff of the
21 agency will help connect those dots.
22 MR. LAYNE: Thank you, Jay. Duly noted, and
23 we did talk about that in the first workgroup meeting.
24 Thank you, sir.
25 And I will say also, just to your point,

ED_002528_00039559-00092

1 nuisance pests can easily become public health pests.
2 MR. KEIGWIN: Cynthia, then Lori Ann, then
3 Kim.
4 MS. PALMER: I appreciate that you've got
5 this workgroup, given the horrors of Zika and the
6 hurricanes. I just had a question regarding that last
7 bullet under Communications. You said that part of
8 the role would be to delineate -- I may be getting
9 this slightly misquoted, but the important role of
10 pesticides in maintaining the high standards of life
11 in the United States, something like that. And I just
12 wanted to acknowledge that sometimes pesticides are a
13 problem and sometimes they're a solution. And, so, if
14 we change the wording to pest -- the importance of
15 pest control, I think we would be good with that.
16 Thank you.
17 MR. LAYNE: Thank you.
18 MR. KEIGWIN: Lori Ann, then Jim.
19 MS. BURD: Thanks. So if human-caused
20 climate change leads to more hurricanes and natural
21 disasters, I think -- I'm curious to hear from you all
22 more about what is an emergency. And, you know,
23 you've just talked very briefly about what, you know,
24 regular sort of pest mosquitoes versus carrying
25 mosquitoes might mean. And, so, I'm -- you know, I'm

ED_002528_00039559-00093

1 hoping you guys will really work on articulating that
2 as an issue.
3 In Houston, there were just 6 million acres
4 of Naled sprayed. And there wasn't a disease risk
5 raised. It was a -- that they were really bothering
6 people on the ground. It was an adulticiding and, you
7 know, I wasn't on the ground. I don't know exactly
8 what was going on there. I wonder if larviciding
9 might have been a better choice for right then, you
10 know, and I just urge a very cautious and thoughtful
11 response to this, you know, measuring is there a human
12 health threat, is there not a human health threat, are
13 we anticipating a huge hatch, or is it happening right
14 now, is it getting in the way of relief efforts.
15 And it's just a really robust conversation
16 about what an emergency is. And from the endangered
17 species perspective, there are a lot of species
18 getting really hammered by these hurricanes right now,
19 and to withstand an aerial application of Naled,
20 especially over such large acreage, could really be
21 the end of some species. So some thoughts for your
22 workgroup.
23 MR. LAYNE: Thank you. We appreciate that
24 and we will take that to the workgroup. We did --
25 just so that you know, we had quite a bit of

ED_002528_00039559-00094

1 conversation on IPM and the role that IPM plays, not
2 just pesticides. And we also talked about the fact
3 that with some of the workgroup members, like
4 Nichelle, for example, how it's so important to get
5 children and educate children.
6 Having served the agency in the lead role
7 for Zika, and it was in the midst of that crisis, I
8 can assure you that when children are taught about
9 public health issues or any issues that you can liken
10 it to recycling, for example. They go home, and they
11 tell the parents, no, don't put that plastic bottle in
12 the garbage, it can be recycled. So we talked a great
13 deal about IPM.
14 It's just not -- I mean, there's a long list
15 of things that fall under those three major headlines
16 that we just don't have the time to talk to you about
17 today. And we want to go back and further refine
18 those three major headlines. But we certainly take
19 into consideration IPM, and we promote IPM quite a
20 bit, as we did with Zika.
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Jim.
22 MR. FREDERICKS: Well, thanks. And I wanted
23 to first of all just commend EPA for putting together
24 this workgroup and also to commend you on noting the
25 importance of pesticides and pest control and IPM in

ED_002528_00039559-00095

1 ensuring public health as we know it in the United
2 States. With regard to the comment about nuisance
3 pests, I think nuisance pests we often think of or we
4 perceive nuisance pests as being simply a nuisance,
5 but oftentimes these nuisance pests are also important
6 tests of public health.
7 And, so, when we think about maintaining
8 that quality of public health, it's important to also
9 consider things that we might consider, you know,
10 thinking about things we might consider a nuisance,
11 like cockroaches and remembering that they're
12 important -- important public health pests because of
13 the fact that they can -- you know, they can -- they
14 can vector foodborne illness. Stinging insects send
15 people to the hospital every year. This is important.
16 And, so, I commend you on that.
17 My caution for the workgroup -- and as part
18 of the workgroup I know that I -- I brought it up, but
19 I think it's important that we maintain a focus within
20 that public health workgroup on the impact areas that
21 EPA has -- has purview over. So specifically the
22 pesticide areas.
23 So, thanks, and appreciate the time.
24 MR. LAYNE: Thank you, and we appreciate
25 that. We actually joked around with staying in our

ED_002528_00039559-00096

1 lane, in the L A Y N E lane at the meeting, so thank
2 you, Jim.
3 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, I think Leyla had a
4 quick --
5 MS. MCCURDY: Yeah, thank you so much. I'm
6 sorry, we're running late, but I need a little
7 clarification about the process. This is functioning
8 -- our health group is functioning a little bit
9 different than the other FACA committees that I have
10 served on. So what is the process -- what is the time
11 line before reporting to us? You said you are
12 reporting to us, and when are we going to see what,
13 and how can we chime in? You said a year time frame.
14 So are there going to be documents shared with us by
15 email, and can you just explain quickly what the
16 process is?
17 MR. LAYNE: Yeah, so, the workgroup is going
18 to deal with that, your very issue. We began talking
19 about that, but, again, this is the body that we
20 report to, so I'm imagining that there will be a
21 number of venues and opportunities to engage the group
22 either by email, when the PPDC gets together. It gets
23 together, I think, just twice a year. So -- and we
24 think that we will have some output sooner than that,
25 and we will find ways in which to communicate upward

ED_002528_00039559-00097

1 and do it the right way. And Dea will help us with
2 that to make sure that we are within the rules of
3 FACA.
4 The year time line or time frame is given to
5 us, and we want to be able to do what we can within a
6 year. There are some opportunities to go a little
7 beyond that, but the whole idea of a side work group
8 under the auspices of the PPDC is to be focused, as
9 Jim said, and get it done within a year. We've talked
10 about there may be things that we just present to the
11 PPDC and ask the PPDC the workgroup can't resolve
12 this, but can we make a recommendation to the PPDC
13 that the agency take up a specific issue and perhaps
14 even form a subworkgroup and another group of people
15 to go work on that particular issue, emanating from
16 the public health workgroup itself and a
17 recommendation coming from that workgroup.
18 So I can't tell you this because just the
19 vast number of topics that fall under the purview of
20 public health, and we would be foolish that in a year
21 that we could take on all of them. And, so, our
22 objective is to narrow the scope of this and do some
23 meaningful work within the year and to provide the
24 PPDC with perhaps other recommendations that can go on
25 beyond the year, or to the agency, for that matter,

ED_002528_00039559-00098

1 that the agency come -- I imagine that the agency come
2 -- I imagine the SOP, having worked with Zika, and
3 having worked with a number of entities with Zika,
4 including the White House and, you know, a number of
5 other federal agencies and so forth and so on, state
6 lead agencies, et cetera, that we're talking about a
7 collaboration here in some of these topic areas.
8 The Armed Forces Pest Management Board, for
9 example, we talked about this having a lot of
10 tentacles and bringing those -- resistance management,
11 for example, has a lot of tentacles, and trying to
12 bring that together in some kind of way. Our
13 workgroup may not be able to do that successfully, but
14 we would urge the PPDC to find a way to coordinate
15 across the board with everybody dealing with
16 resistance management in some form or fashion so that
17 we're all moving in the same direction.
18 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, thanks, Arnold and
19 Susan.
20 So our last major topic of the day, back to
21 the Kevin Keaney Show, is to discuss one issue
22 relative to the certification and training rule. So,
23 Kevin's coming back up.
24 MR. KEANEY: Just a reminder of the -- of
25 the provisions in the revised applicator certification

ED_002528_00039559-00099

1 rule. And to comment on the process we went through,
2 we had extensive stakeholder involvement, and we
3 significantly changed the positions we had in the
4 proposal as a result of the stakeholder involvement.
5 So we engaged with the state regulatory agencies.
6 AAPCO had a group that we worked with. And we
7 received some very telling and useful comments from
8 the group. And it did move us away from a number of
9 our proposed positions to what we ended up with in the
10 final.
11 And if you would characterize -- if you
12 wanted to characterize the movement that we took, we
13 took -- we became much more flexible in what we were
14 proposing and far less prescriptive in what we were
15 ending up with in our final regulation. But some of
16 the key provisions in the areas we had in the final
17 there is there are new exams and administration
18 standards. There's competency gauge for private
19 applicators, where it didn't exist before. There are
20 some application methods, specific categories we
21 established that weren't in the earlier version. And
22 there were no standards for applicator
23 recertification, so we established some of those --
24 something in that area.
25 There's a key area that plays into the

ED_002528_00039559-00100

1 discussion of age, and that's there was no provision
2 in the existing regulation for gauging the competency
3 of noncertified applicators under the direct
4 supervision of a certified applicator. So we
5 established competencies for noncertified applicators,
6 and then there was very vague, vague descriptions or
7 definition of supervision of noncertified applicators.
8 So we tried to become a little more specific in the
9 definition of what constitutes good supervision of
10 noncertified applicators.
11 And then there was the minimum age, which is
12 a minimum age requirements for all certified and
13 noncertified applicators. Noncertified applicators,
14 on the whole, we're talking about the handlers under
15 the work -- the category of workers, with the term
16 handlers under the worker protection regulation. If
17 they are brought in to mixing, loading, or applying
18 under a certified -- the supervision of a certified
19 applicator. And this regulation is focused on
20 restricted-use pesticides, not general-use pesticides.
21 So the dates -- the effective dates have
22 changed. The original effective date was March 4th,
23 2017, and it's been moved for the reasons stated in
24 the slide here. The most recent Federal Register
25 notice changed the effective date to the 22nd of May,

ED_002528_00039559-00101

1 2018. The new administration hadn't had time to
2 adequately review the certification rule, and the --
3 as you'll see in the next slide, there's a long period
4 leading to full implementation to go through. So we
5 intend to adjust other implementation dates to
6 maintain the implementation schedule, which is
7 essentially three years to submit plans for new
8 certification programs at the state level, to submit
9 those plans to EPA for review.
10 There was a lawsuit challenging the rule's
11 change to the effective date, and there was a
12 coalition of advocacy groups that sued the agency.
13 That's currently in the process of the agency
14 challenging the standing of the suers, so that's where
15 that -- that stands at the moment.
16 In this screen, you can see the time line
17 and the activity that has taken place and will take
18 place. So the revised rule, absent any changes, would
19 be in effect in May 22nd, 2018. The states have until
20 2021 to submit their plans to EPA. And EPA will work
21 with the headquarters, and we are -- have a process
22 we're going to follow using headquarters personnel and
23 regional personnel and state agency personnel in
24 dealing with the submissions of state plans for their
25 -- how to comply with the revised regulation.

1 And the -- there are time lines for states
2 to submit their plans, and then there are time lines
3 for EPA to complete the review process for these
4 plans. And until there is an official approval of a
5 revised state plan, the existing regulation stays in
6 place.
7 Here's a graphic which explains the various
8 dates, and then the next screen just gives you a text
9 explanation of the process of movement towards an
10 implementation date. As you -- some of you heard in
11 the last PPDC meeting, during the second day, the
12 regulatory reform focus day, the -- there were
13 comments submitted, and a number of comments relative
14 to this regulation focused on minimum age.
15 And, so, we would like to have you give us
16 some advice there and discussion there. The minimum
17 age requires all persons using restricted-use
18 pesticides to be at least 18; private applicators and
19 commercial applicators, noncertified applicators, are
20 those functioning under the supervision. The
21 exception for the minimum age of -- there is an
22 exception for the minimum age of 16 years old for
23 noncertified applicators on a farm under the
24 supervision of a private applicator who is a member of
25 the noncertified applicator's immediate family.

1 And if you look at the -- one of the
2 handouts you've got in your packets there, there's a
3 table of the status of various states relative to
4 having no minimum age, a minimum age of 18, or a
5 minimum age of 16. And it relates those to commercial
6 applicator, private applicator, and noncertified
7 applicators under the supervision of a commercial
8 applicator and noncertified applicators under the
9 supervision of a private applicator.
10 So the discussion -- as we said in the early
11 discussion, we're seeking to understand the challenges
12 that this would pose for the stakeholders and we'd
13 like to understand and reconcile any information about
14 the states that we already -- that already have
15 minimum age requirements with some of the comments we
16 got in the regulatory reform activity. So we have a
17 set of questions there that might guide our -- guide
18 our discussion, and perhaps we can -- you can respond
19 to any of them, or we can work our way through them
20 for a general response in the sequence they're in in
21 the handout.
22 MR. KEIGWIN: So why don't we open it up,
23 and whoever wants to speak can address any or all or
24 additional questions from what we have posed on the
25 one-pager.

ED_002528_00039559-00104

1 So Preston.
2 MR. PECK: I just have a quick question
3 about the noncertified applicator with commercial --
4 under supervision of commercial applicators and
5 private applicators. The states that do require
6 minimum age, can you give, like, a general idea of
7 which states those are, just so I can understand kind
8 of scope?
9 MR. KEANEY: Which specific states?
10 MR. PECK: Yeah, if you can recall.
11 MR. KEANEY: No, I can't recall offhand.
12 MR. PECK: Okay. Well, I'll look it up,
13 then. Thank you.
14 MR. KEANEY: We can get that to you,
15 obviously.
16 MR. PECK: Okay.
17 MR. KEIGWIN: Iris, Amy, Jim.
18 MS. FIGUEROA: So just a comment on the
19 minimum age. We all had a -- I think a very fruitful
20 discussion earlier today about minimum age in the
21 context of the WPS. And there seemed to be a pretty
22 broad consensus on that, and I would hope that in the
23 context of restricted-use pesticides, which are some
24 of the most toxic pesticides, that, you know, we would
25 have a similar consensus on that.

ED_002528_00039559-00105

1 And then I also had a question on -- I think
2 it was Slide 11 on the delay in the state
3 certification plan. Is the agency taking any steps
4 right now to help states to sort of move along that
5 process of developing their new certification plans
6 while the delay is in place?
7 MR. KEANEY: No, outside of a lot of
8 education and outreach that we've undertaken. There's
9 purposefully a long time line for actually grappling
10 with revised state plans and approval of state plans.
11 All states will have to revise their plans, obviously,
12 but there are provisions that affect every state, no
13 matter what program they have.
14 Many programs are exceeding the federal
15 standard, but there -- there will have to be revision
16 of all state plans. So we -- we are, as I said,
17 conducting outreach and communication on what exists
18 in the revisions, and that's the extent of engagement
19 we have.
20 MR. KEIGWIN: Amy, then Jim, then Andrew.
21 MS. LEIBMAN: Thanks. So it does seem,
22 given our conversation that we had earlier regarding
23 the worker protection standard, that there seems to be
24 some general consensus about the importance of
25 maintaining 18 years of age as a minimum age. And,

ED_002528_00039559-00106

1 so, I think we've talked about a lot of really good
2 reasons for that. We talked about a lot of really
3 good reasons for this for 20 years. We talked about
4 it this morning.
5 And, so, it does -- I'm not sure what the
6 challenge would be, but it seems like this would be in
7 everybody's best interest, both, you know, the worker,
8 the surrounding communities, the farmer, so that we
9 can ensure that if it is going to be applied that you
10 want it applied most -- as, you know, applied well and
11 correctly.
12 And, again, I just want to take us back to
13 yesterday and the Dicamba discussion and all of the
14 challenges that we faced in terms of that particular
15 pesticide and the need for education and what that
16 took. And, you know, relying on someone under 18 to
17 sort of be able to carry out what's on the label, I
18 think puts everybody, including the worker, at risk.
19 MR. KEIGWIN: Jim, then Andrew, then Damon.
20 MR. FREDERICKS: So thanks again. I just
21 want to call out that I think this particular
22 rulemaking was an example of the process working, so
23 we appreciate the agency taking into consideration all
24 of the comments that have been submitted and the
25 advice from the different stakeholders to get to a

ED_002528_00039559-00107

1 place that I think is a good place. I think there's
2 obviously some issues with implementation, and there
3 are some challenges for states, and I think that those
4 have been taken into consideration as well.
5 Naturally, the National Pest Management
6 Association and structural pest control industry is
7 supportive of certification and training in any form
8 to ensure that pesticide applications are made in a
9 safe way and in a professional way.
10 With regard to age, the age restrictions, I
11 think that -- and one of your questions was, you know,
12 is -- are commercial applicators affected differently.
13 And the answer to that, at least from the structural
14 pest control point of view is that for the most part,
15 the 18-year-old restriction does not have a huge
16 impact. There are specific examples not so different
17 from what Damon mentioned earlier. The vast majority
18 of the structural pest control industry is made up of
19 family-owned businesses, small family-owned
20 businesses.
21 And I think that, you know, they're, you
22 know, passed on generation to generation and sons and
23 daughters are working with fathers and mothers. And
24 some of those folks probably are perfectly well
25 trained and able to make decisions regarding even

ED_002528_00039559-00108

1 restricted-use pesticides. Not all are. I think it's
2 always in the -- naturally in the interest of the
3 business to make sure that those people, whoever they
4 are, are making good decisions and are trained
5 properly. And, so, although I think, you know, I
6 think that that would be the one kind of the -- this
7 kind of family exemption would be the one piece that
8 still isn't quite right, but overall I think it's been
9 a good process.
10 I also would encourage EPA to continue to
11 work with the states, with AAPCO and ASPCRO to make
12 sure that these last pieces in terms of the challenges
13 that states have can continue to be worked out.
14 MR. KEIGWIN: Andrew, then Damon, then Liza.
15 MR. THOSTENSON: Well, in North Dakota,
16 we've had a 18-year-old for privates and commercial
17 since the inception of our program in the early 1980s.
18 Along the way, I can't think of any specific issue
19 that has arisen where somebody has made any kind of
20 argument about the advisability or reducing that age.
21 It just -- it just has never come up.
22 We have had 16 and 17-year-olds that do, in
23 fact, participate in some of my training programs, and
24 we do allow them to be participants in those
25 trainings. We just don't issue them a certification

ED_002528_00039559-00109

1 until they reach that 18-year-old barrier, or
2 threshold, I should say. From a state perspective, at
3 least in North Dakota, we just don't think this is a
4 big deal, I mean, you know, barrier to implementation.
5 With respect to how states are moving along
6 in this time line, for purposes of coming together and
7 putting a plan in place, this past spring, EPA
8 convened a pesticide regulatory education program
9 workshop where they brought in about 50, I think,
10 folks, Nancy? Around 50 folks from around the country
11 that were with cooperative extension and state
12 regulatory people to really grapple with and to
13 appreciate and understand what was contemplated in
14 this new rule and how to go about putting together a
15 new plan.
16 And, so, I think at least from a -- you
17 know, I'm satisfied. I'll let Liza talk about from my
18 state lead agency partners, but I think as a pesticide
19 safety educator, I'm comfortable that we have had
20 adequate discussion about the implementation of this
21 particular regulation.
22 One other point I would like to make, I can
23 tell you that when the rule was originally proposed in
24 2015 there were a number of people who were suggesting
25 suicide or getting out of the business of being

ED_002528_00039559-00110

1 involved in training because they thought it would be
2 insane. Some people actually wrote that in their
3 comments to EPA, and obviously they did hear those
4 comments and acted upon them, and we are enormously
5 pleased that that occurred.
6 MR. KEIGWIN: Damon, then Liza. Sharon, is
7 that your card up? Okay, it's hard to see it from
8 this side.
9 MR. REABE: First, I'd like to apologize,
10 Kevin, that it took three tries to get me into the
11 right session. So thanks for your help. I did
12 actually read this, believe it or not, but at any
13 rate, all joking aside, so now we're in the right
14 session to have the discussion. And I do want to
15 clarify something.
16 Aerial application is very unique, and what
17 we're talking about here is the potential for somebody
18 under the age of 18 to get set up who's an immediate
19 family member of an owner of a business to get set up
20 as a certified -- certified applicator. But I think
21 it's important to remember that there won't be any
22 applicators under the age of 18. So I think it would
23 be more accurately stated we're maybe looking to have
24 the ability for them to be certified to be mixers and
25 loaders.

1 The Federal Aviation Administration will not
2 allow a pilot to get a commercial pilot certificate
3 under the age of 18. So kind of separate the two.
4 And it's a unique circumstance. This isn't something
5 I want to use up a lot of credibility, but I want to
6 make sure that the agency understands the nature of
7 our businesses and the amount of supervision that's
8 taking place at our businesses and how that this would
9 be helpful to us.
10 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. Liza, then Sharon, then
11 Jay.
12 MS. TROSSBACH: As I had mentioned
13 previously, pesticide regulatory officials certainly
14 support any enhancement to competencies for pesticide
15 applicators, both, you know, commercial and private.
16 We understand the importance of proper pesticide use
17 and the inherent dangers that are with pesticides. So
18 we certainly support that.
19 And I would say in general we certainly
20 support, again, you know, the minimum age of 18 for
21 pesticide applicators. Obviously, family farms are a
22 little bit, you know, different, and while in some
23 areas, some states may have 18 as a minimum age,
24 others don't, and I'll leave that to, you know, the
25 diplomats to figure that out. But in general,

1 particularly for commercial applicators, we certainly
2 support the minimum age of 18.
3 I think the conversation about the amount of
4 time it will take for states to revise their state
5 certification plans and to get them in just for a
6 little bit of background information, and Andrew had
7 alluded to, in North Dakota, they've had their
8 certification program plan for, you know, well, over
9 30 years or 40 years, and most states are like that.
10 And, so, while EPA has always provided this kind of
11 base requirement, states over the -- you know, since
12 their inception have had programs, had very robust
13 programs, have specified requirements.
14 So for some states, these changes to the
15 federal law will take changes to their statutes and
16 their regulations. And I'm sure everybody here's been
17 involved in that or is aware that that can take years
18 because of the public process that we have in place as
19 government officials. So while in Virginia, I won't
20 have to make many changes, just because of where our
21 certification program is. There are other states that
22 will have to make a lot of changes, and that has to go
23 through that state's political process.
24 And you have some states in which there has
25 been an edict that there will be no new regulations

1 and no new requirements put on small businesses. So
2 there's a lot of issues there. So that explains some
3 of the time that three years, which may seem like a
4 long time, but really in a regulatory arena it's not a
5 long period of time.
6 So just to make people, you know, aware of
7 that. I think states that will -- are and will, you
8 know, move forward with amending their certification
9 plan, part of it is waiting for that actual effective
10 date to make sure we know what's in that final
11 effective rule, should there be any changes, because
12 that could impact the changes we need to make and how
13 we need to make it.
14 There are also, you know, resource issues,
15 et cetera, you know, which there always are. So I
16 just wanted to, you know, make that clear. I think in
17 certain states, the minimum age will be more of an
18 issue than others, you know, because of their
19 industry, because of the type of -- whether it's
20 agriculture or, you know, commercial industries. And
21 in others, it won't be, but, again, in general, I
22 think 18 is good.
23 And I just want to make a comment and just
24 echo what other folks have said. I want to commend
25 and applaud the EPA for their willingness to listen to

ED_002528_00039559-00114

1 all the various, you know, comments and concerns and
2 at the end of the day to recognize the longstanding
3 programs that states have had and their success and
4 allowing that flexibility, because one thing is for
5 sure, if you know how one state works, you know how
6 one state works.
7 And, so, there has to be some flexibility
8 for -- you know, for states, and I just want to thank
9 that. And as Jim had indicated, AAPCO and ASPCRO and,
10 of course, all your state regulatory officials are
11 more than happy to continue to work on, you know, this
12 with the EPA, as they did, and to have it fully
13 implemented.
14 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks. Sharon, then Jay,
15 then Donnie.
16 MS. SELVAGGIO: Just one question, and it's
17 probably a shortcut that was taken on the table here,
18 but on the minimum age section for the final rule,
19 page 2 of 2, it says "except for the minimum age that
20 we have 16 years old for the noncertified applicator
21 on a farm under the supervision of a private
22 applicator who is a member of the noncertified
23 applicator's immediate family." Just in the actual
24 rule language, does it say "private certified
25 applicator"? I mean, I'm assuming that that private

ED_002528_00039559-00115

1 applicator does need to be certified themselves if
2 they're supervising. I'm just wondering if that's in
3 the rule.
4 MR. KEIGWIN: Nancy?
5 MS. FITZ: By definition, in the rule, a
6 private applicator is certified.
7 MS. SELVAGGIO: Okay.
8 MS. FITZ: So it is a private certified
9 applicator, yeah.
10 MS. SELVAGGIO: Okay. And I just have one
11 followup kind of question for this whole discussion
12 that we've had this morning, and that is that it
13 appears that the choices of, you know, the topics that
14 we've discussed today have come out of the May 4th
15 discussion that we had about the regulatory reform
16 order. And I'm just wondering is there -- are there
17 other rules that received comments? Are there other
18 initiatives in -- under way internally in the EPA to
19 discuss other potential rule changes or guidance
20 changes or anything like that that we have not heard
21 about today?
22 MR. KEIGWIN: So the agency received lots of
23 comments in response to the regulatory reform
24 executive order. I don't have the exact number, but
25 it was many, people took advantage of the opportunity.

ED_002528_00039559-00116

1 For the Office of Pesticide Programs, these were the
2 two issues for which we received the most feedback.
3 We're still working our way through the comments, but
4 given the depth of the comments and the number of
5 comments and the -- you know, the upcoming
6 implementation and effective dates, we thought it was
7 important for -- to take advantage of you all's time
8 while you were here with us this day and a half to
9 focus on these two particular issues. And then moving
10 forward, if there are other issues that we identify as
11 we go through the regulatory reform comments, we would
12 likely bring some of those issues back here as well.
13 So Jay, then Donnie, then Charlotte.
14 MR. VROOM: So I think Amy raised a question
15 earlier in the worker protection discussion why should
16 it take so long, and so hopefully, Amy, the answer
17 that Liza gave about the differences in state laws and
18 implementation explains part of the need for a change
19 in the deadline to get to implementation. And it
20 seems to me that we've heard a lot of consensus about
21 the fact that at least everyone who is at the table or
22 is representing someone else's interests at the table
23 that there's a lot of goodwill and sincere intent to
24 ensure that this system that the Federal Government,
25 through EPA's pesticide program, is putting in place

ED_002528_00039559-00117

1 is intended to improve things for all workers and give
2 more clarity to -- and responsibility clarity for
3 those employers that are employing those workers that
4 have these kinds of exposure.
5 So I would hope that we're at a point where
6 we're getting closer to consensus around the knowledge
7 of what the intent is and that we will get to closure
8 and accomplish the things that we all want to
9 accomplish, but particularly the difficulties with the
10 states, and I think, Amy, you had said, you know, the
11 states all saw this coming. You're right, they saw it
12 coming, but they saw it coming 15 years ago, and at
13 some point, people, you know, pivot to do other things
14 that, you know, do happen, and it took a very long
15 time for this rule and the worker protection rule to
16 get finalized.
17 And, so, you know, I'm not making excuses
18 for the states, but I think there are a lot of reasons
19 why the little extra time is reasonable to expect.
20 Thanks.
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Donnie, then Charlotte.
22 MR. TAYLOR: So first of all, thanks for
23 working with the states. I think when this came out,
24 I think you probably got an earful of phone calls
25 coming in, so thanks for working those guys.

1 Do we have any idea how many states would
2 require a legislative action, and do we see those as
3 being difficult or easy?
4 MR. KEANEY: I think, Liza, was that in the
5 survey you did, Liza? Yeah.
6 MS. TROSSBACH: Yes. AAPCO had -- did a
7 survey of states to try to determine how many states
8 would require some type of regulatory change, whether
9 laws or regulations. And I don't remember the exact
10 percentage off the top of my head, but it is on the
11 AAPCO's website. But there was a good number of
12 states that would have to have one or both, so either
13 their statute or their regulations.
14 And, of course, both of those have their own
15 challenges and time lines involved. But that is on
16 the AAPCO's website, and I would be happy to forward
17 that to Dea, that actual survey, if she wants to send
18 it out to the PPDC to see those responses. I just
19 don't remember off the top of my head.
20 MR. KEIGWIN: Andrew, you might have a
21 clarification.
22 MR. THOSTENSON: Yeah, just to add to Liza,
23 the -- you know, most people, most states, at a
24 minimum are going to have to engage in some sort of
25 regulatory, administrative rule change that maybe

ED_002528_00039559-00119

1 doesn't require going to a legislature, but many
2 states will also have to do the legislative piece.
3 The other thing is is that we won't move on
4 any of those items until we know that this law is
5 hard-baked because it's too expensive from a political
6 capital as well as just the time associated with
7 getting the rule in place. So you're not going to see
8 any state trying to get ahead of the ball game on
9 that. I will say, though, that doesn't mean that we
10 aren't talking about it and that we are looking at it
11 and we are grappling with it right now and
12 strategizing how we will go about it once the rule
13 actually does come into force. So that's kind of --
14 that's kind of what I see happening out there.
15 MR. TAYLOR: Well, it was my understanding
16 that some of the states already have educational
17 programs in place that exceed these requirements, so
18 it's not like this is not being done. They may not be
19 scripted the way they're scripted here, but education
20 is being provided.
21 MR. THOSTENSON: Yeah, I agree with that. I
22 mean, Liza mentioned this earlier. I mean, we have a
23 number of states that well exceed these sorts of
24 things. Having said that, though, I don't know any
25 state that is going to be exempted from an overhaul of

ED_002528_00039559-00120

1 their plan. I mean, because all of our plans have
2 different strengths and weaknesses, and this tries to
3 get everybody to a certain level. And, so, we're all
4 going to have to do certain things.
5 MR. KEIGWIN: Charlotte.
6 MS. SANSON: Yeah, thank you. And some of
7 my questions were just answered with Donnie's
8 questions, so I appreciate that.
9 I also just had a technical question, and it
10 has to do with the family exemption on the age
11 requirement. And I was wondering if you could clarify
12 that the family exemption under WPS would apply to the
13 40 CFR Part 171 supervised applicators, just for
14 consistency.
15 MR. KEANEY: The definition will extend --
16 the extended family and worker you're talking about?
17 MS. SANSON: Right, because Part 171
18 addresses supervised applicators, and then (inaudible)
19 that the supervised situations for families, family
20 workers.
21 MR. KEANEY: I guess I don't understand your
22 question. Are you asking is the definition of
23 immediate family the same in both?
24 MS. SANSON: Right.
25 MR. KEANEY: Do we have that spec- -- Nancy?

ED_002528_00039559-00121

1 MS. FITZ: Yeah, it's the same definition of
2 immediate family.
3 MS. SANSON: Okay, thank you.
4 MR. KEANEY: Yeah.
5 MS. FITZ: But if -- you would have to
6 comply with both rules, so you would have to comply
7 with the more stringent age that applies, if that's
8 what your question is.
9 MS. SANSON: Yes. I want to see how they're
10 connected, right?
11 MS. FITZ: It's a really complicated table.
12 MS. SANSON: Yeah.
13 MS. FITZ: Depending on whether it's ag or
14 not and what the activity is and whether -- and WPS
15 only applies to growing crops; it doesn't apply to
16 animals. So it's -- we're working on a table to
17 explain that because we've gotten that question quite
18 a bit.
19 MS. SANSON: Okay, great. Thank you.
20 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. So I just conferred
21 with Kevin, and so I think what we heard was that
22 there's general consensus around 18, that there could
23 be some -- it might need to be some clarification
24 perhaps and guidance around how the family exemption
25 piece works, and that there's an acknowledgment that

ED_002528_00039559-00122

1 because of the processes that virtually every state
2 will need to go through that there may need to be some
3 additional time on the implementation side because of
4 processes that, as I heard, really can't begin until
5 states have certainty about when this rule goes into
6 effect and when things are due for submission to work
7 with stakeholders in their states to develop a revised
8 plan that virtually everyone will have to do, and then
9 subsequently work through any administrative,
10 regulatory, or perhaps even statutory process that
11 would have to ensue based upon local law.
12 Does that reflect the discussion?
13 (No response.)
14 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. So just quickly recap
15 the day. So what -- on the WPS side, what we heard
16 was general consensus around minimum age. On the
17 designated rep provision, the recommendation was to
18 form a very short-term workgroup to work through some
19 of these issues, develop, perhaps, some clarification
20 or some additional options for consideration and that
21 AAPCO has also volunteered to look at the situations
22 in states that have this provision or a similar type
23 of provision to help inform those discussions.
24 And then on the application exclusion zone,
25 what we largely talked about was the need to develop

ED_002528_00039559-00123

1 some additional and enhanced guidance around certain
2 scenarios, then some of which were discussed today.
3 And then on certification and training, what
4 we heard is, again, a general consensus around the
5 minimum age, but the need for some additional
6 clarifications surrounding the family exemption.
7 And I'll just double check that that
8 reflects the discussion from today.
9 Okay, so I have been remiss all day in
10 checking with the two PPDC members that are
11 participating remotely to see if they had any
12 comments, Gina Shultz or Dan Kunkel, was there
13 anything you had meant to chime in that I didn't give
14 you the opportunity to do so earlier?
15 MS. SHULZ: Hey, Rick. This is Gina. I
16 have nothing to add. Thank you for checking.
17 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks for checking in. Hope
18 you feel better.
19 Okay, we have two public commenters. So the
20 first person is our former colleague, Bill Jordan.
21 (Teleconference interruption.)
22 MR. JORDAN: -- you know, and as Rick
23 indicated, I used to work here at EPA and retired in
24 2016 after 40 wonderful years working on pesticide
25 issues. I'm now an independent environmental

ED_002528_00039559-00124

1 consultant working with advocacy organizations,
2 industry, trade associations, law firms, pesticide
3 registrants, but today I'm not representing or
4 speaking on behalf of any client. Rather, I am
5 interested in sensible regulatory efforts that protect
6 human health and the environment because I may be
7 affected by use of pesticides.
8 And, so, I want to thank you for the
9 opportunity to offer comments. I think seeking
10 meaningful public engagement has long been a hallmark
11 of OPP's work, and I'm really pleased that Dr. Beck
12 yesterday expressed EPA's support for continuing that
13 practice. I agree with her wholeheartedly that
14 dialogue leads to better decisions and is a
15 fundamental component of good government.
16 And with that backdrop, I want to offer
17 comments on four different points. First, I'm pleased
18 that the apparently controversial provisions in the
19 worker protection standard, the application exclusion
20 zone, the designated representative, minimum age, and
21 the one in the certification amendment rulemaking
22 minimum age all seem to be ones that can be addressed
23 through additional guidance or at most some relatively
24 small tweaks to very discrete portions of the rule.
25 Before EPA undertakes any rulemaking,

1 however, I think this morning's conversation has
2 illustrated how useful dialogue can be to focus and
3 clarify the concerns that arise around these
4 regulations or have arisen around these regulations.
5 And I know from experience working on notice and
6 comment rulemaking that that's not really the best way
7 to figure out how to sort through complex, nuanced
8 issues like these.
9 So I strongly encourage EPA to continue to
10 use the PPDC process to gather input and develop
11 reasonable approaches to address legitimate concerns.
12 In keeping with the FACA guidance yesterday, I would
13 request that any PPDC efforts be a subcommittee rather
14 than a workgroup. That will ensure transparency,
15 committee balance, and opportunities for public
16 engagement. Who knows, maybe I'll come out of
17 retirement and raise a hand to play in that.
18 But I encourage PPDC members if you agree
19 with me to let EPA know that you also would support
20 subcommittees to work on these issues.
21 Second, it's notable how little in the
22 worker protection standard and the certification rule
23 actually appears to be the subject of continued
24 debate. That's an indication that as many of you have
25 said that the lengthy process of stakeholder

ED_002528_00039559-00126

1 engagement has actually worked and led EPA to do
2 something that's fundamentally reasonable in its
3 approach. And I join the rest of you in commending
4 them for their work.
5 Given that there's a broad consensus that
6 the overwhelming majority of these different rules and
7 provisions are workable and needed, I think there's no
8 reason for delaying the compliance dates of the entire
9 rule. If there is a rulemaking, and I'm not convinced
10 that there necessarily needs to be one, but if there
11 is a rulemaking to introduce these small changes that
12 have been suggested, and to change the compliance
13 date, the changes in the compliance date should apply
14 only to the portion of the rules that might be
15 amended. The rest of the rules should take effect
16 because we need them.
17 Third, I want to point out that it's not
18 possible for EPA to change the compliance dates on the
19 worker protection standard rule before they take
20 effect in January of next year. The statutory
21 procedures for rulemaking are such that you just can't
22 do that legally. So given that the worker protection
23 amendments are going to be fully effective in January
24 and the scope of the rule changes, if any, coming out
25 of this PPDC discussion are going to be pretty small,

1 I strongly encourage EPA to tell the state lead
2 agencies to move ahead with training and compliance
3 assistance on the full rule.
4 Fourth and last, as for the certification
5 amendments, those rule amendments, the rule contains,
6 I think, a very thoughtful, deliberate program for
7 state lead agencies to come into compliance with the
8 new requirements. I don't think that you should alter
9 that compliance schedule absent a showing that the
10 state lead agencies absolutely need more time.
11 Given under the current rule that state lead
12 agencies have six and a half years to figure out what
13 to change and then to make those changes, it seems to
14 me like that ought to be enough. Don't change the
15 time line now. Instead, you should wait until the
16 states have tried to implement this, gone through
17 their legislative process, if they need to, and the
18 rulemaking process, and see if they are, in fact,
19 encountering real problems.
20 If EPA even indicates that it might change
21 the time lines for compliance, I know full well from
22 years of watching this process that states will wait
23 and postpone their efforts to start work on the
24 necessary changes. And if that happens, then you'll
25 be facing this issue again and you will have lost the

ED_002528_00039559-00128

1 benefits that a stronger state certification could
2 bring.
3 Thank you.
4 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Bill.
5 The final person that signed up for public
6 comment is Julie Spagnoli from JM Specialty
7 Consultants.
8 MS. SPAGNOLI: And I'm sort of speaking as a
9 member of the public health workgroup and then kind of
10 with a nexus with the discussion we had yesterday on
11 PRIA 4. One of the set-asides in PRIA 4 is for the
12 development of efficacy guidelines for some specified
13 pests and pests requiring the submission of efficacy
14 data, which includes public health pests.
15 And the need for these guidelines and
16 standardization of these efficacy testing is so that
17 we can guarantee the effectiveness of these products,
18 which is the benefit to registrants to know how to
19 test their products and to know that their studies
20 will be accepted. And it also provides confidence to
21 the applicators that the products that they use will
22 be effective.
23 So as to both the -- by standardizing these
24 requirements and the guidelines, it provides a benefit
25 and especially to public health. And I'm especially

ED_002528_00039559-00129

1 interested in the guideline on fire ants because they
2 are probably my biggest nemesis when it comes to
3 pests. So I look forward to that guideline. Thank
4 you.
5 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Julie.
6 Kevin had one more remark to make before we
7 close -- did a couple of closing things.
8 MR. KEANEY: In the PowerPoint presentation,
9 there are a couple of slides that deal with the
10 cooperative agreements that we have, the grant
11 cooperative agreements we have to support these
12 programs. I urge you to go to those websites and go
13 to the websites of those organizations and see the
14 depth of activities that go on there to help support
15 the programs and provide educational materials,
16 provide science-based information through the
17 Pesticide Information Center, provide training through
18 the app -- AFOP network.
19 We are very indebted to the PRIA funds that
20 support much of -- much of those activities, so it's a
21 combination of common grant monies and PRIA set-aside
22 monies that support those things that are quite
23 essential to making things real in the field for these
24 -- for these programs.
25 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Kevin. I'm mindful of

ED_002528_00039559-00130

1 the time, but I wanted to just quickly see if there
2 are any public commenters from those participating
3 remotely.
4 Anyone remote that would like to make a
5 brief public comment, please identify yourself.
6 MR. KUNSTMAN: Rick, this is Jim Kunstman,
7 PBI Gordon.
8 MR. KEIGWIN: Go ahead.
9 MR. KUNSTMAN: Can you hear me?
10 MR. KEIGWIN: We can hear you. Go ahead.
11 MR. KUNSTMAN: A quick question -- or a
12 quick comment and a question. Definitely appreciate
13 being able to participate by phone. It's been great.
14 I just want to echo what Cindy said yesterday at the
15 end of the session, that oftentimes the EPA and their
16 scientists don't stand up and say that they've
17 actually done some good science and made some good
18 decisions. And I do believe after 30 years in
19 regulatory that I can agree with that.
20 One comment -- question. A news headline
21 that I saw this morning said that the U.S.
22 Environmental Protection Agency head Scott Pruitt said
23 his recent decision to prohibit members of the agency
24 scientific advisory committees from receiving EPA
25 grants will reduce conflicts of interest but experts

ED_002528_00039559-00131

1 say that the move could exclude many of the nation's
2 best environmental scientists and damage the agency's
3 scientific integrity. And I wonder if that includes
4 PPDC volunteers.
5 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Jim. I believe we're
6 -- I believe it only applies to the scientific
7 advisory committees, but we will get confirmation of
8 that from the office that oversees all of the FACA
9 groups at EPA.
10 Are there any other public commenters on the
11 phone?
12 MS. BLACK: Yeah, Rick, this is Carol Black
13 with Washington State University.
14 MR. KEIGWIN: Go ahead, Carol.
15 MS. BLACK: What I would like to just add to
16 the discussion on Dicamba is that when one looks at
17 where the incidents have occurred with damage, I think
18 it's critical that that overlay of the USDA 2016
19 soybean acreages is included in that same schematic.
20 Thank you.
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Thank you, Carol.
22 Any final public commenters on the phone?
23 (No response.)
24 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. So a couple of quick
25 things. We are looking at meeting dates. What I'm

ED_002528_00039559-00132

1 going to do for time purposes is if you --
2 (Teleconference interruption.)
3 MR. KEIGWIN: -- next meeting, you could
4 email them to Dea, and then we'll circulate them to
5 the group to kind of get some consensus around topics
6 moving forward. We really, from the agency side, want
7 to be bringing you issues for which you can provide us
8 with input and consensus to help advance the program.
9 In terms of meeting dates for 2018, for the
10 spring meeting, we are currently looking at May 2nd
11 and May 3rd. So if you could let Dea know if those
12 present any major conflicts, and I know there will be
13 groans for the fall meeting, but we are currently
14 looking at October 31st and November 1st. So part of
15 this is due to meeting room availability, but if that
16 presents major conflicts for people for the fall
17 meeting, also please let Dea know.
18 So let me just say in closing thank you to
19 all of you. We covered a lot of ground in a day and a
20 half. I personally appreciate all of the candor and
21 the efforts to move things forward. For the new
22 members of the group, thank you all for participating
23 because sometimes in sessions like this we kind of
24 wait to kind of feel your way through, and I don't
25 think any of you did that, so thank you very much. I

ED_002528_00039559-00133

1 really appreciate that.
2 I want to appreciate -- I also want to thank
3 Dozina Taylor who manages this room. This may be the
4 first meeting that I can think of in a long time where
5 all the equipment worked, and it worked well. And,
6 so, Dozina did a number of checks with the tech
7 support folks. I know Dea did another with the tech
8 team as well. So I really want to thank them.
9 And then I want to thank Dea and her team
10 and, see, these meetings don't happen as well as they
11 do, and all the coaching that I've gotten for the past
12 couple of days, if Dea's not constantly feeding me
13 stuff and keeping us all in line. And, so, Dea and
14 Emily and I know there were others, Lance, and there
15 were others from FEAD that were also instrumental in
16 helping move those forward and I wanted to thank them
17 as well.
18 And I think Jay may have one closing
19 comment.
20 MR. VROOM: Yeah, thanks, Rick. So I didn't
21 realize that you were actually going to skip some
22 things and go to closing. So I just wanted to
23 acknowledge that Jonathan who works for Senator Udall
24 has been here much of the morning. I've been a member
25 of this PPDC except for last few years for many, many

1 years, and it's very rare that a staffer from Capitol
2 Hill will make the time to come and listen to the
3 dialogue of this group. And it's particularly germane
4 because of the three issues that Senator Udall has
5 expressed concern about with regard to reauthorization
6 of PRIA we've been talking about, and so hopefully
7 Jonathan's had a chance to hear a little bit of some
8 of the consensus-building that's gone on around those
9 topics and also has heard what Kevin just talked
10 about, which is that PRIA and the reauthorization of
11 PRIA will enable fees to go to some of those
12 farmworker programs, matching grant money from the
13 appropriations side that are critical as well.
14 So I just think it's important for us to
15 take note of the fact the Hill does care about what's
16 going on. This isn't lobbying, so we're not stepping
17 over the line, right, with regard to our DFO
18 oversight, but thank you.
19 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Jay. And, again,
20 thanks to all of you and safe travels home.
21 (Whereupon, the committee meeting was
22 concluded.)
23
24
25

1 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPTIONIST
2
3 I, Sara J. Vance, do hereby certify that the
4 foregoing transcription was reduced to typewriting via
5 audiotapes provided to me; that I am neither counsel
6 for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to
7 the action in which these proceedings were
8 transcribed; that I am not a relative or employee of
9 any attorney or counsel employed by the parties
10 hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the
11 outcome of the action.
12
13
14
15 SARA J. VANCE, CERT
16 Transcriptionist
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

In the Matter of:

EPA Pesticide Program Dialogue

November 2, 2017
Committe Meeting - Day Two

Condensed Transcript with Word Index

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

1

UNITED STATES
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

PESTICIDE PROGRAM DIALOGUE
COMMITTEE MEETING

DAY TWO - NOVEMBER 2, 2017

Conference Center - Lobby Level
2777 Crystal Drive
One Potomac Yard South
Arlington, VA 22202

2

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

MR. KEIGWIN: Good morning. I hope you all had a very good evening. I want to thank you all again for the discussion yesterday. We found it to be very helpful in advancing a number of issues. All last night, I was thinking about how to kick off this morning's meeting and then chatting with Leyla earlier, I'm just going to steal her line, and so I'm supposed to say welcome to the Kevin Keaney Show. So there was another line that I said I wouldn't say, and I won't say it. But today -- today is a very important discussion, and that's why we are dedicating the morning to it.

As you know, the last several years, the staff in Kevin Keaney's branch, working across the stakeholder community and at one time even using a subgroup of this committee, worked on developing proposals and draft regulations for how to improve the worker protection standard and to advance the certification and training program. And yeoman effort by his staff and a number of people around this table, and, you know, really across the stakeholder community, giving us some very important input as we promulgated those regulations over the last couple of

3

years.

That being said, obviously whenever we finalize a regulation, questions arise, ideas for possible modifications to those regulations can arise. And for those of you that were here at the May PPDC meeting as part of the regulatory reform public meeting, we heard a number of comments from, again, across the stakeholder community about these two rules, the importance of these rules, some ideas for potential modification, some reasons why the rules should remain as they are.

So what we wanted to spend this morning doing is beginning a conversation about those two rules. Kevin will walk you through the feedback that we heard from the last PPDC meeting and the regulatory reform public meeting. And what we really hope to get is dialogue amongst all of you for, one, better helping to understand the perspectives that we heard and raised and presented during the regulatory reform public meeting, but hopefully getting beyond that and talking about solutions for perhaps some of the issues that have arisen as part of those public comments and finding ways that as a group you all can give us advice for moving forward that reflect the input of everyone around this table.

4

So, at times, I think it will be intense today. That's okay. I just ask that we all be respectful of each other's positions and opinions and know that our goal coming out of this is to try to find or begin to find some workable solutions to moving forward with both of these rules.

So we're going to start the morning with the worker protection standard. We've got roughly -- a little bit over an hour and a half, and then Arnold Layne will come in and give you all an update on the first meeting of the new public health workgroup under the PPDC. We'll then take a break, and then we'll spend about the next hour on the certification and training rule. And then we've got some housekeeping and preparations for our next meeting.

So why don't we get into the meat of today. Let me -- Kevin was here yesterday. Kevin really needs no introduction, but I'll just turn things over to him.

MR. KEANEY: Well, Rick called it the Kevin Keaney Show. I prefer to call it the show and tell. I'll show, and you folks can tell, and to begin, to begin.

To begin, as Rick said, there was -- there was quite a bit of feedback on the reg reform session

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

5

1 after the last meeting of PPDC, the half-day second
2 meeting, second day. And the topics that came out of
3 that are what we're going to be discussing today. And
4 relative to the agriculture worker protection
5 regulation, there's going to be a focus on discussion
6 on the applicator exclusion zone, the designated
7 representative provision, and the minimum age
8 provision.
9 And you have material giving you some basic
10 descriptions, definitions, and a comparison table of
11 the provisions of the worker protection regulation.
12 The second session would be certification, the
13 applicator certification regulation, which is
14 proposed. The ag worker protection regulation is
15 final.
16 And in that, there will be the discussion
17 of minimum age, a different perspective on minimum
18 age relative to applicators as opposed to the minimum
19 age in ag worker protection, focusing on handlers
20 entering -- entering treated fields early. And I'll
21 give you some perspective on the variety of grants
22 and cooperative agreements that we have to support
23 these -- the necessary activities related to
24 implementing and effectively bringing into reality in
25 the field, at least, of these regulations, so grants

6

1 that are substantially supported by PRIA funds.
2 Any regulation that we write in Washington
3 -- and it's a great deal of communication and
4 implementation support before it becomes a reality in
5 the field. And we engaged in really -- in both
6 regulations a very extensive period of outreach and
7 communication. Rick alluded to the prior then --
8 prior to the regulation going final, exchanges we had,
9 but when worker protection did go final, we did
10 conduct pretty extensive outreach and communication
11 and training.
12 Obviously, we -- as you can see by this
13 screen, we devoted a great deal of effort to educating
14 and training the EPA staff and the state regulatory
15 staffs. We had very focused presentations and face-
16 to-face sessions and meetings and webinars with a
17 variety of stakeholder associations. And we engaged a
18 number of our grantees in focusing their activities
19 and developing materials that would help support the
20 implementation of this regulation -- of both
21 regulations, but primarily the worker protection
22 regulation.
23 And we did a lot of safety -- basic safety
24 training with our grantees and with our -- with our
25 staff and with regional staffs. So the compliance

7

1 dates for the regulation have changed. And one of the
2 rationales for the change was a petition we received
3 from the National Association of State Departments of
4 Agriculture, Farm Bureau, and the third -- there was a
5 third member there. Do you recall, Rick?
6 Anyway, there were three -- there are three
7 stakeholder groups that petitioned to change the
8 implementation date. And their rationale was that EPA
9 had not allowed enough time for the states to prepare
10 their -- their folks, stakeholders, and the
11 communities for the regulation. And they asserted
12 that we had violated FIFRA provisions and -- and other
13 -- other regulatory or statutory provisions.
14 And that was received at the end of the last
15 Administration, and the response was negative, and the
16 response denied the fact that the -- the assertion
17 that we had violated FIFRA provisions and statutory
18 provisions and was silent on the time needed to
19 prepare the states to effectively implement the
20 regulation.
21 Early in the -- in the -- in this
22 Administration, as you can see on this screen, there
23 was a repeat submission by the National Association of
24 State Departments of Agriculture alone focusing alone
25 on the argument that there wasn't enough time to

8

1 prepare the states and the materials. The compliance
2 assistance materials weren't -- weren't adequate. We
3 hadn't developed enough of them at that time.
4 And we granted -- we agreed with that
5 petition to extend the implementation of all the
6 revised provisions of the worker protection regulation
7 until there was guidance and training materials
8 completed and to allow the states enough time to train
9 their constituents. Officially, that requires a
10 regulatory action.
11 We mentioned that in the response to the
12 petition. And there's a need for a Federal Register
13 notice to be issued to change that compliance date
14 from 18 to something else, from January 2018 to
15 something else. That hasn't been issued yet, so the
16 initial compliance date is still two thousand --
17 January of 2018. That's the argument, that the
18 training materials and compliance materials weren't
19 adequate.
20 The next screen is some of the productions
21 -- the production of a grant -- a substantial grant we
22 have with Oregon State and California-Davis to produce
23 these materials necessary for training, necessary for
24 compliance assistance and so forth relative to the
25 regulation.

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

ED_002528_00039560-00003

9

1 This is a -- this is really a partial list.
2 If you get on this very -- it's a very deep website,
3 that if you want to get onto that and to see all
4 that's now available and see what is still being
5 worked on to be available soon, it's pretty
6 impressive. And they are instituting -- or they have
7 instituted a clearinghouse for all of this material so
8 that it's available for anyone who wants to download
9 it and use it, and a number of -- or folks obviously
10 are taking advantage of that. So it's a very rich
11 website and a very productive collaborative agreement
12 we have with the University of California-Davis and
13 Oregon State.
14 And that speaks to the argument that there
15 need to be -- there needs to be adequate material out
16 there for effective implementation. This is a time
17 line that might be useful for you. And it shows that
18 the date of the revised regulation when it became
19 final, when it was published in the Federal Register,
20 and then the compliance point for when most of the
21 requirements are in place except for any new content
22 that needs to be expressed in training materials and
23 for the safety poster to be available and for a
24 adequate understanding of the applicator exclusion
25 zone to take place.

10

1 So -- and then that leads to the date for
2 full compliance in -- on January 2nd, 2018. So all
3 the new content of the safety display and the
4 responsibility for handlers to -- to acknowledge and
5 comply with the applicator exclusion zone would be in
6 place then. There is an important note there on that
7 screen that compliance with the new content and the
8 worker and handler training will be required six
9 months after EPA publishes the Federal Register notice
10 about the training materials being available. That
11 still has to occur.
12 So there are two things that have to occur
13 to change that compliance date -- the issuance in the
14 Federal Register specifying what the new compliance
15 date would be and then the issuance of a Federal
16 Register notice alerting folks that the training
17 material -- the training materials needed are
18 available and how -- how they can be gotten, where
19 they are.
20 Some of you that are -- were members last
21 spring of PPDC remember the focus of the second day of
22 that meeting on the regulatory reform agenda. There
23 is an executive order on regulatory reform focusing on
24 relooking at a variety of regulations. And comments
25 were solicited at that meeting, and there were a

11

1 number of comments. It's probably the most raucous
2 PPDC meeting I've ever been at, but you don't usually
3 get hisses and boos and claps, but feel free to clap
4 after this presentation, but it didn't happen -- it
5 didn't happen in May last year.
6 So we did have this outreach and received
7 the comments and -- and sorted the comments into the
8 focus areas that we thought were appropriate and --
9 and the comments and recommendations are currently
10 being considered and, you know, the -- what we're
11 going to be discussing today is an indication of that.
12 But any substantive changes that have to be made to
13 the worker protection will require a separate
14 rulemaking process apart from -- it's quite different
15 than anything focused on the changing of the
16 compliance date.
17 Substantive changes require a different --
18 not -- it's a rulemaking, but it's a different type of
19 rulemaking we'd have to go through to do that. So
20 some of that may come out of -- we'll get guidance on
21 what that may be from this meeting, so we expect a
22 substantial engagement on these three issues --
23 minimum age, designated representative, and the
24 applicator exclusion zone.
25 You have a fact sheet on the applicator

12

1 exclusion zone and you have some skimpy definitions of
2 each of those -- each of those items in the handout
3 you've got. So that's a rough outline that leads us
4 to the more substantial part of what we're here today
5 for, and that is the discussion of those -- of those
6 provisions, and the -- any guidance you might have as
7 to how they can be managed in the field or any
8 alternatives you might propose for us to try to attain
9 similar ends and through different means, that's what
10 we'd be interested in hearing.
11 All right, hold your applause.
12 (Applause.)
13 MR. KEANEY: Thank you very much.
14 MR. KEIGWIN: That might be the first time
15 there has been clapping at an EPA presentation at a
16 PPDC meeting.
17 MR. KEANEY: I'm shameless in soliciting.
18 MR. KEIGWIN: So on the one-page handout
19 that's in your packet, we have two charge questions
20 for the committee relative to the worker protection
21 standard, the first being what challenges do you
22 anticipate with implementing these requirements, and
23 then the second one being consistent with EPA's
24 mandate to protect public health and the environment,
25 what alternatives would you propose to address the

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

13

1 concerns on which these requirements focus.
2 So we can take each charge question. So I
3 wanted to get some input from you all. Do we want to
4 walk through each of these three provisions and answer
5 each question? That might be -- and we'll kind of
6 circle back each time. Does that -- would that work
7 for folks around the table? Okay, so why don't we
8 start with the minimum age one and open it up to the
9 group. What challenges do you all anticipate with
10 implementing the minimum age provision as currently in
11 the regulations?
12 Iris? Amy? We'll start there.
13 MS. FIGUEROA: Thank you. Good morning.
14 Farmworker Justice, along with many other
15 organizations, participated in the process that led up
16 to the revision of the rule, including the three
17 provisions that we're going to be discussing today.
18 And, so, I just first of all wanted to thank the EPA
19 for all the work that went into that process. And I
20 also just want to reiterate our position about why
21 these protections, including the minimum age
22 protection, are so important.
23 So we believe that minors should not be
24 handling pesticides because their bodies are still
25 developing. It can have long-term health effects.

14

1 They may have different levels of maturity, different
2 abilities to follow safety precautions. And in spite
3 of these concerns, the current rule has limits on this
4 minimum age protection. So there's exception for
5 family members, and it only applies to hired workers,
6 so we feel that some of the challenges that might be
7 discussed here may already be taken into account in
8 those exceptions that are already present in the rule.
9 MR. KEIGWIN: Amy, then Leyla, then Preston.
10 MS. LEIBMAN: Thanks, Kevin. That was a
11 good start to your show today, but I don't think that
12 either you or Rick really stressed the amount of work
13 that went into this, the amount of resources that the
14 EPA has spent and the time. So I have some gray hair
15 now, but I didn't in 2001 when I began to work on the
16 revision of the worker protection standard. That's
17 when I entered the show.
18 It was going on prior to that, the efforts
19 within the EPA, to begin to revise the worker
20 protection standard with the idea of protecting
21 farmworkers who are hired to help put food on our
22 tables. So that's been -- it's been going on a long
23 time.
24 I have been engaged in the stakeholder
25 process. I have sat across the table from industry.

15

1 I have sat across the table from farmers. I have
2 sat across the table from the EPA. And I have been a
3 part of the formal workgroup. I have been involved
4 every -- every step of the way, and the EPA has worked
5 really hard to achieve their mission in protecting
6 workers.
7 It's an odd place for EPA because this is a
8 form of exceptionalism in which the agricultural
9 worker and the protection of this worker is put under
10 the responsibility of the EPA. That's not a usual
11 position for EPA. Usually the Occupational Safety &
12 Health Administration has that responsibility. We
13 tried to get it out of EPA because there's lots of
14 challenges, but it was ruled that EPA is, indeed,
15 responsible for protecting workers.
16 So in that light, the move to look at the
17 minimum age and make a minimum age part of the worker
18 protection standard and, what, 18? I think that's a
19 really important move. And, so, the challenge -- I'm
20 confused about the challenges that this would impose
21 since every other industry out there has rules that
22 they must comply with in order to protect young
23 workers.
24 So I actually have teenage boys, and, you
25 know, I had -- I can judge the time of this time frame

16

1 because the one teenage boy was a baby when we started
2 this process. He's now 16. And both those boys work
3 on farms. It's a great opportunity for my two sons.
4 They learn about work ethic. They learn how to show
5 up on time. They learn about the hard work of
6 farming. And I'm so proud of them.
7 But at 16, they did not have and do not have
8 the cognitive ability to be applying pesticides or
9 understanding what it is to be working or how to
10 protect themselves properly. And I think many of us
11 have teenagers in this room or have -- are familiar
12 with teenagers, and this is what we're talking about.
13 And in light of yesterday's conversations as
14 well, when talking about all the challenges that went
15 on with one pesticide and the soybeans, I don't
16 understand why there should be any confusion that the
17 need for an 18-year-old versus a 16-year-old is
18 important.
19 So we should keep the minimum age at 18,
20 and, again, I repeat that we have come to this table.
21 It has been a consensus process. We have -- we have
22 gone back and forth on this, so to move this, to
23 challenge this idea that someone younger than 18
24 should be exposed to pesticides and who's hired -- I
25 want to repeat -- who's hired. Okay, we're not

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

17

1 talking about if it's my decision for my own kid on a
2 farm. I'm talking about if you hire someone.
3 So I'm confused that this is -- this is an
4 issue, and I feel that given that every other industry
5 is able to comply with this idea that an 18-year-old
6 is a limit in terms of their involvement with
7 pesticides, I don't understand what the problem would
8 be here.
9 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Leyla, then Preston,
10 then Andrew.
11 MS. MCCURDY: Thank you. You know, from my
12 perspective and Children's Environmental Health
13 Network's perspective, it's, you know, a given that we
14 should be protecting children younger than 18, at
15 minimum. That is basically -- you know, I think as
16 responsible adults, that's the least we can do to
17 protect our children, so for me that's a no-brainer.
18 And I'm going to take it to the next level.
19 So thank you very much, Amy, for your
20 comments. And, actually, I definitely intended to
21 start by applauding EPA for their efforts, at least
22 I've been involved as far back as Amy, and I've seen
23 all the hard work that Kevin and his staff has put
24 behind this and the support that they have gotten, you
25 know, up the ranks to move this forward. So I want to

18

1 applaud you for all that work, and also I want to
2 applaud the stakeholders.
3 As Amy said, many, many people participated
4 in this process, and -- and we are at a place where we
5 have made some improvements. But, again, as I said,
6 I'm going to take it to the next level, assuming that,
7 you know, this will be embraced, that, you know, hired
8 workers, you know, below the age of 18 will be
9 protected by this. I don't know what the challenges
10 may be, but let's figure it out.
11 So my next level is this -- the exclusion
12 piece. I'm not obviously suggesting -- I'm not that
13 naive -- I'm not going to suggest at this stage that
14 we should -- we should try to change the rules, but I
15 feel like, you know, EPA's mission is to protect
16 public health, and a big piece of that is, you know,
17 children. And, so, I would encourage EPA to think
18 beyond the regulation, and I know this always happens,
19 that, you know, continue doing the voluntary -- to
20 educate families, you know, farm-owner families, since
21 they are excluded, that they need to also protect
22 children.
23 And there is the third thing we should --
24 another issue, so if we can just look at this in the
25 broader sense as I know EPA always does, but let's

19

1 continue to go beyond this regulation and try to
2 protect all children. Thank you.
3 MR. KEIGWIN: And we'll get to the other
4 provisions, too. I think for this conversation we
5 want to focus on the minimum age, but thank you,
6 Leyla.
7 So next I have Preston, Andrew, and then
8 Damon.
9 MR. PECK: Thank you. I am -- I have not
10 been doing this work as long as some of the others
11 that are sitting at the table. I concur with what
12 they've said thus far, but I know our organization
13 that's 31 this year has been involved in this work for
14 quite some time. And [audio glitch] input into the
15 revision and the different rules. And being educated
16 --
17 MR. KEIGWIN: Preston, can you bring your
18 mic a little bit closer.
19 MR. PECK: Being -- there you go. Being
20 educated by former employees at Toxic Free and see
21 about their experiences with these focus groups, one
22 of the shining things that came through were that
23 farmworkers, when discussing these issues and what was
24 important to them, there was disagreement among some
25 things, but they were all in agreement that children

20

1 should not be handling pesticides because they're
2 inherently dangerous. So that is something that the
3 people that are most affected by these rules can all
4 agree upon and should be enforced.
5 I was privy this past summer during outreach
6 to some photo-voice projects that Toxic Free NC worked
7 on with -- in conjunction with Student Action with
8 farmworkers. And one of the interviews that we had, a
9 girl -- a young adult from Washington had grown up
10 picking apples with her father, who is also an apple
11 farmworker. And she recalled one incident when she
12 was younger that a pesticide spray was coming by, and
13 she herself got sprayed during that process.
14 But her concern was not so much about
15 herself but about the woman that was next to her that
16 was pregnant and the impact that that would have on
17 that child and any children that are exposed to
18 pesticides and how awful that is. So I think this is
19 a very real concern that things really happen, and
20 it's something that we hear about, and I think that it
21 is a responsibility of those that choose to engage in
22 agricultural production to protect their workers.
23 Just like any industry it's their
24 responsibility, and a minimum age is a very, I think,
25 small step but important step that we need to take to

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

21

1 protect people as these pesticides -- I hear so many
2 people from industry discuss how they're a tool in a
3 farmer's toolbox. Well, tools come with
4 responsibility, and many of our tools that we use come
5 with age requirements and education requirements. So
6 I think if we are going to use these as tools then
7 they need to be thought of from a regulatory sense as
8 tools.
9 I did have one question -- I have a couple
10 questions about the time line, but I don't want to
11 detract -- distract from this conversation. So I
12 don't know if you want to deal with that later.
13 MR. KEIGWIN: We can do them real quick
14 because if you're having those questions, then others
15 around the table might.
16 MR. PECK: Okay. On the delay in the
17 Federal Register, why has there been such a delay on
18 putting this in the Federal Register as far as the
19 date change?
20 MR. KEIGWIN: So we do have to -- it's a
21 rulemaking that we have to undertake, and there's a
22 process under FIFRA for promulgating rules, even
23 changes to the date. So there's an internal process
24 that has to take place, and then there are additional
25 requirements that the statute requires before the

22

1 public comment period begins.
2 MR. PECK: Okay. Is that a typical -- six
3 or seven months is typical?
4 MR. KEIGWIN: There's a process that
5 involves going to review by the Office of Management &
6 Budget, so those -- there's a number of administrative
7 steps that are involved in it.
8 MR. PECK: Okay. And I don't -- you know,
9 just one quick comment about the NASDA petition, too.
10 I heard Amy and Leyla talking about how they've been
11 working on this since 2001. I think it's a
12 responsibility of the Departments of Agriculture --
13 State Departments of Agriculture and growers, but this
14 is nothing new. This was known to be coming down the
15 pipeline, and I think it's a responsibility to adjust.
16 So I just find it a little -- I'm a little
17 skeptical about the actual -- that we weren't able to
18 prepare ourselves for implementation and effectiveness
19 of this. This is something that you should be
20 thinking about coming down the pipeline and should
21 prepare accordingly. Thank you.
22 MR. KEIGWIN: So Andrew, then Damon, then
23 Liza.
24 MR. THOSTENSON: My organization, the
25 American Association of Pesticide Safety Educators, of

23

1 course, is tasked with educating people about the use
2 of pesticides. So the thing that was most important
3 in our mind was do we have the tools to be able to
4 accomplish whatever the regulatory requirement is. I
5 would have to say a year ago and probably even as late
6 as May that I would agree that we didn't have
7 everything in place that we needed to be able to
8 accomplish that task.
9 Since that time, I've seen a variety of
10 materials that have been released through the PERC
11 process and through other agencies, and I think that
12 many of my colleagues would agree that we do have the
13 necessary tools to do the training at this stage.
14 And, so, that's comforting to me.
15 My big concern, and I think my association's
16 concern, and I think I could speak for Liza, although
17 she'll speak for herself and her organization, is we
18 are about to embark on a new training season. We will
19 be engaged with thousands of applicators and farmers
20 and ranchers across this country this coming winter.
21 It would be extraordinarily useful if we could go to
22 those people and give them some sense of where are we
23 at with the regulation, what is being enforced, what
24 isn't being enforced.
25 Those sorts of questions are going to come

24

1 up. Right now, I don't have any good clear answers
2 for them, other than to say that we're in some kind of
3 compliance assistance mode, which for the average,
4 normal pesticide applicator out there is not very good
5 guidance.
6 So our concern at this stage lies on clarity
7 and not necessarily on whether or not those training
8 tools are in place. I'm becoming more convinced that
9 those materials are now available and that we could
10 train.
11 A couple of other items, at least on a more
12 personal scale, my son became a certified pesticide
13 applicator in January, and when he became 18, he
14 applied pesticides for summers to help pay for college
15 for six years running. My daughter worked in the Weed
16 Science Research Program at North Dakota State
17 University for two years doing handler-related tasks
18 as well as worker tasks.
19 Of course, they're all above average, and
20 they're very smart children. That's what we say in
21 Minnesota and North Dakota. But I hate to always
22 agree with other people in the room, but I'm not so
23 certain that they were capable of understanding or
24 appreciating the level of seriousness with which they
25 needed to conduct themselves with those pesticides

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

25

1 before they were 18 years old.
2 So, you know, my bias is towards the 18-
3 year-old limit, though I am very cognitive of people
4 in the industry who have very difficult problems with
5 sourcing labor to help them in their enterprises, but
6 when we start talking about actually handling
7 pesticides, it requires a certain level of maturity
8 that I'm not sure somebody under the age of 18 has the
9 capacity for.
10 So that's my spiel, and I'm sticking to it.
11 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Damon, then Liza, then
12 Cynthia.
13 MR. REABE: So in regards to the age
14 requirement, if I -- I want to make sure I understand
15 this correctly, though. The minimum age requirement
16 would not apply to family members if they're private
17 applicators. Is that correct?
18 MR. KEANEY: This is the worker protection
19 regulation. Yes, so the minimum age is for handlers
20 that -- and it does have the exception for, you know,
21 a wide range of family relationships, yeah.
22 MR. REABE: And, so, yeah, and that's where
23 my question comes. Aerial application businesses are
24 in general family-owned, but we're commercial
25 applicators. And, so, my question is does it only

26

1 apply to -- the minimum age exemption, does that only
2 apply to family members in the private setting, or
3 would that apply to aerial applicators that are --
4 MR. KEANEY: You're commingling the
5 certification regulation and the worker protection
6 regulation. The worker protection regulation is
7 speaking about handlers, and ...
8 MR. REABE: It says here on the agricultural
9 worker protection final rule, you know, minimum age,
10 and it has the 18-year-old minimum age, and then it
11 goes on to say members of the owner's immediate family
12 are exempt. Does that include owners of aerial
13 application businesses?
14 MR. KEANEY: Hey, Nancy, for folks on the
15 phone, can you come up to a mic or Dea will bring you
16 a mic? Thanks.
17 MS. FITZ: Good morning. This is Nancy
18 Fitz. In WPS, the exemption is only for immediate
19 families of agricultural employers, so the farmers,
20 growers. It does not apply to commercial businesses.
21 MR. REABE: Okay. So would there be any
22 consideration for furthering that exemption to -- and
23 a little background. I grew up, of course, at an
24 aerial application company that my grandfather
25 started. I was mixing and loading at a very young

27

1 age, very young age. I was a human flagger at a very
2 young age. It was a great place to grow up and learn
3 work ethic. And, so, we were -- we were properly
4 trained prior to any training being available.
5 At that time, a lot of this was upon
6 ourselves to figure out, and so we did that with a lot
7 of success. And I left the family business, was a
8 corporate pilot for 15 years, and one of the reasons
9 why I wanted to come back to the industry was to be
10 able to have my children help me out at my business
11 and give them the same opportunities that we had, and
12 I think I share that -- aerial application is a very
13 unique industry in that we are commercial applicators
14 but usually we're very, very small businesses that
15 operate much like small farms.
16 And, so, I'm just interested in possibly
17 pursuing that form of an exemption.
18 MR. KEANEY: That would be -- that would be
19 appropriate if you look at the table -- the discussion
20 on certification, the applicator certification
21 regulation and the table there that gives you the
22 spread of 18, 16 across states and so forth in various
23 categories. So you're then -- once you're certified,
24 it's then legal, is what you're saying?
25 MR. REABE: No, I'm saying you're still

28

1 confusing the worker protection regulation with the
2 applicator certification regulation.
3 MR. REABE: Okay.
4 MR. KEANEY: And, so, when we get to that,
5 it would be much more appropriate to discuss --
6 MR. REABE: Okay.
7 MR. KEANEY: -- to discuss that.
8 MR. REABE: Thank you.
9 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Liza, then Cynthia.
10 Amy, I see your card. Okay.
11 Liza, go ahead.
12 MS. TROSSBACH: On behalf of AAPCO and the
13 state tribal and territorial pesticides control
14 officials, we do support the minimum age of 18 for
15 workers and handlers. We absolutely support enhanced
16 protections for anybody working with pesticides.
17 I will echo what Andrew had indicated, that
18 our concerns with the implementation were the
19 availability of materials, which were not available
20 when -- as early as we would have liked it. You know,
21 it took a little bit sooner, and in fact -- or the
22 fact that part of the implementation of WPS was the
23 commitment by EPA to have those materials available to
24 states were dependent upon those materials being
25 available. So, hence, that was our comments regarding

29

1 the delayed implementation of that.
2 And I would also echo that the concerns of
3 state agencies is kind of the limbo we're in regarding
4 the actual implementation date of the requirement.
5 States are proceeding and doing education based on the
6 requirements that went into effect in 2017 and are
7 preparing for those that are effective January 2018,
8 but because of the limbo, we're not really sure what
9 to tell our agriculture producers and our applicators.
10 But, again, we do support the minimum age requirement.
11 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Cynthia, then Amy.
12 MS. PALMER: Thank you. I'd like to support
13 the others in this room who have spoken because we're
14 -- it seems like we're very close to a consensus. I
15 would like to thank Kevin and others for persevering.
16 Thanks to EPA for 20 years of hard work on this issue.
17 Children are vulnerable, their brains and their
18 reproductive systems, their nervous systems and so
19 forth. I would not want my 12- and 16-year-olds to be
20 handling pesticides.
21 I'm just a little concerned about the
22 questions that were being asked. They seem completely
23 lopsided. We're asking about challenges of
24 implementing this rule? It seems to me so basic to be
25 protecting children from chemicals. A civilized

30

1 country protects its children in the 21st Century.
2 Thank you.
3 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Amy.
4 MS. LEIBMAN: Great. So I'm really pleased
5 to hear that some of the folks that are doing the
6 training and some of the state lead agencies are
7 getting comfortable with the materials that are
8 available, but on Slide -- on Slide 7, you talk about
9 compliance with the new content and worker and
10 handling training will be required six months after
11 EPA publishes the Federal Register notice about the
12 training materials being available.
13 I'd like to encourage you, particularly with
14 the comments that we're hearing today, to get that out
15 there and let people know that these materials are
16 available. And what are your plans for that?
17 MR. KEANEY: Yes, we'll survey what's
18 available and prepare that -- prepare that action or
19 that notice, rather.
20 MS. LEIBMAN: Do you know when?
21 MR. KEANEY: No.
22 MS. LEIBMAN: Okay, so, we're waiting on
23 you.
24 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Pat.
25 MS. BISHOP: You know, I'm certainly not as

31

1 knowledgeable about this issue as many of the folks
2 around the table here, but I was just wondering how is
3 this going to -- this rule going to be enforced and
4 what are the penalties if it's not complied with.
5 MR. KEIGWIN: The program is delegated to
6 state regulatory agencies as you -- as you heard from
7 Liza, that they have the responsibility of
8 implementing and enforcing. And it's enforced via
9 pesticide labels. There's a provision on certain
10 labels that use of -- chemicals used in agriculture
11 that is called an agricultural use box that specifies
12 you be in compliance with -- and it specifies
13 particularly certain health and safety provisions, but
14 then alludes -- says "and other provisions of the
15 worker protection regulation." So it's a use
16 violation that would happen if they're not complying
17 with the regulation.
18 And penalties -- penalties vary from state
19 to state as to what -- what the penalty would be for a
20 use violation. And usually they're triggered --
21 inspections are triggered by tips and complaints.
22 MS. BISHOP: Okay, so, it would -- I mean,
23 so, somebody could conceivably avoid or not comply and
24 not be caught if they weren't under inspection or
25 something like that.

32

1 MR. KEANEY: Yes, and Liza can speak to the
2 scarcity of resources at state levels for that type of
3 activity.
4 MS. TROSSBACH: I'll just echo what Kevin
5 indicated. Your state lead agencies do conduct
6 routine inspections and use observations, as well as
7 investigate any tips, complaints, or reports.
8 Obviously we have thousands of applicators.
9 I can use Virginia as an example. We have 7,000
10 private applicators, all of which have the potential
11 to have workers and handlers. And then there are
12 those that do not require certification, because
13 they're not using restricted-use products, but we do
14 make an attempt to do that. And we do follow up on
15 all of those tips, complaints, and reports.
16 Just like with any type of applications,
17 there is that possibility that pesticides are being
18 misused, and we will not know unless we are observing
19 them or getting a tip, complaint, or report. But
20 primacy does follow the state, and the states have
21 different enforce response policies. Some -- and
22 different authorities. Some states have civil penalty
23 action, which is a monetary action. Some states have
24 the ability to suspend or revoke or modify a
25 certification or a license. So it all depends on that

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

33

1 specific state and their laws and regulations.
2 MR. KEIGWIN: I wanted to -- we've heard a
3 lot of perspectives. Other than Damon from the
4 applicator community side, I don't think we've heard
5 much from the user community side. And I wanted to
6 see if folks around the table who represent that side
7 of the pesticide space to offer any comments they
8 might have.
9 So, Allen?
10 MR. MCLAURIN: Thank you. I agree with
11 everything said. I cannot think of an instance in our
12 area or as a farmer where we would have anyone
13 working, unless it's a family operation, would have
14 anyone under the age of 18 (inaudible). So I think,
15 you know, as far as a private family, you know, like
16 Damon's situation, everything else, as a farmer with
17 his children working, that's the only exception I see
18 where anyone -- because we can't have them operating
19 equipment until they're at least 18 anyway or on the
20 farm.
21 No, what I was saying is as a farmer, we
22 would not have anyone under 18 working on the farm,
23 unless it's a family member, and that applies to
24 family farms. And I was a corporate farm, but very
25 unusual that we would have children working on the

34

1 farm in any case. So I really think it's -- I don't
2 disagree with the 18 minimum age requirement.
3 MR. WHITTINGTON: And, yeah, my
4 understanding is we're fine with the 18 -- age 18
5 requirement with the family exemptions, the minimum
6 age of 18 for hired workers.
7 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Donnie and then Amy.
8 MR. TAYLOR: So I was a farmworker starting
9 at the age of seven in a tobacco field. At that time,
10 I didn't know the term "farmworker." I knew the term
11 "family." So you did what the family told you to do.
12 So this kind of turned out that way.
13 The only thing that we have from a
14 retailer's perspective is the labor pool in rural
15 America is very, very limited. And, oftentimes,
16 you're only dealing with families that have some
17 connection to agriculture. They were born and raised
18 on a farm, and sometimes connections and sometimes
19 experience on a farm level. So with private
20 businesses that are in the retail and application
21 side, we would like to have an opportunity for that
22 family extension as well, because it is a family
23 business, just like the farm is. So...
24 For the task here for handling, I assume the
25 same thing in mixer/loader because that's a similar

35

1 comparison, mixer/loader/handler. That makes
2 perfectly good sense out in the marketplace, I think.
3 Would I let someone younger than that do that, yes, if
4 I trained them, I would, but I would have to be the
5 one to train them. I wouldn't depend on someone else
6 to do that.
7 And then for early entry, I think most of
8 our producer-growers try to do the no entry until the
9 deadline is over, unless in some emergency situation.
10 So we try to apply to that reentry statement as close
11 as possible.
12 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Amy.
13 MS. ASMUS: My background is that I do own a
14 family-owned ag retailer, and I'm the mother of three
15 healthy twenty-something-year-olds. But one thing you
16 have to understand, I have no objection to the minimum
17 age because when we work in ag retail and when we work
18 in farming, you have to understand that the workers
19 that we use are our children, are our neighbors, are
20 our community members. And we love and care for them
21 as much as you may love and care for my child just
22 because it's a child.
23 And we do train them, and we do protect them
24 because our workers, especially in rural ag, are a big
25 asset of our business, and it's very important to us

36

1 that we protect them and that we train them to use the
2 products that we use, the tools that we use
3 effectively. And 18 is not an age that I would object
4 to. I think it's reasonable.
5 It's kind of a "duh" in my mind that
6 somebody like the EPA would have to set a minimum age
7 requirement because as assets of our communities and
8 assets of our business, as an ag retailer, we do
9 protect them, and we do train them, and we do handle
10 our pesticides as safely as we can.
11 MR. KEIGWIN: So is that as close to
12 consensus? I have not heard an alternative point of
13 view expressed. If there is one and you're willing to
14 speak up, now would be the time.
15 (No response.)
16 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay.
17 (Mild applause.)
18 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, so maybe we'll have as
19 much success with the next one. Let's see. So why
20 don't we move on to the designated representative
21 provision. Kevin, do you want to just give folks a
22 brief background on what this provision is intended to
23 do?
24 MR. KEANEY: The ag employer is required to
25 provide pesticide application information and safety

37

1 data sheets to be available for and accessed by
2 workers. And they're -- the worker population is
3 predominantly Hispanic and so it prevents -- it
4 presents challenges, age and, you know, concerns about
5 retaliation and so forth.
6 And, so, what the designated representative
7 provision is designed to help alleviate those
8 concerns, that someone is -- there's an educational
9 challenge, a language challenge, or just a concern for
10 jeopardizing your job by expressing interest in what
11 you may have been exposed to or you will be exposed
12 to. And that can be relieved by having a designated
13 representative gain that information for you.
14 And there is always the requirement that it
15 has to be -- that has to be provided to a medical --
16 medical personnel if the worker or handler requests it
17 because they feel they've been -- they've been exposed
18 and their health has been compromised. But general
19 accessing -- access to the information is a
20 requirement but specifically who gets that is tried to
21 be coped with and the designated representative, as I
22 said, to deal with issues of language or fear of
23 retaliation.
24 And a number of states have -- a number of
25 large -- large ag states have had similar provisions

38

1 and haven't found problems with that provision.
2 MR. KEIGWIN: So same questions as last
3 time. Andy, are you in on this one? Are you -- so
4 Andy, then Iris, then Amy.
5 MR. WHITTINGTON: Yea, it says the
6 information and safety data sheets to a designated
7 representative under certain circumstances. Okay,
8 could you say what those -- what those additional
9 circumstances are?
10 MR. KEANEY: There are provisions -- there
11 are provisions in the regulation that describe, you
12 know, the information that the designated
13 representative would have to provide the employer
14 to -- to validly get that information. So there is
15 attempts to put some boundaries on what the designated
16 rep has to show to justify as getting that
17 information, and which it's --
18 MR. WHITTINGTON: And are there attempts for
19 what that information may be used for? The medical is
20 obvious, but I'm trying to understand what the other
21 circumstances would be.
22 MR. KEANEY: Well, I think what we want to
23 have discussed today is what conditions do you think
24 could be applied as constraining conditions as far as
25 what that information -- if there's concern for how

39

1 that information would be used, then how can we
2 provide constraints to relieve those concerns.
3 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Iris, then Amy.
4 MS. FIGUEROA: So I just want to speak to
5 sort of the context of who farmworkers are and the
6 challenges they face. And hopefully this will answer
7 also some of the questions about what other
8 circumstances or what other types of representatives
9 might be involved.
10 So farmworkers are among the most
11 economically and educationally disadvantaged groups of
12 people in the country. As you mentioned, a lot of
13 them don't have English as a primary language. They
14 may be traveling. They may be in a different state or
15 even country to where they were exposed to the
16 pesticide as they're trying to deal with the impact of
17 that and what that might entail.
18 So, for example, we know, you know, just to
19 give you an example of a worker who was exposed to
20 pesticide, was sent back to his home country, which
21 was Mexico, was from a very small town, it was -- he
22 had to move heaven and earth just to get to a doctor
23 in Mexico. And then he had to try and get this
24 information for his medical treatment while being in
25 Mexico. So, you know, sort of the practical

40

1 challenges that that presents.
2 So for a worker to have the opportunity to
3 designate someone that they trust, you know, to give
4 them, you know, that explicit authority and allow them
5 to help them to get crucial information, not just for
6 medical treatment but, for example, for a workers
7 compensation claim or some other situation is really
8 very important.
9 You also alluded to the fact that many
10 states and -- well, various states, including
11 California, Oregon, Washington, Texas, and Florida to
12 be specific, have similar provisions and have had them
13 for a while without any reports, you know, of abuse of
14 this provision. And that's not surprising to me
15 because working with farmworkers, what we have is
16 exactly the opposite problem, which is that workers
17 are very hesitant to report any incidents. They're
18 very hesitant to seek treatment. And, so, I think
19 it's really important that we have this provision and
20 that we make it easier for them, not harder for them,
21 to report pesticide incidents and to get the treatment
22 and other type of relief that they need.
23 MR. KEIGWIN: Amy, then Preston.
24 Andy, I don't know if you're back.
25 Oh, okay, Amy.

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

41

1 MS. LEIBMAN: Thanks, Iris. I think that's
2 a really good start to helping us understand some of
3 the realities in this field and what farmworkers go
4 through. But I also wanted to just take a moment
5 again on this point and remind everybody about the
6 process leading up to the actual rule and that there
7 were a number of items that dealt with stronger
8 protections for the worker that were left off the
9 table in the spirit of developing a consensus-driven
10 rule that could be applied.
11 So in our opinion, the worker protection
12 standard is an important step forward, but there were
13 protections that are still needed. And, so, this
14 designated representative one is something that the
15 worker protection standard tried to look at against
16 what is happening in other industries, how are other
17 workers protected. And this is -- this is common in
18 other industry, and this is also common, as we talked
19 about, in the agricultural industry in other states.
20 But I think that's a really important
21 context for us to remember as we're thinking about
22 this provision. And then I do want to underscore just
23 even the challenges of a medical provider getting this
24 information. And, so, although that's in the rule and
25 everyone always says, oh, well, the medical provider

42

1 can get it if they need it, there are plenty of
2 challenges, and it does have to do with the
3 vulnerability of the population that we're talking
4 about.
5 We're talking about, by and large, hired
6 workers that aren't from here, that largely do not
7 speak English, and they're here to work. They don't
8 want to cause any problems, but in some cases, they
9 need to know what they've been exposed to. And in
10 some cases, they may be hesitant to even seek clinical
11 care because they don't want to lose any time from
12 work. And, so, sometimes you do need a designated
13 representative to assist in getting this information.
14 So I want to just again remember sort of the
15 context that this is being put into the WPS, remember
16 what is happening in other industries, think about our
17 hired farmworker population, and this is really an
18 important step forward, and there already are
19 restrictions even within the WPS that make it less of
20 a protection for our farmworkers than for other
21 workers in other industries. And that right there is
22 really problematic.
23 So I want to make sure that we -- we keep
24 this and we keep this as strong as possible in
25 thinking about how to protect workers who are putting

43

1 food on our table.
2 MR. KEIGWIN: Preston.
3 MR. PECK: Yeah, I concur with everything
4 that's been said thus far. But also I know that from
5 groups and networks and coalitions that I work with
6 that advocate with farmworkers and deal with
7 farmworkers either in organizing or medical or, you
8 know, legal aid, all of these things, this is a very
9 complicated rule and complicated process, even for
10 people that are familiar with it and even if English
11 is their first language and primary language.
12 And I think that we do have a responsibility
13 as people that eat the food that these people -- that
14 agricultural workers put on our table to protect them
15 and protect the agricultural system. And I think that
16 we all have rights in this room to hire, you know,
17 legal representation if we choose to do so. And I
18 think agricultural workers, especially given the
19 different challenges that they face, either
20 economically or communication-wise, whatever it may
21 be, should have the same right to choose someone, not
22 necessarily even legal representation, but choose
23 someone of their own volition to go about and get
24 information on what they have been exposed to because
25 these chemicals are inherently dangerous and, by

44

1 definition, designed to kill.
2 So I think that that's important that they
3 have access to that information. And I think this is
4 really a matter of access. Thank you.
5 MR. KEIGWIN: Nichelle, then Liza.
6 MS. HARRIOTT: So hearing the previous
7 comments got me thinking about who appoints this
8 designated representative, and given that Kevin
9 mentioned there are concerns about retaliation, it
10 would seem that this representative needs to be
11 independent of the employer. So my question is who
12 would be the person to appoint this designated
13 official.
14 MR. KEANEY: It would be the worker, as
15 someone here mentioned, someone they trust to serve
16 their needs by getting that information. So they
17 would -- the worker would designate -- the worker
18 would pick the designee -- would designate a
19 representative.
20 MS. HARRIOTT: So the workers on this one
21 particular farm would get together and appoint this
22 person?
23 MR. KEANEY: No, no. The process is up to
24 the worker, obviously. It's an individual --
25 individual worker getting an individual.

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

45

1 MS. HARRIOTT: Oh, it's a worker, a
2 farmworker who is also the designated representative?
3 MR. KEANEY: Not necessarily, not
4 necessarily. An individual farmworker would pick
5 someone they trust, and that person would be the
6 designated representative to get the information.
7 MS. HARRIOTT: Well, does each farmworker
8 have a designated representative?
9 MR. KEANEY: No. It's a specific -- it's
10 specific to an incident. If a person feels that
11 they've been infected by pesticides and want
12 information on that pesticide, they have a right to
13 get it. If they have constraints from language or
14 other constraints, then they can designate someone
15 that they trust to get that information for them.
16 I sense I haven't answered your question.
17 MR. KEIGWIN: Liza.
18 MS. TROSSBACH: One of the challenges that
19 pesticide regulatory officials face is language
20 barriers. While there are some states where you will
21 have a state regulatory authority which has the
22 ability to, you know, interact with individuals who
23 don't have English as a primary language, many don't.
24 Those resources aren't available, although we may try
25 to find them and we may be able to find some language

46

1 line type services, you know, that can assist.
2 So I think from a regulatory perspective and
3 wanting to ensure that workers and handlers and all
4 pesticide users are receiving the protections, you
5 know, we support the designated representative. I
6 think that -- unfortunately, I think many times state
7 lead agencies don't get reports because of many issues
8 -- retaliation, et cetera -- but also because of the
9 language barrier. And while we try to meet that, we
10 want to make sure that if there are concerns and
11 instances and reports that we get them so we can do
12 our investigations and we can ensure that the
13 protections are in place and workers and handlers are
14 being protected.
15 So from that perspective, we certainly
16 support the, you know, designated representative. You
17 know, I can understand where there may be some
18 concerns or questions about how that will be
19 implemented on the actual farm, you know, for the
20 producer certainly, and those are issues that, you
21 know, they can address. But from our perspective, if
22 this will assist in us hearing these reports or us
23 being able to assist and get that medical information
24 or do that, you know, we would certainly support that.
25 MR. KEIGWIN: Jay.

47

1 MR. VROOM: Thanks. So it's my
2 understanding that there have been some concerns from
3 one or more farm organizations expressed to the EPA
4 staff about how the specific implementation definition
5 of who may claim to be a designated representative and
6 whether there's any potential ill intent from that
7 individual who may not know anything about the
8 farmworkers that are placed on the farm. Have you
9 gotten those specific questions from any agricultural
10 farm organizations, and are they in writing? Is that
11 something that we could understand better?
12 MR. KEANEY: We did get comments that --
13 generally addressing what you're describing, you know,
14 putting the information to use that's to the
15 disadvantage of the farm. And as I mentioned earlier,
16 it might be useful here to just -- if you want to
17 offer things that can be applied as verification, as
18 constraints on the use of this information and so
19 forth, there are those things in the regulation, but
20 perhaps they need to be bolstered in some fashion.
21 MR. VROOM: Yeah, it was my understanding
22 that there were specific suggestions that have been
23 made, and I didn't know whether they've been provided
24 to you in writing from those farm organizations or
25 not, but it seems to me that there's close to

48

1 universal consensus that you're hearing from around
2 this table that this is a good idea for the
3 advancement of safety compliance. But maybe just a
4 few little details around definition as who can
5 qualify as a designated representative could close
6 this deal and allow you to move forward.
7 MR. KEANEY: Yes, we can look into that and
8 obviously look into how the states that have worked
9 with that provision and found it not an issue manage
10 that aspect.
11 MR. VROOM: So, Liza, is that something that
12 AAPCO and NASDA could help -- you know, come to the
13 table with? Because I think you've got members that
14 have that kind of experience.
15 MS. TROSSBACH: Absolutely.
16 MR. VROOM: Maybe some definitions, yeah.
17 MS. TROSSBACH: Absolutely. I think
18 absolutely more than happy to assist with that.
19 MR. VROOM: My sense is that this has been
20 the biggest lightning rod in this at the close and,
21 you know, if it really is a matter of a few words or
22 definitions with regard to a federal regulation that
23 would define who could be deemed to be a legitimate
24 designated representative, I think this could be taken
25 off the table.

49

1 MR. KEIGWIN: Iris.
2 MS. FIGUEROA: So just to follow up on that,
3 just to clarify it -- and correct me if I'm wrong,
4 there's a lot of elements of the rule, but my
5 understanding is the rule has a requirement that there
6 be an explicit authorization from the worker, first of
7 all. And, second, my understanding is that the
8 information is essentially what pesticides the worker
9 was exposed to. I mean, we're not talking about, you
10 know, trade secrets here or some sort of corporate
11 espionage or I don't know what is the scenario that
12 people are envisioning.
13 So, you know, just the language of ill
14 intent, I'm really having a hard time. Knowing
15 farmworker advocates, you know, I'm really having a
16 hard time envisioning that scenario of someone who
17 tries to get at a farmer by just requesting basic
18 information about pesticide exposure, information
19 which, you know, the employer is supposed to be
20 posting in a lot of cases anyway. So I might be
21 missing something, but I just wanted to clarify that.
22 MR. VROOM: So, you know, in addition to my
23 day job, I happen to be part of a family farming
24 operation, and I can tell you that there's a lot of
25 competition among farmers. And, so, it would not be

50

1 unusual for this to be something that could be used as
2 an asset for ill intent from one farmer to another.
3 And, so, again, I'm not talking about anything that
4 would be of concern to you as I understand your role
5 or those who have -- all of us have an interest in
6 protecting farmworkers -- it is the kind of
7 information that can be attached to this sort of
8 information that could be advantageous to competing
9 farming interests.
10 So I think that has a lot to do with, again,
11 very minute details that I think could be resolved
12 here. I'm not attacking you, understand, right? I'm
13 trying to say that there's very little space left
14 between whoever's on either side of this issue that
15 can be resolved. And let's get there instead of
16 spending another hour talking around the margins of
17 this. If we could get the principals around the table
18 in a small workgroup, I don't think it would take half
19 an hour to resolve this. Thank you.
20 MR. KEIGWIN: So Donnie and then Amy.
21 MR. TAYLOR: I agree, just a definition.
22 The circumstances just need to be well-defined that we
23 can talk about. I do worry about trust. There are
24 people that will do some unethical things to gain
25 trust, and that concerns me. Make sure we protect

51

1 them from that side as well.
2 And then the success of the states, I never
3 really thought about this. It's an issue that's
4 better handled at the state level.
5 MR. KEIGWIN: Amy.
6 MS. LEIBMAN: I just want to underscore
7 again we don't think any of this is personal. But I
8 do -- I am a little bit concerned about the -- I want
9 us to sort of think again about who we're talking
10 about in terms of who needs the designated
11 representative. This person has worked really hard to
12 get to this country to just work, okay? And the risks
13 and challenges that this person has gone through in
14 order to be able to work on a farm are incredible.
15 So then we have a population who is
16 desperate for work. They're economically
17 disadvantaged; often don't speak the language. They
18 want to keep their job. And they are not going to
19 want to do anything that would possibly put themselves
20 at risk for losing their job.
21 So this idea that they would get somebody
22 to, like, you know, get a pesticide trade secret and
23 then pass it on to another farmer is a little
24 farfetched given the farmworker population that we're
25 talking about that desperately, desperately wants to

52

1 work. And it's our responsibility to help that worker
2 be protected. And, so, this is again -- it's in other
3 regs for other industries. It's working in other
4 states. And, so, there is -- you know, there is
5 specifics in the actual rule.
6 So I'm not -- again, I'm not really quite
7 sure what the issue is, but I really want us to
8 remember who we're talking about and who needs to work
9 and who needs our protection when we're thinking about
10 the distrust issue.
11 MR. KEIGWIN: Andrew.
12 MR. THOSTENSON: Well, you know, I work with
13 pesticide applicators. I work with farmers and
14 ranchers. They're very independent-minded. The idea
15 of somebody coming onto their property and demanding
16 some sort of records without any kind of credentials
17 or means of demonstrating whether or not they're
18 reliable or not ambulance chasers or those sorts of
19 things are -- well, it's just -- it goes contrary to
20 their way of life and thinking.
21 Having said that, though, they are also
22 concerned about the welfare of the people that work
23 for them. And, so, I think Jay probably has this
24 thing right. I think that if we can adequately define
25 the circumstances in which this representative would

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

53

1 be able to get these sorts of -- this sort of
2 information then I think that this issue goes away.
3 So, you know, just wanting to add some
4 context as to why there may be sensitivity in the
5 farming and ranching community.
6 MS. LEIBMAN: Kevin, can you just clarify
7 for us, because I think this would solve the problem
8 and some of the issues that you're bringing up, is
9 that it's my understanding that in response to the
10 comments during the comment period that EPA actually
11 further constrained this particular point so that it
12 would be very clear that whoever is coming onto the
13 properties to ask for this information that it's very
14 clear. So, Kevin, please clarify that for us.
15 MR. KEANEY: Yes, I agree, and -- but it
16 still seems to be an issue of concern, so...
17 MR. KEIGWIN: Nancy may have --
18 MS. FITZ: Yeah, this is Nancy Fitz. Amy's
19 right. The proposed designated representative, there
20 were no constraints. Anybody could walk onto an
21 establishment and say I'm Kathy's designated
22 representative, please share the application
23 information and safety data sheets. We got a lot of
24 concerns and comments about that, so the final rule
25 does require that the request from the designated

54

1 representative has to be in writing.
2 It can't be verbally. It has to identify
3 the worker/handler who they're representing. It has
4 to identify the specific information they're looking
5 for, so what -- when the worker was there, what they
6 were doing, and the specific information they want.
7 And it has to have a written statement from the
8 worker/handler, signed, designating that person,
9 identifying their name.
10 So I guess I'm really -- Jay and others, I'm
11 interested in what other constrains you guys think are
12 necessary to make that legit.
13 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. Amy, then Lori Ann,
14 then Preston.
15 Andrew, were you still in, or had you not --
16 okay.
17 MS. ASMUS: I just want to point out that we
18 are not unrealizing of the plight of some farmworkers,
19 but you need to understand that the farmworker
20 population is not defined by the subset of migrant
21 workers that come into the U.S. to work. And, so,
22 while we understand that they need to have access to
23 their information and they need to have a
24 representative, if they don't -- if they have those
25 language barriers. We deal with farmworkers that are

55

1 not disadvantaged migrant workers, and that may or may
2 not use this clause as an advantage to get what we've
3 talked about are growers -- and they are trade
4 secrets. Growers do weed management, insect
5 management, plant nutrition management in the best way
6 they think they are, and they are competitive with
7 their neighbor.
8 And, so, we are not asking for the
9 limitations to take away from any of those
10 farmworkers. We just want to make sure along with the
11 list that Nancy put that possibly you have the intent
12 of the designated user and what their intent to use
13 that information is, not just from the farmworker but
14 an intent of who they are and what their position is
15 and how they intend to use the information that they
16 have to benefit that worker.
17 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Lori Ann, then Preston,
18 then Nichelle.
19 MS. BURD: I, like many around this table,
20 echo the concerns for the workers in recognizing that
21 this is designed to protect people who don't have the
22 ability to get this information themselves after an
23 incident has occurred where they're sick and they need
24 the information. And it seems to me deeply cynical
25 and unnerving to, like, take this to the most extreme

56

1 places we're talking about, that this will be
2 routinely used by farmers against their neighbors to
3 gain unfair advantages.
4 We're talking about sick people wanting
5 information for their doctors. And I just really have
6 concerns about making it harder for people who are
7 vulnerable and are sick to find someone who can help
8 them get this basic information. And I hope that in
9 developing all of this we don't take it to the most
10 cynical scenario possible.
11 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Preston, then Nichelle,
12 then Helen.
13 MR. PECK: I had a question, Kathy, for
14 their efforts. Kathy? When they developed the
15 specificities around it, wasn't it also -- I thought I
16 remembered some provision that caused a concern within
17 the farmworker community about being able to -- having
18 to designate which field the worker was working in at
19 the time. Is that correct?
20 MR. KEIGWIN: So, Nancy, can you clarify?
21 MR. PECK: Nancy, sorry.
22 MS. FITZ: So the ag employers are only
23 required to provide the information that had to be
24 posted when that worker was -- worker/handler was at
25 the establishment. So you do kind of have to narrow

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

57

1 down when they were working and where they were -- or
2 at which -- if there are different establishments to
3 be able to identify the information that they have
4 access to. And it is consistent because that would be
5 -- those would have been the pesticides they might
6 have been exposed to.
7 MR. PECK: But wasn't there -- and there's a
8 time frame in which the worker could give, like a two-
9 year time frame or something like that?
10 MS. FITZ: Yeah, well, the employers are
11 only required to keep the records for two years, so
12 that's as far back as you could go.
13 MR. PECK: I think the concern that was
14 brought up was around the nature of movement with
15 farmworkers and farmworkers being, you know, the
16 migrant farmworker being in a farm -- foreign land and
17 not knowing -- I mean, I know farmworkers in North
18 Carolina that may be -- you know, they get here, the
19 growers -- they go through the growers association.
20 The growers association puts them on a bus and sends
21 them to a farm and they don't know where they are. So
22 that can cause problems, and I just want to talk --
23 you know, elevate that issue.
24 And I -- you know, I hear what Amy has
25 brought up and what Jay brought up around, you know,

58

1 issues that it's a very competitive business, just
2 like any other business may be, but I just want to
3 keep harping on that these chemicals are dangerous and
4 that it's a responsibility. You enter into this
5 business knowing that you have a responsibility to
6 protect your workers.
7 And just like any other business, workers
8 have a right to know what they were exposed to, so
9 that they can provide adequate information to their
10 medical officials, so then if any problems arise, they
11 can get that, or if any legal issues happen, then
12 their attorneys can get that information. And how
13 they do that, I think we've addressed that with -- in
14 writing and making sure that the worker's properly
15 being represented, which is also a protection measure.
16 Thank you.
17 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. Nichelle, then Allen,
18 then Andy.
19 MS. HARRIOTT: So after hearing the
20 discussion, I go back to my original question about
21 who designates this designated representative. It
22 seems to me from hearing some of the conversation
23 today that this person would need to be someone who is
24 a neutral entity.
25 This person would be -- needs to be

59

1 appointed by someone who is a neutral entity. This
2 person needs to be able to talk to the farmer about
3 what is being used to have access to the information
4 that the farmer needs to provide and also needs to be
5 trusted by the farmworker. This person also needs to
6 be versed in the information that he or she is being
7 tasked with trying to make into the farmworker, so
8 this person needs to be able to explain safety data
9 sheets, for example, and be able to be available to
10 access information for medical personnel when
11 necessary.
12 So back to my original question, I know you
13 have said that this person is appointed by the
14 farmworker, but it seems to me that there needs --
15 this person needs to be someone that both the farmer
16 and farmworker could agree on to be the in-between
17 person between these two groups.
18 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, so I'm going to take the
19 last cards that are up because in talking to Kevin I
20 think -- I think we have heard something that we want
21 to pose to all you, but I want to make sure that we
22 hear from the remaining cards up.
23 So, Allen, then Andy, then Amy.
24 MR. MCLAURIN: Amy, let me ask you a
25 question, and I'll try and -- I do not disagree at all

60

1 with the representative. I think it's important that
2 farmworkers have an access to what information they
3 may need. The way we handle it, being in North
4 Carolina, and I'm sure the rest of the states, is if
5 there is a complaint that a neighbor has a complaint,
6 they report it to the pesticide board and within a
7 matter of a day or hours we'll have a call and they'll
8 come by and see us.
9 Is there any way that we can just funnel
10 this through the pesticide division of the states and
11 let them -- let the designated representative and that
12 way the farmer wouldn't even have to know who the
13 complainant was or anything. You just run it through
14 the pesticide division. It would simplify everything,
15 and we trust the pesticide people who come on our
16 farms wanting information. I just throw that out for
17 fair (inaudible).
18 MS. LEIBMAN: I think there's like -- and
19 I'm a little bit confused by your question because it
20 seems like you gave the example of, like, a neighbor
21 wanting to know what was being used.
22 MR. MCLAURIN: Well, no, if someone has the
23 complaint of something that was sprayed or they think
24 it may have harmed them or they want to know -- they
25 report us to the pesticide division and they call us

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

61

1 and they come get the information. In other words,
2 some way we got to be able to trust these people
3 coming to us, that they're --
4 MS. LEIBMAN: So your scenario is a good one
5 as to a completely different scenario than I think
6 what we're talking about, so I think it would be good,
7 again, just to have clarity because a complaint by a
8 neighbor would be handled by -- it's just a whole
9 different set of circumstances. And, really, what
10 we're after here is about the worker.
11 And, also, guys, this is information that in
12 all other parts of the worker protection standard this
13 -- the workers actually have access to it. Like so
14 that we're not saying, like, you know, farmers are
15 giving them. So if you -- like, an unscrupulous
16 neighbor kid who is working on your farm and he wants
17 to steal that information, they can do that. So, you
18 know, maybe you want your kids to, you know, sign a
19 no-compete clause, but this is -- this is not -- this
20 is not what we're talking about.
21 This is really about -- this is information
22 that the workers -- that for safety reasons all have
23 access to it, but sometimes, you know, because there's
24 language barriers, because there's vulnerabilities, I
25 mean, these people, again, they want to work. They

62

1 don't want to cause any problems.
2 And, so, in situations where they need that
3 information, just like in other industries, they
4 should have the right to be able to ask a third-party
5 representative to please ask the farmer what was used,
6 what were they exposed to. And, again, it's
7 information that, you know, with, you know, maybe a
8 higher level of education, maybe with the command of
9 the English language, all those things might be
10 easier, or maybe without fear of being fired because,
11 you know, there's an antiretaliation rule -- or
12 there's an antiretaliation language that was left out
13 of the original WPS.
14 I just want to remind everyone of that. But
15 this is -- this is something really that the worker
16 can get this information. It's just that in many
17 cases because of who this worker is, they're not going
18 to be able to. So if there are concerns about
19 information being spread to other farms or the
20 competition there, that largely isn't going to come
21 from the hired farmworker. And then that's a whole
22 other legal issue that farmers who hire educated,
23 English-speaking workers might want to look into if
24 that's something that they're scared about.
25 MR. KEANEY: Okay, Andy.

63

1 MR. WHITTINGTON: Well, I think we're
2 narrowing it down and that everybody -- everybody is
3 of the opinion that the farmworker needs access to
4 this information, especially for immediate medical --
5 immediate medical conditions or conditions that he's
6 been exposed to. He could possibly need it for some
7 legal action at some point that he would need to have
8 his attorney have that information or, you know,
9 worker comp claim at some point.
10 I think the concern is outside of those
11 people who are required to hold that information
12 confidential what would be the other circumstances
13 that they would need that information and what could
14 the designated representative do with that information
15 outside of his representation of that individual
16 worker.
17 So I think if we can narrow that down or
18 eliminate that, that would be -- I think we're done
19 with this section and we can move on.
20 MR. KEIGWIN: All right. So thank you all
21 for that. I heard two recommendations on this issue
22 coming forward. And, so, I just want to see if I
23 captured it correctly. I think there seems to be
24 general, widespread support across our committee that
25 workers should be able to have access to this

64

1 information.
2 What I heard were two recommended paths
3 forward. One -- and we will take these back. One
4 would be to form a very short-term workgroup to help
5 to work through some of the varied types of issues
6 that Andy and Allen from a user perspective were
7 mentioning. I'll throw Jay in, too, as being part of
8 a family farm operation, mindful of the worker needs
9 that have been expressed by many around the table as
10 well to try to see what types of further clarification
11 might be necessary.
12 And then the second thing that I heard,
13 which might -- the second one might help to inform the
14 first one -- is to enlist AAPCO in looking into those
15 circumstances in states that already have a provision
16 like this or similar to this to find out just kind of
17 operationally how this provision has been utilized and
18 what, if any, concerns have come up in workers being
19 able to avail themselves of a similar type of
20 provision.
21 Does that reflect what people heard around
22 the table?
23 (No response.)
24 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. So we will take that
25 back. So we are at 10:05. This has been a great

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

65

1 discussion. We still have one more aspect of the
2 worker protection standard that we were going to
3 discuss before the break. These have been very robust
4 discussions. I don't know if people want to take a
5 quick break now. I'm seeing some nods. So could we
6 come back at 10:20, no later than that, and we'll pick
7 up with AEZ at that point. All right, thanks.
8 (Brief recess.)
9 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, so we've got one last
10 topic that we wanted to cover today regarding worker
11 protection standard that is the application exclusion
12 zone. I think I said -- I did it right this time,
13 Nancy? So, Kevin, can you help kick this one off?
14 MR. KEANEY: Well, pesticide labels have
15 basic provisions saying don't spray people. And it's
16 kind of straightforward. Perhaps the provision in the
17 worker protection, the application exclusion zone was
18 trying -- it was trying to give ways in which work
19 would not have to be stopped during application in
20 order to prevent spraying people.
21 But I think what we're concerned with here
22 is the challenge, the complexity of the application
23 exclusion zone provision or the fact that there's
24 already a provision labeling that says don't spray
25 people, or does it create challenges for enforcement

66

1 since you have to be present as an inspector to
2 witness violation of the provisions of the application
3 exclusion zone? Those are all questions that I think
4 would be helpful to discuss.
5 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. So Damon, Iris, Amy.
6 All right, Damon.
7 MR. REABE: Just a clarification, does the
8 application exclusion zone -- in aerial application,
9 we're using spotters that are trained by our -- by our
10 company. They travel to the field, and they observe
11 the application and they carry two-way radio
12 communication so that they can communicate with the
13 pilot. And they're observing where the spray is
14 landing and then communicating that back to the pilot.
15 So in an application exclusion zone as --
16 would a -- would a person that's trained and wearing
17 PPE be allowed in the application exclusion zone or
18 not?
19 MR. KEANEY: If you follow the -- if you
20 look at the fact sheet that's provided there, it's --
21 it's admittedly about ground application and then
22 having a sort of a bubble of protection around the
23 application -- applicator equipment that would allow
24 people in, as long as they weren't within that --
25 within that bubble.

67

1 MR. REABE: So, but being -- is it possible
2 to be within the bubble with PPE donned?
3 MR. KEIGWIN: Nancy, do you want to clarify?
4 MS. FITZ: Yeah, I'd love to jump in. Yes,
5 the -- and a handler who is properly trained and
6 equipped and involved with the application is allowed
7 to be in the bubble.
8 MR. REABE: Thank you.
9 MR. KEIGWIN: Iris, then Amy.
10 MS. FIGUEROA: Thank you. So just generally
11 and briefly, we just want to reiterate, we think this
12 is an important protection. One of the leading causes
13 of pesticide poisoning for farmworkers is actually
14 exposure from nearby or adjacent fields, so this is,
15 as you expressed, just trying to get at preventing
16 some of that harm beyond what may be in the label an
17 insert of having explicit and practical measures that
18 can be taken to help prevent that harm, not just for
19 the workers, but also for bystanders who may be
20 affected.
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Amy, then Andy.
22 MS. LEIBMAN: Thank you. I just wanted to
23 echo some of that, and that really I think that it's
24 important to look at the intent of what the worker
25 protection standard is trying to do in terms of

68

1 minimizing the exposure of the worker to pesticides.
2 And it's basically just trying to keep -- keep workers
3 away, and it might have a big word -- application
4 exclusion zone -- but in essence it's something that's
5 pretty important that's looking at how can we make
6 sure -- how can we minimize workers' exposure.
7 So in terms of, you know, the challenges, it
8 is consistent with your mission, and, you know, I have
9 lots of ideas if you want to go further than what's in
10 the WPS, if you want to strengthen this part. I'm
11 happy to chat with you about that, but in terms of
12 what you're trying to do here, it's a good first step
13 in terms of trying to keep the worker protected.
14 MR. KEIGWIN: Andy, then Sharon, then Liza.
15 MR. WHITTINGTON: So agree that we need to
16 keep this stuff off of -- nobody wants to spray
17 people. And I don't come from an area with a lot --
18 large migrant worker population, so I'm thinking of
19 this in terms of explaining it to my farmers who don't
20 have a lot of workers in any particular area, and it's
21 with the difference between the onsite obligations
22 versus the offsite -- outside of the facility
23 boundaries. And the question that I have been asked
24 is a car coming down a highway, if you're spraying the
25 end of the field, a car coming down the end of the

69

1 highway, do you cease application at that point until
2 it moves out of the area. I mean, that's one.
3 Obviously, if a person is walking down the
4 highway, I would advise them to cease application
5 until that person is gone, but that was one of the
6 things when it came up about the houses that are next-
7 door, you know, not owned by the facility but a
8 neighboring house, if the people are inside, do you
9 have to cease application within the hundred feet, or
10 do you have to wait until they're not home?
11 There's -- so those are the two instances
12 that my farmers have asked me for clarification on, is
13 the automobiles on a highway and if you have to cease
14 application for people or if they're -- obviously if
15 they come outside of the house, they would cease
16 application, but if they're inside the house while
17 you're making the application, do you have to cease
18 application until they're not home.
19 MR. KEANEY: Nancy, I'd like you to respond
20 to it just as a result.
21 MS. FITZ: Thanks, Kevin. So the rule
22 itself says if any person -- worker or other person --
23 other than a trained and equipped handler involved
24 with the application is in the AEZ, the handler has to
25 suspend the application. The information -- so if

70

1 there's some -- so that would say if somebody's in
2 that car, if somebody's in the house, if somebody's
3 walking down, they would have to suspend.
4 What we heard from the states right when
5 this came out was, well, when can they start up again.
6 And the rules does -- does not address that. And, so,
7 the handout that Kevin provided with the AEZ
8 interpretation says if that car's coming down or they
9 think somebody's in the house, they have to suspend,
10 but then if they can assess the situation, assure that
11 they can continue the application without contacting
12 that person, then they can resume.
13 So in theory, if the wind's blowing the
14 other direction or they can be sure they're not going
15 to contact the person in the car or in the house, then
16 they can continue. You did get to some areas where we
17 do need to kind of provide some clarification in terms
18 of what exactly is contact in this -- with the car and
19 the house, and that's one of the things on our to-do
20 list yet is to provide some clarification on that.
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Sharon, then Liza.
22 MS. SELVAGGIO: I want to say that with
23 regard to this AEZ, the 100 feet already seems quite
24 minimal for aerial air-blast fumigation, smoke, mist,
25 et cetera. We know that drift, especially for those

71

1 kinds of applications, can extend far beyond that. So
2 we definitely are not in favor of weakening the size
3 of the AEZ at all.
4 The other thing that concerns us is that
5 we've become aware that some -- some producers are
6 apparently interested in interpreting this provision
7 to allow sheltering in place for migrant housing,
8 labor housing that is onsite or adjacent to some of
9 the agricultural areas. And we're very concerned
10 about that. We don't think that that is a fair
11 interpretation of what this rule was meant to address.
12 We do recognize the difficulties in
13 implementing this when there is housing especially and
14 when night applications might take place, but we
15 believe that, you know, the intent of this particular
16 provision really needs to be upheld because we're not
17 just talking workers now, but we're talking the
18 workers' children, the workers' family, and other
19 people who, you know, could potentially be affected
20 that are -- the intent of this provision is to protect
21 those other people who might be quite vulnerable,
22 untrained, young, sick, you know. So we don't want to
23 see any weakening of this particular provision.
24 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Liza, then Dominic, then
25 Tim.

72

1 MS. TROSSBACH: Again, as I had mentioned in
2 our previous discussion, pesticide regulatory
3 officials certainly support protections of
4 workers/handlers/bystanders, you know, any persons
5 involved. I think with the application exclusion
6 zone, I think it is for some kind of a difficult
7 concept because it's a moving target as the
8 application moves, but I think that's a matter of
9 outreach and education, so applicators understand
10 that, and I think the guidance that's been provided by
11 the EPA will assist and that there may be further
12 guidance needed, just so we can make sure, you know,
13 that individuals, you know, do particularly understand
14 that.
15 I think that there was a question or a
16 comment about the enforceability of this and does a
17 state lead agency or a regulatory official need to be
18 onsite. As I had mentioned earlier, we do routine
19 inspections and use observations, so there may be the
20 opportunities that we're actually onsite during these
21 applications, but if we were to get a tip, some kind
22 of report, we would handle it like we do any
23 investigation at that time, which would include, you
24 know, interviewing the complainant, interviewing the
25 respondent, which may be the agriculture producer, you

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

ED_002528_00039560-00019

73

1 know, applicator, you know, handlers, you know,
2 workers to gather as much information, looking at
3 records, et cetera, to try to determine if, in fact,
4 those provisions were met. So we would handle that as
5 we do any other type of tip, complaint, or report
6 regarding a potential pesticide misuse.
7 So it's having your regulators educated,
8 having your industry regulated, and then -- or excuse
9 me, educated, and then being able to go out and do
10 those investigations if needed.
11 MR. KEIGWIN: Dominic, then Tim, then
12 Andrew.
13 MR. LAJOIE: Thank you. I just want to
14 share one of the challenges on my farm. I do all of
15 the applications on our crops, and it's actually ATV
16 riders or all-terrain vehicles that have access to the
17 public roads around our farms, and all these public
18 roads are dirt roads, but it's access to the public.
19 And a lot of times, I don't see them before they show
20 up into my exclusion zone.
21 So whether they show up behind me, and so I
22 immediately stop application, but a lot of times I'm
23 probably in violation with this rule. Some of these
24 ATV riders are educated enough to know that if they
25 see me, they'll stop and wait. A lot of these are

74

1 young kids riding around on the trails. You know,
2 they're just -- they don't understand.
3 But I guess it's going to be a challenge for
4 me to really keep that exclusion zone without knowing
5 when somebody's going to pop up behind me. That's
6 just one challenge of people in that zone.
7 MR. KEIGWIN: Tim, then Andrew.
8 MR. TUCKER: I don't see anything in the
9 notes regarding this, about the considerations of the
10 different materials that might be being applied, you
11 know, whether it's a pesticide or herbicide. And
12 anything that's stating, you know, maybe a time limit
13 for this AEZ, you know, because it seems to me, having
14 been in the pest control industry for 18 years, that
15 we're not only trying to keep it off people when we
16 spray but trying to minimize their exposure maybe even
17 for a certain amount of time.
18 So I think my questions would be -- and I
19 have a concern, too, like Sharon does for the hundred-
20 foot limitation seems very, very minor and very small.
21 But what is the time -- was there any consideration
22 given to the difference in materials or time, and then
23 is there any kind of communication that goes on
24 between the applicators and the harvesters and growers
25 much like we have drift watch where the pickers or

75

1 growers, harvesters are notifying aerial applicators
2 of where they would be harvesting, you know, on
3 certain days to minimize exposure.
4 So are there any -- are there any guidelines
5 for communication as well as these time
6 considerations, how long you should be out of the
7 area?
8 MR. KEANEY: There are the -- excuse me.
9 There are things that are product-specific, obviously,
10 as far as the -- that requires notice of workers, and
11 then there are also the product-specific restrictions
12 on entry based on toxicity of the product, obviously,
13 after application.
14 MR. KEIGWIN: Andrew?
15 MR. THOSTENSON: I believe the AEZ -- and
16 Nancy can help me with this -- the AEZ -- the buffer
17 expires as soon as the application is completed. It
18 goes along -- you know, when you're -- you have to
19 think of it as an invisible bubble around you. When
20 you're going down the field and you're spraying, you
21 know, I'm not going to have people in that area. But
22 as soon as I get further down the field, then that
23 area that I just sprayed is different. It's no longer
24 in an AEZ. It may be under an REI, which is a
25 different animal in general, restricted entry period.

76

1 Does that help you with that?
2 Nancy, am I correct on that? Okay. Boy,
3 scary.
4 You know, I've been training pesticide
5 applicators for 21 years. And the first time I saw
6 this AEZ thing, I thought it was some kind of weird
7 construct that only EPA could come up with. And I
8 thought that it would be very difficult to explain to
9 my applicators. And one applicator explained it all
10 to me in a very short sentence: we don't spray
11 people, okay? So if that's the prime directive, then
12 this whole AEZ thing is not really that big of a deal.
13 We don't spray people. We spray pests.
14 And, so, the AEZ thing seems to me in my experience
15 with my applicators to be a tool to reinforce that
16 notion that we don't spray people. And, so, you know,
17 my early reservations to this particular rule have
18 kind of melted away. As long as it's properly
19 explained, and when the farmer or an applicator
20 explains to me in response we don't spray people, and
21 that's the answer to the AEZ, then it all makes sense.
22 So that's my spiel.
23 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Richard.
24 MR. GRAGG: Okay, so the -- I'm just
25 thinking about the discussion about the drift and then

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

77

1 the minimum age discussion as well. And I'm not clear
2 -- I get what you just said, you don't spray people,
3 but I don't -- I'm not clear how this 100 feet -- what
4 it's really accomplishing. I'm thinking, okay, you're
5 in a plane and you're putting out the pesticide,
6 where's the AEZ on that?
7 MS. FITZ: So the AEZ is basically
8 assistance around the application equipment that moves
9 with the application equipment. So in addition to
10 don't spray people, what it says is if someone's near
11 the application equipment, stop and then the ag
12 employers have to make sure workers are not near the
13 application equipment. So if I'm -- the application
14 equipment, I'm going to stick my arms out, this is the
15 AEZ, as soon as I'm past it's gone. We're trying to
16 keep people out of this area right there.
17 MR. GRAGG: So this only applies to certain
18 types of applications or equipment?
19 MS. FITZ: It applies to different -- it
20 applies to most kinds of application equipment. The
21 distance may be different. It's 100 feet for aerial,
22 air-blast, fumigants, although fumigants tends to be
23 superceded by labels. And if it's a fine or smaller
24 droplet size. Otherwise, they're ground applications,
25 medium droplet-sized, unless you're really, really

78

1 close to the ground, it's 25 feet.
2 MR. GRAGG: So I --
3 MS. FITZ: And it only applies -- it only
4 exists during the application itself.
5 MR. GRAGG: So I just want to go back to his
6 point. Mine's a little different. If you have
7 different types of material that you're applying, then
8 how does one uniform distance apply to all these
9 different types of chemicals that may react with the
10 air or whatever. They're different, so they're going
11 to have different reactions or dispersion, whatever
12 you want to call it.
13 MS. FITZ: So the dispersion really is
14 probably related more to droplet size than anything,
15 as opposed to what -- what the chemistry is, so that's
16 why we accounted for the droplet size. We did think
17 about toxicity, but, frankly, it's confusing enough.
18 Adding toxicity would make it even more difficult to
19 explain and understand.
20 And let's keep in mind, we're not saying
21 there's any pesticide actually being applied in the
22 application exclusion zone. This is -- if this is my
23 target area, we're just saying not every single drop
24 lands exactly where you want it. And if it doesn't,
25 it's probably going to be in this area closest to the

79

1 application equipment. So it's an extra precaution to
2 help people make sure they comply with the do-not-
3 contact requirement.
4 MR. KEIGWIN: Andrew, then Damon.
5 MR. THOSTENSON: Yeah, the -- you know, my
6 friend over here, this aerial applicator, he knows
7 that on a windy day he's going to spray so that that
8 pesticide drifts down into the location that he wants.
9 So he's going to offset that particular spray
10 application. He knows or she knows roughly where that
11 spray droplet's going to go. And you also know that
12 if there's a person in that area, you're going to hit
13 them and you know that you're going to be held liable
14 with the state lead agency if you hit that person.
15 So I do understand the notion that this AEZ
16 thing may be a much bigger deal than it really is, but
17 we already hold aerial applicators or any other
18 applicator responsible for an exposure event,
19 regardless. So, again, it seems to me it's mostly a
20 tool. I'm not sure it's a rule that's a gotcha rule.
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Damon, then Liza.
22 MR. REABE: I think just to answer your
23 question, Richard, the spray drift task force, when
24 they did all the work to develop the ag drift model,
25 what they found was that the chemistries that were

80

1 getting mixed with the water, there was no significant
2 -- there was no difference in the properties as far as
3 downwind dispersion. So when you asked the question
4 about -- I think, if I understand your question
5 correctly, you were asking about one product might
6 drift more than another, and that's not the case.
7 And really to kind of echo what Andrew's
8 saying and when we looked at this, this is -- this
9 is putting in writing a best-management practice.
10 When -- as -- whether you're an aerial applicator or a
11 ground applicator, when there are people downwind, we
12 suspend the application, and there's a lot of
13 variables that are associated with how far they're
14 downwind, what is the wind speed, you know, what is
15 the application hype going to be at that time.
16 There's just a very large number of
17 variables that we're taking into consideration while
18 making these applications. And suspending an
19 application because there's people present downwind is
20 -- I spend more time circling than spraying. I mean,
21 that's a true statement. I'm not saying that to be
22 smart about it. That's what we do. We -- and, so, I
23 hope that provides a little bit of comfort for those
24 that are wondering how this works. It's easy for an
25 applicator to understand the concept, and it's easy

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

ED_002528_00039560-00021

81

1 for an applicator to comply with.
2 MR. KEIGWIN: Liza.
3 MS. TROSSBACH: From a pesticide regulatory
4 perspective, obviously when -- if -- when we're doing
5 any type of inspections or investigations to ensure
6 compliance with the label requirements, we'll look at
7 the compliance at the AEZ, but that does not preclude
8 any other part of the label from being enforceable and
9 having to meet that. So while an applicator may meet
10 an AEZ requirement, if there is drift, that's a
11 completely different issue and it will be looked at
12 separately. So the totality of the application, so
13 the concerns about drift, you're right, certain
14 products, you know, may be apt to drift more, certain
15 types of applications may be more subject to drift.
16 We would still look at the drift component, along with
17 the AEZ.
18 So that kind of takes into account some of
19 those concerns about it's only specific to AEZ is
20 based on the type of application and the droplet size,
21 but other parts of the label focus on the chemistry of
22 that product, and that's why there may be -- you know,
23 the language about drift or buffer zones or other
24 things. So we have to look at it as one part of a
25 label and what has to be done to apply it correctly

82

1 and labeling.
2 MR. KEIGWIN: So I think what Kevin and I
3 have heard from this discussion is that some
4 additional guidance could be useful and that there may
5 be some additional scenarios that -- in the guidance
6 that we've developed to date could be further enhanced
7 and that there's a role that education programs can
8 play in helping to better explain what this provision
9 is meant to be. And does that reflect what -- did
10 this end of the table hear what was happening around
11 the rest of table?
12 Damon?
13 MR. REABE: When you're talking about
14 additional guidance, you know, this is ultimately
15 labeling, which is guidance for the applicator,
16 correct?
17 MR. KEIGWIN: It could be label language.
18 It could also be interpretive guidance that we provide
19 to state agencies to -- up on our website to be
20 included in continuing education programs for
21 certification.
22 MR. REABE: Sure. Okay, well, from -- as a
23 -- from the aerial application community, it's -- it
24 is very clear for whatever that's worth.
25 MR. KEIGWIN: Any other comments before we

83

1 close this one out?
2 (No response.)
3 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. Thank you all very
4 much. So I'm going to invite Arnold Layne, the Deputy
5 Director for OPP for Management, as well as Susan
6 Jennings, who is our Public Health Officer for the
7 Office of Pesticide Programs, to come up and give us a
8 brief update on the first meeting of the new public
9 health workgroup.
10 MR. LAYNE: Good morning, everyone. I'm
11 Arnold Layne. I'm Deputy Office Director, the Office
12 of Pesticide Programs. So at the last PPDC meeting,
13 there was a lot of talk about forming a public health
14 workgroup under the auspices of the pesticide program
15 dialogue committee. And the impetus for doing such
16 was the fact that we were in the height of the Zika
17 crisis, national crisis, and then the growing public
18 health crises, whether they're natural or manmade,
19 including hurricanes and emergent pathogens.
20 And many PPDC members suggested and
21 requested that we form a public health workgroup to
22 deal with some of the issues related to public health.
23 And, so, on Tuesday, October 31st, Halloween, we held
24 our first kickoff meeting, which was an organizing
25 meeting. And it was open to the members of the

84

1 workgroup only because of the fact it was an
2 organizational meeting.
3 And our goal was to define the mission and
4 determine the goals of the workgroup. So just to give
5 you a sense of the diversity of the workgroup, there
6 are 21 members representing registrants, both
7 conventional, biological and antimicrobial pesticides,
8 public health groups, academicians, NGOs and other
9 associations, as well as federal partners, including
10 CDC and NIOSH, the Armed Forces Pest Management Board,
11 as well as our own EPA regional offices.
12 And, so, we were, in the short time that we
13 had, quite ambitious and -- but successful in
14 hammering out a mission statement, and that mission
15 statement should appear on the slides in one second.
16 Oh, I have the clicker. Thank you.
17 So you probably can't read it, but I will
18 read it to you. The workgroup -- the mission
19 statement is intentionally broad, and it reads as
20 follows: The public health workgroup formed under the
21 auspices of the EPA Pesticide Program Dialogue
22 Committee will focus on policy, advice, information,
23 and recommendations regarding pest management methods
24 that control public health pests. The workgroup will
25 provide recommendations to the PPDC for consideration

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

85

1 and sharing with the U.S. Environmental Protection
2 Agency.
3 The group then, once we codified our
4 mission, we then delved into the most difficult area,
5 and that was coming up with areas of focus. And at
6 first we had a plethora of just a long list of
7 suggestions of topic areas. And, so, one of the
8 workgroup members was successful in seeing major
9 headlines and some of the topics could meld together.
10 And, so, we decided to go with three focus areas or
11 three headline areas.
12 The first one, which is pretty overarching,
13 is communications. So in that regard, the
14 discussions focused around how might the agency
15 better communicate the risks and values of public
16 health pest interventions, what should the agency be
17 communicating, how and to whom, how can we improve
18 communications, particularly around technical topics,
19 focus on communicating the role that pesticides play
20 in maintaining and ensuring the high standards of
21 public health enjoyed in the United States.
22 The next focus area was national emergency
23 response plan. So the objective there would be to
24 develop an action plan or a standard operating
25 procedure. Likely you've heard the terminology SOP,

86

1 standard operating procedure, to help respond to
2 natural or manmade disasters. And in that vein, what
3 can the agency do to prepare for emergency public
4 health tests and diseases and to public health
5 emergencies that are a result of natural or manmade
6 disasters?
7 Public health emergencies sometimes test the
8 agency's ability to respond quickly and easily. By
9 anticipating some frequent needs during emergencies,
10 EPA could be a more effective partner for recovery
11 such as creating an SOP or action plan tailored to
12 different scenarios or environments after being
13 impacted by a natural or a manmade disaster, defining
14 suitable tactics for insect disease vector control.
15 An example of a manmade disaster was actually in 2001,
16 which was the Anthrax attacks. EPA supported this
17 incident, but there may be a need to improve our
18 ability to respond to bio attacks in general. So that
19 was the second focus area or headline area.
20 And the last one is resistance management.
21 And the objective there is to further define and
22 elevate the agency's role in public health pest
23 resistance prevention and response. And along those
24 lines, the agency -- or the workgroup, with the
25 support of the PPDC, could do a number of things --

87

1 develop a plan to understand and prevent resistance to
2 treatments such as using predictive modeling and data
3 analytics and proper use of pesticides, evaluate
4 resistance impacts on emergency response.
5 The group would like to focus on resistance
6 management for public health pests, similar to what's
7 been done for herbicides. We want to educate efforts
8 supporting the need to prevent and minimize further
9 development of resistance in pest populations; and,
10 lastly, evaluate expeditious means to clear or approve
11 new pesticides to encounter or counter resistant pest
12 threats when public health risks arise.
13 So our next meeting, which we have not
14 scheduled yet, but will very shortly, will allow us to
15 narrow our focus and add more specificity to these
16 three headlines. Before I end, I do want to thank the
17 workgroup members for their productive meeting. We
18 didn't have a lot of time, but we got a lot
19 accomplished in that short span of time.
20 I also want to thank them for their time,
21 talent, and their commitment to this extremely
22 important topic. And with that, I think I covered
23 this in five minutes.
24 MR. KEIGWIN: You did. Thank you.
25 MR. LAYNE: The agenda called for it.

88

1 MR. KEIGWIN: So are there any quick
2 questions or comments for Arnold? Aaron and then
3 Liza.
4 MR. HOBBS: Thank you. So I have a couple
5 of questions about process and membership. So being
6 new to the PPDC in an official capacity at this
7 meeting, not right now probably, but if we could get
8 some more clarity about how this workgroup was spun
9 up. As I heard it right now, it sounds like let's
10 create a workgroup, and then we'll decide what we're
11 going to do later. It seems a little backwards to me,
12 but, again, I'm new. Maybe that's normal to bring
13 clarity to the mission after the workgroup is created.
14 So I'd like just some more clarity around process for
15 -- so that as we move forward together we understand
16 exactly how to be engaged and what the proper order
17 for that is.
18 But then also membership, given that there
19 are a significant number of new members, myself
20 included, that are extremely interested in anything
21 that relates to public health pesticides, I would call
22 that that membership be reopened and that especially
23 those that are new to the table have the opportunity
24 to serve on the workgroup.
25 MR. LAYNE: Okay, so, as I mentioned, the

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

89

1 impetus for going forward with the workgroup was the
2 fact that we were dealing with a national crisis of
3 Zika. And then came the hurricanes and such. And the
4 PPDC at that time felt that it was important for us to
5 have a side workgroup to focus on public health issues
6 and bring -- as I mentioned, the role of the workgroup
7 is to bring issues to the PPDC for consideration. So
8 the fact that you're on the PPDC will mean that
9 anything that we discuss any recommendations that we
10 bring forward, this entire body will have an
11 opportunity to weigh in on it.
12 And, so, we did open up a call for
13 membership. We got overwhelming response, and as you
14 may know, in order for a workgroup to be successful --
15 and we have a time limit -- we have a year in which to
16 work. In order for any workgroup to be really
17 successful, the membership needs to be as tight as
18 possible. And, so, I would -- I take your
19 recommendation to reopen, but we went through an
20 exhaustive process to get the workgroup where we are.
21 We have now formed and gelled. We went
22 through the storming phase on Halloween, and we're in
23 the process of moving forward. I'm not certain
24 opening up membership -- we had to turn away some
25 folks, and that will cause a lot of angst, and I don't

90

1 think that's a productive approach to take in
2 reopening membership.
3 Again, as this body, we are reporting to
4 you, and you will have an opportunity to weigh in on
5 anything that we bring forward for your consideration.
6 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, I'm just going to take
7 the remaining cards up, plus Jim Fredericks before
8 I -- you just got in.
9 MR. LAYNE: I'm sorry, Rick.
10 MR. KEIGWIN: Yeah.
11 MR. LAYNE: I just want to add one thing.
12 Going forward, as I mentioned, the workgroup meetings
13 are open. And, so, if you would like to attend those
14 meetings, you're more than welcome to attend those
15 meetings. But there will be open meetings, but the
16 workgroup will -- the Public Health Workgroup will be
17 setting the agenda, will be having the dialogue, and
18 depending upon the workgroup's recommendations, we
19 will determine how we will deal with people who attend
20 from the public.
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Liza, then Jay, then
22 Cynthia.
23 MS. TROSSBACH: Thank you. I want to just
24 say that -- I have a comment and question. The
25 comment is I think it's absolutely appropriate to have

91

1 -- that the Public Health Workgroup, I think, the
2 experience that state lead agencies, tribes and
3 territories experience and are experiencing with Zika
4 and, of course, the most recent, you know, national
5 disasters. I think it's absolutely appropriate, and I
6 think there are a lot of issues to be addressed.
7 I particularly am happy with the -- you
8 know, with the national emergency response plan. I
9 think that will help states and tribes and territories
10 to understand what their role is. Obviously as we
11 regulate pesticides, we are brought into a number of
12 those situations, so it would be very helpful to us to
13 understand or to get some guidance on what our roles
14 may be, particularly the role of pesticides in public
15 health situations. You know, I think that's fantastic
16 and, of course, the resistance management.
17 I do have just one question. When we're
18 talking about public health pests, because the group
19 is -- you know, it's broad -- the mission is broad,
20 does that include only those pests that are identified
21 as public health pests, or could it be, you know,
22 anything beyond that? You know, that may come up.
23 And, so, I just want to make sure that it could be,
24 you know, that it is broad or is it just specific to
25 those listed.

92

1 MR. LAYNE: Well, we actually -- thank you,
2 first of all. We got into a conversation about some
3 of the nuisance pests. And remind me where we ended
4 up on those. I think there are -- we will consider
5 those as we move forward, if I'm -- if I remember
6 correctly. And in particular, we were talking about
7 biting mosquitoes that may not vector disease. So --
8 but, yes, I think it will include all kinds of pests.
9 MR. KEIGWIN: Jay, then Cynthia, then Lori
10 Ann.
11 MR. VROOM: So I've talked with a couple of
12 representatives in the workgroup and am impressed with
13 the quality of the work that you've done so far and
14 the agenda that you put together, so congratulations.
15 I think resistance management is important,
16 and I'm glad to see that that's a highlight and focal
17 point and would ask you to keep in mind that quite
18 often agricultural resistance management concerns very
19 much overlap with those in the public health
20 application sector, and I'm sure that the staff of the
21 agency will help connect those dots.
22 MR. LAYNE: Thank you, Jay. Duly noted, and
23 we did talk about that in the first workgroup meeting.
24 Thank you, sir.
25 And I will say also, just to your point,

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

93

1 nuisance pests can easily become public health pests.
2 MR. KEIGWIN: Cynthia, then Lori Ann, then
3 Kim.
4 MS. PALMER: I appreciate that you've got
5 this workgroup, given the horrors of Zika and the
6 hurricanes. I just had a question regarding that last
7 bullet under Communications. You said that part of
8 the role would be to delineate -- I may be getting
9 this slightly misquoted, but the important role of
10 pesticides in maintaining the high standards of life
11 in the United States, something like that. And I just
12 wanted to acknowledge that sometimes pesticides are a
13 problem and sometimes they're a solution. And, so, if
14 we change the wording to pest -- the importance of
15 pest control, I think we would be good with that.
16 Thank you.
17 MR. LAYNE: Thank you.
18 MR. KEIGWIN: Lori Ann, then Jim.
19 MS. BURD: Thanks. So if human-caused
20 climate change leads to more hurricanes and natural
21 disasters, I think -- I'm curious to hear from you all
22 more about what is an emergency. And, you know,
23 you've just talked very briefly about what, you know,
24 regular sort of pest mosquitoes versus carrying
25 mosquitoes might mean. And, so, I'm -- you know, I'm

94

1 hoping you guys will really work on articulating that
2 as an issue.
3 In Houston, there were just 6 million acres
4 of Naled sprayed. And there wasn't a disease risk
5 raised. It was a -- that they were really bothering
6 people on the ground. It was an adulticiding and, you
7 know, I wasn't on the ground. I don't know exactly
8 what was going on there. I wonder if larviciding
9 might have been a better choice for right then, you
10 know, and I just urge a very cautious and thoughtful
11 response to this, you know, measuring is there a human
12 health threat, is there not a human health threat, are
13 we anticipating a huge hatch, or is it happening right
14 now, is it getting in the way of relief efforts.
15 And it's just a really robust conversation
16 about what an emergency is. And from the endangered
17 species perspective, there are a lot of species
18 getting really hammered by these hurricanes right now,
19 and to withstand an aerial application of Naled,
20 especially over such large acreage, could really be
21 the end of some species. So some thoughts for your
22 workgroup.
23 MR. LAYNE: Thank you. We appreciate that
24 and we will take that to the workgroup. We did --
25 just so that you know, we had quite a bit of

95

1 conversation on IPM and the role that IPM plays, not
2 just pesticides. And we also talked about the fact
3 that with some of the workgroup members, like
4 Nichelle, for example, how it's so important to get
5 children and educate children.
6 Having served the agency in the lead role
7 for Zika, and it was in the midst of that crisis, I
8 can assure you that when children are taught about
9 public health issues or any issues that you can liken
10 it to recycling, for example. They go home, and they
11 tell the parents, no, don't put that plastic bottle in
12 the garbage, it can be recycled. So we talked a great
13 deal about IPM.
14 It's just not -- I mean, there's a long list
15 of things that fall under those three major headlines
16 that we just don't have the time to talk to you about
17 today. And we want to go back and further refine
18 those three major headlines. But we certainly take
19 into consideration IPM, and we promote IPM quite a
20 bit, as we did with Zika.
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Jim.
22 MR. FREDERICKS: Well, thanks. And I wanted
23 to first of all just commend EPA for putting together
24 this workgroup and also to commend you on noting the
25 importance of pesticides and pest control and IPM in

96

1 ensuring public health as we know it in the United
2 States. With regard to the comment about nuisance
3 pests, I think nuisance pests we often think of or we
4 perceive nuisance pests as being simply a nuisance,
5 but oftentimes these nuisance pests are also important
6 tests of public health.
7 And, so, when we think about maintaining
8 that quality of public health, it's important to also
9 consider things that we might consider, you know,
10 thinking about things we might consider a nuisance,
11 like cockroaches and remembering that they're
12 important -- important public health pests because of
13 the fact that they can -- you know, they can -- they
14 can vector foodborne illness. Stinging insects send
15 people to the hospital every year. This is important.
16 And, so, I commend you on that.
17 My caution for the workgroup -- and as part
18 of the workgroup I know that I -- I brought it up, but
19 I think it's important that we maintain a focus within
20 that public health workgroup on the impact areas that
21 EPA has -- has purview over. So specifically the
22 pesticide areas.
23 So, thanks, and appreciate the time.
24 MR. LAYNE: Thank you, and we appreciate
25 that. We actually joked around with staying in our

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

ED_002528_00039560-00025

97

1 lane, in the L A Y N E lane at the meeting, so thank
2 you, Jim.
3 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, I think Leyla had a
4 quick --
5 MS. MCCURDY: Yeah, thank you so much. I'm
6 sorry, we're running late, but I need a little
7 clarification about the process. This is functioning
8 -- our health group is functioning a little bit
9 different than the other FACA committees that I have
10 served on. So what is the process -- what is the time
11 line before reporting to us? You said you are
12 reporting to us, and when are we going to see what,
13 and how can we chime in? You said a year time frame.
14 So are there going to be documents shared with us by
15 email, and can you just explain quickly what the
16 process is?
17 MR. LAYNE: Yeah, so, the workgroup is going
18 to deal with that, your very issue. We began talking
19 about that, but, again, this is the body that we
20 report to, so I'm imagining that there will be a
21 number of venues and opportunities to engage the group
22 either by email, when the PPDC gets together. It gets
23 together, I think, just twice a year. So -- and we
24 think that we will have some output sooner than that,
25 and we will find ways in which to communicate upward

98

1 and do it the right way. And Dea will help us with
2 that to make sure that we are within the rules of
3 FACA.
4 The year time line or time frame is given to
5 us, and we want to be able to do what we can within a
6 year. There are some opportunities to go a little
7 beyond that, but the whole idea of a side work group
8 under the auspices of the PPDC is to be focused, as
9 Jim said, and get it done within a year. We've talked
10 about there may be things that we just present to the
11 PPDC and ask the PPDC the workgroup can't resolve
12 this, but can we make a recommendation to the PPDC
13 that the agency take up a specific issue and perhaps
14 even form a subworkgroup and another group of people
15 to go work on that particular issue, emanating from
16 the public health workgroup itself and a
17 recommendation coming from that workgroup.
18 So I can't tell you this because just the
19 vast number of topics that fall under the purview of
20 public health, and we would be foolish that in a year
21 that we could take on all of them. And, so, our
22 objective is to narrow the scope of this and do some
23 meaningful work within the year and to provide the
24 PPDC with perhaps other recommendations that can go on
25 beyond the year, or to the agency, for that matter,

99

1 that the agency come -- I imagine that the agency come
2 -- I imagine the SOP, having worked with Zika, and
3 having worked with a number of entities with Zika,
4 including the White House and, you know, a number of
5 other federal agencies and so forth and so on, state
6 lead agencies, et cetera, that we're talking about a
7 collaboration here in some of these topic areas.
8 The Armed Forces Pest Management Board, for
9 example, we talked about this having a lot of
10 tentacles and bringing those -- resistance management,
11 for example, has a lot of tentacles, and trying to
12 bring that together in some kind of way. Our
13 workgroup may not be able to do that successfully, but
14 we would urge the PPDC to find a way to coordinate
15 across the board with everybody dealing with
16 resistance management in some form or fashion so that
17 we're all moving in the same direction.
18 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, thanks, Arnold and
19 Susan.
20 So our last major topic of the day, back to
21 the Kevin Keaney Show, is to discuss one issue
22 relative to the certification and training rule. So,
23 Kevin's coming back up.
24 MR. KEANEY: Just a reminder of the -- of
25 the provisions in the revised applicator certification

100

1 rule. And to comment on the process we went through,
2 we had extensive stakeholder involvement, and we
3 significantly changed the positions we had in the
4 proposal as a result of the stakeholder involvement.
5 So we engaged with the state regulatory agencies.
6 AAPCO had a group that we worked with. And we
7 received some very telling and useful comments from
8 the group. And it did move us away from a number of
9 our proposed positions to what we ended up with in the
10 final.
11 And if you would characterize -- if you
12 wanted to characterize the movement that we took, we
13 took -- we became much more flexible in what we were
14 proposing and far less prescriptive in what we were
15 ending up with in our final regulation. But some of
16 the key provisions in the areas we had in the final
17 there is there are new exams and administration
18 standards. There's competency gauge for private
19 applicators, where it didn't exist before. There are
20 some application methods, specific categories we
21 established that weren't in the earlier version. And
22 there were no standards for applicator
23 recertification, so we established some of those --
24 something in that area.
25 There's a key area that plays into the

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

101

1 discussion of age, and that's there was no provision
2 in the existing regulation for gauging the competency
3 of noncertified applicators under the direct
4 supervision of a certified applicator. So we
5 established competencies for noncertified applicators,
6 and then there was very vague, vague descriptions or
7 definition of supervision of noncertified applicators.
8 So we tried to become a little more specific in the
9 definition of what constitutes good supervision of
10 noncertified applicators.
11 And then there was the minimum age, which is
12 a minimum age requirements for all certified and
13 noncertified applicators. Noncertified applicators,
14 on the whole, we're talking about the handlers under
15 the work -- the category of workers, with the term
16 handlers under the worker protection regulation. If
17 they are brought in to mixing, loading, or applying
18 under a certified -- the supervision of a certified
19 applicator. And this regulation is focused on
20 restricted-use pesticides, not general-use pesticides.
21 So the dates -- the effective dates have
22 changed. The original effective date was March 4th,
23 2017, and it's been moved for the reasons stated in
24 the slide here. The most recent Federal Register
25 notice changed the effective date to the 22nd of May,

102

1 2018. The new administration hadn't had time to
2 adequately review the certification rule, and the --
3 as you'll see in the next slide, there's a long period
4 leading to full implementation to go through. So we
5 intend to adjust other implementation dates to
6 maintain the implementation schedule, which is
7 essentially three years to submit plans for new
8 certification programs at the state level, to submit
9 those plans to EPA for review.
10 There was a lawsuit challenging the rule's
11 change to the effective date, and there was a
12 coalition of advocacy groups that sued the agency.
13 That's currently in the process of the agency
14 challenging the standing of the suers, so that's where
15 that -- that stands at the moment.
16 In this screen, you can see the time line
17 and the activity that has taken place and will take
18 place. So the revised rule, absent any changes, would
19 be in effect in May 22nd, 2018. The states have until
20 2021 to submit their plans to EPA. And EPA will work
21 with the headquarters, and we are -- have a process
22 we're going to follow using headquarters personnel and
23 regional personnel and state agency personnel in
24 dealing with the submissions of state plans for their
25 -- how to comply with the revised regulation.

103

1 And the -- there are time lines for states
2 to submit their plans, and then there are time lines
3 for EPA to complete the review process for these
4 plans. And until there is an official approval of a
5 revised state plan, the existing regulation stays in
6 place.
7 Here's a graphic which explains the various
8 dates, and then the next screen just gives you a text
9 explanation of the process of movement towards an
10 implementation date. As you -- some of you heard in
11 the last PPDC meeting, during the second day, the
12 regulatory reform focus day, the -- there were
13 comments submitted, and a number of comments relative
14 to this regulation focused on minimum age.
15 And, so, we would like to have you give us
16 some advice there and discussion there. The minimum
17 age requires all persons using restricted-use
18 pesticides to be at least 18; private applicators and
19 commercial applicators, noncertified applicators, are
20 those functioning under the supervision. The
21 exception for the minimum age of -- there is an
22 exception for the minimum age of 16 years old for
23 noncertified applicators on a farm under the
24 supervision of a private applicator who is a member of
25 the noncertified applicator's immediate family.

104

1 And if you look at the -- one of the
2 handouts you've got in your packets there, there's a
3 table of the status of various states relative to
4 having no minimum age, a minimum age of 18, or a
5 minimum age of 16. And it relates those to commercial
6 applicator, private applicator, and noncertified
7 applicators under the supervision of a commercial
8 applicator and noncertified applicators under the
9 supervision of a private applicator.
10 So the discussion -- as we said in the early
11 discussion, we're seeking to understand the challenges
12 that this would pose for the stakeholders and we'd
13 like to understand and reconcile any information about
14 the states that we already -- that already have
15 minimum age requirements with some of the comments we
16 got in the regulatory reform activity. So we have a
17 set of questions there that might guide our -- guide
18 our discussion, and perhaps we can -- you can respond
19 to any of them, or we can work our way through them
20 for a general response in the sequence they're in in
21 the handout.
22 MR. KEIGWIN: So why don't we open it up,
23 and whoever wants to speak can address any or all or
24 additional questions from what we have posed on the
25 one-pager.

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

105

1 So Preston.
2 MR. PECK: I just have a quick question
3 about the noncertified applicator with commercial --
4 under supervision of commercial applicators and
5 private applicators. The states that do require
6 minimum age, can you give, like, a general idea of
7 which states those are, just so I can understand kind
8 of scope?
9 MR. KEANEY: Which specific states?
10 MR. PECK: Yeah, if you can recall.
11 MR. KEANEY: No, I can't recall offhand.
12 MR. PECK: Okay. Well, I'll look it up,
13 then. Thank you.
14 MR. KEANEY: We can get that to you,
15 obviously.
16 MR. PECK: Okay.
17 MR. KEIGWIN: Iris, Amy, Jim.
18 MS. FIGUEROA: So just a comment on the
19 minimum age. We all had a -- I think a very fruitful
20 discussion earlier today about minimum age in the
21 context of the WPS. And there seemed to be a pretty
22 broad consensus on that, and I would hope that in the
23 context of restricted-use pesticides, which are some
24 of the most toxic pesticides, that, you know, we would
25 have a similar consensus on that.

106

1 And then I also had a question on -- I think
2 it was Slide 11 on the delay in the state
3 certification plan. Is the agency taking any steps
4 right now to help states to sort of move along that
5 process of developing their new certification plans
6 while the delay is in place?
7 MR. KEANEY: No, outside of a lot of
8 education and outreach that we've undertaken. There's
9 purposefully a long time line for actually grappling
10 with revised state plans and approval of state plans.
11 All states will have to revise their plans, obviously,
12 but there are provisions that affect every state, no
13 matter what program they have.
14 Many programs are exceeding the federal
15 standard, but there -- there will have to be revision
16 of all state plans. So we -- we are, as I said,
17 conducting outreach and communication on what exists
18 in the revisions, and that's the extent of engagement
19 we have.
20 MR. KEIGWIN: Amy, then Jim, then Andrew.
21 MS. LEIBMAN: Thanks. So it does seem,
22 given our conversation that we had earlier regarding
23 the worker protection standard, that there seems to be
24 some general consensus about the importance of
25 maintaining 18 years of age as a minimum age. And,

107

1 so, I think we've talked about a lot of really good
2 reasons for that. We talked about a lot of really
3 good reasons for this for 20 years. We talked about
4 it this morning.
5 And, so, it does -- I'm not sure what the
6 challenge would be, but it seems like this would be in
7 everybody's best interest, both, you know, the worker,
8 the surrounding communities, the farmer, so that we
9 can ensure that if it is going to be applied that you
10 want it applied most -- as, you know, applied well and
11 correctly.
12 And, again, I just want to take us back to
13 yesterday and the Dicamba discussion and all of the
14 challenges that we faced in terms of that particular
15 pesticide and the need for education and what that
16 took. And, you know, relying on someone under 18 to
17 sort of be able to carry out what's on the label, I
18 think puts everybody, including the worker, at risk.
19 MR. KEIGWIN: Jim, then Andrew, then Damon.
20 MR. FREDERICKS: So thanks again. I just
21 want to call out that I think this particular
22 rulemaking was an example of the process working, so
23 we appreciate the agency taking into consideration all
24 of the comments that have been submitted and the
25 advice from the different stakeholders to get to a

108

1 place that I think is a good place. I think there's
2 obviously some issues with implementation, and there
3 are some challenges for states, and I think that those
4 have been taken into consideration as well.
5 Naturally, the National Pest Management
6 Association and structural pest control industry is
7 supportive of certification and training in any form
8 to ensure that pesticide applications are made in a
9 safe way and in a professional way.
10 With regard to age, the age restrictions, I
11 think that -- and one of your questions was, you know,
12 is -- are commercial applicators affected differently.
13 And the answer to that, at least from the structural
14 pest control point of view is that for the most part,
15 the 18-year-old restriction does not have a huge
16 impact. There are specific examples not so different
17 from what Damon mentioned earlier. The vast majority
18 of the structural pest control industry is made up of
19 family-owned businesses, small family-owned
20 businesses.
21 And I think that, you know, they're, you
22 know, passed on generation to generation and sons and
23 daughters are working with fathers and mothers. And
24 some of those folks probably are perfectly well
25 trained and able to make decisions regarding even

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

109

1 restricted-use pesticides. Not all are. I think it's
2 always in the -- naturally in the interest of the
3 business to make sure that those people, whoever they
4 are, are making good decisions and are trained
5 properly. And, so, although I think, you know, I
6 think that that would be the one kind of the -- this
7 kind of family exemption would be the one piece that
8 still isn't quite right, but overall I think it's been
9 a good process.
10 I also would encourage EPA to continue to
11 work with the states, with AAPCO and ASPCRO to make
12 sure that these last pieces in terms of the challenges
13 that states have can continue to be worked out.
14 MR. KEIGWIN: Andrew, then Damon, then Liza.
15 MR. THOSTENSON: Well, in North Dakota,
16 we've had a 18-year-old for privates and commercial
17 since the inception of our program in the early 1980s.
18 Along the way, I can't think of any specific issue
19 that has arisen where somebody has made any kind of
20 argument about the advisability or reducing that age.
21 It just -- it just has never come up.
22 We have had 16 and 17-year-olds that do, in
23 fact, participate in some of my training programs, and
24 we do allow them to be participants in those
25 trainings. We just don't issue them a certification

110

1 until they reach that 18-year-old barrier, or
2 threshold, I should say. From a state perspective, at
3 least in North Dakota, we just don't think this is a
4 big deal, I mean, you know, barrier to implementation.
5 With respect to how states are moving along
6 in this time line, for purposes of coming together and
7 putting a plan in place, this past spring, EPA
8 convened a pesticide regulatory education program
9 workshop where they brought in about 50, I think,
10 folks, Nancy? Around 50 folks from around the country
11 that were with cooperative extension and state
12 regulatory people to really grapple with and to
13 appreciate and understand what was contemplated in
14 this new rule and how to go about putting together a
15 new plan.
16 And, so, I think at least from a -- you
17 know, I'm satisfied. I'll let Liza talk about from my
18 state lead agency partners, but I think as a pesticide
19 safety educator, I'm comfortable that we have had
20 adequate discussion about the implementation of this
21 particular regulation.
22 One other point I would like to make, I can
23 tell you that when the rule was originally proposed in
24 2015 there were a number of people who were suggesting
25 suicide or getting out of the business of being

111

1 involved in training because they thought it would be
2 insane. Some people actually wrote that in their
3 comments to EPA, and obviously they did hear those
4 comments and acted upon them, and we are enormously
5 pleased that that occurred.
6 MR. KEIGWIN: Damon, then Liza. Sharon, is
7 that your card up? Okay, it's hard to see it from
8 this side.
9 MR. REABE: First, I'd like to apologize,
10 Kevin, that it took three tries to get me into the
11 right session. So thanks for your help. I did
12 actually read this, believe it or not, but at any
13 rate, all joking aside, so now we're in the right
14 session to have the discussion. And I do want to
15 clarify something.
16 Aerial application is very unique, and what
17 we're talking about here is the potential for somebody
18 under the age of 18 to get set up who's an immediate
19 family member of an owner of a business to get set up
20 as a certified -- certified applicator. But I think
21 it's important to remember that there won't be any
22 applicators under the age of 18. So I think it would
23 be more accurately stated we're maybe looking to have
24 the ability for them to be certified to be mixers and
25 loaders.

112

1 The Federal Aviation Administration will not
2 allow a pilot to get a commercial pilot certificate
3 under the age of 18. So kind of separate the two.
4 And it's a unique circumstance. This isn't something
5 I want to use up a lot of credibility, but I want to
6 make sure that the agency understands the nature of
7 our businesses and the amount of supervision that's
8 taking place at our businesses and how that this would
9 be helpful to us.
10 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. Liza, then Sharon, then
11 Jay.
12 MS. TROSSBACH: As I had mentioned
13 previously, pesticide regulatory officials certainly
14 support any enhancement to competencies for pesticide
15 applicators, both, you know, commercial and private.
16 We understand the importance of proper pesticide use
17 and the inherent dangers that are with pesticides. So
18 we certainly support that.
19 And I would say in general we certainly
20 support, again, you know, the minimum age of 18 for
21 pesticide applicators. Obviously, family farms are a
22 little bit, you know, different, and while in some
23 areas, some states may have 18 as a minimum age,
24 others don't, and I'll leave that to, you know, the
25 diplomats to figure that out. But in general,

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

113

1 particularly for commercial applicators, we certainly
2 support the minimum age of 18.
3 I think the conversation about the amount of
4 time it will take for states to revise their state
5 certification plans and to get them in just for a
6 little bit of background information, and Andrew had
7 alluded to, in North Dakota, they've had their
8 certification program plan for, you know, well, over
9 30 years or 40 years, and most states are like that.
10 And, so, while EPA has always provided this kind of
11 base requirement, states over the -- you know, since
12 their inception have had programs, had very robust
13 programs, have specified requirements.
14 So for some states, these changes to the
15 federal law will take changes to their statutes and
16 their regulations. And I'm sure everybody here's been
17 involved in that or is aware that that can take years
18 because of the public process that we have in place as
19 government officials. So while in Virginia, I won't
20 have to make many changes, just because of where our
21 certification program is. There are other states that
22 will have to make a lot of changes, and that has to go
23 through that state's political process.
24 And you have some states in which there has
25 been an edict that there will be no new regulations

114

1 and no new requirements put on small businesses. So
2 there's a lot of issues there. So that explains some
3 of the time that three years, which may seem like a
4 long time, but really in a regulatory arena it's not a
5 long period of time.
6 So just to make people, you know, aware of
7 that. I think states that will -- are and will, you
8 know, move forward with amending their certification
9 plan, part of it is waiting for that actual effective
10 date to make sure we know what's in that final
11 effective rule, should there be any changes, because
12 that could impact the changes we need to make and how
13 we need to make it.
14 There are also, you know, resource issues,
15 et cetera, you know, which there always are. So I
16 just wanted to, you know, make that clear. I think in
17 certain states, the minimum age will be more of an
18 issue than others, you know, because of their
19 industry, because of the type of -- whether it's
20 agriculture or, you know, commercial industries. And
21 in others, it won't be, but, again, in general, I
22 think 18 is good.
23 And I just want to make a comment and just
24 echo what other folks have said. I want to commend
25 and applaud the EPA for their willingness to listen to

115

1 all the various, you know, comments and concerns and
2 at the end of the day to recognize the longstanding
3 programs that states have had and their success and
4 allowing that flexibility, because one thing is for
5 sure, if you know how one state works, you know how
6 one state works.
7 And, so, there has to be some flexibility
8 for -- you know, for states, and I just want to thank
9 that. And as Jim had indicated, AAPCO and ASPCRO and,
10 of course, all your state regulatory officials are
11 more than happy to continue to work on, you know, this
12 with the EPA, as they did, and to have it fully
13 implemented.
14 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks. Sharon, then Jay,
15 then Donnie.
16 MS. SELVAGGIO: Just one question, and it's
17 probably a shortcut that was taken on the table here,
18 but on the minimum age section for the final rule,
19 page 2 of 2, it says "except for the minimum age that
20 we have 16 years old for the noncertified applicator
21 on a farm under the supervision of a private
22 applicator who is a member of the noncertified
23 applicator's immediate family." Just in the actual
24 rule language, does it say "private certified
25 applicator"? I mean, I'm assuming that that private

116

1 applicator does need to be certified themselves if
2 they're supervising. I'm just wondering if that's in
3 the rule.
4 MR. KEIGWIN: Nancy?
5 MS. FITZ: By definition, in the rule, a
6 private applicator is certified.
7 MS. SELVAGGIO: Okay.
8 MS. FITZ: So it is a private certified
9 applicator, yeah.
10 MS. SELVAGGIO: Okay. And I just have one
11 followup kind of question for this whole discussion
12 that we've had this morning, and that is that it
13 appears that the choices of, you know, the topics that
14 we've discussed today have come out of the May 4th
15 discussion that we had about the regulatory reform
16 order. And I'm just wondering is there -- are there
17 other rules that received comments? Are there other
18 initiatives in -- under way internally in the EPA to
19 discuss other potential rule changes or guidance
20 changes or anything like that that we have not heard
21 about today?
22 MR. KEIGWIN: So the agency received lots of
23 comments in response to the regulatory reform
24 executive order. I don't have the exact number, but
25 it was many, people took advantage of the opportunity.

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

117

1 For the Office of Pesticide Programs, these were the
2 two issues for which we received the most feedback.
3 We're still working our way through the comments, but
4 given the depth of the comments and the number of
5 comments and the -- you know, the upcoming
6 implementation and effective dates, we thought it was
7 important for -- to take advantage of you all's time
8 while you were here with us this day and a half to
9 focus on these two particular issues. And then moving
10 forward, if there are other issues that we identify as
11 we go through the regulatory reform comments, we would
12 likely bring some of those issues back here as well.
13 So Jay, then Donnie, then Charlotte.
14 MR. VROOM: So I think Amy raised a question
15 earlier in the worker protection discussion why should
16 it take so long, and so hopefully, Amy, the answer
17 that Liza gave about the differences in state laws and
18 implementation explains part of the need for a change
19 in the deadline to get to implementation. And it
20 seems to me that we've heard a lot of consensus about
21 the fact that at least everyone who is at the table or
22 is representing someone else's interests at the table
23 that there's a lot of goodwill and sincere intent to
24 ensure that this system that the Federal Government,
25 through EPA's pesticide program, is putting in place

118

1 is intended to improve things for all workers and give
2 more clarity to -- and responsibility clarity for
3 those employers that are employing those workers that
4 have these kinds of exposure.
5 So I would hope that we're at a point where
6 we're getting closer to consensus around the knowledge
7 of what the intent is and that we will get to closure
8 and accomplish the things that we all want to
9 accomplish, but particularly the difficulties with the
10 states, and I think, Amy, you had said, you know, the
11 states all saw this coming. You're right, they saw it
12 coming, but they saw it coming 15 years ago, and at
13 some point, people, you know, pivot to do other things
14 that, you know, do happen, and it took a very long
15 time for this rule and the worker protection rule to
16 get finalized.
17 And, so, you know, I'm not making excuses
18 for the states, but I think there are a lot of reasons
19 why the little extra time is reasonable to expect.
20 Thanks.
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Donnie, then Charlotte.
22 MR. TAYLOR: So first of all, thanks for
23 working with the states. I think when this came out,
24 I think you probably got an earful of phone calls
25 coming in, so thanks for working those guys.

119

1 Do we have any idea how many states would
2 require a legislative action, and do we see those as
3 being difficult or easy?
4 MR. KEANEY: I think, Liza, was that in the
5 survey you did, Liza? Yeah.
6 MS. TROSSBACH: Yes. AAPCO had -- did a
7 survey of states to try to determine how many states
8 would require some type of regulatory change, whether
9 laws or regulations. And I don't remember the exact
10 percentage off the top of my head, but it is on the
11 AAPCO's website. But there was a good number of
12 states that would have to have one or both, so either
13 their statute or their regulations.
14 And, of course, both of those have their own
15 challenges and time lines involved. But that is on
16 the AAPCO's website, and I would be happy to forward
17 that to Dea, that actual survey, if she wants to send
18 it out to the PPDC to see those responses. I just
19 don't remember off the top of my head.
20 MR. KEIGWIN: Andrew, you might have a
21 clarification.
22 MR. THOSTENSON: Yeah, just to add to Liza,
23 the -- you know, most people, most states, at a
24 minimum are going to have to engage in some sort of
25 regulatory, administrative rule change that maybe

120

1 doesn't require going to a legislature, but many
2 states will also have to do the legislative piece.
3 The other thing is is that we won't move on
4 any of those items until we know that this law is
5 hard-baked because it's too expensive from a political
6 capital as well as just the time associated with
7 getting the rule in place. So you're not going to see
8 any state trying to get ahead of the ball game on
9 that. I will say, though, that doesn't mean that we
10 aren't talking about it and that we are looking at it
11 and we are grappling with it right now and
12 strategizing how we will go about it once the rule
13 actually does come into force. So that's kind of --
14 that's kind of what I see happening out there.
15 MR. TAYLOR: Well, it was my understanding
16 that some of the states already have educational
17 programs in place that exceed these requirements, so
18 it's not like this is not being done. They may not be
19 scripted the way they're scripted here, but education
20 is being provided.
21 MR. THOSTENSON: Yeah, I agree with that. I
22 mean, Liza mentioned this earlier. I mean, we have a
23 number of states that well exceed these sorts of
24 things. Having said that, though, I don't know any
25 state that is going to be exempted from an overhaul of

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

ED_002528_00039560-00031

121

1 their plan. I mean, because all of our plans have
2 different strengths and weaknesses, and this tries to
3 get everybody to a certain level. And, so, we're all
4 going to have to do certain things.
5 MR. KEIGWIN: Charlotte.
6 MS. SANSON: Yeah, thank you. And some of
7 my questions were just answered with Donnie's
8 questions, so I appreciate that.
9 I also just had a technical question, and it
10 has to do with the family exemption on the age
11 requirement. And I was wondering if you could clarify
12 that the family exemption under WPS would apply to the
13 40 CFR Part 171 supervised applicators, just for
14 consistency.
15 MR. KEANEY: The definition will extend --
16 the extended family and worker you're talking about?
17 MS. SANSON: Right, because Part 171
18 addresses supervised applicators, and then (inaudible)
19 that the supervised situations for families, family
20 workers.
21 MR. KEANEY: I guess I don't understand your
22 question. Are you asking is the definition of
23 immediate family the same in both?
24 MS. SANSON: Right.
25 MR. KEANEY: Do we have that spec- -- Nancy?

122

1 MS. FITZ: Yeah, it's the same definition of
2 immediate family.
3 MS. SANSON: Okay, thank you.
4 MR. KEANEY: Yeah.
5 MS. FITZ: But if -- you would have to
6 comply with both rules, so you would have to comply
7 with the more stringent age that applies, if that's
8 what your question is.
9 MS. SANSON: Yes. I want to see how they're
10 connected, right?
11 MS. FITZ: It's a really complicated table.
12 MS. SANSON: Yeah.
13 MS. FITZ: Depending on whether it's ag or
14 not and what the activity is and whether -- and WPS
15 only applies to growing crops; it doesn't apply to
16 animals. So it's -- we're working on a table to
17 explain that because we've gotten that question quite
18 a bit.
19 MS. SANSON: Okay, great. Thank you.
20 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. So I just conferred
21 with Kevin, and so I think what we heard was that
22 there's general consensus around 18, that there could
23 be some -- it might need to be some clarification
24 perhaps and guidance around how the family exemption
25 piece works, and that there's an acknowledgment that

123

1 because of the processes that virtually every state
2 will need to go through that there may need to be some
3 additional time on the implementation side because of
4 processes that, as I heard, really can't begin until
5 states have certainty about when this rule goes into
6 effect and when things are due for submission to work
7 with stakeholders in their states to develop a revised
8 plan that virtually everyone will have to do, and then
9 subsequently work through any administrative,
10 regulatory, or perhaps even statutory process that
11 would have to ensue based upon local law.
12 Does that reflect the discussion?
13 (No response.)
14 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. So just quickly recap
15 the day. So what -- on the WPS side, what we heard
16 was general consensus around minimum age. On the
17 designated rep provision, the recommendation was to
18 form a very short-term workgroup to work through some
19 of these issues, develop, perhaps, some clarification
20 or some additional options for consideration and that
21 AAPCO has also volunteered to look at the situations
22 in states that have this provision or a similar type
23 of provision to help inform those discussions.
24 And then on the application exclusion zone,
25 what we largely talked about was the need to develop

124

1 some additional and enhanced guidance around certain
2 scenarios, then some of which were discussed today.
3 And then on certification and training, what
4 we heard is, again, a general consensus around the
5 minimum age, but the need for some additional
6 clarifications surrounding the family exemption.
7 And I'll just double check that that
8 reflects the discussion from today.
9 Okay, so I have been remiss all day in
10 checking with the two PPDC members that are
11 participating remotely to see if they had any
12 comments, Gina Shultz or Dan Kunkel, was there
13 anything you had meant to chime in that I didn't give
14 you the opportunity to do so earlier?
15 MS. SHULZ: Hey, Rick. This is Gina. I
16 have nothing to add. Thank you for checking.
17 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks for checking in. Hope
18 you feel better.
19 Okay, we have two public commenters. So the
20 first person is our former colleague, Bill Jordan.
21 (Teleconference interruption.)
22 MR. JORDAN: -- you know, and as Rick
23 indicated, I used to work here at EPA and retired in
24 2016 after 40 wonderful years working on pesticide
25 issues. I'm now an independent environmental

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

125

1 consultant working with advocacy organizations,
2 industry, trade associations, law firms, pesticide
3 registrants, but today I'm not representing or
4 speaking on behalf of any client. Rather, I am
5 interested in sensible regulatory efforts that protect
6 human health and the environment because I may be
7 affected by use of pesticides.
8 And, so, I want to thank you for the
9 opportunity to offer comments. I think seeking
10 meaningful public engagement has long been a hallmark
11 of OPP's work, and I'm really pleased that Dr. Beck
12 yesterday expressed EPA's support for continuing that
13 practice. I agree with her wholeheartedly that
14 dialogue leads to better decisions and is a
15 fundamental component of good government.
16 And with that backdrop, I want to offer
17 comments on four different points. First, I'm pleased
18 that the apparently controversial provisions in the
19 worker protection standard, the application exclusion
20 zone, the designated representative, minimum age, and
21 the one in the certification amendment rulemaking
22 minimum age all seem to be ones that can be addressed
23 through additional guidance or at most some relatively
24 small tweaks to very discrete portions of the rule.
25 Before EPA undertakes any rulemaking,

126

1 however, I think this morning's conversation has
2 illustrated how useful dialogue can be to focus and
3 clarify the concerns that arise around these
4 regulations or have arisen around these regulations.
5 And I know from experience working on notice and
6 comment rulemaking that that's not really the best way
7 to figure out how to sort through complex, nuanced
8 issues like these.
9 So I strongly encourage EPA to continue to
10 use the PPDC process to gather input and develop
11 reasonable approaches to address legitimate concerns.
12 In keeping with the FACA guidance yesterday, I would
13 request that any PPDC efforts be a subcommittee rather
14 than a workgroup. That will ensure transparency,
15 committee balance, and opportunities for public
16 engagement. Who knows, maybe I'll come out of
17 retirement and raise a hand to play in that.
18 But I encourage PPDC members if you agree
19 with me to let EPA know that you also would support
20 subcommittees to work on these issues.
21 Second, it's notable how little in the
22 worker protection standard and the certification rule
23 actually appears to be the subject of continued
24 debate. That's an indication that as many of you have
25 said that the lengthy process of stakeholder

127

1 engagement has actually worked and led EPA to do
2 something that's fundamentally reasonable in its
3 approach. And I join the rest of you in commending
4 them for their work.
5 Given that there's a broad consensus that
6 the overwhelming majority of these different rules and
7 provisions are workable and needed, I think there's no
8 reason for delaying the compliance dates of the entire
9 rule. If there is a rulemaking, and I'm not convinced
10 that there necessarily needs to be one, but if there
11 is a rulemaking to introduce these small changes that
12 have been suggested, and to change the compliance
13 date, the changes in the compliance date should apply
14 only to the portion of the rules that might be
15 amended. The rest of the rules should take effect
16 because we need them.
17 Third, I want to point out that it's not
18 possible for EPA to change the compliance dates on the
19 worker protection standard rule before they take
20 effect in January of next year. The statutory
21 procedures for rulemaking are such that you just can't
22 do that legally. So given that the worker protection
23 amendments are going to be fully effective in January
24 and the scope of the rule changes, if any, coming out
25 of this PPDC discussion are going to be pretty small,

128

1 I strongly encourage EPA to tell the state lead
2 agencies to move ahead with training and compliance
3 assistance on the full rule.
4 Fourth and last, as for the certification
5 amendments, those rule amendments, the rule contains,
6 I think, a very thoughtful, deliberate program for
7 state lead agencies to come into compliance with the
8 new requirements. I don't think that you should alter
9 that compliance schedule absent a showing that the
10 state lead agencies absolutely need more time.
11 Given under the current rule that state lead
12 agencies have six and a half years to figure out what
13 to change and then to make those changes, it seems to
14 me like that ought to be enough. Don't change the
15 time line now. Instead, you should wait until the
16 states have tried to implement this, gone through
17 their legislative process, if they need to, and the
18 rulemaking process, and see if they are, in fact,
19 encountering real problems.
20 If EPA even indicates that it might change
21 the time lines for compliance, I know full well from
22 years of watching this process that states will wait
23 and postpone their efforts to start work on the
24 necessary changes. And if that happens, then you'll
25 be facing this issue again and you will have lost the

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

129

1 benefits that a stronger state certification could
2 bring.
3 Thank you.
4 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Bill.
5 The final person that signed up for public
6 comment is Julie Spagnoli from JM Specialty
7 Consultants.
8 MS. SPAGNOLI: And I'm sort of speaking as a
9 member of the public health workgroup and then kind of
10 with a nexus with the discussion we had yesterday on
11 PRIA 4. One of the set-asides in PRIA 4 is for the
12 development of efficacy guidelines for some specified
13 pests and pests requiring the submission of efficacy
14 data, which includes public health pests.
15 And the need for these guidelines and
16 standardization of these efficacy testing is so that
17 we can guarantee the effectiveness of these products,
18 which is the benefit to registrants to know how to
19 test their products and to know that their studies
20 will be accepted. And it also provides confidence to
21 the applicators that the products that they use will
22 be effective.
23 So as to both the -- by standardizing these
24 requirements and the guidelines, it provides a benefit
25 and especially to public health. And I'm especially

130

1 interested in the guideline on fire ants because they
2 are probably my biggest nemesis when it comes to
3 pests. So I look forward to that guideline. Thank
4 you.
5 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Julie.
6 Kevin had one more remark to make before we
7 close -- did a couple of closing things.
8 MR. KEANEY: In the PowerPoint presentation,
9 there are a couple of slides that deal with the
10 cooperative agreements that we have, the grant
11 cooperative agreements we have to support these
12 programs. I urge you to go to those websites and go
13 to the websites of those organizations and see the
14 depth of activities that go on there to help support
15 the programs and provide educational materials,
16 provide science-based information through the
17 Pesticide Information Center, provide training through
18 the app -- AFOP network.
19 We are very indebted to the PRIA funds that
20 support much of -- much of those activities, so it's a
21 combination of common grant monies and PRIA set-aside
22 monies that support those things that are quite
23 essential to making things real in the field for these
24 -- for these programs.
25 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Kevin. I'm mindful of

131

1 the time, but I wanted to just quickly see if there
2 are any public commenters from those participating
3 remotely.
4 Anyone remote that would like to make a
5 brief public comment, please identify yourself.
6 MR. KUNSTMAN: Rick, this is Jim Kunstman,
7 PBI Gordon.
8 MR. KEIGWIN: Go ahead.
9 MR. KUNSTMAN: Can you hear me?
10 MR. KEIGWIN: We can hear you. Go ahead.
11 MR. KUNSTMAN: A quick question -- or a
12 quick comment and a question. Definitely appreciate
13 being able to participate by phone. It's been great.
14 I just want to echo what Cindy said yesterday at the
15 end of the session, that oftentimes the EPA and their
16 scientists don't stand up and say that they've
17 actually done some good science and made some good
18 decisions. And I do believe after 30 years in
19 regulatory that I can agree with that.
20 One comment -- question. A news headline
21 that I saw this morning said that the U.S.
22 Environmental Protection Agency head Scott Pruitt said
23 his recent decision to prohibit members of the agency
24 scientific advisory committees from receiving EPA
25 grants will reduce conflicts of interest but experts

132

1 say that the move could exclude many of the nation's
2 best environmental scientists and damage the agency's
3 scientific integrity. And I wonder if that includes
4 PPDC volunteers.
5 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Jim. I believe we're
6 -- I believe it only applies to the scientific
7 advisory committees, but we will get confirmation of
8 that from the office that oversees all of the FACA
9 groups at EPA.
10 Are there any other public commenters on the
11 phone?
12 MS. BLACK: Yeah, Rick, this is Carol Black
13 with Washington State University.
14 MR. KEIGWIN: Go ahead, Carol.
15 MS. BLACK: What I would like to just add to
16 the discussion on Dicamba is that when one looks at
17 where the incidents have occurred with damage, I think
18 it's critical that that overlay of the USDA 2016
19 soybean acreages is included in that same schematic.
20 Thank you.
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Thank you, Carol.
22 Any final public commenters on the phone?
23 (No response.)
24 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. So a couple of quick
25 things. We are looking at meeting dates. What I'm

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

133

1 going to do for time purposes is if you --
2 (Teleconference interruption.)
3 MR. KEIGWIN: -- next meeting, you could
4 email them to Dea, and then we'll circulate them to
5 the group to kind of get some consensus around topics
6 moving forward. We really, from the agency side, want
7 to be bringing you issues for which you can provide us
8 with input and consensus to help advance the program.
9 In terms of meeting dates for 2018, for the
10 spring meeting, we are currently looking at May 2nd
11 and May 3rd. So if you could let Dea know if those
12 present any major conflicts, and I know there will be
13 groans for the fall meeting, but we are currently
14 looking at October 31st and November 1st. So part of
15 this is due to meeting room availability, but if that
16 presents major conflicts for people for the fall
17 meeting, also please let Dea know.
18 So let me just say in closing thank you to
19 all of you. We covered a lot of ground in a day and a
20 half. I personally appreciate all of the candor and
21 the efforts to move things forward. For the new
22 members of the group, thank you all for participating
23 because sometimes in sessions like this we kind of
24 wait to kind of feel your way through, and I don't
25 think any of you did that, so thank you very much. I

134

1 really appreciate that.
2 I want to appreciate -- I also want to thank
3 Dozina Taylor who manages this room. This may be the
4 first meeting that I can think of in a long time where
5 all the equipment worked, and it worked well. And,
6 so, Dozina did a number of checks with the tech
7 support folks. I know Dea did another with the tech
8 team as well. So I really want to thank them.
9 And then I want to thank Dea and her team
10 and, see, these meetings don't happen as well as they
11 do, and all the coaching that I've gotten for the past
12 couple of days, if Dea's not constantly feeding me
13 stuff and keeping us all in line. And, so, Dea and
14 Emily and I know there were others, Lance, and there
15 were others from FEAD that were also instrumental in
16 helping move those forward and I wanted to thank them
17 as well.
18 And I think Jay may have one closing
19 comment.
20 MR. VROOM: Yeah, thanks, Rick. So I didn't
21 realize that you were actually going to skip some
22 things and go to closing. So I just wanted to
23 acknowledge that Jonathan who works for Senator Udall
24 has been here much of the morning. I've been a member
25 of this PPDC except for last few years for many, many

135

1 years, and it's very rare that a staffer from Capitol
2 Hill will make the time to come and listen to the
3 dialogue of this group. And it's particularly germane
4 because of the three issues that Senator Udall has
5 expressed concern about with regard to reauthorization
6 of PRIA we've been talking about, and so hopefully
7 Jonathan's had a chance to hear a little bit of some
8 of the consensus-building that's gone on around those
9 topics and also has heard what Kevin just talked
10 about, which is that PRIA and the reauthorization of
11 PRIA will enable fees to go to some of those
12 farmworker programs, matching grant money from the
13 appropriations side that are critical as well.
14 So I just think it's important for us to
15 take note of the fact the Hill does care about what's
16 going on. This isn't lobbying, so we're not stepping
17 over the line, right, with regard to our DFO
18 oversight, but thank you.
19 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Jay. And, again,
20 thanks to all of you and safe travels home.
21 (Whereupon, the committee meeting was
22 concluded.)
23
24
25

136

1 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPTIONIST
2
3 I, Sara J. Vance, do hereby certify that the
4 foregoing transcription was reduced to typewriting via
5 audiotapes provided to me; that I am neither counsel
6 for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to
7 the action in which these proceedings were
8 transcribed; that I am not a relative or employee of
9 any attorney or counsel employed by the parties
10 hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the
11 outcome of the action.
12
13
14
15 SARA J. VANCE, CERT
16 Transcriptionist
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

For The Record, Inc.
(301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

A
AAPCO 28:12 48:12 64:14 100:6 109:11 115:9 119:6 123:21
AAPCO's 119:11 119:16
Aaron 88:2
abilities 14:2
ability 16:8 32:24 45:22 55:22 86:8 86:18 111:24
able 17:5 22:17 23:3 23:7 27:10 45:25 46:23 51:14 53:1 56:17 57:3 59:2,8 59:9 61:2 62:4,18 63:25 64:19 73:9 98:5 99:13 107:17 108:25 131:13
absent 102:18 128:9
absolutely 28:15 48:15,17,18 90:25 91:5 128:10
abuse 40:13
academicians 84:8
accepted 129:20
access 37:19 44:3,4 54:22 57:4 59:3,10 60:2 61:13,23 63:3 63:25 73:16,18
accessed 37:1
accessing 37:19
accomplish 23:4,8 118:8,9
accomplished 87:19
accomplishing 77:4
account 14:7 81:18
accounted 78:16
accurately 111:23
achieve 15:5
acknowledge 10:4 93:12 134:23
acknowledgment 122:25
acreage 94:20
acreages 132:19
acres 94:3
acted 111:4
action 8:10 20:7 30:18 32:23,23 63:7 85:24 86:11 119:2 136:7,11
activities 5:23 6:18 130:14,20
activity 32:3 102:17 104:16 122:14
actual 22:17 29:4 41:6 46:19 52:5 114:9 115:23 119:17
add 53:3 87:15 90:11 119:22 124:16 132:15
Adding 78:18
addition 49:22 77:9
additional 21:24 38:8 82:4,5,14 104:24 123:3,20 124:1,5 125:23
address 12:25 46:21 70:6 71:11 104:23 126:11
addressed 58:13 91:6 125:22
addresses 121:18
addressing 47:13
adequate 8:2,19 9:15,24 58:9 110:20
adequately 52:24 102:2
adjacent 67:14 71:8
adjust 22:15 102:5
administration 7:15 7:22 15:12 100:17 102:1 112:1
administrative 22:6 119:25 123:9
admittedly 66:21
adult 20:9
adulticiding 94:6
adults 17:16
advance 2:20 133:8
advancement 48:3
advancing 2:6
advantage 9:10 55:2 116:25 117:7
advantageous 50:8
advantages 56:3
advice 3:24 84:22 103:16 107:25
advisability 109:20
advise 69:4
advisory 131:24 132:7
advocacy 102:12 125:1
advocate 43:6
advocates 49:15
aerial 25:23 26:3,12 26:24 27:12 66:8 70:24 75:1 77:21 79:6,17 80:10 82:23 94:19 111:16
AEZ 65:7 69:24 70:7,23 71:3 74:13 75:15,16,24 76:6 76:12,14,21 77:6,7 77:15 79:15 81:7 81:10,17,19
affect 106:12
AFOP 130:18
ag 5:14,19 35:14,17 35:24 36:8,24 37:25 56:22 77:11 79:24 122:13
age 5:7,17,18,19 11:23 13:8,10,21 14:4 15:17,17 16:19 18:8 19:5 20:24 21:5 25:8,13 25:15,19 26:1,9,10 27:1,1,2 28:14 29:10 33:14 34:2,4 34:6,9 35:17 36:3 36:6 37:4 77:1 101:1,11,12 103:14,17,21,22 104:4,4,5,15 105:6 105:19,20 106:25 106:25 108:10,10 109:20 111:18,22 112:3,20,23 113:2 114:17 115:18,19 121:10 122:7 123:16 124:5 125:20,22
agencies 23:11 29:3 30:6 31:6 32:5 46:7 82:19 91:2 99:5,6 100:5 128:2 128:7,10,12
agency 1:6 72:17 79:14 85:2,14,16 86:3,24 92:21 95:6 98:13,25 99:1,1 102:12,13,23 106:3 107:23 110:18 112:6 116:22 131:22,23 133:6
agency's 86:8,22 132:2
agenda 10:22 87:25 90:17 92:14
ago 23:5 118:12
agree 20:4 23:6,12 24:22 33:10 50:21 53:15 59:16 68:15 120:21 125:13 126:18 131:19
agreed 8:4
agreement 9:11 19:25
agreements 5:22 130:10,11
agricultural 15:8 20:22 26:8,19 31:11 41:19 43:14 43:15,18 47:9 71:9 92:18
agriculture 5:4 7:4 7:24 22:12,13 29:9 31:10 34:17 72:25 114:20
ahead 28:11 120:8 128:2 131:8,10 132:14
aid 43:8
air 78:10
air-blast 70:24 77:22
alerting 10:16
all-terrain 73:16
all's 117:7
Allen 33:9 58:17 59:23 64:6
alleviate 37:7
allow 8:8 40:4 48:6 66:23 71:7 87:14 109:24 112:2
allowed 7:9 66:17 67:6
allowing 115:4
alluded 6:7 40:9 113:7
alludes 31:14
alter 128:8
alternative 36:12
alternatives 12:8,25
ambitious 84:13
ambulance 52:18
amended 127:15
amending 114:8
amendment 125:21
amendments 127:23 128:5,5
America 34:15
American 22:25
amount 14:12,13 74:17 112:7 113:3
Amy 13:12 14:9 17:19,22 18:3 22:10 28:10 29:11 30:3 34:7 35:12 38:4 39:3 40:23,25 50:20 51:5 54:13 57:24 59:23,24 66:5 67:9,21 105:17 106:20 117:14,16 118:10
Amy's 53:18

analytics 87:3
Andrew 17:10 19:7 22:22 28:17 52:11 54:15 73:12 74:7 75:14 79:4 106:20 107:19 109:14 113:6 119:20
Andrew's 80:7
Andy 38:3,4 40:24 58:18 59:23 62:25 64:6 67:21 68:14
angst 89:25
animal 75:25
animals 122:16
Ann 54:13 55:17 92:10 93:2,18
answer 13:4 39:6 76:21 79:22 108:13 117:16
answered 45:16 121:7
answers 24:1
Anthrax 86:16
anticipate 12:22 13:9
anticipating 86:9 94:13
antimicrobial 84:7
antiretaliation 62:11,12
ants 130:1
anybody 28:16 53:20
anyway 7:6 33:19 49:20
apart 11:14
apologize 111:9
app 130:18
apparently 71:6 125:18
appear 84:15
appears 116:13 126:23
applaud 18:1,2 114:25
applauding 17:21
applause 12:11,12 36:17
apple 20:10
apples 20:10
application 25:23 26:13,24 27:12 34:20 36:25 53:22 65:11,17,19,22 66:2,8,8,11,15,17 66:21,23 67:6 68:3 69:1,4,9,14,16,17 69:18,24,25 70:11 72:5,8 73:22 75:13 75:17 77:8,9,11,13 77:13,20 78:4,22 79:1,10 80:12,15 80:19 81:12,20 82:23 92:20 94:19 100:20 111:16 123:24 125:19
applications 32:16 71:1,14 72:21 73:15 77:18,24 80:18 81:15 108:8
applicator 5:6,13 9:24 10:5 11:24,25 24:4,13 27:20 28:2 33:4 66:23 73:1 76:9,19 79:6,18 80:10,11,25 81:1,9 82:15 99:25 100:22 101:4,19 103:24 104:6,6,8,9 105:3 111:20 115:20,22,25 116:1,6,9
applicator's 103:25 115:23
applicators 5:18 23:19 25:17,25 26:3 27:13 29:9 32:8,10 52:13 72:9 74:24 75:1 76:5,9 76:15 79:17 100:19 101:3,5,7 101:10,13,13 103:18,19,19,23 104:7,8 105:4,5 108:12 111:22 112:15,21 113:1 121:13,18 129:21
applied 24:14 38:24 41:10 47:17 74:10 78:21 107:9,10,10
applies 14:5 33:23 77:17,19,20 78:3 122:7,15 132:6
apply 25:16 26:1,2,3 26:20 35:10 78:8 81:25 121:12 122:15 127:13
applying 16:8 78:7 101:17
appoint 44:12,21
appointed 59:1,13
appoints 44:7
appreciate 93:4 94:23 96:23,24 107:23 110:13 121:8 131:12 133:20 134:1,2
appreciating 24:24
approach 90:1 127:3
approaches 126:11
appropriate 11:8 27:19 28:5 90:25 91:5
appropriations 135:13
approval 103:4 106:10
approve 87:10
apt 81:14
area 33:12 68:17,20 69:2 75:7,21,23 77:16 78:23,25 79:12 85:4,22 86:19,19 100:24 100:25
areas 11:8 70:16 71:9 85:5,7,10,11 96:20,22 99:7 100:16 112:23
aren't 42:6 45:24 120:10
arena 114:4
argument 7:25 8:17 9:14 109:20
arisen 3:22 109:19 126:4
Arlington 1:21
Armed 84:10 99:8
arms 77:14
Arnold 4:9 83:4,11 88:2 99:18
articulating 94:1
aside 111:13
asked 29:22 68:23 69:12 80:3
asking 29:23 55:8 80:5 121:22
ASMUS 35:13 54:17
ASPCRO 109:11 115:9
aspect 48:10 65:1
asserted 7:11
assertion 7:16
assess 70:10
asset 35:25 50:2
assets 36:7,8
assist 42:13 46:1,22 46:23 48:18 72:11
assistance 8:2,24 24:3 77:8 128:3
associated 80:13 120:6
association 7:3,23 22:25 57:19,20 108:6
association's 23:15
associations 6:17 84:9 125:2
assume 34:24
assuming 18:6 115:25
assure 70:10 95:8
attached 50:7
attacking 50:12
attacks 86:16,18
attain 12:8
attempt 32:14
attempts 38:15,18
attend 90:13,14,19
attorney 63:8 136:9
attorneys 58:12
ATV 73:15,24
audio 19:14
audiotapes 136:5
auspices 83:14 84:21 98:8
authorities 32:22
authority 40:4 45:21
authorization 49:6
automobiles 69:13
avail 64:19
availability 28:19 133:15
available 9:4,5,8,23 10:10,18 24:9 27:4 28:19,23,25 30:8 30:12,16,18 37:1 45:24 59:9
average 24:3,19
Aviation 112:1
avoid 31:23
aware 71:5 113:17 114:6
awful 20:18

B

baby 16:1
back 13:6 16:22 17:22 27:9 39:20 40:24 57:12 58:20 59:12 64:3,25 65:6 66:14 78:5 95:17 99:20,23 107:12 117:12
backdrop 125:16
background 26:23 35:13 36:22 113:6
backwards 88:11
balance 126:15
ball 120:8
barrier 46:9 110:1,4
barriers 45:20

54:25 61:24
base 113:11
based 29:5 75:12 81:20 123:11
basic 5:9 6:23 29:24 49:17 56:8 65:15
basically 17:15 68:2 77:7
Beck 125:11
becoming 24:8
began 14:15 97:18
beginning 3:13
begins 22:1
behalf 28:12 125:4
believe 13:23 71:15 75:15 111:12 131:18 132:5,6
benefit 55:16 129:18 129:24
benefits 129:1
best 55:5 107:7 126:6 132:2
best-management 80:9
better 3:17 47:11 51:4 82:8 85:15 94:9 124:18 125:14
beyond 3:20 18:18 19:1 67:16 71:1 91:22 98:7,25
bias 25:2
big 18:16 23:15 35:24 68:3 76:12 110:4
bigger 79:16
biggest 48:20 130:2
Bill 124:20 129:4
bio 86:18
biological 84:7
BISHOP 30:25 31:22
bit 4:9,25 19:18 28:21 51:8 60:19 80:23 94:25 95:20 97:8 112:22 113:6 122:18 135:7
biting 92:7
Black 132:12,12,15
blowing 70:13
board 60:6 84:10 99:8,15
bodies 13:24
body 89:10 90:3 97:19
bolstered 47:20
boos 11:3
born 34:17
bothering 94:5
bottle 95:11
boundaries 38:15 68:23
box 31:11
boy 16:1 76:2
boys 15:24 16:2
brains 29:17
branch 2:16
break 4:12 65:3,5
brief 36:22 65:8 83:8 131:5
briefly 67:11 93:23
bring 19:17 26:15 88:12 89:6,7,10 90:5 99:12 117:12 129:2
bringing 5:24 53:8 99:10 133:7
broad 84:19 91:19 91:19,24 105:22 127:5
broader 18:25
brought 57:14,25,25 91:11 96:18 101:17 110:9
bubble 66:22,25 67:2,7 75:19
Budget 22:6
buffer 75:16 81:23
bullet 93:7
BURD 55:19 93:19
Bureau 7:4
bus 57:20
business 27:7,10 34:23 35:25 36:8 58:1,2,5,7 109:3 110:25 111:19
businesses 25:23 26:13,20 27:14 34:20 108:19,20 112:7,8 114:1
bystanders 67:19

C

C 2:1
California 40:11
California-Davis 8:22 9:12
call 4:21 60:7,25 78:12 88:21 89:12 107:21
called 4:20 31:11 87:25
calls 118:24
can't 33:18 54:2 84:17 98:11,18 105:11 109:18 123:4 127:21
candor 133:20
capable 24:23
capacity 25:9 88:6
capital 120:6
Capitol 135:1
captured 63:23
car 68:24,25 70:2,15 70:18
car's 70:8
card 28:10 111:7
cards 59:19,22 90:7
care 35:20,21 42:11 135:15
Carol 132:12,14,21
Carolina 57:18 60:4
carry 66:11 107:17
carrying 93:24
case 34:1 80:6
cases 42:8,10 49:20 62:17
categories 27:23 100:20
category 101:15
caught 31:24
cause 42:8 57:22 62:1 89:25
caused 56:16
causes 67:12
caution 96:17
cautious 94:10
CDC 84:10
cease 69:1,4,9,13,15 69:17
Center 1:18 130:17
Century 30:1
CERT 136:15
certain 24:23 25:7 31:9,13 38:7 74:17 75:3 77:17 81:13 81:14 89:23 114:17 121:3,4 124:1
certainly 30:25 46:15,20,24 72:3 95:18 112:13,18 112:19 113:1
certainty 123:5
certificate 112:2 136:1
certification 2:21 4:13 5:12,13 26:5 27:20,20 28:2 32:12,25 82:21 99:22,25 102:2,8 106:3,5 108:7 109:25 113:5,8,21 114:8 124:3 125:21 126:22 128:4 129:1
certified 24:12 27:23 101:4,12,18 101:18 111:20,20 111:24 115:24 116:1,6,8
certify 136:3
cetera 46:8 70:25 73:3 99:6 114:15
CFR 121:13
challenge 15:19 16:23 37:9,9 65:22 74:3,6 107:6
challenges 12:21 13:9 14:6 15:14,20 16:14 18:9 29:23 37:4 39:6 40:1 41:23 42:2 43:19 45:18 51:13 65:25 68:7 73:14 104:11 107:14 108:3 109:12 119:15
challenging 102:10 102:14
chance 135:7
change 7:2,7 8:13 10:13 18:14 21:19 93:14,20 102:11 117:18 119:8,25 127:12,18 128:13 128:14,20
changed 7:1 100:3 101:22,25
changes 11:12,17 21:23 102:18 113:14,15,20,22 114:11,12 116:19 116:20 127:11,13 127:24 128:13,24
changing 11:15
characterize 100:11 100:12
charge 12:19 13:2
Charlotte 117:13 118:21 121:5
chasers 52:18
chat 68:11
chatting 2:8
check 124:7
checking 124:10,16 124:17
checks 134:6
chemicals 29:25 31:10 43:25 58:3 78:9
chemistries 79:25
chemistry 78:15 81:21
child 20:17 35:21,22
children 17:14,17

18:17,22 19:2,25 20:17 24:20 27:10 29:17,25 30:1 33:17,25 35:19 71:18 95:5,5,8
Children's 17:12
chime 97:13 124:13
choice 94:9
choices 116:13
choose 20:21 43:17 43:21,22
Cindy 131:14
circle 13:6
circling 80:20
circulate 133:4
circumstance 112:4
circumstances 38:7 38:9,21 39:8 50:22 52:25 61:9 63:12 64:15
civil 32:22
civilized 29:25
claim 40:7 47:5 63:9
clap 11:3
clapping 12:15
claps 11:3
clarification 64:10 66:7 69:12 70:17 70:20 97:7 119:21 122:23 123:19
clarifications 124:6
clarify 49:3,21 53:6 53:14 56:20 67:3 111:15 121:11 126:3
clarity 24:6 61:7 88:8,13,14 118:2,2
clause 55:2 61:19
clear 24:1 53:12,14 77:1,3 82:24 87:10 114:16
clearinghouse 9:7
clicker 84:16
client 125:4
climate 93:20
clinical 42:10
close 29:14 35:10 36:11 47:25 48:5 48:20 78:1 83:1 130:7
closer 19:18 118:6
closest 78:25
closing 130:7 133:18 134:18,22
closure 118:7
coaching 134:11
coalition 102:12
coalitions 43:5
cockroaches 96:11
codified 85:3
cognitive 16:8 25:3
collaboration 99:7
collaborative 9:11
colleague 124:20
colleagues 23:12
college 24:14
combination 130:21
come 4:10 11:20 16:20 21:3,4 23:25 26:15 27:9 48:12 54:21 60:8,15 61:1 62:20 64:18 65:6 68:17 69:15 76:7 83:7 91:22 99:1,1 109:21 116:14 120:13 126:16 128:7 135:2
comes 25:23 130:2
comfort 80:23
comfortable 30:7 110:19
comforting 23:14
coming 4:4 20:12 22:14,20 23:20 52:15 53:12 61:3 63:22 68:24,25 70:8 85:5 98:17 99:23 110:6 118:11,12,12,25 127:24
command 62:8
commend 95:23,24 96:16 114:24
commending 127:3
comment 22:1,9 53:10 72:16 90:24 90:25 96:2 100:1 105:18 114:23 126:6 129:6 131:5 131:12,20 134:19
commenters 124:19 131:2 132:10,22
comments 3:7,22 10:24 11:1,7,7,9 17:20 28:25 30:14 33:7 44:7 47:12 53:10,24 82:25 88:2 100:7 103:13 103:13 104:15 107:24 111:3,4 115:1 116:17,23 117:3,4,5,11 124:12 125:9,17
commercial 25:24 26:20 27:13 103:19 104:5,7 105:3,4 108:12 109:16 112:2,15 113:1 114:20
commingling 26:4
commitment 28:23 87:21
committee 1:10 2:18 12:20 63:24 83:15 84:22 126:15 135:21
committees 97:9 131:24 132:7
common 41:17,18 130:21
communicate 66:12 85:15 97:25
communicating 66:14 85:17,19
communication 6:3 6:7,10 66:12 74:23 75:5 106:17
communication-w... 43:20
communications 85:13,18 93:7
communities 7:11 36:7 107:8
community 2:17,24 3:8 33:4,5 35:20 53:5 56:17 82:23
comp 63:9
company 26:24 66:10
comparison 5:10 35:1
compensation 40:7
competencies 101:5 112:14
competency 100:18 101:2
competing 50:8
competition 49:25 62:20
competitive 55:6 58:1
complainant 60:13 72:24
complaint 32:19 60:5,5,23 61:7 73:5
complaints 31:21 32:7,15
complete 103:3
completed 8:8 75:17
completely 29:22 61:5 81:11
complex 126:7
complexity 65:22
compliance 6:25 8:1 8:13,16,18,24 9:20 10:2,7,13,14 11:16 24:3 30:9 31:12 48:3 81:6,7 127:8 127:12,13,18 128:2,7,9,21
complicated 43:9,9 122:11
complied 31:4
comply 10:5 15:22 17:5 31:23 79:2 81:1 102:25 122:6 122:6
complying 31:16
component 81:16 125:15
compromised 37:18
conceivably 31:23
concept 72:7 80:25
concern 20:14,19 23:15,16 24:6 37:9 38:25 50:4 53:16 56:16 57:13 63:10 74:19 135:5
concerned 29:21 51:8 52:22 65:21 71:9
concerns 13:1 14:3 28:18 29:2 37:4,8 39:2 44:9 46:10,18 47:2 50:25 53:24 55:20 56:6 62:18 64:18 71:4 81:13 81:19 92:18 115:1 126:3,11
concluded 135:22
concur 19:11 43:3
conditions 38:23,24 63:5,5
conduct 6:10 24:25 32:5
conducting 106:17
Conference 1:18
conferred 122:20
confidence 129:20
confidential 63:12
confirmation 132:7
conflicts 131:25 133:12,16
confused 15:20 17:3 60:19
confusing 28:1 78:17
confusion 16:16
congratulations 92:14
conjunction 20:7
connect 92:21
connected 122:10
connection 34:17

connections 34:18
consensus 16:21 29:14 36:12 48:1 105:22,25 106:24 117:20 118:6 122:22 123:16 124:4 127:5 133:5 133:8
consensus-building 135:8
consensus-driven 41:9
consider 92:4 96:9,9 96:10
consideration 26:22 74:21 80:17 84:25 89:7 90:5 95:19 107:23 108:4 123:20
considerations 74:9 75:6
considered 11:10
consistency 121:14
consistent 12:23 57:4 68:8
constantly 134:12
constituents 8:9
constitutes 101:9
constrained 53:11
constraining 38:24
constrains 54:11
constraints 39:2 45:13,14 47:18 53:20
construct 76:7
consultant 125:1
Consultants 129:7
contact 70:15,18 79:3
contacting 70:11
contains 128:5
contemplated 110:13
content 9:21 10:3,7 30:9
context 39:5 41:21 42:15 53:4 105:21 105:23
continue 18:19 19:1 70:11,16 109:10 109:13 115:11 126:9
continued 126:23
continuing 82:20 125:12
contrary 52:19
control 28:13 74:14 84:24 86:14 93:15 95:25 108:6,14,18
controversial 125:18
convened 110:8
conventional 84:7
conversation 3:13 19:4 21:11 58:22 92:2 94:15 95:1 106:22 113:3 126:1
conversations 16:13
convinced 24:8 127:9
cooperative 5:22 110:11 130:10,11
coordinate 99:14
coped 37:21
corporate 27:8 33:24 49:10
correct 25:17 49:3 56:19 76:2 82:16
correctly 25:15 63:23 80:5 81:25 92:6 107:11
counsel 136:5,9
counter 87:11
country 23:20 30:1 39:12,15,20 51:12 110:10
couple 2:25 21:9 24:11 88:4 92:11 130:7,9 132:24 134:12
course 23:1 24:19 26:23 91:4,16 115:10 119:14
cover 65:10
covered 87:22 133:19
create 65:25 88:10
created 88:13
creating 86:11
credentials 52:16
credibility 112:5
crises 83:18
crisis 83:17,17 89:2 95:7
critical 132:18 135:13
crops 73:15 122:15
crucial 40:5
Crystal 1:19
curious 93:21
current 14:3 128:11
currently 11:9 13:10 102:13 133:10,13
cynical 55:24 56:10
Cynthia 25:12 28:9 29:11 90:22 92:9 93:2

D

D 2:1
Dakota 24:16,21 109:15 110:3 113:7
damage 132:2,17
Damon 19:8 22:22 25:11 33:3 66:5,6 79:4,21 82:12 107:19 108:17 109:14 111:6
Damon's 33:16
Dan 124:12
dangerous 20:2 43:25 58:3
dangers 112:17
data 37:1 38:6 53:23 59:8 87:2 129:14
date 7:8 8:13,16 9:18 10:1,13,15 11:16 21:19,23 29:4 82:6 101:22 101:25 102:11 103:10 114:10 127:13,13
dates 7:1 101:21,21 102:5 103:8 117:6 127:8,18 132:25 133:9
daughter 24:15
daughters 108:23
day 1:13 5:2 10:21 49:23 60:7 79:7 99:20 103:11,12 115:2 117:8 123:15 124:9 133:19
days 75:3 134:12
Dea 26:15 98:1 119:17 133:4,11 133:17 134:7,9,13
Dea's 134:12
deadline 35:9 117:19
deal 6:3,13 21:12 37:22 39:16 43:6 48:6 54:25 76:12 79:16 83:22 90:19 95:13 97:18 110:4 130:9
dealing 34:16 89:2 99:15 102:24
dealt 41:7
debate 126:24
decide 88:10
decided 85:10
decision 17:1 131:23
decisions 108:25 109:4 125:14 131:18
dedicating 2:13
deemed 48:23
deep 9:2
deeply 55:24
define 48:23 52:24 84:3 86:21
defined 54:20
defining 86:13
definitely 17:20 71:2 131:12
definition 44:1 47:4 48:4 50:21 101:7,9 116:5 121:15,22 122:1
definitions 5:10 12:1 48:16,22
delay 21:16,17 106:2,6
delayed 29:1
delaying 127:8
delegated 31:5
deliberate 128:6
delineate 93:8
delved 85:4
demanding 52:15
demonstrating 52:17
denied 7:16
Departments 7:3,24 22:12,13
depend 35:5
dependent 28:24
depending 90:18 122:13
depends 32:25
depth 117:4 130:14
Deputy 83:4,11
describe 38:11
describing 47:13
descriptions 5:10 101:6
designate 40:3 44:17,18 45:14 56:18
designated 5:6 11:23 36:20 37:6 37:12,21 38:6,12 38:15 41:14 42:12 44:8,12 45:2,6,8 46:5,16 47:5 48:5 48:24 51:10 53:19 53:21,25 55:12 58:21 60:11 63:14 123:17 125:20
designates 58:21

designating 54:8
designed 37:7 44:1 55:21
designee 44:18
desperate 51:16
desperately 51:25 51:25
details 48:4 50:11
determine 73:3 84:4 90:19 119:7
detract 21:11
develop 79:24 85:24 87:1 123:7,19,25 126:10
developed 8:3 56:14 82:6
developing 2:18 6:19 13:25 41:9 56:9 106:5
development 87:9 129:12
devoted 6:13
DFO 135:17
dialogue 1:9 3:17 83:15 84:21 90:17 125:14 126:2 135:3
Dicamba 107:13 132:16
didn't 11:4,5 14:15 23:6 34:10 47:23 87:18 100:19 124:13 134:20
difference 68:21 74:22 80:2
differences 117:17
different 5:17 11:14 11:17,18 12:9 14:1 14:1 19:15 32:21 32:22 39:14 43:19 57:2 61:5,9 74:10 75:23,25 77:19,21 78:6,7,9,10,11 81:11 86:12 97:9 107:25 108:16 112:22 121:2 125:17 127:6
differently 108:12
difficult 25:4 72:6 76:8 78:18 85:4 119:3
difficulties 71:12 118:9
diplomats 112:25
direct 101:3
direction 70:14 99:17
directive 76:11
Director 83:5,11
dirt 73:18
disadvantage 47:15
disadvantaged 39:11 51:17 55:1
disagree 34:2 59:25
disagreement 19:24
disaster 86:13,15
disasters 86:2,6 91:5 93:21
discrete 125:24
discuss 21:2 28:5,7 65:3 66:4 89:9 99:21 116:19
discussed 14:7 38:23 116:14 124:2
discussing 5:3 11:11 13:17 19:23
discussion 2:5,13 5:5,16 12:5 27:19 58:20 65:1 72:2 76:25 77:1 82:3 101:1 103:16 104:10,11,18 105:20 107:13 110:20 111:14 116:11,15 117:15 123:12 124:8 127:25 129:10 132:16
discussions 65:4 85:14 123:23
disease 86:14 92:7 94:4
diseases 86:4
dispersion 78:11,13 80:3
display 10:3
distance 77:21 78:8
distract 21:11
distrust 52:10
diversity 84:5
division 60:10,14,25
do-not- 79:2
doctor 39:22
doctors 56:5
documents 97:14
doesn't 78:24 120:1 120:9 122:15
doing 3:13 18:19 19:10 24:17 29:5 30:5 54:6 81:4 83:15
Dominic 71:24 73:11
don't 4:16 11:2 13:7 14:11 16:15 17:7 18:9 21:10,12 22:8 24:1 33:4 34:1 36:20 39:13 40:24 42:7,11 45:23,23 46:7 49:11 50:18 51:7,17 54:24 55:21 56:9 57:21 62:1 65:4,15,24 68:17,19 71:10,22 73:19 74:2,8 76:10 76:13,16,20 77:2,3 77:10 89:25 94:7 95:11,16 104:22 109:25 110:3 112:24 116:24 119:9,19 120:24 121:21 128:8,14 131:16 133:24 134:10
donned 67:2
Donnie 34:7 50:20 115:15 117:13 118:21
Donnie's 121:7
door 69:7
dots 92:21
double 124:7
download 9:8
downwind 80:3,11 80:14,19
Dozina 134:3,6
Dr 125:11
draft 2:19
drift 70:25 74:25 76:25 79:23,24 80:6 81:10,13,14 81:15,16,23
drifts 79:8
Drive 1:19
drop 78:23
droplet 77:24 78:14 78:16 81:20
droplet-sized 77:25
droplet's 79:11
due 123:6 133:15
duh 36:5
Duly 92:22

E

E 2:1,1 97:1
earful 118:24
earlier 2:9 47:15 72:18 100:21 105:20 106:22 108:17 117:15 120:22 124:14
early 5:20 7:21 28:20 35:7 76:17 104:10 109:17
earth 39:22
easier 40:20 62:10
easily 86:8 93:1
easy 80:24,25 119:3
eat 43:13
echo 28:17 29:2 32:4 55:20 67:23 80:7 114:24 131:14
economically 39:11 43:20 51:16
edict 113:25
educate 18:20 87:7 95:5
educated 19:15,20 62:22 73:7,9,24
educating 6:13 23:1
education 21:5 29:5 62:8 72:9 82:7,20 106:8 107:15 110:8 120:19
educational 37:8 120:16 130:15
educationally 39:11
educator 110:19
Educators 22:25
effect 29:6 102:19 123:6 127:15,20
effective 9:16 29:7 86:10 101:21,22 101:25 102:11 114:9,11 117:6 127:23 129:22
effectively 5:24 7:19 36:3
effectiveness 22:18 129:17
effects 13:25
efficacy 129:12,13 129:16
effort 2:21 6:13
efforts 14:18 17:21 56:14 87:7 94:14 125:5 126:13 128:23 133:21
either 14:12 43:7,19 50:14 97:22 119:12
elements 49:4
elevate 57:23 86:22
eliminate 63:18
else's 117:22
email 97:15,22 133:4
emanating 98:15
embark 23:18
embraced 18:7
emergencies 86:5,7 86:9
emergency 35:9 85:22 86:3 87:4

91:8 93:22 94:16
emergent 83:19
Emily 134:14
employed 136:6,9
employee 136:8
employees 19:20
employer 36:24 38:13 44:11 49:19
employers 26:19 56:22 57:10 77:12 118:3
employing 118:3
enable 135:11
encounter 87:11
encountering 128:19
encourage 18:17 30:13 109:10 126:9,18 128:1
endangered 94:16
ended 92:3 100:9
ends 12:9
enforce 32:21
enforceability 72:16
enforceable 81:8
enforced 20:4 23:23 23:24 31:3,8
enforcement 65:25
enforcing 31:8
engage 20:21 97:21 119:24
engaged 6:5,17 14:24 23:19 88:16 100:5
engagement 11:22 106:18 125:10 126:16 127:1
English 39:13 42:7 43:10 45:23 62:9
English-speaking 62:23
enhanced 28:15 82:6 124:1
enhancement 112:14
enjoyed 85:21
enlist 64:14
enormously 111:4
ensue 123:11
ensure 46:3,12 81:5 107:9 108:8 117:24 126:14
ensuring 85:20 96:1
entail 39:17
enter 58:4
entered 14:17
entering 5:20,20
enterprises 25:5
entire 89:10 127:8
entities 99:3
entity 58:24 59:1
entry 35:7,8 75:12 75:25
environment 12:24 125:6
environmental 1:6 17:12 85:1 124:25 131:22 132:2
environments 86:12
envisioning 49:12 49:16
EPA 6:14 7:8 10:9 12:15 13:18 14:14 14:19 15:2,4,7,10 15:11,13,14 17:21 18:17,25 28:23 29:16 30:11 36:6 47:3 53:10 72:11 76:7 84:11,21 86:10,16 95:23 96:21 102:9,20,20 103:3 109:10 110:7 111:3 113:10 114:25 115:12 116:18 124:23 125:25 126:9,19 127:1,18 128:1,20 131:15 131:24 132:9
EPA's 12:23 18:15 117:25 125:12
equipment 33:19 66:23 77:8,9,11,13 77:14,18,20 79:1 134:5
equipped 67:6 69:23
especially 35:24 43:18 63:4 70:25 71:13 88:22 94:20 129:25,25
espionage 49:11
essence 68:4
essential 130:23
essentially 49:8 102:7
established 100:21 100:23 101:5
establishment 53:21 56:25
establishments 57:2
et 46:8 70:25 73:3 99:6 114:15
ethic 16:4 27:3
evaluate 87:3,10
evening 2:4
event 79:18
everybody 41:5 63:2 63:2 99:15 107:18 113:16 121:3
everybody's 107:7
exact 116:24 119:9
exactly 40:16 70:18 78:24 88:16 94:7
example 32:9 39:18 39:19 40:6 59:9 60:20 86:15 95:4 95:10 99:9,11 107:22
examples 108:16
exams 100:17
exceed 120:17,23
exceeding 106:14
exception 14:4 25:20 33:17 103:21,22
exceptionalism 15:8
exceptions 14:8
exchanges 6:8
exclude 132:1
excluded 18:21
exclusion 5:6 9:24 10:5 11:24 12:1 18:11 65:11,17,23 66:3,8,15,17 68:4 72:5 73:20 74:4 78:22 123:24 125:19
excuse 73:8 75:8
excuses 118:17
executive 10:23 116:24
exempt 26:12
exempted 120:25
exemption 26:1,18 26:22 27:17 109:7 121:10,12 122:24 124:6
exemptions 34:5
exhaustive 89:20
exist 100:19
existing 101:2 103:5
exists 78:4 106:17
expect 11:21 118:19
expeditious 87:10
expensive 120:5
experience 34:19 48:14 76:14 91:2,3 126:5
experiences 19:21
experiencing 91:3
experts 131:25
expires 75:17
explain 59:8 76:8 78:19 82:8 97:15 122:17
explained 76:9,19
explaining 68:19
explains 76:20 103:7 114:2 117:18
explanation 103:9
explicit 40:4 49:6 67:17
exposed 16:24 20:17 37:11,11,17 39:15 39:19 42:9 43:24 49:9 57:6 58:8 62:6 63:6
exposure 49:18 67:14 68:1,6 74:16 75:3 79:18 118:4
expressed 9:22 36:13 47:3 64:9 67:15 125:12 135:5
expressing 37:10
extend 8:5 71:1 121:15
extended 121:16
extension 34:22 110:11
extensive 6:6,10 100:2
extent 106:18
extra 79:1 118:19
extraordinarily 23:21
extreme 55:25
extremely 87:21 88:20

F

FACA 97:9 98:3 126:12 132:8
face 39:6 43:19 45:19
face- 6:15
faced 107:14
facility 68:22 69:7
facing 128:25
fact 7:16 11:25 28:21,22 40:9 65:23 66:20 73:3 83:16 84:1 89:2,8 95:2 96:13 109:23 117:21 128:18 135:15
fair 60:17 71:10
fall 95:15 98:19 133:13,16
familiar 16:11 43:10
families 18:20,20 26:19 34:16 121:19
family 14:5 25:16,21

26:2,11 27:7 33:13 33:15,23,24 34:5 34:11,11,22,22 49:23 64:8 71:18 103:25 109:7 111:19 112:21 115:23 121:10,12 121:16,19,23 122:2,24 124:6
family-owned 25:24 35:14 108:19,19
fantastic 91:15
far 17:22 19:12 21:18 33:15 38:24 43:4 57:12 71:1 75:10 80:2,13 92:13 100:14
farfetched 51:24
farm 7:4 17:2 33:20 33:22,24 34:1,18 34:19,23 44:21 46:19 47:3,8,10,15 47:24 51:14 57:16 57:21 61:16 64:8 73:14 103:23 115:21
farm-owner 18:20
farmer 33:12,16,21 49:17 50:2 51:23 59:2,4,15 60:12 62:5 76:19 107:8
farmer's 21:3
farmers 15:1 23:19 26:19 49:25 52:13 56:2 61:14 62:22 68:19 69:12
farming 16:6 35:18 49:23 50:9 53:5
farms 16:3 27:15 33:24 60:16 62:19 73:17 112:21
farmworker 13:14 20:11 34:8,10 42:17 45:2,4,7 49:15 51:24 54:19 55:13 56:17 57:16 59:5,7,14,16 62:21 63:3 135:12
farmworkers 14:21 19:23 20:8 39:5,10 40:15 41:3 42:20 43:6,7 47:8 50:6 54:18,25 55:10 57:15,15,17 60:2 67:13
fashion 47:20 99:16
father 20:10
fathers 108:23
favor 71:2
FEAD 134:15
fear 37:22 62:10
federal 8:12 9:19 10:9,14,15 21:17 21:18 30:11 48:22 84:9 99:5 101:24 106:14 112:1 113:15 117:24
feedback 3:14 4:25 117:2
feeding 134:12
feel 11:3 14:6 17:4 18:15 37:17 124:18 133:24
feels 45:10
fees 135:11
feet 69:9 70:23 77:3 77:21 78:1
felt 89:4
field 5:25 6:5 12:7 34:9 41:3 56:18 66:10 68:25 75:20 75:22 130:23
fields 5:20 67:14
FIFRA 7:12,17 21:22
FIGUEROA 13:13 39:4 49:2 67:10 105:18
figure 18:10 27:6 112:25 126:7 128:12
final 5:15 6:8,9 9:19 26:9 53:24 100:10 100:15,16 114:10 115:18 129:5 132:22
finalize 3:3
finalized 118:16
financially 136:10
find 4:5,5 22:16 45:25,25 56:7 64:16 97:25 99:14
finding 3:23
fine 34:4 77:23
fire 130:1
fired 62:10
firms 125:2
first 4:11 12:14,21 13:18 43:11 49:6 64:14 68:12 76:5 83:8,24 85:6,12 92:2,23 95:23 111:9 118:22 124:20 125:17 134:4
Fitz 26:17,18 53:18 53:18 56:22 57:10 67:4 69:21 77:7,19 78:3,13 116:5,8 122:1,5,11,13
five 87:23
flagger 27:1
flexibility 115:4,7
flexible 100:13
Florida 40:11
focal 92:16
focus 5:5 10:21 11:8 13:1 19:5,21 81:21 84:22 85:5,10,19 85:22 86:19 87:5 87:15 89:5 96:19 103:12 117:9 126:2
focused 6:15 11:15 85:14 98:8 101:19 103:14
focusing 5:19 6:18 7:24 10:23
folks 4:22 7:10 9:9 10:16 13:7 26:14 30:5 31:1 33:6 36:21 89:25 108:24 110:10,10 114:24 134:7
follow 14:2 32:14,20 49:2 66:19 102:22
follows 84:20
followup 116:11
food 14:21 43:1,13
foodborne 96:14
foolish 98:20
foot 74:20
force 79:23 120:13
Forces 84:10 99:8
foregoing 136:4
foreign 57:16
form 15:8 27:17 64:4 83:21 98:14 99:16 108:7 123:18
formal 15:3
formed 84:20 89:21
former 19:20 124:20
forming 83:13
forth 8:24 16:22 27:22 29:19 37:5 47:19 99:5
forward 3:24 4:6 17:25 41:12 42:18 48:6 63:22 64:3 88:15 89:1,10,23 90:5,12 92:5 114:8 117:10 119:16 130:3 133:6,21 134:16
found 2:5 38:1 48:9 79:25
four 125:17
Fourth 128:4
frame 15:25 57:8,9 97:13 98:4
frankly 78:17
Fredericks 90:7 95:22 107:20
free 11:3 19:20 20:6
frequent 86:9
friend 79:6
fruitful 105:19
full 10:2 102:4 128:3 128:21
fully 115:12 127:23
fumigants 77:22,22
fumigation 70:24
functioning 97:7,8 103:20
fundamental 125:15
fundamentally 127:2
funds 6:1 130:19
funnel 60:9
further 53:11 64:10 68:9 72:11 75:22 82:6 86:21 87:8 95:17
furthering 26:22

G

G 2:1
gain 37:13 50:24 56:3
game 120:8
garbage 95:12
gather 73:2 126:10
gauge 100:18
gauging 101:2
gelled 89:21
general 25:24 37:18 63:24 75:25 86:18 104:20 105:6 106:24 112:19,25 114:21 122:22 123:16 124:4
general-use 101:20
generally 47:13 67:10
generation 108:22 108:22
germane 135:3
getting 3:20 30:7 32:19 38:16 41:23 42:13 44:16,25 80:1 93:8 94:14,18 110:25 118:6 120:7

Gina 124:12,15
girl 20:9
give 3:23 4:10 5:21 23:22 27:11 36:21 39:19 40:3 57:8 65:18 83:7 84:4 103:15 105:6 118:1 124:13
given 17:4,13 43:18 44:8 51:24 74:22 88:18 93:5 98:4 106:22 117:4 127:5,22 128:11
gives 27:21 103:8
giving 2:24 5:9 61:15
glad 92:16
glitch 19:14
go 6:9 11:19 19:1,19 23:21 28:11 41:3 43:23 57:12,19 58:20 68:9 73:9 78:5 79:11 85:10 95:10,17 98:6,15 98:24 102:4 110:14 113:22 117:11 120:12 123:2 130:12,12 130:14 131:8,10 132:14 134:22 135:11
goal 4:4 84:3
goals 84:4
goes 26:11 52:19 53:2 74:23 75:18 123:5
going 2:9 4:7 5:3,5 6:8 11:11 13:17 14:18,22 17:18 18:6,13 21:6 22:5 23:25 31:3,3 51:18 59:18 62:17,20 65:2 70:14 74:3,5 75:20,21 77:14 78:10,25 79:7,9,11 79:12,13 80:15 83:4 88:11 89:1 90:6,12 94:8 97:12 97:14,17 102:22 107:9 119:24 120:1,7,25 121:4 127:23,25 133:1 134:21 135:16
good 2:3,4 13:13 14:11 24:1,4 26:17 35:2 41:2 48:2 61:4,6 68:12 83:10 93:15 101:9 107:1 107:3 108:1 109:4 109:9 114:22 119:11 125:15 131:17,17
goodwill 117:23
Gordon 131:7
gotcha 79:20
gotten 10:18 17:24 47:9 122:17 134:11
government 113:19 117:24 125:15
GRAGG 76:24 77:17 78:2,5
grandfather 26:24
grant 8:21,21 130:10,21 135:12
granted 8:4
grantees 6:18,24
grants 5:21,25 131:25
graphic 103:7
grapple 110:12
grappling 106:9 120:11
gray 14:14
great 6:3,13 16:3 27:2 30:4 64:25 95:12 122:19 131:13
grew 26:23
groans 133:13
ground 66:21 77:24 78:1 80:11 94:6,7 133:19
group 3:23 13:9 85:3 87:5 91:18 97:8,21 98:7,14 100:6,8 133:5,22 135:3
groups 7:7 19:21 39:11 43:5 59:17 84:8 102:12 132:9
grow 27:2
growers 22:13 26:20 55:3,4 57:19,19,20 74:24 75:1
growing 83:17 122:15
grown 20:9
guarantee 129:17
guess 54:10 74:3 121:21
guidance 8:7 11:20 12:6 24:5 72:10,12 82:4,5,14,15,18 91:13 116:19 122:24 124:1 125:23 126:12
guide 104:17,17
guideline 130:1,3
guidelines 75:4 129:12,15,24
guys 54:11 61:11 94:1 118:25

H

hadn't 8:3 102:1
hair 14:14
half 4:9 50:18 117:8 128:12 133:20
half-day 5:1
hallmark 125:10
Halloween 83:23 89:22
hammered 94:18
hammering 84:14
hand 126:17
handle 36:9 60:3 72:22 73:4
handled 51:4 61:8
handler 10:8 37:16 67:5 69:23,24
handler-related 24:17
handlers 5:19 10:4 25:19 26:7 28:15 32:11 46:3,13 73:1 101:14,16
handling 13:24 20:1 25:6 29:20 30:10 34:24
handout 12:2,18 70:7 104:21
handouts 104:2
happen 11:4,5 20:19 31:16 49:23 58:11 118:14 134:10
happening 41:16 42:16 82:10 94:13 120:14
happens 18:18 128:24
happy 48:18 68:11 91:7 115:11 119:16
hard 15:5 16:5 17:23 29:16 49:14 49:16 51:11 111:7
hard-baked 120:5
harder 40:20 56:6
harm 67:16,18
harmed 60:24
harping 58:3
HARRIOTT 44:6 44:20 45:1,7 58:19
harvesters 74:24 75:1
harvesting 75:2
hasn't 8:15
hatch 94:13
hate 24:21
haven't 38:1 45:16
he's 16:2 63:5 79:7 79:9
head 119:10,19 131:22
headline 85:11 86:19 131:20
headlines 85:9 87:16 95:15,18
headquarters 102:21,22
health 4:11 12:24 13:25 15:12 17:12 18:16 31:13 37:18 83:6,9,13,18,21,22 84:8,20,24 85:16 85:21 86:4,4,7,22 87:6,12 88:21 89:5 90:16 91:1,15,18 91:21 92:19 93:1 94:12,12 95:9 96:1 96:6,8,12,20 97:8 98:16,20 125:6 129:9,14,25
healthy 35:15
hear 20:20 21:1 30:5 57:24 59:22 82:10 93:21 111:3 131:9 131:10 135:7
heard 3:7,15,18 22:10 31:6 33:2,4 36:12 59:20 63:21 64:2,12,21 70:4 82:3 85:25 88:9 103:10 116:20 117:20 122:21 123:4,15 124:4 135:9
hearing 12:10 30:14 44:6 46:22 48:1 58:19,22
heaven 39:22
height 83:16
held 79:13 83:23
Helen 56:12
help 6:19 14:21 24:14 25:5 27:10 37:7 40:5 48:12 52:1 56:7 64:4,13 65:13 67:18 75:16 76:1 79:2 86:1 91:9 92:21 98:1 106:4 111:11 123:23 130:14 133:8

helpful 2:6 66:4 91:12 112:9
helping 3:18 41:2 82:8 134:16
herbicide 74:11
herbicides 87:7
here's 103:7 113:16
hereto 136:10
hesitant 40:17,18 42:10
Hey 26:14 124:15
high 85:20 93:10
higher 62:8
highlight 92:16
highway 68:24 69:1 69:4,13
Hill 135:2,15
hire 17:2 43:16 62:22
hired 14:5,21 16:24 16:25 18:7 34:6 42:5,17 62:21
Hispanic 37:3
hisses 11:3
hit 79:12,14
HOBBS 88:4
hold 12:11 63:11 79:17
home 39:20 69:10 69:18 95:10 135:20
hope 2:3 3:16 56:8 80:23 105:22 118:5 124:17
hopefully 3:20 39:6 117:16 135:6
hoping 94:1
horrors 93:5
hospital 96:15
hour 4:9,13 50:16 50:19
hours 60:7
house 69:8,15,16 70:2,9,15,19 99:4
housekeeping 4:14
houses 69:6
housing 71:7,8,13
Houston 94:3
huge 94:13 108:15
human 27:1 94:11 94:12 125:6
human-caused 93:19
hundred 69:9
hundred- 74:19
hurricanes 83:19 89:3 93:6,20 94:18
hype 80:15

I

I'd 29:12 30:13 67:4 69:19 88:14 111:9
I'll 4:18,22 5:20 32:4 59:25 64:7 105:12 110:17 112:24 124:7 126:16
I'm 2:9,9 12:17 15:19 16:6 17:2,3 17:18 18:6,12,12 18:13 22:16 24:8 24:22 25:8,10 27:16,25 29:21 30:4,25 35:14 38:20 49:3,14,15 50:3,12,12 52:6,6 53:21 54:10,10 59:18 60:4,19 65:5 68:10,18 73:22 75:21 76:24 77:1,3 77:4,13,14,15 79:20 80:21 83:4 83:10,11 88:12 89:23 90:6,9 92:5 92:16,20 93:21,25 93:25 97:5,20 107:5 110:17,19 113:16 115:25 116:2,16 118:17 124:25 125:3,11 125:17 127:9 129:8,25 130:25 132:25
I've 11:2 17:22,22 23:9 76:4 92:11 134:11,24
idea 14:20 16:23 17:5 48:2 51:21 52:14 98:7 105:6 119:1
ideas 3:3,9 68:9
identified 91:20
identify 54:2,4 57:3 117:10 131:5
identifying 54:9
ill 47:6 49:13 50:2
illness 96:14
illustrated 126:2
imagine 99:1,2
imagining 97:20
immediate 26:11,18 63:4,5 103:25 111:18 115:23 121:23 122:2
immediately 73:22
impact 20:16 39:16 96:20 108:16 114:12
impacted 86:13
impacts 87:4
impetus 83:15 89:1
implement 7:19 128:16
implementation 6:4 6:20 7:8 8:5 9:16 22:18 28:18,22 29:1,4 47:4 102:4 102:5,6 103:10 108:2 110:4,20 117:6,18,19 123:3
implemented 46:19 115:13
implementing 5:24 12:22 13:10 29:24 31:8 71:13
importance 3:9 93:14 95:25 106:24 112:16
important 2:13,24 10:6 13:22 15:19 16:18 19:24 20:25 23:2 35:25 40:8,19 41:12,20 42:18 44:2 60:1 67:12,24 68:5 87:22 89:4 92:15 93:9 95:4 96:5,8,12,12,15,19 111:21 117:7 135:14
impose 15:20
impressed 92:12
impressive 9:6
improve 2:19 85:17 86:17 118:1
improvements 18:5
in-between 59:16
inaudible 33:14 60:17 121:18
inception 109:17 113:12
incident 20:11 45:10 55:23 86:17
incidents 40:17,21 132:17
include 26:12 72:23 91:20 92:8
included 82:20 88:20 132:19
includes 129:14 132:3
including 13:16,21 40:10 83:19 84:9 99:4 107:18
incredible 51:14
indebted 130:19
independent 44:11 124:25
independent-min... 52:14
indicated 28:17 32:5 115:9 124:23
indicates 128:20
indication 11:11 126:24
individual 44:24,25 44:25 45:4 47:7 63:15
individuals 45:22 72:13
industries 41:16 42:16,21 52:3 62:3 114:20
industry 14:25 15:21 17:4 20:23 21:2 25:4 27:9,13 41:18,19 73:8 74:14 108:6,18 114:19 125:2
infected 45:11
inform 64:13 123:23
information 36:25 37:13,19 38:6,12 38:14,17,19,25 39:1,24 40:5 41:24 42:13 43:24 44:3 44:16 45:6,12,15 46:23 47:14,18 49:8,18,18 50:7,8 53:2,13,23 54:4,6 54:23 55:13,15,22 55:24 56:5,8,23 57:3 58:9,12 59:3 59:6,10 60:2,16 61:1,11,17,21 62:3 62:7,16,19 63:4,8 63:11,13,14 64:1 69:25 73:2 84:22 104:13 113:6 130:16,17
inherent 112:17
inherently 20:2 43:25
initial 8:16
initiatives 116:18
input 2:24 3:24 13:3 19:14 126:10 133:8
insane 111:2
insect 55:4 86:14
insects 96:14
insert 67:17
inside 69:8,16
inspection 31:24
inspections 31:21 32:6 72:19 81:5

inspector 66:1
instance 33:11
instances 46:11 69:11
instituted 9:7
instituting 9:6
instrumental 134:15
integrity 132:3
intend 55:15 102:5
intended 17:20 36:22 118:1
intense 4:1
intent 47:6 49:14 50:2 55:11,12,14 67:24 71:15,20 117:23 118:7
intentionally 84:19
interact 45:22
interest 37:10 50:5 107:7 109:2 131:25
interested 12:10 27:16 54:11 71:6 88:20 125:5 130:1 136:10
interests 50:9 117:22
internal 21:23
internally 116:18
interpretation 70:8 71:11
interpreting 71:6
interpretive 82:18
interruption 124:21 133:2
interventions 85:16
interviewing 72:24 72:24
interviews 20:8
introduce 127:11
introduction 4:18
investigate 32:7
investigation 72:23
investigations 46:12 73:10 81:5
invisible 75:19
invite 83:4
involved 15:3 17:22 19:13 22:7 39:9 67:6 69:23 72:5 111:1 113:17 119:15
involvement 17:6 100:2,4
involves 22:5
IPM 95:1,1,13,19,19 95:25
Iris 13:12 38:4 39:3 41:1 49:1 66:5 67:9 105:17
isn't 23:24 62:20 109:8 112:4 135:16
issuance 10:13,15
issue 17:4 18:24 29:16 31:1 48:9 50:14 51:3 52:7,10 53:2,16 57:23 62:22 63:21 81:11 94:2 97:18 98:13 98:15 99:21 109:18,25 114:18 128:25
issued 8:13,15
issues 2:6 3:21 11:22 19:23 37:22 46:7 46:20 53:8 58:1,11 64:5 83:22 89:5,7 91:6 95:9,9 108:2 114:2,14 117:2,9 117:10,12 123:19 124:25 126:8,20 133:7 135:4
it's 6:3 9:2,5,8,10 11:1,14,18,18 14:22 15:7 16:3 17:1,13 20:20,23 21:20 22:11,15 27:24 31:4,8,15 33:13,23 34:1 35:22,25 36:4,5 38:17 40:19 44:24 45:1,9,9 47:1 51:3 52:1,2,3,19 53:9 53:13 58:1,4 60:1 61:8 62:6,16 65:15 66:20,21 67:23 68:2,4,12,20 72:7 73:7,15,18 74:3,11 75:23 76:18 77:4 77:15,21,23 78:1 78:17,25 79:1,19 79:20 80:24,25 81:19 82:23 90:25 91:5,19 94:15 95:4 95:14 96:8,19 101:23 109:1,8 111:7,21 112:4 114:4,19 115:16 120:5,18 122:1,11 122:13,16 126:21 127:17 130:20 131:13 132:18 135:1,3,14
items 12:2 24:11 41:7 120:4

J

J 136:3,15
January 8:14,17 10:2 24:13 29:7 127:20,23
Jay 46:25 52:23 54:10 57:25 64:7 90:21 92:9,22 112:11 115:14 117:13 134:18 135:19
Jennings 83:6
jeopardizing 37:10
Jim 90:7 93:18 95:21 97:2 98:9 105:17 106:20 107:19 115:9 131:6 132:5
JM 129:6
job 37:10 49:23 51:18,20
join 127:3
joked 96:25
joking 111:13
Jonathan 134:23
Jonathan's 135:7
Jordan 124:20,22
judge 15:25
Julie 129:6 130:5
jump 67:4
Justice 13:14
justify 38:16

K

Kathy 56:13,14
Kathy's 53:21
Keaney 2:10 4:20,21 12:13,17 25:18 26:4,14 27:18 28:4 28:7 30:17,21 32:1 36:24 38:10,22 44:14,23 45:3,9 47:12 48:7 53:15 62:25 65:14 66:19 69:19 75:8 99:21 99:24 105:9,11,14 106:7 119:4 121:15,21,25 122:4 130:8
Keaney's 2:16
keep 16:19 42:23,24 51:18 57:11 58:3 68:2,2,13,16 74:4 74:15 77:16 78:20 92:17
keeping 126:12 134:13
KEIGWIN 2:3 12:14,18 14:9 17:9 19:3,17 21:13,20 22:4,22 25:11 28:9 29:11 30:3,24 31:5 33:2 34:7 35:12 36:11,16,18 38:2 39:3 40:23 43:2 44:5 45:17 46:25 49:1 50:20 51:5 52:11 53:17 54:13 55:17 56:11,20 58:17 59:18 63:20 64:24 65:9 66:5 67:3,9,21 68:14 70:21 71:24 73:11 74:7 75:14 76:23 79:4,21 81:2 82:2 82:17,25 83:3 87:24 88:1 90:6,10 90:21 92:9 93:2,18 95:21 97:3 99:18 104:22 105:17 106:20 107:19 109:14 111:6 112:10 115:14 116:4,22 118:21 119:20 121:5 122:20 123:14 124:17 129:4 130:5,25 131:8,10 132:5,14,21,24 133:3 135:19
Kevin 2:10,16 3:14 4:17,17,20 14:10 17:23 29:15 32:4 36:21 44:8 53:6,14 59:19 65:13 69:21 70:7 82:2 99:21 111:10 122:21 130:6,25 135:9
Kevin's 99:23
key 100:16,25
kick 2:7 65:13
kickoff 83:24
kid 17:1 61:16
kids 61:18 74:1
kill 44:1
Kim 93:3
kind 13:5 24:2 29:3 34:12 36:5 48:14 50:6 52:16 56:25 64:16 65:16 70:17 72:6,21 74:23 76:6 76:18 80:7 81:18 99:12 105:7 109:6 109:7,19 112:3 113:10 116:11 120:13,14 129:9 133:5,23,24
kinds 71:1 77:20

92:8 118:4
knew 34:10
know 2:15,23 4:4 11:10 15:25 17:11 17:13,15,25 18:7,7 18:8,9,15,16,18,19 18:20,25 19:12 21:12 22:8 25:2,20 26:9 28:20 30:15 30:20,25 32:18 33:15,15 34:10 37:4 38:12 39:18 39:18,25 40:3,4,13 40:24 42:9 43:4,8 43:16 45:22 46:1,5 46:16,17,19,21,24 47:7,13,23 48:12 48:21 49:10,11,13 49:15,19,22 51:22 52:4,12 53:3 57:15 57:17,18,21,23,24 57:25 58:8 59:12 60:12,21,24 61:14 61:18,18,23 62:7,7 62:11 63:8 65:4 68:7,8 69:7 70:25 71:15,19,22 72:4 72:12,13,24 73:1,1 73:1,24 74:1,11,12 74:13 75:2,18,21 76:4,16 79:5,11,13 80:14 81:14,22 82:14 89:14 91:4,8 91:15,19,21,22,24 93:22,23,25 94:7,7 94:10,11,25 96:1,9 96:13,18 99:4 105:24 107:7,10 107:16 108:11,21 108:22 109:5 110:4,17 112:15 112:20,22,24 113:8,11 114:6,8 114:10,14,15,16 114:18,20 115:1,5 115:5,8,11 116:13 117:5 118:10,13 118:14,17 119:23 120:4,24 124:22 126:5,19 128:21 129:18,19 133:11 133:12,17 134:7 134:14
knowing 49:14 57:17 58:5 74:4
knowledge 118:6
knowledgeable 31:1
known 22:14
knows 79:6,10,10 126:16
Kunkel 124:12
Kunstman 131:6,6,9 131:11

L

L 97:1
label 67:16 81:6,8 81:21,25 82:17 107:17
labeling 65:24 82:1 82:15
labels 31:9,10 65:14 77:23
labor 25:5 34:14 71:8
LAJOIE 73:13
Lance 134:14
land 57:16
landing 66:14
lands 78:24
lane 97:1,1
language 37:9,22 39:13 43:11,11 45:13,19,23,25 46:9 49:13 51:17 54:25 61:24 62:9 62:12 81:23 82:17 115:24
large 37:25,25 42:5 68:18 80:16 94:20
largely 42:6 62:20 123:25
larviciding 94:8
lastly 87:10
late 23:5 97:6
law 113:15 120:4 123:11 125:2
laws 33:1 117:17 119:9
lawsuit 102:10
Layne 4:10 83:4,10 83:11 87:25 88:25 90:9,11 92:1,22 93:17 94:23 96:24 97:17
lead 30:6 32:5 46:7 72:17 79:14 91:2 95:6 99:6 110:18 128:1,7,10,11
leading 41:6 67:12 102:4
leads 10:1 12:3 93:20 125:14
learn 16:4,4,5 27:2
leave 112:24
led 13:15 127:1
left 27:7 41:8 50:13 62:12
legal 27:24 43:8,17 43:22 58:11 62:22 63:7
legally 127:22
legislative 119:2 120:2 128:17
legislature 120:1
legit 54:12
legitimate 48:23 126:11
LEIBMAN 14:10 30:4,20,22 41:1 51:6 53:6 60:18 61:4 67:22 106:21
lengthy 126:25
let's 18:10,25 36:19 50:15 78:20 88:9
level 1:18 17:18 18:6 18:11 24:24 25:7 34:19 51:4 62:8 102:8 121:3
levels 14:1 32:2
Leyla 2:8 14:9 17:9 19:6 22:10 97:3
liable 79:13
license 32:25
lies 24:6
life 52:20 93:10
light 15:16 16:13
lightning 48:20
liked 28:20
liken 95:9
limbo 29:3,8
limit 17:6 25:3 74:12 89:15
limitation 74:20
limitations 55:9
limited 34:15
limits 14:3
line 2:9,11 9:17 21:10 46:1 97:11 98:4 102:16 106:9 110:6 128:15 134:13 135:17
lines 86:24 103:1,2 119:15 128:21
list 9:1 55:11 70:20 85:6 95:14
listed 91:25
listen 114:25 135:2
little 4:9 19:18 22:16 22:16 26:23 28:21 29:21 48:4 50:13 51:8,23 60:19 78:6 80:23 88:11 97:6,8 98:6 101:8 112:22 113:6 118:19 126:21 135:7
Liza 22:23 23:16 25:11 28:9,11 31:7 32:1 44:5 45:17 48:11 68:14 70:21 71:24 79:21 81:2 88:3 90:21 109:14 110:17 111:6 112:10 117:17 119:4,5,22 120:22
loaders 111:25
loading 26:25 101:17
Lobby 1:18
lobbying 135:16
local 123:11
location 79:8
long 14:22 19:10 66:24 75:6 76:18 85:6 95:14 102:3 106:9 114:4,5 117:16 118:14 125:10 134:4
long-term 13:25
longer 75:23
longstanding 115:2
look 15:16 18:24 27:19 41:15 48:7,8 62:23 66:20 67:24 81:6,16,24 104:1 105:12 123:21 130:3
looked 80:8 81:11
looking 54:4 64:14 68:5 73:2 111:23 120:10 132:25 133:10,14
looks 132:16
lopsided 29:23
Lori 54:13 55:17 92:9 93:2,18
lose 42:11
losing 51:20
lost 128:25
lot 6:23 27:5,6 33:3 39:12 49:4,20,24 50:10 53:23 68:17 68:20 73:19,22,25 80:12 83:13 87:18 87:18 89:25 91:6 94:17 99:9,11 106:7 107:1,2 112:5 113:22 114:2 117:20,23 118:18 133:19
lots 15:13 68:9 116:22
love 35:20,21 67:4

M

maintain 96:19 102:6
maintaining 85:20 93:10 96:7 106:25
major 85:8 95:15,18 99:20 133:12,16
majority 108:17 127:6
making 56:6 58:14 69:17 80:18 109:4 118:17 130:23
manage 48:9
managed 12:7
management 22:5 55:4,5,5 83:5 84:10,23 86:20 87:6 91:16 92:15 92:18 99:8,10,16 108:5
manages 134:3
mandate 12:24
manmade 83:18 86:2,5,13,15
March 101:22
margins 50:16
marketplace 35:2
matching 135:12
material 5:9 9:7,15 10:17 78:7
materials 6:19 8:1,2 8:7,18,18,23 9:22 10:10,17 23:10 24:9 28:19,23,24 30:7,12,15 74:10 74:22 130:15
matter 44:4 48:21 60:7 72:8 98:25 106:13
maturity 14:1 25:7
MCCURDY 17:11 97:5
MCLAURIN 33:10 59:24 60:22
mean 31:22 49:9 57:17 61:25 69:2 80:20 89:8 93:25 95:14 110:4 115:25 120:9,22 120:22 121:1
meaningful 98:23 125:10
means 12:9 52:17 87:10
meant 71:11 82:9 124:13
measure 58:15
measures 67:17
measuring 94:11
meat 4:16
medical 37:15,16 38:19 39:24 40:6 41:23,25 43:7 46:23 58:10 59:10 63:4,5
medium 77:25
meet 46:9 81:9,9
meeting 1:10 2:8 3:6 3:7,15,16,20 4:11 4:15 5:1,2 10:22 10:25 11:2,21 12:16 83:8,12,24 83:25 84:2 87:13 87:17 88:7 92:23 97:1 103:11 132:25 133:3,9,10 133:13,15,17 134:4 135:21
meetings 6:16 90:12 90:14,15,15 134:10
meld 85:9
melted 76:18
member 7:5 33:23 103:24 111:19 115:22 129:9 134:24
members 10:20 14:5 25:16 26:2,11 35:20 48:13 83:20 83:25 84:6 85:8 87:17 88:19 95:3 124:10 126:18 131:23 133:22
membership 88:5 88:18,22 89:13,17 89:24 90:2
mentioned 8:11 39:12 44:9,15 47:15 72:1,18 88:25 89:6 90:12 108:17 112:12 120:22
mentioning 64:7
met 73:4
methods 84:23 100:20
Mexico 39:21,23,25
mic 19:18 26:15,16
midst 95:7
migrant 54:20 55:1 57:16 68:18 71:7
Mild 36:17
million 94:3
mind 23:3 36:5 78:20 92:17
mindful 64:8 130:25
Mine's 78:6
minimal 70:24
minimize 68:6 74:16 75:3 87:8
minimizing 68:1
minimum 5:7,17,17 5:18 11:23 13:8,10 13:21 14:4 15:17 15:17 16:19 17:15 19:5 20:24 25:15 25:19 26:1,9,10 28:14 29:10 34:2,5 35:16 36:6 77:1 101:11,12 103:14 103:16,21,22 104:4,4,5,15 105:6 105:19,20 106:25 112:20,23 113:2 114:17 115:18,19 119:24 123:16 124:5 125:20,22
Minnesota 24:21
minor 74:20
minors 13:23
minute 50:11
minutes 87:23
misquoted 93:9
missing 49:21
mission 15:5 18:15 68:8 84:3,14,14,18 85:4 88:13 91:19
mist 70:24
misuse 73:6
misused 32:18
mixed 80:1
mixer/loader 34:25
mixer/loader/han... 35:1
mixers 111:24
mixing 26:25 101:17
mode 24:3
model 79:24
modeling 87:2
modification 3:10
modifications 3:4
modify 32:24
moment 41:4 102:15
monetary 32:23
money 135:12
monies 130:21,22
months 10:9 22:3 30:10
morning 2:3,14 3:12 4:7 13:13 26:17 83:10 107:4 116:12 131:21 134:24
morning's 2:8 126:1
mosquitoes 92:7 93:24,25
mother 35:14
mothers 108:23
move 15:16,19 16:22 17:25 36:20 39:22 48:6 63:19 88:15 92:5 100:8 106:4 114:8 120:3 128:2 132:1 133:21 134:16
moved 101:23
movement 57:14 100:12 103:9
moves 69:2 72:8 77:8
moving 3:24 4:6 72:7 89:23 99:17 110:5 117:9 133:6

N

N 2:1 97:1
naive 18:13
Naled 94:4,19
name 54:9
Nancy 26:14,17 53:17,18 55:11 56:20,21 65:13 67:3 69:19 75:16 76:2 110:10 116:4 121:25
narrow 56:25 63:17 87:15 98:22
narrowing 63:2
NASDA 22:9 48:12
nation's 132:1
national 7:3,23 83:17 85:22 89:2 91:4,8 108:5
natural 83:18 86:2,5 86:13 93:20
naturally 108:5 109:2
nature 57:14 112:6
NC 20:6
near 77:10,12
nearby 67:14
necessarily 24:7 43:22 45:3,4 127:10
necessary 5:23 8:23 8:23 23:13 54:12 59:11 64:11 128:24
need 8:12 9:15 16:17 18:21 20:25 21:7 40:22 42:1,9 42:12 47:20 50:22 54:19,22,23 55:23 58:23 60:3 62:2

63:6,7,13 68:15 70:17 72:17 86:17 87:8 97:6 107:15 114:12,13 116:1 117:18 122:23 123:2,2,25 124:5 127:16 128:10,17 129:15
needed 7:18 10:17 23:7 24:25 41:13 72:12 73:10 127:7
needs 4:18 9:15,22 44:10,16 51:10 52:8,9 58:25 59:2 59:4,4,5,8,14,15 63:3 64:8 71:16 86:9 89:17 127:10
negative 7:15
neighbor 55:7 60:5 60:20 61:8,16
neighboring 69:8
neighbors 35:19 56:2
neither 136:5
nemesis 130:2
nervous 29:18
network 130:18
Network's 17:13
networks 43:5
neutral 58:24 59:1
never 51:2 109:21
new 4:11 9:21 10:3 10:7,14 22:14 23:18 30:9 83:8 87:11 88:6,12,19 88:23 100:17 102:1,7 106:5 110:14,15 113:25 114:1 128:8 133:21
news 131:20
next- 69:6
nexus 129:10
NGOs 84:8
Nichelle 44:5 55:18 56:11 58:17 95:4
night 2:7 71:14
NIOSH 84:10
no-brainer 17:17
no-compete 61:19
nods 65:5
noncertified 101:3,5 101:7,10,13,13 103:19,23,25 104:6,8 105:3 115:20,22
normal 24:4 88:12
North 24:16,21 57:17 60:3 109:15 110:3 113:7
notable 126:21
note 10:6 135:15
noted 92:22
notes 74:9
notice 8:13 10:9,16 30:11,19 75:10 101:25 126:5
notifying 75:1
noting 95:24
notion 76:16 79:15
November 1:13 133:14
nuanced 126:7
nuisance 92:3 93:1 96:2,3,4,4,5,10
number 2:6,22 3:7 6:18 9:9 11:1 22:6 37:24,24 41:7 80:16 86:25 88:19 91:11 97:21 98:19 99:3,4 100:8 103:13 110:24 116:24 117:4 119:11 120:23 134:6
nutrition 55:5

O

O 2:1
object 36:3
objection 35:16
objective 85:23 86:21 98:22
obligations 68:21
observations 32:6 72:19
observe 66:10
observing 32:18 66:13
obvious 38:20
obviously 3:2 6:12 9:9 18:12 32:8 44:24 48:8 69:3,14 75:9,12 81:4 91:10 105:15 106:11 108:2 111:3 112:21
Occupational 15:11
occur 10:11,12
occurred 55:23 111:5 132:17
October 83:23 133:14
odd 15:7
offer 33:7 47:17 125:9,16
offhand 105:11
office 22:5 83:7,11 83:11 117:1 132:8
Officer 83:6
offices 84:11
official 44:13 72:17 88:6 103:4
Officially 8:9
officials 28:14 45:19 58:10 72:3 112:13 113:19 115:10
offset 79:9
offsite 68:22
oftentimes 34:15 96:5 131:15
oh 40:25 41:25 45:1 84:16
okay 4:2 13:7 16:25 17:9 21:16 22:2,8 25:11 26:21 28:3,6 28:9,10 29:11 30:3 30:22,24 31:22 34:7 35:12 36:16 36:18 38:7 39:3 40:25 51:12 54:13 54:16 55:17 56:11 58:17 59:18 62:25 64:24 65:9 66:5 71:24 76:2,11,23 76:24 77:4 82:22 83:3 88:25 90:6,21 97:3 99:18 105:12 105:16 111:7 112:10 116:7,10 118:21 122:3,19 122:20 123:14 124:9,19 132:24
old 25:1 103:22 115:20
once 27:23 85:3 120:12
one-page 12:18
one-pager 104:25
ones 125:22
onsite 68:21 71:8 72:18,20
open 13:8 83:25 89:12 90:13,15 104:22
opening 89:24
operate 27:15
operating 33:18 85:24 86:1
operation 33:13 49:24 64:8
operationally 64:17
opinion 41:11 63:3
opinions 4:3
OPP 83:5
OPP's 125:11
opportunities 27:11 72:20 97:21 98:6 126:15
opportunity 16:3 34:21 40:2 88:23 89:11 90:4 116:25 124:14 125:9
opposed 5:18 78:15
opposite 40:16
options 123:20
order 10:23 15:22 51:14 65:20 88:16 89:14,16 116:16 116:24
Oregon 8:22 9:13 40:11
organization 19:12 22:24 23:17
organizational 84:2
organizations 13:15 47:3,10,24 125:1 130:13
organizing 43:7 83:24
original 58:20 59:12 62:13 101:22
originally 110:23
other's 4:3
ought 128:14
outcome 136:11
outline 12:3
output 97:24
outreach 6:6,10 11:6 20:5 72:9 106:8,17
outside 63:10,15 68:22 69:15 106:7
overall 109:8
overarching 85:12
overhaul 120:25
overlap 92:19
overlay 132:18
oversees 132:8
oversight 135:18
overwhelming 89:13 127:6
owned 69:7
owner 111:19
owner's 26:11
owners 26:12

P

P 2:1
packet 12:19
packets 104:2
page 115:19
PALMER 29:12 93:4
parents 95:11

part 3:6,22 12:4 15:3,17 28:22 49:23 64:7 68:10 81:8,24 93:7 96:17 108:14 114:9 117:18 121:13,17 133:14
partial 9:1
participants 109:24
participate 109:23 131:13
participated 13:15 18:3
participating 124:11 131:2 133:22
particular 44:21 53:11 68:20 71:15 71:23 76:17 79:9 92:6 98:15 107:14 107:21 110:21 117:9
particularly 30:13 31:13 72:13 85:18 91:7,14 113:1 118:9 135:3
parties 136:6,9
partner 86:10
partners 84:9 110:18
parts 61:12 81:21
pass 51:23
passed 108:22
Pat 30:24
pathogens 83:19
paths 64:2
pay 24:14
PBI 131:7
PECK 19:9,19 21:16 22:2,8 43:3 56:13,21 57:7,13 105:2,10,12,16
penalties 31:4,18,18
penalty 31:19 32:22
people 2:22 18:3 20:3 21:1,2 23:1 23:22 24:22 25:3 30:15 39:12 43:10 43:13,13 49:12 50:24 52:22 55:21 56:4,6 60:15 61:2 61:25 63:11 64:21 65:4,15,20,25 66:24 68:17 69:8 69:14 71:19,21 74:6,15 75:21 76:11,13,16,20 77:2,10,16 79:2 80:11,19 90:19 94:6 96:15 98:14 109:3 110:12,24 111:2 114:6 116:25 118:13 119:23 133:16
PERC 23:10
perceive 96:4
percentage 119:10
perfectly 35:2 108:24
period 6:6 22:1 53:10 75:25 102:3 114:5
persevering 29:15
person 44:12,22 45:5,10 51:11,13 54:8 58:23,25 59:2 59:5,8,13,15,17 66:16 69:3,5,22,22 70:12,15 79:12,14 124:20 129:5
personal 24:12 51:7
personally 133:20
personnel 37:16 59:10 102:22,23 102:23
persons 72:4 103:17
perspective 5:17,21 17:12,13 34:14 46:2,15,21 64:6 81:4 94:17 110:2
perspectives 3:18 33:3
pest 74:14 84:10,23 85:16 86:22 87:9 87:11 93:14,15,24 95:25 99:8 108:5,6 108:14,18
pesticide 1:9 16:15 20:12 22:25 24:4 24:12 31:9 33:7 36:25 39:16,20 40:21 45:12,19 46:4 49:18 51:22 52:13 60:6,10,14 60:15,25 65:14 67:13 72:2 73:6 74:11 76:4 77:5 78:21 79:8 81:3 83:7,12,14 84:21 96:22 107:15 108:8 110:8,18 112:13,14,16,21 117:1,25 124:24 125:2 130:17
pesticides 13:24 16:8,24 17:7 20:1 20:18 21:1 23:2 24:14,25 25:7 28:13,16 29:20 32:17 36:10 45:11 49:8 57:5 68:1 84:7 85:19 87:3,11 88:21 91:11,14 93:10,12 95:2,25 101:20,20 103:18 105:23,24 109:1 112:17 125:7
pests 76:13 84:24 87:6 91:18,20,21 92:3,8 93:1,1 96:3 96:3,4,5,12 129:13 129:13,14 130:3
petition 7:2 8:5,12 22:9
petitioned 7:7
phase 89:22
phone 26:15 118:24 131:13 132:11,22
photo-voice 20:6
pick 44:18 45:4 65:6
pickers 74:25
picking 20:10
piece 18:12,16 109:7 120:2 122:25
pieces 109:12
pilot 27:8 66:13,14 112:2,2
pipeline 22:15,20
pivot 118:13
place 9:21,25 10:6 15:7 18:4 21:24 23:7 24:8 27:2 46:13 71:7,14 102:17,18 103:6 106:6 108:1,1 110:7 112:8 113:18 117:25 120:7,17
placed 47:8
places 56:1
plan 85:23,24 86:11 87:1 91:8 103:5 106:3 110:7,15 113:8 114:9 121:1 123:8
plane 77:5
plans 30:16 102:7,9 102:20,24 103:2,4 106:5,10,10,11,16 113:5 121:1
plant 55:5
plastic 95:11
play 82:8 85:19 126:17
plays 95:1 100:25
please 53:14,22 62:5 131:5 133:17
pleased 30:4 111:5 125:11,17
plenty 42:1
plethora 85:6
plight 54:18
plus 90:7
point 9:20 36:12 41:5 53:11 54:17 63:7,9 65:7 69:1 78:6 92:17,25 108:14 110:22 118:5,13 127:17
points 125:17
poisoning 67:13
policies 32:21
policy 84:22
political 113:23 120:5
pool 34:14
pop 74:5
population 37:2 42:3,17 51:15,24 54:20 68:18
populations 87:9
portion 127:14
portions 125:24
pose 59:21 104:12
posed 104:24
position 13:20 15:11 55:14
positions 4:3 100:3 100:9
possibility 32:17
possible 3:4 35:11 42:24 56:10 67:1 89:18 127:18
possibly 27:16 51:19 55:11 63:6
posted 56:24
poster 9:23
posting 49:20
postpone 128:23
potential 3:10 32:10 47:6 73:6 111:17 116:19
potentially 71:19
Potomac 1:20
PowerPoint 130:8
PPDC 3:5,15 4:12 5:1 10:21 11:2 12:16 83:12,20 84:25 86:25 88:6 89:4,7,8 97:22 98:8,11,11,12,24 99:14 103:11 119:18 124:10 126:10,13,18 127:25 132:4

134:25
PPE 66:17 67:2
practical 39:25 67:17
practice 80:9 125:13
precaution 79:1
precautions 14:2
preclude 81:7
predictive 87:2
predominantly 37:3
prefer 4:21
pregnant 20:16
preparations 4:15
prepare 7:9,19 8:1 22:18,21 30:18,18 86:3
preparing 29:7
prescriptive 100:14
present 14:8 66:1 80:19 98:10 133:12
presentation 11:4 12:15 130:8
presentations 6:15
presented 3:19
presents 37:4 40:1 133:16
Preston 14:9 17:9 19:7,17 40:23 43:2 54:14 55:17 56:11 105:1
pretty 6:10 9:5 68:5 85:12 105:21 127:25
prevent 65:20 67:18 87:1,8
preventing 67:15
prevention 86:23
prevents 37:3
previous 44:6 72:2
previously 112:13
PRIA 6:1 129:11,11 130:19,21 135:6 135:10,11
primacy 32:20
primarily 6:21
primary 39:13 43:11 45:23
prime 76:11
principals 50:17
prior 6:7,8 14:18 27:4
private 25:16 26:2 32:10 33:15 34:19 100:18 103:18,24 104:6,9 105:5 112:15 115:21,24 115:25 116:6,8
privates 109:16
privy 20:5
probably 11:1 23:5 52:23 73:23 78:14 78:25 84:17 88:7 108:24 115:17 118:24 130:2
problem 17:7 40:16 53:7 93:13
problematic 42:22
problems 25:4 38:1 42:8 57:22 58:10 62:1 128:19
procedure 85:25 86:1
procedures 127:21
proceeding 29:5
proceedings 136:7
process 11:14 13:15 13:19 14:25 16:2 16:21 18:4 20:13 21:22,23 22:4 23:11 41:6 43:9 44:23 88:5,14 89:20,23 97:7,10 97:16 100:1 102:13,21 103:3,9 106:5 107:22 109:9 113:18,23 123:10 126:10,25 128:17,18,22
processes 123:1,4
produce 8:22
producer 46:20 72:25
producer-growers 35:8
producers 29:9 71:5
product 75:12 80:5 81:22
product-specific 75:9,11
production 8:21 20:22
productions 8:20
productive 9:11 87:17 90:1
products 32:13 36:2 81:14 129:17,19 129:21
professional 108:9
program 1:9 2:21 24:16 31:5 83:14 84:21 106:13 109:17 110:8 113:8,21 117:25 128:6 133:8
programs 82:7,20 83:7,12 102:8 106:14 109:23 113:12,13 115:3 117:1 120:17 130:12,15,24 135:12
prohibit 131:23
projects 20:6
promote 95:19
promulgated 2:25
promulgating 21:22
proper 87:3 88:16 112:16
properly 16:10 27:3 58:14 67:5 76:18 109:5
properties 53:13 80:2
property 52:15
proposal 100:4
proposals 2:19
propose 12:8,25
proposed 5:14 53:19 100:9 110:23
proposing 100:14
protect 12:24 15:22 16:10 17:17 18:15 18:21 19:2 20:22 21:1 35:23 36:1,9 42:25 43:14,15 50:25 55:21 58:6 71:20 125:5
protected 18:9 41:17 46:14 52:2 68:13
protecting 14:20 15:5,15 17:14 29:25 50:6
protection 1:6 2:20 4:8 5:4,11,14,19 6:9,21 8:6 11:13 12:20 13:22 14:4 14:16,20 15:9,18 25:18 26:5,6,9 28:1 31:15 41:11 41:15 42:20 52:9 58:15 61:12 65:2 65:11,17 66:22 67:12,25 85:1 101:16 106:23 117:15 118:15 125:19 126:22 127:19,22 131:22
protections 13:21 28:16 41:8,13 46:4 46:13 72:3
protects 30:1
proud 16:6
provide 36:25 38:13 39:2 56:23 58:9 59:4 70:17,20 82:18 84:25 98:23 130:15,16,17 133:7
provided 37:15 47:23 66:20 70:7 72:10 113:10 120:20 136:5
provider 41:23,25
provides 80:23 129:20,24
provision 5:7,8 13:10 31:9 36:21 36:22 37:7 38:1 40:14,19 41:22 48:9 56:16 64:15 64:17,20 65:16,23 65:24 71:6,16,20 71:23 82:8 101:1 123:17,22,23
provisions 5:11 7:12 7:13,17,18 8:6 12:6 13:4,17 19:4 31:13,14 37:25 38:10,11 40:12 65:15 66:2 73:4 99:25 100:16 106:12 125:18 127:7
Pruitt 131:22
public 3:6,16,20,22 4:11 12:24 18:16 22:1 73:17,17,18 83:6,8,13,17,21,22 84:8,20,24 85:15 85:21 86:3,4,7,22 87:6,12 88:21 89:5 90:16,20 91:1,14 91:18,21 92:19 93:1 95:9 96:1,6,8 96:12,20 98:16,20 113:18 124:19 125:10 126:15 129:5,9,14,25 131:2,5 132:10,22
published 9:19
publishes 10:9 30:11
purposefully 106:9
purposes 110:6 133:1
pursuing 27:17
purview 96:21 98:19
put 14:21 15:9 17:23 38:15 42:15 43:14 51:19 55:11 92:14 95:11 114:1
puts 57:20 107:18

putting 21:18 42:25 47:14 77:5 80:9 95:23 110:7,14 117:25

Q

qualify 48:5
quality 92:13 96:8
question 13:2,5 21:9 25:23,25 44:11 45:16 56:13 58:20 59:12,25 60:19 68:23 72:15 79:23 80:3,4 90:24 91:17 93:6 105:2 106:1 115:16 116:11 117:14 121:9,22 122:8,17 131:11 131:12,20
questions 3:3 12:19 21:10,14 23:25 29:22 38:2 39:7 46:18 47:9 66:3 74:18 88:2,5 104:17,24 108:11 121:7,8
quick 21:13 22:9 65:5 88:1 97:4 105:2 131:11,12 132:24
quickly 86:8 97:15 123:14 131:1
quite 4:25 11:14 19:14 52:6 70:23 71:21 84:13 92:17 94:25 95:19 109:8 122:17 130:22

R

R 2:1
radio 66:11
raise 126:17
raised 3:19 34:17 94:5 117:14
ranchers 23:20 52:14
ranching 53:5
range 25:21
ranks 17:25
rare 135:1
rate 111:13
rationale 7:8
rationales 7:2
raucous 11:1
REABE 25:13,22 26:8,21 27:25 28:3 28:6,8 66:7 67:1,8 79:22 82:13,22 111:9
reach 110:1
react 78:9
reactions 78:11
read 84:17,18 111:12
reads 84:19
real 20:19 21:13 128:19 130:23
realities 41:3
reality 5:24 6:4
realize 134:21
really 2:23 3:16 4:17 6:5 9:1 14:12 15:5 15:19 20:19 29:8 30:4 34:1 40:7,19 41:2,20 42:17,22 44:4 48:21 49:14 49:15 51:3,11 52:6 52:7 54:10 56:5 61:9,21 62:15 67:23 71:16 74:4 76:12 77:4,25,25 78:13 79:16 80:7 89:16 94:1,5,15,18 94:20 107:1,2 110:12 114:4 122:11 123:4 125:11 126:6 133:6 134:1,8
reason 127:8
reasonable 36:4 118:19 126:11 127:2
reasons 3:10 27:8 61:22 101:23 107:2,3 118:18
reauthorization 135:5,10
recall 7:5 105:10,11
recalled 20:11
recap 123:14
received 7:2,14 11:6 100:7 116:17,22 117:2
receiving 46:4 131:24
recertification 100:23
recess 65:8
recognize 71:12 115:2
recognizing 55:20
recommendation 89:19 98:12,17 123:17
recommendations 11:9 63:21 84:23 84:25 89:9 90:18 98:24
recommended 64:2
reconcile 104:13
records 52:16 57:11 73:3
recovery 86:10
recycled 95:12
recycling 95:10
reduce 131:25
reduced 136:4
reducing 109:20
reentry 35:10
refine 95:17
reflect 3:24 64:21 82:9 123:12
reflects 124:8
reform 3:6,16,19 4:25 10:22,23 103:12 104:16 116:15,23 117:11
reg 4:25
regard 48:22 70:23 85:13 96:2 108:10 135:5,17
regarding 28:25 29:3 65:10 73:6 74:9 84:23 93:6 106:22 108:25
regardless 79:19
regards 25:13
regional 6:25 84:11 102:23
Register 8:12 9:19 10:9,14,16 21:17 21:18 30:11 101:24
registrants 84:6 125:3 129:18
regs 52:3
regular 93:24
regulate 91:11
regulated 73:8
regulation 3:3 5:5 5:11,13,14 6:2,8 6:20,22 7:1,11,20 8:6,25 9:18 18:18 19:1 23:23 25:19 26:5,6,6 27:21 28:1,2 31:15,17 38:11 47:19 48:22 100:15 101:2,16 101:19 102:25 103:5,14 110:21
regulations 2:19,25 3:4 5:25 6:6,21 10:24 13:11 33:1 113:16,25 119:9 119:13 126:4,4
regulators 73:7
regulatory 3:6,15,19 6:14 7:13 8:10 10:22,23 21:7 23:4 31:6 45:19,21 46:2 72:2,17 81:3 100:5 103:12 104:16 110:8,12 112:13 114:4 115:10 116:15,23 117:11 119:8,25 123:10 125:5 131:19
REI 75:24
reinforce 76:15
reiterate 13:20 67:11
related 5:23 78:14 83:22 136:6
relates 88:21 104:5
relationships 25:21
relative 5:4,18 8:24 12:20 99:22 103:13 104:3 136:8
relatively 125:23
released 23:10
reliable 52:18
relief 40:22 94:14
relieve 39:2
relieved 37:12
relooking 10:24
relying 107:16
remain 3:11
remaining 59:22 90:7
remark 130:6
remember 10:21 41:21 42:14,15 52:8 92:5 111:21 119:9,19
remembered 56:16
remembering 96:11
remind 41:5 62:14 92:3
reminder 99:24
remiss 124:9
remote 131:4
remotely 124:11 131:3
reopen 89:19
reopened 88:22
reopening 90:2
rep 38:16 123:17
repeat 7:23 16:20,25
report 32:19 40:17 40:21 60:6,25 72:22 73:5 97:20
reporting 90:3 97:11,12
reports 32:7,15

40:13 46:7,11,22
represent 33:6
representation 43:17,22 63:15
representative 5:7 11:23 36:20 37:6 37:13,21 38:7,13 41:14 42:13 44:8 44:10,19 45:2,6,8 46:5,16 47:5 48:5 48:24 51:11 52:25 53:19,22 54:1,24 58:21 60:1,11 62:5 63:14 125:20
representatives 39:8 92:12
represented 58:15
representing 54:3 84:6 117:22 125:3
reproductive 29:18
request 53:25 126:13
requested 83:21
requesting 49:17
requests 37:16
require 11:13,17 32:12 53:25 105:5 119:2,8 120:1
required 10:8 30:10 36:24 56:23 57:11 63:11
requirement 23:4 25:14,15 29:4,10 34:2,5 36:7 37:14 37:20 49:5 79:3 81:10 113:11 121:11
requirements 9:21 12:22 13:1 21:5,5 21:25 29:6 81:6 101:12 104:15 113:13 114:1 120:17 128:8 129:24
requires 8:9 21:25 25:7 75:10 103:17
requiring 129:13
Research 24:16
reservations 76:17
resistance 86:20,23 87:1,4,5,9 91:16 92:15,18 99:10,16
resistant 87:11
resolve 50:19 98:11
resolved 50:11,15
resource 114:14
resources 14:13 32:2 45:24
respect 110:5
respectful 4:3
respond 69:19 86:1 86:8,18 104:18
respondent 72:25
response 7:15,16 8:11 32:21 36:15 53:9 64:23 76:20 83:2 85:23 86:23 87:4 89:13 91:8 94:11 104:20 116:23 123:13 132:23
responses 119:18
responsibility 10:4 15:10,12 20:21,24 21:4 22:12,15 31:7 43:12 52:1 58:4,5 118:2
responsible 15:15 17:16 79:18
rest 60:4 82:11 127:3,15
restricted 75:25
restricted-use 32:13 101:20 103:17 105:23 109:1
restriction 108:15
restrictions 42:19 75:11 108:10
result 69:20 86:5 100:4
resume 70:12
retail 34:20 35:17
retailer 35:14 36:8
retailer's 34:14
retaliation 37:5,23 44:9 46:8
retired 124:23
retirement 126:17
review 22:5 102:2,9 103:3
revise 14:19 106:11 113:4
revised 8:6 9:18 99:25 102:18,25 103:5 106:10 123:7
revision 13:16 14:16 19:15 106:15
revisions 106:18
revoke 32:24
rich 9:10
Richard 76:23 79:23
Rick 4:20,24 6:7 7:5 14:12 90:9 124:15 124:22 131:6 132:12 134:20
riders 73:16,24
riding 74:1
right 12:11 24:1 42:21 43:21 45:12 50:12 52:24 53:19 58:8 62:4 63:20 65:7,12 66:6 70:4 77:16 81:13 88:7,9 94:9,13,18 98:1 106:4 109:8 111:11,13 118:11 120:11 121:17,24 122:10 135:17
rights 43:16
risk 51:20 94:4 107:18
risks 51:12 85:15 87:12
roads 73:17,18,18
robust 65:3 94:15 113:12
rod 48:20
role 50:4 82:7 85:19 86:22 89:6 91:10 91:14 93:8,9 95:1 95:6
roles 91:13
room 16:11 24:22 29:13 43:16 133:15 134:3
rough 12:3
roughly 4:8 79:10
routine 32:6 72:18
routinely 56:2
rule 4:14 13:16 14:3 14:8 26:9 29:24 31:3 41:6,10,24 43:9 49:4,5 52:5 53:24 62:11 69:21 71:11 73:23 76:17 79:20,20 99:22 100:1 102:2,18 110:14,23 114:11 115:18,24 116:3,5 116:19 118:15,15 119:25 120:7,12 123:5 125:24 126:22 127:9,19 127:24 128:3,5,5 128:11
rule's 102:10
ruled 15:14
rulemaking 11:14 11:18,19 21:21 107:22 125:21,25 126:6 127:9,11,21 128:18
rules 3:9,9,10,14 4:6 15:21 18:14 19:15 20:3 21:22 70:6 98:2 116:17 122:6 127:6,14,15
run 60:13
running 24:15 97:6
rural 34:14 35:24

S

S 2:1
safe 108:9 135:20
safely 36:10
safety 6:23,23 9:23 10:3 14:2 15:11 22:25 31:13 36:25 38:6 48:3 53:23 59:8 61:22 110:19
SANSON 121:6,17 121:24 122:3,9,12 122:19
Sara 136:3,15
sat 14:25 15:1,2
satisfied 110:17
saw 76:5 118:11,11 118:12 131:21
saying 27:24,25 33:21 61:14 65:15 78:20,23 80:8,21
says 26:8 31:14 38:5 41:25 65:24 69:22 70:8 77:10 115:19
scale 24:12
scarcity 32:2
scared 62:24
scary 76:3
scenario 49:11,16 56:10 61:4,5
scenarios 82:5 86:12 124:2
schedule 102:6 128:9
scheduled 87:14
schematic 132:19
science 24:16 131:17
science-based 130:16
scientific 131:24 132:3,6
scientists 131:16 132:2
scope 98:22 105:8 127:24
Scott 131:22
screen 6:13 7:22 8:20 10:7 102:16 103:8
scripted 120:19,19
season 23:18
second 5:1,2,12

10:21 12:23 49:7 64:12,13 84:15 86:19 103:11 126:21
secret 51:22
secrets 49:10 55:4
section 63:19 115:18
sector 92:20
see 6:12 7:22 9:3,4 19:20 28:10 33:6 33:17 36:19 60:8 63:22 64:10 71:23 73:19,25 74:8 92:16 97:12 102:3 102:16 111:7 119:2,18 120:7,14 122:9 124:11 128:18 130:13 131:1 134:10
seeing 65:5 85:8
seek 40:18 42:10
seeking 104:11 125:9
seen 17:22 23:9
SELVAGGIO 70:22 115:16 116:7,10
Senator 134:23 135:4
send 96:14 119:17
sends 57:20
sense 18:25 21:7 23:22 35:2 45:16 48:19 76:21 84:5
sensible 125:5
sensitivity 53:4
sent 39:20
sentence 76:10
separate 11:13 112:3
separately 81:12
sequence 104:20
seriousness 24:24
serve 44:15 88:24
served 95:6 97:10
services 46:1
session 4:25 5:12 111:11,14 131:15
sessions 6:16 133:23
set 36:6 61:9 104:17 111:18,19
set-aside 130:21
set-asides 129:11
setting 26:2 90:17
seven 22:3 34:9
shameless 12:17
share 27:12 53:22 73:14
shared 97:14
sharing 85:1
Sharon 68:14 70:21 74:19 111:6 112:10 115:14
she'll 23:17
sheet 11:25 66:20
sheets 37:1 38:6 53:23 59:9
sheltering 71:7
shining 19:22
short 76:10 84:12 87:19
short-term 64:4 123:18
shortcut 115:17
shortly 87:14
show 2:10 4:21,21 4:22 14:11,17 16:4 38:16 73:19,21 99:21
showing 128:9
shows 9:17
Shultz 124:12
SHULZ 124:15
sick 55:23 56:4,7 71:22
side 33:4,5,6 34:21 50:14 51:1 89:5 98:7 111:8 123:3 123:15 133:6 135:13
sign 61:18
signed 54:8 129:5
significant 80:1 88:19
significantly 100:3
silent 7:18
similar 12:9 34:25 37:25 40:12 64:16 64:19 87:6 105:25 123:22
simplify 60:14
simply 96:4
sincere 117:23
single 78:23
sir 92:24
sitting 19:11
situation 33:16 35:9 40:7 70:10
situations 62:2 91:12,15 121:19 123:21
six 10:8 22:2 24:15 30:10 128:12
size 71:2 77:24 78:14,16 81:20
skeptical 22:17
skimpy 12:1
skip 134:21
slide 30:8,8 101:24 102:3 106:2
slides 84:15 130:9
slightly 93:9
small 20:25 27:14 27:15 39:21 50:18 74:20 108:19 114:1 125:24 127:11,25
smaller 77:23
smart 24:20 80:22
smoke 70:24
solicited 10:25
soliciting 12:17
solution 93:13
solutions 3:21 4:5
solve 53:7
somebody 25:8 31:23 36:6 51:21 52:15 109:19 111:17
somebody's 70:1,2,2 70:9 74:5
someone's 77:10
son 24:12
sons 16:3 108:22
soon 9:5 75:17,22 77:15
sooner 28:21 97:24
SOP 85:25 86:11 99:2
sorry 56:21 90:9 97:6
sort 39:5,25 42:14 49:10 50:7 51:9 52:16 53:1 66:22 93:24 106:4 107:17 119:24 126:7 129:8
sorted 11:7
sorts 23:25 52:18 53:1 120:23
sounds 88:9
sourcing 25:5
South 1:20
soybean 132:19
soybeans 16:15
space 33:7 50:13
Spagnoli 129:6,8
span 87:19
speak 23:16,17 32:1 36:14 39:4 42:7 51:17 104:23
speaking 26:7 125:4 129:8
speaks 9:14
spec- 121:25
Specialty 129:6
species 94:17,17,21
specific 33:1 40:12 45:9,10 47:4,9,22 54:4,6 81:19 91:24 98:13 100:20 101:8 105:9 108:16 109:18
specifically 37:20 96:21
specificities 56:15
specificity 87:15
specifics 52:5
specified 113:13 129:12
specifies 31:11,12
specifying 10:14
speed 80:14
spend 3:12 4:13 80:20
spending 50:16
spent 14:14
spiel 25:10 76:22
spirit 41:9
spite 14:2
spoken 29:13
spotters 66:9
spray 20:12 65:15 65:24 66:13 68:16 74:16 76:10,13,13 76:16,20 77:2,10 79:7,9,11,23
sprayed 20:13 60:23 75:23 94:4
spraying 65:20 68:24 75:20 80:20
spread 27:22 62:19
spring 10:21 110:7 133:10
spun 88:8
staff 2:16,22 6:14,25 17:23 47:4 92:20
staffer 135:1
staffs 6:15,25
stage 18:13 23:13 24:6
stakeholder 2:17,23 3:8 6:17 7:7 14:24 100:2,4 126:25
stakeholders 7:10 18:2 104:12 107:25 123:7
stand 131:16
standard 2:20 4:8 12:21 14:16,20 15:18 41:12,15 61:12 65:2,11 67:25 85:24 86:1 106:15,23 125:19 126:22 127:19

standardization 129:16
standardizing 129:23
standards 85:20 93:10 100:18,22
standing 102:14
stands 102:15
start 4:7 13:8,12 14:11 17:21 25:6 41:2 70:5 128:23
started 16:1 26:25
starting 34:8
state 6:14 7:3,24 8:22 9:13 22:13 24:16 28:13 29:3 30:6 31:6,18,19 32:2,5,20 33:1 39:14 45:21 46:6 51:4 72:17 79:14 82:19 91:2 99:5 100:5 102:8,23,24 103:5 106:2,10,10 106:12,16 110:2 110:11,18 113:4 115:5,6,10 117:17 120:8,25 123:1 128:1,7,10,11 129:1 132:13
state's 113:23
stated 101:23 111:23
statement 35:10 54:7 80:21 84:14 84:15,19
states 1:5 7:9,19 8:1 8:8 27:22 28:24 29:5 32:20,22,23 37:24,25 40:10,10 41:19 45:20 48:8 51:2 52:4 60:4,10 64:15 70:4 85:21 91:9 93:11 96:2 102:19 103:1 104:3,14 105:5,7,9 106:4,11 108:3 109:11,13 110:5 112:23 113:4,9,11 113:14,21,24 114:7,17 115:3,8 118:10,11,18,23 119:1,7,7,12,23 120:2,16,23 123:5 123:7,22 128:16 128:22
stating 74:12
status 104:3
statute 21:25 119:13
statutes 113:15
statutory 7:13,17 123:10 127:20
staying 96:25
stays 103:5
steal 2:9 61:17
step 15:4 20:25,25 41:12 42:18 68:12
stepping 135:16
steps 22:7 106:3
stick 77:14
sticking 25:10
Stinging 96:14
stop 73:22,25 77:11
stopped 65:19
storming 89:22
straightforward 65:16
strategizing 120:12
strengthen 68:10
strengths 121:2
stressed 14:12
stringent 122:7
strong 42:24
stronger 41:7 129:1
strongly 126:9 128:1
structural 108:6,13 108:18
Student 20:7
studies 129:19
stuff 68:16 134:13
subcommittee 126:13
subcommittees 126:20
subgroup 2:18
subject 81:15 126:23
submission 7:23 123:6 129:13
submissions 102:24
submit 102:7,8,20 103:2
submitted 103:13 107:24
subsequently 123:9
subset 54:20
substantial 8:21 11:22 12:4
substantially 6:1
substantive 11:12 11:17
subworkgroup 98:14
success 27:7 36:19 51:2 115:3
successful 84:13 85:8 89:14,17
successfully 99:13
sued 102:12
suers 102:14
suggest 18:13
suggested 83:20 127:12
suggesting 18:12 110:24
suggestions 47:22 85:7
suicide 110:25
suitable 86:14
summer 20:5
summers 24:14
superceded 77:23
supervised 121:13 121:18,19
supervising 116:2
supervision 101:4,7 101:9,18 103:20 103:24 104:7,9 105:4 112:7 115:21
support 5:22 6:4,19 17:24 28:14,15 29:10,12 46:5,16 46:24 63:24 72:3 86:25 112:14,18 112:20 113:2 125:12 126:19 130:11,14,20,22 134:7
supported 6:1 86:16
supporting 87:8
supportive 108:7
supposed 2:10 49:19
sure 25:8,14 29:8 42:23 46:10 50:25 52:7 55:10 58:14 59:21 60:4 68:6 70:14 72:12 77:12 79:2,20 82:22 91:23 92:20 98:2 107:5 109:3,12 112:6 113:16 114:10 115:5
surprising 40:14
surrounding 107:8 124:6
survey 30:17 119:5 119:7,17
Susan 83:5 99:19
suspend 32:24 69:25 70:3,9 80:12
suspending 80:18
system 43:15 117:24
systems 29:18,18

T

table 2:22 3:25 5:10 13:7 14:25 15:1,2 16:20 19:11 21:15 27:19,21 31:2 33:6 41:9 43:1,14 48:2 48:13,25 50:17 55:19 64:9,22 82:10,11 88:23 104:3 115:17 117:21,22 122:11 122:16
tables 14:22
tactics 86:14
tailored 86:11
take 4:12 9:25 13:2 17:18 18:6 20:25 21:24 41:4 50:18 55:9,25 56:9 59:18 64:3,24 65:4 71:14 89:18 90:1,6 94:24 95:18 98:13,21 102:17 107:12 113:4,15,17 117:7 117:16 127:15,19 135:15
taken 14:7 48:24 67:18 102:17 108:4 115:17
takes 81:18
talent 87:21
talk 30:8 50:23 57:22 59:2 83:13 92:23 95:16 110:17
talked 41:18 55:3 92:11 93:23 95:2 95:12 98:9 99:9 107:1,2,3 123:25 135:9
talking 3:21 16:12 16:14 17:1,2 22:10 25:6 42:3,5 49:9 50:3,16 51:9,25 52:8 56:1,4 59:19 61:6,20 71:17,17 82:13 91:18 92:6 97:18 99:6 101:14 111:17 120:10 121:16 135:6
target 72:7 78:23
task 23:8 34:24 79:23
tasked 23:1 59:7
tasks 24:17,18
taught 95:8
Taylor 34:8 50:21 118:22 120:15 134:3
team 134:8,9

tech 134:6,7
technical 85:18 121:9
teenage 15:24 16:1
teenagers 16:11,12
Teleconference 124:21 133:2
tell 4:21,22 29:9 49:24 95:11 98:18 110:23 128:1
telling 100:7
tends 77:22
tentacles 99:10,11
term 34:10,10 101:15
terminology 85:25
terms 17:6 51:10 67:25 68:7,11,13 68:19 70:17 107:14 109:12 133:9
territorial 28:13
territories 91:3,9
test 86:7 129:19
testing 129:16
tests 86:4 96:6
Texas 40:11
text 103:8
thank 2:4 12:13 13:13,18 17:11,19 19:2,5,9 22:21 28:8 29:12,15 30:2 33:10 44:4 50:19 58:16 63:20 67:8 67:10,22 73:13 83:3 84:16 87:16 87:20,24 88:4 90:23 92:1,22,24 93:16,17 94:23 96:24 97:1,5 105:13 115:8 121:6 122:3,19 124:16 125:8 129:3 130:3 132:20,21 133:18 133:22,25 134:2,8 134:9,16 135:18
thanks 14:10 26:16 29:16 41:1 47:1 65:7 69:21 93:19 95:22 96:23 99:18 106:21 107:20 111:11 115:14 118:20,22,25 124:17 129:4 130:5,25 132:5 134:20 135:19,20
that's 2:13 4:2 8:17 9:4 12:3,9,19 14:16,22 15:10,18 17:16,17 19:13 23:14 24:20 25:10 25:22 33:17 34:25 40:14 41:1,20,24 43:4 44:2 47:14 51:3 57:12 62:21 62:24 66:16,20 68:4,5 69:2 70:19 72:8,10 74:5,12 76:11,21,22 78:15 79:20 80:6,21,22 81:10,22 82:24 88:12 90:1 91:15 92:16 101:1 102:13,14 106:18 112:7 116:2 120:13,14 122:7 126:6,24 127:2 135:8
theory 70:13
there's 5:5 8:12 14:4 15:13 21:21,23 22:4,6 31:9 37:8 38:25 47:6,25 49:4 49:24 50:13 57:7 60:18 61:23,24 62:11,12 65:23 69:11 70:1 78:21 79:12 80:12,16,19 82:7 95:14 100:18 100:25 102:3 104:2 106:8 108:1 114:2 117:23 122:22,25 127:5,7
they'll 60:7 73:25
they're 20:1 21:2 24:19,20 25:16 31:16,20 32:13 33:19 37:2 39:16 40:17 42:7 51:16 52:14,17 54:3,4 55:23 61:3 62:17 62:24 66:13 69:10 69:14,16,18 70:14 74:2 77:24 78:10 78:10 80:13 83:18 93:13 96:11 104:20 108:21 116:2 120:19 122:9
they've 19:12 22:10 37:17,17 42:9 45:11 47:23 113:7 131:16
thing 18:23 23:2 34:13,25 35:15 52:24 64:12 71:4 76:6,12,14 79:16 90:11 115:4 120:3
things 4:18 10:12 19:22,25 20:19 43:8 47:17,19 50:24 52:19 62:9 69:6 70:19 75:9 81:24 86:25 95:15 96:9,10 98:10 118:1,8,13 120:24 121:4 123:6 130:7 130:22,23 132:25 133:21 134:22
think 4:1 14:11 15:18 16:10 17:15 18:17 19:4 20:18 20:20,24 21:6 22:11,15 23:11,15 23:16 27:12 33:4 33:11,14 34:1 35:2 35:7 36:4 38:22,23 40:18 41:1,20 42:16 43:12,15,18 44:2,3 46:2,6,6 48:13,17,24 50:10 50:11,18 51:7,9 52:23,24 53:2,7 54:11 55:6 57:13 58:13 59:20,20 60:1,18,23 61:5,6 63:1,10,17,18,23 65:12,21 66:3 67:11,23 70:9 71:10 72:5,6,8,10 72:15 74:18 75:19 78:16 79:22 80:4 82:2 87:22 90:1,25 91:1,5,6,9,15 92:4 92:8,15 93:15,21 96:3,3,7,19 97:3 97:23,24 105:19 106:1 107:1,18,21 108:1,1,3,11,21 109:1,5,6,8,18 110:3,9,16,18 111:20,22 113:3 114:7,16,22 117:14 118:10,18 118:23,24 119:4 122:21 125:9 126:1 127:7 128:6 128:8 132:17 133:25 134:4,18 135:14
thinking 2:7 22:20 41:21 42:25 44:7 52:9,20 68:18 76:25 77:4 96:10
third 7:4,5 18:23 127:17
third-party 62:4
THOSTENSON 22:24 52:12 75:15 79:5 109:15 119:22 120:21
thought 11:8 21:7 51:3 56:15 76:6,8 111:1 117:6
thoughtful 94:10 128:6
thoughts 94:21
thousand 8:16
thousands 23:19 32:8
threat 94:12,12
threats 87:12
three 7:6,6 11:22 13:4,16 35:14 85:10,11 87:16 95:15,18 102:7 111:10 114:3 135:4
threshold 110:2
throw 60:16 64:7
tight 89:17
Tim 71:25 73:11 74:7
time 2:17 7:9,18,25 8:3,8 9:16 12:14 13:6 14:14,23 15:25,25 16:5 19:14 21:10 23:9 27:5 34:9 36:14 38:3 42:11 49:14 49:16 56:19 57:8,9 65:12 72:23 74:12 74:17,21,22 75:5 76:5 80:15,20 84:12 87:18,19,20 89:4,15 95:16 96:23 97:10,13 98:4,4 102:1,16 103:1,2 106:9 110:6 113:4 114:3 114:4,5 117:7 118:15,19 119:15 120:6 123:3 128:10,15,21 131:1 133:1 134:4 135:2
times 4:1 46:6 73:19 73:22
tip 32:19 72:21 73:5
tips 31:21 32:7,15
to-do 70:19
to-face 6:16
tobacco 34:9
today 2:12,12 4:2,16

5:3 11:11 12:4 13:17 14:11 30:14 38:23 58:23 65:10 95:17 105:20 116:14,21 124:2,8 125:3
told 34:11
tool 21:2 76:15 79:20
toolbox 21:3
tools 21:3,4,6,8 23:3 23:13 24:8 36:2
top 119:10,19
topic 65:10 85:7 87:22 99:7,20
topics 5:2 85:9,18 98:19 116:13 133:5 135:9
totality 81:12
town 39:21
toxic 19:20 20:6 105:24
toxicity 75:12 78:17 78:18
trade 49:10 51:22 55:3 125:2
trails 74:1
train 8:8 24:10 35:5 35:23 36:1,9
trained 27:4 35:4 66:9,16 67:5 69:23 108:25 109:4
training 2:21 4:14 6:11,14,24 8:7,18 8:23 9:22 10:8,10 10:16,17 23:13,18 24:7 27:4 30:6,10 30:12 76:4 99:22 108:7 109:23 111:1 124:3 128:2 130:17
trainings 109:25
transcribed 136:8
transcription 136:4
Transcriptionist 136:1,16
transparency 126:14
travel 66:10
traveling 39:14
travels 135:20
treated 5:20
treatment 39:24 40:6,18,21
treatments 87:2
tribal 28:13
tribes 91:2,9
tried 15:13 37:20 41:15 101:8 128:16
tries 49:17 111:10 121:2
triggered 31:20,21
TROSSBACH 28:12 32:4 45:18 48:15,17 72:1 81:3 90:23 112:12 119:6
true 80:21
trust 40:3 44:15 45:5,15 50:23,25 60:15 61:2
trusted 59:5
try 4:4 12:8 18:14 19:1 35:8,10 39:23 45:24 46:9 59:25 64:10 73:3 119:7
trying 38:20 39:16 50:13 59:7 65:18 65:18 67:15,25 68:2,12,13 74:15 74:16 77:15 99:11 120:8
TUCKER 74:8
Tuesday 83:23
turn 4:18 89:24
turned 34:12
tweaks 125:24
twenty-something... 35:15
twice 97:23
two 1:13 3:8,13 8:16 10:12 12:19 16:3 24:17 57:11 59:17 63:21 64:2 69:11 112:3 117:2,9 124:10,19
two- 57:8
two-way 66:11
type 11:18 32:2,16 40:22 46:1 64:19 73:5 81:5,20 114:19 119:8 123:22
types 39:8 64:5,10 77:18 78:7,9 81:15
typewriting 136:4
typical 22:2,3

U

U.S 54:21 85:1 131:21
Udall 134:23 135:4
ultimately 82:14
underscore 41:22 51:6
understand 3:18 16:16 17:7 25:14 35:16,18 38:20 41:2 46:17 47:11 50:4,12 54:19,22 72:9,13 74:2 78:19 79:15 80:4,25 87:1 88:15 91:10,13 104:11,13 105:7 110:13 112:16 121:21
understanding 9:24 16:9 24:23 34:4 47:2,21 49:5,7 53:9 120:15
understands 112:6
undertake 21:21
undertaken 106:8
undertakes 125:25
unethical 50:24
unfair 56:3
unfortunately 46:6
uniform 78:8
unique 27:13 111:16 112:4
United 1:5 85:21 93:11 96:1
universal 48:1
University 9:12 24:17 132:13
unnerving 55:25
unrealizing 54:18
unscrupulous 61:15
untrained 71:22
unusual 33:25 50:1
upcoming 117:5
update 4:10 83:8
upheld 71:16
upward 97:25
urge 94:10 99:14 130:12
USDA 132:18
use 9:9 21:4,6 23:1 31:10,11,15,20 32:6,9 35:19 36:1 36:2,2 47:14,18 55:2,12,15 72:19 87:3 112:5,16 125:7 126:10 129:21
useful 9:17 23:21 47:16 82:4 100:7 126:2
user 33:5 55:12 64:6
users 46:4
usual 15:10
usually 11:2 15:11 27:14 31:20
utilized 64:17

V

VA 1:21
vague 101:6,6
validly 38:14
values 85:15
Vance 136:3,15
variables 80:13,17
varied 64:5
variety 5:21 6:17 10:24 23:9
various 27:22 40:10 103:7 104:3 115:1
vary 31:18
vast 98:19 108:17
vector 86:14 92:7 96:14
vehicles 73:16
vein 86:2
venues 97:21
verbally 54:2
verification 47:17
versed 59:6
version 100:21
versus 16:17 68:22 93:24
view 36:13 108:14
violated 7:12,17
violation 31:16,20 66:2 73:23
Virginia 32:9 113:19
virtually 123:1,8
volition 43:23
voluntary 18:19
volunteered 123:21
volunteers 132:4
VROOM 47:1,21 48:11,16,19 49:22 92:11 117:14 134:20
vulnerabilities 61:24
vulnerability 42:3
vulnerable 29:17 56:7 71:21

W

wait 69:10 73:25 128:15,22 133:24
waiting 30:22 114:9
walk 3:14 13:4 53:20
walking 69:3 70:3
want 2:4 9:3 13:3,20 16:25 17:25 18:1 19:5 21:10,12 25:14 29:19 36:21 38:22 39:4 41:22 42:8,11,14,23

45:11 46:10 47:16 51:6,8,18,19 52:7 54:6,17 55:10 57:22 58:2 59:20 59:21 60:24 61:18 61:25 62:1,14,23 63:22 65:4 67:3,11 68:9,10 70:22 71:22 73:13 78:5 78:12,24 87:7,16 87:20 90:11,23 91:23 95:17 98:5 107:10,12,21 111:14 112:5,5 114:23,24 115:8 118:8 122:9 125:8 125:16 127:17 131:14 133:6 134:2,2,8,9
wanted 3:12 13:3,18 27:9 33:2,5 41:4 49:21 65:10 67:22 93:12 95:22 100:12 114:16 131:1 134:16,22
wanting 46:3 53:3 56:4 60:16,21
wants 9:8 51:25 61:16 68:16 79:8 104:23 119:17
Washington 6:2 20:9 40:11 132:13
wasn't 7:25 56:15 57:7 94:4,7
watch 74:25
watching 128:22
water 80:1
way 15:4 34:12 52:20 55:5 60:3,9 60:12 61:2 94:14 98:1 99:12,14 104:19 108:9,9 109:18 116:18 117:3 120:19 126:6 133:24
ways 3:23 65:18 97:25
we'd 11:19 12:10 104:12
we'll 4:12,12 11:20 13:5,12 19:3 30:17 36:18 60:7 65:6 81:6 88:10 133:4
we're 4:7 5:3 11:10 12:4 13:17 16:12 16:25 24:2 25:24 27:14 29:3,8,13,14 29:23 30:14,22 34:4 41:21 42:3,5 49:9 51:9,24 52:8 52:9 56:1,4 61:6 61:10,14,20 63:1 63:18 65:21 66:9 71:9,16,17 72:20 74:15 77:15 78:20 78:23 80:17 81:4 88:10 89:22 91:17 97:6 99:6,17 101:14 102:22 104:11 111:13,17 111:23 117:3 118:5,6 121:3 122:16 132:5 135:16
we've 4:8,14 33:2,4 55:2 58:13 65:9 71:5 82:6 98:9 106:8 107:1 109:16 116:12,14 117:20 122:17 135:6
weakening 71:2,23
weaknesses 121:2
wearing 66:16
webinars 6:16
website 9:2,11 82:19 119:11,16
websites 130:12,13
weed 24:15 55:4
weigh 89:11 90:4
weird 76:6
welcome 2:10 90:14
welfare 52:22
well-defined 50:22
went 13:19 14:13 16:14 29:6 89:19 89:21 100:1
weren't 8:2,2,18 22:17 31:24 66:24 100:21
what's 30:17 68:9 87:6 107:17 114:10 135:15
where's 77:6
White 99:4
WHITTINGTON 34:3 38:5,18 63:1 68:15
who's 16:24,25 111:18
whoever's 50:14
wholeheartedly 125:13
wide 25:21
widespread 63:24
willing 36:13
willingness 114:25
wind 80:14
wind's 70:13
windy 79:7
winter 23:20
withstand 94:19
witness 66:2
woman 20:15
won't 2:12 111:21 113:19 114:21 120:3
wonder 94:8 132:3
wonderful 124:24
wondering 31:2 80:24 116:2,16 121:11
word 68:3
wording 93:14
words 48:21 61:1
work 13:6,19 14:12 14:15 16:2,4,5 17:23 18:1 19:10 19:13 27:3 29:16 35:17,17 42:7,12 43:5 51:12,14,16 52:1,8,12,13,22 54:21 61:25 64:5 65:18 79:24 89:16 92:13 94:1 98:7,15 98:23 101:15 102:20 104:19 109:11 115:11 123:6,9,18 124:23 125:11 126:20 127:4 128:23
workable 4:5 127:7
worked 2:18 9:5 15:4 20:6 24:15 48:8 51:11 99:2,3 100:6 109:13 127:1 134:5,5
worker 2:20 4:8 5:4 5:11,14,19 6:9,21 8:6 10:8 11:13 12:20 14:16,19 15:9,9,17 24:18 25:18 26:5,6,9 28:1 30:9 31:15 37:2,16 39:19 40:2 41:8,11,15 44:14 44:17,17,24,25 45:1 49:6,8 52:1 54:5 55:16 56:18 56:24 57:8 61:10 61:12 62:15,17 63:9,16 64:8 65:2 65:10,17 67:24 68:1,13,18 69:22 101:16 106:23 107:7,18 117:15 118:15 121:16 125:19 126:22 127:19,22
worker/handler 54:3,8 56:24
worker's 58:14
workers 14:5 15:6 15:15,23 18:8 20:22 28:15 32:11 34:6 35:18,24 37:2 40:6,16 41:17 42:6 42:21,25 43:14,18 44:20 46:3,13 54:21 55:1,20 58:6 58:7 61:13,22 62:23 63:25 64:18 67:19 68:2,6,20 71:17,18,18 73:2 75:10 77:12 101:15 118:1,3 121:20
workers/handlers... 72:4
workgroup 4:11 15:3 50:18 64:4 83:9,14,21 84:1,4 84:5,18,20,24 85:8 86:24 87:17 88:8 88:10,13,24 89:1,5 89:6,14,16,20 90:12,16,16 91:1 92:12,23 93:5 94:22,24 95:3,24 96:17,18,20 97:17 98:11,16,17 99:13 123:18 126:14 129:9
workgroup's 90:18
working 2:16 16:9 22:11 28:16 33:13 33:17,22,25 40:15 52:3 56:18 57:1 61:16 107:22 108:23 117:3 118:23,25 122:16 124:24 125:1 126:5
works 80:24 115:5,6 122:25 134:23
workshop 110:9
worry 50:23
worth 82:24
wouldn't 2:11 35:5 60:12
WPS 26:18 28:22 42:15,19 62:13 68:10 105:21 121:12 122:14 123:15

write 6:2
writing 47:10,24 54:1 58:14 80:9
written 54:7
wrong 49:3
wrote 111:2

X

Y

Y 97:1
Yard 1:20
Yea 38:5
yeah 25:21,22 34:3 43:3 47:21 48:16 53:18 57:10 67:4 79:5 90:10 97:5,17 105:10 116:9 119:5,22 120:21 121:6 122:1,4,12 132:12 134:20
year 11:5 19:13 23:5 57:9 89:15 96:15 97:13,23 98:4,6,9 98:20,23,25 127:20
year-old 25:3
years 2:15 3:1 24:15 24:17 25:1 27:8 29:16 57:11 74:14 76:5 102:7 103:22 106:25 107:3 113:9,9,17 114:3 115:20 118:12 124:24 128:12,22 131:18 134:25 135:1
yeoman 2:21
yesterday 2:5 4:17 107:13 125:12 126:12 129:10 131:14
yesterday's 16:13
you'll 102:3 128:24
you're 21:14 26:4 27:23,23,24,25 34:16 36:13 40:24 47:13 48:1 53:8 68:12,24 69:17 75:18,20,20 77:4,5 77:25 78:7 79:12 79:13 80:10 81:13 82:13 89:8 90:14 118:11 120:7 121:16
you've 12:3 48:13 85:25 92:13 93:4 93:23 104:2
young 15:22 20:9 26:25 27:1,2 71:22 74:1
younger 16:23 17:14 20:12 35:3

Z

Zika 83:16 89:3 91:3 93:5 95:7,20 99:2,3
zone 5:6 9:25 10:5 11:24 12:1 65:12 65:17,23 66:3,8,15 66:17 68:4 72:6 73:20 74:4,6 78:22 123:24 125:20
zones 81:23

0

1

10:05 64:25
10:20 65:6
100 70:23 77:3,21
11 106:2
12- 29:19
15 27:8 118:12
16 16:2,7 27:22 103:22 104:5 109:22 115:20
16-year-old 16:17
16-year-olds 29:19
17-year-olds 109:22
171 121:13,17
18 8:14 15:18 16:19 16:23 17:14 18:8 24:13 25:1,8 27:22 28:14 33:14,19,22 34:2,4,4,6 36:3 74:14 103:18 104:4 106:25 107:16 111:18,22 112:3,20,23 113:2 114:22 122:22
18- 25:2
18-year-old 16:17 17:5 26:10 108:15 109:16 110:1
1980s 109:17
1st 133:14

2

2 1:13 115:19,19
20 29:16 107:3
2001 14:15 22:11 86:15
2015 110:24
2016 124:24 132:18
2017 1:13 29:6 101:23
2018 8:14,17 10:2 29:7 102:1,19 133:9
2021 102:20
21 76:5 84:6
21st 30:1
22202 1:21
22nd 101:25 102:19
25 78:1
2777 1:19
2nd 10:2 133:10

3

30 113:9 131:18
31 19:13
31st 83:23 133:14
3rd 133:11

4

4 129:11,11
40 113:9 121:13 124:24
4th 101:22 116:14

5

50 110:9,10

6

6 94:3

7

7 30:8
7,000 32:9

Message

From: Zimmerman, Dea [Zimmerman.Dea@epa.gov]
Sent: 8/9/2017 9:27:02 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
CC: Layne, Arnold [Layne.Arnold@epa.gov]; Mosby, Jackie [Mosby.Jackie@epa.gov]; Parrott, Patricia [parrott.patricia@epa.gov]; Wormell, Lance [Wormell.Lance@epa.gov]; Ryan, Emily [ryan.emily@epa.gov]; Dinkins, Darlene [Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov]; Sisco, Debby [Sisco.Debby@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: PPDC Membership Package
Attachments: Action Memo from AA 8 1 17.doc; mm01 - New Members Letter from Administrator 8 1.doc; mm02 - Renewed members Letter from Administrator 8 1.doc; mm03 - Reappointed RGE Members Letter from Administrato 8 01.doc; mm04 - New RGE Letter from Administrator 8 1.doc; mm05 - Letter from Administrator Thanking Former Members of PPDC 8 1.doc

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

-----Original Message-----
From: Rousey, Toni
Sent: Wednesday, August 09, 2017 3:10 PM
To: Zimmerman, Dea <Zimmerman.Dea@epa.gov>
Subject: PPDC Membership Package

Hi Dea

The PPDC membership package has been approved. Please prepare the final package for signature.

Thanks,
Toni

Toni Rousey
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Federal Advisory Committee Management Division
  Committee Policy and Oversight
OARM/OROM
Room 1102 WJC East Building - MC: 1601M
202-564-5356 – Phone
202-564-8129 - FAX
rousey.toni@epa.gov

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Appointment/Reappointment of Members to the Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee

FROM: Wendy Cleland-Hamnett
Acting Assistant Administrator

TO: E. Scott Pruitt
Administrator

The Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee (PPDC) was originally established in November 1995 and has been renewed every two years as required by the Federal Advisory Committee Act. At this time, we are proposing the appointment of 23 new Committee members and the reappointment of 16 existing PPDC members. The new members represent the following constituencies:

- 5 Chemical Industry/Trade Association/Bio Industry representatives
- 2 Environmental/Public Interest/Animal Welfare Group representatives
- 1 Farmworker representative
- 5 Federal Government representatives
- 5 Pesticide User/Grower/Farmer Group representatives
- 3 Public Health representatives
- 2 State/Local/Tribal representatives

The PPDC provides a public forum for our stakeholders to provide high level policy advice to EPA on a broad range of evolving pesticide policy, regulatory and program implementation issues that are associated with evaluating and reducing risks from use of pesticides. It also provides a mechanism to foster communication and a clearer understanding of pesticide issues among our many stakeholders.

Summary of Recommendations

A high level of interest has been expressed by many individuals and organizations to serve on the PPDC. While not required, we always formally solicit interest in the PPDC through notice in the Federal Register. Our proposed list of PPDC members represents a diverse group with a broad range of interests and backgrounds, including representation from the Department of Agriculture; Food and Drug Administration; Armed Forces Pest Management Board; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; as well as one representative for EPA regional offices.

While the size of the PPDC is large at 39 members, we believe that the breadth of pesticide policy and program implementation issues we would like to bring before this Committee will

require the broader membership and benefit from a wider perspective. Each of the proposed new and existing memberships has been contacted regarding availability and willingness to serve on the PPDC. All have expressed interest and have agreed to serve, if invited.

There are 23 former members, many who completed six years of participation on PPDC. Thank you letters are enclosed for all former members not being invited back to the PPDC.

It is recommended that the following individuals be appointed to replace the individuals who will not be returning to PPDC:

- **Chemical Industry/Trade Associations/Biopesticide Industry:**
  Stephen Bennett, Consumer Specialty Products Association
  Rachel Callies, S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc.
  Aaron Hobbs, Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment
  Charlotte Sanson, Bayer US, LLC
  Jay Vroom, Croplife America

- **Environmental/Public Interest/Animal Welfare Groups:**
  Preston Peck, Toxic Free North Carolina
  Edward Wakem, American Veterinary Medical Association

- **Farmworker Representative:**
  Iris Figueroa, Farmworker Justice

- **Federal Government:**
  Richard Keigwin, US EPA, Office of Pesticide Programs
  Walter Alarcon, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
  John Gorman, US EPA, Region 2
  Eric Hoffman, Armed Forces Pest Management Board
  Charlotte Liang, Food & Drug Administration

- **Pesticide User/Grower/Farmer Representatives:**
  Amy Asmus, Asmus Farm Supply Inc.
  Jim Fredericks, National Pest Management Association
  Dominic Lajoie, National Potato Council
  Damon Reabe, National Agricultural Aviation Association
  Tim Tucker, American Honey Producers Association and American Beekeeping Federation

- **Public Health:**
  Leah Colton, Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment
  Stan Cope, Medical Service Corps, United States Navy, Retired
  Leyla Erk McCurdy, Children's Environmental Health Network

- **State/Local/Tribal Government:**
  Liza Fleeson Trossbach, Association of American Pesticide Control Officials
  Andrew Thostenson, American Association of Pesticide Safety Applicators

All of the members being nominated for reappointment have made very important contributions to the work of the PPDC, which we feel is critical in maintaining the high level of advice and assistance that we have received from the Committee over the years. We reviewed the proposed nomination package to ensure the proposed nominations result in a committee that remains balanced in the points of view expressed and we feel fortunate to have such a high caliber of individuals willing to continue their service to this Committee.

Criteria for Selection

We recommend these actions after careful deliberation on the types of experience needed in the PPDC to constructively assess OPP programs and work collaboratively with fellow committee members to help OPP be responsive to the needs of the affected public, non-governmental organizations, industry and state and tribal governments.

We are making arrangements for the next PPDC meeting to be held November 1-2, 2017. We would be pleased to provide you with any additional information or brief you on this request if you so desire. Questions about the package can be directed to the PPDC Designated Federal Officer, Dea Zimmerman, at 312/353-6344.

We have attached letters of invitation to new and existing members and letters of appreciation for outgoing members. Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Attachments

[MERGEFIELD First_Name] [MERGEFIELD Last_Name][MERGEFIELD Educational__Title]
[MERGEFIELD Job_Title]
[MERGEFIELD Company]
[MERGEFIELD Address]
[MERGEFIELD City], [MERGEFIELD State] [MERGEFIELD Zip_Code]

Dear [MERGEFIELD Courtesy__Title] [MERGEFIELD "Last_Name"]:

I am pleased to invite you to serve as a member of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee for a term beginning August 21, 2017, and ending August 20, 2019. [MERGEFIELD Point_of_View_Sentence]

The Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee was established in 1995 as a public forum to advise the EPA on various issues involving the implementation of pesticide policies, regulations and programs. Through the committee the EPA continues to foster meaningful communication with our stakeholders as well as provide a clearer understanding of a wide range of pesticide issues, many of which are often scientifically and technically complex.

The committee comprises a broad array of stakeholders representing: federal, state and tribal governments; industry and trade associations; pesticide-user, grower and farmer representatives; environmental and public-interest groups; farmworker advocacy groups; public-health organizations; animal-welfare groups; and the general public.

The committee is chartered under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, which regulates and governs its operations, including public participation and access to documents. A copy of the *FACA Essentials at EPA* is enclosed for your reference. Although we are unable to offer you compensation for your services, you would be entitled to receive travel and per diem allowances.

To accept this invitation, please return the enclosed membership acceptance form using the preaddressed envelope provided or fax it to Dea Zimmerman, the committee's designated federal officer, at (312) 408-2246. If you have any questions, you may also contact her at (312) 353 6344 or zimmerman.dea@epa.gov.

I hope you will accept this appointment so that EPA can benefit from your experience and perspectives.

Sincerely yours,

E. Scott Pruitt

Enclosures

ED_002528_00039570-00002

[MERGEFIELD First_Name] [MERGEFIELD Last_Name][MERGEFIELD Suffix][MERGEFIELD Educational__Title]
[MERGEFIELD Job_Title]
[MERGEFIELD Company]
[MERGEFIELD Address]
[MERGEFIELD City], [MERGEFIELD State] [MERGEFIELD Zip_Code]

Dear [MERGEFIELD "Courtesy__Title"] [MERGEFIELD "Last_Name"]:

I am pleased to invite you to continue to serve as a member of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee for a term beginning August 21, 2017, and ending August 20, 2019. [MERGEFIELD Point_of_View_Sentence]

As you know, the Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee was established in 1995 as a public forum to advise the EPA on various issues involving the implementation of pesticide policies, regulations and programs. Through the committee, the EPA continues to foster meaningful communication with our stakeholders as well as provide a clearer understanding of a wide range of pesticide issues, many of which are often scientifically and technically complex.

The committee comprises a broad array of stakeholders representing: federal, state and tribal governments; industry and trade associations; pesticide-user, grower and farmer representatives; environmental and public-interest groups; farmworker-advocacy groups; public-health organizations; animal-welfare groups; and the general public.

The committee is chartered under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, which regulates and governs its operations, including public participation and access to documents. A copy of the *FACA Essentials at EPA* is enclosed for your reference. Although we are unable to offer you compensation for your services, you would be entitled to receive necessary travel and per diem allowances.

To accept this invitation, please return the enclosed membership-acceptance form using the preaddressed envelope provided or fax it to Dea Zimmerman, the committee's designated federal officer, at (312) 408-2246. If you have any questions, you may also contact her at (312) 353-6344 or zimmerman.dea@epa.gov.

I hope you will accept this appointment so that EPA can benefit from your experience and perspectives.

Sincerely yours

E. Scott Pruitt

Enclosures

[MERGEFIELD First_Name] [MERGEFIELD Last_Name][MERGEFIELD Educational__Title]
[MERGEFIELD Job_Title]
[MERGEFIELD Company]
[MERGEFIELD Address]
[MERGEFIELD City], [MERGEFIELD State] [MERGEFIELD Zip_Code]

Dear [MERGEFIELD "Courtesy__Title"] [MERGEFIELD "Last_Name"]:

I am pleased to invite you to continue to serve as a member of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee for a term beginning August 21, 2017, and ending August 20, 2019. [MERGEFIELD Point_of_View_Sentence]

As you know, the Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee was established in 1995 as a public forum to advise the EPA on various issues involving the implementation of pesticide policies, regulations and programs. Through the committee the EPA continues to foster meaningful communication with our stakeholders as well as provide a clearer understanding of a wide range of pesticide issues, many of which are often scientifically and technically complex.

The committee compromises a broad array of stakeholders representing: federal, state and tribal governments; industry and trade associations; pesticide-user, grower and farmer representatives; environmental and public-interest groups; farmworker-advocacy groups; public-health organizations; animal-welfare groups; and the general public.

Members of federal-advisory committees who are regular-government employees are subject to conflict-of-interest restrictions, and nominees are required to file the enclosed form OGE-450, a confidential financial-disclosure report. If you choose to accept this invitation, please complete both form OGE-450 and the enclosed membership-acceptance form and return them in the preaddressed envelope provided. You may wish to retain a copy of your completed form OGE-450 for your files.

Also enclosed for your reference are copies of the committee's current charter, *FACA Essentials at EPA* and EPA Ethics Advisory 97-15. Please recall that it is important to understand the applicable ethics regulations and to alert the EPA to any potential conflict between your public responsibilities and your private interests and activities or the appearance of lack of impartiality as defined by these regulations.

Should you have any questions, please contact Dea Zimmerman, the committee's designated federal officer, at (312) 353-6344 or at zimmerman.dea@epa.gov.

I hope you will accept this appointment so that EPA can benefit from your experience and perspectives.

Sincerely yours,

E. Scott Pruitt

Enclosures

ED_002528_00039572-00002

[MERGEFIELD First_Name] [MERGEFIELD Last_Name][MERGEFIELD Educational__Title]
[MERGEFIELD Job_Title]
[MERGEFIELD Company]
[MERGEFIELD Address]
[MERGEFIELD City], [MERGEFIELD State] [MERGEFIELD Zip__Code]

Dear [MERGEFIELD "Courtesy__Title"] [MERGEFIELD "Last_Name"]:

I am pleased to invite you to serve as a member of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee for a term beginning August 21, 2017, and ending August 20, 2019. [MERGEFIELD Point_of_View_Sentence]

As you know, the Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee was established in 1995 as a public forum to advise the EPA on various issues involving the implementation of pesticide policies, regulations, and programs. Through the committee the EPA continues to foster meaningful communication with our stakeholders as well as provide a clearer understanding of a wide range of pesticide issues, many of which are often scientifically and technically complex.

The committee comprises a broad array of stakeholders representing: federal, state and tribal governments; industry and trade associations; pesticide-user, grower and farmer representatives; environmental and public-interest groups; farmworker-advocacy groups; public-health organizations; animal-welfare groups; and the general public.

Members of federal-advisory committees who are regular-government employees are subject to conflict-of-interest restrictions, and nominees are required to file the enclosed form OGE-450, a confidential financial-disclosure report. If you choose to accept this invitation, please complete both form OGE-450 and the enclosed membership-acceptance form and return them in the preaddressed envelope provided. You may wish to retain a copy of your completed form OGE-450 for your files.

Also enclosed for your reference are copies of the committee's current charter, *FACA Essentials at EPA* and EPA Ethics Advisory 97-15. Please recall that it is important to understand the applicable ethics regulations and to alert the EPA to any potential conflict between your public responsibilities and your private interests and activities or the appearance of lack of impartiality as defined by these regulations.

Should you have any questions, please contact Dea Zimmerman, the committee's designated federal officer, at (312) 353-6344 or at [HYPERLINK "mailto:zimmerman.dea@epa.gov"].

I hope you will accept this appointment so that EPA can benefit from your experience and perspectives.

Sincerely yours,

E. Scott Pruitt

Enclosures

ED_002528_00039573-00002

[MERGEFIELD First_Name] [MERGEFIELD Last_Name][MERGEFIELD Educational__Title]
[MERGEFIELD Job_Title]
[MERGEFIELD Company]
[MERGEFIELD Address]
[MERGEFIELD City], [MERGEFIELD State] [MERGEFIELD Zip_Code]

Dear [MERGEFIELD "Courtesy__Title"] [MERGEFIELD "Last_Name"]:

On behalf of everyone at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, I extend to you my sincerest appreciation for service as a member of the EPA's Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee.

During your tenure you made significant contributions toward the EPA's goal of leveraging greater public and private resources to meet our nation's environmental-protection needs. Your active participation and the committee's expert advice have helped the EPA develop practical, protective approaches for addressing implementation issues involving pesticide policies, regulations and programs.

You and your fellow committee members successfully engaged a wide range of stakeholders in discussions on complex environmental matters. The forum we have established will continue to serve as an effective means for exploring solutions to critical challenges.

Please accept my thanks for the time, talent, and energy you devoted to the committee's work. I wish you continued success.

Sincerely yours,

E. Scott Pruitt

Message

From: Zimmerman, Dea [Zimmerman.Dea@epa.gov]
Sent: 10/26/2017 1:02:32 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
CC: Dinkins, Darlene [Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov]; Jewell, Shannon [jewell.shannon@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: OROM's Response RE: Heads Up - Sylvia Palmer CDPA Will Call You

OK Thanks.

From: Keigwin, Richard
Sent: Thursday, October 26, 2017 8:01 AM
To: Zimmerman, Dea <Zimmerman.Dea@epa.gov>
Cc: Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: OROM's Response RE: Heads Up - Sylvia Palmer CDPA Will Call You

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Rick Keigwin
Director, Office of Pesticide Programs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Phone: 703-305-7090
Website: www.epa.gov/pesticides
Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 26, 2017, at 8:17 AM, Zimmerman, Dea <Zimmerman.Dea@epa.gov> wrote:

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 26, 2017, at 1:51 AM, Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov> wrote:

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Rick Keigwin
Director, Office of Pesticide Programs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Phone: 703-305-7090
Website: www.epa.gov/pesticides
Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 20, 2017, at 11:47 AM, Zimmerman, Dea <Zimmerman.Dea@epa.gov> wrote:

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

As fyi:

Previous Chem./Biopest./Trade Assoc. Sector	Current Chem./Biopest./Trade Assoc. Secto
Cheryl Cleveland – BASF	Rachel Callies – SC Johnson
Komal Jain – American Chemistry Council	Komal Jain – American Chemistry Council
Beth Law – CSPA	Steven Bennett - CSPA
Ray McCallister – CLA	Jay Vroom - CLA
Donnie Taylory – ARA	Donnie Taylor - ARA
Jake Vukich – DuPont	Charlotte Sanson - Bayer
Mike White – CPDA	Aaron Hobbs - RISE
Nina Wilson – BPIA	Nina Wilson - BPIA

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

From: Keigwin, Richard
Sent: Thursday, October 19, 2017 3:57 PM
To: Zimmerman, Dea <Zimmerman.Dea@epa.gov>
Cc: Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Heads Up - Sylvia Palmer CDPA Will Call You

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

From: Zimmerman, Dea
Sent: Wednesday, October 18, 2017 3:34 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>
Cc: Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>
Subject: Heads Up - Sylvia Palmer CDPA Will Call You

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Dea Zimmerman
PREP Coordinator, Regional and State Liaison
U.S. EPA - Office of Pesticide Programs
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago IL 60604
telephone (312) 353-6344
fax (312) 408-2246

Message

From: Zimmerman, Dea [Zimmerman.Dea@epa.gov]
Sent: 10/30/2017 5:05:07 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
CC: Layne, Arnold [Layne.Arnold@epa.gov]; Mosby, Jackie [Mosby.Jackie@epa.gov]; Wormell, Lance [Wormell.Lance@epa.gov]; Dinkins, Darlene [Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov]
Subject: Pre-PPDC Check List for 3:00 Today (if you have time)
Attachments: Pre- PPDC Check List.docx; Seating Chart for November 2017 PPDC Meeting.docx

Rick – this PPDC meeting feels different so apologies if I am asking questions unnecessarily. I've attached my questions (the second page are just some suggested bullets for your intro) along with a suggested seating chart (though I did the seating chart last night before I knew that Mike Dourson and Tate Bennett were attending).

Thanks!

Dea

Dea Zimmerman
PREP Coordinator, Regional and State Liaison
U.S. EPA - Office of Pesticide Programs
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago IL 60604
telephone (312) 353-6344
fax (312) 408-2246

Seating Chart for November 2017 PPDC Meeting

Rachel Callies (SCJ)	Eric Gjevre (TPPC)	Jim Fredericks (NPMA)	Amy Asmus WSSA)	Dominc LaJoie (Natl. Pot. Council)	Tim Tucker (ABF & AHPA)

Stan Cope (Amer. Mosq. Control Assoc.)

Aaron Hobbs (RISE)

Leyla McCurdy (Children's Environ. Health Network)

Sharon Selvaggio (NWC for Alter. To Pesticides)

Nina Wilson (BPIA)

Andrew Thostenson (AAPSE)

Allen McLaurin (Natl. Cotton Coun.)

Pat Bishop (Humane Society)

Lori Ann Burd (Center for Bio. Diversity)

Nichelle Harriott (Beyond Pesticides)

Andy Whittington (MS Farm Bureau)

Jay Vroom (CLA)

Walter Alarcon (CDC/NIOSH)

Gina Shultz (FWS)

Speaker

Edward Wakem (Amer. Vet. Med. Assc)

Steven Bennett (CSPA)

Charlotte Sanson (Bayer)

Amy Liebman (MCN)

Iris Figueroa (Farmworker Justice)

Richard Gragg (Florida A&M)

Donnie Taylor (ARA)

Komal Jain (ACC)

Damon Reabe (NAAA)

Liza Fleeson Trossbach (AAPCO)

Preston Peck (Toxic Free NC)

Cynthia Palmer (ABC)

Eric Hoffman (AFPMB)

Charlotte Liang (FDA)

John Gorman (EPA R2)

Speaker	Arnold	Rick	Nancy Beck	Jeff Sands	Sheryl Kunickis (USDA)

Phone only:
1. Dan Kunkel (intermittent)

Wednesday only:
1. Stan Cope (Amer. Mosq. Control Assoc.)

Message

From: Zimmerman, Dea [Zimmerman.Dea@epa.gov]
Sent: 7/19/2018 1:41:43 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]; Dinkins, Darlene [Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov]
CC: Mosby, Jackie [Mosby.Jackie@epa.gov]; Wormell, Lance [Wormell.Lance@epa.gov]; Jewell, Shannon [jewell.shannon@epa.gov]
Subject: Action Requested: Sign Certification for PPDC May 2018 Transcripts
Attachments: Chair Certification of Transcripts for May 2018 PPDC Meeting.docx; Final PPDC Meeting Transcript May 2 2018.pdf; Final PPDC Meeting Transcript May 3 2018.pdf

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Dea Zimmerman
PREP Coordinator, Regional and State Liaison
U.S. EPA - Office of Pesticide Programs
77 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago IL 60604
telephone (312) 353-6344
fax (312) 408-2246

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

OFFICE OF CHEMICAL SAFETY
AND POLLUTION PREVENTION

Chair Certification

I, Richard P. Keigwin, Jr., Chair for the Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee (PPDC) certify the meeting transcripts for May 2-3, 2018, accurately reflect the discussions and decisions of said meeting.

_____ _____

Richard P. Keigwin, Jr. **Date**
PPDC Chair

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES
5 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
6
7
8
9 PESTICIDE PROGRAM DIALOGUE
10 COMMITTEE MEETING
11
12
13 MAY 2, 2018
14
15
16
17 Conference Center - Lobby Level
18 2777 Crystal Drive
19 One Potomac Yard South
20 Arlington, VA 22202
21
22

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

2 - - - - - -

3 MR. KEIGWIN: Good morning. Thank you for

4 joining us. Before we get going on the day, I

5 wanted to turn the mic over to Charlotte Bertrand

6 for some opening remarks.

7 MS. BERTRAND: Good morning, everybody.

8 It's a real pleasure to be here today. The last

9 time I was here, I had just started my position.

10 It's good to see you all again, now that I'm

11 learning a little bit more about the program and the

12 issues.

13 So I wanted to start by -- and talk a little

14 bit about thanking all of you for your time, and I

15 especially want to welcome and thank the members of

16 the PPDC. We know, I know your time is valuable.

17 We appreciate very much the time that you invest

18 here, the input you provide and your service to the

19 committee. I also want to thank Dea Zimmerman and

20 the Office of the Pesticide Programs staff. I know

21 you all worked extremely hard pulling this together

22 and so it's going to be a great meeting and it's

1 thanks to all of the work that Dea and the OPP
2 program staff did today to pull the agenda together.
3 So I'm going to be here briefly this
4 morning. I'll see you all again tomorrow, but I
5 wanted to welcome you here, start the day off, say
6 hello and to give my personal thank you for your
7 time before I turn the reins over to Rick who is the
8 Office of Pesticide Programs director and as you
9 know, the PPDC chair.
10 So like I said, it's been, I guess I started
11 in October so it's been about six months since I've
12 been acting in my position, but it's definitely not
13 the first time that I've been engaged in dialogues
14 and stakeholder involvement. I've been at the EPA
15 for 21 years, and over the course of those years, it
16 has definitely been my experience that stakeholder
17 input and participation is extremely valuable to us.
18 We can't do this alone. Stakeholder input and
19 participation is something that's not a single
20 event. It's a process.
21 And so part of that stakeholder input are
22 the federal advisory committees that play a critical

1 role in providing the valuable input to guide our
2 policy-making at EPA. And federal advisory
3 committees like the PPDC enable us to tap into
4 expertise and in this case with experience in
5 agriculture, labor, public interest, animal
6 protection, business and manufacturing.
7 So I want to say, I was very impressed. I
8 asked before I came here, I said how long has the
9 PPDC been a federal advisory committee? And I
10 learned this committee was formed in 1995. So what
11 a testament to the value that this committee
12 provides us, that 23 years later we are still
13 sitting at a table and EPA is still benefiting very
14 much from your valuable input.
15 So I know that OPP following these meetings,
16 we consider your input and your comments on our
17 actions. We know that this is one of our more
18 effective forums for discussion, giving us the
19 opportunity to gather individuals from different
20 perspectives and experience in one room, present
21 issues and updates, field questions and collect
22 valuable and thoughtful feedback.

1 So I also want to acknowledge that while
2 there's face-to-face meetings, the PPDC extends
3 beyond the input that you're going to provide us
4 today and tomorrow, that twice a year you gather
5 here, but it's not the only time you weigh in on
6 these issues and other issues. So just as you
7 dedicate your valuable time outside these meetings,
8 the reading back on documents to prepare or
9 providing insights on subsequent workgroup meetings,
10 we continue to work on the issues and your input
11 well after this meeting has ended.
12 So one example that I wanted to draw out is
13 that PPDC's 21st Century toxicology workgroup was
14 established to inform and engage stakeholders early
15 on in OCSPP's approach to evaluating invitro
16 technologies and computational sciences and those
17 will replace and supplement some of the more
18 traditional methods of animal toxicity testing and
19 risk assessments. So in the later years, a
20 workgroup weighed in on goals and metrics for
21 success, and ten years since that workgroup started
22 through the PPDC, OPP is still making great progress

1 and is continually engaged in this space.

2 So today you'll hear an update on our

3 progress towards non-animal alternative testing for

4 acute 6-pack studies -- we'll see if I can talk

5 above the sirens -- as well as an update on our

6 pivot to include ecological toxicology studies in

7 this effort. More broadly, these efforts help lay

8 the groundwork for OCSPP's move towards alternatives

9 to animal testing. So that ten years of input

10 really helped and what started ten years ago has

11 really, we're seeing the benefits today.

12 Last month OCSPP released a draft policy to

13 reduce the use of animals in testing chemicals to

14 evaluate whether they cause an allergic reaction,

15 inflammation or sensitization to the skin. In March

16 OCSPP's Office of Pollution and Prevention and

17 Toxics released a draft of alternative strategies to

18 promote the development and implementation of

19 alternative test methods and strategies to reduce,

20 refine and replace vertebrae animal testing as

21 required under the new TSCA laws. PPDC's role in

22 the early coordination of OCSPP's 21st Century

1 toxicology efforts was critical in taking our first
2 steps towards these major changes.
3 So again, I just want to thank the group.
4 Your input is very valuable. Your input is long
5 term and it's helped us shape our policies so it's
6 very much appreciated. I look forward to hearing
7 more about how things are today, I can't stay with
8 you today, and seeing you all again tomorrow.
9 So with that, let me turn it back over to
10 Rick to walk you through the rest of the agenda and
11 start off a good discussion.
12 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Charlotte. Really
13 appreciate that.
14 I wanted to acknowledge before we got going
15 a few new faces here in the Office of Pesticide
16 Programs. The first I wanted to recognize is Ed
17 Messina, who is to Charlotte's right. Ed has joined
18 OPP about two and a half weeks ago now as the acting
19 deputy office director for programs. He joins us
20 from a lot of time at EPA from the Office of
21 Enforcement and Compliance Assurance and several of
22 you may know Ed from his time in OECA. So we're

1 thrilled to have Ed with us.

2 We also have with us today Hema Subramanian

3 who is the agency's acting special assistant for

4 agricultural policy. Hema's up there.

5 And then she could not be with us today but

6 recently Anita Pease has been named the acting

7 director of our antimicrobials division. Anita most

8 recently was the acting deputy director of our

9 biological and economic analysis division and for

10 many years, served in a number of capacities,

11 including the deputy director role in our

12 Environmental Fate and Effects Division. So those

13 are probably our biggest changes here

14 organizationally within the Office of Pesticide

15 Programs since we met last.

16 If I can just quickly walk everyone through

17 the agenda for today and tomorrow. We're going to

18 -- after we do introductions and some housekeeping,

19 we're going to provide you all with an update on our

20 progress in meeting our obligations under the

21 Pesticide Registration Improvement Act. Steve

22 Schaible who is the PRIA coordinator will lead us

1 through that.

2 After the break, we want to share with you

3 our progress in moving some more electronic tools

4 for doing some of our work, so Patricia Parrott from

5 the Field and External Affairs Division will lead a

6 session on what we're currently calling the

7 SmartLabel project, as well as the electronic

8 confidential statement of formula.

9 Then after lunch, we want to provide you all

10 with some updates and get some input from you all on

11 -- in a couple of areas. One is, actually they both

12 relate to what Charlotte was talking about, part of

13 our efforts to move towards non-animal alternatives

14 for testing chemicals. So we will provide you first

15 with an update on our efforts to reduce and remove

16 certain studies from the Acute 6-pack and then

17 secondly, Kimberly Nesci from our Environmental Fate

18 and Effects Division will give you all an update on

19 some of the new approaches that we're looking at to

20 do something similar on the ecological risk

21 assessment side.

22 And then we'll end the day today with some

1 updates on some of the work going on in our
2 biopesticides division regarding novel mosquitos and
3 biopesticides. And then Yu-Ting Guilaran will wrap
4 up the day with a registration review update. And
5 then we will have an opportunity for public comment
6 at the end of the day. Those are -- the members of
7 the public that would like to provide public
8 comment, you should register at the desk that you
9 saw when you came in, please.
10 Then tomorrow morning, Marietta Echeverria,
11 our director of our Environmental Fate and Effects
12 Division, will give us an Endangered Species Act
13 update and OPP's efforts in that arena. Wynne
14 Miller from our, from our Biological and Economic
15 Analysis Division will be sharing with you all some
16 thoughts that we have on our communications plan on
17 resistance management and we would like to get some
18 input from you there.
19 And then Arnold Layne will lead as session
20 debriefing us on the progress by the public health
21 workgroup and Julie Spagnolli, who is a workgroup
22 member from that workgroup, will be assisting in

1 that presentation. And then we'll discuss next
2 steps and possible topics for our fall meeting.
3 So since our fall meeting, we have had a
4 couple of membership changes. Cynthia Palmer who
5 had been with the American Bird Conservancy has
6 resigned from the committee, and then Rachel Calles,
7 who had been with SC Johnson, and Preston Peck who
8 had been with Toxic Free North Carolina, had moved
9 to new employers that are now either outside the
10 scope of OPP's work or moved to a different
11 viewpoint all together. Cynthia or excuse me,
12 Sylvia Palmer from the Council of Producers and
13 Distributors of Agro Technology has joined the
14 committee, although I believe she's not able to join
15 us here today.
16 Some other housekeeping issues, hopefully
17 everyone has signed in at the registration desk. If
18 you have not, please do so at the break. In terms
19 of when we turn things over to the committee for
20 feedback, the same system that we've used. Turn up
21 your tent card, make sure the light on your
22 microphone has turned red when it's your turn to

1 speak and then turn that back off when you are
2 finished with your remarks.
3 We do have some members of the PPDC that are
4 participating remotely today, so after we've gone
5 around the room for PPDC members to give their
6 remarks or their questions, we will open things up
7 for members who are on the phone. We are
8 controlling the muting and unmuting, so please do
9 not unmute your phone remotely unless we ask you to
10 do so.
11 We heard the sirens during Charlotte's
12 remarks, so in the event of an emergency over here
13 by Dea, Dea will move first but there is an
14 emergency exit here so that you don't have to go out
15 -- there are other emergency exits but this is the
16 primary one. As I guess as they say on the plane,
17 look for the closest exit door. It may be behind
18 you.
19 And finally, I just want to say we're really
20 looking forward to today's discussions. We
21 acknowledge that some of the issues that we'll be
22 discussing today, there is not going to be agreement

1 across the committee. That is fine and we welcome
2 that. We only gain in our deliberations internally
3 from a robust discussion amongst all of the PPDC
4 members and we believe that a range of feedback
5 helps to further inform our decision-making.
6 So we do appreciate the time that you all
7 are taking out of your very busy days over the next
8 day and a half to be with us, and for many of you
9 who have traveled from out of town, we're really
10 talking about probably a week all together and that
11 really means a lot to us. So thank you.
12 With that, why don't we do introductions. I
13 will start to my left.
14 ATTENDEE: Good morning, Arnold Layne,
15 deputy office director for management in the Office
16 of Pesticide Programs.
17 ATTENDEE: Steve Schaible, Office of
18 Pesticide Programs, PRIA coordinator.
19 ATTENDEE: Eric Hoffman, Armed Forces Pest
20 Management Board.
21 ATTENDEE: Charlotte Liang, U.S. Food and
22 Drug Administration, Office of Food Safety.

1 ATTENDEE: Eric Gjevre, Tribal Pesticide
2 Program Council, Coueur d'Alene tribe.
3 ATTENDEE: I'm Tim Tucker with the American
4 Beekeeping Federation.
5 ATTENDEE: Good morning, I'm Amy Liebman
6 with the Migrant Clinicians Network.
7 ATTENDEE: Donny Taylor with the Ag
8 Retailers Association.
9 ATTENDEE: Amy Asmus with the Weed Science
10 Society.
11 ATTENDEE: Charlotte Sanson with ADAMA USA.
12 ATTENDEE: Steve Bennett with the Household
13 and Commercial Products Association, formerly known
14 as the Consumer Specialty Products Association.
15 ATTENDEE: Komal Jain with the Biocides
16 panel of the American Chemistry Council.
17 ATTENDEE: Andrew Thostenson with the
18 American Association of Pesticide Safety Educators.
19 ATTENDEE: Damon Reabe with the National
20 Agriculture Aviation Association.
21 ATTENDEE: Liza Fleeson Trossbach, the
22 Association of American Pesticide Control Officials.

1 ATTENDEE: Jay Vroom, CropLife America.

2 ATTENDEE: Andy Whittington, Mississippi

3 Farm Bureau Federation.

4 ATTENDEE: Aaron Hobbs, RISE.

5 ATTENDEE: Nina Wilson with Gowan

6 representing the Biological Products Industry.

7 ATTENDEE: Domenic LaJoie with the National

8 Potato Council.

9 ATTENDEE: Dan Kunkel with the IR-4 Program.

10 ATTENDEE: Lori Ann Burd, Center For

11 Biological Diversity.

12 ATTENDEE: Nichelle Harriott, Beyond

13 Pesticides.

14 ATTENDEE: Jim Fredericks with the National

15 Pest Management Association.

16 ATTENDEE: Stan Cope, American Mosquito

17 Control Association.

18 ATTENDEE: Good morning, Leyla McCurdy with

19 the Children's Environmental Health Network.

20 ATTENDEE: John Gorman, EPA, Region 2.

21 ATTENDEE: Gina Schultz, Fish and Wildlife

22 Service.

1 ATTENDEE: Sheryl Kunickis, I'm the director
2 in the Office of Pest Management Policy at the
3 United States Department of Agriculture.
4 ATTENDEE: Ed Messina, acting deputy office
5 director of --
6 ATTENDEE: Charlotte Bertrand, acting
7 principal deputy assistant administrator for OCSPP.
8 MR. KEIGWIN: I indicated we had some
9 members on the phone, so PPDC members who are
10 participating remotely, could you introduce
11 yourselves, please?
12 (Pause.)
13 I believe we should have Sharon Selvaggio
14 participating over, via teleconference. Is Sharon
15 available?
16 (Pause.)
17 MR. KEIGWIN: Iris erFigueroa, or Pat Bishop?
18 Perhaps I would check to see if anybody on
19 the phone can hear what we are saying here around
20 the table?
21 ATTENDEE: Can you hear me now? This is
22 Sharon Selvaggio.

1 ATTENDEE: Can you hear us now?

2 MR. KEIGWIN: We can hear you now.

3 ATTENDEE: Okay, it's Pat Bishop from the

4 Humane Society.

5 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Pat.

6 ATTENDEE: Hi, it's Iris Figueroa from

7 Farmworker Justice. Good morning.

8 MR. KEIGWIN: Good morning, Iris.

9 ATTENDEE: And Sharon Selvaggio from the

10 Northwest Center for Alternatives to Pesticides.

11 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Sharon, welcome. I

12 know it's early for you.

13 ATTENDEE: Yes.

14 MR. KEIGWIN: So with that, I believe those

15 are the only PPDC members that were participating

16 remotely, okay.

17 With that, I think we can move on to our

18 first topic which is --

19 I'd ask Steve Schaible who is our PRIA

20 coordinator to walk us through the presentation.

21 The presentation for this should all be in your

22 materials for the PPDC members. For those

1 participating remotely, all of the presentations are
2 available on the agency's website for the Pesticide
3 Program Dialogue Committee.
4 So Steve, let me turn things over to you.
5 MR. SCHAIBLE: First of all, good morning,
6 and I am going to run you through some of our
7 performance metrics for PRIA through the midyear of
8 our fiscal year 2018. I'm a technological black
9 hole.
10 So just to run through quickly what I want
11 to talk about, we'll do a brief update on PRIA 4
12 which would be the next reauthorization of PRIA and
13 we will get into some of the numbers. We'll talk
14 about the PRIA submissions that we've received so
15 far to date, as well as our completion. We'll talk
16 about some of those completions, the negotiation
17 rate of those and our on-time completions.
18 Then we'll briefly touch on the fees
19 collected but maintenance fees as well as PRIA fees,
20 electronic submissions and our progress in moving
21 towards receiving as much as we can electronically.
22 Electronic label reviews, reviewing things

1 electronically and then finally the 45/90-day
2 preliminary technical screen under PRIA and sort of
3 what has been the activity and performance under
4 that. And then the last is just points of contact
5 for PRIA, should you have any questions.
6 So next slide, please.
7 For the PRIA summary, we are still under
8 PRIA 3. For a while there, we were getting
9 reauthorized on one and two-month increments. With
10 the Consolidated Appropriations Act that passed back
11 in March, we are -- PRIA 3's expiration date was
12 extended through the end of this fiscal year so
13 through September 30, 2018. The PRIA 4 bill that
14 was introduced in the House and passed in the House
15 last March and advanced to the Senate and passed out
16 of the Senate Ag Committee is still pending.
17 The Farm Bill that was recently reintroduced
18 in the House, HR 2, does include a provision
19 enacting the House version of PRIA 4 should the Farm
20 Bill pass and that would, that version, the House
21 version reauthorized PRIA through fiscal year 2023.
22 The version pending in the Senate, the amended

1 version in the Senate reauthorizes PRIA through
2 2020.
3 Next slide, please.
4 As far as what we've received and what we've
5 completed, I don't know if you're going to be able
6 to easily look at these numbers but the light blue
7 on the left side is going to be the number of
8 primary applications that have been received.
9 Across the bottom, we have antimicrobial actions,
10 biopesticides, conventionals, inert ingredient
11 actions as well as miscellaneous actions.
12 The yellow is the number of completed
13 decisions. And so within a decision, there's
14 primary decisions and secondary decisions. The
15 primary decision is basically counting the action
16 once, even if there are a number of associated, for
17 instance, new product registrations associated with
18 that new chemical submission. You send in a new
19 chemical. There is, you know, a technical product
20 and five end use products and there's tolerance
21 decisions, so that's seven PRIA decisions. And so
22 the primary counts that new chemical once instead of

1 seven times, so just to clarify that.

2 So the gray is the primary. And then the

3 dark blue are the number of those completed

4 decisions in which there are one or more

5 negotiations of the original PRIA due date. So with

6 that explanation, and again this is through the end

7 of March 31st, so this is the first half of our

8 fiscal year.

9 For antimicrobials there were 132 primary

10 applications that were received through the first

11 two quarters. There were 173 completions and of

12 those, 139 of those were primary decisions and two

13 of those were involved in negotiation of the PRIA

14 due date. So in the big picture, it looks like we

15 were receiving about as many as we were completing

16 in primary decisions and the negotiation rate is

17 quite low for that.

18 For biopesticides, there were 74 primary

19 applications submitted. There were 84 primary and

20 secondary decisions completed. 63 of those were

21 primary decisions and there were 12 negotiations.

22 For the conventional pesticides, there were

1 419 primary decisions that were submitted -- or
2 received by the agency. There were 517 completions
3 through the first two quarters. 414 of those were
4 primary decisions and there were 136 negotiations of
5 the due date associated.
6 For inerts, there were 29 applications
7 received, there were 19 completed and all of them
8 were primary decisions. And of those 19, 11 of them
9 involved in negotiations of the PRIA due date.
10 And finally for the miscellaneous, the
11 lion's share of these miscellaneous actions are
12 going to be requests for gold seal letters, so
13 that's documentation that the product is currently
14 registered with the U.S. EPA and that documentation
15 is sent to other countries. There were 278
16 miscellaneous categories received, 275 of those --
17 well, there were 275 completions. All of them were
18 primary decisions. There were no negotiations
19 involved with any of the miscellaneous categories
20 that were completed.
21 Next slide, please.
22 This slide talks about our rate of

1 negotiation and it starts historically, it starts
2 with 2010. We've been under PRIA 3 since 2013. And
3 so you can see up towards the top of this, we're
4 looking at 35 percent, 60 percent, 26 percent, and
5 you can sort of see a trend over time of how the
6 current fiscal year relates to previous fiscal years
7 in terms of negotiations.
8 I'm going to talk specifically about FY18
9 only. For the antimicrobials, again, there were two
10 negotiations and that represents 1.2 percent of the
11 total completions that they had for the first two
12 quarters of this year. And that's quite low
13 compared to historic performances here.
14 So the biopesticide, there were 12
15 negotiations out of 84 completions for 14 percent
16 negotiation rate. For the conventionals, there were
17 517 completions and of those, 136 were negotiated,
18 so that's a 26 percent negotiation rate. Again for
19 miscellaneous, there were no negotiations so that's
20 zero percent.
21 And for the inert ingredients, 11 of the 19
22 completions involved one or more negotiations. And

1 so that is 58 percent. And I know that for the
2 inert ingredients, these were first introduced in
3 PRIA 3. I think we have better information now on
4 what are the resources and the timeframes that go
5 into reviewing those inert ingredient applications
6 and PRIA 4 proposes modifications to those
7 timeframes and fees that will hopefully if passed,
8 would hopefully bring these negotiation rates for
9 inerts down lower.
10 Overall for the office through March, we are
11 at a 15 percent negotiation rate. Last year I think
12 we ended up at 15 percent as well. So we're pretty
13 much within the framework of the last three years of
14 our performance as far as the negotiation rate.
15 Next slide, please.
16 Okay. In terms of on-time completions, this
17 is the percentage of our completions on which the
18 PRIA due date or the negotiated due date was met by
19 the agency. So for the antimicrobial division,
20 there were no completions so far this fiscal year
21 which did not meet or beat the PRIA due date. So
22 they're at 100 percent.

1 For biopesticides, likewise. All of their
2 completions have been before or on the PRIA due
3 date. There have been two completions for the
4 conventionals that did not meet the PRIA due date
5 and so that on-time completion rate is 99.6 percent.
6 For the inerts, there have been no late completions.
7 For miscellaneous, there has been one missed action,
8 a gold seal. And so they're at 99.6.
9 And so overall for the office, there have
10 been three decisions out of 1,068 that did not meet
11 or beat the PRIA due date, and so our on-time
12 completion rate for the office is 99.7 percent. I
13 will say this is better than we have been
14 experiencing historically and I would say quite
15 commendable, I think, given some of the resource
16 constraints that we're under.
17 Next slide, please.
18 These are the fees that have been collected
19 to date for both the PRIA fees and the maintenance
20 fees. The maintenance fees are invoiced in the
21 autumn and the due date for submitting those
22 maintenance fees is in January and then there's some

1 slow trickle once you get beyond January. These are
2 annual fees that are paid to support registrations
3 with the agency. These fees go to support
4 reevaluation activities, review of new products,
5 amendments that are substantially similar, inert
6 clearances and then IT improvements for the office.
7 The PRIA fees, of course, are paid at the
8 time of the application, the application is
9 submitted. So to date, well, through April 19th,
10 PRIA fees collections were at $9.58 million, and I
11 actually as of a week later, they were up to 9.8
12 million. Last year we collected after refunds were
13 taken into account, we collected around 18 million.
14 And so we are on target to collect, you know,
15 assuming you have the same degree of collection in
16 the second half of the year, we're on target to
17 collect 18 million or possibly more.
18 On the maintenance fee side, the PRIA 3 has
19 a collection target of 27.8 million for the year.
20 Through April 19th and likewise, I checked the
21 numbers as of April 26th, and we've collected 27.76
22 million in maintenance fees so far. We're pretty

1 close to the $27.8 million goal or target.

2 Okay. This next slide has to do with

3 electronic submissions. It was going on three years

4 come September that the portal was made available

5 and that was a secure web-based means by which

6 applicants can submit their applications to the EPA.

7 Prior to that, our electronic submissions involved

8 CD's and DVD's being submitted to the agency. And

9 so this lays out the number of paper submissions we

10 were receiving, the number of submissions on CD or

11 DVD and the number of submissions that are being

12 submitted through the web-based portal.

13 Likewise, these submissions take into

14 account both PRIA and non-PRIA submissions and they

15 take into account all submissions. So these could

16 be resubmissions of additional information, not just

17 the initial application.

18 For conventionals, the total number of

19 submissions is 3,855. Of those, 1,943 were

20 submitted on paper. That's 50 percent overall.

21 There were nine submissions on CD or DVD or less

22 than 1 percent, and 1,903 were submitted through the

1 portal or 49 percent. So half of the submissions
2 are coming in electronically and then half in paper.
3 And just as an aside, I will say there are
4 certain types of actions that might make sense to
5 submit one way or the other. Especially if you are
6 an infrequent user of the portal, I think that the
7 challenges of getting set up in the portal and
8 understanding the portal and remembering what your
9 password is, you know, I think a lot of people just
10 think it's a one-page gold seal letter request or
11 something, they just go ahead and send it in paper.
12 But I think we are looking to improve the customer
13 experience around the portal in general.
14 For antimicrobials, the total number of
15 submissions was 1,260. Of those, 402 were in paper
16 or 32 percent. There was one CD or DVD submission,
17 less than 1 percent. And then 68 percent were
18 submitted through the portal.
19 For biopesticides, there were 542 total
20 submissions. Of those, 250 were in paper, 28 were
21 on CD or DVD and 264 were using the portal. So 46
22 percent in paper, 5 percent on CD or DVD and 49

1 percent through the portal.

2 Overall, we were at 46 percent of our total

3 submissions are submitted on paper, less than 1

4 percent on CD or DVD, and 53 percent being submitted

5 through the portal. And I think we are seeing still

6 a gradual and slow increase in the use of the portal

7 in terms of overall percentage of our submissions.

8 Okay. As far as electronic label reviews,

9 there was money set aside in PRIA 3 to -- for EPA to

10 develop certain IT capabilities and one of the

11 specific activities mentioned in the IT set-aside

12 was the development of software and the ability for

13 EPA to review labels electronically. I think in

14 terms of our overall objective of having a fully

15 electronic system of receiving applications,

16 reviewing applications internally and then providing

17 information back to you electronically, it's pretty

18 crucial. So the portal was the first step, stage of

19 that, that we need to be able to receive everything

20 electronically.

21 The label comparison software is a means by

22 which we can do our work electronically. I think

1 the idea is that if you are able to use this
2 comparison software, that represents an efficiency
3 for the agency. We're able to complete our work
4 more quickly and therefore, get decisions to you
5 more quickly.
6 And so this report basically gives us -- so
7 when a reviewer closes out an action, there's a
8 prompt in our system that says, was this label
9 reviewed electronically? Yes, no. If you say no,
10 it has a follow-up pop-up box that talks about if it
11 was not reviewed electronically, what was the reason
12 for that? And it gives the different reasons so
13 that we can understand sort of behaviors of our
14 reviewers and sort of respond to those concerns
15 where they exist.
16 And if you don't answer anything, that's
17 where you're getting the uncertainty, this range of
18 percentages. If you don't answer, then we -- our
19 numbers are more squishy and there's been a
20 concerted effort, there's actually a report that
21 addresses this range and I think our boundaries have
22 shrunk as a result of that.

1 So again, this relates to the label review
2 specifically, and I just spoke about the
3 uncertainty. So for RD, for the conventional
4 chemicals, the percent of labels that are reviewed
5 electronically range from 87 percent to 93 percent.
6 For AD, the antimicrobials, it's 89 percent to 95
7 percent, and for the biopesticides, the percent of
8 labels reviewed electronically is 76 percent to 88
9 percent.
10 Okay. Moving on to the preliminary
11 technical screen, this is a tool that was introduced
12 in PRIA 3. Depending on the timeframe, the PRIA
13 timeframe associated with the action, you either
14 have -- the agency has 45 days from the start of the
15 PRIA date or 90 days from the start of the PRIA date
16 to do a preliminary screen of the application. So
17 at the very front end, there's a 21-day completeness
18 screen and that's basically where EPA is just
19 looking to make sure that all the forms are there
20 that are supposed to be there, they're signed. The
21 11-3 screen is done for the data and your
22 confidentiality page is signed. So these are

1 basically the very basic things you need to do for
2 us, for the application to be complete.
3 That occurs in the first 21 days and that
4 precedes the start of the PRIA due date. Once the
5 PRIA due date starts, there's either 45 or 90 days
6 for the agency to get into the actual data, look at
7 the studies, any waiver requests and make a
8 determination on is there enough there in the
9 application that we should, based on this screen,
10 have some certainty that we could conduct a risk
11 assessment and make a regulatory decision.
12 EPA must complete the screen within that
13 timeframe. And usually if there are deficiencies
14 that are identified, a letter is sent from the
15 agency that's commonly called a ten-day letter.
16 That alerts the applicant of the deficiencies, and
17 the applicant has ten days from the receipt of that
18 letter to provide a response to the agency which
19 addresses the deficiencies that have been
20 identified.
21 And so I am going to -- and depending on
22 whether that response is adequate or not, we move

1 ahead with the review because the response addressed
2 the deficiencies. The applicant -- if it does not
3 address the deficiencies, the applicant has the
4 opportunity to withdraw the application or the EPA
5 can reject the application under the preliminary
6 technical screen.
7 So that's the whole process. So now I want
8 to walk through the pieces of it. This slide has to
9 do with the actions that have been completed the
10 screen. So these numbers aren't going to exactly
11 match up with our completions because some of the
12 screen numbers are things that have, you know,
13 recently been received and so it's a slightly
14 different window of time. This is looking at
15 everything that, for which a screen has been
16 completed.
17 Likewise, the agency has 45 or 90 days to
18 provide a response to the applicant. If the agency
19 has not done that, then the screen is deemed to have
20 been completed. And so those numbers, so if there
21 was no ten-day letter sent, basically there's no
22 deficiency, those numbers are counted here as well.

1 For the antimicrobials division, there were
2 140 screens completed. For biopesticides, there
3 were 88 screens completed through midyear. There
4 were 580 screens completed for RD, 29 for the inerts
5 group and 4 screens completed for miscellaneous.
6 And again, most of the miscellaneous actions that we
7 receive are gold seals. Gold seals have a one-month
8 PRIA timeframe and so there is no preliminary
9 technical screen that occurs for those and so that
10 low number there reflects that the gold seals are
11 not counted.
12 Okay. And so assuming there is one or more
13 deficiencies that are identified, the agency sends
14 out a ten-day letter. And so for the antimicrobials
15 division, there were nine ten-day letters that were
16 sent out. For biopesticides, there were 43 ten-day
17 letters sent out. 18 for the conventionals in RD,
18 and there were no ten-day letters sent out for the
19 inerts or for miscellaneous actions.
20 Okay. And then this next slide has to do
21 again with the results. As you can see, most of the
22 responses to the ten-day letters on the previous

1 slide addressed the deficiencies that were
2 identified. For the registration division, one
3 action out of the -- if I go back, out of the 580
4 actions that went through the screen, 18 had ten-day
5 letters sent and of those 18, there was one
6 withdrawal as a result of the deficiency not being
7 remedied and there were two rejections.
8 For the biopesticides, out of a total of 88
9 screens conducted, there were 43 ten-day letters
10 sent. Of those, there were three withdrawals as a
11 result and there were four rejections. And for the
12 antimicrobials, out of 140 screens completed with
13 nine ten-day letters sent, the deficiencies were
14 adequately addressed in all nine situations.
15 Here are some of the reasons, and so that we
16 can run a report that lists out all of the reasons
17 for all of the deficiencies, and here are some of
18 the reasons for our rejections and withdrawals and
19 this list quite honestly, having been doing this for
20 two years now, really doesn't change.
21 So the new product application was found to
22 be not substantially similar, either in the label or

1 in the formulation of the product to the cited
2 product. There were data deficiencies. Either they
3 were missing data or a rationale for not requiring
4 data was not found to be adequate.
5 Efficacy data, the efficacy data submitted
6 or not submitted did not support the claims that
7 were on the label. There were uncleared inerts in
8 the formulation or there was missing inert data. In
9 some cases, the inert ingredient is misidentified.
10 There are data matrix or data compensation
11 issues. The offer to pay wasn't checked, the cited
12 studies, you know, did not support the claims being
13 made. And then finally if there's a bridging
14 argument being made, the bridging argument was found
15 to be unacceptable.
16 And this last slide is just the PRIA points
17 of contact should you have any PRIA questions. I am
18 at the office level, and I am also helping out the
19 registration division to some degree while that
20 position remains vacant.
21 Aswathy Balan is also a resource within the
22 registration division for PRIA questions and if you

1 would like, I can provide that email as a follow-up.
2 Diane Isbell is the contact in the Antimicrobials
3 Division, and Andy Bryceland and Cara Finn are the
4 contacts within the Biopesticides Division. Thank
5 you.
6 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Steve.
7 So let me open it up to members of the PPDC
8 who might have questions or comments.
9 Amy.
10 MS. LIEBMAN: Good morning. Thank you so
11 much for the update. I have a couple of questions
12 on your update. The first one is that at our last
13 meeting, you talked about the fact that there's
14 about a million dollars that PRIA sets aside in
15 order to address the worker protection
16 implementation activities and I am -- while it's
17 interesting to see your fees and the maintenance
18 fees and all of that, I'm curious as to why you
19 wouldn't have included any update on that. Because
20 there are many members that are interested in what
21 activities are funded by PRIA that are going to
22 worker protection. So that's my first question.

1 And then the second question that I have is
2 that last time you talked about the Pesticide
3 Education Resource Center or the PERC, which is a
4 PRIA-funded group to help with various worker
5 protection activities. And since our last meeting,
6 a Federal Court ruled that the certified pesticide
7 applicator rule is indeed in effect and that it's
8 unlawful to delay it. And so I'm just wondering
9 what EPA and PERC are doing with the PRIA money to
10 help with a very important worker protection
11 regulation that now is indeed, according to the law,
12 in effect.
13 MR. SCHAIBLE: Well, first of all, thank
14 you. And yeah, we did not include the worker
15 protection grant in the slides and we will do so
16 going forward. My understanding is that, so yes,
17 there's one million in worker protection that is
18 awarded annually. Then there's 500,000 for the
19 pesticide education and then there is the, what's
20 the third -- and then there's another $500,000, what
21 is the third one? So there's $2 million dollars in
22 the entirety. And is Kevin here or -- okay.

1 MR. KEIGWIN: Amy, thank you for pointing
2 out that we didn't include that in the slides and we
3 should have. What we will do is we will compile
4 that information today and we will have it available
5 to everybody for tomorrow's meeting.
6 MS. LIEBMAN: Great, thank you. And then
7 you can, I'd like to hear about the certified
8 protection, certified applicator rule.
9 MR. KEIGWIN: So do you want me to take that
10 one, Steve?
11 MR. KEIGWIN: So we have, you pointed out
12 the status of the litigation that was filed against
13 the agency regarding the rule-makings that we had
14 undertaken to change the effective dates. So the
15 effective date of the certification rule is now as
16 it was originally, March of 2017. States have and
17 tribes and other groups that have certification
18 programs have until March of 2020 to submit their
19 revised plans. In the meantime, their plans that
20 have been previously approved are the plans that are
21 in effect, and provided they submit their revised
22 plans by that March 2020 date, their previously

1 approved plan remains in effect while we go through
2 the process.
3 We have been working cooperatively with our
4 state regulatory partners and our tribal partners on
5 answering questions relative to what they need to do
6 as they work towards 2020. In the meantime, we are
7 continuing to work through the PERC to help in the
8 development of additional resources.
9 And then as we announced in December of '20
10 -- of last year, excuse me, we did announce that we
11 were undertaking a rule-making to reconsider the
12 minimum age provision in the final rule, and we are
13 expecting to issue that proposed rule for public
14 comment later this year. But in the meantime the
15 certification programs, as they have been in place,
16 are the certification programs that entities are
17 working under.
18 MS. LIEBMAN: And I just want to add, thank
19 you for that update. But what a shame, shame on
20 everybody, at EPA for reducing the minimum age.
21 That's just -- just shameful. You know, I can't
22 believe that a really solid, moderate step forward

1 in terms of regulation that has such an important
2 piece about a minimum age is now up for discussion,
3 and I'm not sure who supports that. I'm not sure
4 who around this table would support kids being,
5 applying pesticide. I'm not sure why that's good
6 for our environment. I'm not sure why that's good
7 for human beings.
8 And I think all of us should be scared and
9 the EPA is just certainly failing in its mission and
10 it's certainly failing the people who pick our food
11 and apply pesticides and they happen to be largely
12 underserved minorities.
13 MR. KEIGWIN: Steve?
14 MR. BENNETT: Thank you. Looking at the --
15 the renegotiations, especially with respect to the
16 conventionals, it seems to have shifted noticeably
17 from last year. I think last year was about 29
18 percent and this year is about 26 percent. I would
19 like to get an idea of what types of factors are
20 driving those, if it's just the types of
21 negotiations have changed, get a better idea of
22 what's driving those, where they're going and how

1 many are out there.

2 MR. SCHAIBLE: Okay. Thank you for that

3 question. I think for the negotiations, I think

4 that some of those are us working through a federal

5 register process and I think that we're starting to

6 see some better performance on that. That relates

7 to some of the negotiations. I wouldn't say looking

8 at -- I think that some of this quite honestly is

9 going to be that we are, our resources are less than

10 they were. I think that -- I think that, yeah.

11 I think we are down around 600 staff right

12 now. I think we were around 40 higher than that at

13 this time last year. I think this is sort of a

14 logical outcome of, you know, attrition and a lag

15 time in our being able to hire up qualified people

16 to fill that position.

17 MR. BENNETT: I'll do a follow-up then.

18 You're on-time rate went up in light of the, you

19 know, the resource constraints. I'm trying to

20 correlate the two of that perspective.

21 MR. SCHAIBLE: So on-time means that we met

22 or beat the original PRIA due date or the negotiated

1 date and so we're on time because we're negotiating.
2 MR. KEIGWIN: Steve, you look perplexed. Do
3 you have a follow-up?
4 MR. BENNETT: Yeah, I'm just not -- I'm not
5 sure if the date is reflecting the issue I'm trying
6 to get at, of whether the renegotiations are fully
7 reflecting the reasons why they're negotiated and
8 that's fully reporting, that's reflecting the
9 on-time. Because if you're having issues with the
10 resource constraints but you're on-time rate goes
11 up --
12 MR. KEIGWIN: Let me try to talk about it a
13 little bit. So when we say that something is on
14 time, we're saying that we met the statutory
15 decision timeframe, with or without a renegotiation,
16 okay. So even if we renegotiate and we meet, we
17 complete the action within that extended period of
18 time through the renegotiation, we're still on time.
19 And so you do have scenarios where your completion
20 rate goes up but your renegotiation rate also goes
21 up.
22 We've also had a number of scenarios, and we

1 saw this last year, that our on-time rate went up
2 and our renegotiation rate went down. I'll just add
3 that, you know, when PRIA 3 was designed, we
4 basically had a few hundred more people onboard than
5 we have now and so those timeframes were built off
6 of having onboards that we had at the time. Frankly
7 in my opinion since we are hovering now around 600,
8 that our on-time rate is as high as it is and our
9 renegotiation rate is as low as it is is a testament
10 to the dedication of the staff in the Office of
11 Pesticide Programs to try to meet these timeframes.
12 And we continue to look for process
13 efficiencies. That's one of the requirements in the
14 statute and we're continuing to look for those. But
15 as Steve was mentioning, the staffing challenges
16 right now have been difficult, and it's been hard to
17 find qualified applicants to come onboard when we
18 have been able to hire.
19 MR. KEIGWIN: Charlotte, then Nina, then
20 Jay.
21 MS. SANSON: Thanks, Steve, for the update.
22 And I guess related to the resource constraints that

1 you're dealing with, would be the experience that a
2 lot of registrants are having with non-PRIA actions
3 in terms of getting those through, through the
4 process. And so I was wondering if you could speak
5 to what the current track record is on non-PRIAs and
6 what can be done to try to help improve that side of
7 things?
8 MR. SCHAIBLE: Okay. I had not prepared any
9 of the fast track amendment or notification
10 statistics for this meeting, but I had run those
11 numbers in preparation for the last PRIA stakeholder
12 meeting that occurred in early March. And I would
13 say, without remembering the exact numbers, that I
14 think that we do have backlogs for the fast tracks
15 and for the notifications. I think as far as our
16 priority in terms of directing our resources that we
17 are, the PRIA actions have a higher priority than
18 the non-PRIA actions.
19 That being said, we are looking at ways that
20 we can provide decisions on the fast track actions
21 and the notifications in a timely fashion. We are
22 tracking internally what our performance is around

1 those and trying to bring those numbers down from
2 what they were.
3 MR. KEIGWIN: Nina, then Jay.
4 MS. WILSON: Thanks, Rick. I just wanted to
5 say that probably one of the process improvements
6 that's come about in the last couple years is the
7 technical screen, that I think has done a lot as far
8 as weighing down some of the renegotiations, some of
9 the issues. I mean we'd still like to see less
10 renegotiations but that's helped tremendously, is
11 that technical screen.
12 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Nina.
13 Jay?
14 MR. VROOM: All right. The first thing I
15 would like to say is congratulations to the agency
16 staff for making the kind of progress against the
17 headwinds that you're facing and you've already
18 pointed out a little bit. I think you've
19 understated those headwinds considerably and I would
20 encourage all of us on the PPDC and others to think
21 about ways that we can help contribute to both the
22 operational creativity, some of which you have

1 internal at EPA and some of the advisory inputs and
2 other stakeholder input help to advance.
3 But I would like to just spend a little more
4 time at a future meeting really thinking about what
5 more could we be doing from the private sector and
6 the stakeholders around this table and others to
7 come up with creative ideas and processes to help
8 move the process even farther along. I'm
9 disappointed because I think about the kind of
10 discussion that I felt like we had had at the last
11 PPDC meeting about trying to help break the impasse
12 around getting PRIA released. It's still being held
13 hostage in the Senate and I thought there was
14 momentum at the end of that last PPDC meeting last
15 fall to see some progress and I just don't see
16 evidence of that.
17 A couple of questions that I would like to
18 get your feedback on. One is the omnibus has a
19 restriction on hiring that probably limits your
20 ability to use some of the additional taxpayer funds
21 that were appropriated in the omnibus for OPP. What
22 are the limitations and what are you able to do with

1 that money so far and through the end of the fiscal
2 year?
3 There's also an oddity in the existing PRIA,
4 I think is section 4K2, that has tied up about $60
5 million dollars worth of industry fees. The
6 passage, although the passage of PRIA 4 should
7 release that 60 million, do you have a plan for
8 where those resources could go, assuming that the
9 prohibition on hiring as contained in the omnibus
10 were to go away?
11 Lastly, I would just say the complexity of
12 what OPP manages is amazing on every level and
13 again, compliments to the team that you've got in
14 place and the comments you made, Rick, earlier,
15 about the staff still having an incentive to get the
16 job done is very much appreciated and ought to be
17 something that the public knows more about.
18 MR. KEIGWIN: So thanks, Jay. So in terms
19 of your first question regarding some provisions in
20 the omnibus, the agency's operating plan is still
21 under review by the Office of Management and Budget.
22 So I'm somewhat limited in what I can say until that

1 operating plan has been approved, but we are looking
2 to see how we can maximize the utilization of fees
3 to support bringing onboard additional hires
4 consistent with the requirements in the omnibus.
5 In terms of the 4K2 provision, I think, you
6 know, in shorthand for those of you who are not
7 familiar with this provision, it's a provision that
8 has been in FIFRA for a number of years. I think it
9 dates back a few decades at least, and in lay terms
10 it essentially means that on the maintenance fee
11 side, to spend a dollar of maintenance fees, you
12 have to pair it with a dollar of appropriated
13 dollars. There's probably some legal nuance and
14 appropriations law nuance but that's how, that's how
15 I describe it to myself.
16 And so as, as the appropriated dollars have
17 declined in certain years for the office, it's made
18 it more challenging to fully utilize the maintenance
19 fee money, and many of you know, the maintenance fee
20 money is primarily utilized to support the
21 reevaluation program, the registration review
22 program. So we have been accruing balances from

1 year to year. PRIA 4 would have a provision to
2 remove that requirement to do the one-for-one
3 pairing.
4 It would also have some language relative to
5 expanding what activities within the office could be
6 funded using maintenance fee dollars. So we are
7 developing a plan. There's also a requirement in
8 the omnibus for us to meet regularly with the
9 appropriations committee staff to work through our
10 plan with them and so those meetings are in the
11 process of getting scheduled.
12 And then I forget what your third piece was,
13 so. I apologize.
14 MR. KEIGWIN: Lori Ann, and then Steve, were
15 you coming in for round two? Okay. So Lori Ann and
16 then Amy.
17 MS. BURD: Thank you. Senators Udall,
18 Harris, Booker and Blumenthal proposed a compromise
19 to PRIA reauthorization that essentially said hands
20 off the worker protection standards and
21 certification of pesticide applicator rules and also
22 asked this office to respond to concerns to the

1 abrupt face on chlorpyrifos, which we all of course
2 know causes brain damage in children. What, if any,
3 actions have this office taken to respond to their
4 concerns and compromise?
5 MR. KEIGWIN: So we are in routine contact
6 with Senator Udall's office and we have been
7 providing technical assistance to his office as he
8 has been requesting. And we will continue to do so.
9 MR. KEIGWIN: You go first and then I can go
10 to the phone.
11 MS. LIEBMAN: Yeah, I just wanted to clarify
12 that, you know, we used the term "held hostage",
13 PRIA is being held hostage a little while ago in
14 this discussion. And I think that you have to
15 understand a hostage situation really. And it's
16 not. It's simply we have senators who care about
17 kids, who care about the environment and are saying,
18 you mess with the worker protection standard, you
19 mess with some of these rules that are out,
20 important to protect our environment, important to
21 protect our workers, important to protecting our
22 children, we're going to put a hold on it. And it's

1 just, it's pretty simple.

2 So I think that the hostage situation is

3 arising in that EPA is messing with these rules and

4 you're putting out, you're going back to it and

5 we're going to see something in the Federal Register

6 that's going to talk about moving the minimum age

7 for when a child can apply pesticides. It's

8 unbelievable. So it's not really a hostage

9 situation. They're just standing up for human

10 rights. They're standing up for kids and they're

11 standing up for our environment.

12 MR. KEIGWIN: So I thought Amy Asmus just

13 put up her card. But let me first check on the

14 phone.

15 So Sharon, Iris or Pat, do you have a

16 comment or a question?

17 IRIS: This is Iris, I do, but I don't know

18 if others do as well.

19 MR. KEIGWIN: Well, Iris, you've got the

20 mic, so.

21 MS. FIGUEROA: Thank you. So I just want to

22 Follow up on some of the points that were made by Amy and

1 Jay and Lori Ann. As a farm worker organization, we
2 obviously are echoing these comments that it's
3 important to receive updates as well on the worker
4 protection component of PRIA. But I think, you
5 know, as has also been brought up, it's really
6 important not just for the current PRIA but for the
7 reauthorization. The whole reason behind the hold,
8 as has been clear from the beginning, was the
9 senators fear that the worker protection rules would
10 be rolled back.
11 And at the last meeting which Jay
12 referenced, I think to our credit, there was pretty
13 broad consensus about the reasonableness of these
14 provisions that had been identified for discussion
15 as controversial. So we were pretty perplexed when
16 in the letter that was sent to Senator Udall's
17 office, the agency characterized that discussion
18 very differently and then went ahead to, as you
19 mentioned, Rick, have a notice of a proposed
20 rule-making that's going to be happening soon.
21 So it seems that practically to move forward
22 with that rule-making and expect that the hold is

1 going to be taken off, when that was exactly the
2 fear that prompted the hold, is not a very realistic
3 proposition and if we don't address that, I don't
4 know how we can move forward.
5 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Iris.
6 Amy.
7 MS. ASMUS: I just want to make a brief
8 comment from the field. I commend you for relooking
9 at the minimum age. We have excellent programs that
10 we work with in the field through 4-H and through
11 FFA programs, and when you move the minimum age to
12 18, we do a travesty to these kids because they're
13 not allowed to learn in a situation with wonderful
14 organizations like that how to correctly handle, how
15 to correctly apply and to do projects around what
16 they're going to go into the future.
17 And I don't really think we should repeal it
18 back to 14 or 15, but even to 16 would allow these
19 kids that are in an environment to learn and to get
20 hands-on learning under programs and excellent
21 mentors to teach them how to do it correctly. I
22 think it's very important that we look at repealing

1 that back, at least to the point where we can
2 properly train and work with and mentor our seniors
3 and juniors in the high school level and in these
4 wonderful programs.
5 MS. LIEBMAN: But can you clarify about the
6 rule that it's really for hired workers, and that's
7 where our concern is in that we're not talking about
8 4-H? Could you spend a little bit of time on that?
9 MR. KEIGWIN: This is when I wish Kevin were
10 here. Many of you may know, Kevin has had to be out
11 of the office for a few weeks.
12 So when we're talking about certification,
13 we're talking about people first off that are
14 handling restricted use pesticides. It does cover
15 commercial applicators in some states and I would
16 look to Liza to clarify this for me. I believe it
17 also would cover private applicators.
18 So I mean this is, the Amy Asmus' concern is
19 one that was expressed through various fora. I
20 think it came in in part as a comment in response to
21 regulatory reform. When we do issue the proposed
22 rule, we would invite everyone to submit their

1 comments and their feedback and their perspectives
2 and that will help to inform the final rule.
3 MS. LIEBMAN: Just to clarify, that we're
4 looking at the worker protection standard in this
5 rule. Are we or are we not talking about workers
6 that are hired? It's --
7 MR. KEIGWIN: I mean there is the provision
8 for family farms and family members on family farms
9 under WPS and there's a lower minimum age currently
10 under the finalized WPS rule that went into effect
11 in 2015.
12 MS. LIEBMAN: So if you have a family member
13 and you choose to have them do it, you're not hiring
14 them, then it's fine, but like if you hire someone,
15 it's not, correct?
16 MR. KEIGWIN: So as, under the WPS
17 standpoint, I think Amy might be talking a little
18 about certification. I'm not -- but I don't want to
19 put words in her mouth.
20 MS. ASMUS: A lot of our 4-H kids and our
21 FFA kids come from non-ag families and we really
22 need to encourage their, their interest in ag and

1 interest in ag fields. And some of them don't have
2 family farms in order to work on, and we really need
3 to encourage them and mentor them at that age. And
4 if they can't touch a third of what we apply, that
5 really takes them out of some of those programs and
6 projects that they're working towards. We can't
7 assume that just because they're a 4-H kid or an FFA
8 kid that they come from a farm family. We really
9 need to grow our pool of workers and we really need
10 to reach out to those kids that are interested in ag
11 and not necessarily growing up on a farm or in an ag
12 family.
13 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. Aaron, then Leyla, then
14 Damon.
15 MR. HOBBS: Thanks. I just want to
16 reinforce the appreciation that we have for the
17 resilience shown by the agency in a very challenging
18 time with the inability for PRIA 4 to be passed.
19 You know, we have talked repeatedly about the
20 challenges as leaders and managers that you're
21 having and just appreciate the dedication that you
22 have, the things that you've done to improve the

1 program in a challenging political time.

2 And I guess my concern is all of the issuee

3 that are being discussed are important and need a

4 thoughtful response. And my concern is that two

5 issues have been linked and the result is

6 potentially the burning down of the house. To solve

7 an issue that if the agency isn't properly funded

8 and you don't have the resources you need to do your

9 job, the results would be significantly greater.

10 And so I'm just concerned that the house is burning

11 down with these two issues being linked and it

12 doesn't seem that those folks that are the most

13 engaged there are working towards a solution that

14 allows us to get PRIA moving forward.

15 So I just wanted to share that concern

16 again, reiterate my appreciation for all the

17 leadership within the program, for what you're doing

18 to keep your teams motivated and focused at a time

19 where attrition seems to be going in the wrong

20 direction for the life of the program, so thank you.

21 MR. KEIGWIN: Leyla, then Damon.

22 MS. McCURDY: Thank you. I have a question

1 for Amy Asmus, actually. It's a three-part
2 question. You said that the 4-H or similar programs
3 are a pathway for young people to get into
4 agriculture and for those kids who may not come from
5 families that are in agriculture, the only way to
6 train them for that type of career is to expose them
7 to pesticides, according to the way you spoke about
8 it.
9 So around that, here are my questions. How
10 long does it take to train someone? Number one.
11 And these kids, if they come into these programs,
12 how much are they exposed to pesticides? Thirdly,
13 isn't there a way to train them without exposing
14 them to pesticides? There are many, many training
15 programs I know that goes through the routine
16 without having kids touching hazardous materials.
17 MS. ASMUS: First of all, I would like to
18 say that we operate under the rules of our labels
19 and each of the labels have material safety data
20 sheets go along with them, and we're all trained in
21 protective equipment, PPE, that go along with it.
22 And so these kids, if they're working under, under

1 those label directions, their exposure to it is
2 minimal. Just like the workers that I put the
3 field, their exposure to it is minimal. All of that
4 safety stuff is listed on the use labels. And when
5 we follow that, we're limiting the exposure to
6 somebody who is 16 or to somebody that's 36. We all
7 want to operate under the same rules and limit
8 exposures to any of these pesticides.
9 And we do need to train them to use the
10 protective equipment that is listed on the label and
11 to apply them correctly. And if we do that, we work
12 really hard to minimize that exposure to anybody
13 applying pesticides, not just children.
14 MS. McCURDY: That only answers one of my
15 questions and not really to my satisfaction.
16 Because minimal exposure is still exposure and
17 children are more vulnerable to these types of
18 exposures. I don't need to show a chart to show you
19 why children are more vulnerable, et cetera. So the
20 other piece of my question was why couldn't that
21 training occur without actual exposure, actual
22 exposure, to minimal exposure? Couldn't you do your

1 training still but not actually have them be near
2 these hazardous materials?
3 MS. ASMUS: I believe training is a
4 life-long thing. I'm not an educator myself, but I
5 do believe we could give them book knowledge without
6 exposing them. But a lot of the projects that these
7 kids, 4-H kids work on through 4-H and FFA, the
8 application of the chemistry is only a very small
9 part of it. And the same thing with production. We
10 want to teach them the big picture of production and
11 this application is a small part of it. And so what
12 they learn through the application is how to apply
13 it correctly but once they learn and being hands-on
14 and truly involved in a project that this is a
15 portion of, is something you can't teach in a
16 classroom and it's not something that you can teach
17 in a book.
18 MS. McCURDY: I am not for this thing,
19 training without hands-on. Why can't they just use
20 water as a substitute for pesticide? You go still
21 through the training . It doesn't have to be the
22 toxic material that they need to be using for the

1 training. I mean if this is, you know, the premise
2 why we need to expose these kids to a pesticide,
3 that oh, we have to do the training with the real
4 material. What is the reasoning of the real
5 material there? Use the same exposure techniques,
6 go through your training but substitute some
7 non-hazardous materials in place of that. I mean it
8 seems like common sense and I would like to hear an
9 argument against this.
10 MS. ASMUS: I suppose we could for a sense
11 of time agree to disagree, and if you want to catch
12 me later, we can continue this conversation.
13 MS. LIEBMAN: I do think we need better
14 clarification from the Office of Pesticide Programs
15 here about the population that these regulations are
16 targeting. Because this discussion seems to have
17 gone a bit far field from what we are looking at in
18 terms of the worker protection standards and the
19 certified pesticide applicator rule which deals with
20 restricted use pesticides. I was involved with 4-H.
21 I don't see any need for a restricted use pesticide
22 to learn about agriculture when I'm 14 and 15.

1 So I really recommend that we take some time
2 at some point during this meeting so you can explain
3 the existing rule, particularly since you're going
4 to issue something in the Register to roll it back.
5 I mean it just, this is bizarre.
6 MR. KEIGWIN: So we do have some good
7 materials on our website and we can get that link
8 around to everybody, that provides sort of a basic
9 overview of the two rules as they are currently in
10 effect and would be in effect until and if changes
11 were made through our formal notice and comment
12 rule-making process. And so we'll get those
13 materials around to people before the meeting ends.
14 Damon.
15 MR. REABE: One point of clarification I
16 think on this particular rule is that there is a
17 current exemption for family members to be able to
18 get trained and handle restricted use pesticides at
19 the age of 16. And so just to refresh everybody's
20 memory, at the last meeting I pointed out that
21 aerial application companies are typically small
22 family-owned companies and we were interested in

1 having the provision of family members that applies
2 to farms be applied to our small businesses because
3 they operate much like farms. And so that's just a
4 little perspective I think on the comments that I
5 made at the previous meeting to kind of frame,
6 provide some framework of what was one of the
7 suggestions that was made.
8 MR. KEIGWIN: Andrew, at one point you had
9 your hand up. I didn't know if it had fallen down
10 or if you were --
11 MR. THOSTENSON: I just took it down because
12 I thought we were going to move on. But I am a
13 professional pesticide safety educator. I've been
14 educating pesticide applicators formally for about
15 22 years. It seems to me that we're kind of talking
16 across each other a little bit right now, but I can
17 assure you that in a formal training setting where I
18 have people in a classroom situation, I'm not using
19 live pesticides whatsoever in those events. I mean
20 it just doesn't make any sense.
21 On the other hand, there are times when
22 we're doing some sort of continuing education or

1 some sort of learning-by-doing exercise with an FFA
2 or 4-H project that may be outside of the venues of
3 a traditional training that it would be useful to be
4 able to actually use pesticides in those particular
5 situations. And I do know that that sort of thing
6 goes on. I don't have any qualms about that being
7 done, but as I said in a formal training situation,
8 we really wouldn't be using pesticides.
9 MR. KEIGWIN: Any last comments before we go
10 to break? Let me check one time on the phone for
11 Iris, Pat or Sharon.
12 MS. SELVAGGIO: Hi, this is Sharon. Can you
13 hear me?
14 MR. KEIGWIN: Yes, Sharon. Go ahead, thank
15 you.
16 MS. SELVAGGIO: Okay. Just a couple of
17 things I guess I wanted to comment on. First, you
18 know, in listening to the comments by Amy, you know,
19 she emphasized the need to encourage and mentor
20 young kids. And I have to agree with Amy Liebman
21 and some of the others here, Leyla, that, you know,
22 that's an important goal. Farming is a complex

1 business. There's a lot to it, and encouraging and
2 mentoring teenagers to engage in farming can happen
3 because there's a lot to teach. But it's not
4 necessary to expose teenagers to live pesticides at
5 that age when there is so many other ways and topics
6 that need to be explored. So I just, I don't really
7 buy that argument.
8 And I'm also recognizing that we do seem to
9 be a bit afield since this doesn't seem to be
10 covered, but it is a human safety issue that it
11 seems like there should be some kind of protection
12 for kids in a training situation, whether or not
13 they were hired workers, that they're not
14 inadvertently exposed to pesticides or other toxic
15 chemicals by people who are training them.
16 Just a question on the technical data, going
17 back to some of the stats that Steve covered. I was
18 struck, like some others were, about the sort of
19 performance metrics that Steve presented. Your
20 performance metrics are looking really good, even
21 though you have fewer workers working on this
22 particular -- on PRIA stuff. And it raises a

1 question for me about whether mistakes are being
2 made, you know, or if review is less stringent than
3 it used to be. Have there been any changes in
4 what's covered? So without being a registrant
5 myself, I'm not 100 percent clear on the data that's
6 being covered in these reviews and it would be
7 helpful to get just a brief overview of that. Thank
8 you.
9 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Sharon. I think a lot
10 of the efficiency has come from our use of
11 electronic tools to review the label. If we were to
12 -- Steve, in one of his slides, presented the
13 percentage utility of some of our electronic label
14 comparison tools. If you were to look at our
15 percentage utilization of those tools from even a
16 couple of years ago, you would see that those ranges
17 that he presented were significantly lower. So
18 we're upwards of 80-plus percent in some cases, you
19 know, into the 90 percent utilization of the
20 electronic label tools.
21 And from the people who are doing the final
22 review and acceptance of the labels, in the past it

1 used to be a very manual process where you would
2 literally put the previously accepted label on one
3 side of you and the current or the pending label
4 before you, and you would go line by line with
5 rulers or fingers to figure it out. And now that
6 piece of it, very manually intensive, is now
7 essentially done by the computer. And then the
8 reviewers are then looking at where there are
9 differences to figure out if those differences are
10 ones that warrant further technical consideration or
11 ones that are acceptable to move forward. So that
12 tool in and of itself accounts for a great deal.
13 In the science divisions, and I think you'll
14 hear a little bit about this later today, a lot of
15 work has been done to reduce reliance on animal
16 testing and so we are starting to see either reduced
17 data coming in or alternative testing beginning to
18 come in that necessitates less science resources to
19 effectuate the same type of assessment and so we're
20 seeing some resource savings there as well.
21 We have hit 10:30, which was our target mark
22 for our break. Thank you all for this discussion.

1 We will reconvene at 10:45. Thank you.

2 (Break in proceedings.)

3 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. So our next two

4 presentations that will take us, with questions, to

5 our lunch break will be updates on two of our

6 efficiency projects, one related to what we're

7 currently calling the SmartLabel and then a second

8 regarding making our confidential statements of

9 formula available in electronic and digitized form.

10 So let me first turn to Patricia Parrott,

11 who is acting as the senior advisor in our Field and

12 External Affairs Division. She's also our Homeland

13 Security advisor for the Office of Pesticide

14 Programs. Patty.

15 MS. PARROTT: Okay, good morning. Thanks,

16 Rick.

17 So I'm here to talk about SmartLabel. For

18 some of you, this, some of it might be a little

19 redundant and you've heard about it before, but I'm

20 going to start and kind of give an overview.

21 So our SmartLabel is our electronic

22 pesticide label and what we've done is we've

1 developed a way to bring it in as structured data
2 rather than a flat Adobe Acrobat file. And it's
3 part of our change and to utilize IT systems to help
4 us gain efficiencies in moving information around
5 and accessing the information.
6 So right now, our IT systems have developed
7 over time, like a lot of big companies or
8 bureaucracies, into these disparate systems that we
9 cobble together to work with each other but it's not
10 the most efficient process. So what we've done is
11 through developing SmartLabel, we partnered with FDA
12 and we built on their best practices that they
13 developed in changing their pharmaceutical labels
14 into an electronic, electronic label. And they've
15 been doing it for years.
16 So we used their standard, the HL7 standard,
17 which is an international standard that will allow
18 us to share information with agencies and other
19 health entities. This model is also expandable and
20 the idea is we envision that we will eventually
21 delve out and have a clean database that functions
22 as a single unit for all of OPP's information.

1 We had to start somewhere. We started with
2 the electronic pesticide label because that touched
3 every aspect of the program and also the ECSF.
4 Those are the beginning steps of getting our entire
5 IT transformation.
6 So this will just show you visually how the
7 information streams. The information will come in
8 electronically through a submission entry point. At
9 this time we're using the central data exchange
10 portal. A lot of you are familiar with that.
11 That's the agency standard. Then running validation
12 on the information before it goes into our database
13 that is modular in fashion and talks to each other,
14 which is the honeycomb, and then it goes into a
15 piece for electronic workflow. We're trying to move
16 away from the paper, like Rick said, going down line
17 by line.
18 We've made an interim step where we do
19 document compare with Adobe Acrobat and we're
20 envisioning moving to the fully electronic with
21 internal validation that can go in and make sure
22 that we have -- everything adds to 100, the

1 signatures are there, things like this, that are
2 very routine so that we can use our human resources
3 doing science review and things we really need to,
4 using automation where possible.
5 So in the summer of 2014 we solicited pilot
6 participants, partnerships to work with us and build
7 out our model and to test it, and these are the
8 companies that were selected.
9 We've had three phases through 2017, and
10 this is to highlight some of the feedback that we
11 got. So initially we came up with something and we
12 got feedback that it was too complicated. It wasn't
13 clear. It was just too cumbersome to work with. So
14 we simplified the data model. And we have different
15 parts, so we have a label content section and an
16 index piece. We also updated our user guidance and
17 in Phase 3 we started developing a builder,
18 something to assist with actually building the label
19 in the manner that we wanted. The idea is that we
20 want the electronic data, the XML files submitted
21 and that can be developed through our builder or
22 not.

1 And think of the IRS. You can use Turbo
2 Tax, you can use any number of tools, but they want
3 that electronic file submitted. And so that's the
4 model. As I said, not only with FDA but we're using
5 other best practices within the federal government
6 to develop our standards and our system.
7 So one of the major improvements that we had
8 to work on, and it has taken time, is to get our
9 arms around our terminology management, and so we
10 standardized. We've built out vocabulary lists,
11 we've borrowed lists. We've gone to experts,
12 definitive sources. We're using the Entomological
13 Society to help clarify our test list and we've
14 established consistency with other federal agencies
15 in our list.
16 We've taken our terms and we've registered
17 them with the EPA system. It's currently Synaptica
18 is the language or the system that we use for
19 managing our terminology. This is to show some of
20 the categories that we've used.
21 This next slide just shows that we have a
22 description in here. It's a center pivot sprinkler

1 irrigation system. And then we've defined it and
2 this is what it is. And what's not shown is we also
3 have synonyms for this. So when someone comes in
4 and they use a different term, like, okay, is this
5 -- do we already have this in our list? And we can
6 do an electronic check. We don't have to add any
7 term. We also have rigor around if someone does, if
8 there is something new that's invented or submitted,
9 that we'll have a committee and a team and really
10 look at it and say is this actually a new thing, do
11 we have to add that? And this way we'll get away
12 from what we have now, which over time, we have a
13 drop-down list of 1100 items, which doesn't do
14 anybody any good. It's virtually useless, so.
15 And this is to show how we managed to put
16 some boundaries around what we have by getting basic
17 categories and then fitting things into those, while
18 still managing to cover all of the different systems
19 that we have. It's pretty -- that's my layman's way
20 of saying this. A lot of work went into this with a
21 lot of developers and experts here in OPP.
22 So this is a screen shot, and this is our

1 test environment for the portal but this should look
2 familiar to most of you. You can see that there is
3 on the bottom right-hand corner, the SmartLabel
4 submission. So if you went to the portal and you're
5 registered to go in there and you want to submit a
6 label, you would click on that icon.
7 And this is the next screen that you would
8 get. So you can either upload a previous file.
9 Like I said, if you have your own system, if you've
10 already built a label and you just made a small
11 change to it, you can just upload the XML or you can
12 go, begin a new SmartLabel and you can use our
13 builder that we've provided to go ahead and build
14 your label.
15 This is the first screen that you would see
16 and it's got the document information and it will
17 pre-populate where it can, based on your name. And
18 then you'll have a product label and the use index
19 piece. The product label has more text and the use
20 index has more data fields to it for specific
21 information. The idea is that your marketing
22 claims, places where you have latitude, that can all

1 be there, and then the underlying data that wouldn't
2 change. Your application rate would be there,
3 submitted as data that can automatically be pulled
4 for risk assessment, risk mitigation purposes. And
5 this way the registrant is submitting the
6 information on the label. We do away with manual
7 entry and any kind of errors that that could create,
8 also any interpretation of the label. The
9 registrant is telling us exactly what they intend on
10 their label.
11 This is the ingredient statement, what it
12 would look like. And as you can see, there is the
13 guidance there on the right. And then at the bottom
14 in blue there's a description of what the page is
15 actually looking for for that additional guidance.
16 In addition to this, there is a user guide,
17 all of the code, the instructions, everything is
18 also posted online, like I said. So it's available
19 if anyone wanted to build their own builder or a
20 third-party vendor, either to customize for certain
21 industries. That's available.
22 So what are the next steps? So right now

1 we're currently in the final phase. We've gotten
2 our pilot participants back together. We've shown
3 them what we have, and based on their input, they're
4 testing it at the moment. On May 15th, we're going
5 to get their feedback. We'll do some final
6 revisions. At that time we'll be ready for our
7 initial launch. We plan on doing a soft launch
8 initially, just to get some additional testing done,
9 and then we envision sometime later this year, it
10 would be available for voluntary submissions.
11 While we're developing these electronic
12 tools to get information in here quicker and to help
13 the registrants and move things along, we need some
14 tools internally so that we're not getting it in
15 electronically and then turning it into paper and
16 doing our Adobe Acrobat reviews and things. So
17 while we're doing all of this, we are also working
18 on developing tools for electronic review in
19 management of our information within OPP.
20 So for implementation, we're reaching out.
21 We're letting people know about this and we will,
22 when it's launched, encourage some voluntary

1 participation and submission of your labels. It
2 will be voluntary initially. Of course, there will
3 be a learning curve. We plan on providing
4 assistance in getting it in. Once the initial label
5 is in and it gets reviewed, the advantages are going
6 to be that it will be easy to track. It will be a
7 quicker review time. It will be easy to make
8 changes to your label for amendments and stuff, so
9 there are benefits on both sides.
10 And then we're going to label, I'm sorry,
11 leverage the label information to further develop
12 our IT systems. Because the label contains, I would
13 say, most or a lot of the essential information
14 needed. It's got, you know, the registrant, the
15 name, the active ingredients, tied with what you're
16 going to hear from Diane about the ECSF as part of
17 the package, and we're going to build on that to
18 further develop our IT system.
19 One of the things we have to do is we have
20 to find a new name. We realize that the Grocery
21 Manufacturers' Association trademarked the name
22 SmartLabel in December of 2016. So internally

1 we're, we're maybe going to have a contest to rename
2 it. If anybody out there has a suggestion, feel
3 free to raise it. And I'm not sure that you'll get
4 the prize but -- which is lunch, but anyway. So
5 we're calling it SmartLabel now but like I said,
6 that will change, but hopefully it will be something
7 obvious that you will know it's still there.
8 So here, like I said, we expect that there
9 will be benefits on both sides when this is
10 implemented. It's I think everyone -- labels are
11 developed electronically, whether they're Word or
12 any manner and stuff, so this is just an advance
13 that's going to help everyone and it's just the way
14 that we need to move and use the tools available to
15 us to have efficiency.
16 And right now, I'll take questions or what?
17 MR. KEIGWIN: Why don't we have Diane do her
18 presentation and then we can take questions on both.
19 So Diane Isbell is with our Antimicrobial
20 Division.
21 MS. ISBELL: Okay. So I am going to talk
22 about the eCSF. The electronic confidential

1 statement of formula is an electronic version of
2 EPA's current CSF. This project began a number of
3 years ago. Actually probably I believe it was 2008
4 we had a product chemistry workshop where we noticed
5 that we had a lot of errors that seemed to be
6 happening all the time and that we felt like we
7 needed a way to help, you know, help everybody be
8 more efficient. And we also knew that we wanted to
9 move into a more electronic way of managing our
10 work, so we started this project.
11 And now we are in the process of developing
12 the electronic software so, and the software will
13 provide an option for people to submit the
14 structured product data in lieu of what people have
15 been just submitting now, which is the paper version
16 or electronic but not searchable. So in this case
17 we'll actually be able to search for certain aspects
18 of a formula because we often get inquiries about
19 how much of a particular inert ingredient is in --
20 are in various products or a particular active
21 ingredient, and it's a little bit cumbersome to do
22 that now.

1 So similar to the SmartLabel, the eCSF will
2 be submitted through EPA's pesticide submission
3 portal. So this is, as Patty showed you, this is
4 also the test area for the portal and the ECSF is
5 located at the top right corner. And so similar to
6 the SmartLabel, if you clicked on that, then you
7 would be able to upload an existing file that you
8 already had submitted before or a new one.
9 So this will allow applicants to submit the
10 electronic information to EPA, and if you have
11 submitted the electronic submission before, it will
12 automatically populate your CSF the next time. So
13 it will be a little bit cumbersome maybe at first,
14 but eventually it will improve. But it will also
15 prepopulate information from your portal logon, so
16 it would be your company name, the company number
17 and, you know, the address, all that information
18 would be there.
19 The chemical name will link to the agency
20 information sources, and we're using the substance
21 registry system, and that's also consistent with the
22 SmartLabel. And this also includes the product

1 properties as are currently assessed. And the
2 manufacturer and formulating sites and addresses.
3 So this page shows the initial, the page
4 just with the basic information about the company.
5 So the name and the address and the company number,
6 but there's a couple of new fields that are down at
7 the bottom and they are for, asking if this is a
8 food use or if it's a microbial. And those are new
9 which I think will help the registrants of microbial
10 products but also will help clarify certain uses,
11 especially antimicrobials that are food uses where
12 it may not always be evident.
13 Some of the benefits of using this
14 electronic form are that we anticipate to have
15 significant time and resource savings for both the
16 agency and for applicants. We feel like most
17 submissions of CSF are actually modifications of
18 currently -- which are forms that are already
19 in-house. And so if you had submitted it previously
20 electronically, then you would just be able to
21 update the fields that you wanted to change. We
22 think that will help save resources as well.

1 And as I mentioned before, the structured
2 data fields will allow for the data to be searched
3 and you wouldn't need to reenter it. So we think
4 that this will help everyone, especially reducing
5 time to fill it out initially and also time and
6 effort needed for error corrections.
7 So now this actually is the screen where you
8 can see the -- where you add the components so, and
9 on this screen you can actually, you can enter in
10 the chemical name. If you would like to choose it,
11 you can enter the chemical name or you could enter
12 the cas number. So, and then once you fill in one
13 of those, it should prepopulate with the other,
14 other pieces of it. So we also ask the question is
15 this nano material and also as part of this, it will
16 calculate the upper and lower certified limits
17 automatically because that seems to be one of the
18 biggest error, errors that we get.
19 So some more on the benefits, just basically
20 what I was mentioning about the microbial fields and
21 the data validation, but also consistent with
22 SmartLabel, we will be relying less on paper and the

1 paper-based processes because we are developing a
2 database that will manage those, the SmartLabel and
3 the eCSF data together, and this is just one module
4 in our overall electronic management process.
5 So the eCSF team is continuing to work with
6 all divisions on the eCSF elements and to include
7 data fields, harmonized OPP-wide vocabularies and
8 data validation rules, so that we're consistent with
9 the SmartLabel.
10 And we have collaborated with the SmartLabel
11 to overlap -- to harmonize overlapping vocabulary
12 such as like the chemical names. And we have also
13 been working with nine registrants on the testing
14 and development. So we've had, I believe we've had
15 two sessions working with the registrants and we
16 will be having another one as we move along.
17 The rendered format for the eCSF will be
18 very similar to the current format. However, there
19 are some additional fields such as the microbial
20 chemicals and the (inaudible) that I mentioned. So
21 we're trying to fit those in the best that we can
22 but we want it to remain as similar as possible.

1 And we're also working on establishing the
2 workflow management for future eCSF data and we are,
3 you know, looking toward the future in terms of how
4 we could manage that workflow through our electronic
5 processes. We anticipate releasing this the summer
6 of '18 or some, maybe a little bit later. We're
7 still kind of working that out, but at least
8 sometime in 2018.
9 So the registrants, the nine registrants
10 that we have participated with on the testing are
11 listed here on this screen and we're very grateful
12 for the input that we've had. It's been productive
13 and we are hoping to have one more round as I
14 mentioned.
15 So our next steps are to develop the
16 electronic workflow internally and train OPP staff
17 and encourage registrants to implement use of the
18 ECSF. And we also plan to have more outreach and
19 training with the registrants when we roll this out
20 and we will provide assistance to the registrants as
21 we do implement this . And well, it's going to
22 continue with other modernization, OPP IT

1 modernization initiatives.

2 Do you have any questions or comments?

3 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Patty and Diane.

4 Questions?

5 All right. Damon, then Charlotte.

6 MR. REABE: My comment is for the first

7 presenter. How about E-label?

8 MS. PARROTT: Sounds good to me.

9 MR. KEIGWIN: Charlotte.

10 MS. SANSON: First I would like to commend

11 you guys, EPA for all the work you put into these

12 tools. I know it's a lot of effort that's going

13 into it and I think in the long run, it will be a

14 big savings. I look back in the days years and

15 years ago when I did this work and all manually.

16 We've come a long way so that's, I appreciate that.

17 So a couple questions I have. I have a

18 whole bunch. So if you want me to like stop, just

19 tell me but I think most of these apply to both, the

20 ECSF and the Smart or E-label.

21 One is if you could define a little bit more

22 what you mean by soft launch that you're

1 anticipating on both of these tools. And will there
2 be an opportunity for those registrants who have not
3 participated in either workgroup to participate in
4 providing some input and explore these tools before
5 they're fully launched, if that's going to be part
6 of the soft launch? So I can stop there if you
7 would like to address that.
8 MS. PARROTT: Yes, I think that is part of
9 the problem, not part of the problem but part of our
10 thinking is to do a soft launch before we, you know,
11 let everyone go and find all these problems is to
12 somehow stagger it out in a fair manner. I mean
13 we've been working with the pilot participants but
14 how do we release it in a fashion where we can get
15 feedback that's manageable to us, if any errors, or
16 there are any problems that come up. We do intend
17 to have webinars and training sessions to show
18 everyone what's available and then, like I said, and
19 then to have it available for voluntary use. We're
20 still trying to work some of this out but yes, we do
21 want feedback.
22 We also, at every step of the pilot

1 previously we've had, we've put all the materials up
2 and they've been available for people to see and
3 comment on into a mailbox. And that mailbox was
4 available for additional comments but at this time
5 since the next step is what we see as the soft
6 launch, that's why -- I'm not sure about the timing
7 of when we're going to be doing this. But yes, we
8 do intend in doing some outreach. And for the ECSF,
9 the same.
10 MS. SANSON: Okay. Thank you for that. And
11 then the other question I have is is this tool
12 intended for like from this point or when it's
13 launched that point going forward or how will
14 existing labels and eCSFs be uploaded and is there
15 going to be any kind of a batch loading or one by
16 one? How do you envision that going or is it just
17 going -- in other words, is it going to be
18 retroactive as well as going forward?
19 MS. PARROTT: Okay. The way the system is
20 envisioned is that registrants would submit their
21 own information. We're not going to like upload
22 anything ourselves because we want you all, the

1 registrants to tell us --

2 (Simultaneous speech.)

3 MS. SANSON: -- or will they do that

4 individually?

5 MS. PARROTT: To tell you, I'm not sure how

6 that would go. You mean to upload many at once?

7 MS. SANSON: Right.

8 MS. PARROTT: That's an IT question I'm not

9 sure that I'm -- that I can answer right now. It

10 depends how the portal works but, yeah, we can look

11 into that and get back to you, so.

12 MS. SANSON: Okay. So, but as far as, so it

13 would be up to the registrants then to upload their

14 own labels and go back to the existing ones is what

15 you're saying.

16 MS. PARROTT: Correct.

17 MS. SANSON: There's an opportunity for

18 that.

19 MS. PARROTT: Yes, yes.

20 MS. SANSON: Okay. And CSFas well, okay.

21 That's all I have at the moment. I'll probably have

22 more. I'll let somebody else.

1 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. Andrew, then Jay.

2 MR. THOSTENSON: I saw with some interest

3 the desire eventually to make this tool available to

4 states and tribes, and I understand it's in the

5 development phase right now, but what sorts of

6 conversations and what are some of your visions for

7 trying to make some of these tools available to

8 other agencies that may be registering pesticides

9 like states, as well as educators like myself, where

10 I would want to do some sort of review about a

11 particular label statement and how many labels might

12 contain a certain PPE string and that sort of thing?

13 Is that a five- or ten-years down the road sort of

14 thing or is it maybe sooner than we think?

15 MS. PARROTT: Okay. For making the tools

16 available, this will be available online to anyone

17 who wants to use it. We are in conversations with

18 Canada and California. We've also been speaking

19 with NPIRS, so reaching a lot of the states.

20 They're aware of this and we've gotten some input

21 and we've presented them. So there is some

22 harmonization and knowledge going on there.

1 As far as making it fully searchable to the
2 public, what we'll publish is a structured rendered
3 label in a consistent format for the master label
4 and that will be available. Think of PPLS but it
5 would be in a structured format.
6 As far as the searchability across, you
7 know, different labels and things, that is a step
8 that we're still going to have to think about and
9 develop. Initially registrants didn't want to be
10 potentially penalized if they were early adopters
11 because someone could easily search and find like a
12 gap and then come in with registration for that gap.
13 So we're trying to think about what's fair to
14 everyone and we'll get additional input with that.
15 You had another piece of your question and
16 I'm not sure. Did I -- I can't remember. You got
17 it?
18 MR. THOSTENSON: Yeah.
19 MS. PARROTT: Okay, all right. Thank you.
20 MR. KEIGWIN: Jay, then Eric.
21 MR. VROOM: Three quick questions. Slide 5
22 has a reference to 6A2 submissions as input. So how

1 and how often are 6A2 notifications impacting label
2 changes and is 6A2, an electronic or an electronic
3 option? The second question is could you tell us a
4 little bit more about Synaptica. Are they a
5 contractor that the agency has used elsewhere? Just
6 give us a little more context to that.
7 And also you made reference to some
8 learnings that were gathered from FDA, electronic
9 submissions and ultimately that sort of comes back
10 to the initiative at the administrator's level with
11 the new chief operating officer and smart sectors,
12 how much enhancement, synergy is going on across EPA
13 to ensure that you're taking advantage of things
14 that are on the shelf, that may be already adopted
15 elsewhere in the agency? And also I'm reminded that
16 the registration and registration evaluation offices
17 have mentioned that their computing systems are on
18 different platforms, so how does all that progress
19 moving forward? Maybe Rick, for your kind of
20 overarching perspective.
21 MS. PARROTT: Okay. For 6A2, we do have an
22 incident data system where submissions come in, and

1 what we were showing on slide 5 was that eventually
2 we see the harmonization of all of our electronic
3 submissions. I mean as far as how often a 6A2
4 impacts a label, I don't have those data right now
5 but that was the intention of the slide. That's a
6 different question and we can get back to you if you
7 need that.
8 For Synaptica, from what -- and I'm not the
9 expert. It's what our Office of Environmental
10 Information uses. I believe it's a platform for
11 computer languages and stuff. I know it goes out.
12 It's got (inaudible) codes and other things that go
13 with it. Database people, programmers would
14 probably know more about that, but it's an agency
15 standard that we use.
16 As far as you said according to the chief
17 operating officer, I think this started back in the
18 last administration but what we've tried to do is to
19 be consistent and harmonize and not redevelop to be
20 consistent, use existing standards and best
21 practices that exist so that we're not creating a
22 one offer system that wouldn't be consistent with

1 any other thing. All of our IT development systems
2 go through a review by our chief information
3 officer. It's a SAKARA (phonetic) review and I have
4 no idea what that acronym means, but there is, there
5 is rigor around that, so we are aware of that and
6 building to those standards.
7 MR. VROOM: I'm also curious to know for the
8 registrants that have been participating in the
9 pilot, I mean is there some metric that they can
10 say, you know, we've gained something as a
11 registrant by, you know, participating in this so
12 that other registrants can see an incentive outcome
13 as well?
14 MS. PARROTT: I will tell you that our pilot
15 participants are enthusiastic about the tool. They
16 have pulled -- the feedback we've gotten is that
17 it's going to help them. They're building systems
18 anyway. They want them to be consistent with ours
19 because they need this tool themselves, something
20 electronically to keep version control, to easily
21 make changes, to react quickly.
22 We can, you know, have more of that as it

1 rolls out, maybe have the pilot participants seek,
2 you know, additional advantages. We've said some of
3 them. We think time, time savings is going to be a
4 big, a big value to both sides of the equation.
5 Was there anything else?
6 MR. VROOM: Just about systems that can talk
7 to each other between the offices, Rick?
8 MR. KEIGWIN: I think the agency has a
9 longer term goal, to make sure that all of our
10 systems across the agency are talking to each other,
11 you know. We're starting here. There's also an
12 effort -- some of this system, once fully
13 operational, will also contain some of the tolerance
14 information as well and so there will be an
15 opportunity to share that information directly with
16 our colleagues at FDA who do tolerance enforcement,
17 for example. So we are building this in mind for
18 that longer term vision.
19 MR. KEIGWIN: Eric, are you good?
20 MR. GJEVRE: I think you more than answered
21 the questions I had. But I was just curious, how
22 many total registrants after all this is built out

1 do you think you'll have that could use it?
2 MS. PARROTT: All of them. We've built it
3 out to handle all types and we did a -- in selecting
4 pilot participants, we want a representation from
5 all of the major groups, small, large,
6 antimicrobial, biopesticides. We've worked -- as
7 well as conventionals. We've worked on all of the
8 lists. So we're hoping that eventually because it
9 will be fully, it will meet its full potential when
10 it's fully loaded with all of the information and of
11 course, we can't get it all at once but we're hoping
12 that everyone will see value in using it.
13 MR. KEIGWIN: Liza.
14 MS. TROSSBACH: To follow up on Andrew's
15 comment, I wanted to offer on behalf of states,
16 tribes and territories, just the importance of the
17 system. I think that state-lead agencies, tribes
18 and territories ought to be on registration programs
19 as well and so this is a tool, would be great for
20 us. We use PPLS a lot to do label comparisons and
21 that can be cumbersome and so anything to streamline
22 that.

1 I would encourage EPA to have some kind of
2 searchability function, in that at some point,
3 particularly for us as your co-regulators, when we
4 get a label in our particular offices, we want to
5 make sure that it is in concert with the EPA
6 accepted label and so having that searchability
7 would greatly enhance our ability to do that.
8 And then the other thing with the webinars
9 and the outreach that you're going to do, I would
10 request that you have that, some of those sessions
11 specifically for your states, tribes and territories
12 so they can understand the applicability directly to
13 those registration programs, in addition to those
14 that you're going to do, you know, for the
15 registrants and other interested users. Thank you.
16 MS. PARROTT: Okay, thank you. And we will,
17 we will look into those.
18 And one of the things I wanted to say in
19 addition to, we were talking about benefits of the
20 system, is that right now web-distributed labeling,
21 we haven't had any applications for web-distributed.
22 Getting the labels, pesticide labels into this

1 electronic format we believe is going to facilitate
2 also web-distributed labeling which will then also
3 be a benefit to states and others. You can look for
4 a particular section of a label, rather than going
5 through all 30. So the searchability function and
6 all of those attributes are things that we are
7 working towards.
8 MS. TROSSBACH: Just one follow-up question
9 for the web-distributed labeling. So this system,
10 you know, when it gets to that point will be able to
11 track the versions of the labels? Because that was
12 really important with web-distributed labeling and
13 what label was in effect at the time of application.
14 So that would be built into this somehow as well?
15 MS. PARROTT: Yes, it is.
16 MS. TROSSBACH: Thank you.
17 MR. KEIGWIN: Let me check with PPDC members
18 on the phone. Sharon, Iris or Pat, do you have any
19 comments or questions?
20 Any more comments or questions from PPDC
21 members in the room? Aaron.
22 MR. HOBBS: I'll be brief. You have a great

1 representative sample of the industry. I just want
2 to encourage that more communication and outreach to
3 a broader section of the community is going to be
4 valuable as this moves forward and just, if you
5 think you're communicating enough, maybe add another
6 10 percent. Thank you.
7 MS. PARROTT: Okay, thank you. We will.
8 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. Any other questions,
9 comments?
10 MR. THOSTENSON: You mentioned the term
11 "web- distributed labeling" as something that we
12 have had conversations over the last five or six
13 years about and this would certainly facilitate that
14 process. Can you give me some sort of indication or
15 idea as to how many web-distributed labels have
16 actually tried to go through the system as it exists
17 now?
18 MS. PARROTT: None.
19 MR. THOSTENSON: None.
20 MS. PARROTT: Yeah.
21 MR. THOSTENSON: And presumably the
22 impediment is the ability to generate some sort of

1 electronic labeling?

2 MS. PARROTT: Yes, we believe that is a

3 limiting factor. I am not the expert on it but yes,

4 we do feel that. And so the thought is that the

5 SmartLabel, the electronic pesticide label will

6 facilitate that. The information will be available

7 in that format anyway, and so it will be ready to be

8 delivered through the web-disputed labeling

9 platform.

10 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. So we are running 15

11 minutes ahead of schedule, which means you have a

12 little bit more time for lunch which means you'll

13 have a little bit more time to get through security

14 to come back in. We are going to -- we've got a

15 very packed afternoon, so we would like to start

16 again promptly at 1:15, so you might want to try to

17 get here for security no later than 1:00 or earlier,

18 if you can. Have a good lunch. See you this

19 afternoon.

20 (A lunch recess was taken.)

21 MR. KEIGWIN: All right, welcome back. So

22 the first half of the afternoon we're going to

1 update you all on some of our efforts in employing
2 some 21st Century toxicology techniques and
3 transitioning to less animal testing. So we're
4 going to start off with a session, Anna Lowit, who
5 is the senior science advisor for the Office of
6 Pesticide Programs and Garland Waleko, who is in our
7 Pesticide Reevaluation Division, will kick things
8 off.
9 MS. WALEKO: Hi, I'm Garland. I'm a
10 chemical review manager in the Pesticide
11 Re-Evaluation Division, as Rick said, and I help
12 Anna co-coordinate the acute tox modernization
13 efforts in OPP. This presentation, the background
14 part, is similar to what I talked about last year,
15 but we do have some updates further in on some of
16 the specific tests, so bear with me if you've heard
17 parts of it before.
18 So the 6-pack, easy pack 6-pack, those tests
19 are required for all formulations as well as active
20 ingredients. It's for precautionary labeling,
21 re-entry intervals, clothing and PPE, things like
22 that on the label. It's acute oral, dermal and

1 inhalation tests, as well as eye irritation, dermal
2 irritation and dermal sensitization, so that's what
3 I'll be talking about.
4 So some background, OPP has developed a
5 strategic direction for new pesticide testing and
6 assessment approaches, and this is to implement the
7 2007 National Academy of Science report called
8 Toxicity Testing in the 21st Century. The strategic
9 direction is on our website listed there and the
10 anticipated outcomes of this move are many, but a
11 few of them are listed below.
12 So they include more computer-aided methods
13 rather than animal tests to identify hazard as well
14 as exposure, as well as to focus testing, improved
15 approaches with the traditional tests that we
16 already have to minimize the number of animals we
17 use while also getting more information, as well as
18 an improved understanding of tox pathways so that we
19 can develop other non-animal methods.
20 And this is all about adopting something
21 called IATA which stands for Integrated Approaches
22 to Testing and Assessment, and this is a more

1 weight-of-evidence based approach. It's hypothesis
2 based, systematic and meant to integrate exposure
3 and hazards in risk assessment.
4 So guiding principles for data needs for
5 pesticides, this is for EPA staff, and the bottom
6 line is that there is flexibility in our regulations
7 to accept alternative approaches as well as grant
8 waivers, so we do have that built into our
9 regulations. But the guiding principle is to
10 provide consistency in identifying data needs. They
11 promote the use of existing knowledge and a focus on
12 the critical data needed for the risk assessment, so
13 what do we really need to know to make a decision?
14 And it's more of an efficiency approach, not just a
15 check the box.
16 So these are the acute test guidelines, and
17 about the numbers, each test that we get per year.
18 So 2012 through last year, as you can see about the
19 numbers we're getting for each one and they're
20 pretty consistent.
21 In 2016 our then director, Jack Housenger,
22 wrote a letter to stakeholders sort of reiterating

1 our goal to reduce animal testing and also our
2 commitment to that goal. So it kind of outlined our
3 commitment to work with our partners, so NGO's,
4 other federal agencies but also internationally
5 across the government. So the activities outlined
6 in that letter follow three main objectives which
7 I'll go through examples of each of these things,
8 critically evaluating which studies form the basis
9 of our decisions, expanding acceptance of
10 alternative methods and also reducing barriers to
11 adopting alternative methods. And some of those
12 barriers can be challenges of data sharing among our
13 industry partners as well as international
14 harmonization.
15 So we have an internal workgroup in OPP to
16 work on these issues and we meet biweekly and
17 sometimes monthly. There's representation across
18 the divisions and we discuss updates and what's
19 going on and who can work on what, that kind of
20 thing. And then we also have a stakeholder group
21 made of external stakeholders. We also meet
22 regularly to discuss progress and opportunities to

1 work together. If you're interested in joining the
2 stakeholder group, you can contact Shannon Jewell.
3 Her information is there. I think the last meeting
4 we had was at SAP in March of this year. We also
5 have webinars pretty regularly on new developments
6 on the different tests.
7 We also have a public docket where we post
8 draft guidance for comments. We have draft guidance
9 in there right now for skin sensitization which I'll
10 talk about more later. And we also post our final
11 guidance there which is also on our website.
12 So U.S. federal collaboration. EPA is part
13 of the ICCVAM that was created in 2000 by Congress.
14 It stands for the Interagency Coordinating Committee
15 on the Validation of Alternative Methods. That's a
16 mouthful. But it's 17 federal agencies that either
17 require, use, generate or disseminate tox and safety
18 testing information. The operationals and
19 scientific support arm for ICCVAM is NICEATM at the
20 National Institute of Health. They do most of the
21 data collection and modelling and really are
22 critical to our success in this area.

1 Okay. So an example of critically
2 evaluating which things form the basis of OPP
3 decisions. The acute tox -- the Acute Dermal and
4 Pesticide Formulation Waiver was finalized in
5 November of 2016. It had gone out for comment in
6 March of that year. This is a collaboration between
7 EPA and NICEATM to look at the relative contribution
8 of data from both the acute oral and the dermal tox
9 tests to what actually ends up on labels for hazard
10 classification and labeling.
11 So data was collected on acute lethality,
12 dermal and oral tox data from rat studies, just for
13 pesticide formulation. So that guidance isn't
14 finalized. We've been receiving and granting those
15 waivers. We get about 200 or 300 dermal formulation
16 tests annually, so you can see the potential for
17 animal savings.
18 Expanding acceptance of alternative methods.
19 So these are some of the OECD guidelines out there
20 for these three tests, skin irritation, eye
21 irritation and skin sensitization. And we're
22 working towards accepting these existing guidelines.

1 They're kind of like our starting points.

2 So eye irritation, I have some updates on

3 this one. So this is a collaboration that's

4 currently ongoing. We have a policy in place right

5 now to accept eye irritation assays for the

6 antimicrobial products and we're looking to expand

7 that to the conventionals as well. So NICEATM has

8 collected over 200 pairs of in vitro-in vivo data

9 provided voluntarily by industry and analyzed that.

10 They've determined that we need some prospective

11 testing to fill in some of the gaps in that

12 database. So right now Phase 1 is underway to look

13 at six formulations donated by industry and I think

14 five different assays related to the eye. Once

15 that's complete, anticipated about this June, we'll

16 move into Phase 2 to look at 40 additional

17 formulations donated by industry.

18 So this effort is co-chaired by PETA

19 International Science Consortium as well as NICEATM,

20 Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine, EPA

21 Canada, Europe and of course, our industry partners.

22 So skin sensitization, there's a lot going

1 on with this one right now. There was, last time I
2 gave this talk, a project proposal had been
3 approved, at an OECD meeting in December of 2016 and
4 this was a follow-up to that. So in December 2017,
5 they had a special meeting to talk about what
6 happens next.
7 So there are multiple non-animal testing
8 strategies out there that actually perform better
9 than the mouse (inaudible) assay, which is the
10 animal test we currently were using. There is an
11 assessment framework that could serve as a
12 replacement for that test and that performance
13 criteria is laid out in that paper, the Casati paper
14 cited up there.
15 So last time I talked to you about this, I
16 said there would be an EPA draft policy forthcoming
17 and we have just put that draft out last month,
18 April 10th, that describes the science that supports
19 moving towards this. The LLNA is a local lymph node
20 assay in the mouse but the combination of different
21 non-animal assays actually does better and is more
22 reproducible than the mouse test. So the policy

1 that describes that science is out for comment now
2 in the docket until June 9th, but this was a result
3 of a collaboration between ICCVAM, NICEATM and then
4 our European counterparts, as well as Canada.
5 So EPA will be accepting the alternative
6 approaches for skin sensitization immediately under
7 the conditions described in the policy. So only
8 existing OECD guidelines for determining hazard, you
9 can use the approach that's the best two of three
10 described in the draft. Right now it's just active
11 or inert ingredients, not formulations just yet.
12 But the National Toxicology Program at NIH is
13 working to see if we can't expand it to formulations
14 and mixtures, and if that's the case, we can revise
15 the policy later. But the docket is listed up there
16 with the website. If anyone is interested in
17 commenting, we're accepting those until June 9th.
18 Okay. The last example, we began a pilot
19 program in December 2016 to look at the possibility
20 of using the GHS equation for formulation for oral
21 and dermal. We assembled a data set or we're trying
22 to actually, we're still accepting data to look at

1 the oral and inhalation formulation testing that we
2 currently require but also submitting currently with
3 the GHS equation.
4 So the equation just adds to the components
5 of the formulation. It adds up the LD50's to
6 predict the hazard for the formulation. So this
7 could potentially save a lot of animals by not
8 having to do either of those tests anymore and just
9 accept the equation.
10 But so far we've received submissions from
11 Dow, BASF, EcoLab, Control Solutions and Procter &
12 Gamble, and I think we have a few more anticipated,
13 so we should be able to start that analysis in the
14 next few months. But this is a good example of our
15 efforts to harmonize. EFSA in Europe uses this
16 already.
17 And then outside of acute tox 6-pack, we're
18 looking at some potential with the dermal absorption
19 triple pack, which is a human in vitro, a rat in
20 vitro and a rat in vivo study that all use similar
21 protocols, so like the same test material and doses.
22 And this was used by OPP to refine the dermal

1 assessments, to adjust for differences between in
2 vitro and in vivo absorption, as well as the species
3 differences.
4 But NICEATM is in the process of looking at
5 data from existing triple pack studies to see if we
6 can't just rely on the human in vivo for risk
7 assessment. So that's another thing that we're
8 working on. And that is all.
9 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Garland.
10 MS. WALEKO: Sure.
11 MR. KEIGWIN: Questions from the committee?
12 Let me check with PPDC members on the phone.
13 MS. BISHOP: Yeah, hi, it's Pat Bishop. Can
14 you hear me?
15 MR. KEIGWIN: Hey, Pat. Go ahead.
16 MS. BISHOP: Hi. Yeah, thanks, Garland, for
17 that update. I think this is really, I want to just
18 say this is real great work that's going on and I
19 think as Charlotte mentioned this morning, a lot of
20 impetus for this came out of the tox 21 workgroup
21 from PPDC as well as the Jack Housenger letter which
22 was probably a first where some, where a major, you

1 know, regulatory authority director came out and
2 committed to going forward with this work. And I
3 know, Rick, you support it, ongoing work as well.
4 I just wanted to ask you one question. I
5 was at a meeting last week at Croplife and Anna was
6 talking about the HASPOC group that's also been --
7 you mentioned there's a lot of flexibility in Part
8 151 as far as granting waivers and so forth.
9 She mentioned that the HASPOC group has been
10 reviewing a lot of submissions and has -- I mean the
11 numbers she was talking about were astounding to me,
12 something like 40,000 animals were saved over a
13 certain time period. Can you comment on that at
14 all?
15 MS. LOWIT: Hey, Pat, it's Anna. So yes, so
16 as you know, I gave two presentations at the
17 Croplife RISE conference last week, and they were
18 largely two related presentations. The first one
19 was in large part a similar presentation to what
20 Garland just gave which was focused on our efforts
21 around the 6-pack. So the acute oral, dermal,
22 inhalation and then the three topical studies that

1 are used for labeling.

2 And then the second presentation was on our

3 efforts on human health to reduce our animal usage

4 for repeat dose testing. So for those of you in the

5 room not familiar with the acronym, the HASPOC, OPP

6 has an internal committee called the Hazard and

7 Science Policy Council, hence the acronym HASPOC.

8 It's kind of a little ugly, ugly acronym. But it's

9 an extremely productive committee.

10 Since December of 2011, the group meets

11 every other Thursday afternoon and looks at waiver

12 opportunities for conventional actives with the

13 health effects division but also antimicrobial

14 products and biopesticides. And over the course

15 since December of 2011, all the way up until April,

16 we've granted 1,047 waivers and in fiscal year '17

17 alone, we granted enough waivers to save over 40,000

18 animals and save upwards of, I don't remember the

19 number off my head, it's upwards of near $100

20 million dollars to the industry. That's just in a

21 single fiscal year.

22 So we are fully committed to reducing our

1 animal footprint but also to use the resources of
2 industry appropriately and the taxpayer dollars
3 appropriately, as we're not asking for studies that
4 don't make a real difference in our risk assessment,
5 we're using our own staff time much better.
6 MS. BISHOP: Great. Thank you.
7 MR. KEIGWIN: Other comments or questions?
8 Okay, thank you.
9 So next up we have Kimberly Nesci who is
10 deputy director of the Environmental Fate and
11 Effects Division, and Melissa Panger, who is a
12 senior scientist in EFED, who will share with you
13 some of the work that we're beginning to do on
14 reducing animal testing for ecological effects
15 analysis.
16 MS. NESCI: Good afternoon, everybody.
17 Thank you so much. So as Rick said, my name is
18 Kimberly Nesci. I'm the deputy director of the
19 Environmental Fate and Effects Division. So Melissa
20 Panger, a senior science advisor, and Ed
21 Odenkirchen, who unfortunately could not be here
22 today, is also a senior science advisor and he sends

1 his regrets. I'm going to be talking a little bit
2 about some of our reduced animal testing on the eco
3 side, so sort of as a continuation of what Garland
4 was just talking about, Garland and Anna.
5 This work is a priority for us and we're
6 actually really excited about it. And as you will
7 see from the presentation, we're open to ideas for
8 collaboration and additional ideas that you all
9 might have. So if you, as we're going through this,
10 if you seem to have ideas and you want to come in
11 and talk to us, please, please reach out.
12 And with that, I'll turn it over to Melissa.
13 MS. PANGER: All right, thanks. So yes, as
14 Kimberly was saying, we're going to talk a little
15 bit about OPP's efforts to reduce animal testing for
16 ecological risk assessment, so focusing more away
17 from the human health side, along the eco side and
18 we'll just talk a little bit about new approach
19 methodologies, methodologies and some retrospective
20 analyses that we're currently working on.
21 So just as an overview of what we'll be
22 talking about today, we're going to start a little

1 bit about, talking about some of the guiding
2 principles that we're using as we move through some
3 of this work. We're going to talk about two
4 specific retrospective studies that we're doing, one
5 with acute and subacute avian dietary studies and
6 then one with fish acute studies. And then we're
7 going to talk a little bit about a couple of groups
8 that we're involved with with ICCVAM and then our
9 participation in an upcoming toxicology forum, and
10 then as Kimberly suggested, we're also looking for
11 some feedback and ideas, so that would be the last
12 slide.
13 So our guiding principles as we move through
14 these projects and think about moving forward on
15 these things, we want to make sure that as we're
16 moving forward with new approach methodologies, so
17 it's a new acronym NAM is what we're calling some of
18 these approaches now. It's equivalent to the
19 alternative test methods and strategies. So as we
20 move towards some NAMs, we'll just shorten it to
21 that, we're going to -- we want to make sure that
22 the tasks that we're working on are fit for purpose,

1 meaning that they, the projects will be able to
2 provide information that are usable for risk
3 assessment, for eco risk assessments.
4 And we want to make sure that as we move
5 forward, the approaches are scientifically relevant,
6 reliable and confident. We have to have confidence
7 in it, so we want to make sure as we move forward
8 with the approaches that the answers we're getting
9 from the data are as good as or if not better than
10 what we're currently getting.
11 And then of course, we'll have to involve
12 some staff training, education and collaborative
13 work with this and we're trying to leverage as many
14 partner resources as possible.
15 Now, also as we move forward with NAMs and
16 the ecological risk assessment under FIFRA, we have
17 a commitment of time and resources through the
18 completion of some of these specific NAMs, and then
19 as we move forward, obviously if we have, develop
20 new approaches, they'll have to go through, we'll
21 have to develop OPP guidance and policy that's
22 publically transparent.

1 All right. And so for the NAMs, just to
2 kind of remind folks or let folks know if you're not
3 already aware that we've been using NAMs for years
4 in our eco assessments, things such as ECOSAR,
5 EPISuite, things that can model toxicity in fate
6 parameters and in quantitative structural analysis
7 and read-acrosses. So we've been using some of
8 these approaches for years. What we've been
9 primarily using them for are screening for
10 degradates, effects toxicity, trying to prioritize
11 degradates we need data for, using it to compare the
12 degradate toxicity to the parent toxicity and then
13 trying to address any potential data gaps we have
14 with the parent.
15 So as we move forward, we'd like to expand
16 the use of the NAMs and move more towards actually
17 using it to replace whole animal testing where we
18 can. And so as was said earlier, for this to
19 happen, there will have to be fit for purpose.
20 We'll have to be able to make sure that they are
21 useful for risk assessment purposes and are
22 scientifically relevant, reliable and we have

1 confidence in them.

2 Now, one of the retrospective projects that

3 we're currently working on that I wanted to spend a

4 couple minutes talking about is a retrospective of

5 the acute avian studies we get and in comparison

6 with the subacute avian studies. And just as a

7 little background, when we get an outdoor

8 conventional pesticide registration, we typically

9 require two acute oral bird studies, usually those

10 are with a bobwhite quail or mallard duck and a song

11 bird species. And then two subacute dietary studies

12 with birds, usually with the mallard and a bobwhite

13 quail. And we use all of the data in our risk

14 assessment process.

15 So what we typically do is we'll use the

16 most sensitive acute oral endpoint and the most

17 sensitive subacute oral endpoint, and whatever has

18 the highest risk quotient when we compare it to our

19 exposure values is what usually is the regulatory

20 endpoint, the one that we use for our risk

21 decisions.

22 And so -- and just, so we use, we use both

1 the acute oral and subacute dietary studies. And so
2 what we're doing now is we're working with PETA,
3 working on a collaborative project with PETA to do a
4 retrospective analysis of those data and what we're
5 trying to address is whether or not we really need
6 both types of studies in all cases to make a robust
7 regulatory decision.
8 So the question we're specifically answering
9 or asking is can we confidently assess acute risk
10 for birds using a reduced suite of effects studies
11 focusing on the single oral dose protocol? And so
12 what we're looking at is looking to see is how often
13 are we actually using the subacute data to make a
14 quantitative or qualitative -- use it for our risk
15 decisions and ultimately our risk management
16 decisions.
17 And so we're focusing for this retrospective
18 not just on the toxicity endpoints but actually on
19 the risk quotient, the risk assessment outcomes.
20 Because for the birds, we test one species but we
21 relate that, extrapolate to species of different
22 sizes with different dietary categories, so exposure

1 values vary across the birds. So we're actually
2 looking at that quotient of the exposure versus the
3 effects which is our risk quotient or RQ. So we're
4 comparing the RQ's across the acute oral and the
5 subacute.
6 And the data set that we're using is we're
7 focusing on chemicals that have been registered from
8 1998 to 2016, with the idea that we're using the
9 most recently registered chemicals, thinking that
10 that would be the best examples of the types of
11 chemicals that we'll be getting in the future.
12 So PETA is doing a lot of legwork and
13 they're reviewing most recent publically available
14 risk assessments for these chemicals and because
15 they don't have CBI, they're using the publically
16 available assessments and they're also looking at
17 determining the mode of action for each pesticide,
18 and we'll see what the value of that is in just a
19 minute.
20 But from each risk assessment document,
21 we're pulling out and extracting and comparing the
22 single oral dose in dietary-based risk quotient to

1 see how they're deriving the risk conclusions and
2 ultimately the risk management decisions and then
3 summarizing any of the risk characterization that is
4 qualitatively addressing the subacute dietary
5 studies.
6 So the analysis, what we've done is there's
7 been 181 pesticides new to the agency of
8 conventional pesticides based on the annual reports
9 from 1998 to 2016, and of these, 119 of the
10 chemicals have publically available eco risk
11 assessment documents. Of these 119, 79 of the
12 chemicals did not have an RQ value calculated. Most
13 of those, 70 of them it's because they were limit
14 tests. There were no effects noted at the highest
15 doses tested for the acute oral or subacute dietary.
16 In nine of the cases, there weren't RQ's
17 calculated because it was an odd kind of a
18 substance, indoor use, greenhouse use, that type of
19 thing. And in 40 of the chemicals from those 119,
20 there actually were RQ's that could be compared. In
21 37 of those cases, the acute oral dominated the
22 dietary and drove the risk assessment, meaning that

1 the acute oral RQ was higher than the subacute
2 dietary RQ's. And in two cases the RQ's, we had
3 RQ's for dietary studies and no RQ's for acute oral
4 because the acute oral studies were based on limit
5 tests, where no effects were noted at the highest
6 concentration. But in those two cases, there were
7 no risks identified to birds, so acute oral data
8 would not have likely changed that risk conclusion
9 if we had RQ's for those.
10 And then in one case, we did have dietary
11 RQ's that were higher than the acute oral RQ's and
12 it was for an anticoagulant rodenticide, where you
13 kind of could expect that that might happen because
14 of the cumulative effects of those types of
15 pesticides.
16 So the bottom line of the analysis was that
17 in over 99 percent of the cases, 118 out of 119, the
18 subacute dietary approach did not change the risk
19 conclusion that was already reached using the oral
20 dose-based RQ's.
21 Now, there were 62 cases that were not
22 evaluated out of the 181 chemicals that have been

1 registered since 1998. So what we did was looked at
2 the mode of action for those, for those chemicals to
3 see if those, those chemicals that were not in the
4 analysis matched the chemical classes, any of the
5 chemical classes for chemicals that were in the
6 analysis, so kind of using them as an analog. And
7 we found that of those 62 cases, most of them had a
8 chemical class that was involved in the analysis.
9 There were only eight chemicals that were not
10 included at the chemical class level in the analysis
11 and they had unique modes of action, so they were
12 kind of unique.
13 So the bottom line in that is that the
14 majority of the unevaluated cases, those 62 cases,
15 the subacute dietary approach was represented by a
16 chemical analog or a member -- a chemical in the
17 same chemical class. Now, it did indicate that for
18 unique modes of action, we may need to do some
19 additional analysis in the future.
20 So the next step with this is that we are
21 currently developing a manuscript and hopefully for
22 publication in a peer-reviewed scientific journal.

1 PETA is the lead author on that and then agency
2 staff will be co-authors on that.
3 And EPA will be developing a policy guidance
4 document that basically, outlining the kind of
5 project that I just discussed here. And then we'll
6 be recommending that for new chemicals with
7 mechanisms of action that were covered in the
8 analysis that we rely really, we rely heavily on the
9 acute oral avian studies and hold the subacute
10 dietary studies in reserve.
11 And that we do recommend that for a certain
12 set of chemicals, those with unique modes of action,
13 cases where the data on the mode of action suggests
14 a mechanism of cumulative damage such as what we saw
15 in the anticoagulant rodenticide, those chemicals
16 that have a high potential for bioaccumulation or
17 facilitated transport mechanism for absorption, that
18 any kind of chemical that we think that the route of
19 exposure via the dietary route might be more
20 sensitive than the oral route, then we will need
21 additional information or may have to call in those
22 data.

1 And then as we move forward, we'll continue
2 outreach to our international and other partners and
3 then obviously any policy, before it goes final,
4 will have to go out for public comment.
5 Now another retrospective study we're
6 currently working on is dealing with our fish acute
7 lethal endpoint studies. And just a little
8 background there is that for most conventional
9 outdoor-use chemicals, we require three acute fish
10 studies, two freshwater fish, one warm water, one
11 cold water, and then also an estuarine marine fish
12 study. And so in these we usually, in the
13 assessments we'll use usually the most sensitive,
14 the freshwater endpoint as our regulatory endpoint
15 and then the estuarine marine fish for estuarine
16 marine fish as regulatory endpoint.
17 And so just the point here, that the
18 exposure estimates for each fish RQ calculation are
19 identical across the fish, whether it's freshwater
20 or estuarine marine. And so here, as you will see,
21 we won't have to compare RQ's in this retrospective
22 analysis. We can actually compare LC50 values.

1 So the question we're asking here is can we
2 confidently assess acute risk for fish using a
3 reduced suite of effects studies focusing on a
4 consistently most sensitive fish? Basically is
5 there a consistently most sensitive fish across all
6 compounds is one question we're going to ask.
7 Another one, if not, are there patterns of most
8 sensitive fish based on chemical properties,
9 chemical classes or modes of action? And can we
10 reduce the data sets to two or even one fish study?
11 For this project, we're collaborating with
12 NICEATM as our federal partner. And as I said
13 earlier, exposure is not a confounding factor here,
14 so we're actually going to be comparing the effects
15 endpoints in this retrospective and so we're
16 actually going back to the data evaluation records
17 or DER's for the studies that have been submitted
18 for the chemicals. And I'll just state, I think I
19 might have skipped this, we're going to be focusing
20 on the same chemicals that we're using in the avian
21 retrospective so those chemicals registered from
22 1998 to 2016.

1 So the data points will actually be
2 extracted from the data evaluation records. They're
3 going to be submitted to a shared drive. NICEATM
4 will then review the quality of the information, see
5 if there -- and cross walk with available structure
6 and mechanism of data.
7 So so far to date, we have shared about 250
8 individual fish toxicity records with NICEATM and
9 there's a little over 700 studies, fish studies
10 associated with these chemicals, so this is a subset
11 of the total. And what they're doing now, NICEATM
12 is looking through them to see if they're going to
13 be adequate, the information in there will be
14 adequate to do the type of -- answer the types of
15 questions we're asking. So they have the 250
16 studies now and they're going through them and so we
17 expect to hear within a few weeks back from them in
18 terms of getting feedback on whether we think we
19 should move forward with the additional studies or
20 how we should move forward.
21 So those are the two, the two retrospective
22 studies I wanted to talk about. Then there's also a

1 couple of groups that we're involved with. One,
2 ICCVAM had an organizing committee on predictive
3 modelling of rat oral acute systemic toxicity.
4 There was an organizing committee that was held, it
5 was a workshop in April, and we had participation,
6 as he said in -- on that committee. The objective
7 of the committee is to integrate the collective
8 expertise of the international modelling community
9 to develop predictive models for acute oral toxicity
10 based on regulatory needs put forward by ICCVAM.
11 And the role that we played there in EFED is
12 to basically make sure the EPA, the ecological risk
13 assessment perspective was considered in the
14 prioritization. Because a lot of this is driven
15 obviously by human health and toxicity, so we wanted
16 to make sure that as we move forward that the eco
17 part is considered as we move forward.
18 And we focused on methods most suitable for
19 application in a quantitative manner. As we said
20 previously, it needs to be fit for purpose and we
21 wanted to make sure there's transparency and
22 consideration to the mechanism of action, a high

1 degree of documentation for the method and any
2 method would have to have an accuracy in predicting
3 the LD50. And then EPA selection criteria led to a
4 proposed methods selection that was highly
5 consistent with other agency priority selections.
6 And then another group that ICCVAM has
7 started, it's a new ecotoxicity working group and
8 EPA will be represented on the group and also will
9 be a co-chair, so Ed Odenkirchen will be a co-chair
10 of that workgroup. A draft charter has been
11 developed and the charges for the group are
12 basically to identify agency needs across the United
13 States for different agencies, what the ecotox data
14 requirements and needs are, and also move into the
15 international data needs also but in a catalog
16 existing approaches to toxicology testing for
17 emerging technologies to see where they might fit
18 with the data requirements and needs for the
19 different agencies.
20 And then the plan is to establish a
21 stakeholder group comprised of both government and
22 non-government scientists to coordinate efforts

1 towards developing and implementing alternative
2 approaches for ecotoxicology testing.
3 And then a final kind of group I wanted to
4 talk about today is that there is -- we'll be
5 participating in a toxicology forum which is -- will
6 be a meeting this summer in July in Annapolis and
7 the objective of the toxicology forum, if folks
8 aren't familiar with it, it's an international
9 nonprofit organization and it's really devoted to
10 creating an open dialogue among various groups in
11 the society, primarily for experts of U.S. and
12 international government regulatory and health
13 agencies to get perspective on issues of mutual
14 interest. And so some of the topics that will be,
15 session topics at the meeting that we'll be involved
16 with is, one is building on the science, possible
17 opportunities to reduce toxicology testing and
18 better allocate resources for evaluating ecological
19 risk and, and Tom Steeger in EFED will be chairing
20 that session, I believe.
21 And then there's integration of
22 toxicokinetics and kinetically derived maximum dose

1 into toxicity testing and risk assessment. And then
2 U.S. FDA's predictive toxicology road map.
3 And just in closing, I just wanted to
4 reiterate a couple things. One is that EPA is
5 committed to reduced animal testing burden but we
6 want to do that without compromising the quality of
7 the risk assessment process and that's the fit for
8 purpose that we've talked about throughout this
9 session or this talk today.
10 We are, as Kimberly mentioned, interested in
11 considering ideas for additional projects, so we
12 would like to hear feedback on that from folks.
13 We're operating under of a set of principles to
14 achieve streamlined testing, alternative method
15 endpoints for, as we said, fit for quantitative
16 ecological risk assessment.
17 And we are considering different mechanisms
18 for policy and guidance, and one of those is things
19 like waiver guidance. And then we intend to partner
20 with government and private stakeholders, and so
21 we're looking for feedback and thoughts on who, you
22 know, if you guys have ideas and thoughts and

1 suggestions on who we can include in these
2 discussions. And then we're open to other ideas and
3 opportunities for collaborative work in the future,
4 in future retrospective studies. So if folks have
5 ideas for those, we're open to that, too.
6 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Melissa. Questions?
7 Amy.
8 MS. LIEBMAN: Thanks, everyone, for the
9 update on this. I have a couple of questions.
10 First of all, I think -- I don't think there's any
11 argument it's great that you're trying to reduce the
12 animal testing, but particularly in light that the
13 EPA is about to propose rules that will gut
14 protections for people exposed to pesticides, I'm
15 just curious as to where you are in terms of some of
16 your population and exposure data that's part of the
17 whole 21st Century toxicology approach.
18 And also, you know, we talked a long time
19 ago about some biomark hearing, and EPA does have
20 the regulatory authority to request that in terms of
21 the registration process. What's happening in that
22 area?

1 MS. LOWIT: So I can talk a long time on
2 where we are on tox A-1 and not everyone wants to
3 hear me jibber-jabber for that long. I know you
4 don't. So we're advancing the science with respect
5 to modernizing our risk assessment approaches on
6 many fronts. I think one of the ones that really
7 highlights what you're asking about is advances
8 we're making in physiologically based
9 pharmacokinetic modelling or what people called PBPK
10 modelling. If you're not familiar with that
11 acronym, essentially a PBPK model is a set of
12 differential equations of known human physiology so
13 you can make very accurate predictions of how
14 someone is exposed from the outside and what
15 happens, where that compound goes in their body and
16 the frequency and the speed at which they eliminate
17 that.
18 And it's a very powerful tool that allows us
19 to look at specific life stage effects, gender
20 effects. You can make very scenario-specific
21 evaluations of a child playing on the lawn versus a
22 worker working in the field and make very explicit

1 refined assessments of those to ensure that we're
2 doing accurate and predictive assessments. And
3 those models also have the power of doing full-on
4 population based evaluations using Monte Carlo and
5 different kinds of techniques.
6 And we are active in this area. We have
7 multiple projects looking towards advancing PBPK for
8 both individual chemicals but as a science in
9 general. We have a lot of projects in that area
10 that I think is what you're talking about.
11 MS. LIEBMAN: Thank you. My next question
12 is I'm just curious in terms of some of the work
13 that you're doing in this area and there's another
14 proposed rule out right now about sensing
15 transparency in regulatory science and I'm wondering
16 how, how it is currently proposed, how that will
17 impact the work that you're doing?
18 MR. KEIGWIN: We're reading the proposed
19 rule as well and evaluating that ourself and we
20 would encourage anyone who has perspectives on that
21 proposed rule to submit comments to the docket for
22 that proposed rule.

1 MS. LIEBMAN: Our initial reading of that is
2 that it's pretty dramatic for some of the work that
3 you're attempting to do.
4 MR. KEIGWIN: We're in the process of
5 evaluating how it would impact the program. We
6 encourage you to submit comments.
7 MS. LIEBMAN: And I guess I want to just
8 keep encouraging everyone to remember people in the
9 process and that when we regulate pesticides and we
10 use them, people are exposed and they're human
11 beings. I just want to say that for the record.
12 Thank you.
13 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Amy. Any other
14 comments? Lori Ann.
15 MS. BURD: I commend this office for its
16 efforts to reduce animal suffering in the lab and
17 also remind you all that animals are suffering in
18 the field where these pesticides are used across
19 hundreds of millions of acres and most generously,
20 but this office is making incredibly slow progress
21 on Endangered Species Act consultations. So as we
22 factor in people and lab animals, we should also be

1 factoring in the suffering experienced by all these
2 species that are not having any analysis done on the
3 impact of these pesticides on them.
4 MR. KEIGWIN: Dan.
5 MR. KUNKEL: Thanks, Rick, and I just wanted
6 to shout out also, it's great work. It's really
7 good to see all the progress that's been made over
8 the years. From I guess our perspective with minor
9 uses, it kind of resonates back to using crop groups
10 to extrapolating to really address some of the minor
11 use issues. So we really appreciate the work with
12 crop groups and some of the other chem sac decisions
13 to set standing policies for extrapolations to some
14 of the other ultra minor crops. I think we would
15 just like to continue to encourage you to look at
16 other areas where you can extend data or reduce data
17 requirements, where we can use extrapolation and
18 good science and models to deal with that.
19 And my last comment would be, again, just to
20 make sure we're in tune with the other international
21 regulatory agencies, that we're not doing something
22 that's going to -- well, we're going to reduce data

1 requirements here in the U.S. and not address some
2 of the requirements in other areas of the world. So
3 thanks.
4 MR. KEIGWIN: Jay.
5 MR. VROOM: I have a couple comments about
6 tox 21 but just to respond to a previous comment, I
7 believe it's a matter of extensive public record
8 that there is an incredible amount of ecological
9 risk assessment testing, including on wildlife
10 species in all places in the United States the EPA
11 collects, receives and analyzes in ecological risk
12 assessment and so I just couldn't leave that comment
13 left unanswered.
14 With respect to tox 21, topics both the
15 acute and the environmental risk assessment, two
16 questions. One is where else can this go beyond the
17 two areas that you've just addressed in the two
18 presentations? And secondly, what do you see is
19 advancing in traditional toxicological testing?
20 (Teleconference interruption.)
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Let's regroup, so we are going
22 to kick off the last session of the afternoon before

1 the public comment period with regulatory updates.
2 What we'll do in this session is we'll have the
3 three speakers do their presentations and then we'll
4 open it up for questions. So Yu-Ting Guilaran, who
5 is the director of the Pesticide Re-Evaluation
6 Division, has an update for us on progress in
7 registration review.
8 Mike Mendelsohn, who is the branch chief in
9 the Biopesticides and Pollution Prevention Division,
10 has a presentation for us on some novel mosquito
11 products and then Bob McNally, who is the director
12 of the Biopesticides and Pollution Prevention
13 Division, has an update for us on the new types of
14 biopesticides in general that we're seeing in the
15 registration queue. So let me first turn things
16 over to Yu-Ting.
17 MS. GUILARAN: Good afternoon, everybody. I
18 hope you're -- I'm going to try to bring you back on
19 schedule now. No, I never listen to him. That's
20 what he says. I'm listening now. I will keep up
21 with the pace.
22 So like Rick said, I'm Yu-Ting Guilaran,

1 director of the Pesticide Re-Evaluation Division. I
2 just wanted to start from kind of the beginning, I
3 know there are a few new faces here, is that
4 registration review of a pesticide is a statutory
5 mandate as part of FIFRA, section 3G. That means
6 the agency needs to review each registered pesticide
7 every 15 years. So overall across the program, I'm
8 overseeing the conventional pesticides, while Bob
9 sees, the biopesticides, Anita Pease, who is the
10 acting antimicrobial division director. All
11 combined we have about 725 cases that's going
12 through the registration review program.
13 And that means it's about, a little bit over
14 a thousand active ingredients that we're looking at.
15 And we have to finalize this round of review by
16 October 1, 2022. So time is coming up pretty fast.
17 It's about four and a half years left.
18 So for the registration review program in
19 general across OPP, I think you guys have a sheet
20 that's in your packet. Basically as you can see
21 overall speaking, we're about 50 percent complete
22 with our draft risk assessment. Folks probably know

1 we start with a docket opening of work plans,
2 talking about data gaps that we have, the risk
3 assessment that we plan to do. That's the work
4 planning. And then we issue data call-in to get all
5 the studies in, and now we're kind of in the process
6 of developing draft risk assessments. So we have
7 about 50 remaining to do, 50 percent rather.
8 And then for the next step which is the
9 proposed interim decision, that will take the risk
10 and the benefit of the chemical into consideration
11 in determining whether or not any risk mitigation
12 needs to be done. We're about 50 percent remaining
13 to do, and similarly with our interim decisions. So
14 that's kind of overall for the program.
15 Kind of diving in a little bit into the
16 conventional program, which is my division, we are
17 doing pretty well. We have 40 percent of our risk
18 assessments left to do and then we have about 50
19 percent proposed interim decisions and interim
20 decisions. So that's kind of the overall big
21 picture of what's happening with the registration
22 review program for the conventional chemicals.

1 So I think in your one-pager, we also have a
2 few things that we are intending to do for FY18. I
3 think generally we're trying to complete about 55
4 cases of both the risk assessment and also proposed
5 and interim decisions.
6 So I am going to go into some of the higher
7 profile chemicals that's going to happen for the
8 remaining of 2018 and perhaps slightly going into
9 the early of 2019. Number one is our Neonics. So
10 we have the four Neonics that's going through
11 registration review right now. The status update is
12 in your sheet, which is we already issued all the
13 draft risk assessments, including both the
14 pollinator and also the non-pollinator risk
15 assessment and the comment period is for, they kind
16 of came up at different times throughout 2016 and
17 2017 and the last batch of the draft risk
18 assessment, the comment period just closed the end
19 of April.
20 We're currently considering all the public
21 comments. Well, first the docket step, we have to
22 load, all the public comments in, but so far we have

1 a million comments that we have received.
2 (Inaudible). We have a million comments we
3 received. So we're going to have to go through
4 those comments and work with EFED Marietta's shop to
5 figure out if we need to make any revision to any of
6 the draft risk assessments and then basically start
7 to look at the benefit assessment associated with
8 these pesticides.
9 We have also at the same time as the latest
10 batch of draft risk assessment, issued the draft
11 benefit assessment for cotton and citrus. So we
12 will be looking through those comments as well. And
13 that is prepared by our division BEAD, the
14 biological and economic analysis division. So
15 considering both the risk and the benefit, we're
16 planning to hopefully try our best to propose
17 interim decisions by later this year and then trying
18 to come out with our interim decision by 2019. So
19 that's for the Neonics.
20 For Glyphosate, we issued our draft risk
21 assessment also back in 2017. The comment period
22 for that, we had a 60-day extension I believe, also

1 just closed as of Monday. So so far, we have about
2 7,000 comments received. We set up a separate email
3 box just as well and we have about 75,000 emails to
4 go through and try to gather information and
5 consolidate that with the comments. So we'll be
6 spending a lot of our time in the remaining of 2018
7 going through the public comments that were
8 submitted and working with HED, Dana Vogel's
9 division, to figure out if we need to revise the
10 risk assessment based on either new data or comment
11 that we receive. And then we're also hoping to
12 propose the interim decision by this year, and in
13 2019 hope to issue the interim decision.
14 So another group of chemicals I think folks
15 are interested in is Pyrethroids. For that we
16 issued the ecological risk assessment a little bit
17 earlier and we tried to streamline that and there's
18 about 20 chemicals right here, 20 active ingredients
19 in this group. And we have also completed a draft
20 risk assessment for the human health piece of this.
21 So some of the human health risk assessments go out
22 for comment so in the meantime, we're starting to

1 look at ecological risk assessment comments, which
2 is about, a little bit over a thousand, 1400
3 comments that we have received and trying to start
4 to look at the benefit associated with this group of
5 chemical and trying to figure out if we should take
6 a look at the ecological risk-mitigation first.
7 And so that is currently still on schedule
8 in terms of what we're planning to do is hopefully
9 come out with some proposed interim decision by the
10 end of this fiscal year as well. So as you can
11 tell, it's going to be fairly busy for my division.
12 And Rick knows that, right? Yes. He's
13 nodding, so.
14 And then the last group and not the least is
15 the fumigants, so structural commodity fumigants
16 which is already information on your one-pager. So
17 we have been working with the registrants and also
18 NPMA on addressing the OIG report that came out last
19 year. At the same time, we are going through the
20 data that have come in, trying to get our risk
21 assessment together by 2019, so this group is a
22 little bit behind the schedule compared to the

1 previous three that I spoke about. So we're
2 planning to do proposed interim decision and interim
3 decision 2020 and '21. So that's an update on the
4 conventional registration review program.
5 MR. KEIGWIN: So I think, Mike, you were
6 going to go next.
7 MR. McNALLY: I'm going to go next.
8 MR. KEIGWIN: Oh, you're going to go next.
9 Okay, great, thanks, Bob.
10 MR. McNALLY: Try it again. Hello. So
11 thanks, Rick. I just want to talk little bit about
12 the biological pesticide program we have within the
13 office. As you see here, this is kind of the
14 mission statement for all of OCSPP, and I want to
15 try to differentiate a little bit about what we do
16 in the biopesticide program.
17 So in essence we're a stand-alone division.
18 So Yu-Ting just talked about the registration review
19 program. That's something that's done within our
20 matrix within OPP, so we have the Health Effects
21 Division, the EFED folks and others working together
22 to handle conventional pesticide registration

1 review. In our case, all the science resources or
2 all the regulatory resources, all the policy
3 resources are within the division.
4 Now, there's three categories of
5 biopesticides in general. The first category would
6 be biochemical pesticides. So something like kaolin
7 clay would be a natural substance that would be
8 classified as a biochemical. These are things that
9 are naturally occurring. They have a non-toxic mode
10 of action and there's a history of minimal toxicity.
11 So those are biochemicals.
12 The next category is microbial pesticides
13 and my colleague, Mike Mendelson, will be speaking
14 to you a little bit about Wolbachia mosquitos. That
15 would be a microbial pesticide. Now those are not
16 genetically engineered type of pesticides or GMOs or
17 biotech. They're completely different.
18 The third category that we work on in my
19 division are biotech pesticides. So those of you
20 who are familiar with Bt corn, for example, or Mike
21 will speak a little bit genetically engineered
22 mosquitos, those types of biotech products are also

1 handled within BPPD.

2 So what I want to cover today is sort of

3 some of the nuts and bolts of our results and how we

4 do our work, but I also want to also cover a little

5 bit about some of our key policy issues to give you

6 a flavor of the types of issues we confront in our

7 program.

8 So this is just a snapshot of what we did in

9 2017. We registered nine new active ingredients, so

10 again, we're doing both registration and

11 registration review. That's some of the work we did

12 in registration review last year.

13 One thing I do want to point out is the

14 electronic label submissions, how important that is.

15 We had over 500 last year. That is an upward trend

16 and we want to try to keep those numbers going. We

17 think it's efficient for the regulating community.

18 It's also efficient for us to utilize that

19 technology.

20 The next slide here is sort of a graph of

21 our renegotiation rate since 2010. And as you see,

22 in 2010 it was roughly 60 percent and today it's

1 roughly 14 percent. Now, you might wonder why that
2 is. And I think there are two major reasons as to
3 why we've seen the decrease.
4 First, we've really put an emphasis, not
5 just in my division but all divisions, on the
6 initial screen. So when a package comes in, we want
7 to make sure it's ready for prime time and can get
8 through the entire process. So we emphasized that
9 initial screen in the last several years to try to
10 move packages out that aren't ready to go through
11 the rest of the process.
12 I think the second reason is better
13 communication between the regulated community and
14 the staff in BPPD, to kind of clarify expectations.
15 We have what's called a presubmission meeting. So a
16 registrant will come in and we'll talk about kind of
17 what they have in mind. To some extent there's some
18 coaching going on there and some problem formulation
19 to make sure when we embark on this, we kind of know
20 where we might be going. And that doesn't mean we
21 might get something rejected at some point down the
22 road.

1 The best example or analogy I can use about
2 the screening process is how many people here took
3 an airplane to the meeting and came through Reagan
4 Airport? Anybody? So the airport that you left
5 from, there's a screening process we go through to
6 get on the airplane. And those of you who are
7 seasoned travelers, you know what to do. You know
8 to take out your laptop, your iPhone, your keys, you
9 put them on the thing and you move right through.
10 You know, we all know people who travel once every
11 ten years and they're the ones up there emptying
12 their pockets while you stand in line waiting to get
13 through to get on your airplane.
14 So I think what we're trying to do with the
15 technical screen is the same thing. We want the
16 registrant to meet, to make their destination, which
17 is a PRIA registration on time, and if that means
18 taking people out of line who aren't quite ready
19 yet, we think that's an effective tool.
20 So when I started in BPPD about five years
21 ago, I think it was Nina Wilson or someone else in
22 EPA pulled me aside and said, look, there's going to

1 be this growth spurt in biopesticides, so get ready.
2 Now, if this were Apple stock, I wish I had invested
3 in 2015. You see there's been a precipitous
4 increase in these types of products to the point
5 where in 2018 and 2019 combined, we could make as
6 many as 60 registration decisions for new AI's.
7 Mostly the new AI's in OPP come through
8 biopesticides, I would say roughly two-thirds are in
9 my division and the other third might be in the
10 antimicrobial and the conventional world. So
11 clearly there's an interest in this technology.
12 The next slide gives you a flavor for the
13 types of decisions we have pending, what's been
14 accomplished thus far and the type of pesticides
15 that we're looking at. So as you see, we've
16 registered I think about eight or nine. We have
17 another two or three that will be done this month.
18 There's some that are pending and some that have
19 been withdrawn and some that have been rejected.
20 Now that rejected number is a bit of an
21 outlier. Normally we have about 20 to 25 percent of
22 the applications to get rejected or withdrawn. This

1 year it's much higher so far. I think there was one
2 application that had four or five similar new AI's
3 that were all rejected for the same reason.
4 So as you see on the right there, that's the
5 list of the ones we registered thus far. Mike will
6 be speaking more about Wolbachia in a few minutes.
7 My sense is the rest of the year we'll finish with
8 about 15 or 16 registrations for the biopesticides
9 program through the fiscal year.
10 A little bit of history on the program.
11 Since its inception, we've registered over 400
12 biopesticides. And the next bullet gives you some
13 sense of some of the most popular ones, you might
14 say, in terms of use. We had numbers of over 8
15 million pounds applied in 2015 is our best guess.
16 And the last bullet is several crops really seem to
17 be using a lot of biopesticides. You see the
18 distribution there.
19 Now I don't want to steal Mike's thunder
20 here, but we'll be talking a little bit about
21 Wolbachia and the mosquito registration we did last
22 year. This current section 3 registration is in 27

1 states. There are several experimental use permits
2 they're still working on for this particular
3 registration to expand that use. Basically the way
4 it works is there's some incompatibility between the
5 male mosquitos that are the Wolbachia mosquitos are
6 released into the wild to breed with the wild female
7 mosquitos, which have a different type of Wolbachia
8 that results in unsuccessful reproduction.
9 One thing I want to highlight, even though
10 we're a standing division, a stand-alone division,
11 is we use the same committee structure that the
12 conventional pesticide program uses. So we go
13 through these committees as appropriate. I think
14 for the most part, the one I would focus on for BPPD
15 is the first one, the HASPOC. Generally we've been
16 taking all our biochemicals through this particular
17 committee. It's an effort to make consistent
18 decisions across the office. We don't use the other
19 committees as much.
20 One thing in our program, we tend to have
21 from the registrant more often than conventional
22 waiver requests, rationale in lieu of data. And I

1 think the reason for that is in certain instances,
2 there might not be exposure potential. So for some
3 of the non-target studies, we don't necessarily need
4 those, let's say for aquatic species, and so more
5 often than not, we're going to have more of the
6 waiver requests and we want to go through HASPOC to
7 make sure we're making decisions in a consistent
8 fashion.
9 I just wanted to highlight this. So this is
10 not just for our division but all the programs in
11 OPP, that the acute dermal toxicity tests, we're not
12 encouraging these, and if you meet the criteria that
13 are listed there, you don't need to submit those.
14 Again, we have a lot of waiver requests to begin
15 with and again, the goal at the bottom is to try to
16 reduce the amount of animal testing to save
17 resources for everybody, including time for us to
18 review those studies.
19 As I mentioned, every year we deal with some
20 policy issues. I want to highlight just two this
21 afternoon. The first one deals with tolerances. I
22 think the main message in tolerances is that for the

1 most part in biopesticides, 99 percent of the
2 registrations we have have complete tolerance
3 exemptions for all crops. So no tolerances.
4 The reason for that is there's no hazard
5 endpoint. Now, there can be a rare case where there
6 may be a toxic endpoint that suggests a tolerance
7 might be appropriate and in that case, there may or
8 may not be a need for a tolerance. There could be
9 some conservative assumptions about exposure. There
10 could be a weight of the evidence argument presented
11 by the registrant, but even in those cases, there
12 might not be a need for a tolerance.
13 To illustrate kind of how we do our work in
14 the division, is every year we try to have at least
15 one policy issue we try to work with the industry.
16 So I see Keith Jones here, we worked with BPIA in
17 February and had a workshop dealing with tolerances.
18 The goal of these sessions is to try to figure out a
19 way that we can deal with an important issue to
20 industry or a stakeholder to kind of work through it
21 and provide some clarity in terms of what the
22 registrant needs to do or doesn't need to do. So

1 this year we dealt with tolerances and tolerance
2 exemptions.
3 I just want to highlight the last point
4 there on the slide. Again, these presubmission
5 meetings are critical. We really encourage the
6 members to come in and talk with us about what they
7 have in mind, and if there are hazard endpoints,
8 which happens rarely, let's kind of talk about what
9 that involves. Does it involve some kind of
10 rationale that would suggest you don't need a
11 tolerance or do you need to do residue data?
12 I suspect Rick and Arnold and Ed probably
13 have talked about this already, but PRIA 4 in the
14 budget, the key thing I want to highlight here is
15 the third bullet under PRIA 4, which is there could
16 be changes that deal specifically with microbial and
17 biochemical pesticides. So for example, just like
18 the rest of OPP, we would go to the two-day label
19 review. There might be some new codes for plant
20 incorporated protectants. There might be a slightly
21 longer timeframe for new AI's and there could be a
22 fee for a pesticide determination. So those are the

1 changes, the key changes that would affect the
2 biological biopesticide program.
3 Another key policy area, I mentioned
4 tolerances, is the whole biostimulant area. Is
5 there anybody here today who is in the biostimulant
6 industry field at all? Anybody? Okay, I see a few
7 hands.
8 So why is this important to OPP? Well,
9 those of you who know FIFRA, we have a provision
10 dealing with plant growth regulators. And you see
11 the definition there, anything that meets those
12 criteria has to come in and be registered, just like
13 any other pesticide.
14 So one thing we're doing this year is
15 putting out guidance to help the regulated community
16 to get a sense of when they have to come in and see
17 us because they're a plant growth regulator, even
18 though they may call themselves a plant biostimulant
19 and when they do not have to come in. So if it
20 triggers that requirement, then they need to get
21 registered. And we think this is an important
22 clarity for industry because I think sometimes

1 there's confusion whether or not you have to be
2 registered by EPA or you don't.
3 Now biostimulants, as I understand it, are
4 increasing in importance in the agricultural
5 industry. These are products that help farmers.
6 It's not just a growth in this country but also in
7 Europe, and so this is a developing field. I think
8 the goal here is to provide clarity in the guidance
9 on what label claims would trigger FIFRA and what
10 label claims would not trigger FIFRA.
11 A good way to look at this, you know,
12 there's fertilizers, which I think we all know what
13 those are. There's pesticides and then there's
14 biostimulants. So those are sort of three
15 categories. There's a lot of confusion, I see some
16 state folks here at the state level, as to what
17 falls into which category. So one of the goals of
18 the guidance is to provide more clarity, not just to
19 industry stakeholders but also to states to
20 understand, you know, what the definitions are.
21 There's also been a lot of work in Europe in
22 this whole area of biostimulants. So an example of

1 a biostimulant would be something that might enhance
2 water uptake in a plant, whereas an example of a
3 pesticide that's a plant growth regulator might be
4 something that accentuates or accelerates the
5 ripening of the fruit. So there's a little bit of a
6 delineation in terms of the categories if you're not
7 exactly clear.
8 Now in FIFRA, there's certain things that
9 are specifically excluded, and you see those on this
10 slide here. Those four are mentioned by name. They
11 do not have to be regulated under FIFRA. And the
12 guidance will also expand a bit on those topic as
13 well.
14 Again, for those of you who have been
15 looking for the guidance, I apologize. It's taken
16 longer than we thought. We have to go through an
17 agency clearance process. Our goal is to get it out
18 this year, so if you bear with us, we hope to have
19 that out for comment in the latter half of 2018.
20 So I've covered a lot of the pesticides. I
21 also want to cover something that's also in our
22 division, integrated pest management. As I look

1 around the room, I see some folks here who were
2 involved in the PPDC over the years dealing with
3 structural IPM, so that's been part of our program.
4 I just wanted to give an overview of how this works.
5 That's kind of the pyramid of IPM. The
6 first one is set action thresholds. Just a
7 take-home point here is if you see one insect, don't
8 panic. You know, that's only one insect so maybe
9 you're okay.
10 Monitor and identify, the second one, is
11 maybe there are a lot of insects but upon further
12 identification, they're beneficial insects. So
13 maybe you don't need to do anything in terms of
14 taking any action at that point.
15 The third category is prevention and it's
16 sort of in the ag realm. That might be crop
17 rotation, a way to address an insect problem. It
18 also might be putting screens on windows, for
19 example, in a structural sense. So that's an idea
20 of prevention.
21 And the last item is control at the base
22 there, which is you would treat with pesticides as

1 appropriate if you do, in fact, have a pest problem
2 and you haven't been able to address it otherwise.
3 This is just an overview of how we would deal with
4 IPM in the agricultural sector.
5 You know, those of you who have been around
6 a while, we had a SAI, the Strategic Ag Initiative.
7 A number of years back we worked very closely with
8 growers. Part of that was IPM. You know, more
9 recently we've had a series of webinars. I don't
10 know if any of you participated in webinars we've
11 had on structural IPM, we have them monthly, or on
12 mosquito vector-borne type issues, and those are run
13 monthly out of our Dallas Center of Expertise. And
14 generally we get 200 or 300 people attending those
15 webinars. A lot of them are state and local
16 government officials who want to understand more
17 about IPM and we view those as a real successful
18 outcome.
19 So let me wrap up, the outlook for the
20 future. As predicted, there's been a surge in these
21 applications. The vast majority of these are not in
22 the biotech realm. They're in the microbial and

1 biochemical realm. The 60 applications there, I
2 would say 55 are biochemical and microbial and the
3 remaining ones are sort of the biotech area.
4 Obviously if PRIA 4 passes, we'll implement with
5 those provisions I highlighted that are specific
6 biopesticides.
7 I don't want to steal Mike's thunder but to
8 sort of tee up some of his issues, he's the emerging
9 technologies branch chief. We see a lot of
10 innovations coming down the road, gene mosquito,
11 gene editing, RNAi interference. The one commitment
12 I make to this group, and we've done this before, is
13 if you all would like to hear more about any of
14 these technologies, let us know and we'll be happy
15 in future PPDC's to give you an overview and some
16 examples that might be useful for you to consider.
17 And last but not least, we hope to get the
18 biostimulant guidance out to help stakeholders
19 understand when they do or don't have to come in to
20 see us. So you can ponder this on your way home
21 tonight. And with that, let me turn it over to Mike
22 Mendelsohn. He'll talk some more specifically about

1 the mosquito technology. Thank you.

2 MR. MENDELSOHN: Great. Thanks, Bob.

3 Good afternoon. As Bob mentioned, I'm Mike

4 Mendelsohn, chief of the Emerging Technologies

5 Branch, and I'll share with you some information

6 about some of the novel mosquito products we're

7 looking at right now, some very exciting things we

8 have. And I'll be talking about Wolbachia. As Bob

9 said, we consider that a microbial pesticide because

10 it's a microorganism, Wolbachia, a microorganism

11 that's causing the effect and then also some GE

12 mosquito product that we're looking at.

13 So this slide here, the two species that are

14 currently being targeted are the Aedes albopictus

15 and Aedes aegypti. And just want to talk a little

16 bit about them, of course, the Aedes albopictus is

17 also known as the Asian tiger mosquito. It prefers

18 forested areas, is active during the day. It can

19 carry Zika and other diseases and it's invasive to

20 the U.S. That map there shows its estimated range

21 in the U.S.

22 Aedes aegypti, or the yellow fever mosquito,

1 is anthropophilic or it prefers humans, is active
2 during the night. It's a major carrier of Zika and
3 it's also invasive, and that blue shows its
4 estimated range in the U.S.
5 Now current methods for mosquito control
6 include adulticides, both fogging and spraying,
7 larvacides, and the use of IPM. And I'll talk a
8 little later here, we did register Wolbachia in
9 November so that's also a tool.
10 I'm first going to talk a little bit about
11 Wolbachia mosquitos. And as we mentioned earlier,
12 EPA regulates the Wolbachia as a microbial
13 pesticide. Wolbachia is a bacterium that is
14 estimated to occur naturally in over one million
15 insect species, including mosquitos. It's been
16 around for a while and it's been out there. The
17 bacterium resides within mosquitos throughout their
18 lifespan and the mosquito bacterium combinations are
19 often fixed, so specific species with specific
20 Wolbachia.
21 And what they figured out is if you take a
22 different Wolbachia and put it into the mosquito, it

1 ends up providing sort of a sterile insect release
2 effect. So the Wolbachia is a ZAP strain, we're
3 talking about, occurs in the common house mosquito
4 which is Culex, while the two other strains are
5 present in Aedes albopictus. And essentially what
6 the technology does is it switches the strains in
7 the mosquitos and that provides control when you
8 release the male mosquitos.
9 The presence of Wolbachia can cause
10 reproductive failure in mosquitos when mating
11 partners carry different strains of the bacterium.
12 When Aedes albopictus males carrying the ZAP strain,
13 that's the current product we have registered
14 MosquitoMate, mates with females that carry the
15 natural strains, the offspring's development is
16 arrested and they will not reach adulthood. So it's
17 a cytoplasmic incompatibility they call it that
18 prevents the offspring from surviving. So that's
19 the method. That's kind of the mode of action for
20 the Wolbachia mosquitos.
21 Now, Oxitec has submitted applications to
22 the agency for using another technology that

1 achieves roughly the same thing as far as the
2 sterile release. Regarding that, FDA was previously
3 overseeing this, and in 2017 they finalized guidance
4 that moved that jurisdiction to EPA. This was
5 following through with what we had -- what was put
6 forward in the biotechnology strategy that went out
7 in 2016.
8 The mechanism of action for the Oxitec or
9 the GE mosquitos is they carry two additional genes,
10 tTAV and DsRed, which they pass on to the next
11 generation when they mate with wild type mosquitos.
12 Essentially what happens is the mosquitos produce a
13 lot of the tTAV protein which interferes with
14 regular cellular functions and the mosquitos die
15 before reaching adulthood. The DsRed is used as a
16 marker so they can tell which mosquitos are GE. So
17 essentially the Oxitec genetically engineered
18 mosquitos and the Wolbachia both act by preventing
19 the offspring from surviving. And the technology
20 that's using by releasing male mosquitos, you
21 prevent the population from increasing.
22 This is another diagram here explaining the

1 Wolbachia, MosquitoMate's Wolbachia mosquito. And
2 let's see here. I don't want to get anybody in the
3 eye there. If you look at the picture, the little
4 blue dot, that's supposed to represent one type, one
5 strain of Wolbachia that's in the mosquito. And as
6 you can see in the first diagram, the male and the
7 female have the same type of Wolbachia, the
8 offspring have the same type of Wolbachia and they
9 survive into adulthood.
10 The second diagram here shows two different
11 colors, one is yellow and one is blue, just to show
12 different strains of Wolbachia in the mosquito and
13 when they mate, the offspring are not viable. They
14 don't survive.
15 Again for the -- let's see here. Let me go
16 forward here. Okay. This shows the situation with
17 the Oxitec or the GE mosquito. As you can see here,
18 on the left part of the slide, the little gray
19 circles represent the tTAV protein. And when
20 they're growing this in the lab, they're growing up
21 all these mosquitos, they have tetracycline which
22 interferes with the tTAV. When they go into the

1 wild, the tTAV is not suppressed, and as you can
2 see, there's a whole lot of this gray circle. Those
3 gray circles represent tTAV being produced and when
4 that's produced, it interferes with the cellular
5 machinery and again, the result is is that the
6 progeny or the offspring don't survive to adulthood.
7 Okay. I want to point out a couple of
8 things here, here we go, about the slide, about the
9 technology here. So here is some commonalities
10 between MosquitoMate and the Oxitec products. You
11 can see on the left there, this is from Oxitec and
12 then below is MosquitoMate. They're releasing the
13 male mosquitos into the environment. So basically
14 how this works is that the mosquito control
15 authorities and the folks that are doing this have
16 to release lots of these male mosquitos.
17 Another technology that has and we have an
18 EUP, is some trucks that blow them out, but they're
19 essentially releasing thousands of these male
20 mosquitos. So the release of live adult male
21 mosquitos in the environment. The offspring of
22 these males cannot develop into adulthood, much like

1 many of the sterile release programs that have
2 successfully been done by USDA. There's a species
3 specific effect, so really, you're only affecting
4 the species that you're releasing the male
5 mosquitos. Right now the Wolbachia product that we
6 have out there is for the Asian tiger mosquito.
7 That's the only mosquito species that is being
8 controlled by that release. Similarly for the Aedes
9 aegypti, if you're releasing those mosquitos, those
10 would be the mosquitos that would be controlled.
11 And then again, it reduces the mosquito
12 population by hindering the successful reproduction.
13 I want to point out that the two pictures at the
14 bottom there kind of show some of the benefit as far
15 as the release. All those little red dots in the
16 kind of grayish, that's kind of an aerial photo of a
17 neighborhood, and those would be where all the
18 larvacide would have to be placed in the
19 neighborhood, whereas these green circles on the
20 right show the areas of release for the Wolbachia or
21 for the Oxitec or Wolbachia.
22 What that means is that the mosquitos can

1 fly around and they can fly into areas that are hard
2 to get to. You don't have to apply the larvacide.
3 You're not having to apply in the same degree that
4 you are with the larvacide.
5 And then another thing to point out here is
6 that only the female mosquitos bite, so we're
7 releasing -- the male mosquitos are being released
8 but it's the females that bite.
9 A couple other points to make here, special
10 considerations for both products. That first square
11 there shows the release point as opposed to where
12 the mosquitos disseminate. The dissemination is
13 mosquito-dependent. The release point is not equal
14 to treatment area. You release the mosquitos and
15 they fly away. It's a broader area than where
16 they're actually released.
17 Efficacy testing and claims are unique among
18 mosquito control products for these. And again, the
19 other thing is that these can get where other
20 products can't because the mosquitos are flying away
21 from where they're released.
22 The second block there, health of released

1 mosquitos, is a consideration. We have to consider
2 the age of the mosquitos at the time of release.
3 They need to be viable and able to release and mate.
4 Handling conditions during shipping is a
5 consideration, and fitness cost of the new trait.
6 So again, these are some of the considerations that
7 EPA evaluates in looking at these products.
8 The next issue below there, that block is
9 the density of the existing wild mosquito
10 population. You have to kind of fine tune how many
11 mosquitos you're going to release based upon how
12 many mosquitos are in the treatment area. You
13 adjust the release numbers according to population
14 density.
15 The last thing I want to mention here about
16 special considerations for these types of products
17 is accidental female release. So we need to make
18 sure that the females are not being released, ID the
19 mosquito species, species specific to make sure that
20 female mosquitos are not being released and there's
21 a monitoring program in place. Also there's human
22 health risk considerations. One of the things we

1 look at is to make sure that the mosquitos that are
2 being released are not carrying disease and that
3 they're not, they're not females.
4 I want to mention a couple of things about
5 the current status right now. EPA, as Bob
6 mentioned, issued a registration in November for the
7 Wolbachia ZAP strain in the Asian tiger mosquito or
8 the albopictus for five years in several states. We
9 also issued experimental use permits and
10 experimental use permit amendment extensions that
11 allow experimental field testing and release of both
12 the Aedes aegypti and the albopictus in several
13 states, Florida, Texas, California for the aegypti;
14 and Florida, Hawaii, Texas and Virginia for the
15 albopictus. And for both of these, field efficacy
16 data is needed to support label claims for
17 registration. And the current states that were
18 approved for the ZAP strain had existing efficacy
19 data that was sufficient to support those uses.
20 I want to also mention that Oxitec, that's
21 the developer of the genetically engineered
22 mosquito, has submitted both an experimental use

1 permit and a registration application to EPA. Both
2 are currently under review. And for the
3 experimental use permit for Oxitec, the Federal
4 Register notice of receipt comment period, we're
5 reopening that for another time, for another month
6 to allow more time for public comment.
7 That's it. Thanks. If you have any
8 questions, let me know.
9 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Mike.
10 Questions, comments for Yu-Ting, Bob or
11 Mike.
12 Eric.
13 MR. GJEVRE: Where is your presentation
14 available?
15 MR. KEIGWIN: So the presentation should be
16 on the PPDC website.
17 MR. KEIGWIN: Stan, then Jim, then Michelle.
18 MR. COPE: Thanks for the presentation,
19 Mike. And Rick I want to publically go on record
20 from the AMCA of thanking EPA for giving the
21 mosquito control people some more tools in our
22 toolbox. Because you know better than anybody that

1 we've been asking for them.

2 Three points. These two mosquitos are not

3 only driving some of this innovation but they're

4 also driving a huge uptick in private industry

5 mosquito control, because of the fact that they do

6 occur in people's backyards, primarily in artificial

7 containers. And so the conventional mosquito

8 control methods that have been in use for 60, 70

9 years really don't impact them very much. The

10 typical truck driving through a residential area in

11 the evening putting out an ultra low volume does

12 almost nothing to control these two mosquito species

13 which tend to hang around in people's yards and

14 sometimes even inside their houses. So we're very

15 excited to have something like this.

16 But they're both active during the daytime

17 and this is -- they also feed at night but they're

18 particularly active and biting during the daytime.

19 And this has been really kind of a public

20 information nightmare for organizations such as ours

21 and NPMA trying to get people to understand that

22 they're being now bitten during the day and it's not

1 just when they're sitting out in the evening being
2 bitten by mosquitos and they need to protect
3 themselves during the daytime. And that's a point
4 that we still need help on, anytime you're talking
5 to people about these mosquitos.
6 Secondly, the maps that he showed, those
7 have caused a lot of consternation for mosquito
8 control people. They were first rolled out at the
9 White House Zika Summit almost two years ago now,
10 which was held in Atlanta, Georgia. I was really
11 excited when I saw White House Zika Summit on the
12 invitation but it was at CDC.
13 Those are not distribution maps for those
14 two species. And it got into the media that, oh, my
15 gosh, all these Zika vectors are occurring in
16 Connecticut and New Hampshire and places where we've
17 never had them. So be very careful when you see
18 those maps. They are not distribution maps. They
19 are estimated potential ranges based on the optimum
20 conditions for those two species.
21 The distribution of Aedes aegypti in this
22 country is actually pretty much restricted to the

1 Southeast and the Gulf Coast, although there's one
2 population that reoccurs every year in a place
3 called Washington, DC, and nobody has ever been able
4 to find it, of the yellow fever mosquito. They
5 don't know exactly where it's coming from. So be
6 careful when you look at maps. Be sure you know
7 what they're trying to say.
8 And just thirdly, let's don't let our guard
9 down. These two methods and a couple others that
10 are coming along are fairly slow acting. They're
11 just another tool in our mosquito control toolbox.
12 They in no way are a substitute for the pesticides
13 that we need to be able to apply by ground and
14 aerially when we're in the middle of a mosquito-
15 borne disease outbreak, because we're going to
16 continue to have them. So we need to keep those
17 other tools in our toolbox as well. And that's all
18 I have to say about all that.
19 MR. KEIGWIN: Jim, then Nichelle, then Nina.
20 MR. FREDERICKS: Thanks, I want to thank you
21 for your presentation. We really appreciate all the
22 hard work that's getting done.

1 Actually a comment and a question. One is
2 actually, I didn't realize, we didn't plan it but I
3 am going to echo some of Stan's comments about, you
4 know, this is a great additional -- with regard to
5 these mosquitos, it's a great additional tool to be
6 added to the integrated pest management toolbox.
7 And when we saw the pyramid up on the screen that
8 Bob showed us, you know, you take into consideration
9 as many different tools as you can and then use
10 those tools in the best possible fashion. But it
11 shouldn't be lost that we still are in need of the
12 pesticide tools that we use. So that's the comment
13 I really wanted to echo, that we can't lose sight of
14 that we have these innovations, but those
15 innovations are not enough. We need every tool
16 possible.
17 And third, the question was with regard to
18 Yu-Ting's presentation. We appreciate actually the
19 opportunity to continue to work on things like
20 structural fumigants and we hope that we can be
21 helpful as a resource there. But my question is
22 with regard to the Neonics, a million comments. How

1 does, how does OPP deal with a million comments?
2 I mean if you spend five minutes each, and
3 I'm no mathematician, but if you spend five minutes
4 on each comment, you know, you're talking about
5 83,000 staff hours, 40 years of work. How does that
6 even work? I imagine some are duplicates but it's
7 still a lot of comments.
8 MS. GUILARAN: Right. So obviously some are
9 substantive comments. So the first, number one is
10 to, for us to receive all the comments I don't think
11 it's quite done yet so. And then first is to figure
12 out the, sort of the mass letter writing campaign
13 versus substantive things that we can consider and
14 use to reconsider what we had done in the risk
15 assessment and also the benefit, for example. So
16 that will probably take the bulk of the time.
17 The other tool that we're trying to put in
18 place is actually some kind of contractual support
19 to help, so to free up our staff to respond to
20 substantive comments and then for contractors to
21 help us kind of sort them and thin them so that we
22 can more easily identify the ones that we need to

1 address earlier. I mean Rick was the previous PRD
2 director and had the staff pretty well set up for
3 responding to a mass amount of comments. So I think
4 we'll basically still shoot for the target for the
5 Neonics for some time later this year to try to
6 propose any necessary mitigation.
7 Yes, I agree. Thank you. Yes, 100 percent
8 agree.
9 MR. KEIGWIN: Nichelle, then Nina, then
10 Charlotte.
11 MS. HARRIOTT: So thank you for your really
12 informative presentation. My first question/comment
13 is for the mosquito staff, Mike. In your
14 presentation you mentioned that there is some
15 efficacy testing and claims that the mosquito
16 product, I guess the registrant has. Do you have
17 that efficacy data? Do you know how efficacious
18 these Wolbachia mosquitos are or could be?
19 MR. MENDELSOHN: Yeah, the current claims
20 are for suppression and we have, the label claims
21 are backed up by data that's been submitted. And
22 that's why the original registration was limited to

1 the states that it was because those were the states
2 that were supported by data that we had in hand.
3 MR. HARRIOTT: So do you, can you share some
4 of that data with us in terms of the numbers of
5 efficacy that we're working with?
6 MR. MENDELSOHN: Not right now, but we can
7 get that information for you.
8 MR. HARRIOTT: Okay, I'm just, I'm just
9 really curious because I, I am cautiously optimistic
10 about this new tool so I am just curious about
11 efficacy.
12 My other question and maybe this is more a
13 question for Stan actually. I'm just curious how
14 would, if I was a mosquito control district and I'm
15 interested in using this Wolbachia mosquitos, how
16 would the timing work with actual spraying? Because
17 it would be a shame to release them and then spray,
18 release them in the morning and spray in the
19 afternoon, so how would that work.
20 MR. COPE: Do I have to put this up first?
21 I want to do the right thing.
22 Actually what you brought up is a little bit

1 of a misunderstanding. There are lots -- of the
2 950-some mosquito abatement districts that we have
3 in this country, many of them, the majority of them
4 do not spray. They do source reduction and larval
5 surveillance and they only spray if there's an
6 indication of disease in the mosquitos. So the idea
7 that they go out three nights a week or four nights
8 a week in every district and spray doesn't happen.
9 Also with the sophistication of how they do
10 the sprays using GIS and everything like that
11 nowadays and other tools, one of the larger
12 districts could easily be releasing these
13 genetically modified organisms in one part of their
14 district where they might be spraying in another
15 part of it. So it would go hand in hand. They
16 certainly wouldn't want to -- this is not cheap. I
17 mean you can tell from how it's done, it's pretty
18 expensive. So they'd really be shooting themselves
19 in the foot were they to release all these mosquitos
20 and then drive the truck that night and kill them
21 all. But as I said, most of them are not going to
22 be out during the evening anyway, so the sprays

1 wouldn't harm them too much.

2 And also if you don't know, the flight range

3 of these mosquitos is very limited to maybe the

4 length of a football field or a little more from

5 where they breed in the water, so they're not going

6 to be really great distances. Thank you for that,

7 Mr. NPMA.

8 MS. HARRIOTT: Thank you. My second set of

9 questions for Yu-Ting. So you have here like your

10 high profile risk assessments, and thank you for all

11 the work that you guys have done in that, I really

12 appreciate it and I look forward to EPA finalizing

13 these decisions. And I do not envy you going

14 through one million comments but I guess there is a

15 lot of public interest in these things.

16 So my first is about, so you have your

17 neonics, glyphosate, pyrethroids and the fumigants

18 but you didn't mention anything about chlorpyrifos.

19 And the last time we were here, EPA said to us that

20 they need more data or more understanding about how

21 chlorpyrifos impacts children's brains. So I'm just

22 wondering where the agency is on that? Are there

1 going to be data call-ins? Like what more does the
2 agency need? How can we help provide you with
3 information so that you can quickly come to a
4 resolution on chlorpyrifos?
5 My second question is about mosquito spray
6 again. There are several pesticides or classes of
7 pesticides that are registered for mosquito spray
8 and I know you have the pyrethroids that I'm
9 expecting a decision on, a decision on maybe in the
10 New Year. But I'm thinking of some of the OP's that
11 are still registered for mosquito spraying and
12 particularly Naled (phonetic), which was in the news
13 a couple years ago, and since mosquito season is
14 almost upon us, I'm just wondering what is the
15 registration review status of some of the other
16 mosquito spray pesticides?
17 MR. KEIGWIN: Nichelle, thanks. I'm going
18 to start with the chlorpyrifos question, and Yu-Ting
19 can respond to the mosquito products question.
20 So we have been in a dialogue with Columbia
21 University to get some additional information that
22 underlies the analyses that they've done in the

1 epidemiological area. There have been, and I think
2 we've got a number of these exchanges posted on our
3 website currently and we've recently reengaged with
4 Columbia to try to obtain some additional
5 information that would help to inform moving forward
6 with our analyses.
7 So let me turn to Yu-Ting about the mosquit
8 part.
9 MS. GUILARAN: So for the Naled DDVP, we're
10 still working on the risk assessment and we're
11 working on some additional studies that will have to
12 be incorporated into the draft risk assessment and
13 right now, I think we're expecting the studies to be
14 completed by the end of this year and hopefully we
15 will have a draft risk assessment out shortly after
16 that.
17 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. Nina, and then
18 Charlotte.
19 MS. WILSON: Thanks for that information,
20 Bob and Mike. You said tolerance exemptions,
21 biostimulants, IPM and PRIA, and those are all words
22 that I feel like I say everyday 100 times a day.

1 But as you know, we're very interested in tolerance
2 exemptions and making sure that the tolerance
3 exemption requirements and how to get there are
4 commensurate with the risk. And that is a very,
5 sometimes a confusing process because I think people
6 don't realize that it's something like 6 to 8
7 percent acetic acid which is vinegar, if we call it
8 a pesticide has to go through all the requirements
9 and we have to demonstrate to you. And we try to do
10 that in such a way that it doesn't require a lot of
11 animal testing and use the weight of evidence as
12 much as possible.
13 But, and as for biostimulants as well. It
14 somewhere lays in between an IGR, insect growth
15 regulator which is a FIFRA product or a fertilizer
16 which is more state-regulated and so trying to find
17 a home and definition of that was very important to
18 us as well.
19 And these products all work in integrated
20 test management which your group also looks at, not
21 just for schools which you have looked at but also
22 we work in -- with conventional products. We work

1 with genetically modified and the whole idea is to
2 get a total reduced risk program. And I know
3 anybody and all these different sectors that we have
4 are interested generally in that kind of reduced
5 risk IPM, resistant management programs.
6 And as far as PRIA, I think just a reminder
7 to everybody that if you -- that not having PRIA and
8 not giving you the tools, the resources to be able
9 to review all these products in the same diligent
10 way that we tend to think of some of the other
11 products, does keep these lower-risk pesticides from
12 being reviewed and registered in a timely manner as
13 well. So I appreciate your comments and your
14 support and all the work that you guys do there.
15 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, thanks, Nina. Charlotte
16 and then Dan.
17 MS. SANSON: All right, thanks. I have a
18 request for Yu-Ting. Yu-Ting, as you were talking
19 about the comments, I think, I think it might have
20 been relative to Glyphosate, I just wanted to
21 clarify that I heard correctly. You mentioned about
22 7,000 comments have come in and then you mentioned

1 an email box. So I was just curious as to what the
2 difference is between comments that you're receiving
3 via email versus -- as opposed to the docket. Are
4 you talking about the same thing or are they
5 different processes?
6 MS. GUILARAN: So for some of these
7 chemicals where we know the case will receive a lot
8 of inquiries, so we have set up both emails to
9 receive those inquiries and also a phone line. So
10 there are some comments that were submitted through
11 the email system, so that's part of what we need to
12 do is go through the emails as well, and then the
13 ones that are actually comments and to incorporate
14 that with the comments that we receive through the
15 docket.
16 MS. SANSON: Okay. So the comments that are
17 uploaded to the docket I think are visible to the
18 public. What about the comments you're receiving in
19 the mail --
20 MS. GUILARAN: We'll be adding them to the
21 visibility of the docket. So first we need to go
22 through all of them, extract all the comments that

1 are relevant, load it onto the docket.

2 MS. SANSON: Okay, yeah. And the million

3 that you've received have also come through --

4 MS. GUILARAN: The million, we did not have

5 a specialized email for the Neonics, so I guess

6 that's why there were a million.

7 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Dan and then Eric.

8 MR. KUNKEL: Thanks, Rick, and I think my

9 comment and it's not really a question, is for Bob

10 McNally. And one of the outcomes, we had a global

11 minor use summit last October. One of the outcome

12 action items was to develop a list of products that

13 are exempt or very low toxicity so they can be

14 recognized. So we're working on this through Codex

15 and OECD, but I wanted to make you aware of that.

16 But again, we're just trying to create an

17 international list that's internationally recognized

18 so if we could draw from some of your experiences

19 that you had in your workshop last year and so on,

20 we would appreciate that. Thank you.

21 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. Eric.

22 MR. GJEVRE: I saw, early I saw a bullet

1 point for CRISPR. Can we get a CRISPR update or can
2 you put it on? I'm just curious, does EPA ride herd
3 on that regulatorily?
4 MR. McNALLY: So the question is about
5 CRISPR. So as I mentioned earlier, we can do, maybe
6 at the next PPDC, just an overview briefing of what
7 the technology is and specifically how it might
8 apply to the pesticide realm because we have not
9 received any applications for any CRISPR products
10 but we do know the technology is out there and at
11 some point it might be a possibility.
12 One of the things we did as part of the
13 coordinated framework update and the national
14 strategy sort of for ag-biotech is we kind of
15 highlighted some approaches that the government is
16 looking at on things like gene editing, and so
17 that's certainly something we want to establish some
18 policy on in the next year or so, and we're working
19 with our colleagues at FDA and USDA to have
20 hopefully a concerted approach across the
21 government, maybe not entirely consistent, given the
22 different statutory mandates but at least the left

1 and the right hand know what each is doing.

2 MR. KEIGWIN: Stan, did you --

3 MR. COPE: I can tell by looking at

4 everybody's faces that you're all wondering how you

5 can learn more about these invasive mosquitos, and

6 there's some really good news on that. If you are

7 interested or you need to learn or any of your staff

8 want to learn more about these, about a year and a

9 half ago the CDC came to AMCA and awarded us a

10 sizable contract to develop best management

11 practices for these species. So if you go to -- we

12 have a very cleaver website address, it's WWW dot

13 mosquito dot org, and the very top button says CDC

14 Training and Certification.

15 The best management practices manual is

16 there. It's about 78 or 80 pages, and it covers

17 all, all aspects that you would need to know about

18 biology, surveillance and control for these things.

19 And then there are four E-modules that you can sit

20 down and take at your own pace. They're not -- it's

21 not easy. You have to get 85 percent to pass.

22 That's 15 percent above what we were required in the

1 military to pass, by the way, so that tells you how
2 important mosquito control really is.
3 You don't have to be a member of AMCA to
4 take them. They're a great place for people to
5 start that might be get thrown into a job or a
6 responsibility where they know nothing about these
7 things. And at the end you get a nice little
8 certificate that says that you have been trained on
9 the CDC/AMCA best management practices, which is a
10 pretty good thing to have in your dossier.
11 So it's available, everything is available
12 now in English and Spanish as of last week and we're
13 very proud of that. So take advantage of it but
14 study hard for the test.
15 MR. KEIGWIN: Damon.
16 MR. REABE: This is a comment with regards
17 to the biopesticides. I would like to encourage the
18 EPA to -- and maybe this is already being done, but
19 we're starting to see more use of biopesticides in
20 our business and one thing I'm noticing that's
21 lacking is real clear instructions. I'll use an
22 example. There's a particular biopesticide that we

1 handle that requires refrigeration. So there is
2 the, the company that formulates the product is well
3 aware of it. The sales staff might be well aware of
4 it. It gets distributed, it gets watered down. It
5 gets to dealerships, that information gets watered
6 down. And when it finally gets to the applicator,
7 they may not know that. And so, you know, clear
8 packaging, labeling that would, you know, provide
9 that type of direction.
10 Also for aerial applicators, from what I can
11 tell, it's quite obvious to me that because these
12 products are so specific at how they control a pest,
13 the timing of application is extremely critical. So
14 aerial application will play a very significant role
15 on that. So clear instructions for us, droplet size
16 is important for us to know what works best. How
17 long these products can be in the diluted form in
18 our hoppers. As time goes on and these products
19 become more widely used, pesticide dealers go into
20 bulk mixing. Certain products that are conventional
21 products when they're at a particular pH may have
22 really short half-lives. Some of these

1 biopesticides may no longer be viable after so many
2 hours, and this is all information that we, that we
3 need in order to use them properly and have them
4 work.
5 MR. KEIGWIN: Lori Ann.
6 MS. BURD: Thanks. I have a few questions.
7 First I know it's the practice to do final final
8 interim risk decisions. Do the decisions ever
9 become final final and not final interim? And can
10 you explain why that is the practice? And then I'll
11 ask my two other questions after.
12 MS. GUILARAN: I know. So yes, that's my
13 goal to have final decisions. So part of the reason
14 I have the interim is we are, I think Marietta is
15 going to cover it tomorrow, the ESA piece of it. So
16 that piece we're still working with Fish and
17 Wildlife and also USDA and NMFS on trying to figure
18 out the ESA piece of it. So the biological
19 evaluation for EPA, the biological opinion for the
20 services, so that's a part that is not -- when we
21 have that figured out, that's one of the pieces that
22 we need to have for the final decision. So that's

1 why it's interim right now. Does that answer your
2 question?
3 MS. BURD: Yeah, great. Thank you.
4 My next question is can you give us an
5 update on Malathion re-registration?
6 MS. GUILARAN: So for Malathion, the draft
7 risk assessment was already released and is
8 currently going through -- the second part of it is
9 the ESA. So I think, are you going to cover some of
10 the -- or are you asking about the ESA piece of it
11 or just --
12 MS. BURD: No, I just wanted to know what
13 was happening.
14 MS. GUILARAN: Yes, the risk assessment has
15 been released and also the comment period closed,
16 yeah, but that's part.
17 MS. BURD: So that's what we're waiting for.
18 You don't anticipate doing the final interim on
19 Malathion, you'll hopefully have a final final?
20 MS. GUILARAN: It depends on how the timing
21 all works out. Sometimes it depends on if we can
22 effectuate some of the risk mitigation earlier on,

1 we'll do a piece of that and have that implemented
2 first. It really depends on the timing of
3 everything, how it's going to work out.
4 MS. BURD: Okay, great, thanks.
5 And my final question is on Neonics. As we
6 all know, the EU finalized its ban on outdoor use of
7 three Neonics on Friday.
8 MS. GUILARAN: Right.
9 MS. BURD: And I'm wondering how you all
10 will be incorporating the information they utilized
11 in your decision-making processes and also the
12 information coming out of Canada as well.
13 MS. GUILARAN: Right. So as I said before,
14 with all the comments that we have received,
15 obviously part of our consideration for EPA is
16 different from EU. So we need to first of all take
17 a look at the comments that we have received on a
18 risk assessment and then along with the benefit
19 assessment that we have put all together. So FIFRA
20 requires us to balance both pieces and then
21 basically make a determination after we have
22 sufficient time to look into that and to see whether

1 or not we need to revise any of our risk assessment
2 as well, so.
3 MS. BURD: So you will be looking at the
4 information that they looked at?
5 MS. GUILARAN: Yeah, I don't -- I don't know
6 specifically what information.
7 MS. BURD: The EFSA report.
8 MS. GUILARAN: Yeah, we have looked at that.
9 MS. BURD: Okay, great.
10 MS. GUILARAN: Yes.
11 MR. KEIGWIN: Let me check with Sharon and
12 Pat to see if they have any questions.
13 MS. SELVAGGIO: This is Sharon. Can you
14 hear me?
15 MR. KEIGWIN: Yes. Go ahead, Sharon.
16 MS. SELVAGGIO: Okay. So I'm sorry, I was
17 taking some notes and I'm trying to find my
18 question, okay.
19 So my question was to Bob McNally about the
20 biopesticides. Recently at the IPM symposium that
21 happens every couple of years, the one that just
22 happened in Baltimore this spring, there was a

1 discussion on nano technology by Jason White, the
2 state chemist for Connecticut, and the takeaway from
3 his presentation was basically that traditional risk
4 assessment methods are inadequate for nano
5 pesticides because nano pesticides interact in
6 unique ways with biochemical, genetic and cellular
7 processes. And according to him, there's no nano
8 specific safety assessments that are required right
9 now by either the EPA or the Food and Drug
10 Administration, although the EU is a little bit
11 further along.
12 So in thinking about Bob's presentation and
13 also this morning's discussion about EPA's efforts
14 to streamline testing and risk assessment methods,
15 I'm curious about what discussions, guidance and
16 policies are underway to achieve the mission of
17 safety for OPP that Bob pointed out at the very
18 beginning of his presentation and basically to
19 ensure adequate assessment of human and ecological
20 risks for both biopesticides and nano pesticides.
21 I am also just kind of curious, given the
22 sort of division of responsibility that Bob talked

1 about with conventional and how you guys are
2 classifying different kinds of pesticides, where do
3 nano pesticides fit into that structure?
4 MR. McNALLY: Yeah, this is Bob. Thank you
5 for the comment. I guess what I would like to do is
6 get -- we had people at that IPM conference in
7 Baltimore and they were basically our IPM folks, as
8 the name would suggest. If you can give us more
9 information about the presentation, I think the
10 first thing would be to take a look at it and see
11 how it relates to our program, either in the
12 biopesticide program, the conventional world, the
13 antimicrobial world.
14 I think the first thing we look at is the
15 delineation between a biochemical, you know, the
16 three criteria I listed, to see whether it fits in
17 our bin or somebody else's bin. I think we would
18 probably need to know more about the specific
19 delineation that the presenter in Baltimore made
20 about nano pesticides. So I think that's the key
21 criteria for us that I listed, and I think maybe the
22 best bet is for us to look at that paper and then

1 see what impact, if any, that has on the program in
2 my group, in Yu-Ting's group or in the antimicrobial
3 group.
4 Can you tell me again the name of the
5 presenter?
6 MS. SELVAGGIO: Yes, Jason White. He's the
7 state chemist for the state of Connecticut.
8 MR. McNALLY: All right, thank you.
9 MS. SELVAGGIO: You're welcome.
10 MR. KEIGWIN: Any other questions for Bob,
11 Mike or Yu-Ting? Amy.
12 MS. LIEBMAN: I have a question on this
13 overall session, so is it okay to ask that now? I'm
14 just kind of curious, like particularly given sort
15 of how the agenda went today and the time that's on
16 a regulatory update session within the PPDC, why
17 some major regulatory updates were not included on
18 the agenda when they were requested by many
19 participants. So I'm specifically asking like it
20 just seems like when you're about to start gutting
21 the WPS, and when we have the judge, federal judge
22 saying that the certified pesticide applicator rule

1 is actually now in effect, why you wouldn't sort of
2 bring us up-to-date on that in this setting.
3 MR. KEIGWIN: So we are now in the
4 rule-making process and that's really the next step
5 in the process. Our websites are up-to-date on the
6 status of those two regulations and so we felt that
7 the information was out there. We -- there was an
8 opportunity to ask questions earlier in the session.
9 Those questions were asked. I think the agency
10 answered them.
11 I know there were a couple questions, Amy,
12 that you asked earlier this morning that we're in
13 the process of getting answers for and we hope to
14 have the answers to those tomorrow. And very much
15 consistent with past PPDC meetings, we have tended
16 to provide regulatory updates on other aspects of
17 the program, be it registration review and the
18 biopesticide program, and so this part of the agenda
19 is consistent with that.
20 MS. LIEBMAN: Okay, I guess I just see some
21 large gaps in the overall agenda. It was brought up
22 but it wasn't really on the agenda today. So I

1 think in the future I think it's important when,
2 when it's current, when it's a current event, even
3 if it's on your web -- everything else is on your
4 website, too. So I'd appreciate it being addressed.
5 MR. KEIGWIN: Other questions? Okay.
6 No one here in the room signed up for public
7 comments. I just want to check quickly to see if
8 anyone participating on the phone would like to make
9 public comments.
10 Okay. Well, then, I want to thank everyone
11 for their participation today. We will give you
12 back the gift of an hour of your time.
13 Thank you all for today's discussion. We
14 will begin tomorrow at 9:00 a.m. Have a good
15 evening.
16 (The meeting was adjourned.)
17
18
19
20
21
22

1 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPTIONIST

2

3

4 I, Roberta R. Katz, do hereby certify that
5 the foregoing proceedings were transcribed by me via
6 digital audio file and reduced to typewriting under
7 my supervision; that I am neither counsel for,
8 related to, nor employed by any of the parties to
9 the action in which these proceedings were
10 transcribed; and further, that I am not a relative
11 or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by
12 the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise
13 interested in the outcome of the action.

14

15

16

17

18 ROBERTA R. KATZ, RPR, CSR

19

20

21

22

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES
6 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
7
8
9 PESTICIDE PROGRAM DIALOGUE
10 COMMITTEE MEETING
11
12
13 MAY 3, 2018
14
15
16
17
18 Conference Center - Lobby Level
19 2777 Crystal Drive
20 One Potomac Yard South
21 Arlington, VA 22202
22

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

2 (Due to technical issues with phone line - transcript begins 2-3

3 minutes after meeting commenced.)

4 MS. ECHEVERRIA: -- request the court to not

5 grant the extension. NMFS issued a final BiOp on

6 December 29th. In order to continue the collaborative

7 dialogue between the agencies, EPA initiated informal

8 consultation on these chemicals in the (inaudible) of

9 public comment period.

10 Specifically, we requested comment on

11 scientific approaches and data sources used in the

12 biological opinion. We also requested comments

13 specifically on the reasonable included alternatives and

14 reasonable included measures, whether they are feasible

15 and whether other measures should be considered that

16 achieve similar protection but are less burdensome.

17 Finally, we specifically requested comment on

18 national and state usage data, in particular for

19 nonagricultural uses such as wide area mosquito control,

20 rights-of-ways, pastures, golf courses, and nurseries.

21 And also usage information for Hawaii, Alaska, and the

22 Territories, which is an area of uncertainty for us.

23 The Fish and Wildlife Service had also agreed

1 to issue a BiOp for these three pesticides by December
2 31st. However, the terms of their agreement has given
3 them additional flexibility. In response to a request
4 that we received back in November, EPA, and, in
5 particular, our Biological and Economic Analysis
6 Division, has been compiling additional usage data on
7 these three organophosphates.
8 Additionally, the agencies have agreed and have
9 established a technical working group which is
10 collaborating to develop an approach to consider this
11 usage information in the ongoing consultations.
12 I'm going to provide a very high-level overview
13 of the biological opinion based on our very preliminary
14 review. So, the biological opinion found -- this is
15 NMFS's biological opinion -- found jeopardy to 38 species
16 and adverse modification to 37 critical habitat units.
17 This was for chlorpyrifos and malathion. The results are
18 a little bit different for diazinon.
19 For species where they concluded jeopardy
20 findings, the biological opinion presents reasonable and
21 prudent alternatives which are identified to avoid
22 jeopardy. Additionally, the biological opinion

1 identifies reasonable and prudent measures which are
2 intended to minimize take of an individual.
3 Reasonable and prudent measures are
4 nondiscretionary in the BiOp. They include measures for
5 EPA to develop, EPA Endangered Species Protection Plan
6 Bulletins to conserve listed species, and to develop a
7 user education program and incident tracking and
8 reporting system.
9 In addition to the nondiscretionary measures
10 intended to minimize take, the reasonable and prudent
11 alternatives in the biological opinion are focused on
12 reducing exposure. They include options for limiting the
13 frequency of applications to once per year, limiting the
14 area of application for mosquito control and wide area
15 uses, options in a point system intended to provide
16 flexibility in reducing run-off and drift through a
17 combination of use deletions, no spray buffers, drift
18 reduction technology, enrollment in approved stewardship
19 programs, and the use of vegetative filter strips and
20 other best management practices.
21 Finally, the RPAs suggest for EPA to employ an
22 effectiveness monitoring plan to ensure that the RPAs are

1 feasible, effective, and implemented.

2 So, in terms of our next steps, as I described,

3 EPA is currently reviewing the BiOp and additional

4 discussions with NMFS to understand more fully the scope

5 and intentions behind the biological opinion.

6 Additionally, we initiated a public comment period. As I

7 mentioned, that comment period opened on March 23rd and

8 was originally intended to close on May 22nd. We have

9 received several requests and are likely extending that

10 comment period.

11 Although Fish and Wildlife had a similar date,

12 they have had more flexibility in this process. We have

13 been collaborating with them and other agencies to

14 incorporate the usage information in the ongoing

15 consultations.

16 The Agency is committed to meeting the

17 statutory mandates under both under both FIFRA and ESA.

18 Carbaryl and Methomyl are the next two chemicals in the

19 pilot process. Consultation has not yet been initiated

20 on these pesticides, however, my team has begun our work

21 on those biological evaluations.

22 The EPA is collaborating with the Services to

1 develop interim scientific approaches and create a
2 sustainable process for completing consultations that
3 meet requirements of both statutes. Our goal remains the
4 same, and that is to streamline the process to a point
5 where it's protective of species, timely for FIFRA
6 registration review decisions, feasible within the
7 agencies' resource constraints, and transparent to the
8 public.
9 Finally, I would like to provide a brief
10 summary of the Memorandum of Agreement that was signed by
11 the agencies in January of this year. On January 31st,
12 EPA, with the Department of Interior and the Department
13 of Commerce, signed a Memorandum of Agreement
14 establishing an interagency workgroup.
15 The working group is charged with reviewing
16 statutory requirements, regulations, and case law, and
17 making recommendations to improve scientific and policy
18 approaches. In addition to the signators of the
19 Memorandum of Agreement, the agencies have invited
20 participation of the working group from USDA, the Council
21 of Environmental Quality, and the Office of Management
22 and Budget.

1 The working group is charged with providing
2 recommendations to EPA, Fish and Wildlife Service, and
3 NMFS leadership on improving the ESA consultation process
4 for pesticide registration and registration review.
5 So, that concludes my update. I'm happy to
6 answer questions, and I also welcome input from the
7 committee as we move forward.
8 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Marietta.
9 Questions from the committee? Lori Ann.
10 MS. BURD: So, I'm confused. My understanding
11 is that the label is the law. Now you're saying that the
12 analysis is on the actual use. So, which is it? Is the
13 label the law or is the actual use the law? If we're
14 going to be looking at actual use, are you also going to
15 be factoring in a significant portion of pesticide use?
16 (Inaudible) allowed on the label and with the legal use,
17 we know about 50 percent of pesticide users don't bother
18 to read the label. So, are you factoring that into your
19 actual use analysis? If so, how will you?
20 MS. ECHEVERRIA: So, the label is the law. And
21 our analyses include consideration of the label,
22 certainly. That's always our starting point. The idea

1 is when you're moving away from a localized situation and
2 you're trying to draw conclusions on a larger spacial
3 scale and you're trying to make a determination of
4 whether or not something is likely to occur -- we have
5 best available information that is robust and informs us
6 what is likely to occur based on actual usage
7 information. That should be considered in the final
8 determination. So, that is what the interagency working
9 group is considering as we move forward. So, it's to
10 answer that question of what is likely to occur.
11 MS. BURD: So, is the plan if there's a new
12 pest outbreak requiring a new type of use, that you guys
13 will reinitiate consultation every time the actual use
14 shifts significantly? What will your threshold be for
15 that? How will you continue to move through other
16 pesticides if that is the process, looking at actual use?
17 MS. ECHEVERRIA: So, we have experts who have
18 knowledge on pest outbreaks and the use of these
19 chemicals under those situations. We're not just looking
20 at sort of a one single data point of use but averages
21 over time. So, we're considering that information to the
22 best of our expert's ability to understand, how from an

1 entomological standpoint, how these pest outbreaks occur.
2 That is part of the consideration when we're evaluating
3 these data. So, that is certainly something that we are
4 considering.
5 MS. BURD: So, in every other consultation
6 process that happens in the United States, they look at
7 the scope of the action, not the practice they imagine?
8 Why is this different?
9 MS. ECHEVERRIA: So, I'm not an expert on other
10 consultations. So, I'm not sure how to answer your
11 question. I'd ask Gina.
12 MS. SHULTZ: So, this consultation isn't
13 different. The action, as Marietta said, is the
14 reregistration of the three OPs. In determining what the
15 direct and reasonably certain to occur indirect effects
16 of that action on threatened endangered species and
17 designated critical habitat requires looking at not only
18 the labeled use, but also the historic actual use and
19 likely future use to determine the effects.
20 MS. BURD: So, does that then, since we're
21 moving away from just the label being the action,
22 wouldn't you be looking at the legal use as well?

1 MS. SHULTZ: So, the action is the
2 reregistration per the label. The additional information
3 is to determine what the likely indirect effects are, the
4 reasonably certain to occur indirect effects from EPA's
5 action of reregistering those labels.
6 MS. BURD: Can you give us a sense of how many
7 of your calls in the BiOp will change as a result of your
8 revamped analysis incorporating actual use? How will
9 this actually change the determinations?
10 MS. SHULTZ I can't say that at this point
11 because we haven't completed the analyses.
12 MS. BURD: Do you have a sense of whether it
13 will change any of them?
14 MS. SHULTZ: Not at this point. I don't know.
15 MR. KEIGWIN: Other questions? Amy.
16 MS. LIEBMAN: This is an interesting
17 discussion. I know it surrounds the Endangered Species
18 Act. But it is an interesting approach that we're taking
19 in response to a law. I just wonder why some of the
20 similar approaches are not being taken when we look at
21 the real use of what happens to workers, for instance,
22 who are exposed to certain chemicals. We have a number

1 of documented exposures that occurred to workers in
2 Hawaii, California, and Washington, and other places this
3 year. I'm just curious if you can respond to how the EPA
4 looks at the actual use when it comes to workers. I'll
5 just throw in some of the epi studies as well that we
6 have, and how does that impact how we look at humans?
7 MR. KEIGWIN: So, on the human exposure side,
8 for example, when we're assessing dietary risks, we
9 routinely incorporate pesticide use and usage information
10 into those assessments. The Food Quality Protection Act
11 specifically directs us to when we have best available
12 data to look at things like anticipated residues in food,
13 as well as percent crop treated.
14 We do something similar when we do our worker
15 exposure assessments where we look at not only the
16 labeled use but we look at typical use. Oftentimes, that
17 could be an opportunity for us to look at, for example,
18 the re-evaluation program opportunities for risk
19 reduction where some thresholds might be exceeded or risk
20 benefit balance is not in the same place as it was at the
21 time of registration.
22 Incident data is oftentimes used as a line of

1 evidence in the risk assessment where we have incident
2 data. It can also be used to help inform risk
3 management. So, I think there are some parallels in what
4 we do on the human health side that we're now exploring
5 the utility of incorporating that on the ecological side
6 effects.
7 MS. LIEBMAN: Thanks for your response. I also
8 just wanted to encourage you to take a look at some of
9 the states as well. I think Hawaii, for instance, has
10 moved in an interesting direction in taking some actions
11 where the federal government is failing. We just saw
12 that Hawaii is (inaudible) to banning chlorpyrifos.
13 They've had a really interesting and painful experience
14 in terms of humans and workers being exposed.
15 MR. KEIGWIN: Let me see, is Sharon on the
16 phone today?
17 MS. SELVAGGIO: I am. Can you hear me?
18 MR. KEIGWIN: I can. I wanted to make sure I
19 gave you an opportunity to ask questions if you had
20 wanted to.
21 MS. SELVAGGIO: I do have a few questions.
22 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, go ahead.

1 MS. SELVAGGIO: Well, I'll start with this one.
2 So at the PPDC meeting last May -- I think it was
3 Marietta again, but I can't remember. EPA acknowledged
4 that (inaudible) BEs completed for the carbamates and the
5 original date was March 2018, so that was a year ago. We
6 are curious, when will you release that BE to the public?
7 Why haven't you released it yet? Seems (inaudible) you
8 already completed that BE, at least stated that you had a
9 year ago. So any information on that would be helpful.
10 MS. ECHEVERRIA: Hi, Sharon, it's Marietta.
11 I'm not sure I caught all of it, but I think you're
12 asking about the Carbaryl and Methomyl BEs that we had
13 talked about last May. So, in response to that, we
14 always intended for the pilot process to be iterative and
15 to learn as we go through that pilot process. So, what
16 we're doing with Carbaryl and Methomyl, we're taking
17 stock of all of the input that we have gotten from the
18 stakeholders leading up to the finalization of the first
19 three BEs.
20 So, that included five stakeholder meetings, a
21 requested public comment period. We're considering those
22 additional areas of refinement for Carbaryl and Methomyl

1 going forward. We have not yet established a due date
2 for those, in part because we're working still with Fish
3 and Wildlife on the approach for incorporating usage
4 information.
5 So, we want to ensure that we are still moving
6 together with our federal partner in terms of our
7 approaches moving forward. So, that is one of the areas
8 that we're looking to refine, in addition to others that
9 we've started to explore.
10 MS. SELVAGGIO: I have another couple
11 questions. Is that okay?
12 MR. KEIGWIN: Yes, Sharon, go ahead.
13 MS. SELVAGGIO: Okay. So, it's been mentioned
14 several times today that there is a need to focus on
15 usage data. I just, a few months ago, went back and
16 looked at the NAS report that was authored in 2013 upon
17 request from the EPA and Services to get, really in our
18 country, the best scientific minds just thinking about
19 how to do consultation analyses. We recognize that they
20 are really complex. I think we all should remember that
21 these are done because we have a law, the Endangered
22 Species Act, that requires us to protect our most

1 threatened and vulnerable species.

2 When you look at that NAS report, they

3 specifically recommended that step one and two of the ESA

4 consult should ensure that no potentially unsafe

5 pesticide applications (inaudible) and that, therefore,

6 an exposure model can only assume that a given pesticide

7 is applied at the maximum allowable rate. If information

8 were to be used to suggest that substantially lower

9 applications were to be used, it had to be based upon

10 supporting data, which should include the statistical

11 descriptions of the spatially and temporarily distributed

12 application rate.

13 And that some measures would have to be taken

14 to ensure the use pattern could not dramatically increase

15 in any particular season or locale (inaudible) for

16 example, because of (inaudible) or as Lori Ann mentioned,

17 a new pest. So, they concluded that for now without data

18 at that level, pesticide use is probably an inaccurate

19 input for exposure analysis and that registration and

20 labeling are not well-suited for solving what they call

21 exposure analysis bias.

22 I know that that was kind of a lengthy intro,

1 but I just wanted to remind everybody what the NAS
2 concept said. So, my questions are, how do you intend to
3 improve upon a process that was already reviewed and
4 considered by the National Academy of Sciences?
5 Do you intend to have any new processes
6 reviewed by the National Academy of Sciences? How can
7 usage data become the driver of exposure now when the NAS
8 recommended against it just five years ago? Usage data
9 isn't more robust now than it was then. We know that
10 California is the only state that requires actual usage
11 reports.
12 MS. ECHEVERRIA: So, the NAS gave us general
13 recommendations on a framework for moving forward with
14 our coordinated interim approaches. There is much more
15 detail, folks who are familiar with the biological
16 evaluation process that was fleshed out in the interim
17 approaches and also in our analysis plan for the
18 biological evaluations. So, we are still considering the
19 guidance from the National Academy of Sciences as we work
20 on these requirements. That is still our framework.
21 What the team is doing is exactly what the
22 advice was, to consider the variability in terms of the

1 spacial scale and the temporal scale and what assumptions
2 are necessary to make or to approximate what is likely to
3 occur. So, we're still following that advice. That is
4 the framework. In addition to that, there is a lot of
5 specific, more detailed information as part of our
6 analysis plan. That's exactly what the experts across
7 the agencies are working on right now.
8 MS. SELVAGGIO: So, just to follow up on that,
9 I'm wondering how is EPA and the Services ensuring that
10 the usage data that's used in consultation is accurate in
11 a location-specific level. Because when we think about,
12 for instance, salmon in the Pacific Northwest and
13 California, we have species that have evolved to return
14 to different watersheds. Each of the consultation
15 determinations were made based upon those species
16 ranges.
17 So, will EPA be requiring all pesticide users
18 to report each and every application? Because location
19 and timing of these matters a great deal. So, how will
20 you ensure that your data captures not just the volume of
21 use in general but specific locations and times?
22 MS. ECHEVERRIA: So, again, those are the

1 approaches. That methodology is currently being
2 developed. But that is being considered. So, when you
3 move from a very localized locale and then you increase
4 your analysis to species location and then you move from
5 whether or not there's likely to be an effect on an
6 individual to whether or not there's going to be jeopardy
7 to the whole species, different scales are appropriate to
8 consider. That is exactly the methodology that we're
9 currently working on and intend to make fully transparent
10 so folks can ask questions and also to comment during the
11 public comment period.
12 MS. SELVAGGIO: So, we've been hearing a lot in
13 the past about the new information standards for the
14 acceptance scientific data. So, what does this mean in a
15 pesticide context?
16 MR. KEIGWIN: Sharon, this is Rick. I think
17 this question also came up yesterday. It is a proposed
18 rule. We're looking at how the proposed rule as
19 finalized in its current form would be incorporated into
20 the pesticide program evaluation activities. But I would
21 stress that it's a proposed rule. So, we would invite
22 you to submit any comments or concerns that you might

1 have about the proposal and how it would be incorporated
2 into EPA's regulatory programs to the docket for that
3 rulemaking.
4 MS. SELVAGGIO: My last question is about the
5 working group that got established under the MOA, I
6 think, in January of this year. So, I'm curious what
7 documents are available for public review and whether
8 there is any nonagency representation in that group?
9 MS. ECHEVERRIA: So, the MOA is publicly
10 available for folks to review and to consider. I'm not
11 aware of any other participation at this point. Right
12 now it is still between the agencies, so it's EPA and
13 Department of Commerce, the Department of Interior.
14 We've invited participation from the USDA, Office of
15 Management and Budget. I'm not aware of any other public
16 documents that are available for review at this time.
17 MS. SELVAGGIO: I'm sorry, I didn't quite hear
18 you. Did you say there are no documents available for
19 public review except for the MOA itself?
20 MS. ECHEVERRIA: To my knowledge, that's
21 correct.
22 MS. SELVAGGIO: Okay. I'm done, thank you.

1 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Sharon.

2 Any other comments or questions on this? Lori

3 Ann.

4 MS. BURD: When Administrator Pruitt announced

5 the MOA at the NASDA meeting, he also announced that he

6 was going to seek reinitiation on the NMFS biological

7 opinion. This is just completely unprecedented and a

8 shocking abuse of the public trust and taxpayer funds to

9 get a BiOp and say we don't like its conclusions, so

10 we're going to send it back. This I believe has never

11 happened in the history of the Endangered Species Act for

12 a just completed BiOp to be greeted this way. Because

13 this was announced while the MOA was unrolled, we assume

14 that this is sort of what the MOA group is going to be

15 working on. Can you comment on the initiation of

16 consultation?

17 I'll add one more comment to that before I

18 close this question. We learned last year at the spring

19 meeting that the biological opinions were done and there

20 is no reason why they were not released except for the

21 interference that we've seen. It's an unprecedented

22 level of political interference which has caused these

1 endless refinements which result in nothing but endless
2 delay, typically refinements mean you're refining the
3 process and you're moving along.
4 You're getting documents out. Just like you're
5 always refining your registration process and making it
6 better. When you get new information, you incorporate it
7 into future documents. You don't just keep sticking with
8 one document, working on it endlessly year after year and
9 claiming that it's really, really complicated.
10 It's just incredibly frustrating, and it feels
11 like a true betrayal of trust in a good faith process,
12 especially now that we're hearing that Administrator
13 Pruitt would like to send it back. Can you comment on
14 that at all in what you guys anticipate, that this
15 comment period is just the first step in that
16 reinitiation?
17 MS. ECHEVERRIA: So, we initiate informal
18 consultation of NMFS to continue the dialogue and to do
19 the public comment period. All of the agencies agree
20 that it is important for our work to be transparent and
21 for stakeholders to have input on drafts. As I discussed
22 in the presentation, because of the court order, NMFS was

1 not able to actually publish a draft biological opinion,
2 which they had intended to do.
3 So, we want to provide the public with an
4 opportunity to comment at this time. We believe it's
5 important to get input from stakeholders who had
6 experience with these pesticide applications, growers who
7 may be impacted by restrictions that come out of a
8 biological opinion process, and then also experts with
9 species conservation to provide the agencies with input
10 prior to any further decisions regarding the biological
11 opinions.
12 MS. BURD: So, we also believe that it's
13 important to have lots of public input. This process has
14 been the most transparent biological opinion and
15 consultation process in all of history, and the most
16 robust I've ever witnessed.
17 When you're saying that it's because of the
18 court's decision that there wasn't an opportunity for
19 comment, I'm a little bit confused. Because you said
20 last year in the spring that the BiOps were done. So,
21 are you saying that there was significant work done on
22 the BiOps between spring and the end of the year when the

1 court made that decision?

2 MS. ECHEVERRIA: I'm not in a position to

3 comment on what NMFS was doing in terms of their process.

4 This is really a more appropriate question for the

5 National Marine Fisheries Service.

6 MR. KEIGWIN: Any other comments or questions

7 on this session?

8 (No verbal response.)

9 MR. KEIGWIN: So, why don't we transition,

10 then, into the next session on the development of a

11 communications plan on resistance management. Wynne

12 Miller, the Director of the Biological and Economic

13 Analysis Division will lead the session for us.

14 MS. MILLER: Good morning. As Rick mentioned,

15 my name is Wynne Miller. I'm the Director of the

16 Biological and Economic Analysis Division at OPP. It's

17 my division that's been leading the effort looking at

18 resistance management in regards to conventional

19 pesticides.

20 Bill Chism is here to give a presentation to

21 recognize that trying to develop a -- communications

22 strategy is really important into tackling this issue.

1 So, I'll let Bill provide a little more background on
2 resistance management to those folks who haven't heard
3 this talk before and then where we're going with our
4 communication plan.
5 So, hopefully, you'll have some good ideas,
6 because we realize that it's really important that we
7 target the right folks with a consistent message and make
8 sure that that message is focused. So, let me turn it
9 over to Bill and let him talk a little bit about what we
10 plan to do.
11 MR. CHISM: Thank you very much. Nikhil
12 Mallampalli and I have been here before talking about our
13 work on resistance management, our pesticide registration
14 notices on that topic. I'm really happy to be here
15 again. We're moving along in this pattern.
16 We'd like to talk about our communication plan
17 for resistance management. As Wynne mentioned, this is
18 targeting herbicides. We sort of think of herbicides as
19 one of the bigger problems right now. We've got a lot of
20 cooperation from the weed science societies, so we're
21 moving forward with that topic first. We're hoping to
22 gain some knowledge along the way that would be helpful

1 for insecticides and fungicides as well.

2 So, we'll talk a little bit on the background

3 of herbicide resistance. We'd like to talk about an

4 overview of our resistance management communications

5 plan. Then, what we'd really like to do is spend some

6 time getting some feedback from everyone here as to ways

7 to communicate the message, to target the message, when

8 to target the message, et cetera.

9 Our background on herbicide resistance, weed

10 resistance can be defined as a wicked problem. That's a

11 term of art in sociology that we have borrowed. It means

12 that it does not have a clear cause or a clear solution.

13 Therefore, it's going to be very difficult to solve.

14 Resistance results from a variety of biological

15 and technical and economic factors. It's driven by, as

16 David Shaw says, the vagaries of human decision-making.

17 I'd just like to point out that the end of our

18 presentation has a number of references. We have a

19 reference and a link to pesticide registration notices.

20 We have a link to David Shaw's publication. We also have

21 a link to a review by our Office of Inspector General.

22 The impacts in the US, there's over 70 million

1 acres impacted with herbicide resistant weeds. That
2 number, unfortunately, is continuing to rise. It affects
3 all major crop groups in the US. It's present across all
4 agricultural regions. Resistance is more prevalent now
5 than it was ever before. We'll show you a little example
6 on slide 5. The cost to US growers is estimated to be
7 about two billion dollars per year. That's out of Vince
8 Davis at the University of Wisconsin. So, this is having
9 a major impact on agricultural processes.
10 As we have said before, there has not been a
11 new herbicide mode of action registered in over 30 years,
12 which is unfortunate. In 2017, the Office of Pesticide
13 Programs published two pesticide registration notices on
14 resistance management. I'll talk a little bit about
15 those coming up, trying to address what we could do to
16 help with the resistance plan, the resistance issue.
17 We have now gone on to develop a communication
18 plan, and we're hoping to work with outside groups. We
19 have been working with outside groups for years now. We
20 think this communication plan would be helpful to reach a
21 variety of stakeholders. Also, we'll talk about what
22 we're hoping to address with the communication plan.

1 I just want to point out that resistance is a
2 problem for weeds. Here's a nice picture of Palmer
3 Amaranth down in Georgia, diamondback moth, and powdery
4 mildew. It applies to all disciplines. We're targeting
5 herbicides right now because we think we have a lot of
6 good cooperation, and we can make some headway with that.
7 I mentioned that the number of resistant weeds
8 is continuing. The acreage is continuing. This is a
9 slide from Ian Heap's website just showing the number of
10 unique cases of herbicide resistant weeds by year. We're
11 over 160 weed species. A unique case means there is a
12 weed resistant to a herbicide. Unfortunately, that
13 number is continuing to climb. The first herbicide
14 resistant weed was identified in the late 50s, so it's
15 been an ongoing problem.
16 This is some work by Mutha Bagavathiannan and
17 Jason Norsworthy. They made an estimate of how much
18 Palmer Amaranth would spread. This is a worst-case
19 scenario by 2020. There's shading of the map. As you
20 get to the darker colors, they're estimating that up to
21 50 percent of some farmland will be infested with Palmer
22 Amaranth. Areas along the Mississippi, areas between

1 Alabama and Georgia, and the two Carolinas are predicted
2 to be heavily infested. This weed, unfortunately, is
3 transformative. It can cause people to change their
4 agronomic practices and have huge economic loss.
5 So, why is OPP involved? A number of years ago
6 stakeholders asked us to take a more active role in
7 resistance management to see what we could do in terms of
8 labels and communications. Our goal is to extend the
9 useful life of herbicide products. We have a limited
10 number of products. We'd like to extend their life span
11 as much as possible. We'd like to help reduce the
12 economic loss due to resistance. If we can slow the
13 spread of resistance, potentially, we could reduce
14 herbicide usage and unnecessary pesticide loading in the
15 environment.
16 This issue requires cooperation across many,
17 many different groups of stakeholders. We'll talk about
18 that in a little bit. We're hoping to provide a
19 consistent message with information on how to manage
20 resistant weeds.
21 I just wanted to point out the little picture
22 there is glyphosate resistant horseweed. You see two

1 dead individuals and one living one. That's a typical
2 example of early onset resistance where you're getting
3 one individual surviving and reproducing. That's by Brad
4 Hanson out of UC Davis.
5 Recently, we had a review conducted by our
6 Office of Inspector General. Again, there's a reference
7 in the back of this of that final report. They wanted to
8 review our management and oversight of resistance issues
9 related to herbicide resistance in genetically engineered
10 crops. So, it was a pretty specific categorization and
11 category.
12 They looked at the EPA processes and practices,
13 the steps we were taking to consider the risks from
14 herbicide resistance, and how the agency collects
15 herbicide resistant data. That review was completed in
16 June of last year. One of the recommendations out of
17 that report was that OPP establish a process to increase
18 communication and collaboration regarding herbicide
19 resistance with our stakeholders.
20 So, the next step that we're embarking on how,
21 and this is with help from Skee Jones, Jonathan Becker,
22 and Nikhil Mallampalli, we've developed a communication

1 plan. I'd like to go over it and hopefully get some good
2 feedback and suggestions from the audience.
3 So, the topics I'll cover are the background
4 and current situation, the overall objectives of our
5 communications plan, the target audience and the key
6 messages, methods of communication and promoting the
7 method, the message, and some performance metrics.
8 You'll trust me when I say I'm not very good in
9 communications, so this whole process is new to us. So,
10 any feedback would be greatly appreciated.
11 We've gone over the background, just sort of
12 some information from our communication plan. Resistance
13 is a major economic, biological, and technical problem.
14 It affects many important crops. It's present across all
15 agricultural regions. The problem is especially
16 challenging because its causes and potential solutions
17 depend on the collective behavior of many individuals.
18 You can't have one grower doing everything right with the
19 neighbors not doing everything right. It's really,
20 unfortunately, a community problem.
21 Managing weed resistance to herbicides may have
22 an economic cost. Growers may be forced to spend more

1 money to control these weeds. Although there's a history
2 of educational efforts to address the problem, the
3 problem persists and it's worse than ever before. The
4 geographic scope of the problem and the diversity of US
5 agriculture have limited effective national
6 communications on this topic.
7 So, the current situation in terms of what OPP
8 has done, I mentioned we have two pesticide registration
9 notices. PRN 2017-1 updates an earlier pesticide
10 registration notice from 2001 and provides general
11 guidance for pesticide labeling to promote resistance
12 management practices. The second one provides specific
13 guidance for herbicide resistance management. It's a
14 much more targeted list of options.
15 We have been going through ongoing discussions
16 with the USDA, the Weed Science Society of America,
17 academics, crop consultants, and grower groups on this
18 topic.
19 So, the overall objectives are to leverage the
20 combined resources and outreach capabilities of
21 government agencies, commodity groups, cooperative
22 extension services, and industry to focus on the problem

1 of weed resistance to herbicides, and to develop an
2 effective strategy for communicating to US farmers the
3 importance of practicing a diversified weed control
4 program. We're hoping that that can significantly delay
5 the onset of weed resistance to herbicides. Without new
6 herbicide modes of action coming on at the market, we
7 have to husband what we have as best we can.
8 Communications objectives, the first one is to
9 develop a consistent message across stakeholders. We've
10 been told time and time again from user groups, from
11 farmers and commodity experts, that the communications
12 are coming from many directions and they aren't
13 consistent. Users, crop consultants, et cetera, are
14 saying they're getting so many different messages from
15 different groups and that they aren't always consistent.
16 So, it's leading to confusion.
17 So, one of the things we -- I don't think we
18 can develop a great communications plan, but I think we
19 can get people together and cooperatively develop a
20 communications plan. Our first goal is to see if we can
21 make it consistent across the different sources of
22 information.

1 We'd like to build awareness of the problem and
2 its potential solutions among a wide range of
3 stakeholders. Key stakeholders include growers,
4 herbicide users, including custom applicators, commodity
5 groups, retailers, researchers, extension personnel, and
6 state and federal government agencies. I think they all
7 have a hand in this problem.
8 Secure the commitment of these stakeholders to
9 an understanding of the problem, its severity, and to
10 work together to address the problem by delivering a
11 consistent message to the target audiences.
12 Through the collaborative efforts of the
13 stakeholders, advocate for resources and policies to
14 address the problem of weed resistance to herbicides.
15 Identify ways to encourage participation among the
16 entities with the ability to positively affect the
17 outcomes.
18 Stress the importance of early identification
19 and reporting of suspected resistance. Facilitate
20 communication regionally to spread awareness of specific
21 instances and suspected resistance. One of the things
22 that we're trying to focus on is we've heard of cases

1 where the first resistant species was thought to exist.
2 They've started doing testing. It's taken as long as
3 five years to confirm resistance. We think of those
4 early years as being a golden opportunity to attempt to
5 control those weeds. So, we think that early suspected
6 resistance is a key point.
7 (Interruption from the phone operator.)
8 So, the crop consultants are one of our target
9 audience. Clearly, the growers, the custom pesticide
10 applicators, the soil conservation agencies, registrants,
11 academic researchers, extension agents, state and federal
12 agencies, and commodity groups.
13 One of the things -- just as a side note, in
14 discussions, we've heard comments from the retailers, for
15 example. They say if they don't know what a resistance
16 management plan is, they won't have the product in their
17 warehouse. If they don't have the product in their
18 warehouse, the grower can't use it. So, everybody sort
19 of needs to understand the plan and how they might be
20 helpful towards that goal.
21 So, the key message we're hoping to be able to
22 have each member of the target audience receive a message

1 tailored to their specific needs, and we hope this can be
2 developed in consultation with all of our partners in
3 this effort.
4 Clearly, we won't be the ones developing this
5 message. We need a lot of help in outreach figuring out
6 how to develop the correct message and what that message
7 would be. But we're confident we can convince a bunch of
8 people to come into a room and talk to us, because it's a
9 big problem.
10 Methods of communication in promoting the
11 message, we'd like or we have done presentations at
12 national and regional scientific meetings, the Weed
13 Science Society, the Southern Weed Science Society,
14 national meetings, working with commodity groups,
15 registrants, to develop training materials, social media
16 and Twitter. Facebook might be available. Seek
17 assistance of organizations who regularly communicate
18 with key stakeholders. One of the groups we would like
19 to work with is the National Association of County
20 Agricultural Agents. We can also use our existing
21 agricultural news bulletin, which is published out of our
22 EPA Region 7.

1 Another thing that we count on heavily I don't
2 mention here is the Resistance Action Committee. We're
3 meeting in a couple weeks with the Insecticide Resistance
4 Action Committee. We've met recently with the Herbicide
5 Resistance Action Committee, and they have great
6 programs. We use their communication material and their
7 help quite extensively.
8 The performance metrics, we'd like to say our
9 new chemical decisions will rely on and conform to the
10 information we've talked about or we talk about in the
11 PRN 2017-1 and -2. All of our exclusive use extension
12 determinations that involve resistance management, we'd
13 like those programs to look at our PR notices and
14 incorporate those elements that are appropriate to those
15 pests.
16 Also, we have been working with the Weed
17 Science Society and receive regular updates on the status
18 of resistance management. We've gotten advice from them,
19 and we meet with them annually on policy advice and the
20 situation with herbicide resistance.
21 So, we have a bunch of questions, and we're
22 hoping to get some good feedback and insight on some

1 things. So, one of our thoughts was that we could get
2 some input on an appropriate way to communicate with
3 stakeholders. One of the things -- I personally harbor
4 the thought that if we can get communications from the
5 crop groups, it would be so much more effective than if
6 something comes out from us. I just have that thought.
7 So, if you have thoughts on ways to communicate the
8 message, if anybody has thoughts on the most effective
9 ways to communicate with stakeholders -- I don't know,
10 shall I go through them all? Okay.
11 Another question we had was how long should our
12 message be? Is short better? I mean, is several pages
13 way too long? We'd like some thoughts on that.
14 What time of year is best to communicate with
15 growers? I'm pretty sure between now and the next few
16 months, they're not listening. They're planting.
17 They're getting a whole bunch of things done. So, time
18 of year I think is critical.
19 General feedback on the approach? Do you have
20 recommendations for how EPA can participate, given its
21 limited authority? Do you have recommendations for other
22 stakeholders that should be included? Are there other

1 resources to tap that we have not considered?

2 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Bill.

3 So, I see Andy, Amy, and Liza.

4 MR. THOSTENSON: So, a suggestion that I have

5 would be obviously trying to engage with and visit with

6 the agricultural trade publications, the major ones.

7 Many of their reporters are very competent and very

8 comfortable in dealing with this particular issue. I

9 think they would be more than open to doing more in-depth

10 type interviews and engage with EPA on trying to spread

11 the message. They've already been doing a certain level

12 of this, especially over the last year or two. But

13 certainly hearing directly from EPA on this issue would

14 be welcomed by their readers as well, I believe.

15 The other question that popped into my mind

16 literally was in the first slide or two where you said

17 there hasn't been a new mode of action released in over

18 30 years, and that's unfortunate. Now, I understand that

19 there are a whole variety of reasons why that's the case,

20 but I wonder if some of them may be regulatory

21 impediments that can be identified and dealt with on some

22 level to facilitate the introduction of new modes of

1 action.

2 While some folks may suggest that that may be

3 counterproductive in terms of reducing pesticide use, the

4 problem is that under the current regimen, we are

5 actually seeing an escalation, at least in my opinion, of

6 the number of pesticides that are used in the

7 environment, with some of them with rather adverse

8 effects.

9 So, it seems like that point, that fact, that

10 30 years we've not had a new mode of action, why is that?

11 Is there an ability or desire by EPA to sit down with

12 industry and other people and try to identify any kind of

13 impediments to the release or the bringing out of new

14 modes of action?

15 MR. CHISM: So, thank you very much. That

16 would be a good point for us to check with the Ag

17 communications folks. We'll follow up on that.

18 The second thing, I'm afraid I do not have a sense

19 from the registrant's point of view what the impediment

20 to a new mode of action is. They clearly could address

21 that much better than I.

22 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Amy, then Liza, then Andy.

1 MS. ASMUS: First of all, I would love to
2 commend you for working together in community. We've
3 been working on this issue forever, it seems like. I'm
4 not old enough to remember when we started. But this
5 approach is great because I am the first one that would
6 say keep the government out of my business. But there
7 are so many cats to herd in this and so many different
8 conversations that we have. I really appreciate the fact
9 that you are willing to step in and use some of the tools
10 and influence that you have to bring this group of
11 stakeholders together and include the group of
12 stakeholders in working towards management of this wicked
13 problem. So, I want to start off commending you with
14 that.
15 I really want to point out the importance of working
16 with state agencies. I know I can speak for the State of
17 Iowa. We have been working for the last three-plus years
18 on putting together an Iowa Pest Resistance Management
19 Plan. I really hope you coordinate with your state and
20 regional people and your universities as well so that
21 everything works in concert and, again, we don't find
22 another place where the message is confusing.

1 It's very important for us to work on the
2 national level, but also at the local level, so that we
3 can talk about the nuances between cropping systems, row
4 crops, annual crops, permanent crops, the pest spectrum,
5 the mobility within the environment, the environment
6 influences on it. It's really a wicked problem because
7 there's not one solution across the way. So, I really
8 encourage you to work on a local level.
9 What's the best time of year to communicate with
10 growers? Can I answer that one because I sit across the
11 table from a lot of growers as a retailer? The best time
12 to communicate with growers is when they're willing to
13 listen. That is why it is so important to get the
14 information to their trusted advisers. You say this time
15 of year may not be the best to communicate with them, but
16 this is the time of year when we're implementing all the
17 work we've done with our management programs throughout
18 production with them. Guess what? Technology has
19 provided them with tractors that drive themselves, and
20 they just have to turn on the corners. So, I get a lot
21 more phone calls than I ever got.
22 Hang on a second, Amy. I'm at the end rows.

1 I've got to turn around. Turn around.

2 Okay, so, now, when are we going to do this?

3 So, they're a captive audience. Technology has allowed

4 them to communicate even in those periods of times when

5 we thought were not traditional times to reach out to

6 producers and growers. So, I think a great communication

7 plan would be a trained, trusted advisor type of plan

8 where instead of going direct to the growers, go to the

9 grower's network of their trusted advisor. Then, when

10 the grower is ready to listen, they're armed with the

11 tools to actually have that conversation with the

12 growers.

13 I could go through and answer most of those.

14 You know I've been working with this a very long time.

15 You have my ear. So, I'll let everybody else speak, but

16 I just wanted to say thank you for your role in this

17 because I do think you're the chief cat herder in all of

18 this. You've recognized the role of other stakeholders,

19 and that's very important for all of us to work together

20 to at least manage this wicked problem. So, thank you.

21 MR. KEIGWIN: Liza, then Andy, then Layla.

22 MS. TROSSBACH: I'd like to build on the

1 previous comments. I think your state, tribal, and
2 territorial regulatory officials are certainly one of the
3 groups that you want to reach out to. I agree with you
4 need to do this on a local level, and your regulatory
5 officials not only have direct contact to those
6 individuals that they certify as pesticide applicators,
7 but also normally with their pesticide safety educators,
8 their extension services.
9 So, that would be a good way to get a
10 consistent message to those individuals working through
11 the regulatory officials to the pesticide safety
12 educators to your extension agents, which is often the
13 first call that an agricultural producer will make, also
14 to retailers, certainly. But I think the extension
15 agents probably have that best direct contact. That
16 would also contact growers that are not required to be
17 certified but use pesticides but don't use restricted use
18 pesticides. So, I think that would be a great way to get
19 a consistent message.
20 In addition, of course, you have your
21 Association of Pesticide Safety Educators which Andrew
22 represents, AAPCO which I represent. So, I think those

1 are probably a really good group that you want to get on
2 board as well. I would offer NASDA because it deals with
3 the commissioners from all of the state departments of
4 agriculture.
5 It would certainly be another way to make that
6 top-down approach that we really want to focus on
7 resistance management. This is the message that we want
8 to get out. So, not only could the Departments of
9 Agriculture or whatever agency that pesticide regulation
10 is in could do it, but they can do it from an agency
11 perspective and then work with extension as well.
12 As far as the best time of year, I agree that
13 retailers and different groups have different times of
14 year when they're working really closely with their
15 growers. As far as a regulatory agency and probably
16 extension, I'm going to go out on a limb here. I would
17 say probably in the fall into the early spring, that's
18 when you have your certification and recertification
19 courses, your continuing education credits. That's a
20 good way to have a captive audience.
21 Agents are always looking for that good
22 information to give to their growers. In addition to

1 their pesticide piece, they offer a variety of topics,
2 and that would be the perfect opportunity to talk about
3 resistance management.
4 It is talked about now. I go to many courses
5 where they talk about resistance management. I mean,
6 that's a huge issue, certainly. Our concern from a
7 regulatory official side is when you have resistance
8 management you set up -- there's a potential for misuse
9 because a product is not working. So, they're either
10 going to use more, they're going to try to use something
11 else, potentially be tempted to use something off label.
12 That's a huge concern for us, so we certainly want to
13 talk about that.
14 That's a good kind of time to really talk about
15 that. I think you have a lot of education already going
16 on about resistance management across the country. I
17 know I can speak for Virginia specifically. There's a
18 lot of focus from our Virginia cooperative extension.
19 But I think a consistent message would be fantastic to
20 have, to have all the different stakeholders in and all
21 those different things.
22 So, I agree. I applaud the agency for doing

1 that, to make sure that we're all talking about the same
2 thing, but also give states the ability to talk about
3 what is specific to their state and their weed issues.
4 That can also foster -- maybe you can bring in -- while
5 you have a national message, states can talk about, for
6 example, the research that's going on in their state for
7 their specific pest issues and what they're seeing is
8 working or not working.
9 So, again, I would just encourage you to go
10 through your state departments of Agriculture, your
11 pesticide regulatory specialists, and of course AAPSE as
12 well.
13 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Liza. Andy, then Leyla,
14 then Jay.
15 MR. WHITTINGTON: Okay, so, bravo. This is a
16 topic that's near and dear to my heart, so I will be
17 happy to provide you some input. This goes along with a
18 lot of what some of the others have said, but I'm from
19 Mississippi so I'm from ground zero of a lot of this. I
20 know that Bill knows most of my weed scientists very
21 well.
22 So, in the southern states, extension model is

1 still keen. It is the driver. I know that the extension
2 model has changed somewhat in a lot of the other states,
3 but in the southern states that's still the most trusted
4 source of information, along with the independent crop
5 consultants. If you're going to be in the southern
6 states, you're going to have to go through the extension
7 agency.
8 Your message? Your message should be short.
9 Your message should be that it's very important to
10 address weed resistance. But the message should be you
11 need to follow a weed resistance management plan. Your
12 management plan could be more extensive, but it needs to
13 be consistent. The message needs to be consistent, and
14 it needs to be consistent from all of the different
15 places that it comes from. I would encourage you to work
16 with all of the groups that you have listed to develop
17 that very consistent message.
18 The best time to communicate? Start in the
19 south and work your way up north. Amy is in Iowa. She's
20 still got snow on the ground. If it wasn't for the rain,
21 we'd be pretty close to through planting. So, we have a
22 ton of meetings in January and February. That's when we

1 hit most of our row crop short courses. The Ag
2 Consultant Associations, that's when they get together.
3 That's when everybody is going through the field trials
4 and variety trials and deciding what their
5 recommendations are going to be throughout the year. So,
6 I think that is the time that needs to be focused on.
7 I can tell you that even though we don't have
8 the new mode of actions, there have been a couple of
9 developments that we're pretty excited about. One is
10 (inaudible) for rice. We are extending it with a rice
11 soybean rotation. Whatever we can take care of in the
12 rice year, we don't have to address in the soybean year.
13 Also with (inaudible) peanuts. It's also going to help
14 in that same framework.
15 So, while we may not have a new mode of action,
16 we are finding new ways to use what we do have in order
17 to address some of those problems. I think it stresses
18 the importance of having multiple tools in the toolbox
19 that we can use.
20 I also want to stress that the ultimate goal as
21 a producer is to spend zero money on this and to not
22 spray a thing. They would love to put Damon's group out

1 of business because that airplane costs about $7.00 an
2 acre every time it goes up. That's before you put
3 anything in it.
4 So, whatever we can do to manage these weed
5 problems so that we don't have to use any product, that
6 would be very beneficial. I think the growing community
7 is as open to this conversation as I've ever seen. Thank
8 you.
9 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Andy. Leyla, then Jay,
10 then Dan.
11 MS. McCURDY: Thank you. First let me say that
12 you really put a really good communications plan in front
13 of us. You were very humble about it. You said you
14 didn't know this topic really well, but I believe it's a
15 really good one.
16 Of course, I want to acknowledge all the
17 expertise around the table. It seems like major
18 stakeholders are here. That doesn't mean obviously this
19 is it. But all the comments that were made are right on
20 target. So, I just want to say yes to consistent
21 messages coming from trusted sources is really key. I
22 don't want to belabor everything that was said.

1 Obviously, those are all great points.

2 A couple things I wanted to add from my

3 experience. Regarding the process, there may be a model

4 for you to look at coming right out of OPP. You

5 mentioned that -- I don't know exactly -- I can't recall

6 how you said it. Just excuse my rephrasing it. But you

7 didn't want EPA to be kind of appearing as the lead, but

8 you wanted stakeholder engagement speaking for this,

9 which obviously we all agree. I think that's a good way

10 to look at it.

11 One model that is again coming from OPP, the

12 National Strategies for Healthcare Providers Pesticides

13 Initiative from Kevin Keaney's shop, at the time, I was

14 at the National MR Mental Education Foundation. I led

15 that effort with OPP. So, the way that worked is that

16 EPA gave a grant with trusted nonprofit who had expertise

17 in this area. The role of the nonprofit was to bring all

18 the stakeholders together. That worked extremely well.

19 So, I would suggest considering that type of an effort.

20 Of course, EPA is a key player in this, again, but you

21 had a trusted nonprofit partner who is leading it. That,

22 I think, adds to the credibility of the effort from your

1 perspective, which I agree.

2 The last thing that I am going to say is that

3 my assumption is that as we get more resistance, we are

4 using more herbicides, right. So, that means more

5 exposure for everybody. So, think about the

6 untraditional stakeholders like the health community. I

7 definitely support that state agriculture departments

8 should be part of this. Obviously, they are a key.

9 But think about also state departments of

10 health and departments of environmental quality as well

11 as other health professional groups like the American

12 Academy of Pediatrics and some of the others that we can

13 easily engage in this if we had a health message that

14 goes along with this.

15 I'm happy to work with whoever wants to

16 continue this dialogue. Thank you.

17 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks. Jay, then Dan Kunkel,

18 then Stan.

19 MR. VROOM: So, I'd like to also echo the

20 commendations that have already been expressed to EPA's

21 positioning on this and the work that you've done. We

22 obviously had a keen interest in seeing a lot of

1 stakeholders together, but the agency has predominant
2 expertise in so many of these areas with regard to the
3 registered chemistries. It's important that your
4 leadership is as it has been and continues.
5 Certainly, the principal issues of large acre
6 crops and successful weed control technologies that were
7 easy to use and were easy to repeat year on year are
8 major drivers of a lot of this. But there are a lot of
9 assumptions that aren't always correct.
10 Leyla, you just said that the assumption is
11 that resistance leads to more pesticide use. In fact, we
12 know there's plenty of agronomic evidence to show that at
13 least a secondary driver has been farmer use reduced
14 below the maximum label rate that has actually added to
15 the evolution of some resistance in some environments.
16 So, there's no one standard answer to this. It certainly
17 isn't putting more on always is part of the problem.
18 Another example of an unintended consequence is
19 the success that the agency has led, along with industry
20 and grower and applicator and dealer support and
21 engagement of reducing drift. Drift reduction
22 technologies have been very successful and have developed

1 a lot of common practice by pesticide applicators to
2 follow standard practices that reduce drift.
3 One of those is, in many cases, with regard to
4 herbicide technology, increased droplet size. But
5 there's also now research that proves that some
6 resistance has been accelerated because larger droplet
7 size as opposed to smaller droplet size with the same
8 amount of application rate results in less coverage of
9 weed leaf surface and has accelerated resistance.
10 The great news about cover crops adoption for
11 so many other environmental benefit outcomes also can
12 increase the spread of weed seed because cover crop seed
13 can contain weed seed contamination. I know that's on
14 the radar of the seed's industry, so I'm hoping that
15 you're reaching out and engaging the American Seed Trade
16 Association and seed companies in this work, because the
17 acceleration of the demand of cover crop seed sources is
18 going to require more attention to making sure that seed
19 purity is a factor in ensuring that we're not
20 unintentionally spreading weed seed, some of which will
21 be resistant weed seed through the pursuit of other well-
22 intentioned undertakings. The practice of tillage can

1 also enhance resistance outcomes. So, there are so many
2 factors to take into account.
3 A couple of questions have been raised about
4 why don't we have more new modes of action. The simple
5 truth is that all the easy to find substances have been
6 discovered. The good news is that our industry,
7 particularly at the discovery level, is practicing a
8 speed of science that no one could have imagined 5 or 10
9 years ago because of computational toxicology and other
10 testing means and just information management, robotics
11 in research and development, and so many other things
12 that have sped up science. So, we're closer at the speed
13 of we're moving with science and discovery and innovation
14 than we ever have been before with finding new modes of
15 action. But there are modes of action that are
16 available.
17 I know of one compound that made it many years
18 through EPA review process back in the 90s and finally
19 was withdrawn by one of our member company applicants for
20 reasons with respect to certain standards of regulatory
21 science here in the United States. I just checked on the
22 Internet. This product is now being used by farmers in

1 Belarus. I'm sure it is contributing to the management
2 of weed resistance in Belarus.
3 So, Bill, I might ask, have you had a chance to
4 look at the inventory of herbicide compounds that are not
5 currently registered for use by American farmers? Is it
6 worth going back to look at that inventory of products to
7 think about are there creative ways to take another run
8 at seeing if a limited focused registration for some of
9 those modes of action might be considered, given the
10 magnitude of the weed resistance problems that we've got
11 in the United States? So, that's a thought.
12 Lastly, I just wanted to ask a question about
13 the second PR notice that you referenced. I think there
14 is some confusion about whether that's intended to be
15 specific to just one compound in herbicide resistance or
16 is it applicable to all weed resistance and all
17 herbicides, the PR 2017-2.
18 MR. CHISM: Our intention with 2017-2 was to
19 look at all the herbicides, the conventional herbicides
20 for agronomic crops but not homeowner products.
21 MR. VROOM: That might be an opportunity to
22 more clearly communicate that because I think there's

1 some opinion that that was just about one particular
2 herbicide product.
3 MR. CHISM: Thank you.
4 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Dan, then Stan, then Damon.
5 MR. KUNKEL: Thanks, Rick. I agree with a lot
6 of the comments made about communicating with the growers
7 putting information in trade magazines and communicating
8 at the grower meetings that are often in January and
9 February.
10 One question I have is if you could take
11 advantage of some of the regional offices, so greater use
12 of some of the staff at the regional offices. I know
13 there's a publication that you mentioned from Region 7,
14 but can they be used for greater outreach and maybe
15 solidifying some of the partnerships with the extension
16 and other state people that work there as well.
17 MR. KEIGWIN: Stan, then Damon, then Donnie.
18 MR. COPE: I'm going to make my remarks as if I
19 were the first one to go. Otherwise, I wouldn't have
20 anything left to say. I really find refreshing your
21 willingness to come here and bare all and to say that you
22 need help with this. I don't think there's a person in

1 this room who at some time or another has had experience
2 and probably struggled with writing a proper message and
3 then figuring out how to communicate it.
4 In the military, we get a lot of experience
5 with that. I'm going to use my colleague over there,
6 Captain Hoffman, as an example. He might get all of 15
7 seconds with the surgeon general of the Navy to explain
8 to him why Navy medical entomology shouldn't be
9 abolished. You better be able to package that message or
10 your program could be gone.
11 So, that being said, I think crafting these
12 messages is a little bit of -- it's a lot of science
13 because -- and that's probably the easy part. There's a
14 little bit of art to it, obviously, and then there's just
15 plain good luck that has to go into it too to get it
16 right.
17 So, one thing I would urge you to think about
18 is if you can -- with all these targeted audiences that
19 you have, I'm not a supporter of trying to send one key
20 message to each of those audiences. I think that will
21 still keep it somewhat fragmented. But if you can come
22 up with two or three, let's say three, key overarching

1 short, impactful, bulletized messages that apply to all
2 of these people, that will become the flag that they're
3 all going to be waving. Then, either you can help them
4 or they can come up with their own individual key
5 messages that apply to their group. That will build
6 unity. It will build a consistent message.
7 Mosquitos kill one million people a year. In
8 the last 10 years, 9 new mosquito pathogens have emerged.
9 There's been a three-fold incidence in vector borne
10 disease in the last 10 years in the United States, boom,
11 boom, boom. Weeds are bad. Weeds cost this much money.
12 Weeds are taking over, something like that, that
13 everybody can latch on to. If everybody can hitch to
14 that same wagon, then the rest of the prey behind them
15 can be them in their own little individual wagons of what
16 message applies to them.
17 So, that's just a suggestion on a technique.
18 Keep it as short as you possibly can and think about the
19 impact. They'll all jump in the pool.
20 MR. KEIGWIN: Damon, then Donnie, then
21 Nichelle.
22 MR. REABE: Thanks. I'll probably be taking it

1 in a slightly different direction. In your presentation,
2 you mentioned -- in the context, we're talking about weed
3 resistance, but this would apply to pathogens and insects
4 as well. I just want to make sure that there's a broader
5 look at -- during the registration process, the impacts
6 on resistance and the speed at which resistance develops
7 when you cannot make an application to control a pest in
8 a timely manner and how that relates to aerial
9 application.
10 We want to make sure that the Office of
11 Pesticide Programs is keenly aware that that is a tool
12 that is used by integrated pest management practitioners,
13 and it's an important tool, because, obviously, there are
14 going to be scenarios where soil conditions aren't going
15 to allow for ground application. If the producer does
16 not have the opportunity to use aerial application to
17 control that particular pest at that critical time, the
18 likelihood of their being resistance survivors increases.
19 I think Palmer Amaranth is probably one of the best
20 examples of that. The window at which you can control
21 that weed is extremely small. So, that's my first point.
22 The next point I'd like to make is the

1 importance of maintaining products in specialty crops.
2 Weed seeds don't know what crop they're growing in. They
3 don't know what field they're growing in. So, we've seen
4 a lot of products go by the wayside for various reasons
5 in these smaller markets. A lot of those smaller markets
6 are serviced by aerial application because they're non-
7 GMO crops. So, they need to control the pests using the
8 pesticides. As we see labels disappear, that accelerates
9 the resistance of that pest, which ultimately increases
10 pesticide usage. There's nobody here that wants to see
11 that.
12 The final point I'd like to make is when going
13 through the registration process -- and I believe this is
14 already being considered at the Office of Pesticide
15 Programs, but it should be, I think, restated. The use
16 of buffer zones in and of itself is one of the most
17 effective ways to speed up pesticide resistance because
18 you're going to expose individuals to low doses of the
19 pesticide which is, in fact, how pesticide resistance is
20 developed.
21 So, that needs to be a major consideration when
22 making these applications. It's not just about

1 controlling the weeds; it's actually about reducing
2 pesticides, pesticide usage, and protecting the
3 environment. These two things actually go hand in hand.
4 MR. KEIGWIN: Donnie and then Nichelle.
5 MR. TAYLOR: So, looking at your bullet point
6 number two, I just recommend that it be shorter than a
7 PPDC meeting, just to get started.
8 On point number four, your target audience, I'd
9 recommend you add the retailers to that. You mention
10 them in the third point but not the fourth. You may also
11 want to look at adding certified crop advisors to that as
12 well. I think they actually have a program where you can
13 get certification in that area. So, they may be a group
14 that can help you as far as your concern.
15 I'm not sure if this is happening or not, but
16 we may want to look at color-coding labels as far as mode
17 of actions are concerned so that when a producer is
18 getting ready to pour product and put product into a
19 tank, they can say, well, these two have the same color;
20 that means they're the same mode of action. Therefore,
21 I'm not accomplishing what I'm hoping I'd get
22 accomplished based on our training. So, you may want to

1 look at that as well.

2 As far as communication, always look at radio.

3 There's a great Ag radio network out there. Make sure

4 you put your commercials in your farms reports because

5 the rest of the time, as Amy said, they're watching

6 Netflix. So, make sure you do it around the crop reports

7 so you make sure you get heard that way.

8 I think we also need to investigate

9 alternatives, meaning I know there's been some

10 experimentation with gibberellic acid added to certain

11 products. It's actually crossed over and prevented the

12 resistance from occurring or at some time taken a

13 resistant weed and making it susceptible again. So, I

14 think we need to look at our expansion and our technology

15 and what may be available if we can figure out a way to

16 enhance the crossover of those modes of action.

17 MR. KEIGWIN: Nichelle.

18 MS. HARRIOTT: So, I think you guys got all

19 your questions answered, so I'm not going to add anything

20 to that, except to say that when it comes to

21 communications, I think we need clarity and consistency

22 across the board so that everyone that is tasked to do

1 this on the ground is speaking the same language, that
2 growers are concerned on getting different messaging from
3 different places.
4 I do want to take issue with one of your
5 earlier slides, slide number 3, where it says that it
6 does not have a clear cause for weed resistance. I think
7 some have already touched on it in this comment session
8 right here.
9 It's well documented that selected groups have
10 questions about what is actually the cause of weed
11 resistance. You use the same herbicide with the same
12 mode of action over and over and it leads to resistance.
13 I think you know by now that that takes three to five
14 years of happening. So, we do know that there is a cause
15 of weed resistance. This is something to maybe hopefully
16 reword in your slide if you were to give this
17 presentation again.
18 I do have two questions. Given that we know
19 that herbicide overuse is a leading cause of weed
20 resistance, how much of the agency's work is focused on
21 nonchemical strategies for addressing the issue? And
22 does the agency take the resistance issue into

1 consideration when going through section 3 reregistration
2 review process in terms of ecological impact? I say this
3 because glyphosate's comment period just ended and there wasn't
4 any mention about glyphosate impact on the onset of weed
5 resistance in the assessments.
6 MR. CHISM: Thank you. I was just going to say
7 that one of the reasons we say that the problem of
8 resistance isn't so clear cut, there's a lot of cases of
9 nontarget site resistance where weeds are resistant to
10 herbicides that they've never been treated with before.
11 That's an ongoing problem that's sort of a new wrinkle
12 for us.
13 In terms of the registration review process, we
14 do look for resistance problems. To your point, you're
15 right. Most of the time we look at maintaining tools to
16 combat resistance; we don't really look at the impact of
17 a specific product on resistant weeds and the numbers of
18 acres that may be infected with that.
19 MR. KEIGWIN: Komal, and then Amy, were you
20 coming back? Okay.
21 MS. JAIN: Amy, you might want to go first.
22 I'm going to shift the conversation a little bit.

1 MS. ASMUS: I just was writing down a little
2 bit in a gap analysis kind of thing, so hopefully I don't
3 repeat things that people said. But our conversation is
4 around ag land, and I believe that we really need to also
5 focus on commercial, turf, residential, and any
6 infrastructure, right-of-way lands, to make sure that
7 we're not reading our next weed infestation on those
8 lands. So, we have to think bigger than ag and ag land,
9 which then leads me to my next comment.
10 Leyla talked about the importance of the health
11 system as it relates to how we apply pesticides and
12 handle resistance management. But they are also
13 quandering with the same issues with pharmaceutical
14 resistance and that type of thing. Are there other
15 things outside of the ag world that also deal with
16 resistance? Do we need to use them in a consultative
17 role to say what have you done and are there any
18 crossovers from what you have learned and what you have
19 applied that apply to our situation? Is there anything
20 that we have conversely applied that worked that would
21 apply to their situation as well? So, again, it's not
22 just a conversation about ag, ag land, and resistance of

1 ag issues, but it's a resistance management over a lot of
2 things.
3 And I just wanted to point out, it was kind of
4 touched upon, this approach we're using the stakeholders
5 and they work in community to have an effective approach.
6 We also have to understand that resistance management is
7 a system. It's like that community. Each part has their
8 own roles and their own tasks to play. Resistance
9 management, even though you deal with labeling and
10 everything, is not going to come in a jug. It's not going
11 to be the easy button that you push. Just as we have to
12 work as a community, management needs to be done in an
13 entire system.
14 MR. KEIGWIN: Komal.
15 MS. JAIN: That's actually a good lead in,
16 thank you.
17 So, as we're talking about resistance and
18 pesticides, I want to just turn it towards antimicrobial
19 pesticides and talk about antibiotic resistance. As many
20 of you might know, it's well in the news, there is
21 greater and greater allegations of links between biocide
22 use and antibiotic resistance. I'm not here to say that

1 that's not a critical issue, but I do think that there
2 needs to be some greater evaluation and some messaging.
3 On the topic, the UN environment and WHO has
4 put out a publication, and I think it's got some
5 potential for great global regulation or the influence
6 for greater regulation. So, it's really just an ask of
7 EPA. And you have the full support of the biocides panel
8 to look into this. Maybe that can be an agenda item for
9 later meetings. I know Anita is not here, but you could
10 pass that along.
11 MR. KEIGWIN: Dominic.
12 MR. LAJOIE: So, I am a grower. I just want to
13 share my grower perspective. In my area, a lot of the
14 growers make decisions based on cost. It's unfortunate
15 that it happens that way, but I'm surrounded by a lot of
16 contract growers. Their income is kind of fixed. We've
17 been getting squeezed in our contracts by the processors
18 for a long time. You've got to cut -- in other words,
19 you're going to get less revenue, so somewhere you've got
20 to cut costs.
21 So, herbicides, a lot of guys will take the risk of
22 using products that weeds are resistant to, but the cost

1 per acre is half of the other cost. So, they'll take
2 that risk and squeeze through the season and say, well,
3 we'll control it next season. It's unfortunate because
4 they're just creating more resistance. In my county
5 where the processor is set up, if you drew a map, you
6 would see this resistance centering where the processor
7 is and kind of going out from there.
8 I'm just a few years away from getting
9 resistant weeds on my farm. So, it is something that I'm
10 watching closely. But, like you said in the beginning,
11 if one farmer works at it and the rest don't, it's not
12 going to happen. So, the cost is a big thing. Thank
13 you.
14 MR. KEIGWIN: Let me just check to see if any
15 PPDC member on the phone had a comment. I think today
16 Sharon is our only member participating remotely.
17 MS. SELVAGGIO: Can you hear me? This is
18 Sharon.
19 MR. KEIGWIN: Yes. We can hear you, Sharon.
20 Did you have a comment or a question?
21 MS. SELVAGGIO: I did have a comment. I
22 appreciate especially what Dominic just said. I think

1 when we talk about the system, as many people have
2 alluded to, a kind of understanding the cost and economic
3 issues from a grower perspective is just so important and
4 what that really means.
5 So, kind of going back, I really appreciated
6 the presentation. I thought it was an excellent
7 presentation. I'm not sure if it was William or Bill who
8 was the presenter, but you shouldn't downplay your
9 communication skills. You did a great job.
10 I see resistance as a perfect example of what
11 happens when there's an overreliance on pesticides. The
12 resistance issue is worse than ever before. The graph
13 shows an accelerating problem of resistance. There's an
14 overreliance on pesticides that's developed in farming
15 for decades.
16 When you look at the goals that you described
17 on I think it was slide 7, I saw something missing. I
18 think it really is important that it be added that really
19 the primary goal is to prevent resistance from happening
20 in the first place. You really have your golden
21 opportunity where resistance hasn't yet happened in a
22 broad scale way yet.

1 So, as important as it is to work on problems
2 like Palmer Amaranth and some of the other weeds that
3 have already developed resistance, it's even more
4 important to think about what's happening in places where
5 growers have been relying on the same tools, there's a
6 large agricultural sector, bad land use and all of that.
7 So, I don't have the answers. I'm glad that
8 EPA is working on this. It seems to me that really
9 important is research on those diversified weed
10 management practices because insanity is doing the same
11 thing over and over again and expecting different
12 outcomes. So, really understanding and having more
13 research and hopefully support, as Dominic alluded to the
14 need for support, so that growers actually can implement
15 those diversified weed management practices.
16 So, that's all I want to say. Thank you.
17 MR. KEIGWIN: I think we may have successfully
18 got ourselves back on track. So, I'm going to take the
19 last three cards that are up. So, Nichelle, then Andy,
20 then Lori Ann.
21 MS. HARRIOTT: So, just to follow up, because I
22 don't think one of my questions got answered. So, I know

1 everyone in this room is looking to find new chemistries
2 that have different modes of action to deal with the weed
3 resistance problem. But how much of EPA's work is
4 focused on nonchemical strategies to deal with the
5 problem?
6 MR. CHISM: I apologize for not answering that.
7 In our PRN number 2, we talk about best management
8 practices. About half of those are nonchemical best
9 management practices. They're clearly targeting annual
10 crop production practices. We talk about crop rotation,
11 we talk about cultivation. Those are not relevant for a
12 perennial crop. It's not relevant for turf, not relevant
13 for trees where you can't really rotate. But in the best
14 management practices, we do try and emphasize nonchemical
15 control methods.
16 MS. HARRIOTT: Hopefully, that's communicated
17 in our communication.
18 MR. KEIGWIN: Andy.
19 MR. WHITTINGTON: So, as a procedural point, I
20 wanted to compliment Bill on the way he has designed and
21 presented his information. Anytime that the EPA can
22 provide specific questions, since this is a dialogue

1 committee, anytime you can provide specific questions
2 that can guide the dialogue to get you the information
3 back that you need to continue the work that you're
4 doing, I think that's an appropriate way to address that.
5
6 And to be more specific, to address Nichelle's
7 comments, I think we are moving along with that. One is
8 the use of cover crops I think is becoming a much more
9 widely accepted practice. A lot of that is to manage
10 weeds.
11 We also, in the past several years, have moved
12 to a much earlier planting date and trying to lap the
13 mills as quickly as possible. That's as much a weed
14 resistance thing as it is to try and get an early
15 harvest.
16 Those are two of the issues that popped in my
17 head right now. We try to keep a cultivator out of the
18 field, one because you're just burning diesel and two is
19 the soil health issue and trying to maintain that soil on
20 the ground.
21 MR. KEIGWIN: Lori Ann.
22 MS. BURD: Nichelle alluded to this earlier,

1 but I just wanted to again reiterate that it would be --
2 the risk assessments at reregistration would be an
3 excellent place to incorporate the increased load in
4 pesticides for things that are really heavily used. We
5 addressed this in our glyphosate comments, but assessing
6 glyphosate or dicamba or 2,4-D or other pesticides that
7 are used in these systems much more heavily than a
8 typical pesticide, just as a regular pesticide, without
9 factoring in that increase load seems like a real missed
10 opportunity. I hope for future risk assessments you
11 would look at that increased load, especially for dicamba
12 and 2,4-D.
13 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay. So, we are back on track.
14 Let's take a break and we can reconvene at 11.
15 (A brief recess was taken.)
16 MR. KEIGWIN: -- topics to discuss. So, if I
17 could ask folks to take their seats.
18 I'd like to introduce Arnold Layne who is the
19 Deputy Director for Management for the Office of
20 Pesticide Programs and Julie Spagnoli from the Public
21 Health Workgroup to give us an update on their progress.
22 MR. LAYNE: Good morning, and thank you, Rick,

1 for that introduction. So, in the spirit of cooperation
2 and collaboration, the Public Health Workgroup that was
3 formed at the request of the full PPDC, we have formed a
4 great group. We work in collaboration. There's a lot of
5 commitment to this effort. So, in the spirit of
6 cooperation and collaboration, I thought it would be a
7 great opportunity and somewhat unusual but, what the
8 heck, to ask the workgroup members if anyone wanted to
9 provide a readout with me at the full PPDC meeting.
10 Julie was the first volunteer, so that's why she's here.
11 So, as I mentioned, for those of you who were
12 not on the PPDC when this was talked about, the PPDC
13 charged and challenged us to form a public health working
14 group. They gave us a pretty broad mandate around this
15 important topic. I do want to thank each of the members
16 of that workgroup. We've done quite a bit of work.
17 So, this PPDC Public Health Workgroup has met
18 four times since the last PPDC to discuss, frame, and
19 offer recommendations to you all, the full PPDC. Today,
20 we are proposing the creation of a pesticide emergency
21 preparedness action plan and want to share with the full
22 PPDC our progress to date on the key ideas, key elements,

1 and recommendations to the PPDC that the workgroup
2 continue as we have.
3 We also would like to hear your advice,
4 guidance, and thoughts as we move forward towards our
5 specific deliverable. We seek approval from the PPDC to
6 continue this work and to form additional detail on the
7 framework -- in other words, put some more meat on the
8 bones of the framework that you'll see shortly -- and
9 provide an annotated outline and ultimately a final
10 product that we all could be proud of and something that
11 is going to be useful for this very important topic.
12 The purpose of the Pesticide Emergency
13 Preparedness Action Plan is to establish a guide for use
14 by EPA's Office of Pesticide Programs to allow us to
15 respond during our pest related emergency. Also, allow
16 us to interact with other agencies and communicate with a
17 diverse set of stakeholders including the general public.
18 The workgroup believes that a preparedness plan
19 would ease the way for coordinated, sound science-based
20 response to emergencies and emergent pests that involve
21 IPM, integrated pest management, as well as pesticides.
22 The workgroup discussed past public health emergencies

1 and some of the lessons learned in response to them,
2 notably the Anthrax incident, West Nile Virus, something
3 that I was intimately involved in and led for the Agency,
4 for EPA, which was Zika, and hurricane responses, for
5 example. These emergency responses could have been more
6 efficient with proactive planning and just readiness.
7 That's what this is really about, readiness.
8 The group notes that while there is a focus on
9 disease vector control, we're not limited to mosquitos at
10 all. Hurricane responses, for example, can include
11 rodent and mold control, and microbial outbreaks can
12 occur in the healthcare and other facilities. Bedbugs
13 and ticks are still also significant public health pests,
14 should there be a major outbreak or disease occur.
15 I just want to bring your attention to, if you
16 have not seen it, that just this week the New York Times
17 had a front page story on citing the Centers for Disease
18 Control's concern about the spread of tick and mosquito
19 infections. So, this is real. This is probably very
20 important and appropriate that we take these steps and
21 that this workgroup continue doing its work. We
22 certainly will ask for your advice and guidance and

1 thoughts on that.

2 So, the workgroup believes that the

3 stakeholders and audience for this plan is quite large

4 and diverse, as I stated before. That includes

5 governmental level, state, local, travel, and the federal

6 level to the public health community, NGOs, to

7 registrants, and to members of the general public.

8 As we discussed at our last meeting, the

9 workgroup has determined that this plan will address the

10 role of IPM and pesticides or pest control in different

11 types of emergencies such as new diseases, disasters such

12 as hurricanes and floods, human error, or even

13 bioterrorism. This plan will also cover any pests from

14 microbial to insect to mammal.

15 At this juncture, I'm going to turn it over to

16 Julie who is going to talk to you about the elements of

17 the plan.

18 MS. SPAGNOLI: Hello. I participated on the

19 PPDC for a number of years and have also participated in

20 a number of PPDC workgroups over the years. I just want

21 to start out by saying I've seen that the PPDC workgroups

22 are one of the most effective ways a lot of times of

1 getting work done. We've done a lot of work through PPDC
2 workgroups that comes back then to the PPDC. So, I'm
3 very encouraged by this workgroup and the work that it's
4 done.
5 As Arnold said, we're in the process of
6 developing an emergency preparedness plan. We've kind of
7 decided on five key elements that we think to include in
8 the plan. We say the names of these elements may be
9 temporary because as they get defined more clearly, we
10 may end up kind of revising the name of the element.
11 The first one is EPA roles and
12 responsibilities. This will just clarify the roles that
13 EPA will play in the plan, who they may be interacting
14 with, and what their responsibilities are to interact
15 with other parties such as other agencies like CDC, state
16 agencies, other groups. So, it's just kind of defining
17 those roles and responsibilities.
18 The one element that we really struggled with
19 coming up with a name with, because we knew what we
20 wanted it to be about, but we just kind of struggled with
21 getting a name. It was pesticides, IPMs and other
22 control tools. This is how do we in a response plan

1 identify the control tools that are going to be
2 appropriate for responding to that emergency, and to
3 relay that information to the users, to the public, and
4 to other agencies, and states.
5 This would include what tools are available and
6 what EPA processes may be used to access other tools.
7 This could include Section 18 exemptions such as reviews
8 in the Anthrax response, it could include 24Cs, some of
9 which were used in this Zika response. But knowing the
10 processes of how to access those additional tools so that
11 people can do it efficiently. We heard that in the Zika
12 response that sometimes people weren't always aware of
13 what the actual process was. So, that's going to be one
14 of the key elements of the plan.
15 Identifying and engaging stakeholders, this
16 will, of course, be relevant to what the response is, to
17 what the emergency is. If it's a hurricane response, it
18 may be different than if it's a new disease vector. So,
19 we want to be sure to engage the proper stakeholders,
20 identify who they are, and then make sure that we engage
21 them. That would be identified through the plan.
22 Communications is a really large focus area,

1 topic area. Again, this will probably kind of depend on
2 the type of emergency, the type of information that needs
3 to be communicated, who do we need to communicate it to.
4 Again, this will address various topics to the public.
5 What actions can the public take for IPM and protecting
6 themselves, but also looking at all the other aspects
7 such as endangered species and what risks there might be.
8 It's communicated to people that what are the actual
9 risks -- if you're applying a pesticide to control
10 mosquitos, what are the actual risks, so that it's
11 communicated clearly.
12 And then, the last element we're calling
13 technology, innovation, and science. What this really
14 means is we want this plan to be a living plan. We'd
15 never just say, here it is, and that's all we're ever
16 going to do. It would always incorporate any kind of new
17 technology, innovation, new practices, if there's a new
18 IPM practice that has been identified. So, this would be
19 a periodic review of the plan that then can incorporate
20 any of these new ideas and new technologies.
21 So, those are the elements that we've
22 identified. As Arnold said, these are the bones. We

1 still obviously need to put a lot of meat on the bones,
2 but I think we feel we're off to a good sound plan.
3 With that, I'm going to turn it back over to
4 Arnold. He's got a few questions for you.
5 MR. LAYNE: As you know, the role of the PPDC
6 is to provide advice, guidance, and input. We thought
7 that it was very important to get your input, advice, and
8 guidance as we move forward.
9 Before I do that, Julie talked about awareness.
10 One of the key things that the workgroup thought and
11 talked a lot about was awareness from everybody,
12 everyone's perspective, and education. We've seen in
13 examples where even industry, for example, in emergency
14 situations tend not to know what to do in terms of
15 getting something registered or a Section 18, or whatever
16 the case may be, from the general public to not
17 understanding why something is being used to control a
18 particular pest or vector.
19 So, awareness and education with a sound
20 communication plan is very, very key to the success of
21 this. There are different levels and different ways in
22 which to communicate and different kinds of people to

1 whom we need to communicate. So, you would not
2 communicate to the general public the same way that we
3 communicate to industry, for example.
4 Then, on the technology, under one of the
5 elements, here in the pesticide program, we are making or
6 trying to make strides in improving technology and
7 innovation, all for the sake of bringing about efficiency
8 in the world of registration and reregistration and just
9 the whole operation of the pesticide program. That will
10 lead to, I'm hoping, increased efficiencies.
11 So, even in the cases of emergencies or an
12 emergent pest or doing analysis or data mining and such
13 and having those capabilities and being on the forefront
14 of those emerging technologies, that they will come in
15 handy as we try to figure out what's happening, what's
16 going on. That in conjunction with other partners, we'll
17 be able to respond in a much more effective and efficient
18 way from a registration aspect to the communications
19 aspect. So, that was our thought about the fifth
20 element.
21 In that regard, I'm going to jump to the
22 questions for the full PPDC. So, the first one is, does

1 the PPDC agree that this is an important product for the
2 workgroup to continue to work on? Any comments, advice,
3 recommendations?
4 I see Jim and then Lori Ann. Jim and Jay.
5 MR. FREDERICKS: To answer your question
6 directly, yes, I do think it's important for the
7 workgroup to continue the work. I happen to be a member
8 of the workgroup, so I have some self-interest there.
9 I'd encourage the PPDC to let this group
10 continue their work for a couple of reasons. One of
11 those, not the least of which, is the fact that this
12 group really is a diverse group but I think really works
13 well collaborating and having productive discussions in
14 an environment that we're able to get some work done and
15 hash some things out. So, I think that in the beginning
16 steps, that was really encouraging to me personally.
17 OPP really plays an important role in public
18 health. So, I think this is important that this group
19 thinks about this emergency preparedness plan and
20 continues to build one for whatever the next public
21 health emergency may be, whether it's a vertebrate
22 emergency or a microbial emergency or it happens because

1 of some sort of a natural phenomenon or it's a disease
2 outbreak.
3 OPP's role in public health is not only
4 assuring that pesticides are available to control some of
5 these pests that may arise but also, on the flip side,
6 ensuring that the pesticides that are used are not a risk
7 to public health. So, it's really an important role, I
8 think.
9 I would note that one of the points that Arnold
10 made about we were kind of working on each of these
11 elements and what the elements were called, one actually
12 had in parentheses a temporary name. That's certainly
13 one that we spent a bunch of time. Even in this one, you
14 see that we have broken out IPM and pesticides as two
15 separate things. Obviously, pesticides are part of IPM.
16 So this kind of stuff is in flux.
17 But I would encourage the -- in fact, I think I
18 would even encourage some thought going into expanding
19 the group, because I think if someone like Stan, who I
20 don't believe is a member of that group and I think
21 probably has some important and unique perspectives, that
22 could be contributed.

1 So, that's my thoughts.

2 MR. LAYNE: Thank you, Jim.

3 MR. KEIGWIN: Jay and then Leyla.

4 MR. VROOM: So, I'm not a member of the

5 subgroup, so it's even easier for me to say yes. I

6 understand that one of these natural disaster pest

7 control challenges in the last year was frustrated in

8 part because follow-up treatments didn't take into

9 account known information about insect resistance. So,

10 that's a piece that you may have already touched on, but

11 it sounds to me like there's opportunity for getting some

12 of those kinds of known facts and geography reaches of

13 resistance to certain chemistries dialed into the

14 planning process in advance.

15 MR. LAYNE: Thank you for that, Jay.

16 MR. KEIGWIN: Leyla, then Liza.

17 MS. McCURDY: Thank you. To answer your

18 question this definitely seems like a no-brainer

19 worthwhile effort. I fully support this.

20 Actually, I have a question about the

21 membership. I joined the PPDC. I guess was it

22 November's meeting was my first one. I didn't get a good

1 sense of how this group came about and what the direction
2 was. I wasn't given a clear answer as to who is on the
3 committee. I still don't have a list of committee
4 members. When I inquired about it, I was told I can't
5 join. So, I'd like to get a little bit of the clarity
6 about the group.
7 MR. LAYNE: So, as I mentioned at the outset,
8 previous PPDC -- this was an area that the full PPDC felt
9 was a very important topic to take on. We thought that a
10 workgroup would be the best approach. That gave us a
11 little bit more flexibility with regard to being able to
12 go away and do some work and bring it back to the Agency.
13 We can certainly get you a list of the
14 membership. People volunteered to be on the membership.
15 We did not want a group that was super large because we
16 felt as though we may not be able to get the consensus
17 and the collaboration and what was needed in order to
18 make this group hum and to get to a point where we would
19 have a final work product. We were only given a year in
20 which to do so. So, we're moving at a fast clip, but we
21 would be happy to get you the workgroup members' names.
22 The process that was followed was followed from

1 the direction of folks who know FACA. This is a side
2 workgroup from FACA, so we followed those procedures.
3 That's how the workgroup was formed.
4 MS. McCURDY: I kind of sense a little bit
5 defensive response. My intent was not to put you on the
6 defense.
7 MR. LAYNE: Oh, no.
8 MS. McCURDY: I've served on other FACAs. I'm
9 very familiar with that. I think for transparency sake,
10 for example, can we have a show of hands here who is on
11 the committee?
12 MR. LAYNE: Sure.
13 MS. McCURDY: As a new member to the PPDC, I
14 wasn't given an opportunity to be able to participate in
15 this group, which my background is totally public health
16 focus. So, I'm just trying to understand -- not that I'm
17 begging to be on. The point is how transparent is it,
18 how inclusive is it. I understand concerns about keeping
19 it small so that you can get to a point. But, on the
20 other hand, wouldn't it be more amicable or friendly if
21 new members join to the PPDC to give them an opportunity
22 to be part of it. I don't know. I think these are the

1 kinds of things we should be able to discuss if we are
2 going to be working collaboratively in a group like this.
3 Can we have a show of hands? Who is on this
4 committee, on this workgroup? So, you have people
5 outside the PPDC?
6 MR. LAYNE: Yes, that's the beauty of a
7 workgroup outside of the main PPDC.
8 MS. McCURDY: Right, I understand.
9 MR. LAYNE: You can have people from outside of
10 the PPDC be on the workgroup. That's not the total
11 people.
12 MS. McCURDY: Yes, I'd like to see a list. I
13 think everybody should have a copy.
14 MR. LAYNE: Sure. It's on the website.
15 MR. KEIGWIN: The website has the list of the
16 workgroup members, Leyla. Certainly, any work product of
17 the workgroup before it can be formal advice back to EPA
18 has to come before this body. So, all PPDC members can
19 contribute when it comes here towards amending or
20 enhancing the work product that comes out of the
21 workgroup.
22 MR. LAYNE: Every PPDC so far we've provided

1 updates. That's another opportunity to give us direction
2 and feedback which is what we were hoping to get today.
3 MR. KEIGWIN: Liza.
4 MS. TROSSBACH: I echo the other comment
5 regarding that this is an important product. I think
6 it's certainly appropriate. I think it's best to be as
7 proactive as you can. Obviously, you don't want to be
8 trying to figure out what to do when the emergency
9 arises.
10 I do have a question, if I can, just for
11 clarification. You talked about pesticides and IPM and
12 it's not just going to be focusing on vectors of disease
13 but a whole variety of pests. I'm curious, is the plan
14 going to be pest specific or emergency specific like a
15 hurricane versus something else? How is that going to be
16 formed? That may help get additional information from
17 the committee. Is it just a broad-based these are the
18 steps that you want to take? I'm trying to understand a
19 little bit about what the plan is going to entail?
20 MS. SPAGNOLI: The specific plan for OPP is
21 really kind of focusing on the role OPP would play in an
22 emergency response, so it wouldn't be the total emergency

1 response. As we know, in a hurricane response, it's not
2 just mosquitos. It can be rodents, it can be moles.
3 There's a lot of factors that go into it that wouldn't
4 possibly involve pesticides and the need for pesticides.
5 So, that's I think how they're looking at it. What role
6 does OPP play and who do they need to reach out with to
7 make that element of that plan?
8 MS. TROSSBACH: Okay, thank you. I appreciate
9 that.
10 MR. LAYNE: Those areas are also going to be
11 talked about in the background section of this plan
12 because they come into play, obviously. It will help us
13 get to where we need to be in the pesticide program in
14 the event of an emergency.
15 MS. TROSSBACH: Thank you.
16 MR. LAYNE: Mm-hmm, thank you.
17 MR. KEIGWIN: Okay, Tim, then Charlotte, then
18 Stan.
19 MR. TUCKER: Yes, Arnold. Did I hear you
20 correctly that this emergency preparedness planning would
21 be in a subgroup of the group, the workgroup?
22 MR. LAYNE: No. The workgroup itself is going

1 to develop it to put the meat on the bones to that
2 preparedness plan.
3 MR. TUCKER: Because it seems like there's so
4 many categories and the scope is so broad that you might
5 consider that a benefit.
6 MR. LAYNE: Yes. We've actually talked about
7 taking members of the workgroup and having them deal with
8 specific elements.
9 MR. TUCKER: Exactly.
10 MR. LAYNE: So, in that respect, yes. But I
11 thought you were referring to taking an element and then
12 forming a separate --
13 MR. TUCKER: Subgroup, right, to deal with
14 hurricanes, to deal with pest issues. There's a real
15 need for expertise as well.
16 MR. LAYNE: So, we'll consider that along the
17 way. But right now, we're working as a team and trying
18 to get your approval on are these the right elements
19 before we sort of venture any further. And then figure
20 out how best to get that done from a resource
21 perspective.
22 MR. TUCKER: So, I did mean to say also that I

1 think it's a great idea.

2 MR. LAYNE: Thank you.

3 MR. TUCKER: I think it's an ongoing topic that

4 might involve -- you can't ever have enough planning for

5 emergencies. If you didn't, then we've got real issues.

6 MR. KEIGWIN: Charlotte and then Amy.

7 MS. SANSON: So, I agree with everybody. Going

8 on to question 2, or 3, I'm not sure which one my

9 question relates to. I saw the information there about

10 communication plans, outreach. But I was curious as to

11 what's the mechanism for receiving information,

12 information coming into the workgroup, so looking at

13 intelligence efforts for pending threats and other

14 regions of the world that could end up here in our

15 country, that sort of thing. So, what's the mechanism

16 and intelligence effort do you see playing a role?

17 MS. SPAGNOLI: Well, I think that's sort of

18 that fifth element where this is not going to be a static

19 plan as new information is made available or new

20 technologies are available. I think that's part of the

21 technology side of it, how do you best gather that

22 information.

1 MR. LAYNE: If I may, and correct me if I'm
2 wrong, for the workgroup members that are here, we did
3 look at documentation from a number of sources to help us
4 get underway. We will continue to do that as the
5 workgroup progresses and its work progresses. So, we've
6 looked at a number of situations that have taken place, a
7 number of test issues, a number of emergent issues to
8 help feed into what this was actually going to be. We
9 struggled with what this was going to be so that's not so
10 cumbersome, but also to make sure that it's something
11 that's going to be useful to all involved. But we will
12 continue that effort and stay abreast of what's going on
13 and feed that into the plan that Julie said will be a
14 living document.
15 MR. KEIGWIN: Amy.
16 MS. LIEBMAN: Thank you for your update. I do
17 think this workgroup is addressing some important
18 aspects.
19 One comment that I've made at several PPDC
20 meetings has to do with the overall title of this group.
21 While I get it that we're kind of looking at pesticide
22 used for like public health purposes in terms of vector

1 control, I think it's misleading to sort of just call
2 this the public health workgroup because there's so many
3 public health components of pesticides. When we look at
4 the worker protection standards, when we look at other
5 aspects, there's always public health involved. So, I
6 think it's just a little bit a misnomer. I really could
7 encourage you to consider changing it and maybe focus
8 more on the emergency preparedness or something that that
9 fits it, because public health is so broad and this is
10 just one component of that.
11 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks, Amy.
12 MR. LAYNE: Thank you.
13 MR. KEIGWIN: Aaron.
14 MR. HOBBS: Thanks. So, I would just like to
15 reiterate that several of the comments, Jim in
16 particular, that there is a lot of expertise that exists
17 that does currently have the opportunity to participate.
18 So, again, I make the request that those opportunities be
19 provided to people that have expertise, on the ground
20 expertise, that were intimately and personally involved
21 in emergency response within the last 18 months. You do
22 have some of that, but additional expertise exists.

1 Create a product that is truly valuable to all
2 stakeholders. I think having people that have actually
3 had that on their hands, if you'll let me use that
4 analogy, would be valuable. So, I would like to see the
5 workgroup expanded. I think that's my second request for
6 expansion of the workgroup, so I just want to get that on
7 the table.
8 And then a concern I have just generally about
9 the dialogue yesterday and today as it relates to IPM.
10 IPM is an integrated approach to pest management. It
11 concerns me that we continue to say IPM is here and
12 pesticides are there. Pesticides are a part of IPM, and
13 I guess that's particularly pointed feedback for our EPA
14 colleagues. As we proceed in the dialogue, let's keep
15 the two together.
16 An integrated pest management strategy includes
17 all the tools in the toolbox. I think maybe the visual
18 representation of having IPM on the screen next to
19 pesticides as them not being the same thing sets the
20 wrong tone.
21 So, let's remember that an integrated pest
22 management strategy includes all the tools, social,

1 cultural, mechanical, and pest control. So, let's keep
2 those two things together. Thanks.
3 MR. LAYNE: Thank you. We actually thought
4 about that. We just wanted to make sure that the full
5 PPDC understood that we were taking IPM into
6 consideration here, the full suite of things associated,
7 not just pesticides. We get the flip all the time as
8 well that you only focus on pesticides. We want to make
9 sure that we said specifically IPM. So, thank you for
10 that.
11 MS. HOBBS: Well, great. So, this is the
12 pesticide program dialogue committee. Also, the
13 definition of IPM, the statutory definition of IPM,
14 speaks to all the tools. So, the two things are
15 intimately related. I'm just concerned that there's a
16 continual division or separation of one of the tools out
17 of the toolbox and not just to focus on IPM, which I
18 believe everyone here supports. That's the best way to
19 manage pests in any setting.
20 MR. KEIGWIN: Let me just check, Sharon, if you
21 had any questions or comments on this topic.
22 MS. SELVAGGIO: No, I don't, thanks.

1 MR. KEIGWIN: So, what we'd like to do for a
2 few minutes is just to get your initial thoughts on some
3 possible discussion topics for the next PPDC, which would
4 be sometime this fall. This certainly is not the only
5 time that you all can provide us with suggestions for
6 topics. Things inevitably will come to mind over the
7 course of the next several months. The Agency will
8 likely also have some topics that it will want your
9 feedback on that might even be different than those that
10 we might think of today. So, just a quick initial
11 thought or ideas for discussion topics for next time.
12 I see Nina's card is up, so why don't we start
13 there.
14 MS. WILSON: Yes, thanks, Rick. I could have
15 made some comments on the last couple of topics, but I'm
16 going to save them. I think for biopesticides we would
17 like to hear, or I would in our community that works in
18 pesticides, would like to hear about the biopesticides.
19 There are products based on nationally occurring that are
20 very low toxicity. I think that their benefits speak to
21 everybody around this table.
22 To put this in context, something that we go to

1 everyday in our coffee or our tea, something like
2 caffeine, would not be considered a biopesticide because
3 it's considered too toxic. So, it would be considered a
4 conventional product. So, that tells you the bar of
5 safety that biopesticides have.
6 I want people to understand that and want
7 people to understand how it's used in programs. Because
8 of this low toxicity, they can be difficult sometimes --
9 and I think you alluded to that -- that there is a
10 certain way to use them and that they can be tricky and
11 maybe takes a little bit of extra work.
12 But I think growers certainly seem to be
13 wanting a more IPM focused approach which include
14 biopesticides. They use them because they are seeking a
15 lower risk for their workers, lower risk for the
16 environment. The challenge of getting them to work I
17 think is something that we'd like to hear more about
18 because I think we could have examples for a lot of those
19 topics about how they're used.
20 I would like people to understand that when
21 they talk about pesticides, that includes biopesticides,
22 including mosquito control. And IGR, that's considered a

1 biopesticide. There are a few registered under them. I
2 know that in Puerto Rico when they have the issue with
3 mosquitos, they elected not to use a pesticide and they
4 elected not to use an IGR which has very low toxicity.
5 That probably could have helped the problem and the
6 benefit probably would have outweighed the risk that they
7 have with their mosquito issue there.
8 Again, they're not considered a complete
9 program. They're considered part of an IPM or resistance
10 program as well. We are designed for organic production
11 as well. I think it would be interesting to look at that
12 and understand how people are using those products and
13 those programs and why and how difficult it is to achieve
14 either the safety target that EPA set forth as well as
15 the organic component.
16 The US has got one of the most stringent
17 organic components for biopesticides. They go down to
18 the actual how it's made and what's in it. Other
19 countries don't go down to that level, and yet the
20 produce from organic is considered -- there are
21 reciprocal agreements for everything, although we have
22 the highest bar. So, I think that's something that a lot

1 of us would be interested in. People don't really
2 understand the context of what they are.
3 MR. KEIGWIN: Thanks for that suggestion.
4 Amy.
5 MS. LIEBMAN: Thanks. So, I've offered a
6 number of topics via e-mail when requested, as did many
7 other stakeholders. Those topics were either not
8 important to the PPDC planning committee or ignored. I'm
9 not sure what happens. I'm not quite sure how worthwhile
10 it is for me to suggest other topics the next time. So,
11 I'm just a little disappointed with agenda planning. I
12 would like it to be more inclusive and represent all
13 stakeholder's needs not just a few. So, that's the first
14 comment.
15 The second comment that I'd like to express is
16 a little bit about process when we're doing our meetings.
17 The last November meeting I thought was actually a very
18 productive meeting with a lot of important dialogue, a
19 lot of different stakeholder input. The way that our
20 comments were misconstrued and presented was not okay.
21 We put together a letter, many of us, on March
22 2nd and submitted it to Charlotte Bertrand as well as

1 other OPP and EPA employees. We haven't heard a thing
2 back from that letter.
3 So, I am questioning the utility of my presence
4 here as a public health stakeholder. Sure, I found ways
5 to sort of talk about meaningful topics of public health,
6 protection of workers, protection of children within this
7 very sanitized agenda.
8 But, I'm just not sure we're being heard, and
9 I'm not sure you're listening to the stakeholders
10 equally. It just might be the agenda of the EPA and this
11 administration that is anti-worker, anti-environment, and
12 this is what we're seeing. If you want our input and you
13 ask our input, then I would like to have some inclusion.
14 MR. KEIGWIN: Damon.
15 MR. REABE: I'd like to reiterate Nina's point.
16 The aerial application industry is very interested in
17 biopesticides. We think that our industry is going to
18 play a very critical role in getting those products out
19 in a timely manner so that they are effective.
20 I do want to go on the record. I hope that my
21 statements yesterday weren't misunderstood. There are a
22 lot of new manufacturers that have not been in the

1 pesticide realm and don't have a lot of experience going
2 through the registration process, unlike Alan, for
3 instance, that are bringing some biological pesticides to
4 the market.
5 So, my comments yesterday were really just to
6 ask the OPP to really guide them through the process of
7 understanding maybe that they're coming with less
8 experience. And having these labels be of a format that
9 is extremely similar to the conventional products that
10 we're using. It will simply make them easier for us to
11 find the information so that we can handle the products
12 appropriately.
13 MR. KEIGWIN: So, continue to think about what
14 topics you would like to discuss. Please get them to
15 Dea. We can't always include every topic on the agenda,
16 given the day and a half that we have. So, we do
17 prioritize based upon areas where we feel we need advice
18 or want to provide you all with an update. There are
19 times that we can't fit everything, but we will do the
20 best that we can, as we always do, moving forward.
21 We do have two public commentors who wanted to
22 give some remarks. So, I'd first ask Cindy Smith from

1 Gowan (phonetic) to come forward.

2 MS. SMITH: Thank you, Rick. I tried to get

3 Bill to go first, but he told me I had to go first. So,

4 I said maybe I'd reserve the right to talk to him after.

5 But I really appreciate the opportunity to

6 address the committee. As Rick said, my name is Cindy

7 Smith. I'm the Ag Relations Director for Gowan USA.

8 I've been attending PPDC meetings for a little over 20

9 years, for some of those years, as a member of the PPDC.

10 By and large, I think they've been very productive

11 meetings, and I hope helpful to the Office of Pesticide

12 Programs.

13 But the last few meetings have been troubling

14 to me because they seem rather than forum for

15 constructive dialogue, they've become public shaming of

16 EPA, particularly Office of Pesticide Programs, and

17 sometimes members of the PPDC, and when members speak up,

18 their comments and sometimes mode of their questions and

19 even ridiculed on social media. I get it.

20 Over the last 24, 24 really, 12 or 20 years,

21 there have been very different views on topics. I fully

22 respect that all of us come here and the reason that we

1 come here is to be able to express our views. There's
2 been very understandable passion on all sides.
3 But it feels a bit different to me now, and I
4 would just really encourage members of the PPDC to be
5 here to provide advice to the career staff at OPP who day
6 in and day out make decisions based on their mandate. In
7 my experience, EPA career staff take seriously their
8 mandate to protect people and the environment, and there
9 are always ways that we have and other ways that we have
10 to address the political appointees.
11 I also would like to talk about just a few
12 items that were on the agenda, the worker protection
13 standard. I really sincerely believe that everyone in
14 this room wants to ensure workers are protected. I don't
15 believe that anyone here is trying to gut the worker
16 protection standard. I think there are few target items
17 for which people are seeking clarification.
18 I actually agree, Amy, with what you said about
19 the November meeting. I think there was some very
20 productive dialogue about two of those topics at least,
21 the minimum age and the designated rep. I think that
22 there are workable solutions.

1 So, I would hope that we can wait and see
2 before we predetermine that it will be a complete rolling
3 back of WPS. To my knowledge, none of it has been
4 released yet publicly, so we don't know what's in there.
5 Unlike when the WPS rule was released before and a
6 designated rep position was slipped in after the public
7 notice and comment period, I believe, and I take Rick at
8 his word, that when that rule is released later this
9 year, that we'll all have an opportunity to comment on
10 what's in there. EPA will have to consider those
11 comments. If it's still finalized and people are unhappy
12 with it, there are processes that you can follow to
13 address that.
14 With respect to PRIA, because I think it's
15 critically important to the continuation of the Office of
16 Pesticide Programs, the first three PRIA laws were passed
17 with agreement by a PRIA coalition that was made up of
18 industry and NGOs. They very successfully passed each
19 time because all the parties agreed to keep the PRIA
20 legislation free of any issues not related to PRIA.
21 Industry certainly could have tried to get
22 things slipped into PRIA but we didn't to support the

1 interest of the coalition. Now that PRIA 4 is being held
2 up for nothing to do with anything that is in PRIA, as
3 was publicly discussed yesterday, it's being blocked
4 because of concerns related to WPS and chlorpyrifos, it
5 is what it is. But who suffers is the Office of
6 Pesticide Programs, the very people who we want to make
7 the decisions on new products, products and registration
8 review, and biologicals that, as pointed out yesterday
9 and just now by Nina, are often products that are seen as
10 largely lower risk.
11 People are leaving OPP already due to the lack
12 of certainty regarding their jobs, and they're losing
13 good people, and it doesn't need to be happening. If
14 people want to challenge the decisions made around WPS or
15 even chlorpyrifos, I think there are ways to do that
16 without holding up PRIA. I would really encourage for
17 OPP's future work we go back to PRIA being about funding
18 OPP activities and providing dollars for WPS
19 implementation and leave it clean so that we can continue
20 to have that program.
21 I feel like I have to address the numerous we-
22 all-know statements that have been made about

1 chlorpyrifos or 50 percent of pesticide use being illegal
2 or people don't follow labels. Those statements are not
3 supported by facts. We don't all know that and we don't
4 all agree.
5 On chlorpyrifos specifically, there are very
6 credible scientists, and I'm not talking about industry
7 scientists, I'm talking about some of EPA's own science
8 advisory panel members and other experts in the
9 epidemiology who have looked at these epi data and do not
10 conclude that there is additional risk to children,
11 neither do other regulatory authorities around the world.
12 Yesterday, EPA was encouraged to look to EFSA
13 and Europe action regarding neonics. That same EFSA said
14 about these epidemiology data at the heart of the
15 chlorpyrifos assessment, that the epidemiological studies
16 in their current form are not ready to be implemented
17 into risk assessment. So, my point here is that we can't
18 pick and choose when we want EPA to do what other
19 countries do or don't do. We're not Europe.
20 The laws regulating pesticide regulation here
21 in the US are different than those in Europe. The Office
22 of Pesticide Programs is seen as a regulatory leader

1 around the world. They participate in the discussions
2 with their counterparts in Europe, Canada, Australia, and
3 other countries. And they have to make their decisions
4 based on the standards in US law, which is utilizing the
5 best available science and reliable and available data.
6 I certainly don't always agree with their
7 decisions or their positions, but I believe they are
8 making those decisions on what they believe is protective
9 of humans in the environment. Thank you.
10 MR. KEIGWIN: The next public commentor is Bill
11 Jordan.
12 MR. JORDAN: Thanks, Rick. Thanks for the
13 opportunity to make a comment. I'm Bill Jordan. I'm a
14 consultant on pesticide issues. I work with advocacy
15 organizations, pesticide companies, law firms, and the
16 like. I'm not speaking on behalf of any of those
17 organizations today, but rather just offering my views as
18 a citizen who is interested in the work of EPA and the
19 pesticide program.
20 I want to comment about five issues briefly.
21 The first is I commend the work that EPA is doing on
22 smart labels, eCSF, electronic confidential statements of

1 formula, also the work that you're doing on non-animal
2 alternative methods of evaluating pesticide risks. I
3 think this is important, not only to make the agency more
4 efficient, but also to have the agency in a position to
5 make better decisions concerning protection of human
6 health and the environment. It's work that goes under
7 the radar screen largely, and it's important to continue
8 to put resources into that work.
9 The second topic is the risk resistance
10 management communications plan. I want to speak in favor
11 of regulation. I know that there are a number of people
12 who thought the communication plan was great just because
13 it was only working with stakeholders to try to get them
14 to do different things to change their behavior. But
15 there is a role for regulation in this field. EPA is the
16 regulator.
17 Amy Asmus talked about lessons that could be
18 learned from the antibiotic resistance issues. In that
19 area, the federal government has put in place regulatory
20 requirements restricting the use of antibiotics in animal
21 husbandry area. That has made, according to a lot of
22 people, the most significant impact on addressing

1 antibiotic resistance issues.

2 I'm not saying that EPA ought to put in place

3 heavy-handed regulations, but there are things that EPA

4 has asked industry and agricultural sectors to do and

5 that those folks have not done. Adding mode of action

6 information to pesticide product labels is in place by

7 many of the large companies, but many of the smaller

8 companies have not done that. I think it's a

9 disadvantage to the companies that have followed EPA's

10 good guidance on that point for those small companies to

11 be left out of compliance with that good guidance.

12 Similarly, there are programs that have been

13 put in place through registration decisions affecting

14 enlist, duo and dicamba to address resistance management.

15 Those programs are promised to be very effective, but

16 they are only two of the herbicides that have consistency

17 issues. That program should be expanded and it will

18 require probably regulation to other herbicide issues.

19 The third thing I want to talk about is the reg

20 review program. I commend the work again that EPA is

21 doing on that front. The agency, however, in its interim

22 decisions, is not addressing the effects that the

1 pesticides may have with regard to endocrine disruption.
2 That's a provision that was put into the Food Quality
3 Protection Act over 10 years ago. The Agency is still
4 somewhat behind in addressing that.
5 They have the ability through the Tox 21
6 program to do assessments. They had collected data
7 through data call in to evaluate at least 40 of the
8 chemicals. Yet, those results of those programs is not
9 being reflected in the regulatory risk assessments that
10 are being prepared. I encourage the Agency in adding
11 that as soon as you can.
12 The next area I want to talk about is
13 endangered species. I agree with Lori Ann Burd that the
14 Agency's work in this area has been painfully slow. I
15 know from having worked at the Agency how much effort
16 they are putting into it. One of the very significant
17 reasons I think work has not moved ahead as quickly as it
18 might is because it requires so much resources. When
19 that's the case, I think it's important to set priorities
20 so that the Agency and the Services work on the most
21 important risks to endangered species.
22 So, I strongly encourage the Agency to try to

1 establish clear priorities, both about which pesticides
2 may be of the most concern and about what types of risks
3 may be of the most concern. If you focus on those, the
4 protections that are needed for species will be more
5 easily and more quickly identified and put in place.
6 And I think it might be following Cindy's
7 recommendation about a more cooperative consensus
8 building effort by this committee. It might be an
9 appropriate thing for this committee to consider creating
10 a workgroup to try to identify such priorities, if not
11 this committee then I hope perhaps that's one of the
12 things that the interagency workgroup looks at.
13 The last thing I want to talk about is the
14 worker protection standard. The worker protection
15 standard and the certified pesticide applicator rules
16 were developed through a long process of consultation and
17 communication among the effected stakeholders. I think
18 it resulted in a very strong factual record basis to
19 support those rules.
20 Yet, the kind of changes that are being
21 proposed, considered at least by the Agency, have not had
22 that same kind of consultation and development. I think

1 that's a mistake, and I think it has led to proposed
2 ideas about proposals that will weaken the rule.
3 I have yet to hear any strong arguments made in
4 favor, for example, of lowering the minimum age. To the
5 extent that the Agency is going about it without
6 continuing that kind of consultation process, I think
7 it's missing an opportunity. I hope that the Agency will
8 consider reaching out to all effective stakeholders in
9 trying to find solutions, as has been done in the past,
10 and that the rulemaking will reflect that kind of broad
11 input. Thank you.
12 MR. KEIGWIN: I want to thank you all for your
13 participation over the past day and a half. We do
14 appreciate the feedback.
15 I first want to thank Dea Zimmerman for all of
16 her help in organizing all of this over the past day and
17 a half. Shannon Jewell who has been apprenticing under
18 Dea and a big help in moving things along, I want to
19 thank her. Dozina Taylor and the conference center staff
20 (inaudible) thank you to her (inaudible) for whatever
21 magic was done. And then Deborah Leftridge of the travel
22 center staff for helping get many of you here

1 (inaudible).

2 Our next meeting is scheduled for Halloween, so

3 Wednesday the 31st and Thursday, November 1st. Thank you

4 all and safe travels. Talk to you soon.

5 (The meeting was adjourned.)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPTIONIST

2

3 I, Marilynn H. McNulty, do hereby certify that
4 the foregoing transcription was reduced to typewriting
5 via audiotapes provided to me; that I am neither counsel
6 for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to
7 the action in which these proceedings were transcribed;
8 that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or
9 counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially
10 or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.

11

12

13

14 MARILYNN H. McNULTY, Transcriptionist

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Message

From: Aaron Hobbs [ahobbs@pestfacts.org]
Sent: 5/3/2018 9:55:15 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
Subject: Thank you

Rick

Great job organizing and leading the PPDC meeting the last two days. Thank you.

Aaron Hobbs
RISE
202-872-3860
www.debugthemyths.com

Message

From: Overstreet, Anne [overstreet.anne@epa.gov]
Sent: 5/18/2017 3:22:02 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
CC: Berckes, Nicole [Berckes.Nicole@epa.gov]; Mosby, Jackie [Mosby.Jackie@epa.gov]; Goodis, Michael [Goodis.Michael@epa.gov]; Colby, Deanna [colby.deanna@epa.gov]; Zimmerman, Dea [Zimmerman.Dea@epa.gov]; Borges-Silva, Quentin [Borges-Silva.Quentin@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: PPDC Pollinator Protection Plans Metrics Workgroup
Attachments: Jan 18 Meeting Minutes.docx; Feb 15 Meeting Minutes.docx; March 15 Meeting Minutes_plus docs.pdf; April 13 Meeting Minutes_plus docs.pdf

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

From: Colby, Deanna
Sent: Thursday, May 11, 2017 11:59 AM
To: Overstreet, Anne <overstreet.anne@epa.gov>
Cc: Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>; Zimmerman, Dea <Zimmerman.Dea@epa.gov>
Subject: PPDC Pollinator Protection Plans Metrics Workgroup

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Deanna (Dee) Colby, Ph.D.
Entomologist, EPA
Invertebrate & Vertebrate Branch 3
Registration Division
703-347-8657

PPDC Pollinator Protection Plan Metrics WG - Meeting Minutes

4/13/2017

Attendees:
(in person) Mike Goodis, Lead; Meredith Laws; Tom Steeger; Dee Colby; Cathryn Britton
(phone) Stephanie Binns (for Aaron Hobbs), Ray Brinkmeyer, Michele Colopy; Mark Dykes, David Epstein, Jim Fredericks; Dudley Hoskins; Rose Kachadoorian; Don Parker; Peg Perreault; Caydee Savinelli; Julie Shapiro; Al Summers; Tom Van Arsdall; Andy Whittington

Agenda (attached)
Welcome, Introductions, Ground Rules, Agenda Review – Mike/Dee
Workgroup members introduced themselves.

Review of Meeting Minutes from March 15, 2017 - Dee
Meeting minutes were finalized from the March meeting and will be posted on the PPDC website.

Report from the Metrics Subgroup – Don Parker and Julie Shapiro
Subgroup members reviewed the progress of the group to date and the variety of resources that were used to formulate a metric. They chose to expand on a point system and incorporate a rubric approach in the assessment of MP3 plans, to produce a national perspective of states' accomplishments. A rubric, often used in education, lists specific criteria for scoring projects or in our case, states' efforts to mitigate acute risk to managed bees and/or improve conditions for pollinators via MP3 plans. This is not a pass/fail grading of state plans. In fact, the perspective is to give credit where credit is due (i.e., what have the states done). This type of metric would allow for observations of improvements over time, and also provide the public with each state's progress in relation to a national score. States may still need to survey stakeholders in order to generate the data for rating themselves within the rubric. The EPA would then pool the states' scores to produce a national score.

Potential categories within the assessment, based on common themes of MP3s, would be: engagement of stakeholders and local participation, evidence of educational outreach, communication, development of BMPs, progress measures, etc. Options within each category would also serve to provide ideas for expansion of state plans.

Discussion of proposed metrics – Metrics Subgroup facilitated
Dialogue continued from the Subgroup report. A question was asked about what process is envisioned by the Subgroup for the individual states. It was suggested that the states really need to assess themselves because it would be difficult to score the states from an outsider's perspective. The states know and can tally their progress better from within. Incident reports were brought up and whether or not they have a place in the metric; however, the data varies so widely from state to state and it was decided not include this as a category in the metric.

The Subgroup was hearing support for their proposed metric and it was decided to refine the approach further. Mike pointed out that the Workgroup is at a good point to get feedback from the full PPDC about the proposed approach. The Subgroup will have a shortened version of the presentation for the PPDC and a longer, working, version for the Workgroup.

Meeting Recap – Dee

Metrics Subgroup (Subgroup II), going forward:

1) Caydee Savinelli volunteered to coordinate the Metrics Subgroup until the May meeting,
2) the Subgroup will put together a shortened version of the presentation for introduction to the full PPDC,
3) Workgroup members will provide the Subgroup with any issues/concerns over the proposed metric for discussion during the May meeting,
4) Mark Dykes will participate in the Subgroup, and
5) Dee will confirm that Claudio Gratton from WI will present during the May meeting.

In-Person Meeting...May 2, 2017 1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. (full PPDC Meeting May 3-4, 2017). A call-in option will be provided for those who will not be attending in person. Note: Accounts are being created for Workgroup members to have Wi-Fi access during the meeting.

Pollinator Protection Plans Metrics PPDC Workgroup

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

The objective of this meeting is to discuss potential metrics to recommend to the EPA.

Agenda:

Welcome, Introductions, Ground Rules, Agenda Review – Mike (10 min)
Workgroup members and participants will introduce themselves.

Review of Meeting Minutes from March 15, 2017 - Dee (5 min)
Finalize meeting minutes from the March meeting. March Meeting Minutes are attached.

Report from the Metrics Subgroup – Don Parker and Julie Shapiro (30 min)
Don and Julie will present the continued progress of the Subgroup's efforts this past month in developing a framework for a proposed survey and/or point system approach to measuring success of all States' plans. A draft point system spreadsheet is attached.

Discussion – Metrics Subgroup facilitates (40 min)
Success of the Workgroup to best represent stakeholder viewpoints depends on Workgroup member feedback and input. *That being said, the group will continue their discussion of survey and point system approaches as possible metrics options for the EPA. Possible questions for discussion:*

- *Have data gaps been identified?*
- *Is additional information from experts (e.g. Extension Services) required in order for the group to refine the proposed metric(s) and/or resolve the selection of one approach over the other?*
- *What preparation is needed over the next few weeks for our presentation to the full PPDC in May?*

Check-in: Do Workgroup members support the proposed metric(s)? If not, what are sources of dissatisfaction with the proposed metric(s)? The idea is to poll Workgroup members via email and receive responses prior to the May 2nd meeting. The Workgroup will then discuss and work through issues during the May 2nd meeting.

Work Plan feedback: Does the Workgroup have any feedback on the revised work plan from April – November 2017. Should anything else be included/revised/omitted? Refer to the Work Plan (below).

Meeting Recap – Dee (5 min)
Review any action items
In-Person Meeting…May 2, 2017 1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. (full PPDC Meeting May 3-4, 2017). A call-in option will be provided for those who will not be attending in person. Note: Accounts are being created for Workgroup members to have Wi-Fi access during the meeting.

PPDC Pollinator Protection Plan Metrics WG - Meeting Minutes

2/15/2017

Attendees:
(in person) Mike Goodis, Lead; Tom Steeger; Dee Colby; Mary Clock-Rust
(phone) Stephanie Binns (for Aaron Hobbs), Ray Brinkmeyer, Michele Colopy; Steven Coy; Mark Dykes; David Epstein; Jim Fredericks; Nichelle Harriot; Rose Kachadoorian; Jim Lyons; Don Parker; Peg Perreault; Caydee Savinelli; Julie Shapiro; Al Summers; Tim Tucker; Tom Van Arsdall; Andy Whittington; Karen Rennich; Robyn Rose

Agenda (attached)
Welcome, Introductions, Ground Rules, Agenda Review – Mike
Workgroup members and guest speakers introduced themselves.

Review of Meeting Minutes from January 18, 2017 - Dee
Meeting minutes were finalized from the January meeting and will be posted on the PPDC website.

Report from USDA APHIS – Robyn Rose
Robyn provided an overview of the USDA APHIS National Survey of Honey Bee Pests and Diseases.
Key points:

- Invasive pest and disease distribution/incidence is monitored, such as *Nosema*, *Varroa*, viruses, etc.; diagnostics are free to participating beekeepers
- Pollen samples are analyzed for pesticide residues; results showed few pesticides were detected in pollen...most, ~ 40%, were miticides for *Varroa* control
- Number of states and territories participating has increased from 38 states and Puerto Rico in 2015 to 46 states and territories in 2017
- Wax sampling for pesticide residues will begin in 2017

Refer to: [HYPERLINK "https://www.aphis.usda.gov/aphis/ourfocus/planthealth/plant-pest-and-disease-programs/pests-and-diseases/non-regulated/honey-bees"]

Report from Apiary Inspectors of America – Mark Dykes
Mark discussed AIA's perspective of honey bee health, metrics for monitoring, and ways AIA can assist in collecting data for national level assessment. Refer to the AIA Report document (below) for Mark's presentation.
Key points:

- There is a greater awareness of MP3 plans by beekeepers and applicators
- Communication between stakeholders has increased
- Reluctance by beekeepers to report exposure incidents makes it difficult to document them for data purposes
- State to state differences are numerous: MP3s, beekeeping activities and size of operations, distribution of diseases, not all states have inspectors, etc.
- Inspectors or state beekeeping associations may be able to: identify operations most at risk of exposure, gather data on yearly losses, ask questions/gauge awareness during inspections, etc.

Report from the Metrics Subgroup – Michele Colopy

Michele presented the progress of the Subgroup's efforts to categorize metrics from multiple resources, identifying common themes where possible.

Key points:

- Numeric data is lacking and it is difficult to evaluate plans that are voluntary; therefore, data would need to be generated through surveys and/or direct communication
- Allow states to customize their surveys to fit the scope of their plans, possibly beyond beekeepers and growers
- Considerations:
    - survey should be short and direct
    - include open-ended questions for qualitative responses
    - pollinator health – use expert assessments (e.g. inspector) or rely on survey responses

Discussion of metrics from multiple resources - Mike

A question was asked about perspective.

1) Members pointed out that it is important to keep in mind that all plans are different and development of and participation with plans is voluntary. So when viewing these plans at a national level, they are not just about the honeybee.
2) The focus also seems to be towards evaluating behavioral changes. Only three states have produced data from surveys evaluating their specific plans. Conversation was generated around how to best proceed. Perhaps looking into the development of behavioral questions and specialists that deal with those type of questions may be of benefit.

Another question was posed to the group about if there are surveys in existence that do ask the right questions for the information that the Workgroup is trying to glean. The Metrics Subgroup responded that they are not sure yet, and addressing that question would be the next step. It was asked if the EPA thought that the direction towards a survey and a broader view of pollinators and/or flexibility to accommodate state-specific differences was hitting the mark. Mike would like to come back to that question after getting some internal input from the Agency, but investigating plans was important to see where our focus should be with respect to states, then metrics and their differences.

The Work Plan will need to be updated for dates and milestones beyond March. The following members were participants in the Work Plan Subgroup: Ray Brinkmeyer, Caydee Savinelli, Jim Fredericks, Julie Shapiro, Jeanette Klopchin and Mark Dykes.

Meeting Recap – Dee

Metrics Subgroup (Subgroup II) will continue to include additional resources as they look for existing metrics for the March Meeting report to the Workgroup. Don Parker requested to join the Subgroup. Work Plan Subgroup should convene and add to the existing framework, and possibly look at more specific deliverables.

Next teleconference date will be in March 2017...tentative date 03/15/2017

DRAFT Pollinator Protection Plans Metrics PPDC Workgroup

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

The objective of this meeting is to discuss process and product based metrics from multiple resources.

Agenda:

Welcome, Introductions, Ground Rules, Agenda Review – Mike and Meredith (10 mins)
Workgroup members and participants will introduce themselves.

Review of Meeting Minutes from January 18, 2017 - Dee (3 min)
Finalize meeting minutes from the January meeting. January Meeting Minutes are attached.

Report from USDA APHIS – Robyn Rose (15 min)
Robyn will provide a review of the USDA APHIS Survey of Honey Bee Pests and Diseases.

Refer to: [HYPERLINK "https://www.aphis.usda.gov/aphis/ourfocus/planthealth/plant-pest-and-disease-programs/pests-and-diseases/non-regulated/honey-bees"]

Report from Apiary Inspectors of America – Mark Dykes (15 min)
Mark will report on AIA's perspective of honey bee health, metrics for monitoring, and ways AIA can assist in collecting data for national level assessment. Refer to the AIA Report document (below) for Mark's presentation.

Report from the Metrics Subgroup – Michele Colopy (25 min)
Michele will present the progress of the Subgroup's efforts to categorize metrics from multiple resources, identifying common themes where possible.

Discussion of metrics from multiple resources - Mike (20 min)
The group will discuss where we are in identifying process and product based metrics from existing resources begin to consider if sufficient measures are in place to document change at a national level.

Work Plan check-in…where are we in the Work Plan and are adjustments needed to the work flow going forward? The following were participants in the Work Plan Subgroup: Ray Brinkmeyer, Caydee Savinelli, Jim Fredericks, Julie Shapiro, Jeanette Klopchin and Mark Dykes. (Work Plan included below)

Meeting Recap – Dee (2 mins)
Review any action items
Next teleconference date will be in March 2017…tentative date 03/15/2017

2/10/2017

AIA Report for PPDC Workgroup on MP3 Metrics

During the 2017 AIA national meeting the topic of State MP3s and metrics for monitoring use and success were discussed. Overall most states have varied plans but the following were identified as ways inspectors could contribute to monitoring the success of MP3 plans:

1. Recorded yearly losses from inspection (if collected).
2. Short questionnaire during inspection (to gauge awareness).
3. Website hits and usage data for states that have mapping programs (i.e. Field watch, drift watch, Florida online map) or information listed on their websites.
4. Form state working groups to include state pesticide regulators, apiary inspectors, and state beekeeper's associations to evaluate impacts of MP3s.
5. Review plan annually with state working group.
6. Identify beekeepers most at risk of exposure (by operation type)

Other suggestions from the group included:

1. Include awareness questions on both Bee Informed Partnership and NASS Surveys.
2. Include as requirement for the USDA-ELAP program.

Some obstacles identified by the group were:

1. Differences in plans form state to state
2. Beekeeping activities in different states (i.e. pollination, honey, hobby)
3. Size of operations (commercial vs small scale)
4. Ability to identify actual acute pesticide exposure
    a. Confounding factors such as: time since exposure, in hive chemical use, delay of affects, synergistic affects with labeled in hive pesticides, etc.
5. Treatment of other pest and diseases
6. Reluctance of beekeepers to report incidents

Milestones that were identified as indicators for success were:

1. Awareness of MP3 plans by beekeepers and applicators (indicated by survey)
2. Documented communication between applicators and beekeepers (i.e. usage of mapping programs, contact cards, etc.)
3. Lower colony loss rates in state according to NASS or BIP survey
4. Lower number of pesticide incidents reported

AIA members had an overall positive perception of the state MP3 plans and feel the plans are a step in the right direction to reducing one factor of colony loss. AIA as an organization supports the creation and implementation of MP3 in the member states and will continue to provide support as needed.

Workplan

Project Stage	Description of Project Stage	Deliverable	
1	Identify number of completed plans and whether they have been implemented	Update the Excel spreadsheet (Association of American Pesticide Control Officials [AAPCO])	20 Nov 2016
2	Identify scope of each state/tribal plan and whether plans have associated metrics?	List of processes/products identified in each state/tribal plan and their associated metrics. Determine whether plans identified extent to which stakeholders were engaged. Are plans responsive to SFIREG/AAPCO guidance? Tribal template? Do the plans focus on managed bees alone or include other pollinator species? If other pollinator species are included, identify.	28 Nov 2016
3	PPDC Workgroup Update	Status Check (PPDC workgroup conference call). Provide overview of existing plans.	1 Dec 2016
4	Evaluate processes/products associated with each plan for areas of commonality. Can binning occur?	Subgroup to identify areas of commonality? If binning is possible, identify common themes (bins). Are there common metrics which can be associated with these themes?	Jan 2017
5	Identify process- and product-based metrics?	List of process- (*e.g.*, educational programs) and product-based (*e.g.*, number of colonies registered) metrics. Develop list of possible existing resources for measuring change at a regional and/or national level. Are sufficient measures in place across states/tribes to document change, *e.g.*, bee kill incident investigation/reporting; numbers of managed colonies (National Agricultural Statistics Service [NASS] survey data; beekeeper association databases); pollinator health estimates (Bee Informed Partnership [BIP] survey; USDA Animal and Plant Health	Feb 2017

		Inspection Service [APHIS] survey; state apiary inspector reports) Identify means of measuring outcomes? Are there financial constraints to collecting information/data?	
6	Outreach	Conference call with NASS to discuss current/ additional measurement tools (*e.g.*, survey questions). Conference call with BIP (Dennis vanEngelsdorp/Karen Rennick) to discuss current/additional measurement tools (survey questions).	Jan 2017
7	Identify tools to quantify how MP3s reduce acute inadvertent exposure of managed pollinators to pesticides.	Form subgroup to identify pollinator health metrics. Develop list of general measures (*e.g.*, overwintering success; incidence of disease; incidence of CCD). Conference calls with USDA APHIS/ARS and BIP to determine possible metrics. Evaluate NASS, Bee Informed Partnership, APHIS databases to determine extent to which pollinator losses are affected. SFIREG Survey on enforcement actions; similar state survey. American Beekeeping Federation (ABF) survey tools. Evaluate California Pesticide Use Report or similar use/market report data to determine changes in use. Discussion with State Apiary Inspector where appropriate.	Feb 2017
8	Are other factors beyond pesticide exposure addressed in plans?	What are realistic metrics for evaluating efficacy of additional mitigation measures that extend beyond pesticides (*e.g.*, increased number of acres devoted to pollinator habitat; increase in CRP; decreased incidence of pests/disease).	

	PPDC Workgroup Update	**Status Check (PPDC workgroup conference call). Provide overview of potential metrics and options for collecting data.**	Feb
9	**Do plans have short-comings that may dictate further development?**	**Identify particular limitations/data gaps of state/tribal plans.**	Feb

PPDC Pollinator Protection Plan Metrics WG - Meeting Minutes

1/18/2017

Attendees:
(in person) Mike Goodis, Lead; Tom Steeger; Dee Colby; Tom Moriarty
(phone) Stephanie Binns (for Aaron Hobbs), Ray Brinkmeyer, Michele Colopy; Steven Coy; Mark Dykes; David Epstein; Jim Fredericks; Nichelle Harriot; Dudley Hoskins; Rose Kachadoorian; Jeanette Klopchin; Peg Perreault; Caydee Savinelli; Julie Shapiro; Robin Shepard; Tom Van Arsdall; Andy Whittington; Angus Catchot; Jeff Gore; Jeff Harris; Josh O'Rear; Dennis vanEnglesdorp

Agenda (attached)

Welcome, Introductions, Ground Rules, Agenda Review – Mike

Workgroup members and guest speakers introduced themselves. It was suggested that the Ground Rules, #8 be revised to make participation in Workgroup meetings for members or their representatives and guest speakers only. Public participation would occur at the full PPDC meetings; that is, the public would not be allowed to listen in during meetings. This suggestion was supported by various group members.

Review of Meeting Minutes from December 1, 2016 - Dee

Meeting minutes were finalized from the December meeting and will be posted on the PPDC website.

Report from the States' Plans Metrics Subgroup – Jeanette Klopchin

Jeanette went through the progress of the Subgroup's efforts to categorize metrics from states' plans, identifying common themes and corresponding metrics. There were 8 common themes from 30 finalized state plans. A summary document is attached.

Report on the Mississippi Beekeeper/Farmer Survey – Angus Catchot, Jeff Gore, Jeff Harris

The three speakers talked about the survey metric (see attached) of the Mississippi Honey Bee Stewardship Program: who was involved, the intended purpose, lessons learned and where to improve. Some key points in their discussion:

1) The survey was intended to measure if an increase in awareness of the importance of pollinator health had resulted from state MP3 efforts.
2) Formulation of questions involved all stakeholders; beekeeper and grower questions were developed separately and then combined.
3) Ultimately they would like to know if the increased awareness resulted in a change in behaviors, but it is difficult to document/quantify face to face changes.
4) Also, it was hoped that MP3 efforts, including the survey, would help safeguard the large commercial beekeeping industry in MS, but the "big guys" did not respond to the survey. There were a lot of side liners responding but not the beekeepers with the most interaction with agriculture.
5) The importance of keeping the survey as simple as possible was stressed. This survey has not been through the University's formal data collection process yet. Questions will be improved with the assistance of behavioral extension specialists.

Report from Bee Informed Partnership – Dennis vanEnglesdorp

Dennis presented information from the Bee Informed Partnership's National Management Survey. The basis of their data collecting is to reduce colony mortality by predicting colony health by knowing the 'drivers'. While BIP data collection is strategic and NASS data collection is stratified and random, Dennis reports that the results are congruent. BIP is interested in management strategies, like *Varroa* mite management, and trends. In 2015-2016, *Varroa* was the main reason for colony loss for backyard beekeepers, sideliners and commercial beekeepers. Commercial beekeepers report 3% colony loss/month. Because 95% of beekeepers own 5% of the colonies in the U.S. and 5% of beekeepers own 95% of the colonies, the platform to address both groups should be different. The challenge is protecting confidentiality in sharing data.

See [HYPERLINK "https://beeinformed.org"] for information about Bee Informed Partnership surveys and results.

Report from National Agricultural Statistics Service – Josh O'Rear

Josh provided a review of NASS honey bee surveys and reports. NASS does data collection for the USDA. In general, the Honey Report gathers data on the number of colonies, cost of honey, etc. for beekeepers with ≥ 5 colonies. The Colony Loss Survey tracks a subsample of colonies quarterly, gathering data on the number of colonies, renovated colonies, and loss in the U.S. The Cost of Pollination report is sent to crop producers and requests information per acre and per colony. When asked about adaptability of surveys, Josh indicated that altering a survey is difficult due to funding and approval. Also, developing questions that ask what they need to ask can be difficult as well. Questions tend not to produce a single response. He also provided advice on how to elevate participation from commercial beekeepers by: 1) shooting for a 70% response rate, 2) speaking at conferences...beekeepers were easier to reach than crop producers, 3) reiterating that you are interested in just statistics and nothing personal, and 4) realizing that persistence is important for reaching commercial beekeepers.

Refer to [HYPERLINK "https://www.nass.usda.gov/Surveys/Guide_to_NASS_Surveys/Bee_and_Honey/"] for NASS reports. The Cost of Pollination report can be found at [HYPERLINK "https://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/MannUsda/viewDocumentInfo.do?documentID=2008"]

Discussion of metrics from multiple resources - Mike

There was little time left to discuss common themes of metrics, but it was noted that we may be able to selectively pick metrics from different sources and adapt them for our purposes. It was suggested and agreed that we would keep the current Subgroup and add additional volunteers to help expand on the state list to include metrics from additional resources (e.g. NASS, BIP, and USDA APHIS surveys; State Apiary Inspector Reports, etc.) as we move into Project Stage 5 of the work plan. Project Stage 5 includes identifying process and product based metrics from existing resources so that the Workgroup can determine if sufficient measures are in place to document change at a national level. The amended Subgroup will consist of Stephanie Binns, Michele Colopy, Jim Fredericks, Jeanette Klopchin, Peg Perreault (EPA representative), Caydee Savinelli, Julie Shapiro and Tom Van Arsdall.

Meeting Recap – Dee

Mark Dykes will be on the agenda for February to present from Apiary Inspectors of America

Next teleconference date will be in February 2017...tentative date 02/23/2017 (turned out to be 2/15/2017)

Pollinator Protection Plans Metrics PPDC Workgroup

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

The objective of this meeting is to discuss metrics within states' plans and areas of commonality, and to begin identifying process and product based metrics from multiple resources.

Agenda:

Welcome, Introductions, Ground Rules, Agenda Review – Mike and Meredith (5 mins)
Workgroup members and participants will introduce themselves.

Review of Meeting Minutes from December 1, 2016 - Dee (5 min)
Finalize meeting minutes from the December meeting. December Meeting Minutes are attached.

Report from the States' Plans Metrics Subgroup – Jeanette Klopchin (15 min)
Jeanette will present the progress of the Subgroup's efforts to categorize metrics from states' plans, identifying common themes and corresponding metrics. A summary document is attached.

Also, refer to [HYPERLINK "http://www.dec.ny.gov/docs/administration_pdf/nyspollinatorplan.pdf"] *and* [HYPERLINK "https://datcp.wi.gov/Documents/PPPComplete.pdf"] *for NY and WI pollinator plans. For measures guidance from SFIREG, see* [HYPERLINK "https://aapco.files.wordpress.com/2016/02/sfireg-joint-working-committee-performance-measures-for-mp3-meeting-revision-clean-up.pdf"].

Report on the Mississippi Beekeeper/Farmer Survey – TBD (15 min)
MS will report on the metric of the Mississippi Honey Bee Stewardship Program…a summary of the Mississippi Bee Stewardship Program Survey is attached.

Report from National Agricultural Statistics Service – Josh O'Rear (15 min)
Josh will provide a review of NASS honey bee surveys and reports.

Refer to [HYPERLINK "https://www.nass.usda.gov/Surveys/Guide_to_NASS_Surveys/Bee_and_Honey/"] *for NASS reports. The Cost of Pollination report can be found at* [HYPERLINK "https://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/MannUsda/viewDocumentInfo.do?documentID=2008"].

Report from Bee Informed Partnership – Dennis vanEngelsdorp (15 min)
Dennis will present information on Bee Informed Partnership's National Management Survey.

See [HYPERLINK "https://beeinformed.org"] *for information about Bee Informed Partnership surveys and results.*

Discussion of metrics from multiple resources - Mike (15 min)
The group will discuss common themes of metrics and if a new subgroup should form to expand on the state list to include metrics from additional resources (e.g. NASS, BIP, and USDA APHIS surveys; State Apiary Inspector Reports, etc.) as we move into Project Stage 5 of the work plan. Project Stage 5 includes identifying process and product based metrics from existing resources so that the Workgroup can determine if sufficient measures are in place to document change at a national level.

Meeting Recap – Dee (5 mins)
Review any action items
Work Plan Subgroup check-in…adjustments to work flow going forward
Next teleconference date will be in February 2017…tentative date 02/23/2017

PPDC Subgroup - Common Themes of State MP3s

Composed by: Jeanette Klopchin, Caydee Savinelli, Stephanie Anne-Binns, Pegg Perault

Objectives

1. Reduce pesticide exposure through enhanced communication and collaboration among stakeholders.
2. Ensure positive relationships and peaceful co-existences among beekeepers, landowners and pesticide applicators, everyone to be part of the solution.
3. Utilize specific BMP's target state=specific problems.

Outreach

1. Outreach and education program to raise awareness of importance of pollinators.
2. Training and education of pesticide applicators on pollinator stewardship.
3. Public service announcements, Press releases
4. Website - How to protect pollinators, safe alternatives to pesticides.
5. Engage public - active participation in reversing pollinator decline.
6. Partnerships with Extension, trade associations, government agencies to promote the plan.

Communication

1. Beekeeper BMPs
2. Landowner/leaseholder BMPs
3. Pesticide user BMPs
4. Farmer/applicator BMPs
5. Interactive map of hive locations/pesticide use
6. System to or promotion of system to report all suspected pesticide poisonings of honey bees.

Location of Apiaries of Beehives in Landscape

1. Drift Watch
2. Kelly Registration
3. Bee Flags – MS, MO, GA
4. State Apiary Mapping – ND, FL
5. Sensitive Crop Registry

Pesticide Risk Mitigation

1. Provide information for safer alternative pesticides.
2. Pollinator protection info in pesticide applicator training materials.
3. Label interpretation.
4. Expand opportunities for identifying pollinator protection areas.
5. Utilize IPM

Applicators BMPs

1. Take an IPM approach to pest control.
2. Choose appropriate pesticides to reduce the risk to pollinators from pesticides.
3. Understanding/interpretation pollinator language on labels.
4. Select products that are lower risk to honey bees if available.

5. Pesticide applicators are encouraged to work with beekeepers in regards to timing of the applications to reduce risk to honey bees.
6. Always use products at the recommended label rates and spray intervals with appropriate application equipment.
7. Inform beekeepers 48 hours before an insecticide application (Before applying a pesticide, identify and notify beekeepers of the application).
8. Method for growers and applicators to identify and contact beekeepers prior to an application - 1-2 mile radius of treatment.
9. Avoid applications when honey bees are actively foraging.
10. Don't allow pesticides to drift to non-target areas.
11. Check the application area for the presence of bees before spraying and avoid the use of pesticides during bloom or when pollinators are present.
12. When possible make applications early in the morning or in the evening to minimize the exposure of bees to pesticides.

Landowners / Growers BMPs

1. Communicate with leaseholders about honeybee issues.
2. Work with beekeepers to choose hive locations.
3. Decide who is responsible for locating hives and notifying beekeepers of application.
4. Notify ground and aerial applicators of hive locations.
5. Consider the timing of pesticide applications, and apply products according to the label.
6. Apply insecticides when drift onto bee hives is not likely.
7. Agronomists should consider pollinator impacts when making pesticide recommendations.
8. Always follow the pesticide label exactly regarding application timing and dose.
9. Use Integrated Pest Management (IPM) guidelines for your crop pest problems.
10. Heed pesticide labels that say "highly toxic to bees," "toxic to bees" or "extended residual toxicity".
11. To help choose products that are less toxic to pollinators, refer to the "Bee precaution pesticide rating" online tool from University of California Integrated Pest Management Program (UC IPM). Also see EPA's "Information on Residue Toxicity Times."
12. Avoid spraying pesticides on blooming plants being visited by pollinators. This includes crops, weeds in cropland, and wildflowers or weeds in field margins/ditches.
13. If treated seed is used:
    a. Remove blooming crop weeds before planting treated seed.
    b. Reduce dust release when planting treated seed.
    c. Collect and properly dispose of any spilled treated seed. Treated seed can be toxic to birds and other wildlife if ingested.
    d. Refer to the ASTA and CropLife guide to seed treatments
14. Educate yourself about safe pesticide use. The pesticide applicator certification training manual is a useful resource for everyone, and is required training for some types of pesticide applicators.
15. Consider using buffer strips between pollinator habitat and land that gets sprayed regularly with pesticides.

Beekeeper BMPs

With Landowners

1. Be a good partner with landowners - be flexible and work to develop a long-standing relationship
2. Work with the landowner to select apiary locations.
3. Beekeepers should be aware of the needs of the landowner
4. Communicate with land owners and consider your hive locations in relation to pesticide applications and other activities on the property.
5. Be aware of property boundaries and neighboring landowners when locating colonies.
6. Notify all adjoining landowners when placing, removing or moving hives.
7. When granted permission to keep hives on a parcel, do not ""sublet"" and allow other beekeepers to bring in their hives.
8. Do not assume that because you've worked with a landowner before, you can bring your hives in again without written permission."
9. Keep the landowner informed of hive locations, status, and concerns, and be willing to consider removing hives if the need arises.

With Applicators

1. Collaborate with applicators when informed that a pesticide application is planned.
2. Make preparations in case hives need to be moved.
3. Don't leave hives in orchards or fields that are unmarked.
4. Inform local Mosquito Abatement District of beehive locations."
5. Ensure visibility of hives by obvious colors and locations. Posting a sign or placard with contact information is good practice."

Forage and Nutrition

1. Manage forage in non-crop areas for bees.
2. Plant and maintain habitat
3. Avoid invasive plants and noxious weeds
4. A minimum goal is at least three plant species flowering at all times from early spring through late fall, but the more diverse the wildflower mix the better. The total seed count should be comprised mostly of forb seeds so that grasses do not crowd out forbs.
5. Annuals can be planted in the first year for rapid establishment of floral resources and weed blocking while perennial plants get established.
6. Match the seed mix to local site conditions (soil type, moisture, sun exposure, etc.)
7. A good seed mix will contain plants that host butterfly larvae (e.g., milkweeds for monarch butterflies) and bunch grasses (e.g., little bluestem) that provide nesting habitat for bees and birds.
8. If shrubs or trees are desired at your site, these can be chosen to benefit pollinators as well: American basswood, willows, and many fruit trees have flowers attractive to pollinators.
9. A combination of prescribed fire and end-of-season haying are critical to stimulate flowering in many plant species. Mowing can be done in lieu of burning, but fire is better than mowing at stimulating flowering over time.

Metrics/Evaluation Methods

1. Changes in behavior
    a. Improvements in levels of communication and cooperation among stakeholders.
    b. Working relationships among beekeepers, farmers, and pesticide applicators
2. Changes in overall pollinator health.
    a. Colony loss data across the state where the Plan would apply (instate surveys and credible research; Bee Informed Partnership)
3. Changes in pollinator friendly forage (quality/quantity)

Metrics Example: Wisconsin Set One

1. Behavioral surveys – measure plan use and behavioral change pre/post plan release. Track website hits regarding plan.
2. Track the number of organizations, agencies, residents and others plus what programs (e.g. Conservation Reserve Program (CRP)) are using plan recommendations.
3. Survey readers on how the plan content improves their knowledge of pollinator health issues.
4. Develop and record an annual survey that organizations can distribute at growers' conferences.

Metrics Example: Wisconsin Set Two

1. Track honey bee health and colony loss:
    a. Hive health checklist via statewide inspection
    b. Bee Informed surveys for colony loss
    c. Expand the NASS survey on managed bees/honey production
2. Long-term monitoring research to track wild pollinator populations (collaborative effort).
3. Identify where pollinator habitat is currently and monitor over time.
4. Track acres of pollinator-friendly plantings along highway rights-of-way. DOT could monitor.
5. Track acres of pollinator friendly plants in Conservation Reserve Program and other private land programs.
6. Work with specific landowners or land mangers as a pilot program.
7. Identify and offer incentives for "whole-farm" conservation planning.
8. Work with homeowners planting pollinator friendly plants.
9. Work with organizations advocating/planting pollinator friendly plants, e.g., Master Gardeners.
10. Develop a baseline evaluation tool that could be used on a county or regional basis to evaluate education/awareness every 3-10 years. Gather current and new partners to apply for grant funding.
11. Increase participation of large operators in Bee Informed surveys (large operators underrepresented in current surveys).

Mississippi Bee Stewardship Program Survey

1. Are you a Beekeeper or a Row Crop Farmer?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Beekeeper	41.2%	68
Row Crop Farmer	58.8%	97
	answered question	165
	skipped question	0

2. Please indicate what portion of the state you have bees in (check all that apply):

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Northeast	20.0%	13
Delta	7.7%	5
Central	35.4%	23
South MS	38.5%	25
Blackbelt Prairie Area	4.6%	3
	answered question	65
	skipped question	100

3. What is your primary purpose for beekeeping (check all that apply)?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Hobby	59.4%	38
Honey production,	65.6%	42
Pollination services,	23.4%	15
Queen production,	17.2%	11
Bee production (selling packages, nucs, etc.),	18.8%	12
Bee rescue (swarm trapping and colony removal)	18.8%	12
	answered question	64
	skipped question	101

4. What is the relative size of your beekeeping operation?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
50 or less hives	73.8%	48
50 to 250 hives	18.5%	12
250 to 500 hives	6.2%	4
500 or more hives	1.5%	1

	answered question	65
	skipped question	100

5. How long have you been a beekeeper?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
0 to 5 years	46.9%	30
5 to 10 years	25.0%	16
10-15 years	4.7%	3
Over 15 years	23.4%	15
	answered question	64
	skipped question	101

6. Do you move your bees to row crops for honey production or to fruit or nut trees for pollination service at any time during the year?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	15.9%	10
No	84.1%	53
	answered question	63
	skipped question	102

7. Over the last 18 months, has your awareness of the importance of pollinator health been enhanced?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	84.1%	53
No	15.9%	10
	answered question	63
	skipped question	102

8. If Yes---please indicate the source of this information (check all that apply):

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
MSU Extension Service	83.3%	45
Farm Bureau	42.6%	23
Bee related publications	72.2%	39
Other Beekeepers	53.7%	29
Social media	22.2%	12
Other Ag Industry Associations	9.3%	5
Other national or local media sources	29.6%	16
	answered question	54

skipped question	111

9. In your opinion, what is the most significant production problem for you as a beekeeper (Rank them 1 to 5 in order of importance)?

Answer Options	1	2	3	4	5	6	Rating Average	Response Count
Varoa mite/Viruses	36	9	5	2	3	0	1.67	55
Small hive beetle	11	26	7	10	3	0	2.44	57
Loss of forage	2	8	17	15	3	0	3.20	45
Theft/vandalism	3	1	0	3	21	9	4.76	37
Pesticide exposure	1	7	20	8	7	1	3.36	44
Unsure	4	0	4	3	4	10	4.32	25
							answered question	65
							skipped question	100

10. Are your bees kept near/on row crop farms?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Never	46.2%	30
Sometimes	35.4%	23
All The Time	18.5%	12
	answered question	65
	skipped question	100

11. If your bees are near/on row crop areas--do you utilize any of the cooperative standards of the Mississippi Bee Stewardship Program with your farm host?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	30.6%	15
No	69.4%	34
	answered question	49
	skipped question	116

12. Do you have other standing pesticide mitigation arrangements/measures to protect your bees from pesticides on the host farm?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	10.3%	4
No	89.7%	35
	answered question	39
	skipped question	126

13. If your bees are near/on row crop areas --has the Mississippi Bee Stewardship Program enhanced the dialogue between you and your farm host?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	34.1%	15
No	65.9%	29
	answered question	**44**
	skipped question	**121**

14. If your bees are near/on row crop areas –do you discuss or have you ever discussed hive location on the farm with the landowner/operator prior to placement?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	47.9%	23
No	52.1%	25
	answered question	**48**
	skipped question	**117**

15. If your bees are near/on row crop areas –do you utilize the Bee Aware Flag to mark hive locations on the farm?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	19.1%	9
No	80.9%	38
	answered question	**47**
	skipped question	**118**

16. If your bees are near/on row crop areas–does your farm host take any precautions to reduce pesticide exposure to your bees?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	43.5%	20
No	56.5%	26
	answered question	**46**
	skipped question	**119**

17. Please indicate what portion of the state you farm (check all that apply).

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Northeast	5.3%	5
Delta	76.8%	73
Central	9.5%	9
South MS	3.2%	3
Blackbelt Prairie Area	6.3%	6
	answered question	**95**
	skipped question	**70**

18. Please indicate the commodities you produce (check all that apply):

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Cotton	35.5%	33
Rice	43.0%	40
Corn	68.8%	64
Soybeans	92.5%	86
Milo	39.8%	37
	answered question	**93**
	skipped question	**72**

19. How long have you been actively engaged in farming?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
0 to 5 years	3.2%	3
5 to 10 years	7.4%	7
10-15 years	12.8%	12
Over 15 years	76.6%	72
	answered question	**94**
	skipped question	**71**

20. Over the last 18 months, has your awareness of the importance of pollinator health been enhanced?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	97.8%	91
No	2.2%	2
	answered question	**93**
	skipped question	**72**

21. If Yes–please indicate the source of this information: Check all that apply

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
MSU Extension Service	76.7%	69
Farm Bureau	95.6%	86
Ag Press/Publications	66.7%	60
Other Farmers	22.2%	20
Social media	23.3%	21
Other Ag Industry Associations	31.1%	28
Other national or local media sources	24.4%	22
	answered question	**90**
	skipped question	**75**

22. Have you heard of the Mississippi Bee Stewardship Program?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	93.5%	86
No	6.5%	6
	answered question	**92**
	skipped question	**73**

23. Do you host bees on any portion of your farming operation?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	42.4%	39
No	57.6%	53
	answered question	**92**
	skipped question	**73**

24. If you host bees on your farm, do you utilize any of the cooperative standards of the Mississippi Bee Stewardship Program on your farm?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	61.1%	22
No	30.6%	11
N/A	8.3%	3
	answered question	**36**
	skipped question	**129**

25. Do you have other standing pesticide mitigation arrangements/measures to protect bees from pesticides on your farm?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	44.4%	16
No	52.8%	19
N/A	2.8%	1
	answered question	**36**
	skipped question	**129**

26. If you host bees on your farm–has the Mississippi Bee Stewardship Program enhanced the dialogue between you and your beekeeper?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	66.7%	24
No	13.9%	5

N/A	19.4%	7
	answered question	**36**
	skipped question	**129**

27. If you host bees on your farm–do you discuss or have you ever discussed hive location on the farm with your beekeeper prior to placement?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	66.7%	24
No	16.7%	6
N/A	16.7%	6
	answered question	**36**
	skipped question	**129**

28. If you host bees on your farm–do you encourage your host beekeeper to utilize the Bee Aware Flag to mark hive locations on your farm?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	45.7%	16
No	8.6%	3
Not Needed	31.4%	11
N/A	14.3%	5
	answered question	**35**
	skipped question	**130**

29. If you host bees on your farm–how do you modify or would you be willing to modify insecticide applications to better protect bees on the farm (check all that apply)?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Apply insecticides early in the morning	58.8%	20
Apply insecticides later in the afternoon	61.8%	21
Ensure wind velocity is low	82.4%	28
Utilize insecticides with less toxicity	23.5%	8
Avoid spraying during bloom	5.9%	2
Nothing	8.8%	3
	answered question	**34**
	skipped question	**131**

30. How do you typically apply insecticides on the farm?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Ground	25.3%	22
Air	9.2%	8
Both	65.5%	57
	answered question	**87**
	skipped question	**78**

31. Do you discuss or have you ever discussed insecticide applications in regard to protecting bees with (check all that apply)?

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Farm workers	45.1%	32
Ground applicators	45.1%	32
Aerial applicators	74.6%	53
Consultants/Scouts	59.2%	42
Surrounding Farmers	38.0%	27
	answered question	**71**
	skipped question	**94**

PPDC Pollinator Protection Plan Metrics WG - Meeting Minutes

3/15/2017

Attendees:
(in person) Mike Goodis, Lead; Meredith Laws; Tom Steeger; Dee Colby; Mary Clock-Rust; Cathryn Britton
(phone) Stephanie Binns (for Aaron Hobbs), Michele Colopy; Jim Fredericks; Tim Hatten; Dudley Hoskins; Rose Kachadoorian; Jeanette Klopchin; Jim Lyons; Jayme Mestes; Don Parker; Peg Perreault; Caydee Savinelli; Al Summers; Tim Tucker; Andy Whittington; Tim Joseph

Agenda (attached)
Welcome, Introductions, Ground Rules, Agenda Review – Mike
Workgroup members and guest speakers introduced themselves.

Review of Meeting Minutes from February 15, 2017 - Dee
Meeting minutes were finalized from the February meeting and will be posted on the PPDC website.

Report on progress of tribes – Mary Clock-Rust
The Tribal Pesticide Program Council (TPPC) Pollinator Protection Workgroup meets for conference calls monthly; check the website tppcwebsite.org/pollinators for information. During their March-meeting the Region 9 draft template for a pollinator protection plan was discussed, as well as, possible adaptations of the plan for other tribes. The template is a useful tool for any tribe developing a pollinator plan. It is comprehensive and can be adapted as needed for tribes that want to focus on protecting managed or non-managed bees, or more generalized pollinator protection goals (such as youth education). Development and adherence to the plan will be voluntary. The tribes in the TPPC Workgroup are primarily interested in protection of medicinal plants and native pollinators over managed bees (such as honey bees). An outstanding opportunity for training was offered by Dr. Diana Cox-Foster, Research Leader at the USDA ARS Pollinating Insects Research Center in Logan, Utah. The lab has developed a training program around native bees, their habitat and identification that tribes are welcome and encouraged to attend for no cost. Possible funding for travel and lodging is available for some tribes with cooperative agreements with some EPA Regions. For additional information, contact Mary at clock-rust.mary@epa.gov

Report from the Metrics Subgroup – Caydee Savinelli
Caydee started with a reminder of the top two common themes in MP3 Plans:

1) Improve communication; generates qualitative data
2) Outreach; potential for quantitative data

The Subgroup is considering two metric options. The first is a survey as a metric. They would like to have Extension Services' input in the development of questions and measures. Possible options for surveys include:

1) National survey, possibly via NASS
2) EPA guidance to states and tribes on survey topics and questions
3) States and tribes initiate surveys

The second metric option would be to assess state plans using a National Metrics Point System. The Subgroup asked for feedback on the following: who would collect and store the data, the cost and who would pay, developing survey details, and developing points for a National Metric

Discussion was generated on the question of pollinator health and how to measure it. We were reminded that the primary goal shared across plans was about changing behavior and as such, our measure should

consider outcomes of behavior first...to get to pollinator health. Ultimately, if those who are participating in plans are satisfied with the outcome it is because the plans improved pollinator health.
The charge for this Workgroup is not an easy task; it is complicated and nuanced. This may be where Extension Services could help with behavioral specialists and evaluation of ideas. Paul Mitchell, an Extension specialist at the University of Wisconsin has been working with the Subgroup this past month. He has a survey mechanism in place that the group would like to adapt based upon the Workgroup's needs. Proponents of the point system like the idea of evaluating all plans with one set of measures. Other agencies, such as APHIS, are generating a better indication of overall pollinator health with their metrics. Therefore, we shouldn't have to duplicate efforts. The Workgroup's focus should be metrics to evaluate pollinator plans.

During the next month, the Metrics Subgroup will develop an outline of a survey and a point system. They will try to get additional input from Extension Services. Tim Hatten would like to participate in the Subgroup this month.

Report from the Work Plan Subgroup – Members
A revised Work Plan was presented. Members wanted input about the direction forward in order to provide a more detailed plan prior to the full PPDC in May. It was suggested that the Workgroup has reviewed and considered enough of the existing resources on pollinator protection metrics to begin to develop a recommendation to the EPA. While there was agreement on that thought, the Workgroup would also like to hear from someone in Extension Services and possibly Claudio Gratin from WI about their Pollinator Protection Plan.

Discussion of metrics from multiple resources and Work Plan - Mike
Dialogue continued from the Subgroup reports and it was brought to the Workgroup's attention that approximately 15 of 596 tribes participate in TPPC in part due to variability in the size of land holdings, and as such, those tribes may not represent all tribes. Only the North Dakota Spirit Lake Tribe has a plan. Tribes do not have mechanisms in place to have MP3s. Tribes typically will not get involved with these plans and measures because the generation of data is not as important to tribes. This brought up a very relevant point in reference to plans and metrics which is, it is important for States to reach out to their stakeholders and be as inclusive as possible. It was suggested that a point system would encourage states to include as many stakeholders as possible if it increased their score.

The Subgroups were asked to continue their work and report again in April.

Meeting Recap – Dee
Metrics Subgroup (Subgroup II), going forward:

1) continue to work on the survey and point system approaches to measuring success of all States' plans,
2) contact Claudio Gratin from WI,
3) obtain and share copy of the Spirit Lake Tribe's plan, and
4) obtain additional input from Extension Services.

Work Plan Subgroup (Subgroup I) will continue to add detail to the existing framework, and possibly look at more specific deliverables.
Next teleconference date will be in April 2017...tentative date 04/13/2017
In-Person Meeting...May 2, 2017 1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. (full PPDC Meeting May 3-4, 2017)

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

DRAFT

Message

From: Miller, Wynne [Miller.Wynne@epa.gov]
Sent: 11/9/2018 9:21:18 PM
To: Charlotte Sanson [charlotte.sanson@adama.com]; ahobbs@pestfacts.org; aliebman@migrantclinician.org; allen@zvpate.com; amy@afschem.com; Andrew Thostenson [andrew.thostenson@ndsu.edu]; awhittington@msfb.org; charlotte.liang@fda.hhs.gov; damon@dairylandaviation.com; Daniel.Kunkel@rutgers.edu; djlajoie1985@hotmail.com; dtaylor@aradc.org; e.wakem@gmail.com; egjevre@cdatribe-nsn.gov; Eric Hoffman (eric.r.hoffman2.mil@mail.mil) [eric.r.hoffman2.mil@mail.mil]; Shultz, Gina [gina_shultz@fws.gov]; Gorman, John [Gorman.John@epa.gov]; ifigueroa@farmworkerjustice.org; Jim Fredericks (jfredericks@pestworld.org) [jfredericks@pestworld.org]; Jain, Komal (Komal_Jain@americanchemistry.com) [Komal_Jain@americanchemistry.com]; laburd@biologicaldiversity.org; leylamccurdy@outlook.com; Liza Fleeson [Liza.Fleeson@vdacs.virginia.gov]; nwilson@gowanco.com; Bishop, Patricia [PBishop@hsi.org]; Richard.gragg@famu.edu; sbennett@TheHCPA.org; Sheryl.Kunickis (Sheryl.Kunickis@osec.usda.gov) [Sheryl.Kunickis@osec.usda.gov]; Spalmer@cpda.com; sselvaggio@pesticide.org; tuckerb@hit.net; vroom@croplifeamerica.org; Walter Alarcon (wda7@cdc.gov) [wda7@cdc.gov]; secope29@gmail.com
CC: Jennings, Susan [Jennings.Susan@epa.gov]; Jewell, Shannon [jewell.shannon@epa.gov]
Subject: PPDC Public Health Workgroup

Hi PPDC Members:

Thank you for participating in last week's PPDC meeting. We especially appreciated your time and interest in discussing the work of the PPDC Public Health Workgroup.

As mentioned last week, there are several vacancies on the Public Health Workgroup that we would like to offer to any PPDC member who may be interested. We expect the time commitment to be a few hours per month, since the workgroup is planning to meet monthly until the next PPDC meeting (May 2019) to prepare the draft recommendations for the Emergency Preparedness and Action Plan. We anticipate breaking into small groups to work on the details for each core topic for the draft Emergency Preparedness and Action Plan (OPP Roles and Responsibilities; Identify and Engage Stakeholders; Pesticides, IPM and Other Control Tools; Communications; and Technology, Innovation, and Science). The small groups may meet more often than monthly, depending on the needs of the topic.

If you would like to join the PPDC Public Health Workgroup in its work on recommendations, please email both Wynne (Miller.Wynne@epa.gov) and Susan (Jennings.Susan@epa.gov) by Monday, November 19th. At that time, Susan will begin polling the members to determine the meeting times for the recurring meeting. At last week's PPDC meeting, Aaron Hobbs and Edward Wakem requested to join the Public Health Workgroup – so we have included added their names to the workgroup list below. If you have any questions, please let us know and we would be happy to respond. Once again, thank you for your participation in the PPDC!!

Best regards,
Wynne Miller
Director, Biological and Economic Analysis Division (BEAD)
Acting Deputy Director of Management, Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP)
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention (OCSPP)
(Phone) 703-308-8111
(Fax) 703-308-8091
Mail code 7503P
Room # PY S9724

Current list of members for the PPDC Public Health Workgroup:

1. Walter Alarcon, CDC
2. Jonathan Berger, BASF
3. Diane Boesenberg, Reckitt Benckiser Group
4. Elaine Black, EcoLab

5. Peter Connelly, AMVAC
6. Kamal Chauhan, USDA
7. Jim Fredericks, National Pest Management Association
8. Robyn C. Gilden, University of Maryland
9. Dawn Gouge, University of Arizona
10. Aaron Hobbs, Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment
11. Eric Hoffman, Armed Forces Pest Management Board
12. Karen Larson, Clarke
13. David Jones, Lonza
14. Kenneth McPherson, EPA/Region 6
15. Claudia Riegel, City of New Orleans
16. Julie Spagnoli, Industry Consultant
17. Kurt Vandock, Bayer
18. Edward Wakem, American Veterinary Medical Association
19. Mike Waldvogel, North Carolina State University
20. Jennifer Wren, Georgia Dept. of Ag

Message

From: Schaible, Stephen [Schaible.Stephen@epa.gov]
Sent: 7/10/2017 8:12:22 PM
To: Rosenblatt, Daniel [Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov]; Laws, Meredith [Laws.Meredith@epa.gov]; Davis, Kable [Davis.Kable@epa.gov]
CC: Davis, Donna [Davis.Donna@epa.gov]; Goodis, Michael [Goodis.Michael@epa.gov]; Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: PRIA Quarterly Stakeholder Meeting, July 12

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Stephen A. Schaible, PRIA Coordinator (acting)
Office of Pesticide Programs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
ph: (703)308-9362

From: Rosenblatt, Daniel
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 4:10 PM
To: Schaible, Stephen <Schaible.Stephen@epa.gov>; Laws, Meredith <Laws.Meredith@epa.gov>; Davis, Kable <Davis.Kable@epa.gov>
Cc: Davis, Donna <Davis.Donna@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>; Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: PRIA Quarterly Stakeholder Meeting, July 12

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

From: Schaible, Stephen
Sent: Thursday, July 06, 2017 6:21 PM
To: Laws, Meredith <Laws.Meredith@epa.gov>; Davis, Kable <Davis.Kable@epa.gov>
Cc: Davis, Donna <Davis.Donna@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>; Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: PRIA Quarterly Stakeholder Meeting, July 12

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Stephen A. Schaible, PRIA Coordinator (acting)
Office of Pesticide Programs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
ph: (703)308-9362

From: Phil Klein [mailto:philklein1992@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 06, 2017 5:35 PM
To: Schaible, Stephen <Schaible.Stephen@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: PRIA Quarterly Stakeholder Meeting, July 12

FYI.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Kelly Hoskins <Kelly.Hoskins@perrigo.com>
> **Date:** June 30, 2017 at 10:27:35 AM EDT
> **To:** Phil Klein <philklein1992@gmail.com>, Beau Greenwood <BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org>, Steve Goldberg <steven.goldberg@basf.com>, Bill Balek <bill@issa.com>, "Ambuter, Hal" <Hal.Ambuter@rb.com>, "Boesenberg, Diane" <Diane.Boesenberg@rb.com>, Ray McAllister <RMcAllister@croplifeamerica.org>, Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>, "charlottte.sanson@bayer.com" <charlottte.sanson@bayer.com>, "amassey@bio.org" <amassey@bio.org>, Clint Nesbitt <cnesbitt@bio.org>, "julie.schlekau@valent.com" <julie.schlekau@valent.com>, "nbreaux@dow.com" <nbreaux@dow.com>, "sspaulding@central.com" <sspaulding@central.com>, "monty.dickson@sygenta.com" <monty.dickson@sygenta.com>, "jennifer.mulcahy@solvay.com" <jennifer.mulcahy@solvay.com>, "steve.christenson@ecolab.com" <steve.christenson@ecolab.com>, John Wood <John.Wood@ecolab.com>, "nwilson@gowanco.com" <nwilson@gowanco.com>, Owen Caine <ocaine@cspa.org>, Kyle Kunkler <kkunkler@bio.org>, "kreiner@tsgusa.com" <kreiner@tsgusa.com>, "william.mccormick@clorox.com" <william.mccormick@clorox.com>, Komal Jain <komal_jain@americanchemistry.com>, "aroberts@lallemand.com" <aroberts@lallemand.com>, "david.jones@lonza.com" <david.jones@lonza.com>, "ted.head@ecolab.com" <ted.head@ecolab.com>, "julie.spagnoli@jmspconsultanting.com" <julie.spagnoli@jmspconsultanting.com>, John Conner <JConner@crowell.com>, "rslone@stepan.com" <rslone@stepan.com>, "connie.welch@toxcel.com" <connie.welch@toxcel.com>, "cindys@amvac-chemical.com" <cindys@amvac-chemical.com>, Laurie Flanagan <LFlanagan@dclrs.com>, "jkunstman@pbigordon.com"

<jkunstman@pbigordon.com>
Subject: RE: PRIA Quarterly Stakeholder Meeting, July 12

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

PR98-10 Update ?

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Kelly Hoskins | Manager of Regulatory Affairs
Sergeant's Pet Care Products, Inc. dba Perrigo Animal Health
10077 South 134th Street
Omaha, NE 68138-3710
T: (402) 938-7079
E: kelly.hoskins@perrigo.com | perrigoanimalhealth.com

Quality Affordable Healthcare Products® for Pets!

Perrigo® Animal Health

From: Phil Klein [mailto:philklein1992@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, June 30, 2017 7:47 AM
To: Beau Greenwood <BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org>; Steve Goldberg

<steven.goldberg@basf.com>; Bill Balek <bill@issa.com>; Ambuter, Hal <Hal.Ambuter@rb.com>; Boesenberg, Diane <Diane.Boesenberg@rb.com>; Ray McAllister <RMcAllister@croplifeamerica.org>; Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>; charlottte.sanson@bayer.com; amassey@bio.org; Clint Nesbitt <cnesbitt@bio.org>; julie.schlekau@valent.com; nbreaux@dow.com; sspaulding@central.com; monty.dickson@sygenta.com; jennifer.mulcahy@solvay.com; steve.christenson@ecolab.com; John Wood <John.Wood@ecolab.com>; nwilson@gowanco.com; Kelly Hoskins <Kelly.Hoskins@perrigo.com>; Owen Caine <ocaine@cspa.org>; Kyle Kunkler <kkunkler@bio.org>; kreiner@tsgusa.com; william.mccormick@clorox.com; Komal Jain <komal_jain@americanchemistry.com>; aroberts@lallemand.com; david.jones@lonza.com; ted.head@ecolab.com; julie.spagnoli@jmspconsultanting.com; John Conner <JConner@crowell.com>; rslone@stepan.com; connie.welch@toxcel.com; cindys@amvac-chemical.com; Laurie Flanagan <LFlanagan@dclrs.com>; jkunstman@pbigordon.com
Subject: Fwd: PRIA Quarterly Stakeholder Meeting, July 12

PRIA Steering Committee, Work team leaders and past participants - Please see the following email from Steve Schaible. The next PRIA Coalition quarterly meeting is July 12. If you have additional agenda topics please let Beau, Steve or me know. Trades please share with your membership and let us know if others will participate. Thanks, Phil Klein

Message

From: Schaible, Stephen [Schaible.Stephen@epa.gov]
Sent: 7/7/2017 5:27:23 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
Subject: Pet product issue: PRIA Quarterly Stakeholder Meeting, July 12

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

From: Davis, Kable
Sent: Friday, July 07, 2017 10:34 AM
To: Schaible, Stephen <Schaible.Stephen@epa.gov>; Laws, Meredith <Laws.Meredith@epa.gov>
Cc: Davis, Donna <Davis.Donna@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>; Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: PRIA Quarterly Stakeholder Meeting, July 12

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

From: Schaible, Stephen
Sent: Thursday, July 6, 2017 6:21:23 PM
To: Laws, Meredith; Davis, Kable
Cc: Davis, Donna; Rosenblatt, Daniel; Goodis, Michael; Keigwin, Richard
Subject: FW: PRIA Quarterly Stakeholder Meeting, July 12

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Stephen A. Schaible, PRIA Coordinator (acting)
Office of Pesticide Programs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
ph: (703)308-9362

From: Phil Klein [mailto:philklein1992@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 06, 2017 5:35 PM
To: Schaible, Stephen <Schaible.Stephen@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: PRIA Quarterly Stakeholder Meeting, July 12

FYI.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Kelly Hoskins <Kelly.Hoskins@perrigo.com>
Date: June 30, 2017 at 10:27:35 AM EDT
To: Phil Klein <philklein1992@gmail.com>, Beau Greenwood <BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org>, Steve Goldberg <steven.goldberg@basf.com>, Bill Balek <bill@issa.com>, "Ambuter, Hal" <Hal.Ambuter@rb.com>, "Boesenberg, Diane" <Diane.Boesenberg@rb.com>, Ray McAllister <RMcAllister@croplifeamerica.org>, Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>, "charlottte.sanson@bayer.com" <charlottte.sanson@bayer.com>, "amassey@bio.org" <amassey@bio.org>, Clint Nesbitt <cnesbitt@bio.org>, "julie.schlekau@valent.com" <julie.schlekau@valent.com>, "nbreaux@dow.com" <nbreaux@dow.com>, "sspaulding@central.com" <sspaulding@central.com>, "monty.dickson@sygenta.com" <monty.dickson@sygenta.com>, "jennifer.mulcahy@solvay.com" <jennifer.mulcahy@solvay.com>, "steve.christenson@ecolab.com" <steve.christenson@ecolab.com>, John Wood <John.Wood@ecolab.com>, "nwilson@gowanco.com" <nwilson@gowanco.com>, Owen Caine <ocaine@cspa.org>, Kyle Kunkler <kkunkler@bio.org>, "kreiner@tsgusa.com" <kreiner@tsgusa.com>, "william.mccormick@clorox.com" <william.mccormick@clorox.com>, Komal Jain <komal_jain@americanchemistry.com>, "aroberts@lallemand.com" <aroberts@lallemand.com>, "david.jones@lonza.com" <david.jones@lonza.com>, "ted.head@ecolab.com" <ted.head@ecolab.com>, "julie.spagnoli@jmspconsultanting.com" <julie.spagnoli@jmspconsultanting.com>, John Conner <JConner@crowell.com>, "rslone@stepan.com" <rslone@stepan.com>, "connie.welch@toxcel.com" <connie.welch@toxcel.com>, "cindys@amvac-chemical.com" <cindys@amvac-chemical.com>, Laurie Flanagan <LFlanagan@dclrs.com>, "jkunstman@pbigordon.com" <jkunstman@pbigordon.com>
Subject: RE: PRIA Quarterly Stakeholder Meeting, July 12

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

PR98-10 Update ?
Less Notification options, more PRIA submission requirements. I have heard it has been reviewed by the BC and sitting with the Directors.

2YR Conditional Registration

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Kelly Hoskins | Manager of Regulatory Affairs
Sergeant's Pet Care Products, Inc. dba Perrigo Animal Health
10077 South 134th Street
Omaha, NE 68138-3710
T: (402) 938-7079
E: kelly.hoskins@perrigo.com | perrigoanimalhealth.com

Quality Affordable Healthcare Products® for Pets!

Perrigo Animal Health

From: Phil Klein [mailto:philklein1992@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, June 30, 2017 7:47 AM
To: Beau Greenwood <BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org>; Steve Goldberg <steven.goldberg@basf.com>; Bill Balek <bill@issa.com>; Ambuter, Hal <Hal.Ambuter@rb.com>; Boesenberg, Diane <Diane.Boesenberg@rb.com>; Ray McAllister <RMcAllister@croplifeamerica.org>; Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>; charlottte.sanson@bayer.com; amassey@bio.org; Clint Nesbitt <cnesbitt@bio.org>; julie.schlekau@valent.com; nbreaux@dow.com; sspaulding@central.com; monty.dickson@sygenta.com; jennifer.mulcahy@solvay.com; steve.christenson@ecolab.com; John Wood <John.Wood@ecolab.com>; nwilson@gowanco.com; Kelly Hoskins <Kelly.Hoskins@perrigo.com>;

Owen Caine <ocaine@cspa.org>; Kyle Kunkler <kkunkler@bio.org>; kreiner@tsgusa.com; william.mccormick@clorox.com; Komal Jain <komal_jain@americanchemistry.com>; aroberts@lallemand.com; david.jones@lonza.com; ted.head@ecolab.com; julie.spagnoli@jmspconsultanting.com; John Conner <JConner@crowell.com>; rslone@stepan.com; connie.welch@toxcel.com; cindys@amvac-chemical.com; Laurie Flanagan <LFlanagan@dclrs.com>; jkunstman@pbigordon.com
Subject: Fwd: PRIA Quarterly Stakeholder Meeting, July 12

PRIA Steering Committee, Work team leaders and past participants - Please see the following email from Steve Schaible. The next PRIA Coalition quarterly meeting is July 12. If you have additional agenda topics please let Beau, Steve or me know. Trades please share with your membership and let us know if others will participate. Thanks, Phil Klein

Message

From: Keigwin, Richard [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=151BAABB6A2246A3A312F12A706C0A05-RICHARD P KEIGWIN JR]
Sent: 1/9/2018 8:47:37 PM
To: Johns, Linda [LJohns@mt.gov]
CC: Liza Fleeson [Liza.Fleeson@vdacs.virginia.gov]; ahobbs@pestfacts.org; Irene King [IKing@nmda.nmsu.edu]
Subject: Re: Speaker Invite for 2018 ASPCRO Conference

Linda—

Personal Matters / Ex. 6

—Rick

Rick Keigwin
Director, Office of Pesticide Programs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Phone: 703-305-7090
Website: www.epa.gov/pesticides
Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 9, 2018, at 11:58 AM, Johns, Linda <LJohns@mt.gov> wrote:

<image001.gif>
The Association of Structural Pest Control Regulatory Officials (ASPCRO) will hold its 2018 Annual Meeting August 20 – August 24 in San Antonio, TX. We are planning a session currently titled "Succession Planning: Pesticides & Regulation" on Thursday, August 23 at 8:00 AM and concluding at 9:00 AM. This session is follow-up from the 2017 Annual Meeting and thus we are extending this invitation to you to participate as one of the presenters for this session.

This session we will focus on planning and developing laws and regulations that are currently relevant yet flexible enough to address the future of the dynamic environment that is pesticides and the challenges often faced when undertaking such an effort. These may include those that are imposed by an organization itself or the paradigm shift from reactive to proactive regulations and related programs.

I would like the opportunity to discuss the session with you further. Please let me know of your availability and willingness to participate and when we may be able to schedule a conference call. In the interim, please do not hesitate to contact me or Irene King 9NM) Vice President & Planning Committee Chair, at IKing@nmda.nmsu.edu or (575) 646-2733 should you have any questions or need additional information.

Thank you and I look forward to hearing from you.

Linda Johns
Program Manager
Montana Department of Agriculture
302 North Roberts * PO Box 200201 * Helena, MT 59620-0201
Phone (406) 444-3676 * Fax (406) 444-9493
http://agr.mt.gov/Pesticides

"The individual who says it is not possible should move out of the way of those doing it" Tricia Cunningham

Message

From: Keigwin, Richard [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=151BAABB6A2246A3A312F12A706C0A05-RICHARD P KEIGWIN JR]
Sent: 1/3/2018 8:24:03 PM
To: Aaron Hobbs [ahobbs@pestfacts.org]
Subject: RE: CLA and EPA Smart Sectors - EPA West

I think it was a good introduction for the Smart Sectors team.

From: Aaron Hobbs [mailto:ahobbs@pestfacts.org]
Sent: Wednesday, January 03, 2018 3:03 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: CLA and EPA Smart Sectors - EPA West

Sadly, we just went in the wrong entrance. How do you think the call went today?

Aaron Hobbs
President
RISE, Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment
202-872-3861
www.pestfacts.org
www.debugthemyths.com

From: Keigwin, Richard [mailto:Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 03, 2018 1:15 PM
To: Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>
Subject: RE: CLA and EPA Smart Sectors - EPA West

The scenic route through the old EPA library, I'm sure. Happy New Year to you, as well!

From: Aaron Hobbs [mailto:ahobbs@pestfacts.org]
Sent: Wednesday, January 03, 2018 1:09 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: CLA and EPA Smart Sectors - EPA West

We went for a little walk through the building. Happy New Year.

Aaron Hobbs
RISE
202-872-3860
www.debugthemyths.com

On Jan 3, 2018, at 1:08 PM, Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov> wrote:

> OPP is on the line. Getting lots of music.
>
> ---
>
> **From:** Sharpe, Kristinn
> **Sent:** Wednesday, January 03, 2018 9:25 AM
> **To:** Fred Bosco <FBosco@croplifeamerica.org>; Subramanian, Hema <Subramanian.Hema@epa.gov>; Sachs, Robert <Sachs.Robert@epa.gov>; Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>; Corona, Elizabeth

<Corona.Elizabeth@epa.gov>; Sands, Jeffrey <sands.jeffrey@epa.gov>; janet collins <jcollins@croplifeamerica.org>; Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>; Jay Vroom <JVroom@croplifeamerica.org>; EPA Smart Sectors <sectors@epa.gov>; Beau Greenwood <BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org>; Fred Bosco <FBosco@croplifeamerica.org>; Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>; Jay Vroom <JVroom@croplifeamerica.org>; Beau Greenwood <BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org>
Cc: Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>; Shaw, Nena <Shaw.Nena@epa.gov>
Subject: CLA and EPA Smart Sectors - EPA West

Good morning and happy 2018 everyone!

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

If you are braving the cold and heading over here in person, please arrive a few minutes early to allow time to go through EPA's security screening. Please enter through EPA's West entrance on Constitution Ave (between 14th St and 12th St), and let the guards know you are here to see me. If you need more details, here is a helpful EPA website for visitors: https://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/visiting-epa-headquarters

This email is being sent to everyone who received the calendar invitation, so please forward to anyone who may not have been on the original invitation.

Thanks, and see you soon,
Kristinn

Kristinn L. Sharpe
Smart Sectors Program Liaison
Office of Policy, Immediate Office
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office: (202) 343-9062
Mobile: (202) 256-3126

<image001.png>

Message

From: Keigwin, Richard [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=151BAABB6A2246A3A312F12A706C0A05-RICHARD P KEIGWIN JR]
Sent: 1/3/2018 7:55:01 PM
To: Sharpe, Kristinn [Sharpe.Kristinn@epa.gov]
CC: Corona, Elizabeth [Corona.Elizabeth@epa.gov]
Subject: Re: CLA and EPA Smart Sectors - EPA West

Thanks Kristinn. I talking with Jay Vroom yesterday, he indicated that he'd be able to share their draft agenda in the near future. Once we have that, I'd be happy to work with OP on identifying speakers from EPA. At least a couple of Program and Regional offices, at least on the past, have/had ag advisors, so we might be able to tap into that network to identify speakers/participants from other offices.

Rick Keigwin
Director, Office of Pesticide Programs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Phone: 703-305-7090
Website: www.epa.gov/pesticides
Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 3, 2018, at 2:47 PM, Sharpe, Kristinn <Sharpe.Kristinn@epa.gov> wrote:

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Kristinn L. Sharpe
Smart Sectors Program Liaison
Office of Policy, Immediate Office
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office: (202) 343-9062
Mobile: (202) 256-3126

<image002.png>

From: Keigwin, Richard
Sent: Wednesday, January 03, 2018 1:08 PM
To: Sharpe, Kristinn <Sharpe.Kristinn@epa.gov>
Cc: Jay Vroom <JVroom@croplifeamerica.org>; Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>; janet collins <jcollins@croplifeamerica.org>; Beau Greenwood <BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org>
Subject: RE: CLA and EPA Smart Sectors - EPA West

OPP is on the line. Getting lots of music.

From: Sharpe, Kristinn
Sent: Wednesday, January 03, 2018 9:25 AM
To: Fred Bosco <FBosco@croplifeamerica.org>; Subramanian, Hema <Subramanian.Hema@epa.gov>; Sachs, Robert <Sachs.Robert@epa.gov>; Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>; Corona, Elizabeth <Corona.Elizabeth@epa.gov>; Sands, Jeffrey <sands.jeffrey@epa.gov>; janet collins <jcollins@croplifeamerica.org>; Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>; Jay Vroom <JVroom@croplifeamerica.org>; EPA Smart Sectors <sectors@epa.gov>; Beau Greenwood <BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org>; Fred Bosco <FBosco@croplifeamerica.org>; Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>; Jay Vroom <JVroom@croplifeamerica.org>; Beau Greenwood <BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org>
Cc: Hughes, Hayley <hughes.hayley@epa.gov>; Shaw, Nena <Shaw.Nena@epa.gov>
Subject: CLA and EPA Smart Sectors - EPA West

Good morning and happy 2018 everyone!

I am looking forward to our meeting this afternoon at 1 p.m. in 4128 EPA West. If you are calling in, the

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

If you are braving the cold and heading over here in person, please arrive a few minutes early to allow time to go through EPA's security screening. Please enter through EPA's West entrance on Constitution Ave (between 14th St and 12th St), and let the guards know you are here to see me. If you need more details, here is a helpful EPA website for visitors: https://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/visiting-epa-headquarters

This email is being sent to everyone who received the calendar invitation, so please forward to anyone who may not have been on the original invitation.

Thanks, and see you soon,
Kristinn

Kristinn L. Sharpe
Smart Sectors Program Liaison
Office of Policy, Immediate Office
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office: (202) 343-9062
Mobile: (202) 256-3126

<image003.png>

Message

From: Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
Sent: 7/7/2017 5:38:34 PM
To: Schaible, Stephen [Schaible.Stephen@epa.gov]
Subject: Re: Pet product issue: PRIA Quarterly Stakeholder Meeting, July 12

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Rick Keigwin
Acting Director, Office of Pesticide Programs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 7, 2017, at 1:27 PM, Schaible, Stephen <Schaible.Stephen@epa.gov> wrote:

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

From: Davis, Kable
Sent: Friday, July 07, 2017 10:34 AM
To: Schaible, Stephen <Schaible.Stephen@epa.gov>; Laws, Meredith <Laws.Meredith@epa.gov>
Cc: Davis, Donna <Davis.Donna@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>; Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: PRIA Quarterly Stakeholder Meeting, July 12

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

From: Schaible, Stephen
Sent: Thursday, July 6, 2017 6:21:23 PM
To: Laws, Meredith; Davis, Kable

Cc: Davis, Donna; Rosenblatt, Daniel; Goodis, Michael; Keigwin, Richard
Subject: FW: PRIA Quarterly Stakeholder Meeting, July 12

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Stephen A. Schaible, PRIA Coordinator (acting)
Office of Pesticide Programs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
ph: (703)308-9362

From: Phil Klein [mailto:philklein1992@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 06, 2017 5:35 PM
To: Schaible, Stephen <Schaible.Stephen@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: PRIA Quarterly Stakeholder Meeting, July 12

FYI.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Kelly Hoskins <Kelly.Hoskins@perrigo.com>
> **Date:** June 30, 2017 at 10:27:35 AM EDT
> **To:** Phil Klein <philklein1992@gmail.com>, Beau Greenwood <BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org>, Steve Goldberg <steven.goldberg@basf.com>, Bill Balek <bill@issa.com>, "Ambuter, Hal" <Hal.Ambuter@rb.com>, "Boesenberg, Diane" <Diane.Boesenberg@rb.com>, Ray McAllister <RMcAllister@croplifeamerica.org>, Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>, "charlottte.sanson@bayer.com" <charlottte.sanson@bayer.com>, "amassey@bio.org" <amassey@bio.org>, Clint Nesbitt <cnesbitt@bio.org>, "julie.schlekau@valent.com" <julie.schlekau@valent.com>, "nbreaux@dow.com" <nbreaux@dow.com>, "sspaulding@central.com" <sspaulding@central.com>, "monty.dickson@sygenta.com" <monty.dickson@sygenta.com>, "jennifer.mulcahy@solvay.com" <jennifer.mulcahy@solvay.com>, "steve.christenson@ecolab.com" <steve.christenson@ecolab.com>, John Wood <John.Wood@ecolab.com>, "nwilson@gowanco.com" <nwilson@gowanco.com>, Owen Caine <ocaine@cspa.org>, Kyle Kunkler

<kkunkler@bio.org>, "kreiner@tsgusa.com" <kreiner@tsgusa.com>, "william.mccormick@clorox.com" <william.mccormick@clorox.com>, Komal Jain <komal_jain@americanchemistry.com>, "aroberts@lallemand.com" <aroberts@lallemand.com>, "david.jones@lonza.com" <david.jones@lonza.com>, "ted.head@ecolab.com" <ted.head@ecolab.com>, "julie.spagnoli@jmspconsultanting.com" <julie.spagnoli@jmspconsultanting.com>, John Conner <JConner@crowell.com>, "rslone@stepan.com" <rslone@stepan.com>, "connie.welch@toxcel.com" <connie.welch@toxcel.com>, "cindys@amvac-chemical.com" <cindys@amvac-chemical.com>, Laurie Flanagan <LFlanagan@dclrs.com>, "jkunstman@pbigordon.com" <jkunstman@pbigordon.com>
Subject: RE: PRIA Quarterly Stakeholder Meeting, July 12

Phil,
I will be attending in person.

Outstanding issues off the top of my head, these are not necessary tied directly to PRIA but could/should.

PR98-10 Update ?
Less Notification options, more PRIA submission requirements. I have heard it has been reviewed by the BC and sitting with the Directors.

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Kelly Hoskins | Manager of Regulatory Affairs
Sergeant's Pet Care Products, Inc. dba Perrigo Animal Health

10077 South 134th Street
Omaha, NE 68138-3710
T: (402) 938-7079
E: kelly.hoskins@perrigo.com | perrigoanimalhealth.com

Quality Affordable Healthcare Products® for Pets!
<image002.png>

From: Phil Klein [mailto:philklein1992@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, June 30, 2017 7:47 AM
To: Beau Greenwood <BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org>; Steve Goldberg <steven.goldberg@basf.com>; Bill Balek <bill@issa.com>; Ambuter, Hal <Hal.Ambuter@rb.com>; Boesenberg, Diane <Diane.Boesenberg@rb.com>; Ray McAllister <RMcAllister@croplifeamerica.org>; Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>; charlottte.sanson@bayer.com; amassey@bio.org; Clint Nesbitt <cnesbitt@bio.org>; julie.schlekau@valent.com; nbreaux@dow.com; sspaulding@central.com; monty.dickson@sygenta.com; jennifer.mulcahy@solvay.com; steve.christenson@ecolab.com; John Wood <John.Wood@ecolab.com>; nwilson@gowanco.com; Kelly Hoskins <Kelly.Hoskins@perrigo.com>; Owen Caine <ocaine@cspa.org>; Kyle Kunkler <kkunkler@bio.org>; kreiner@tsgusa.com; william.mccormick@clorox.com; Komal Jain <komal_jain@americanchemistry.com>; aroberts@lallemand.com; david.jones@lonza.com; ted.head@ecolab.com; julie.spagnoli@jmspconsultanting.com; John Conner <JConner@crowell.com>; rslone@stepan.com; connie.welch@toxcel.com; cindys@amvac-chemical.com; Laurie Flanagan <LFlanagan@dclrs.com>; jkunstman@pbigordon.com
Subject: Fwd: PRIA Quarterly Stakeholder Meeting, July 12

PRIA Steering Committee, Work team leaders and past participants - Please see the following email from Steve Schaible. The next PRIA Coalition quarterly meeting is July 12. If you have additional agenda topics please let Beau, Steve or me know. Trades please share with your membership and let us know if others will participate. Thanks, Phil Klein

Message

From: Keigwin, Richard [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=151BAABB6A2246A3A312F12A706C0A05-RICHARD P KEIGWIN JR]
Sent: 5/15/2017 3:37:38 PM
To: Jewell, Shannon [jewell.shannon@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Checking in // RE: Need to schedule a WPS rulemaking meeting

Yes, we should send out the invite for the OPP Town Hall – 2:00-3:30pm on Monday, 5/22. Thanks.

From: Jewell, Shannon
Sent: Monday, May 15, 2017 11:33 AM
To: Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Checking in // RE: Need to schedule a WPS rulemaking meeting

Hi Rick – In addition to the list below from Friday, I wanted to ask about an OPP invitation for the Town Hall, as nothing has gone out yet.

Subject: Checking in // RE: Need to schedule a WPS rulemaking meeting

Hi Rick,

I put this on the WPS meeting on the schedule – on Thursday the 18th at 1pm. However, you now have no breaks (other than lunch) on the 18th, and Kevin Keaney mentioned wanting to schedule another meeting. I was wondering if you would like me to reschedule the Path Fwd on Glyphosate meeting currently scheduled for the 18th at 2pm, and place a hold on that hour to carve out some time. Just say yea if so and let me know how soon it would need to be rescheduled.

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

From: Keigwin, Richard
Sent: Friday, May 12, 2017 12:46 PM
To: Mosby, Jackie <Mosby.Jackie@epa.gov>; Keaney, Kevin <Keaney.Kevin@epa.gov>
Cc: Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>
Subject: Need to schedule a WPS rulemaking meeting

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

Rick Keigwin
Acting Director, Office of Pesticide Programs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Sent from my iPhone

Message

From: Keigwin, Richard [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=151BAABB6A2246A3A312F12A706C0A05-RICHARD P KEIGWIN JR]
Sent: 1/30/2018 11:27:15 PM
To: Aaron Hobbs [ahobbs@pestfacts.org]
Subject: RE: Speaker Invite for 2018 ASPCRO Conference

Personal Matters / Ex. 6

From: Aaron Hobbs [mailto:ahobbs@pestfacts.org]
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 4:53 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Speaker Invite for 2018 ASPCRO Conference

Personal Matters / Ex. 6

Aaron Hobbs
President
RISE, Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment
202-872-3861
www.pestfacts.org
www.debugthemyths.com

From: Keigwin, Richard [mailto:Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 09, 2018 3:48 PM
To: Johns, Linda <LJohns@mt.gov>
Cc: Liza Fleeson <Liza.Fleeson@vdacs.virginia.gov>; Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>; Irene King <IKing@nmda.nmsu.edu>
Subject: Re: Speaker Invite for 2018 ASPCRO Conference

Linda—

Thanks for your note and invitation. I so much enjoyed the panel discussion last summer in Vermont and I'm glad to see that there is an interest in continuing the dialogue.

Personal Matters / Ex. 6

—Rick

Rick Keigwin
Director, Office of Pesticide Programs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Phone: 703-305-7090
Website: www.epa.gov/pesticides
Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 9, 2018, at 11:58 AM, Johns, Linda <LJohns@mt.gov> wrote:

<image001.gif>
The Association of Structural Pest Control Regulatory Officials (ASPCRO) will hold its 2018 Annual Meeting August 20 – August 24 in San Antonio, TX. We are planning a session currently titled "Succession Planning: Pesticides & Regulation" on Thursday, August 23 at 8:00 AM and concluding at 9:00 AM. This session is follow-up from the 2017 Annual Meeting and thus we are extending this invitation to you to participate as one of the presenters for this session.

This session we will focus on planning and developing laws and regulations that are currently relevant yet flexible enough to address the future of the dynamic environment that is pesticides and the challenges often faced when undertaking such an effort. These may include those that are imposed by an organization itself or the paradigm shift from reactive to proactive regulations and related programs.

I would like the opportunity to discuss the session with you further. Please let me know of your availability and willingness to participate and when we may be able to schedule a conference call. In the interim, please do not hesitate to contact me or Irene King 9NM) Vice President & Planning Committee Chair, at IKing@nmda.nmsu.edu or (575) 646-2733 should you have any questions or need additional information.

Thank you and I look forward to hearing from you.

Linda Johns
Program Manager
Montana Department of Agriculture
302 North Roberts * PO Box 200201 * Helena, MT 59620-0201
Phone (406) 444-3676 * Fax (406) 444-9493
http://agr.mt.gov/Pesticides

"The individual who says it is not possible should move out of the way of those doing it" Tricia Cunningham

Message

From: Keigwin, Richard [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=151BAABB6A2246A3A312F12A706C0A05-RICHARD P KEIGWIN JR]
Sent: 3/28/2018 3:27:13 PM
To: Jewell, Shannon [jewell.shannon@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: CLA/RISE Regulatory Conference

Let's say that we will get back to him asap; Elissa is out this week for spring break and I want to make sure that she is okay with making the presentation.

From: Jewell, Shannon
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2018 11:26 AM
To: Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: CLA/RISE Regulatory Conference

Rick, In Darlene and Elissa's absence, do you think I should answer "yes" *or* tell Ray that we will get him an answer asap re: his question directly below?

From: Ray McAllister [mailto:RMcAllister@croplifeamerica.org]
Sent: Wednesday, March 28, 2018 10:20 AM
To: Schaible, Stephen <Schaible.Stephen@epa.gov>
Cc: Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Stephanie Ann Binns <sbinns@pestfacts.org>; Courtney DeMarco <cdemarco@croplifeamerica.org>; Jewell, Shannon <jewell.shannon@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: CLA/RISE Regulatory Conference

Darlene & Elissa:

Can we add Elissa to the speakers list for the CLA/RISE Regulatory conference, to speak on CATSAC?

Ray S. McAllister, PhD
Senior Director Regulatory Policy
CropLife America
O: 202-872-3874 C: 202-577-6657
ray@croplife.us

From: Schaible, Stephen <Schaible.Stephen@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 27, 2018 5:07 PM
To: Ray McAllister <RMcAllister@croplifeamerica.org>
Cc: Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: [PRIA-Implement] Fwd: March 7 PRIA Quarterly Meeting

Hi Ray,

Yes, the CATSAC is the new name for the Similarity Clinic function. With regard to the follow-up questions below, I am cc'ing Elissa Reaves, who presented this information at the PRIA Quarterly meeting and chairs that committee.

Best regards, Steve

Stephen A. Schaible, PRIA Coordinator
Office of Pesticide Programs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20460
ph: (703)308-9362

From: Ray McAllister [mailto:RMcAllister@croplifeamerica.org]
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2018 11:09 AM
To: Schaible, Stephen <Schaible.Stephen@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: [PRIA-Implement] Fwd: March 7 PRIA Quarterly Meeting
Importance: High

Steve:

I'm sorry I missed the recent Quarterly update. Y Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ray S. McAllister, PhD
Senior Director Regulatory Policy
CropLife America
O: 202-872-3874 C: 202-577-6657
ray@croplife.us

From: PRIA-Implement@yahoogroups.com <PRIA-Implement@yahoogroups.com> **On Behalf Of** Laurie Flanagan lflanagan@dclrs.com [PRIA-Implement]
Sent: Tuesday, March 6, 2018 6:17 PM
To: Laurie Flanagan <lflanagan@dclrs.com>; Steven Goldberg <steven.goldberg@basf.com>; Komal Jain <Komal_Jain@americanchemistry.com>; Clint Nesbitt <cnesbitt@bio.org>; David Crow <dcrow@dclrs.com>; Zumwalt, Bryan <Bryan_Zumwalt@americanchemistry.com>; Owen Caine <ocaine@cspa.org>; Beau Greenwood <BGreenwood@croplifeamerica.org>; Hunt Shipman <hshipman@cgagroup.com>; Duvall, Amy (Amy_Duvall@americanchemistry.com) <Amy_Duvall@americanchemistry.com>; Ethan Mathews <emathews@croplifeamerica.org>; Bill Balek (BILL@issa.com) <BILL@issa.com>; Kyle Kunkler <kkunkler@bio.org>; Aaron Hobbs <ahobbs@pestfacts.org>; David Beaudreau <dbeaudreau@dclrs.com>; Keith Jones <jones@bpia.org>; ddavis@cpda.com; Karen Reardon <kreardon@pestfacts.org>; pria-implement@yahoogroups.com
Subject: [PRIA-Implement] Fwd: March 7 PRIA Quarterly Meeting

FYI, updated slides for tomorrow's quarterly meeting are attached. It's simply a date correction on one of the slides.

Sent from my iPad

--

Regards,

Laurie-Ann Flanagan

Executive Vice President

D.C. Legislative and Regulatory Services, Inc.

2221 S. Clark Street, 11th Floor

Arlington, VA 22202

(202) 872-4850

Posted by: Laurie Flanagan <lflanagan@dclrs.com>

Reply via web post • Reply to sender • Reply to group • Start a New Topic • Messages in this topic (2)

Have you tried the highest rated email app?
With 4.5 stars in iTunes, the Yahoo Mail app is the highest rated email app on the market. What are you waiting for? Now you can access all your inboxes (Gmail, Outlook, AOL and more) in one place. Never delete an email again with 1000GB of free cloud storage.

VISIT YOUR GROUP

• Privacy • Unsubscribe • Terms of Use