Message

From: Caughie, Nuala [Caughie.Nuala@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/3/2021 9:50:19 PM
To: AO OPA OMR CLIPS [AO_OPA_OMR_CLIPS@epa.gov]
Subject: Daily News Clips: Afternoon Edition 3/3/2021

Chemicals

Seresto flea collars named in thousands of complaints involving nearly 1,700 pet deaths
Popular flea collar linked to 1,700 pet deaths across U.S.
EPA issued no warning about popular flea collar linked to 1,700 pet deaths: Report

Water

Arizona agency investigates water contamination from base

Policy

Republicans press Biden environment nominee on Obama-era policies
Biden EPA nominee takes heat for role in Obama Clean Power Plan
Biden Picks Grilled on Clean Power, Stay on Confirmation Path

Emissions

California Air and Climate Vol 18: EPA Waiver to CARB Regarding "Non-Road" Diesel Engine Regulations Upheld; Phasing Out Agricultural Burning in San Joaquin Valley by 2025

Seresto flea collars named in thousands of complaints involving nearly 1,700 pet deaths

https://www.consumeraffairs.com/news/seresto-flea-collars-named-in-thousands-of-complaints-involving-nearly-1700-pet-deaths-030321.html

A top-selling flea and tick collar has reportedly been linked to nearly 1,700 pet deaths and 1,000 incidents involving harm to humans, according to the Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting.

The group says Seresto pet collars have been named in approximately 75,000 incident reports with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), but the agency has yet to issue an official warning about the apparent risks of the collars.

"The EPA appears to be turning a blind eye to this problem, and after seven years of an increasing number of incidents, they are telling the public that they are continuing to monitor the situation," Karen McCormack, a former EPA official, said of the agency, according to the report. "But I think this is a significant problem that needs to be addressed sooner rather than later."

McCormack added that Seresto collars, which are developed by Bayer and manufactured by Elenco, "has the most incidents of any pesticide pet product" she's ever seen.

EPA responds

Seresto's pet collar works by slowly releasing chemicals into the pet's body over time. The active ingredients are imidacloprid and flumethrin. The former affects the central nervous system of fleas, and the latter repels and kills ticks.

In the report, an EPA spokesperson was quoted as saying that no pesticide "is completely without harm."

"EPA ensures that there are measures on the product label that reduce risk," the spokesperson said. "Some pets, however, like some humans, are more sensitive than others and may experience adverse symptoms after treatment."

In another statement, the agency appeared to place some of the blame for its inaction on the Trump administration

"Under the Biden-Harris Administration EPA has returned to its core mission, which includes protecting our pets' health," the statement said. "We take every incident reported seriously and review these data to see whether action is necessary."

The agency said it "encourages pet owners to read the entire label before using the pesticide product and follow all directions carefully, including monitoring your pet after application to see if side effects occur. If side effects develop, the label tells the consumer to consult the pet's veterinarian immediately."

Consumer reviews

As of June 2020, the collars have been linked to numerous incidents involving both pet and human harm, according to EPA documents.

Consumers reviewing the product on Amazon have said they noticed changes in their pet's behavior that appeared to crop up in connection with the use of the collar. Others have claimed the collar caused skin rashes or neurological issues in their pets.

"Put this collar on my 10 pound Maltese and 14 pound Shih Tzu in May 2016," one reviewer said. "Within 3 days the Shih Tzu was laying in his bed all day whining and every time I picked him up he would cry out, as if he was in pain.... take the collar off, bathe him AND by the next morning he is back to normal!!!! Called my Vet and Bayer and was told he must be allergic to an ingredient in the collar."

Although the number of reported incidents may be far fewer than the number of incidents that have actually occurred, the sheer volume should be a cause for concern for pet owners. Nathan Donley, a senior scientist at the Center for Biological Diversity and an expert on U.S. pesticide regulation, told USA Today that the reported incidents are "just the tip of the iceberg."

"My God, if this doesn't trigger a concern, that's a fundamental problem with the process," Donley said in the report. "The fact that EPA has not done anything to alert the public that there might be an issue here, it strikes me as bordering on criminal. The EPA has this system in place to compile information and it's just collecting dust in some database."

Popular flea collar linked to 1,700 pet deaths across U.S.

https://www.ajc.com/news/popular-flea-collar-linked-to-1700-pet-deaths-across-us/N6ECNWGBYJCRLP6Q7M6KL4AT6M/

Seresto collar still being sold on Amazon; EPA hasn't warned public of any potential risks

A popular flea and tick collar has been linked to nearly 1,700 pet deaths across the country, according to reports citing documents obtained from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

The Seresto collar, which can be worn for months as it releases small amounts of pesticide onto an animal's fur, is also suspected of sickening or injuring tens of thousands of cats and dogs as well as hundreds of their owners, reports said.

Seresto, developed by Bayer in 2012 and distributed by Elanco, is the top-selling collar on Amazon and is widely advertised as being safe for pets.

But the EPA — which regulates pesticides — has not warned the public to any potential risks of using the product despite receiving at least 1,698 reports of deadly incidents since the collar arrived on the market.

The federal agency has received more than 75,000 incident reports related to the collars, including nearly 1,000 reports of human illnesses through June 2020, according to USA Today.

The alarming number of deaths was known behind the scenes for years but only became public knowledge after the Center for Biological Diversity — a nonprofit watchdog group — obtained documents from the EPA through a public records request.

"The EPA appears to be turning a blind eye to this problem, and after seven years of an increasing number of incidents, they are telling the public that they are continuing to monitor the situation," said Karen McCormack, a retired EPA employee who called the staggering number of deaths and illnesses unprecedented. "I think this is a significant problem that needs to be addressed sooner rather than later."

It's unclear how Seresto compares to the safety of other pet collars.

A spokesperson for the agency told USA Today that the two pesticides found in Seresto were "eligible for continued registration" based on the latest scientific data and testing.

"No pesticide is completely without harm, but EPA ensures that there are measures on the product label that reduce risk," the spokesperson wrote in an email. "The product label is the law, and applicators must follow label directions. Some pets, however, like some humans, are more sensitive than others and may experience adverse symptoms after treatment."

Through the years, the collar had received numerous complaints from customers who claimed the collar had caused pets skin rashes and neurological issues.

In one case last year, a New Jersey veterinarian suggested an owner buy the Bayer Seresto collar for use on her indoor service animal.

Rhonda Bomwell's 9-year-old Papillon suffered a seizure June 2 after wearing the collar for one day, reports said.

The dog, Pierre, collapsed and stopped breathing.

Bomwell said she administered CPR but never thought to remove the collar. She rushed Pierre to the hospital, but he died before receiving treatment.

"I just didn't put it together," she said, noting that she had never used a flea and tick collar before.

EPA issued no warning about popular flea collar linked to 1,700 pet deaths: Report

https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/news/epa-issued-no-warning-on-collar-linked-to-pet-deaths

The Environmental Protection Agency did not warn consumers about a popular flea and tick collar that's been linked to 1,700 pet deaths despite having documents indicating that it caused hundreds of pet deaths and thousands of injuries.

Seresto, a collar developed by Bayer and sold by Elanco, works by releasing small amounts of pesticide onto the animal wearing it for months at a time, according to a report by the Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting.

The pesticide is used to kill fleas, ticks, and other pests, but it is supposed to be safe for dogs and cats. However, the effects of the collar have hurt thousands of animals, including Rhonda Bomwell's 9-year-old Papillon service dog named Pierre.

Bomwell, of New Jersey, purchased a collar after it was recommended by her veterinarian, but a day after Pierre began wearing the Seresto collar, he had a seizure, collapsed with his eyes rolled back, and stopped breathing.

"I just didn't put it together," Bomwell said, referring to his death being linked to the collar.

Since Seresto collars were introduced in 2012, the EPA has received at least 1,698 incident reports of pet deaths. Through June 2020, the agency had more than 75,000 incident reports, including almost 1,000 that involved human harm.

Karen McCormack, a retired EPA employee who worked as a scientist and communications officer, said the agency knew of the risks but did not inform the public and that the collars had the most incident reports of any pesticide pet product she's ever seen.

"The EPA appears to be turning a blind eye to this problem, and after seven years of an increasing number of incidents, they are telling the public that they are continuing to monitor the situation, but I think this is a significant problem that needs to be addressed sooner rather than later," McCormack said.

The EPA, which is in charge of regulating products that contain pesticides, told the *Washington Examiner* that the agency takes reported incidents seriously and encourages pet owners to look carefully at a product's label before deciding to use it.

"Under the Biden-Harris Administration, EPA has returned to its core mission, which includes protecting our pets' health," an agency spokesperson said via email. "We take every incident reported seriously and review these data to see whether action is necessary. EPA encourages pet owners to read the entire label before using the pesticide product and follow all directions carefully, including monitoring your pet after application to see if side effects occur. If side effects develop, the label tells the consumer to consult the pet's veterinarian immediately."

Keri McGrath, a spokeswoman for Elanco, said that the company takes the safety of their products "very seriously and thoroughly investigates potential concerns related to their use."

McGrath also said global data shows 1 in 568 users of Seresto have an incident and that the majority are "nonserious effects," such as reddening of skin or hair loss below the collar.

"Keep in mind that the existence of an adverse event report does not necessarily mean the product caused the problem," McGrath said. "Causality between the observed signs and the use of the product is evaluated on a case-by-case basis. That said, every adverse event collected, regardless of causality, is reported to the authorities."

But Ron Packard, a Massachusetts resident who created a Facebook page to raise awareness of the issue, is asking people to share their stories and help prevent others from losing their beloved pets. His two dogs died shortly after wearing the Seresto collars. Packard is encouraging everyone to report their story to the EPA.

"I don't want others to go through what we went through," Packard said. "Every time I read the stories, it brings me back to my dogs. But if I can save a few pets, I can deal with it."

Arizona agency investigates water contamination from base

https://www.theintelligencer.com/news/article/Arizona-agency-investigates-water-contamination-15997473.php

PHOENIX (AP) — The Arizona agency that regulates utilities is calling together water companies near Luke Air Force Base in metro Phoenix, where drinking water was found to be contaminated with chemicals commonly found in firefighting foam.

The Arizona Corporation Commission was holding an emergency open meeting Wednesday afternoon to discuss the recent discovery of the chemicals — which prompted the U.S. Air Force to start distributing bottled water to thousands of residents and business owners.

Commissioner Anna Tovar has encouraged affected residents to join the meeting being held online.

"I want to make sure the residents and businesses near the base can trust the water coming out of their taps," Tovar said before the meeting.

Luke Air Force Base said in February that studies showed high levels of contaminants had affected drinking water for about 6,000 people in roughly 1,600 homes plus several neighboring businesses.

The base has recommended that people in the affected area use bottled water for drinking and cooking but deemed tap water safe for bathing and laundry.

In the meantime, a contractor is delivering drinking water to homes until a long-term filtration facility can be set up in April, a base spokesman said last week.

Similar contamination tied to the use of firefighting foam has been found in water supplies near dozens of military sites in Arizona, Colorado and other states, triggering hundreds of lawsuits.

Growing evidence that it is dangerous to be exposed to the chemicals found in the foam has prompted the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to consider setting a maximum level for those chemicals in drinking water nationwide.

But they aren't regulated now, meaning the base cannot be punished even though the EPA says the chemicals stay in the body for long periods and may cause adverse health effects.

The Arizona Department of Environmental Quality has said it is working with the base, regulators and federal and local officials to ensure actions are taken to ensure healthy drinking water for residents.

A statement from Luke Air Force Base last month said testing had detected levels of perfluorooctanoic acid and perfluorooctane sulfonate above the EPA's health advisory for how much should be consumed in drinking water over a person's lifetime.

The so-called forever chemicals from a class known collectively as PFAS were found during tests of water from Valley Utilities Water Co.

The compounds are used in many industrial and consumer products and in foam used by commercial industries and the armed services to extinguish fuel fires.

The U.S. Air Force Academy in 2019 said unsafe levels of PFAS were found in groundwater at four sites on its Colorado Springs campus, south of Denver. The chemicals also have been discovered around the Peterson Air Force Base in Colorado Springs.

Republicans press Biden environment nominee on Obama-era policies

https://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/541441-republicans-press-biden-environment-nominee-on-obama-era-policies

Republicans senators pressed one of President Biden's nominees for a major environmental post on a power plant regulation she helped promulgate during the Obama administration.

The lawmakers on the Environment and Public Works Committee particularly honed in on the regulation during a hearing to examine Janet McCabe's nomination to be deputy Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) administrator and that of Brenda Mallory to lead the White House Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ).

"Do you believe that the EPA has the authority to...regulate a power plant's carbon dioxide emissions outside the fence line as the Clean Power Plan did?" the panel's top Republican, Sen. Shelly Moore Capito (W.Va.), asked McCabe.

"The Clean Power Plan was one of the most important and impactful rules that we worked on during the Obama administration," McCabe said.

"We've never had a legal ruling on that very question and certainly we would not have put that rule forward if we did not believe we were acting within the four corners of the Clean Air Act," she added.

Sen. Kevin Cramer (R-N.D.) called the Clean Power Plan "one of the most overbearing, big government impositions on states," and told McCabe she has "a lot to answer for."

"I know that there were many who disagreed with the outcome of that rule, but in terms of listening to people and hearing people and taking everybody's perspective into account, we certainly did that," McCabe replied. "The rule was about carbon emissions...but what we tried to do in that rule was build a very flexible approach."

During his own confirmation hearing, Biden's pick to lead the agency, Michael Regan, pledged to operate with a "clean slate."

During the Obama administration, McCabe served as acting assistant administrator of the EPA's Office of Air and Radiation. If confirmed, she'd be the agency's second-in-comment.

Mallory served as the CEQ's top lawyer during the Obama administration. In her new role, she would take charge of an office that deals with the implementation of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and advises the president on issues like environmental justice, public lands and wildlife conservation.

She may take action to reverse the Trump administration's rollbacks to protections provided under NEPA, which requires environmental analyses ahead of projects like pipelines, highways and drilling on public lands.

The Trump administration sought to reduce the amount of time that environmental reviews under the law take, from about 4 1/2 years to two years.

It also removed requirements to consider climate change impacts, complicated the procedure for community input and allowed more industry involvement in environmental reviews.

"I view the challenge of finding a way to ensure that NEPA is serving its multiple purposes in a way that allows the president's full agenda to be met as the challenge that we face," Mallory said during the hearing on Wednesday.

"It not only has to create an opportunity for there to be a full, robust analysis of the impacts on major projects, it has to create an opportunity for there to be a way for citizens and the community to engage, but it also has to be done in a way that ensures that we have significant infrastructure projects and that economic recovery which is based on those projects can occur," she added

Cramer questioned Mallory about her stance on pipelines in light of her work with an environmental group that has opposed some of them in court, asking, "Have you ever supported a pipeline?"

"In my life as a private practice lawyer, I worked with pipelines and helped pipelines get permitted as well but that was 20 years ago and what I'm focused on now is serving President Biden's agenda."

Cramer also asked the nominee to guarantee that the White House would not "interfere politically" with a decision before the Army Corps of Engineers about whether to shut down the Dakota Access Pipeline after a court ruled against a permit that allowed it to move forward.

"I can commit that I will carry out the president's agenda in making sure that decisions that are made are based on sound science," Mallory replied.

Biden EPA nominee takes heat for role in Obama Clean Power Plan

https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/policy/biden-epa-nominee-gop-clean-power-plan

Republican lawmakers told Janet McCabe, President Biden's pick for the Environmental Protection Agency's second-in-command, that they don't fully trust her given her involvement in crafting climate mandates during the Obama administration.

During a Senate Environment and Public Works Committee nomination hearing Wednesday, several Republicans from fossil fuel states pointed to McCabe's role, alongside then-EPA Administrator and now Biden climate czar Gina McCarthy, developing the Obama administration's centerpiece climate rule, known as the Clean Power Plan. McCabe

served seven years as a political appointee in the EPA's air office during the Obama administration, ultimately as its acting chief.

"You have a steeper hill to climb, frankly, that most," Sen. Kevin Cramer, a North Dakota Republican, told McCabe. Cramer voted in committee to support Biden's nominee to lead the EPA, Michael Regan, with hopes he will "keep an open mind."

Cramer recalled that McCabe, during a prior nomination hearing, promised to work with states on environmental regulations.

"And yet the Clean Power Plan proved to be one of the most overbearing big government impositions on states ever," Cramer said.

The Clean Power Plan issued first-time carbon limits for existing power plants, setting a nationwide goal for the sector to cut its emissions 32% below 2005 levels by 2030. Under the rule, each state had its own reduction target, and state regulators were tasked with crafting a plan to meet it.

Cramer said his state felt blindsided after the Obama EPA significantly ratcheted up North Dakota's emissions reduction target between the proposed and final versions of the power rule, from an 11% to a 45% required cut.

Several other GOP senators told McCabe they also felt their states were cut out of the decision-making process on climate regulations.

"There was a feeling back in the Obama administration in developing the Clean Power Plan that there was a Washington, D.C., decision forced on the states, and we didn't have a practice of cooperative federalism," said Sen. Roger Wicker, a Mississippi Republican.

McCabe, if confirmed, would likely play a significant role in developing the Biden administration's version of power plant carbon controls. Just before Biden's inauguration, a federal appeals court struck down the Trump administration's weaker carbon rule, essentially giving Biden's team at the EPA a blank slate to craft a regulation that helps meet his aggressive climate agenda.

McCabe didn't directly answer a question from Sen. Shelley Moore Capito of West Virginia, the top Republican on the committee, about how broad of a regulatory reach she thinks the EPA has over power plant emissions.

Republicans slammed the Clean Power Plan for encouraging generation shifting from coal to cleaner burning natural gas and renewable energy, a "beyond the fenceline" approach they said far exceeded the EPA's authority.

McCabe, however, noted the courts never ruled on the legality of the Clean Power Plan, which was put on pause by the Supreme Court in 2016 and then rewritten by the Trump administration.

"Certainly, we would not have put that rule forward if we did not believe that we were acting within the four corners of the Clean Air Act. I understand that people have different views about that," McCabe told Capito. McCabe added she wasn't sure whether she would be directly involved in crafting a new power sector rule but noted the EPA would solicit input from all stakeholders on the issue.

McCabe also defended the development of the Clean Power Plan, which she called "one of the most important and impactful rules" she worked on during the Obama administration. She said the Obama EPA undertook a "lengthy" process that involved "hours and hours" of conversations with state officials about how to cut emissions.

"My state is also a state with a lot of fossil energy, and it had a large reduction expectation as well," she said, referring to Indiana, where she previously led air policy in its Department of Environmental Management. "But what we tried to do in that rule was build a very flexible approach" to give states as many options as possible, she added.

Biden Picks Grilled on Clean Power, Stay on Confirmation Path

https://news.bloomberglaw.com/environment-and-energy/biden-picks-grilled-on-clean-power-stay-on-confirmation-path

Two of President Joe Biden's picks for top environmental posts sailed mostly unscathed through a congenial Senate hearing Wednesday, increasing chances they'll win confirmation.

The confirmation of Janet McCabe as Environmental Protection Agency deputy administrator and Brenda Mallory as Council on Environmental Quality chief would let Biden lock down two more Obama-era veterans for a team already brimming with holdovers from that administration.

That prospect seemed to trouble some Republicans on the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee. They tried to link the nominees to past policies they disfavor, most notably by asking McCabe about her involvement in the Obama administration's Clean Power Plan.

The Clean Power Plan was "one of the most overbearing, big-government impositions on states ever," despite McCabe's promises during the Obama years to embrace federalism and states' rights, Sen. Kevin Cramer (R-N.D.) said.

Ranking member Shelley Moore Capito (R-W.Va.) also grilled McCabe on the topic, asking the nominee if she thought the EPA has authority under the Clean Air Act to regulate power plants' carbon dioxide emissions beyond the fenceline.

Few Signs Given

McCabe defended the Clean Power Plan but gave few signs about specific steps the agency would take to limit greenhouse gas emissions. She also said she wasn't sure if the job of EPA deputy administrator would require her to be directly involved in any future rulemakings.

The Biden administration is reviewing new climate and environmental rules, including carbon regulations for new and existing power plants. In February, the EPA asked a federal court to leave the Clean Power Plan in limbo to avoid confusion over whether its obligations would kick in now that the Trump administration's replacement, the American Clean Energy rule, is dead.

At another point in the hearing, Capito said she was confused by the panoply of high-ranking Biden climate and energy officials, including domestic climate chief Gina McCarthy, climate envoy John Kerry, and EPA administrator nominee Michael Regan.

"How does this all fit together?" Capito asked. "Who's the lead here?"

Mallory said the roles will be clearly coordinated, and McCabe said Regan will be making the decisions at the EPA.

NEPA Streamlining

Lawmakers from both parties also asked Mallory what steps she would take to streamline permitting under the National Environmental Policy Act to promote economic growth.

Mallory said she would strive to find a middle path if confirmed. Under her leadership, CEQ will do robust analyses of permits, "but it also has to be done in a way that ensures that we have significant infrastructure projects and that economic recovery, which is based on those projects, can occur," she said.

Sen. Cynthia Lummis (R-Wyo.) asked Mallory to explain why the individual members of the team that recalculated the social cost of carbon in late February haven't been revealed, suggesting the lack of disclosure indicates a non-transparent process.

In response, Mallory said the process Obama used to calculate the social cost of carbon involved public participation, and that "a new process is being set up."

At various points, Republicans suggested that both McCabe and Mallory represented an elitist ideology disconnected from the concerns of rural and red states.

Sen. Joni Ernst (R-Iowa) said McCarthy has perpetuated a "we-know-best attitude that's pretty common among our coastal elite counterparts."

McCabe was the principal deputy head of the EPA's Office of Air and Radiation in the Obama administration, where she played a key role in shaping the Clean Power Plan. More recently, McCabe has been a professor at the Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law and director of the university's Environmental Resilience Institute.

Mallory, who would be the first Black CEQ leader, was the agency's general counsel during the Obama administration. Prior to that, she was the EPA's acting general counsel and principal deputy general counsel.

Regan also underwent a mostly congenial confirmation hearing in early February. The committee approved his nomination and a vote on the Senate floor is expected this month.

California Air and Climate Vol 18: EPA Waiver to CARB Regarding "Non-Road" Diesel Engine Regulations Upheld; Phasing Out Agricultural Burning in San Joaquin Valley by 2025

https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/california-air-and-climate-vol-18-epa-6061935/

Ninth Circuit Upholds U.S. EPA Waiver to CARB Regarding "Non-Road" Diesel Engine Regulations

On February 10, 2021, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit denied a challenge to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) waiver of authority to the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to issue emissions regulations for "non-road" diesel engines that are stricter than federal requirements under the federal Clean Air Act (CAA). (*See Dalton Trucking, Inc. v. U.S. EPA*, Case No. 13-74019 (9th Cir. Feb. 10, 2021).) Several trucking and industry groups brought the challenge, which specifically relates to EPA's granting of a request by CARB to authorize CARB's In-Use Off-Road Diesel Fueled Fleets Regulation (Fleet Requirements). CARB's Fleet Requirements regulate the use of non-road diesel engines often used in construction or other industrial activities with the goal to reduce certain emissions such as nitrogen oxides (NOx) and particulate matter (PM). Under the CAA, EPA "shall, after notice and opportunity for public hearing, authorize California to adopt and enforce standards and other requirements relating to the control of emissions from" specified non-road vehicles or engines "if California determines that California standards will be, in the aggregate, at least as protective of public health and welfare as applicable Federal standards." (42 U.S.C. § 7543(e)(2)(A).) However, "[n]o such authorization shall be granted" if EPA finds that (among other things) "California does not need such California standards to meet compelling and extraordinary conditions." (42 U.S.C. § 7543(e)(2)(A)(ii).) The industry groups argued in relevant part that CARB's Fleet Requirements were not needed to "meet compelling and extraordinary conditions" as anticipated under the CAA. However, the Ninth Circuit disagreed and concluded that under the relevant legal test, CARB provided sufficient data and a satisfactory explanation to EPA for the Fleet Requirements so that CARB can meet its goals under the CAA. Accordingly, the Ninth Circuit denied the industry groups' petition for review.

Agricultural Burning to be Phased-Out in San Joaquin Valley by 2025

At its February 25, 2021 meeting, CARB concurred with the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District's (SJVAPCD) 2020 Agricultural Burning Assessment setting a pathway to end this practice by 2025. The San Joaquin Valley has 60 percent of the state's harvested acres and contributes 36% of PM 2.5 emissions from open agriculture burning in the state, about two tons per day. SB 705, codified at California Health and Safety Code section 41855.5, called for the ending of agricultural burning in the San Joaquin Valley by 2010, but provides for the postponement of this requirement to allow for the development of viable alternatives.

SJVAPCD was one of the first air districts to restrict open air agriculture burning and by 2011, the region had reduced burning by 80 percent. Since 2011, however, burning has increased due to drought conditions and the closure of several biomass facilities. Currently, vineyard removals are the single largest category of burning in San Joaquin Valley at 71%.

The 2020 Assessment calls for a phase-out of all agricultural burning by 2025, but allows continued burning of certain crop materials including vineyard and citrus orchard removals in the interim, to allow additional time to develop viable alternatives to burning. The Assessment highlights the need to provide funding and incentives to expand access to burning alternatives and to explore biomass and bioenergy opportunities. Additional information is available here.

Message

From: Kibilov, Nicholas [Kibilov.Nicholas@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/3/2021 4:44:41 PM
To: AO OPA OMR CLIPS [AO_OPA_OMR_CLIPS@epa.gov]
Subject: Daily News Clips: Morning Edition, 3/3/21

Daily Media Clips: March 3, 2021 (morning edition)

Agency

Politico: EPA, CEQ nominees set for Senate grilling

Agriculture

WCIA: From the Farm: Pesticide laws

Chemicals

Fox4: Investigation links pet sickness, death to metro-made flea and tick collar
News 12: EPA: Pet collar linked to over 1,700 dog and cat deaths
kfor: Pet sickness, death linked to flea and tick collar, investigation finds
Penn Live: Popular flea collar for pets linked to 1,698 animal deaths: report
NYPost: Popular flea collar reportedly linked to 1,700 pet deaths
Local12: Report: Popular flea collar linked to nearly 1,700 pet deaths
DailyMail: Seresto flea collars are linked to 1,700 pet deaths after animals are 'poisoned' by pesticide which should be safe for cats and dogs - as owners blast EPA for 'turning a blind eye to the problem'

Emissions

CLEAN Future Act Includes RFS Provisions

Environmental Justice

WNYPapers: EPA announces availability of up to $6 million in annual environmental justice grants

Water

Progressive Farmer: Court Stay Allows Water Rule Review
CBS Denver: Elevated Levels Of 'Forever Chemicals' Found In Some Colorado Drinking Water Districts
The Ouachita Citizen: EPA releases study on benefits of river to local economy
SupplyHT: Fight for efficiency
Water Technology: Report: EPA has completed 3 of 6 actions under PFAS plan
ReedSmith: United States: EPA Indicates Intention To Regulate Certain PFAS In Drinking Water

Wildlife

isthmus: Wisconsin's wolf hunt travesty

EPA, CEQ nominees set for Senate grilling

https://www.politico.com/newsletters/morning-energy/2021/03/03/epa-ceq-nominees-set-for-senate-grilling-793725
By MATTHEW CHOI and KELSEY TAMBORRINO
03/03/2021 10:00 AM EST

EPA, CEQ NOMS WILL GET BLAST FROM THE PAST: The Senate Environment and Public Works Committee will grill President Joe Biden's nominees for Council on Environmental Quality and deputy EPA administrator this morning — and they could take a drubbing about their work during the Obama administration. Unlike pending EPA chief Michael Regan, who arrived without any ties to the Obama regulatory agenda reviled by red states, both nominees in the spotlight today will have to defend Obama-era policy choices while promoting Biden's agenda.

Nominee for chair of the Council on Environmental Quality, Brenda Mallory, speaks on Dec. 19, 2020. | Joshua Roberts/Getty Images

Janet McCabe, picked to be EPA's deputy administrator, was the agency's acting air chief under former President Barack Obama and helped write the Clean Power Plan and other major regulations; expect to hear a lot about her thoughts on EPA's authority to regulate carbon. And Brenda Mallory, the CEQ chair-designate, was a longtime EPA attorney before she was picked as CEQ's general counsel for Obama's final years in office, when major greenhouse gas guidance was issued.

The duo have plenty of bipartisan praise outside of Congress: Mallory won the backing of several Republican former EPA and CEQ officials, while McCabe picked up endorsements from a bipartisan group of former EPA deputies and 220 former agency employees. But it remains to be seen if they'll win as many Republican votes in the Senate as Regan, who cleared committee 14-6 but is still awaiting final confirmation.

ON THE HILL

ENERGY AND COMMERCE DEMOCRATS UNVEIL CLIMATE BILL: The hefty 981-page measure to combat climate change aims to take a sector-by-sector approach to eliminate carbon dioxide and reach net-zero emissions by 2050, Pro's Anthony Adragna reports. The bill builds off last year's CLEAN Future Act and calls for a federal clean energy standard that sets goals of 80 percent clean electricity by 2030 and 100 percent by 2035.

What's next: E&C Chair Frank Pallone vowed the legislation would move through regular order but notably did not take reconciliation off the table. "I mean obviously we'd like to move it through regular order — I don't rule anything out — but I'm hoping that the Republicans would participate, so we don't have to go to reconciliation," he said, adding they would continue to hold hearings and take input from Republicans on how to improve the bill. "We certainly want to hear any new ideas that the Republicans have and we will offer the opportunity to incorporate them into this bill," said Rep. Bobby Rush, chair of the Energy Subcommittee.

Rush said E&C Democrats have a "good, productive, positive history" with key senators, including Energy Chair Joe Manchin, whom they worked with on the end-of-year energy bill last year.

Rep. Paul Tonko, chair of the Environment and Climate Change Subcommittee, said the Biden administration provided "input" on the legislation and would continue to do so. Pallone also laid out this bold prediction: "I do believe that this bill has the support of all the Democrats on the committee. Some may like certain parts and not other parts, but it was put together to try to capture all the Democrats as well as some Republicans," he said. Read a section-by-section summary of the bill.

GREENS AGAINST THE FILIBUSTER: More than 70 environmental groups are calling on Sen. Chuck Schumer to abolish the filibuster, which they say in a letter to the majority leader is blocking urgent measures needed to combat climate change. "Action on the climate crisis in a way that centers environmental justice should not be obstructed by a minority of Senators representing a minority of the country," they wrote. Signatories include Climate Justice Alliance, Sunrise Movement and 350.org. Schumer fielded similar calls from advocacy groups last month, including from labor unions and progressive organizations.

AROUND THE AGENCIES

COME AND TAKE IT: Texas' power failures this winter could prompt the federal regulator to seek new reliability standards in the Lone Star State. The Federal Power Act gives FERC only limited authority in the state, but experts told Pro's Eric Wolff that there are still other avenues to make sure a similar disaster doesn't happen again, notably by instructing NERC, which develops grid standards, to create rules that force Texas generators to take measures to reduce winter weather risks. And commissioners could employ their soft power and hold technical conferences to pressure state regulators to protect the grid. Though FERC can't probe price fluctuations in the state, the Natural Gas Act allows it to dig into market manipulation through interstate pipelines, plus it can investigate the nearby MISO and SPP grid operators, which also struggled that week.

TANDEN BOWS OUT: Biden's pick for OMB director, Neera Tanden, withdrew her nomination amid mounting scrutiny over her past tweets. Sen. Joe Manchin (D-W.Va.) had said he would not support her nomination, putting her in a particularly precarious position. Hill Democrats have been pushing for Shalanda Young, deputy director of OMB, for the post. Other names floating around include Ann O'Leary, former aide to Hillary Clinton, and Gene Sperling, former economic adviser to Presidents Bill Clinton and Obama. Tanden's withdrawal came after GOP Sen. Lisa Murkowski (Alaska) "conveyed to the White House that she was going to be a no," according to CNN's Jake Tapper, citing a senior administration official.

CODE FIGHTS: The International Code Council meets today on whether to follow through on changing how energy conservation building codes are crafted. The changes would decrease input from local governments, which have previously pushed for aggressively greener building codes. The Energy Department weighed into the fight last month, trying to pause the change, which activists feared could dampen local efforts at the behest of construction and gas companies.

"ICC had set this process in place specifically to encourage increased participation. And now that they have achieved increased participation, something else seems to have been triggered that they want to take it away," Kim Cheslak, who serves as director of codes at New Buildings Institute and has participated in the code process, told ME.

Acting Assistant Secretary for Energy Kelly Speakes-Backman wrote to the ICC board that the need for the change "remains unclear" and could stunt "important economic and environmental benefits at the local level," HuffPost's Alexander Kaufman reports. But the ICC signaled an aversion to switching course in a response to Speakes-Backman shared with ME. It said a delay in the changes would throw a wrench in a whole suite of building codes the ICC is responsible for. Still, a council spokesperson told ME its board had a productive conversation with DOE on Tuesday and that the council was "committed to assisting communities in meeting their energy efficiency and greenhouse gas reduction priorities."

BIDEN BACKS TRUMP ON SOLAR: The Biden administration earlier this week backed its predecessor's move to revoke a tariff loophole created for double-sided solar panels. In a Monday filing in the U.S. Court of International Trade, the Justice Department said the court should dismiss a solar industry complaint, led by the Solar Energy Industries Association, challenging the import tariff move. DOJ attorneys argued that former President Donald Trump was "lawfully and fully within his authority" when he closed the loophole, after determining it had been "undermining the effectiveness of the safeguard measure on solar products." SEIA declined comment.

Watch this spot: A research note from ClearView Energy Partners said Tuesday the filing signals the administration is unlikely to end Trump's solar tariffs, as some in the industry had hoped. "Although one could interpret the brief as seeking to defend Biden's Executive Branch prerogatives, it may also suggest that Biden's hard line on protecting U.S. industry could continue," it said. However, ClearView said it currently regards a tariff extension as unlikely.

ADVOCACY

ABOUT THAT API CARBON PRICE: The energy world was atwitter after a news report that the American Petroleum Institute may be ready to back a price on carbon. API's saying it supports a carbon price isn't necessarily new — it has broached the subject in years past and mentioned it as a possible "market based solution" in a recent annual report — but word that it could be preparing to put its lobbying might where it's PR mouth spurred intrigue among industry lobbyists. An association spokesperson would only confirm to ME that "API and its membership continue to discuss and consider carbon pricing among other policy solutions to reduce emissions and reach the ambitions of the Paris Agreement."

Several lobbyists told ME the "leaked" news of a carbon endorsement was merely the API trying to calm warring factions among its membership, which includes a mix of international companies that may not mind a carbon tax if it keeps them in regulators' good graces and those who want to fight against it. "This is simply a case of Shell and BP pushing the API toward a progressive stance, but it is not a view that is uniformly held by API members," said one source familiar with the group's inner workings. Other lobbyists were less sure. Businesses are coming to grips that Biden at some point will propose a carbon tax, that one could be included in a reconciliation package, and that it might be better for the industry than an emissions limit companies may not be able to meet. "The position that no one supports [a carbon price] but the fruitcakes from the EU, that's definitely not the case," the person said.

BEYOND THE BELTWAY
EXXON HIT WITH $14M PENALTY FOR REFINERY AIR VIOLATIONS: Exxon Mobil must pay a $14.25 million penalty for thousands of violations of the Clean Air Act at its Baytown refinery near Houston, a judge ruled on Tuesday. The company was previously slapped with a $20 million penalty in a citizen suit brought by Environment Texas and the Sierra Club. But it convinced an appeals court to order a reconsideration by Judge David Hittner of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas, a Reagan appointee. After doing so, Hittner levied penalties of $14,251,302 (plus the green groups' expenses).

Even after chucking some of the allegations, Hittner still found more than 2,000 violations spanning 3,651 days and totaling 10 million excess pounds of airborne pollution. He also rejected Exxon's effort to blame some of the violations on Hurricane Ike, ruling that the 2008 disaster did not count as an "act of God." Exxon has already paid more than $1.4 million to state and county regulators over the violations, bringing the total to almost $15.7 million. Exxon said it is reviewing the decision and declined to say whether it will appeal again.

MAKING THE GRADE: The country's infrastructure is still not an honor student, but it's on the way up. In the American Society of Civil Engineers' new report card, overall infrastructure in the U.S. gets a C-, the first time the metric has risen out of the D range in 20 years.

The ASCE report, which comes out every four years, carries a lot of weight. It's by far the most widely cited measure of national infrastructure quality on the Hill and around the country.

Five category grades went up: Aviation (which is now up to a D+, thanks in part to increased airport investment from Congress), drinking water, energy, inland waterways and ports. Only one went down since the last report card: Bridges, which is now a C, given 46,154 bridges in the country are structurally deficient, and the roughly $125 billion repair backlog. Rail remains the highest ranked segment, at a B. And stormwater infrastructure was included for the first time, scoring a D.

Better, but still not good: "This is not a report card anyone would be proud to take home," said ASCE Executive Director Thomas Smith. "We have not made significant enough investments to maintain infrastructure that in some cases was built more than 50 years ago."

From the Farm: Pesticide laws
https://www.wcia.com/the-morning-show/from-the-farm-pesticide-laws/
by: Stu Ellis
Posted: Mar 3, 2021 / 07:56 AM CST / Updated: Mar 3, 2021 / 07:56 AM CST

ILLINOIS (WCIA) — When the Legislature is in session, all issues are on the table — and agriculture tries to keep a low profile.

Pesticide issues make both national and state headlines, and lobbyists for farm groups work hard to minimize regulatory initiatives in the General Assembly.

"Of course we have tried every year to manage dicamba effectively," says Jean Payne, President of the Illinois Fertilizer and Chemical Assoication. "This year the Department of Agriculture is going to rule-making to establish a June 20 cut-off and again an 85 degree temperature restriction.

"But because they couldn't do it with the U.S. EPA's blessing, the rule-making process kicks in, which is new for us in Illinois."

Payne says state-based rule-making for pesticides is much different than federal rule-making.

"But long term, having to amend pesticide labels using your state regulatory authority poses some problematic scenarios," says Payne. "We are going to be working very hard on stewardship in the 2021 application season so we don't end up with more legislative battles over how we use pesticides in Illinois.

"We truly want the Department of Agriculture to be the oversite agency and the U.S. EPA labels to be the ones that are the law for applicators in Illinois."

Jean Payne says dicamba herbicide became controversial because farmers were divided over its use.

"We often have our common enemies that people think of anti-agriculture, anti-pesticide groups; but the truth is there are many people within agriculture that are not happy about how these scenarios are played out. So that is what concerns me because our history in Illinois is that agriculture sticks together; and with dicamba you have the possibility of that not being the case.

"So we are going to work very hard to make sure we don't have legislative issues to deal with relative to dicamba use, or other pesticide uses including 2, 4-D, and the neonicotinoid insecticides, all the things that make the headlines in the national media every day."

Investigation links pet sickness, death to metro-made flea and tick collar
https://fox4kc.com/news/investigation-links-pet-sickness-death-to-metro-made-flea-and-tick-collar/
by: Matt Stewart, Travis Meier
Posted: Mar 3, 2021 / 07:20 AM CST / Updated: Mar 3, 2021 / 07:20 AM CST

SHAWNEE, Kan. — Could the flea and tick collar you put on your pet be hurting them? The results of a new investigation are concerning for pet owners.

Whether its man's best friends or a furry feline, pets are a part of the family, and many owners love them like their own children. When you put a flea and tick collar on them, you expect it to be safe for them to wear.

But an investigation that published this morning by the Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting along with USA Today discovered a troubling trend.

After looking over thousands of federal documents from the EPA, investigators learned there have been more than 75,000 complaints about the Seresto-brand flea and tick collar over the past nine years. They discovered close to 1,700 dogs and cats wearing this collar died.

Elanco Animal Health recently bought Bayer Animal Health, which for years did research in Shawnee on animal products like the flea and tick collar in question.

Bayer created this collar with the brand name Seresto, and Elanco now sells it. It uses two types of pesticides to kill fleas and ticks, releasing small amounts of chemicals onto your pet over time. Investigators found evidence this collar might be killing dogs and cats, too.

Elanco did not have an immediate statement in response to the investigation. FOX4 has attempted to contact the company and will provide their response when it's made available.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency regulates all products with pesticides and responded by saying they believe it is still safe enough. They noted that some warnings exist on the product's packaging. Despite the complaints, the product will stay on the market.

An EPA spokesperson said they believe some pets just might be more sensitive to this particular pesticide combination than others.

The EPA has never warned the public about this Seresto product, and there is no evidence to think the agency will anytime soon.

Not only are pets having problems with the Seresto flea and tick collar. Humans might be too. More than 1,000 people have reported health problems from it, mostly rashes.

Almost all flea and tick collars contain pesticide, so if your dog or cat are having health problems, that could be the cause. You should consult your vet before using chemicals in tandem with your pets.

Pet sickness, death linked to flea and tick collar, investigation finds
https://kfor.com/news/pet-sickness-death-linked-to-flea-and-tick-collar-investigation-finds/
by: Matt Stewart, Travis Meier, WDAF, Nexstar Media Wire
Posted: Mar 3, 2021 / 09:04 AM CST / Updated: Mar 3, 2021 / 09:04 AM CST

SHAWNEE, Kan. (WDAF) — Could the flea and tick collar you put on your pet be hurting them? The results of a new investigation suggest the answer may be yes.

Whether it's man's best friend or a furry feline, pets are a part of the family. When you put a flea and tick collar on them, you expect it to be safe. But an investigation published Wednesday by the Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting along with USA Today discovered a troubling trend.

After looking over thousands of federal documents from the Environmental Protection Agency, investigators learned there have been more than 75,000 complaints about the Seresto brand flea and tick collar over the past nine years. They found that nearly 1,700 dogs and cats wearing the collar have died.

Elanco Animal Health pharmaceutical company recently bought Bayer Animal Health, which created the collar with the brand name Seresto. Elanco now sells it. It uses two types of pesticides to kill fleas and ticks, releasing small amounts of chemicals onto your pet over time. Investigators found evidence the collar might be killing dogs and cats.

Elanco did not have an immediate statement in response to the investigation.

The EPA, which regulates products with pesticides, responded by saying it believes the collar is still safe enough, noting that some warnings exist on the product's packaging. Despite the complaints, the product will stay on the market.

An EPA spokesperson said some pets just may be more sensitive to this particular pesticide combination than others.

The EPA has never warned the public about this Seresto product, and there is no evidence to think the agency will anytime soon.

Not only are pets having problems with the Seresto flea and tick collar. Humans might be, too. More than 1,000 people have reported health problems from it, mostly rashes.

Almost all flea and tick collars contain pesticides, so if your dog or cat is having health problems, consult your vet before using chemicals in tandem.

Popular flea collar for pets linked to 1,698 animal deaths: report
https://www.pennlive.com/life/2021/03/popular-flea-collar-for-pets-linked-to-1698-animal-deaths-report.html
Updated 7:24 AM; Today 7:24 AM

By Deb Kiner | dkiner@pennlive.com

The Seresto flea collar for animals has been linked to almost 1,700 deaths of pets, according to the Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting.
Working with USA Today, the center yesterday released a story saying, "Seresto, one of the most popular flea and tick collars in the country, has been linked to hundreds of pet deaths, tens of thousands of injured animals and hundreds of harmed humans, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency documents show.

Yet the EPA has done nothing to inform the public of the risks.

Seresto, developed by Bayer and now sold by Elanco, works by releasing small amounts of pesticide onto the animal for months at a time. The pesticide is supposed to kill fleas, ticks and other pests but be safe for cats and dogs."

The center reported that not only has the EPA received reports of 1,698 pet deaths, it also has received reports of almost 1,000 people becoming ill.

A retired EPA employee told the center, "The EPA appears to be turning a blind eye to this problem, and after seven years of an increasing number of incidents, they are telling the public that they are continuing to monitor the situation, but I think this is a significant problem that needs to be addressed sooner rather than later."

The center reported that pet owners realize too late what is causing their pet's distress. Pet owners have reported not only deaths of animals but also rashes and neurological disorders.

Popular flea collar reportedly linked to 1,700 pet deaths

https://nypost.com/2021/03/02/popular-flea-collar-reportedly-linked-to-1700-pet-deaths/
By Lisa Fickenscher
March 2, 2021 | 1:28pm

The EPA has received 75,000 incident reports about Seresto pet collars, developed by Bayer and manufactured by Elenco, since they were introduced in 2012.

A popular flea and tick collar is reportedly making thousands of pets sick and even killing some of them — and critics are blaming the Environmental Protection Agency for turning a blind eye to the problem.

The EPA, which is responsible for regulating products that contain pesticides, has received 75,000 incident reports about Seresto pet collars, developed by Bayer and manufactured by Elenco, since they were introduced in 2012, according to public records.

Those include 1,698 pet deaths and nearly 1,000 incidents involving harm to humans, according to an explosive report published Tuesday by the Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting and USA Today.

"After seven years of an increasing number of incidents, they are telling the public that they are continuing to monitor the situation," Karen McCormack, a former EPA official, said of the agency, according to the report. "But I think this is a significant problem that needs to be addressed sooner rather than later."

Seresto, McCormack added, "has the most incidents of any pesticide pet product" she's ever seen.

Keri McGrath, a spokeswoman for Louisville, Ky.-based Elanco, told The Post in an emailed statement that More than 25 million Seresto collars have been sold since they were approved in 2012. Figures cited in an incident report for last year amounted to "a fraction of 1 percent of users," defined by the World Health organization as "uncommon," she said.

"It is critically important to understand that a report is not an indication of cause," McGrath said. "What those numbers represent is the number of reports received, and do not reflect causality."

EPA officials appeared to downplay the incidents in a statement for the Tuesday report.

"No pesticide is completely without harm," an EPA spokesperson said, according to the report, confirming that the agency has found the Seresto collars are "eligible for continued registration."

"EPA ensures that there are measures on the product label that reduce risk," the spokesperson added. "Some pets, however, like some humans, are more sensitive than others and may experience adverse symptoms after treatment."

But in a statement to The Post, the agency appeared to suggest the lapse was a failure of the Trump administration.

"Under the Biden-Harris Administration EPA has returned to its core mission, which includes protecting our pets' health," the statement said. "We take every incident reported seriously and review these data to see whether action is necessary. EPA encourages pet owners to read the entire label before using the pesticide product and follow all directions carefully, including monitoring your pet after application to see if side effects occur. If side effects develop, the label tells the consumer to consult the pet's veterinarian immediately."

Rhonda Bomwell, of Somerset, NJ, said she lost her 9-year-old Papillon service dog, Pierre, after putting a Seresto collar on him in June, according to the report. A day later, Pierre had a seizure. She rushed him to the

hospital but he died before he could get treatment. Bomwell didn't think to take off Pierre's collar at the time, the report said.

"I just didn't put it together," Bomwell said.

On Amazon, the Seresto has been the top-selling collar. Nevertheless, there have been many disturbing reviews about the collar, which is worn for six to eight months and slowly releases the chemicals onto the animal.

"10 days after placing the Seresto collar on my dog, she suffered a neurological problem diagnosed as meningitis of 'unknown origin,'" one customer wrote. "She temporarily lost the use of her hind legs and vet bills have already exceeded $5,000."

Another reviewer said, "Put this collar on my 10 pound Maltese and 14 pound Shih Tzu in May 2016. Within 3 days the Shih Tzu was laying in his bed all day whining and every time I picked him up he would cry out, as if he was in pain…. take the collar off, bathe him AND by the next morning he is back to normal!!!! Called my Vet and Bayer and was told he must be allergic to an ingredient in the collar."

Report: Popular flea collar linked to nearly 1,700 pet deaths
https://local12.com/news/nation-world/report-popular-flea-collar-linked-to-nearly-1700-pet-deaths-seresto-tick-collars-usa-today-epa
by CNY Central
Wednesday, March 3rd 2021

(CNYCentral) - A popular flea collar has been linked to at least 1,698 related pet deaths and thousands of pet injuries, according to an investigative report from USA TODAY based on U.S. Environmental Protection Agency documents.

The report says that EPA documents show that Seresto, one of the most popular flea and tick collars in the country, has been linked to pet deaths, injuries, and also harmed humans.

Seresto's collar works by releasing small amounts of pesticide that is supposed to kill fleas and ticks but be safe for cats and dogs.

However, since the collars were introduced in 2012, the EPA has reportedly received incident reports of at least 1,698 related pet deaths. Overall, the agency has gotten more than 75,000 incident reports related to the collars through June 2020, including nearly 1,000 involving human harm.

An EPA spokesperson told USA TODAY that the two pesticides in Seresto have "been found eligible for continued registration."

"No pesticide is completely without harm, but EPA ensures that there are measures on the product label that reduce risk," the spokesperson told USA TODAY in a statement. "The product label is the law, and applicators must follow label directions. Some pets, however, like some humans, are more sensitive than others and may experience adverse symptoms after treatment."

The EPA did not respond to USA TODAY's request for how Seresto compared to other flea and tick collars in terms of incidents.

Seresto flea collars are linked to 1,700 pet deaths after animals are 'poisoned' by pesticide which should be safe for cats and dogs - as owners blast EPA for 'turning a blind eye to the problem'
https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-9317489/Seresto-flea-collars-linked-nearly-1-700-pet-deaths.html
By VALERIE EDWARDS FOR DAILYMAIL.COM
PUBLISHED: 14:13 EST, 2 March 2021 | UPDATED: 17:36 EST, 2 March 2021

- Report shows that the Seresto flea collars, developed by Bayer, have been linked to at least 1,698 pet deaths since being introduced in 2012
- Through June 2020, the Environmental Protection Agency received more than 75,000 major and minor injury reports related to the collars
- The EPA report also includes nearly 1,000 incidents of humans being harmed
- EPA spokeswoman said: 'No pesticide is completely without harm, but EPA ensures that there are measures on the product label that reduce risk'
- Keri McGrath, a spokeswoman for Elanco, which sells Seresto, told DailyMail.com: 'We take the safety of our products very seriously'
- McGrath said Elanco will investigate 'potential concerns related to their use'

A popular brand of flea collars has been linked to the deaths of nearly 1,700 pets, but the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has not issued a warning to the public.

According to USA Today, which cited the EPA, the Seresto flea collars, developed by Bayer, have been linked to at least 1,698 pet deaths since being introduced in 2012.
Through June 2020, the EPA received more than 75,000 major and minor injury reports related to the collars

The EPA report also includes nearly 1,000 incidents of humans being harmed while in close proximity of the collars.

Karen McCormack told USA Today that the EPA has known about these incidents for years but has not informed the public of the potential risks associated with this product.

McCormack, a retired EPA employee said: 'The EPA appears to be turning a blind eye to this problem, and after seven years of an increasing number of incidents, they are telling the public that they are continuing to monitor the situation.

'But I think this is a significant problem that needs to be addressed sooner rather than later.'

A popular brand of flea collars, Seresto (file image), that have been linked to the deaths of nearly 1,700 pets yet the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has not issued a warning to the public

Rhonda Bomwell came forward to say reveal that she believes her dog, Pierre (left and right) died from wearing the collar

Last year, Bomwell bought the Bayer's Seresto flea collar for her nine-year-old Papillon service dog, Pierre, and attached it around his neck. But just a day later, Pierre had a seizure, collapsed and stopped breathing

Keri McGrath, a spokeswoman for Elanco, which sells Seresto, told DailyMail.com: 'We take the safety of our products very seriously, and thoroughly investigate potential concerns related to their use.'

She then explained what the numbers mean, saying: 'It is critically important to understand that a report is not an indication of cause. What those numbers represent is the number of reports received, and do not reflect causality.

'So, if a dog were to be wearing a collar and experience any sort of adverse event, the collar would be mentioned in the report.

McGrath then noted that 'reporting rates have actually been decreasing over the life of the product'.

'That said, we continuously monitor the safety of our products on an on-going basis,' she added.

The Seresto flea collar releases small amounts of pesticide onto the animal for months at a time in a bid to kill fleas, ticks and other pests while also being safe for the cat or dog wearing it.

Pet owners who believe their beloved dogs fell victim to the dangers of the flea collars have also come forward.

Rhonda Bomwell told USA Today that she had never used a flea collar until her veterinarian recommended she use one.

Last year, Bomwell bought the Bayer's Seresto flea collar for her nine-year-old Papillon service dog, Pierre, and attached it around his neck.

But just a day later, Pierre had a seizure, collapsed and stopped breathing. She called police who arrived to help her lift Pierre into her car. But it was too late. Pierre died before he could even receive medical treatment.

She told the news outlet that she didn't even think about the collar being a cause to his seizure, saying: 'I just didn't put it together.'

Ron Packard, of Massachusetts, also spoke to the news outlet about the loss of his two dogs. Both dogs, Danny, 10, and five-year-old Dominic, died in June 2019. Packard is pictured with both of his dogs before they died

Before their deaths, Packard said his dogs had seizures, became lethargic and started vomiting before refusing to eat. He then took them to a veterinarian who couldn't figure out what was wrong with the dogs. Both Danny and Dominic died two weeks later

While the EPA has yet to respond to a DailyMail.com request for comment on this matter, a spokeswoman for the agency told USA Today that the two pesticides - imidacloprid and flumethrin -in Seresto have 'been found eligible for continued registration'.

'No pesticide is completely without harm, but EPA ensures that there are measures on the product label that reduce risk,' the spokesperson said.

'The product label is the law, and applicators must follow label directions. Some pets, however, like some humans, are more sensitive than others and may experience adverse symptoms after treatment.'

The Imidacloprid pesticide is part of a class of neonicotinoid, which are insecticides, most commonly used on crops in the US.

Imidacloprid is banned in the European Union for outdoor use.

Flumethrin is only an active ingredient in Seresto, according to EPA documents.

In addition to death, other pet owners have reported their fur friends breaking out in skin rashes and having neurological issues after using the collars.

Ron Packard, of Massachusetts, also spoke to the news outlet about the loss of his two dogs.

Both dogs, Danny, 10, and five-year-old Dominic, died in June 2019.

Before their deaths, Packard said his dogs had seizures, became lethargic and started vomiting before refusing to eat.

He then took them to a veterinarian who couldn't figure out what was wrong with the dogs.

Both Danny and Dominic died two weeks later.

In a bid to get to the bottom of what happened to his dogs, Packard retraced his steps and the only thing he could think of was that he had put the Seresto collars on both dogs just a month before their deaths.

To prevent other tragedies, Packard created a Facebook page where people can share their experiences with the Seresto collars.

While some have shared that their pets have also died, others said they managed to save their pets after picking up on what could have been causing their illnesses.

'I don't want others to go through what we went through,' Packard told USA Today. 'Every time I read the stories, it brings me back to my dogs. But if I can save a few pets, I can deal with it.'

The collars have also harmed people by causing seizures and rashes.

In one incident a 67-year-old woman who slept in a bed with a dog that was wearing a collar reported having a heart arrhythmia and fatigue.

The family of a 12-year-old boy who slept in a bed with a dog wearing a collar reported that he started having seizures and vomiting.

CLEAN Future Act Includes RFS Provisions
http://energy.agwired.com/2021/03/03/clean-future-act-includes-rfs-provisions/
CINDY ZIMMERMAN MARCH 3, 2021

Leaders of the House Energy and Commerce Committee Tuesday introduced the Climate Leadership and Environmental Action for our Nation's (CLEAN) Future Act, intended to achieve net zero greenhouse gas pollution by 2050.

The Renewable Fuels Association welcomed the inclusion of certain provisions in the legislature that would help bring more transparency and integrity to EPA's implementation of the Renewable Fuel Standard. Those provisions include requirements that EPA take more expeditious action to approve new renewable fuel pathways under the RFS, set reasonable deadlines for the submission of any small refinery waiver petitions, and ensure more transparency in the refinery waiver petition process.

RFA President and CEO Geoff Cooper said they will continue to work with the committee to promote the climate and environmental justice benefits that renewable fuels bring to the table. "In particular, we are eager to discuss the importance of fuel- and vehicle-neutral carbon performance standards that can aggressively and immediately reduce GHG emissions from the transportation sector," said Cooper.

EPA announces availability of up to $6 million in annual environmental justice grants
https://www.wnypapers.com/news/article/current/2021/03/03/145594/epa-announces-availability-of-up-to-6-million-in-annual-environmental-justice-grants
Wed, Mar 3rd 2021 09:35 am

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has announced the availability of up to $6 million in grant funding under The Environmental Justice Collaborative Problem-Solving (EJCPS) Cooperative Agreement Program and The Environmental Justice Small Grants (EJSG) Program.
"These grants are crucial to supporting vulnerable and overburdened communities disproportionately affected by environmental health risks," said Office of Environmental Justice Director Matthew Tejada. "With renewed leadership to address environmental justice under the Biden-Harris administration, we are excited to support community efforts to address historically challenging issues."

EPA will be giving special consideration to the following focus areas:
√ Addressing COVID-19 concerns faced by low-income communities and communities of color;
√ Climate change and natural disaster resiliency outreach and planning;
√ New applicants to either opportunity;
√ Ports initiative to assist people living and working near ports across the country; and
√ Small nonprofits.

The EJCPS Cooperative Agreement Program's total estimated funding for this opportunity is approximately $3,200,000. EPA anticipates awarding two cooperative agreements of $160,000 each within each of the 10 EPA regions. To learn more about preapplication assistance calls and how to apply for funding, visit https://www.epa.gov/environmental-justice/environmental-justice-collaborative-problem-solving-cooperative-agreement-0.

The EJSG Program estimates approximately $2,800,000 will be awarded to approximately five applications per EPA region in amounts of up to $50,000 per award. This includes the EPA's ports initiative program, which anticipates funding up to six additional projects that address clean air issues at coastal and inland ports or rail yards. To learn more about preapplication assistance calls and how to apply for funding, visit https://www.epa.gov/environmentaljustice/environmental-justice-small-grants-program.

Applicants interested in either opportunity must submit proposal packages on or before May 7 to be considered for the available funding. Applicants should plan for projects to begin on Oct. 1.

For more information on environmental justice grants, funding and technical assistance, visit https://www.epa.gov/environmentaljustice/environmental-justice-grants-funding-and-technical-assistance.

Court Stay Allows Water Rule Review
https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/news/world-policy/article/2021/03/03/federal-court-stays-water-lawsuit
3/3/2021 | 10:15 AM CST
By Todd Neeley , DTN Staff Reporter

OMAHA (DTN) -- A federal court in South Carolina granted a 60-day stay in an ongoing lawsuit challenging the Trump administration's Navigable Waters Protection Rule.

The EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers asked for the stay from the U.S. District Court for the District of South Carolina to allow more time to review the rule.

The lawsuit, brought by the South Carolina Coastal Conservation League in July 2020, https://www.dtnpf.com/..., would have the effect of "dramatically reducing the universe of waters protected" by the Clean Water Act.

In the motion granted by the court on Monday, the agencies said the additional time will allow for continued review of the rule, which is largely supported by agriculture groups.

Also playing into the court's decision is the pending Senate vote on EPA Administrator nominee Michael Regan, https://www.dtnpf.com/..., who told members of a Senate committee he intends to engage the agriculture community on the rule.

The Senate has yet to set a date for the vote on Regan's nomination.

In New Mexico, a lawsuit filed by the New Mexico Cattle Growers Association also has been stayed, https://www.dtnpf.com/..., by the U.S. District Court for the District of New Mexico.

The federal government said in its motion granted this week in South Carolina that the additional 60 days allows for more time for Regan to be confirmed and to review the rule.

"Here, though the agencies were hopeful that they would have an understanding as to how the new administration plans to approach the NWPR within the parties' first 30-day continuance," the government said in its motion, "it has become apparent that the review will necessarily take some additional time. Perhaps most importantly, the EPA administrator-designate, Michael Regan, has not yet been confirmed by the Senate. Indeed, at the committee hearing on Mr. Regan's confirmation, senators repeatedly raised questions about the NWPR, demonstrating the importance of this issue to the administration and the incoming administrator."

The government said that, because the water rule is 'significant,' the agencies' new leadership "should be afforded this opportunity to consider (and potentially reconsider) their approach to the NWPR before the court considers the merits of the pending summary judgment motions. It is at least possible that the agencies' review of the NWPR may ultimately lead to a significant modification or withdrawal of the rule."

While serving as secretary of the North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality, Regan objected to the Trump administration's Navigable Waters Protection Rule.

Regan was asked during a Feb. 3 hearing before the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works whether he supports a new WOTUS rule similar to the 2015 rule agriculture and other industries fought in court.

"There are a lot of lessons learned, pragmatic experiences or pragmatic solutions that we've learned from experiences," Regan said.

"I spent a lot of time with a lot of small farmers. I spent a lot of time with a lot of environmental groups, and what I would say is I'm looking forward to convening multiple stakeholder groups on how we chart a path forward. I don't believe that we have to sacrifice water quality at the expense of making sure that farmers, especially small farmers, have a fighting chance in this economy. I believe that you can do both."

Regan said he understands it is "difficult for any kind of federal regulation to truly address the unique agricultural needs" of different regions.

"So, I want a rule that moves forward, that's not overly burdensome, but gives the states the flexibility to protect water quality and protect the local agricultural economy," he said.

The navigable waters definition in the Clean Water Act has been the subject of numerous lawsuits.

The 2015 waters of the United States, or WOTUS, rule in particular drew attention from states attorneys general, agriculture and other industry groups that challenged the rule based on concerns it expanded the federal government's reach onto private property, https://www.dtnpf.com/....

Agriculture, other industry groups and state governments across the country alleged the WOTUS rule expanded federal jurisdiction to waters not traditionally protected by the Clean Water Act.

Even prior to the completion of the WOTUS rule, farmers and ranchers faced uncertainty as to which waters were considered jurisdictional. So far, neither Congress, nor the EPA, has been able to make the law more understandable.

Todd Neeley can be reached at todd.neeley@dtn.com
Follow him on Twitter @toddneeleyDTN

Elevated Levels Of 'Forever Chemicals' Found In Some Colorado Drinking Water Districts
https://denver.cbslocal.com/2021/03/03/chemicals-water-denver-colorado-pfas/
By Kati WeisMarch 3, 2021 at 8:48 am

(CBS4) – Poisonous "forever chemicals" have been found at levels higher than what some states say are safe in more than a dozen Colorado water districts. This, after massive statewide testing for the pollutants was conducted during the pandemic.

The technical term for forever chemicals is PFAS, which stands for perfluoroalkyl substances, and they're referred to as "forever chemicals," because one they're in the body, they don't leave, and instead build up over time. According to the EPA, "exposure to PFAS can lead to adverse health outcomes in humans."

The EPA says two types of PFAS chemicals, PFOA and PFOS, can cause cancer, birth defects, and thyroid hormone disruption.

PFAS can be found in a variety of common products, like clothing, cookware, and furniture. Pollution of those products can then lead to contamination of the water supply.

While the EPA has no legal limit for PFAS in drinking water, it recommends the level not be any higher than 70 parts per trillion for PFOA and PFOS. But eight states say that's not good enough, setting more stringent legal limits. Like Massachusetts, which has a PFAS maximum of only 20 parts per trillion for six PFAS chemicals, including PFOA and PFOS.

In Colorado, the state health department just tested 400 water districts for the very first time, touting it found no water systems had levels above the EPA's guidelines.

But CBS4 Investigates dug through the findings, learning 13 water systems have levels above the 20 parts per trillion limit Massachusetts recently set.

Those districts include Arapahoe County WWWA, with a level of 23 parts per trillion for the six PFAS chemicals regulated under Massachusetts, Forest Hills Riva Chase Water in the foothills at 26.4 parts per trillion, and Frisco Water with a level of 58.5 parts per trillion at one entry point tested.

(credit: CBS)
CBS4 Investigates reached out to those water systems, and so far has only heard back from Frisco, which said of the results, "the EPA's health advisory specifically applies to PFOA and PFOS compounds, two compounds out of the 18 PFAS compounds tested for in drinking water. Frisco's water did not test above the maximum contaminant level for the two chemical compounds in the Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) family, PFOA and PFOS, which the EPA has established guidance for at this point."

As far as next steps said, a spokesperson for Frisco said, "even though Frisco's PFOA and PFOS levels were well below the maximum set by the advisory, the Town of Frisco will be partnering with the EPA and the CDPHE to further evaluate PFAS levels and increase frequency of testing to see if they change over time. The Town of Frisco will also test PFAS levels in the blended water at various locations in the water distribution system to determine actual concentration levels at the tap, which are likely to be lower. The Town of Frisco will continue to closely follow this evolving scientific knowledge around PFAS provided by the EPA and CDPHE in order to continue to provide safe and delicious drinking water to Frisco residents and visitors."

Further analysis of the testing data shows three Colorado water systems would be above the legal limit Michigan recently set at 8 parts per trillion for PFOA. Seven other districts had levels that would trigger further testing in Michigan, due to being just under the level of 8 parts per trillion for PFOA.
CBS4 Investigates questioned John Putnam, the director of environmental programs for the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, about the findings.

Asked whether he thought residents in those water districts with elevated levels should be concerned, Putnam said, "at this point we don't believe they should be concerned."

"The science indicates that the 70 parts per trillion for the two chemicals included in that (EPA) health advisory provides a level below which we wouldn't expect health effects," Putnam explained. "We do know that some other states have looked at creating an even broader margin of safety. In order for us to look at doing that we have to collect the sort of information that we're collecting now to evaluate that in the future. So we're glad to be able to be added to get this data and continue reviewing the rapidly evolving science on this issue. So we can continue to protect the safety of drinking water across Colorado."

Putnam led the effort to test the 400 water districts after the state legislature appropriated funds for his agency to do so in spring 2020.

"If people are still concerned, they can look at options for themselves, they can look at bottled water for example, or reverse osmosis systems for their own home," Putnam said.

Putnam also explained the legislature appropriated some funding to assist with any mitigation efforts that might be necessary.

"We received some funding from the legislature net last year to provide a take back program to provide resources to some of the districts to help them reduce the chemicals in their drinking water," Putnam said. "And we're going to want to take all of those steps to reduce the chain or break the chain of exposure between this chemical and people's health."

PFAS is not a new issue for many people in Colorado Springs. More than a hundred people there are suing several chemical companies after they claim their water was contaminated by PFAS in fire fighting foam used nearby.

"I felt betrayed, I felt frustration, irritation," said Chris Graham, one of the plaintiffs in the suit.

Graham has lived in his home in Colorado Springs since 2005. The veteran believes his water has poisoned him over the years, causing him to have thyroid issues that have become so severe, he had to quit work.

"It does weigh on you, it weighs on your mind," Graham said. "How would it not?"

His lawyer, David McDivitt, says the lawsuit is part of a nationwide class-action suit against the harmful chemicals.

"This is one of the most significant environmental litigations that has taken place in the last several decades, it's significant because thousands of people around the country have been impacted by chemicals that have seeped into their water supply system from foam that was used by the U.S. military to help put out fires, and the chemicals were put into this foam decades and decades ago," McDivitt said.

McDivitt and Graham believe Colorado should look at passing more stringent laws to further regulate PFAS levels in drinking water across the state.

"I think it's very prudent for states to take a hard look at what's an appropriate level," McDivitt said. "I think the lower the better, because no exposure is healthy."

"Zero would be the absolute best," Graham said. "So that way, there is no more guesswork."

EPA releases study on benefits of river to local economy
https://www.hannapub.com/ouachitacitizen/news/local_state_headlines/epa-releases-study-on-benefits-of-river-to-local-economy/article_97d4bfd2-7c38-11eb-bed8-bfbea16febf2.html
3 Mar. 2021

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Ouachita Parish Police Jury recently completed a three-year ecosystem study of the Ouachita River.

The two are now releasing a report, entitled "A Deeper Look at the Ouachita River, How investment in Ouachita River infrastructure sustains human well-being in Ouachita Parish, Louisiana."

The report will serve as a planning roadmap for flood resilience and a decision-making guide for federal, state and local officials.

"Every day, we see so many benefits from the Ouachita River," said Kevin Crosby, a consulting engineer for the Ouachita Parish Police Jury. "EPA helped us better describe the economic, social and environmental value of the Ouachita River to the citizens of the Parish. This information will help demonstrate how investments in the river directly benefit people and maintain proper levels."

The report provides information and guidance on increasing community flood resilience for the unincorporated areas of Ouachita Parish, Monroe and West Monroe, La. It is based on the sustainability of the Ouachita River ecosystem. The research by federal, state and local jurisdictions aims to further preparedness efforts and help communities become more resilient. In 2018, EPA conducted two in-person workshops with community members and later held an online webinar to discuss analysis and results, before finalizing the report. The final report will help advance Ouachita Parish's roadmap to flood resilience.

"This research is a valuable tool that will guide investment in critical infrastructure that will further protect human health and the environment so Americans may continue to enjoy the benefits of nature," said EPA Acting Regional Administrator David Gray. "By forging relationships at the ground level, we are building

resiliency programs with local communities, providing the information they need to be better prepared to protect important wetlands and ecosystems when threatened with flooding."

According to the EPA report, flood control strategies on the Ouachita River should include stakeholder engagement, increase public understanding of flood control effects on important ecosystem services, and better integrate flood control options into the strategic planning processes.

Resilience plans should account for community fundamental objectives regarding important ecosystem goods and services, under the report.

Services interact with infrastructure to support community well-being, the report shows.

EPA conducted this research through the Office of Research and Development's Center for Environmental Measurement and Modeling. This center conducts research to advance the EPA's ability to measure and model contaminants in the environment, including research to provide fundamental methods and models needed to implement environmental statutes.

Shipping tonnage on the Ouachita River has dropped below 1 million since 2013.

"All commercial use of the river generates nearly $5.7 billion in annual economic activity," stated a 2017 University of Louisiana-Monroe study by Dr. Bob Eisenstadt and Dr. Paul Nelson. "All commercial use of the river returns nearly $1.2 billion in income to households in Louisiana and Arkansas."

Fight for efficiency
https://www.supplyht.com/articles/103835-fight-for-efficiency
March 3, 2021
Natalie Forster

PHCP-PVF industry continues to advocate for legislation and standards optimal for water conservation and efficiency.

PHCP-PVF professionals throughout the supply chain are always concerned with ensuring clean water is delivered to communities in an efficient manner. Thankfully, industry associations and organizations are constantly working to advocate for the best legislative and code changes that benefit the industry and the communities it serves. Aging infrastructure, balancing efficiency with water safety, maintaining and strengthening the EPA WaterSense program and reliable efficient product innovation are among the top concerns.

Infrastructure and the new administration

Christoph Lohr, vice president of strategic initiatives at IAPMO, explains there is some hope for an increased commitment to water conservation under the new administration.

"At the federal level, we are already seeing Congress, the Biden Administration and incoming agency officials place a high priority on conservation efforts," he says. "President Biden is expected to unveil his major infrastructure package, which may include critical water provisions. Further, early discussions with the new incoming U.S. EPA leadership already indicate an increased level of commitment to water conservation and plumbing resiliency."

Aging water infrastructures is a huge concern for many areas of the country. Salvatore Pennachio, eastern regional manager for Niagara Conservation, a manufacturer focused on water and energy-saving technologies, says population growth is putting strain on already aging infrastructures.

"Managing water is a growing concern in U.S. cities as they look at challenges regarding water supply, water processing and how to update aging water treatment and delivery systems," Pennachio notes. "Many states are continuing to update their standards to improve water conservation and there are a variety of federal and local incentive programs that encourage water conservation."

One example of state initiatives is that of Texas, California, Georgia and New York who have mandates for new construction requiring that toilets must be 1.28 GPF or less. Additionally, The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) offers a significant Mortgage Insurance Premium Reduction (MIP) incentive when green certification and energy benchmarking are pursued.

Niagara notes its Stealth Technology innovation offers enhanced efficiency and conservation already, and it continues to improve. The vacuum-assist technology allowed Niagara to be the first to put a 0.8 GPF toilet on the market with a powerful flush that users expect. Photo courtesy of Niagara Conservation.

"Many builders are incentivized through programs like LEED and USGBC/NGBS to include toilets that are 1.0 or 0.8 GPF." Pennachio says.

Speaking to infrastructure concern, Lohr says FEMA and other government agencies are putting a premium on "resiliency" measures for buildings. "Plumbing is obviously just one component of this, but I am seeing the start of a trend that some jurisdictions are talking about it more and more. The Biden administration appears to want to tackle infrastructure issues, which means those 'downstream' will follow suit, as well."

When thinking about water efficiency, energy production and efficiency is a factor as well; pumping, heating and treating water all requires energy. Kerry Stackpole, CEO and executive director for Plumbing Manufactures International (PMI) explains the absence of sufficient energy is a concern.

"Some states have certainly started proposed legislations for 2021 including ways to promote energy efficiency," Stackpole says. "Consumers and their local legislators are pretty savvy, so I think they're stepping up to figure out solutions in those areas where energy is in limited or short supply."

Another area of infrastructure concern is building water safety. Jim Kendzel, director of codes and standards at ASA notes the association is actively engaged in several standards and guideline development processes specifically related to providing scientifically sound practices for water management systems designed to protect the water from contamination and ultimately help to reduce public health risks.

"As we continue to strive for increased water conservation and efficiency, we have found that building water systems and quality of the water within the building start to experience increased levels of contaminants mainly due to the 'water life' within the system increasing," Kendzel adds. "It's important that codes and standards, as well as regulations designed to reduce water use and set requirements for plumbing fixtures, do not go below the existing U.S. EPA WaterSense Program requirements."

According to Lohr, balancing water sustainability and water safety is vital, and the plumbing industry is at a nexus point.

"According to the EPA, showers and toilets account for almost half of the total water usage in an average home, and fixtures in restrooms account for more than a third of total water usage in an average office building.

"For so the last decade-plus we have focused entirely on water sustainability, unfortunately often in a non-holistic way. As a result, we have created conditions that likely contributed to the amplification of waterborne pathogens during that time," Lohr says. "The COVID-19 crisis exasperated these fears due to the massive number of vacant buildings with stagnant water. In addressing safety concerns we don't want to swing too far the other way, or we likely create conditions that further accelerate our water supplies drying."

Lohr explains that water efficiency is just one component of plumbing resiliency, and IAPMO has been and continues to work towards standards to find the balance between safety and sustainability.

"In 2018, IAPMO released the Water Demand Calculator (WDC), which vastly improves water efficiency by reducing the size of domestic water piping systems for the first time in 70 years," he says. "During the COVID pandemic, IAPMO worked with the American Water Works Association (AWWA) to produce the "Responding to Stagnant Water" document and is currently working on "The Manual of Best Practices for Safe Closure and Reopening of Buildings," which provides additional guidance on flushing."

WaterSense

WaterSense, created by the EPA in 2006 as a program to promote water efficiency by creating a label for consumer facing products that have been certified, continues to grow and encourage water conservation.

Stackpole again points out that consumers are becoming more and more savvy, which is reflected in the success of the WaterSense program. "There are now over 3,800 toilets that match the WaterSense specification," he says. "We've seen double digit growth in available products over the past five years, not only in toilets, but in faucets and shower heads, urinals, flushometers; almost any type of plumbing product."

Stephanie Salmon, Washington representative for PMI agrees, saying consumer demand for water efficient and money-saving products throughout the is continuing to grow. "WaterSense has a special label for homes that meet consumer efficiency demands — the WaterSense Specification for Homes," she explains. "In February, WaterSense released version 2.0 of this specification, which ensures WaterSense labeled homes are at least 30% more water-efficient than a comparable home using typical new construction."

Applicable to single-family and multifamily buildings, the version 2.0 specification increases flexibility in meeting WaterSense's technical requirements without compromising on overall water efficiency or performance, improves collaboration with green certification programs and allows for easier implementation and certification.

According to the EPA, showers and toilets account for almost half of the total water usage in an average home, and fixtures in restrooms account for more than a third of total water usage in an average office building.

"Americans are becoming more and more concerned about their water usage as several reports point to climate change and population growth causing water shortages in most of the United States," Pennachio says. "Many municipalities have rebate programs in place if residents select and install WaterSense products in their homes."

Kendzel says ASA uses WaterSense specifications as the benchmark to measure state legislative activities. "We're advocating for a national efficiency standards to avoid conflicting state and local requirements, which leads to confusion in the marketplace and increased costs for complying with varied requirements," he explains. "Our efforts this year are focused on monitoring and commenting on various state legislations, ensuring they are consistent with WaterSense specification, and the implementation dates of the legislation are based on a manufacture date and not a sell date."

Lohr again notes that plumbing fixtures must continue to become more efficient, but not at the expense of safety. "WaterSense certification will become more important to consumers, but we also need to pay attention

to our supporting infrastructure, such as the way we size the piping systems connecting to the fixture," he says. "We need to have both WaterSense products and right-size systems or we are sacrificing safety on behalf of sustainability.

Again, balance is key and plumbing resiliency is the answer."

Recent advocacy

On a federal level, Kendzel says the most significant proposed legislation is related to improving the infrastructure of water distribution systems. According to the U.S. EPA, the volume of water lost through distribution systems is 1.7 trillion gallons per year, at a cost of $2.6 billion.

"In May of 2020, ASA signed onto a statement by the Clean Water Council to the Senate Environmental and Public Works Committee, urging increased funding for America's Water Infrastructure Act of 2020 (AWIA) and the Drinking Water Infrastructure Act of 2020 (DWIA)." Kendzel explains.

Additionally, ASA recently joined the Alliance for Water Efficiency (AWE) and worked appeal on recent decisions made by the Department of Energy related to the interpretation of the testing of multi-head shower heads. Kendzel notes that since at least 2011, DOE has been clear that showerhead manufacturers and distributors may only sell showerheads in the U.S. with a maximum flow rate of 2.5 gpm, regardless of how many nozzles the showerhead may have.

Kendzel adds that DOE's redefinition of "showerhead" would put ASA members at a significant competitive disadvantage. "Foreign manufacturers are and have been free to manufacture and distribute showerheads outside the U.S. that exceed the Energy Policy and Conservation Act standards," he says. "ASA and its members are concerned about foreign products ready for sale and distribution in the U.S. that take advantage of DOE's 'showerhead' redefinition, but would not have been compliant under the previous rule."

The showerhead rule, AWE notes, would also waste billions of gallons of water, causing spikes in consumers water bills and compromising water availability.

Focuses for the year ahead

As 2021 continues, especially under the new administration, PHCP-PVF industry advocates have many goals in terms of water efficiency.

"Education is who we are at PMI, and that'll continue to be the focus moving forward," Salmon says. "There are almost 70 new lawmakers, including some in states like Georgia where we have a really strong presence. So we have reached out and will continue to reach out to educate these lawmakers about the great things our industry is doing."

Salmon notes PMI plans to have meetings with the Department of Energy, the EPA and the department of transportation in order to advocate for water infrastructure spending and to help get water-efficient products and supplies where they need to go.

Kendzel says ASA is engaged in several codes and standards updates regarding water efficiency and conservation. "Recently, I had the opportunity to chair a task group which developed draft proposals for the alternative water sources," he notes. "Specifically, the proposals address requirements for blackwater recycling equipment and storm water recycling equipment. The proposed changes have been submitted for consideration and adoption to IAPMO and Water Efficiency Standard (WE-Stand)."

On the product development side, Niagara explains flush performance, reliability, cleanliness and efficiency are all top-of-mind when designing toilets. “Our patented Stealth Technology has answered consumer concerns,” Pennachio says. “The vacuum assist technology utilizes both air and water to create a powerful, quiet flush, an extra-large water spot and superior line carry at only 0.8 GPF.”

All parties agree education and research are key for the continued push for efficient and safe water usage. “ASA is advocating for research initiatives related to the impact of increased water efficiency and reduced consumption on the entire building plumbing system,” Kendzel notes. “As the use of recycled water continues to grow within the building environment, it is critical that the recycled water is maintained to specific quality characteristics to ensure it does not have a negative impact on the performance and life of the plumbing system and its fixtures.”

Lohr stresses the importance of education within the industry. “In order for industry to take the next step and find balance between sustainability and safety, we need to be smarter and think more holistically,” he says. “This means attracting and retaining the brightest and best. It likely means everyone’s job will require more from them, but we don’t really have a choice — especially as water shortages and increasing water quality issues loom.”

Report: EPA has completed 3 of 6 actions under PFAS plan
https://www.watertechonline.com/industry/article/14198630/report-epa-has-completed-3-of-6-actions-under-pfas-plan
Mar 3rd, 2021

The Government Accountability office recently released a report finding that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has completed three of six selected regulatory-related actions for addressing per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) outlined in EPA's PFAS Action Plan . For two of the three completed actions, the steps EPA took were also in response to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 (FY20 NDAA):

After proposing a supplemental significant new use rule in February 2020, EPA met a June 2020 deadline set in the FY20 NDAA when the EPA Administrator signed the final rule. Among other things, under the final rule, articles containing certain PFAS as a surface coating, and carpet containing certain PFAS, can no longer be imported into the U.S. without EPA review.

EPA incorporated 172 PFAS into the Toxics Release Inventory in June 2020. The FY20 NDAA directed EPA to take this action, extending EPA's original planned action to explore data for listing PFAS chemicals to the inventory.

Finally, in March 2020, EPA completed a third regulatory-related action, not required under the FY20 NDAA, when the agency proposed a preliminary drinking water regulatory determination for two PFAS—an initial step toward regulating these chemicals in drinking water.

Status of Six Selected Regulatory-Related Actions in the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) Action Plan

Source: GAO analysis of EPA's 2019 PFAS Action Plan. | GAO-21-37

Three of the six selected regulatory-related actions are ongoing, and EPA's progress on these actions varies. For example:

As of August 2020, EPA was developing a proposed rulemaking for a nationwide drinking water monitoring rule that includes PFAS, which EPA officials said the agency intends to finalize by December 2021.

EPA planned to continue the regulatory process for designating two PFAS as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, would allow the agency to require responsible parties to conduct or pay for cleanup. On January 14, 2021, EPA issued an advance notice of proposed rulemaking for the hazardous substances designation to get public comment and data to inform the agency's ongoing evaluation of the two PFAS.

Beginning in the 1940s, scientists developed a class of heat- and stain-resistant chemicals—PFAS—that are used in a wide range of products, including nonstick cookware, waterproof clothing, and some firefighting foams. PFAS can persist in the environment for decades or longer. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has found that most people in the U.S. have been exposed to two of the most widely studied PFAS, likely from consuming contaminated water or food. According to EPA, there is evidence that continued exposure above certain levels to some PFAS may lead to adverse health effects. In February 2019, EPA issued its PFAS Action Plan , which outlined 23 planned actions to better understand PFAS and reduce their risks to the public.

GAO was asked to examine the status of regulatory-related actions in EPA's plan. For six regulatory-related actions GAO selected in EPA's PFAS Action Plan , this report examines (1) the number of actions that are complete and the steps EPA took to complete them and (2) the number of actions that are ongoing and EPA's progress toward completing them. GAO first identified those actions in the PFAS Action Plan that may lead to the issuance of federal regulations or could affect compliance with existing regulations. GAO then assessed the status of the actions by reviewing EPA documents and examining EPA's response to related FY20 NDAA requirements.

To read the full report, go to https://www.gao.gov/assets/720/712011.pdf

---

United States: EPA Indicates Intention To Regulate Certain PFAS In Drinking Water
https://www.mondaq.com/unitedstates/environmental-law/1042380/epa-indicates-intention-to-regulate-certain-pfas-in-drinking-water
03 March 2021
by Megan Haines , Daniella D. Landers , Todd Maiden , Benjamin H. Patton , Jennifer Smokelin and Phillip Babich

The EPA is moving towards establishing a drinking water standard for PFOA and PFOS, and has stated that it is considering avenues for regulating additional groups of PFAS under the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) as well. On February 22, 2021, the EPA announced two actions under SDWA to address PFAS.

First, the agency reissued the final regulatory determination to implement a National Primary Drinking Water Regulation (NPDWR) for PFOS and PFOA (the "Determination"). This Determination is a continuation of an intended action under the Trump administration, but indicates the Biden administration intends to continue to move forward. The Determination also states that the EPA is considering the regulation of additional PFAS chemicals.

In a related move, on the same day, the EPA indicated an even stronger focus on this issue than the previous administration. The EPA revised the proposed fifth SDWA-directed review under the Fifth Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring Rule (UCMR 5) to include an additional 29 PFAS chemicals. The proposed UCMR 5, once published in the Federal Register, will be subject to a 60-day public comment period. If promulgated, the UCMR 5 will impose data collection obligations on public water systems of a certain size. When completed,

that data collection can serve as part of the underpinning for additional SDWA actions, including adding chemicals to the Contaminant Candidate List and potentially regulating those chemicals under the SDWA. The action is unusual in targeting and potentially regulating a family of chemicals in that the list of potential contaminants is specifically focused on PFAS. The February 22nd regulatory determination triggers a rulemaking that, in the past, has often resulted in the establishment of a maximum contaminant level for the contaminants on which the rile focused.

Feel free to reach out to your regular Reed Smith contact with any questions.

Wisconsin's wolf hunt travesty
https://isthmus.com/opinion/citizen-dave/wisconsins-wolf-hunt-travesty/
BY DAVE CIESLEWICZ
MARCH 3, 2021

There was no biological or social imperative for a hunt. It only happened because some hunters just wanted to kill wolves.

I am a Wisconsin hunter and I am embarrassed and disgusted at what took place in my state last week with a rushed and ill-considered wolf hunt.

The Milwaukee Journal Sentinel's outdoor writer, Paul Smith, has written an excellent account of the history that got us to this point. But "this point" is carnage that exceeded the Department of Natural Resources' harvest goals by an astounding 82 percent.

Don't blame the DNR's wildlife professionals for that. They wanted to delay the hunt until November to give them adequate time to set proper limits, consult with Native American tribes, and administer the program correctly. But they were overruled by the courts, legislators and their own bosses on the Natural Resources Board.

"Never before had the DNR put together an application period and drawing for a hunt in such a short period of time," Smith writes. "It compromised the agency's legal requirement to consult with Native American tribes.

"And never before had the state held a hunting and trapping season during the wolves' breeding season."

To make matters worse, almost 90 percent of those wolves were hunted with dogs. Most ethical hunters would consider that to be out of bounds, unless you were trying to track down wolves that had been known to kill domestic animals. And to those who would say that it is very hard to find wolves without dogs, I'd say: Yes. It's hard. That's what makes it hunting instead of a video game.

A quick summary of the lengthy story recounted by Smith goes like this. On Jan. 4, the Trump EPA delisted the gray wolf as endangered. Wisconsin law requires that, when these federal protections come off, the DNR must schedule a hunt between the beginning of November and the end of February. (This is a bad law. DNR scientists and wildlife managers should make this decision, not legislators.)

DNR staff told agency policy makers that that did not give them enough time to put together a hunt by February. They recommended waiting for November. The board went along, but then a Kansas-based extremist group called Hunter Nation (Ted Nugent is on its board; enough said) sued and Wisconsin courts agreed that the DNR had no authority to delay the hunt. The result is this awful mess: a harvest quota grossly exceeded, tribal relations damaged, and the general non-hunting public appalled.

According to the DNR, wolves took only 152 domestic animals last year and their owners were well compensated by the public with payments totaling $1.8 million. And many of those animals were dogs used to hunt bear, another unethical hunting practice. Finally, Wisconsin law already allows anyone to shoot a wolf at any time if the wolf is threatening a domestic animal.

On the other hand, the wolf population now stands at over 1,000 and, even with the exceeded quotas, the department isn't worried that the population will crash. But obviously we can't exceed harvest quotas by this much every year.

But let's be honest: There was no biological or social imperative for a hunt. It only happened because some hunters just wanted to kill wolves.

Extremist groups like Hunter Nation should understand that they may have unwittingly helped end wolf hunts for a good long time into the future. This kind of thing will, no doubt, be used to push the Biden EPA to relist the gray wolf, thereby automatically ending Wisconsin's wolf hunt. Under the circumstances, I'd be for that.

If you accept the idea that hunting is okay (as about 70 percent of Americans do), then responsible policy makers should regulate it in a way that is sustainable for the species, is consistent with the ethical tradition of "fair chase," and also respects the prevailing cultural values of the public at large.

The rushed wolf hunt travesty of last week honored none of those goals.

Message

From: OCSPPNews [OCSPPNews@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/3/2021 10:19:25 PM
To: Blair, Susanna [Blair.Susanna@epa.gov]; Collazo Reyes, Yvette [CollazoReyes.Yvette@epa.gov]; Dennis, Allison [Dennis.Allison@epa.gov]; Diaz, Catherine [Diaz.Catherine@epa.gov]; Drinkard, Andrea [Drinkard.Andrea@epa.gov]; Freedhoff, Michal [Freedhoff.Michal@epa.gov]; Garcia, Beth [garcia.beth@epa.gov]; Goodis, Michael [Goodis.Michael@epa.gov]; Hanley, Mary [Hanley.Mary@epa.gov]; Hartman, Mark [Hartman.Mark@epa.gov]; Hauff, Amanda [Hauff.Amanda@epa.gov]; Henry, Tala [Henry.Tala@epa.gov]; Hughes, Hayley [hughes.hayley@epa.gov]; Kaiser, Sven-Erik [Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov]; Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]; Kochis, Daniel [Kochis.daniel@epa.gov]; Kramer, George [Kramer.George@epa.gov]; Labbe, Ken [Labbe.Ken@epa.gov]; Layne, Arnold [Layne.Arnold@epa.gov]; Messina, Edward [Messina.Edward@epa.gov]; Nguyen, Khanh [Nguyen.Khanh@epa.gov]; OPP Branch Chiefs [OPP_Branch_Chiefs@epa.gov]; OPP Deputy & Associate Directors [OPP_Deputy_&_Associate_Directors@epa.gov]; OPP Division Directors [OPP_Division_Directors@epa.gov]; OPP IO [OPP_IO@epa.gov]; OPPT Managers [OPPT_Managers@epa.gov]; OPS CSID CB [OPS_CSID_CB@epa.gov]; Picone, Kaitlin [Picone.Kaitlin@epa.gov]; Pierce, Alison [Pierce.Alison@epa.gov]; Richmond, Jonah [Richmond.Jonah@epa.gov]; Schmit, Ryan [schmit.ryan@epa.gov]; Siciliano, CarolAnn [Siciliano.CarolAnn@epa.gov]; Sullivan, Melissa [sullivan.melissa@epa.gov]; Tyler, Tom [Tyler.Tom@epa.gov]; Vendinello, Lynn [Vendinello.Lynn@epa.gov]; Vernon, Jennifer [Vernon.Jennifer@epa.gov]
Subject: OCSPP News for March 2, 2021

OCSPP Daily News Round-Up

Special News on Seresto Flea Collars

- AJC Atlanta 03/03; Seresto collar still being sold on Amazon; EPA hasn't warned public of any potential risks
- Consumer Affairs NA; Seresto flea collars named in thousands of complaints involving nearly 1,700 pet deaths
- Daily Mail 03/02; Seresto flea collars are linked to 1,700 pet deaths after animals are 'poisoned' by pesticide which should be safe for cats and dogs - as owners blast EPA for 'turning a blind eye to the problem'
- Fox 4 Kansas City 03/03; Investigation links pet sickness, death to flea and tick collar with Shawnee connection
- Local 12 03/03; Report: Popular flea collar linked to nearly 1,700 pet deaths
- News 12, The Bronx 03/03; EPA: Pet collar linked to over 1,700 dog and cat deaths
- NY Post 03/02; Popular flea collar reportedly linked to 1,700 pet deaths
- WHDH 7News, Boston 03/02; Report: Popular flea collar linked to nearly 1,700 pet deaths
- Wsahington Examiner 03/03; EPA issued no warning about popular flea collar linked to 1,700 pet deaths: Report

Toxics

- Bloomberg Law 03/02; Watchdog Faults Federal Climate Change, Chemical Efforts
- E&E News 03/03; Panels question GAO on climate risk, chemical pollution
- Inside TSCA 03/02; GAO: EPA's Ability To Assess And Manage Chemical Risks Has 'Regressed'
- Inside TSCA 03/02; Industry Scrambles To Comply With PBT Bans Ahead Of March 8 Deadline
- Inside TSCA 03/02; UCS Sees 'Brain Drain,' Scientific Integrity As Hurdles For TSCA Agenda
- Washington Post 03/02; The new list of troubled federal programs is longer than ever, watchdog reports

Blog/OpEd/Other

- Bergeson & Campbell Blogs 03/02; GAO Report States EPA Has Completed Some Regulatory-Related Actions for PFAS
- Bergeson & Campbell Blogs 03/03; GAO Reports that EPA's Process for Assessing and Controlling Toxic Chemicals Has Regressed
- Beyond Pesticides 03/03; Massachusetts Regulators Restrict Consumer Use of Bee-Toxic Neonicotinoid Pesticides
- Nation of Change 03/02; Despite pressure from US and Bayer, Mexico will ban glyphosate
- National Law Review NA; Updated Toxics in Packaging Legislation Adds PFAS and Phthalates

++

Seresto collar still being sold on Amazon; EPA hasn't warned public of any potential risks
ArLuther Lee, AJC Atlanta
https://www.ajc.com/news/popular-flea-collar-linked-to-1700-pet-deaths-across-us/N6ECNWGBYJCRLP6Q7M6KL4AT6M/

A popular flea and tick collar has been linked to nearly 1,700 pet deaths across the country, according to reports citing documents obtained from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

The Seresto collar, which can be worn for months as it releases small amounts of pesticide onto an animal's fur, is also suspected of sickening or injuring tens of thousands of cats and dogs as well as hundreds of their owners, reports said.

Seresto, developed by Bayer in 2012 and distributed by Elanco, is the top-selling collar on Amazon and is widely advertised as being safe for pets.

But the EPA — which regulates pesticides — has not warned the public to any potential risks of using the product despite receiving at least 1,698 reports of deadly incidents since the collar arrived on the market.

The federal agency has received more than 75,000 incident reports related to the collars, including nearly 1,000 reports of human illnesses through June 2020, according to USA Today.

The alarming number of deaths was known behind the scenes for years but only became public knowledge after the Center for Biological Diversity — a nonprofit watchdog group — obtained documents from the EPA through a public records request.

"The EPA appears to be turning a blind eye to this problem, and after seven years of an increasing number of incidents, they are telling the public that they are continuing to monitor the situation," said Karen McCormack, a retired EPA employee who called the staggering number of deaths and illnesses unprecedented. "I think this is a significant problem that needs to be addressed sooner rather than later."

It's unclear how Seresto compares to the safety of other pet collars.

A spokesperson for the agency told USA Today that the two pesticides found in Seresto were "eligible for continued registration" based on the latest scientific data and testing.

"No pesticide is completely without harm, but EPA ensures that there are measures on the product label that reduce risk," the spokesperson wrote in an email. "The product label is the law, and applicators must follow label directions. Some pets, however, like some humans, are more sensitive than others and may experience adverse symptoms after treatment."

Through the years, the collar had received numerous complaints from customers who claimed the collar had caused pets skin rashes and neurological issues.

In one case last year, a New Jersey veterinarian suggested an owner buy the Bayer Seresto collar for use on her indoor service animal.

Rhonda Bomwell's 9-year-old Papillon suffered a seizure June 2 after wearing the collar for one day, reports said.

The dog, Pierre, collapsed and stopped breathing.

Bomwell said she administered CPR but never thought to remove the collar. She rushed Pierre to the hospital, but he died before receiving treatment.

"I just didn't put it together," she said, noting that she had never used a flea and tick collar before.

Seresto flea collars named in thousands of complaints involving nearly 1,700 pet deaths
Sarah D. Young, Consumer Affairs
NA

A top-selling flea and tick collar has reportedly been linked to nearly 1,700 pet deaths and 1,000 incidents involving harm to humans, according to the Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting.
The group says Seresto pet collars have been named in approximately 75,000 incident reports with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), but the agency has yet to issue an official warning about the apparent risks of the collars.

"The EPA appears to be turning a blind eye to this problem, and after seven years of an increasing number of incidents, they are telling the public that they are continuing to monitor the situation," Karen McCormack, a former EPA official, said of the agency, according to the report. "But I think this is a significant problem that needs to be addressed sooner rather than later."

McCormack added that Seresto collars, which are developed by Bayer and manufactured by Elenco, "has the most incidents of any pesticide pet product" she's ever seen.

EPA responds
Seresto's pet collar works by slowly releasing chemicals into the pet's body over time. The active ingredients are imidacloprid and flumethrin. The former affects the central nervous system of fleas, and the latter repels and kills ticks.

In the report, an EPA spokesperson was quoted as saying that no pesticide "is completely without harm."

"EPA ensures that there are measures on the product label that reduce risk," the spokesperson said. "Some pets, however, like some humans, are more sensitive than others and may experience adverse symptoms after treatment."

In another statement, the agency appeared to place some of the blame for its inaction on the Trump administration

"Under the Biden-Harris Administration EPA has returned to its core mission, which includes protecting our pets' health," the statement said. "We take every incident reported seriously and review these data to see whether action is necessary."

The agency said it "encourages pet owners to read the entire label before using the pesticide product and follow all directions carefully, including monitoring your pet after application to see if side effects occur. If side effects develop, the label tells the consumer to consult the pet's veterinarian immediately."

Consumer reviews
As of June 2020, the collars have been linked to numerous incidents involving both pet and human harm, according to EPA documents.

Consumers reviewing the product on Amazon have said they noticed changes in their pet's behavior that appeared to crop up in connection with the use of the collar. Others have claimed the collar caused skin rashes or neurological issues in their pets.

"Put this collar on my 10 pound Maltese and 14 pound Shih Tzu in May 2016," one reviewer said. "Within 3 days the Shih Tzu was laying in his bed all day whining and every time I picked him up he would cry out, as if he was in pain.... take

the collar off, bathe him AND by the next morning he is back to normal!!!! Called my Vet and Bayer and was told he must be allergic to an ingredient in the collar."

Although the number of reported incidents may be far fewer than the number of incidents that have actually occurred, the sheer volume should be a cause for concern for pet owners. Nathan Donley, a senior scientist at the Center for Biological Diversity and an expert on U.S. pesticide regulation, told USA Today that the reported incidents are "just the tip of the iceberg."

"My God, if this doesn't trigger a concern, that's a fundamental problem with the process," Donley said in the report. "The fact that EPA has not done anything to alert the public that there might be an issue here, it strikes me as bordering on criminal. The EPA has this system in place to compile information and it's just collecting dust in some database."

Seresto flea collars are linked to 1,700 pet deaths after animals are 'poisoned' by pesticide which should be safe for cats and dogs - as owners blast EPA for 'turning a blind eye to the problem'
VALERIE EDWARDS, Daily Mail
https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-9317489/Seresto-flea-collars-linked-nearly-1-700-pet-deaths.html

A popular brand of flea collars has been linked to the deaths of nearly 1,700 pets, but the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has not issued a warning to the public.

According to USA Today, which cited the EPA, the Seresto flea collars, developed by Bayer, have been linked to at least 1,698 pet deaths since being introduced in 2012.

Through June 2020, the EPA received more than 75,000 major and minor injury reports related to the collars

The EPA report also includes nearly 1,000 incidents of humans being harmed while in close proximity of the collars.

Karen McCormack told USA Today that the EPA has known about these incidents for years but has not informed the public of the potential risks associated with this product.

McCormack, a retired EPA employee said: 'The EPA appears to be turning a blind eye to this problem, and after seven years of an increasing number of incidents, they are telling the public that they are continuing to monitor the situation.

'But I think this is a significant problem that needs to be addressed sooner rather than later.'

Investigation links pet sickness, death to flea and tick collar with Shawnee connection
Matt Stewart, Travis Meier, Fox 4 Kansas City
https://fox4kc.com/news/investigation-links-pet-sickness-death-to-metro-made-flea-and-tick-collar/

Could the flea and tick collar you put on your pet be hurting them? The results of a new investigation are concerning for pet owners.

Whether its man's best friends or a furry feline, pets are a part of the family, and many owners love them like their own children. When you put a flea and tick collar on them, you expect it to be safe for them to wear.

But an investigation that published this morning by the Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting along with USA Today discovered a troubling trend.

After looking over thousands of federal documents from the EPA, investigators learned there have been more than

75,000 complaints about the Seresto-brand flea and tick collar over the past nine years. They discovered close to 1,700 dogs and cats wearing this collar died.

Elanco Animal Health recently bought Bayer Animal Health, which for years did research in Shawnee on animal products like the flea and tick collar in question.

Bayer created this collar with the brand name Seresto, and Elanco now sells it. It uses two types of pesticides to kill fleas and ticks, releasing small amounts of chemicals onto your pet over time. Investigators found evidence this collar might be killing dogs and cats, too.

PETS IN THE METRO
Video captures Northland man hitting dog with machete after it attacked his pet pig
Pet hospice services help manage pain, anxiety and tough decisions in final days
New pet owner pays it forward to KC cat rescue in need of new home
"There is no established link between death and exposure to the active ingredients contained in Seresto," A spokesperson for Elanco wrote in a statement. "We take the safety of our products very seriously, and thoroughly investigate potential concerns related to their use."

The United States Environmental Protection Agency regulates all products with pesticides and responded by saying they believe it is still safe enough. They noted that some warnings exist on the product's packaging. Despite the complaints, the product will stay on the market.

An EPA spokesperson said they believe some pets just might be more sensitive to this particular pesticide combination than others.

The EPA has never warned the public about this Seresto product, and there is no evidence to think the agency will anytime soon.

[...]

Report: Popular flea collar linked to nearly 1,700 pet deaths
CNY Central, Local 12
https://local12.com/news/nation-world/report-popular-flea-collar-linked-to-nearly-1700-pet-deaths-seresto-tick-collars-usa-today-epa

A popular flea collar has been linked to at least 1,698 related pet deaths and thousands of pet injuries, according to an investigative report from USA TODAY based on U.S. Environmental Protection Agency documents.

The report says that EPA documents show that Seresto, one of the most popular flea and tick collars in the country, has been linked to pet deaths, injuries, and also harmed humans.

Seresto's collar works by releasing small amounts of pesticide that is supposed to kill fleas and ticks but be safe for cats and dogs.

However, since the collars were introduced in 2012, the EPA has reportedly received incident reports of at least 1,698 related pet deaths. Overall, the agency has gotten more than 75,000 incident reports related to the collars through June 2020, including nearly 1,000 involving human harm.

An EPA spokesperson told USA TODAY that the two pesticides in Seresto have "been found eligible for continued registration."

"No pesticide is completely without harm, but EPA ensures that there are measures on the product label that reduce risk," the spokesperson told USA TODAY in a statement. "The product label is the law, and applicators must follow label directions. Some pets, however, like some humans, are more sensitive than others and may experience adverse symptoms after treatment."

The EPA did not respond to USA TODAY's request for how Seresto compared to other flea and tick collars in terms of incidents.

EPA: Pet collar linked to over 1,700 dog and cat deaths
News 12 Staff, News 12, The Bronx
https://bronx.news12.com/epa-pet-collar-linked-to-over-1-700-dog-and-cat-deaths

A popular pet collar is being linked to over 1,700 animal deaths.

Environmental Protection Agency documents show Seresto's flea and tick collar has been tied to a number of cat and dog deaths, and even hundreds of injuries to humans.

The product reportedly releases small amounts of pesticide. The toxin is meant to kill common vermin, while being safe for pets.

A dog owner in New Jersey lost her 9-year-old service dog Pierre last year. The dog suffered a seizure after wearing a Seresto collar for one day.

No recalls or warnings have been issued for the collar by any government agency yet.

Popular flea collar reportedly linked to 1,700 pet deaths
Lisa Fickenscher, NY Post
https://nypost.com/2021/03/02/popular-flea-collar-reportedly-linked-to-1700-pet-deaths/

A popular flea and tick collar is reportedly making thousands of pets sick and even killing some of them — and critics are blaming the Environmental Protection Agency for turning a blind eye to the problem.

The EPA, which is responsible for regulating products that contain pesticides, has received 75,000 incident reports about Seresto pet collars, developed by Bayer and manufactured by Elenco, since they were introduced in 2012, according to public records.

Those include 1,698 pet deaths and nearly 1,000 incidents involving harm to humans, according to an explosive report published Tuesday by the Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting and USA Today.

"After seven years of an increasing number of incidents, they are telling the public that they are continuing to monitor the situation," Karen McCormack, a former EPA official, said of the agency, according to the report. "But I think this is a significant problem that needs to be addressed sooner rather than later."

Seresto, McCormack added, "has the most incidents of any pesticide pet product" she's ever seen.

Keri McGrath, a spokeswoman for Louisville, Ky.-based Elanco, told The Post in an emailed statement that More than 25 million Seresto collars have been sold since they were approved in 2012. Figures cited in an incident report for last year amounted to "a fraction of 1 percent of users," defined by the World Health organization as "uncommon," she said.

"It is critically important to understand that a report is not an indication of cause," McGrath said. "What those numbers represent is the number of reports received, and do not reflect causality."

EPA officials appeared to downplay the incidents in a statement for the Tuesday report.

"No pesticide is completely without harm," an EPA spokesperson said, according to the report, confirming that the agency has found the Seresto collars are "eligible for continued registration."

"EPA ensures that there are measures on the product label that reduce risk," the spokesperson added. "Some pets, however, like some humans, are more sensitive than others and may experience adverse symptoms after treatment."

But in a statement to The Post, the agency appeared to suggest the lapse was a failure of the Trump administration.

"Under the Biden-Harris Administration EPA has returned to its core mission, which includes protecting our pets' health," the statement said. "We take every incident reported seriously and review these data to see whether action is necessary. EPA encourages pet owners to read the entire label before using the pesticide product and follow all directions carefully, including monitoring your pet after application to see if side effects occur. If side effects develop, the label tells the consumer to consult the pet's veterinarian immediately."

[...]

Report: Popular flea collar linked to nearly 1,700 pet deaths
Frank O'Laughlin, WHDH 7News, Boston
https://whdh.com/news/report-popular-flea-collar-linked-to-nearly-1700-pet-deaths/#:~:text=(WHDH)%20%E2%80%94%20A%20popular%20flea,according%20to%20multiple%20published%20reports

(WHDH) — A popular flea and tick collar for dogs and cats has been linked to nearly 1,700 pet deaths, as well as tens of thousands of injuries, according to multiple published reports.

Scores of pets are being harmed by Seresto collars, which work by releasing small amounts of pesticide onto the animal for months at a time, according to a new report published by the Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting and USA Today.

Since Seresto introduced the collars in 2012, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has received reports of at least 1,698 pet-related deaths.

As of June 2020, the EPA had also received more than 75,000 incident reports related to the collars, according to documents obtained by the Center for Biological Diversity and shared with the Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting.

Nearly 1,000 of the reported incidents involved human harm, the documents indicated.

EPA issued no warning about popular flea collar linked to 1,700 pet deaths: Report
Mica Soellner, Wsahington Examiner
https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/news/epa-issued-no-warning-on-collar-linked-to-pet-deaths

The Environmental Protection Agency did not warn consumers about a popular flea and tick collar that's been linked to 1,700 pet deaths despite having documents indicating that it caused hundreds of pet deaths and thousands of injuries.

Seresto, a collar developed by Bayer and sold by Elanco, works by releasing small amounts of pesticide onto the animal wearing it for months at a time, according to a report by the Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting.

The pesticide is used to kill fleas, ticks, and other pests, but it is supposed to be safe for dogs and cats. However, the effects of the collar have hurt thousands of animals, including Rhonda Bomwell's 9-year-old Papillon service dog named Pierre.

Bomwell, of New Jersey, purchased a collar after it was recommended by her veterinarian, but a day after Pierre began wearing the Seresto collar, he had a seizure, collapsed with his eyes rolled back, and stopped breathing.

"I just didn't put it together," Bomwell said, referring to his death being linked to the collar.

Since Seresto collars were introduced in 2012, the EPA has received at least 1,698 incident reports of pet deaths. Through June 2020, the agency had more than 75,000 incident reports, including almost 1,000 that involved human harm.

Karen McCormack, a retired EPA employee who worked as a scientist and communications officer, said the agency knew of the risks but did not inform the public and that the collars had the most incident reports of any pesticide pet product she's ever seen.

"The EPA appears to be turning a blind eye to this problem, and after seven years of an increasing number of incidents, they are telling the public that they are continuing to monitor the situation, but I think this is a significant problem that needs to be addressed sooner rather than later," McCormack said.

The EPA, which is in charge of regulating products that contain pesticides, told the Washington Examiner that the agency takes reported incidents seriously and encourages pet owners to look carefully at a product's label before deciding to use it.

"Under the Biden-Harris Administration, EPA has returned to its core mission, which includes protecting our pets' health," an agency spokesperson said via email. "We take every incident reported seriously and review these data to see whether action is necessary. EPA encourages pet owners to read the entire label before using the pesticide product and follow all directions carefully, including monitoring your pet after application to see if side effects occur. If side effects develop, the label tells the consumer to consult the pet's veterinarian immediately."

Keri McGrath, a spokeswoman for Elanco, said that the company takes the safety of their products "very seriously and thoroughly investigates potential concerns related to their use."

McGrath also said global data shows 1 in 568 users of Seresto have an incident and that the majority are "nonserious effects," such as reddening of skin or hair loss below the collar.

"Keep in mind that the existence of an adverse event report does not necessarily mean the product caused the problem," McGrath said. "Causality between the observed signs and the use of the product is evaluated on a case-by-case basis. That said, every adverse event collected, regardless of causality, is reported to the authorities."

But Ron Packard, a Massachusetts resident who created a Facebook page to raise awareness of the issue, is asking people to share their stories and help prevent others from losing their beloved pets. His two dogs died shortly after wearing the Seresto collars. Packard is encouraging everyone to report their story to the EPA.

"I don't want others to go through what we went through," Packard said. "Every time I read the stories, it brings me back to my dogs. But if I [...]

Watchdog Faults Federal Climate Change, Chemical Efforts
Pat Rizzuto, Bloomberg Law
https://news.bloombergiaw.com/environment-and-energy/watchdog-faults-chemical-analysis-programs-under-trump-epa?context=search&index=4

Federal agencies under President Trump failed to manage climate change risks, according to a Government Accountability Office report released Tuesday that also faulted EPA chemical analysis programs.

The High-Risk Series report, which also addressed cybersecurity, public health, and fiscal responsibility programs, was the focus of a House Committee on Oversight and Reform hearing Tuesday. Many committee members echoed Chairwoman Carolyn B. Maloney (D-N.Y.) in calling the report and hearing among Congress' most important, because they provide a blueprint for improving government effectiveness.

Rep. Jamie Raskin (D-Md.) asked during the hearing whether the government's failure to develop a strategic plan to guide national efforts to prepare for and adapt to climate change could have helped prevent widespread power outages in Texas last month that occurred because of extremely cold temperatures.

Gene L. Dodaro, the comptroller general of the United States and sole witness, said several of the report's recommendations could help reduce damage and protect communities.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency and the Department of Defense had only partly implemented the 2018 Disaster Recovery Reform Act as of mid-January, the GAO report said. The law requires damaged infrastructure to be rebuilt at the same or better levels to improve U.S. capacity for the next catastrophic event, Dodaro said.

The federal government should provide national leadership, but building codes and development policies are set at the local level, he said. "If we don't have those in place, we will be limited in what we do," Dodaro said.

FEMA didn't immediately reply to questions about concerns raised in the GAO report.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture and Office of Management and Budget were also faulted in the GAO report for having an inadequate response to climate change.

Chemical Concerns
Two Environmental Protection Agency programs that analyze chemicals aren't meeting the federal government's needs or congressional mandates, according to the report. It focused on the Integrated Risk Information System, or IRIS program, which the research office runs to serve offices throughout the agency, and the risk evaluations the EPA's chemicals office conducts to implement the 2016 Toxic Substances Control Act amendments.

The EPA hasn't provided sufficient resources for the IRIS, which didn't issue any final assessments between August 2018 and December 2020, and the chemicals office is failing to meet chemical risk evaluation deadlines set by the 2016 Toxic Substances Control Act amendments, the report said.

Committee members didn't directly discuss the report's TSCA findings, but Dodaro asked Mark Gaffigan, who focuses on natural resources and the environment at GAO, to reply to Rep. Rashida Tlaib (D-Mich.) statements about the need for assessments that account for the exposures "black and brown" communities experience because they often live in highly polluted areas.

Chemical assessments need to better account for environmental justice, Gaffignan said.

Committee members' views on IRIS illustrated the diametrically opposed positions that program has long attracted.

Rep. Andy Biggs (R-Ariz.) mentioned the the Improving Science in Chemical Assessments Act, H.R. 62, he introduced in January. It would eliminate the IRIS program that he called "unnecessary and duplicative."

Tlaib said the program's problems result in recent years from the Trump administration's efforts to eliminate it.

Gaffigan said the federal agency can't take action without an assessment of the underlying problem, but GAO has no position on which part of the EPA should carry out such analyses.

The EPA, now under President Joe Biden, said it will review the report and soon be briefed on it.

The agency "is committed to ensuring IRIS assessments are high-quality and adhere to the highest standards of scientific integrity," a spokesperson said by email.

The agency also said it's [...]

Panels question GAO on climate risk, chemical pollution
Kylie Mohr, E&E News
https://www.eenews.net/eedaily/2021/03/03/stories/1063726473

House and Senate lawmakers yesterday questioned Comptroller General Gene Dodaro on the federal government's preparedness for climate change.

The Government Accountability Office's latest report on "high risk" programs notes the government's need to limit its fiscal exposure by better managing climate risk.

The document says that since GAO's 2019 report, "the federal government has not made measurable progress to reduce its fiscal exposure to climate change."

The House Oversight and Reform Committee and the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee held hearings on the report yesterday.

Dodaro noted that the federal government is the biggest property and landowner in the United States and recommended structural changes to flood and crop insurance programs to confront risk.

The comptroller general also spoke about building better resilience upfront with the goal of reducing spending on disaster relief.

"Limiting the federal government's fiscal exposure by managing climate risk is a very important issue," Dodaro told lawmakers.

Rep. Jamie Raskin (D-Md.) drilled in on the report's call for a national climate strategic plan, the prioritization of national climate resilience projects and the creation of a pilot program for community climate migration.

A discussion on the need for cooperation through all levels of government ensued, with Raskin arguing, "We need to mobilize the whole society to confront this danger."

PFAS
Senate Homeland Security Chairman Gary Peters (D-Mich.) focused his questioning on pollution from per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances, or PFAS, linked to military installations.

The government's environmental liability is a focus of the GAO report, with the departments of Energy and Defense bearing the bulk of the costs to clean up nuclear and hazardous waste.

"I'm concerned about the lack of progress that's been made by the Department of Defense to address this public health and environmental crisis," Peters said of PFAS.

GAO is reviewing the military response to the contaminants, with another report expected later this year.

"It's really important to figure out what standard we're going to clean that up to," said Mark Gaffigan, the managing director of GAO's natural resources and environment team.

IRIS
EPA's Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) garnered attention from both Reps. Andy Biggs (R-Ariz.) and Rashida Tlaib (D-Mich.).

Both were visibly frustrated that the report noted that IRIS didn't issue a completed chemical assessment between August 2018 and December 2020.

Biggs, like many conservative Republicans, believes IRIS chemical reviews are duplicative and would like to see them eliminated.

Tlaib, a progressive Democrat, made the lack of thorough analysis by the agency personal, talking about pollution issues in her district.

"The problem isn't IRIS; the problem is Republican refusal to believe in science and take climate change seriously," she said. "It's no coincidence the EPA failed to do its job under the Trump administration."

The GAO report said EPA needs to improve its hazards monitoring efforts. The issue made the high-risk list beginning in 2009.

Rep. Cori Bush (D-Mo.) told the story of how her basement flooded with potentially radioactive waste from a nearby creek in St. Louis and asked lawmakers if they would live there knowing that.

Gaffigan said, "We think this is just the tip of the iceberg. We think there are a lot more places like Coldwater Creek that need to be identified, and we need to figure out to what degree they need to be cleaned up."

GAO: EPA's Ability To Assess And Manage Chemical Risks Has 'Regressed'
Maria Hegstad, Inside TSCA
https://insideepa.com/tsca-news/gao-epa-s-ability-assess-and-manage-chemical-risks-has-regressed

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has found that EPA programs to assess and control chemical risks have "regressed" against its criteria despite already being rated a "high risk" of fraud, waste or abuse, the Congressional watchdog announced in its latest, biennial High-Risk Report assessing programs across the federal government.

The finding focuses on both EPA's Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) program and Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) program within EPA's research office. EPA's ability to assess and control chemicals has been on GAO's high-risk list since 2009 but GAO notes in its latest report that EPA has "regressed in [its] ratings against our criteria for removal from the High-Risk List."

GAO explains in its March 2 High-Risk Report that what it calls the "Transforming EPA's Process for Assessing and Controlling Toxic Chemicals high-risk area declined in the monitoring criterion from a partially met rating in 2019 to a not met rating in 2021."

The report cites the fact that IRIS did not release a completed assessment in the months GAO reviewed -- from August

2018 to December 2020 -- and "lacked implementation steps and resource information in its strategic plan and metrics to define progress."

And it says the toxics office that oversees TSCA implementation "did not complete workforce or workload planning to ensure the agency can meet TSCA deadlines; and (2) did not meet initial statutory deadlines for releasing its first 10 chemical risk evaluations."

Overall, GAO writes, "four criteria remain unchanged" for EPA between its 2019 and 2021 high risk reports but "ratings for three criteria in the [IRIS] Program and four criteria in the [TSCA] segments declined."

Specifically, it says, "ratings for demonstrated progress remained unchanged. However, ratings for leadership commitment declined from met to partially met; ratings for capacity, action plan, and monitoring declined from partially met to not met."

The report comes as EPA is beginning the next batch of 20 TSCA evaluations for existing chemicals, which are subject to a three-year statutory deadline. The agency has also committed to completing a handful of industry-requested evaluations, using a procedure set out for the first time in Congress' 2016 re-write of the chemicals law.

But the agency is still building the program, including its ongoing, first-time effort to write rules designed to manage the unreasonable risks identified in the first 10 evaluations it completed under the Trump administration, at the same time as President Joe Biden's leadership team is arriving and could demand major changes in how EPA implements TSCA.

And even though the agency has sought to bolster staffing at the toxics program -- and recently posted openings for industrial hygienists and environmental engineers -- questions remain about whether it has sufficient resources to meet the demanding statutory requirements in the revised law.

GAO's report notes that since the watchdog "added TSCA implementation to our High-Risk List in 2009, we have made three recommendations related to this high-risk area, of which one remains open. Specifically, EPA needs to carry out workforce planning to ensure it has the resources and plans in place to facilitate progress on chemical risk evaluations and other work implementing TSCA. EPA needs to issue 20 high-priority risk evaluations by December 2022 and submit annual plans to Congress that contain details about resource needs and implementation steps for completing mandated work."

While the Trump administration touted its completion of the first 10 evaluations in the weeks before the presidential transition, just one of that set, that of methylene chloride, was released by the June 2020 statutory deadline. While TSCA provides for six-month extensions of its three-year deadline for completing existing chemical evaluations, not all the remaining evaluations met that deadline either.

The TSCA program now faces the [...]

Industry Scrambles To Comply With PBT Bans Ahead Of March 8 Deadline
David LaRoss, Inside TSCA
https://insideepa.com/tsca-news/industry-scrambles-comply-pbt-bans-ahead-march-8-deadline

Sectors from electronics makers to big box retailers are scrambling to comply with EPA's five first-time TSCA rules on persistent, bioaccumulative and toxic (PBT) chemicals before a March 8 deadline -- a process one attorney says has been complicated by the fact that some firms subject to the rules lack experience with the law.

The Jan. 6 rules set out new restrictions on the processing or distribution in commerce of five PBTs, including importing and selling finished goods and other "articles" whose components include the chemicals.

Environmental groups, who are already suing over one of the rules, criticized the Trump-era rulemaking for exempting a host of uses from any restrictions. But the Biden EPA opted not to block the rules from becoming effective on Feb. 5, which in turn set the first round of compliance deadlines for March 8. Instead, the agency noted that it could revisit the rules to either make them more protective or address implementation issues.

Those implementation issues could arise as soon as the March 8 compliance deadline arrives, in large part because the rules do not exempt imported "articles" containing the chemicals from their requirements.

As a result, several industry sectors that have historically been exempt from the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), because their sales of finished products are not considered chemical "uses" under most EPA rules, will nonetheless be required to follow the PBT bans since they include no corresponding exemption.

"These are generally companies that are not subject to TSCA restrictions, because they're importing articles. . . . now you have the big box retail stores suddenly subject to TSCA for the first time," Richard Engler, director of chemistry at the law firm Bergeson & Campbell, tells Inside TSCA.

And sources say many of the companies that will be subject to the rules might not have been tracking their development before EPA finalized them early this year.

For instance, a spokesperson for the Electronic Components Industry Association tells Inside TSCA that the PBT rules "came up rather suddenly," and that the group is currently "working on a response" alongside the National Association of Manufacturers.

Thus, while EPA may have expected regulated entities to have been preparing for compliance since it first selected the five PBTs for regulation in 2016, many companies may in fact have only become aware of the rule in recent months.

"These companies are now faced with needing to know what's in their imported products," which can be a resource-intensive investigation, Engler says.

"If you're importing something that's really complex, like a computer, you have to know for all the bits and bobs and widgets, what's in each of those. . . . The retailer has to ask the brand, and the brand has to ask the foreign manufacturer, and the manufacturer has to ask the part suppliers, and they have to ask the chemical suppliers. It's a deep, deep supply-chain question."

Supply-Chain Concerns

Observers previously warned that the PBT rules could interfere with supply chains. For instance, during a Feb. 25 panel discussion on chemicals policy during the American Legal Institute-Continuing Legal Education program's annual environmental law conference, Lynn Bergeson, managing partner at Bergeson & Campbell, warned of "continuing supply chain interruptions" from new TSCA rules.

"I think there will be continuing supply chain interruptions and in that regard we need look no further than some of the phase out dates and risk mitigation measures implemented under the January PBT rules. . . . I think it's a very good illustration of some of the supply chain interruptions and disruptions that will be occasioned by TSCA implementation," she said.

But Engler says it is unclear what short-term relief EPA can offer since even though the compliance deadline has not arrived the rule has already reached its effective date, limiting the agency's ability to postpone [...]

UCS Sees 'Brain Drain,' Scientific Integrity As Hurdles For TSCA Agenda
Diana DiGangi, Inside TSCA

https://insideepa.com/tsca-news/ucs-sees-brain-drain-scientific-integrity-hurdles-tsca-agenda

While the Biden administration is expected to pursue an aggressive toxics agenda, those plans could be undermined by Trump-era staffing losses and the need to overhaul core protections for scientific integrity and the independence of staff scientists, says an analyst at the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS).

Research analyst Anita Desikan told Inside TSCA in a recent interview that UCS is treating "capacity building" of career scientists at EPA and other federal agencies as a top priority in the Biden administration, as a remedy to the Trump-era "federal brain drain" that "damaged our nation's science capacity."

"So many EPA scientists and scientists from other federal agencies, we've been losing them, their workforce has been diminishing," Desikan said. "I think another area that the Biden administration has prioritized is hiring more qualified scientists so they can do these excellent risk evaluations and carry out science-based decision-making processes that help people."

She said how the agency addresses those fundamental staffing needs will determine whether it can follow through on President Joe Biden's promises -- on the campaign trail and since taking office -- on toxic substances, including ambitious goals for action on per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS).

Biden's plan for PFAS, which includes limiting use of the chemicals under the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) alongside drinking water protections, applying the Superfund law and other steps, "are all really good things, and they indicate strong science-based measures," Desikan said. But she and other UCS staff say EPA will struggle to complete them unless it bolsters its scientific capacity.

For instance, the group in January argued that the loss of 672 scientific staff at the agency between 2016 and 2020 has left it unable to "fulfill its science-based mission."

"The EPA cannot fulfill its important mission to protect public health and our environment if it does not have the scientific staff to conduct the needed science to inform its decisions," wrote UCS research scientist Jacob Carter.

And Desikian said the agency will also need to bolster its commitment to scientific integrity and scientists' independence from political decision-making, reiterating environmentalists' long-standing charge that the Trump administration allowed political officials to override career staff.

For instance, she said EPA should withdraw a controversial guidance on the 2020 significant new use rule for several PFAS chemicals that the Trump administration finalized in its final days only a day after the comment period closed, drawing attacks from environmentalists who called the comment process a "sham."

"This guidance was implemented by Trump appointee Nancy Beck, who used it to weaken the rule to protect public health," Desikan said. Beck a former American Chemistry Council official, who served as a top political appointee in the toxics office during the first years of the Trump administration, was widely accused of shaping TSCA policies to favor industry.

The Biden EPA on Feb. 9 withdrew its Trump-era risk assessment for perfluorobutanesulfonic acid (PFBS) on the grounds that it was the product of "political interference," and that move has already spurred more calls to scrap other actions that environmentalists say were politically motivated, such as the TSCA assessment of the solvent trichloroethylene (TCE).

Chemical Data

Desikan said EPA will particularly need a robust scientific program to monitor and possibly verify the data companies submit on their new uses of regulated chemicals, which could help bolster the TSCA section 5 new-chemicals program.

"One thing we're thinking about is that chemicals should be required to submit the testing methods they're using and the chemical samples they're using with their new chemical applications, so EPA can monitor them and independent scientists can study them," Desikan said.

Such an approach could be [...]

The new list of troubled federal programs is longer than ever, watchdog reports
Joe Davidson, Washington Post
https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/trump-gao-watchdog-omb/2021/03/02/4a67a9c0-7aea-11eb-b0fc-83144c02d676_story.html

The federal government's new list of troubled programs has more items than ever.

At the beginning of a new Congress every two years, the main government watchdog agency issues a list of government programs with major problems.

This year's 302-page high-risk report card, which was released Tuesday, is worse than it should be. The document indicates the Trump administration's unwillingness to fully engage with the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office (GAO) that audits agencies.

In the penultimate paragraph of the 34-page letter to congressional leaders that opens the report, Comptroller General Gene L. Dodaro said GAO meetings with top administration officials are important to resolving these particularly vexing problems.

But Trump officials in the agencies and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) generally declined to meet with GAO as previous administrations did, wrote Dodaro, who heads the GAO. "We hope that these sessions can be resumed," he wrote, "because they have in the past led to greater progress on high-risk issues."

Russ Vought, Trump's OMB director, disputed Dodaro's assessment. "OMB met regularly with GAO, and not once in all our meetings did the Comptroller ever raise concerns about not getting OMB's input on the high risk work," Vought said in a statement.

A lack of progress is the report's main message. The list does not cover policies and actions by the Biden administration, which took office on Jan. 20.

[...]

Booby prizes for going backward or joining the list go to agencies with programs needing quick and significant action. With GAO's explanations, they include:

[...]

Environmental Protection Agency toxic chemicals programs. Among other problems, EPA "did not complete workforce or workload planning to ensure the agency can meet ... deadlines," including for chemical risk evaluations. An agency statement said Biden officials "will review the conclusions and recommendations in the GAO Report."

GAO Report States EPA Has Completed Some Regulatory-Related Actions for PFAS
Lynn L. Bergeson and Carla N. Hutton, Bergeson & Campbell Blogs
http://www.tscablog.com/entry/gao-report-states-epa-has-completed-some-regulatory-related-actions-for-pfa

On March 1, 2021, the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) publicly released a report entitled Man-Made Chemicals and Potential Health Risks: EPA Has Completed Some Regulatory-Related Actions for PFAS. GAO was asked to examine the status of regulatory-related actions in EPA's 2019 Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances (PFAS) Action Plan. GAO found that EPA completed three of six selected regulatory-related actions for addressing PFAS outlined in the PFAS Action Plan. For two of the three completed actions, the steps EPA took were also in response to the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020 (FY20 NDAA):

After proposing a supplemental significant new use rule (SNUR) in February 2020, EPA met a June 2020 deadline set in the FY20 NDAA when the EPA Administrator signed the final rule. Among other things, under the final rule, articles containing certain PFAS as a surface coating, and carpet containing certain PFAS, can no longer be imported into the United States without EPA review; and

EPA incorporated 172 PFAS into the Toxics Release Inventory in June 2020. The FY20 NDAA directed EPA to take this action, extending EPA's original planned action to explore data for listing PFAS chemicals to the inventory.
Finally, in March 2020, EPA completed a third regulatory-related action, not required under the FY20 NDAA, when it proposed a preliminary drinking water regulatory determination for two PFAS, "an initial step toward regulating these chemicals in drinking water."
According to GAO, three of the six selected regulatory-related actions are ongoing, and EPA's progress on these actions varies:

As of August 2020, EPA was developing a proposed rulemaking for a nationwide drinking water monitoring rule that includes PFAS, which EPA officials stated that EPA intends to issue in final by December 2021;

EPA is currently examining available information about PFAS discharges to surface water to identify industrial sources that may warrant further study for potential regulation through EPA's National Effluent Limitations Guidelines. EPA expects to publish a final Effluent Guidelines Program Plan 14 in early 2021 that will include an update on the current status of EPA's multi-industry study; and

EPA plans to continue the regulatory process for designating two PFAS as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), which would allow EPA to require responsible parties to conduct or pay for cleanup. On January 14, 2021, EPA issued an advance notice of proposed rulemaking for the hazardous substances designation to obtain public comment and data to inform EPA's ongoing evaluation of the two PFAS.

GAO Reports that EPA's Process for Assessing and Controlling Toxic Chemicals Has Regressed
Lynn L. Bergeson and Carla N. Hutton, Bergeson & Campbell Blogs
http://www.tscablog.com/entry/gao-reports-that-epas-process-for-assessing-and-controlling-toxic-chemicals

On March 2, 2021, the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) published its latest High Risk List, which includes 36 areas across the federal government vulnerable to waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement or needing broad-based transformation. According to GAO, five areas have regressed since 2019, including the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) process for assessing and controlling toxic chemicals. GAO's report, High-Risk Series: Dedicated Leadership Needed to Address Limited Progress in Most High-Risk Areas, states that this high-risk area declined in the monitoring criterion from a partially met rating in 2019 to a not met rating in 2021; three criteria in each of the two segments declined to a not met rating in 2021. GAO notes that the Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) Program did not issue a completed chemical assessment between August 2018 and December 2020, and EPA (1) did not indicate how it was monitoring its assessment nomination process to ensure it was generating quality information about chemical assessment needs; and (2) lacked implementation steps and resource information in its strategic plan and metrics to define progress in the IRIS Program. Additionally, according to GAO, EPA's programs supporting the Toxic

Substances Control Act (TSCA) (1) did not complete workforce or workload planning to ensure the agency can meet TSCA deadlines; and (2) did not meet initial statutory deadlines for releasing its first ten chemical risk evaluations.

Massachusetts Regulators Restrict Consumer Use of Bee-Toxic Neonicotinoid Pesticides
NA, Beyond Pesticides
https://beyondpesticides.org/dailynewsblog/2021/03/massachusetts-regulators-restrict-consumer-use-of-bee-toxic-neonicotinoid-pesticides/

Earlier this week, pesticide regulators in the commonwealth of Massachusetts voted to restrict outdoor consumer uses of neonicotinoid insecticides. The move is the result of sustained advocacy from broad coalition of individuals and organizations focused on protecting pollinators and ecosystem health. While advocates are pleased that the Pesticide Board Subcommittee made Massachusetts the first state in the country to restrict neonicotinoids through a regulatory process, they note this is only the first step in eliminating these hazardous insecticides.

"This marks an incremental victory which took us 6 years to land, and it only happened because of immense, ongoing grassroots action and legislative allies who are willing to hold state regulators accountable," said Martin Dagoberto, Policy Director of the Northeast Organic Farming Association, Mass. Chapter in a press release. "We still have a monumental endeavor ahead if we are to reduce toxins and rein in the toxic influence of the chemical lobby," Mr. Dagoberto added.

Advocates had been pushing the legislature to pass An Act to protect Massachusetts Pollinators, sponsored by pollinator champion Representative Carolyn Dykema, since 2014. Following several failures by state lawmakers to bring the bill over the finish line, efforts in 2019 resulted in a literature review on the impacts of neonicotinoids on pollinators. The literature review found the vast majority of studies showing neonicotinoids contributing to pollinator declines. It noted that the only studies minimizing pollinator impacts are those conducted by the pesticide industry, and that "the author's analyses relied heavily on unpublished reports published by these manufacturers, which limits third-party review of the underlying studies."

Despite years of advocacy and education, and a legislature-commissioned literature review showing clear danger from neonicotinoid use, Massachusetts lawmakers again failed to pass Representative Dykema's bill during the 2020 session. As a result, efforts turned towards the Massachusetts Pesticide Board Subcommittee, the regulatory body within the commonwealth tasked with registering or restricting pesticide use.

A hearing late last year saw over 100 supporters show up to provide testimony over zoom. Fifty-five agricultural, environmental, climate and pollinator advocacy organizations delivered a letter to state regulators, and 80 Massachusetts lawmakers called on the subcommittee to act to restrict neonicotinoids. In a blistering critique on their work to date, the lawmakers noted, "Despite concerns about neonicotinoids being brought to the Department's attention repeatedly by the Attorney General's office, legislators and others since 2014,the Subcommittee failed to initiate an independent review or take any consequential action until 2019, when legislatively required to do so. This inability or unwillingness to respond to concerns that clearly fall within its purview raises concerns about whether the Subcommittee is able to fulfill its charge under the law to regulate pesticides."

At the next meeting of the Subcommittee, the following motion was introduced:

That the Pesticide Board Subcommittee has determined that current uses of neonicotinoid pesticides used in outdoor non-structural uses or outdoor non-agricultural uses, may pose unreasonable adverse effects to the environment as well as pollinators, when taking into account the economic, social and environmental costs and benefits of their use in the Commonwealth. Therefore, the Subcommittee modifies the registration classification of pesticide products containing neonicotinoids that have outdoor non-structural uses or outdoor non-agricultural uses on the label from general use to state restricted use. These include but are not limited to, uses on lawn and turf, trees and shrubs, ornamentals, and vegetable and flower gardens. The reclassification shall begin on July 1, 2022.

This motion, finalized and passed [...]

Despite pressure from US and Bayer, Mexico will ban glyphosate
Amanda Mills, Nation of Change
https://www.nationofchange.org/2021/03/02/despite-pressure-from-us-and-bayer-mexico-will-ban-glyphosate/

As reported by NationofChange journalist Marlee Kokotovic in mid-February, Bayer and US officials had been pressuring Mexico to abandon their intended ban on glyphosate. Mexican President Andrés Manuel López Obrador had given farmers until 2024 to stop the use of glyphosate.

López Obrador, however, did not give in to influence and has stuck by his promise to his country: to protect consumers and help small-scale farmers.

"Our rationale is based on the precautionary principle in the face of environmental risks as well as the right of the Mexican government to take action in favor of the public good, in important areas such as public health and the environment. We are a sovereign nation with a democratic government, which came to power with the support of the majority of citizens, one that places compliance with our constitution and respect for human rights above all private interests," says Victor Suárez, Mexico's Undersecretary of Agriculture for Food and Competitiveness.

Industry and U.S. government officials seemed shocked that their lobbying had failed to stop López Obrador from acting. The pressure campaign was intense, reports Inter Press Service. While many applaud the decree, Mexico's farmer and environmental organizations say it is just the first step and implementation will be the key.

Updated Toxics in Packaging Legislation Adds PFAS and Phthalates
Keller and Heckman LLP, National Law Review
https://www.natlawreview.com/article/updated-toxics-packaging-legislation-adds-pfas-and-phthalates

The Toxics in Packaging Clearinghouse (TPCH) revised its Model Toxics in Packaging Legislation in February 2021. The revised model legislation includes per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) and phthalates as regulated chemicals, and establishes new processes for identifying additional packaging chemicals of high concern. The model legislation has no legal effect, but the prior version of the model legislation was enacted – in some form – in 19 states.

By way of background, the TPCH was created by the Coalition of Northeastern Governors (CONEG) to promote the Model Toxics in Packaging Legislation. Prior to the recent update, the model legislation prohibited the sale or distribution of packages and packaging components to which lead, cadmium, mercury, or hexavalent chromium have been intentionally introduced at more than an incidental presence. The model legislation limits the sum of lead, cadmium, mercury, and hexavalent chromium that is incidentally present in packages and packaging components to 100 parts per million (ppm) by weight.

In 2016, members of the TPCH began discussing the possibility of expanding the list of substances regulated under the model legislation and developing criteria for identifying new packaging chemicals that should be regulated. In June 2020, the TPHC introduced a draft update to the model legislation that, among other things, added PFAS and phthalates as regulated chemicals. In responding to the public's comments on the draft revised model legislation, the TPCH noted that it had looked to the recent legislative changes in the State of Maine when adding to the model legislation a means of identifying other packaging chemicals of high concern. (For more information see, Maine Identifies Food Contact Chemicals of High Concern.)

The revised model legislation prohibits manufacturers, suppliers, and distributors from offering for sale or promotional

purposes packages or packaging components to which phthalates have been intentionally added, subject to a limit on the incidental presence of phthalates of 100 ppm. The model legislation also prohibits the sale or distribution of a package or packaging component to which PFAS has been intentionally introduced. Even more stringent than the phthalate standard, PFAS must be non-detectable in the package or packaging component. The revised model legislation also includes that substitute materials for the substances regulated by the model legislation may not be used "in a quantity or manner that creates a hazard as great or greater than the hazard created by the chemical regulated by this Act."

The revised model legislation establishes new criteria for identifying additional packaging chemicals of high concern, including credible scientific evidence that the chemical is the following:

A carcinogen, a reproductive or developmental toxicant, or an endocrine disruptor;

Persistent, bioaccumulative, and toxic (PBT), or very persistent and very bioaccumulative (vPvB), persistent mobile and toxic (PTM), or very persistent and very mobile (vPvM).

The chemical must also meet one of more of the following additional criteria:

It has been found through biomonitoring studies to be present in human bodily tissues or fluids;

It has been found through sampling and analysis to be present in packaging;

It has been added to or is present in a package;

Now that the revised model legislation has been finalized, it will be at the discretion of each state whether to adopt the revised model legislation through their own legislation initiatives.

++

For more news, visit:

- Inside EPA: https://insideepa.com/
- Inside TSCA: https://insideepa.com/inside-tsca-home
- Bloomberg Environment and Energy: https://news.bloombergenvironment.com/environment-and-energy/

If you'd like to be removed or would like to add someone to the listserv please contact Bailey Rosen at Rosen.Bailey@epa.gov. Feedback and interesting articles are welcomed. Thanks and enjoy!

And while you're reading.... Remember to shoot your coworkers a shooting star!
"

Message

From: Biscoe, Melanie [Biscoe.Melanie@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/2/2021 10:17:26 PM
To: Britton, Cathryn [Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov]; Aubee, Catherine [Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov]; Reaves, Elissa [Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov]; Overbey, Dian [Overbey.Dian@epa.gov]
CC: Echeverria, Marietta [Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov]; Rosenblatt, Daniel [Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov]; Saunders, Jennifer [Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov]; Herrick, Jacquelyn [Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

I don't have anything to add at this point.

From: Britton, Cathryn <Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 2, 2021 5:04 PM
To: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>; Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Biscoe, Melanie <Biscoe.Melanie@epa.gov>
Cc: Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Thanks Catherine – you've addressed my comments.

From: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 02, 2021 4:56 PM
To: Britton, Cathryn <Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov>; Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Biscoe, Melanie <Biscoe.Melanie@epa.gov>
Cc: Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

I circulated a shared document for us to rework the proposed response. I'm finished and I saw Cathryn's edits (hopefully resolved all editing conflicts). Reattaching if needed.

Best,
Catherine

From: Britton, Cathryn <Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2021 4:33 PM
To: Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Biscoe, Melanie <Biscoe.Melanie@epa.gov>
Cc: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

I'm looping Catherine in too, I thought Dian mentioned a 2 PM deadline, but am not sure of the status.

From: Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2021 4:25 PM
To: Britton, Cathryn <Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Biscoe, Melanie <Biscoe.Melanie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Sorry, I am just finishing meetings and have not had time to review. Did this go forward already?

From: Britton, Cathryn <Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 1, 2021 1:25 PM
To: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Biscoe, Melanie <Biscoe.Melanie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

I'm done with it now. I think Elissa is still looking at this.

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2021 1:18 PM
To: Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Britton, Cathryn <Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov>; Biscoe, Melanie <Biscoe.Melanie@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting
Importance: High

Please let me know when you've finished with (and closed) the document, so I can review and send forward. I need to move on by 2:00 pm.

Thanks,

Dian D. Overbey
Communications Branch
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Potomac Yard S-8927
(703) 305-5018 (O)
(571) 302-0764 (OC)
Ex. 6 PP – personal phone (Personal Cell)

From: Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2021 11:47 AM
To: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>
Cc: Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

I will loop in the leads on the pet incident team and will do the best we can given the timeframe.

From: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 1, 2021 11:44 AM
To: Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>
Cc: Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

This is a draft press response on Seresto (the incoming is at the bottom of this email chain). It came to the RD IO on Friday; we think PRD has equity in the response. Dian received an extension to today.

Best,
Catherine

From: Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2021 11:40 AM
To: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>
Cc: Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Not sure what is being asked here. First we are being looped in. Please direct where specifically you need input. Looks like the deadline was last Friday.

From: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 1, 2021 11:34 AM
To: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>; Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>
Cc: Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Revised here to reflect the Reg Review language. This is not my lane, so Tim and Elissa, please review and revise as needed. Please let Dian or me know if you have trouble with the file.

Best,
Catherine

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 11:16 AM
To: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>
Cc: Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Hope I did it right!

Dian

From: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 11:00 AM
To: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>
Cc: Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Hi Dian – could you please put the current draft Q's and responses in a OneDrive/Sharepoint/Teams document to facilitate editing?

Thanks!

Best,

Catherine

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 8:57 AM
To: Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Also, attached are the data the reporter had received and the aggregate data (Excel) I received from ISB.

From: Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 8:51 AM
To: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Dian – these need some work to me. How did these answers come together? For instance – did the team clear these and also PRD members?

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 8:39 AM
To: Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting
Importance: High

Hi All.

Below is the draft response to a press inquiry that is due today. I would appreciate your review and edit by noon today so I can forward it on in the lo-o-o-ng review chain!

According to a records request of EPA documents, there have been at least 75,000 incident reports involving pets, including 1,698 deaths. Is this a high number? Why is it still sold? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

It is my understanding that these incidents do not include the main incident reporting system, which likely has additional incidents. Do you have more information about the number of incidents?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

California toxicologists said the Bayer studies the EPA relied on to approve the collars underestimated the harm to adult dogs and cats. However, the EPA approved them. What science is there to support these registrations? How can customers know that these are safe to use?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

There have been at least 907 human-related incidents since 2013, according to EPA data. Is this a high number? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

It is my understanding that Bayer knew about these incidents for years, prior to selling dog collars to Elanco. Did Bayer make Elanco aware of these issues when selling the product to Elanco?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

From my understanding talking with former EPA staff, Health Canada denied to approve Seresto because of the incident data. Do you have any response to this?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Background

The law under which EPA regulates products for pests of pets is the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA). Under the law, EPA must make a determination that the product will not cause "unreasonable adverse effects on the environment," defined in FIFRA 2(bb) as (in part) "any unreasonable risk to man or the environment, taking into account the economic, social, and environmental costs and benefits of the use of any pesticide." Thus, the benefits of a product must be weighed against the risks.

No pesticide is completely without harm, but EPA ensures that there are measures on the product label that reduce risk. The product label is the law, and applicators must follow label directions. Some pets, however, like some humans, are more sensitive than others and may experience symptoms.

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP) Evaluations for pet products like shampoos, collars, and spot-ons rely upon data on companion animal safety, efficacy, and safety for humans who may be exposed as a result of product use. Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

As stated above, manufacturers are required by law to report adverse incident information to EPA. Individuals may report incidents potentially associated with use of an EPA-registered product by contacting the product manufacturer, their state lead pesticide agency, the National Pesticide Information Center, or by contacting EPA directly.

Thanks. Looking forward to hearing from you.

Dian

From: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 4:09 PM
To: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>; OPS CSID CB <OPS_CSID_CB@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Hi all, Please see inquiry below. Deadline EOD Friday.

Thanks,

Ken

From: Johnathan Hettinger <jhettinger@investigatemidwest.org>
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 4:05 PM
To: Press <Press@epa.gov>; Daguillard, Robert <Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov>; Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>; Jones, Enesta <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>
Subject: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Hello,

I'm a reporter with the Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting, a nonprofit newsroom based in Champaign, Illinois, that covers agribusiness. I am working on a story about EPA incident data surrounding Seresto collars. It is my understanding that there have been a significant amount of incidents surrounding the pesticides in the collars, and I had some questions.

According to a records request of EPA documents, there have been at least 75,000 incident reports involving pets, including 1,698 deaths. Is this a high number? Why is it still sold? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

It is my understanding that these incidents do not include the main incident reporting system, which likely has additional incidents. Do you have more information about the number of incidents?

California toxicologists said the Bayer studies the EPA relied on to approve the collars underestimated the harm to adult dogs and cats. However, the EPA approved them. What science is there to support these registrations? How can customers know that these are safe to use?

There have been at least 907 human-related incidents since 2013, according to EPA data. Is this a high number? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

It is my understanding that Bayer knew about these incidents for years, prior to selling dog collars to Elanco. Did Bayer make Elanco aware of these issues when selling the product to Elanco?

From my understanding talking with former EPA staff, Health Canada denied to approve Seresto because of the incident data. Do you have any response to this?

If possible, I would very much like to speak to someone for this story. Please let me know if you would have some time. My deadline is Friday, end-of-day.

Thanks,
Johnathan Hettinger
Investigative Reporter
Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

217-493-9791

Message

From: Aubee, Catherine [Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/2/2021 9:56:57 PM
To: Britton, Cathryn [Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov]; Reaves, Elissa [Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov]; Overbey, Dian [Overbey.Dian@epa.gov]; Biscoe, Melanie [Biscoe.Melanie@epa.gov]
CC: Echeverria, Marietta [Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov]; Rosenblatt, Daniel [Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov]; Saunders, Jennifer [Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov]; Herrick, Jacquelyn [Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

(Sorry, responded to the wrong email thread, but the link is for the current inquiry.)

Best,
Catherine

From: Aubee, Catherine
Sent: Tuesday, March 02, 2021 4:56 PM
To: Britton, Cathryn <Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov>; Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Biscoe, Melanie <Biscoe.Melanie@epa.gov>
Cc: Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

I circulated a shared document for us to rework the proposed response. I'm finished and I saw Cathryn's edits (hopefully resolved all editing conflicts). Reattaching if needed.

Best,
Catherine

From: Britton, Cathryn <Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2021 4:33 PM
To: Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Biscoe, Melanie <Biscoe.Melanie@epa.gov>
Cc: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

I'm looping Catherine in too, I thought Dian mentioned a 2 PM deadline, but am not sure of the status.

From: Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2021 4:25 PM
To: Britton, Cathryn <Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Biscoe, Melanie <Biscoe.Melanie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Sorry, I am just finishing meetings and have not had time to review. Did this go forward already?

From: Britton, Cathryn <Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 1, 2021 1:25 PM
To: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Biscoe, Melanie <Biscoe.Melanie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

I'm done with it now. I think Elissa is still looking at this.

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2021 1:18 PM
To: Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Britton, Cathryn <Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov>; Biscoe, Melanie <Biscoe.Melanie@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting
Importance: High

Please let me know when you've finished with (and closed) the document, so I can review and send forward. I need to move on by 2:00 pm.

Thanks,

Dian D. Overbey
Communications Branch
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Potomac Yard S-8927
(703) 305-5018 (O)
(571) 302-0764 (OC)
(202) 460-4875 (Personal Cell)

From: Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2021 11:47 AM
To: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>
Cc: Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

I will loop in the leads on the pet incident team and will do the best we can given the timeframe.

From: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 1, 2021 11:44 AM
To: Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>
Cc: Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

This is a draft press response on Seresto (the incoming is at the bottom of this email chain). It came to the RD IO on Friday; we think PRD has equity in the response. Dian received an extension to today.

Best,
Catherine

From: Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2021 11:40 AM
To: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel

<Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>
Cc: Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Not sure what is being asked here. First we are being looped in. Please direct where specifically you need input. Looks like the deadline was last Friday.

From: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 1, 2021 11:34 AM
To: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>; Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>
Cc: Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Revised here to reflect the Reg Review language. This is not my lane, so Tim and Elissa, please review and revise as needed. Please let Dian or me know if you have trouble with the file.

Best,
Catherine

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 11:16 AM
To: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>
Cc: Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Hope I did it right!

Dian

From: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 11:00 AM
To: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>
Cc: Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Hi Dian – could you please put the current draft Q's and responses in a OneDrive/Sharepoint/Teams document to facilitate editing?

Thanks!

Best,
Catherine

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 8:57 AM
To: Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Also, attached are the data the reporter had received and the aggregate data (Excel) I received from ISB.

From: Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 8:51 AM
To: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Dian – these need some work to me. How did these answers come together? For instance – did the team clear these and also PRD members?

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 8:39 AM
To: Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting
Importance: High

Hi All.

Below is the draft response to a press inquiry that is due today. I would appreciate your review and edit by noon today so I can forward it on in the lo-o-o-ng review chain!

According to a records request of EPA documents, there have been at least 75,000 incident reports involving pets, including 1,698 deaths. Is this a high number? Why is it still sold? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

It is my understanding that these incidents do not include the main incident reporting system, which likely has additional incidents. Do you have more information about the number of incidents?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

California toxicologists said the Bayer studies the EPA relied on to approve the collars underestimated the harm to adult dogs and cats. However, the EPA approved them. What science is there to support these registrations? How can customers know that these are safe to use?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

There have been at least 907 human-related incidents since 2013, according to EPA data. Is this a high number? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

It is my understanding that Bayer knew about these incidents for years, prior to selling dog collars to Elanco. Did Bayer make Elanco aware of these issues when selling the product to Elanco?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

From my understanding talking with former EPA staff, Health Canada denied to approve Seresto because of the incident data. Do you have any response to this?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Background

The law under which EPA regulates products for pests of pets is the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA). Under the law, EPA must make a determination that the product will not cause "unreasonable adverse effects on the environment," defined in FIFRA 2(bb) as (in part) "any unreasonable risk to man or the environment, taking into account the economic, social, and environmental costs and benefits of the use of any pesticide." Thus, the benefits of a product must be weighed against the risks.

No pesticide is completely without harm, but EPA ensures that there are measures on the product label that reduce risk. The product label is the law, and applicators must follow label directions. Some pets, however, like some humans, are more sensitive than others and may experience symptoms.

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP) Evaluations for pet products like shampoos, collars, and spot-ons rely upon data on companion animal safety, efficacy, and safety for humans who may be exposed as a result of product use. Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

As stated above, manufacturers are required by law to report adverse incident information to EPA. Individuals may report incidents potentially associated with use of an EPA-registered product by contacting the product manufacturer, their state lead pesticide agency, the National Pesticide Information Center, or by contacting EPA directly.

Thanks. Looking forward to hearing from you.

Dian

From: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 4:09 PM
To: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>; OPS CSID CB <OPS_CSID_CB@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Hi all, Please see inquiry below. Deadline EOD Friday.

Thanks,

Ken

From: Johnathan Hettinger <jhettinger@investigatemidwest.org>
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 4:05 PM
To: Press <Press@epa.gov>; Daguillard, Robert <Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov>; Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>; Jones, Enesta <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>
Subject: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Hello,

I'm a reporter with the Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting, a nonprofit newsroom based in Champaign, Illinois, that covers agribusiness. I am working on a story about EPA incident data surrounding Seresto collars. It is my understanding that there have been a significant amount of incidents surrounding the pesticides in the collars, and I had some questions.

According to a records request of EPA documents, there have been at least 75,000 incident reports involving pets, including 1,698 deaths. Is this a high number? Why is it still sold? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

It is my understanding that these incidents do not include the main incident reporting system, which likely has additional incidents. Do you have more information about the number of incidents?

California toxicologists said the Bayer studies the EPA relied on to approve the collars underestimated the harm to adult dogs and cats. However, the EPA approved them. What science is there to support these registrations? How can customers know that these are safe to use?

There have been at least 907 human-related incidents since 2013, according to EPA data. Is this a high number? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

It is my understanding that Bayer knew about these incidents for years, prior to selling dog collars to Elanco. Did Bayer make Elanco aware of these issues when selling the product to Elanco?

From my understanding talking with former EPA staff, Health Canada denied to approve Seresto because of the incident data. Do you have any response to this?

If possible, I would very much like to speak to someone for this story. Please let me know if you would have some time. My deadline is Friday, end-of-day.

Thanks,
Johnathan Hettinger
Investigative Reporter
Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting
217-493-9791

Message

From: Aubee, Catherine [Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov]
Sent: 1/29/2021 4:20:47 PM
To: Overbey, Dian [Overbey.Dian@epa.gov]; Rosenblatt, Daniel [Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov]; Echeverria, Marietta [Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov]
CC: Herrick, Jacquelyn [Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov]; Saunders, Jennifer [Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

It works! Thank you.

Best,
Catherine

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 11:16 AM
To: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>
Cc: Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Hope I did it right!

Dian

From: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 11:00 AM
To: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>
Cc: Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Hi Dian – could you please put the current draft Q's and responses in a OneDrive/Sharepoint/Teams document to facilitate editing?

Thanks!

Best,
Catherine

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 8:57 AM
To: Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Also, attached are the data the reporter had received and the aggregate data (Excel) I received from ISB.

From: Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 8:51 AM
To: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Aubee, Catherine

<Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Dian – these need some work to me. How did these answers come together? For instance – did the team clear these and also PRD members?

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 8:39 AM
To: Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting
Importance: High

Hi All.

Below is the draft response to a press inquiry that is due today. I would appreciate your review and edit by noon today so I can forward it on in the lo-o-o-ng review chain!

According to a records request of EPA documents, there have been at least 75,000 incident reports involving pets, including 1,698 deaths. Is this a high number? Why is it still sold? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

It is my understanding that these incidents do not include the main incident reporting system, which likely has additional incidents. Do you have more information about the number of incidents?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

California toxicologists said the Bayer studies the EPA relied on to approve the collars underestimated the harm to adult dogs and cats. However, the EPA approved them. What science is there to support these registrations? How can customers know that these are safe to use?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

There have been at least 907 human-related incidents since 2013, according to EPA data. Is this a high number? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

It is my understanding that Bayer knew about these incidents for years, prior to selling dog collars to Elanco. Did Bayer make Elanco aware of these issues when selling the product to Elanco?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

From my understanding talking with former EPA staff, Health Canada denied to approve Seresto because of the incident data. Do you have any response to this?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Background

The law under which EPA regulates products for pests of pets is the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA). Under the law, EPA must make a determination that the product will not cause "unreasonable adverse effects on the environment," defined in FIFRA 2(bb) as (in part) "any unreasonable risk to man or the environment, taking into account the economic, social, and environmental costs and benefits of the use of any pesticide." Thus, the benefits of a product must be weighed against the risks.

No pesticide is completely without harm, but EPA ensures that there are measures on the product label that reduce risk. The product label is the law, and applicators must follow label directions. Some pets, however, like some humans, are more sensitive than others and may experience symptoms.

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP) Evaluations for pet products like shampoos, collars, and spot-ons rely upon data on companion animal safety, efficacy, and safety for humans who may be exposed as a result of product use. Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

As stated above, manufacturers are required by law to report adverse incident information to EPA. Individuals may report incidents potentially associated with use of an EPA-registered product by contacting the product manufacturer, their state lead pesticide agency, the National Pesticide Information Center, or by contacting EPA directly.

Thanks. Looking forward to hearing from you.

Dian

From: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 4:09 PM
To: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>; OPS CSID CB <OPS_CSID_CB@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Hi all, Please see inquiry below. Deadline EOD Friday.

Thanks,

Ken

From: Johnathan Hettinger <jhettinger@investigatemidwest.org>
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 4:05 PM
To: Press <Press@epa.gov>; Daguillard, Robert <Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov>; Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>; Jones, Enesta <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>
Subject: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Hello,

I'm a reporter with the Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting, a nonprofit newsroom based in Champaign, Illinois, that covers agribusiness. I am working on a story about EPA incident data surrounding Seresto collars. It is my understanding that there have been a significant amount of incidents surrounding the pesticides in the collars, and I had some questions.

According to a records request of EPA documents, there have been at least 75,000 incident reports involving pets, including 1,698 deaths. Is this a high number? Why is it still sold? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

It is my understanding that these incidents do not include the main incident reporting system, which likely has additional incidents. Do you have more information about the number of incidents?

California toxicologists said the Bayer studies the EPA relied on to approve the collars underestimated the harm to adult dogs and cats. However, the EPA approved them. What science is there to support these registrations? How can customers know that these are safe to use?

There have been at least 907 human-related incidents since 2013, according to EPA data. Is this a high number? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

It is my understanding that Bayer knew about these incidents for years, prior to selling dog collars to Elanco. Did Bayer make Elanco aware of these issues when selling the product to Elanco?

From my understanding talking with former EPA staff, Health Canada denied to approve Seresto because of the incident data. Do you have any response to this?

If possible, I would very much like to speak to someone for this story. Please let me know if you would have some time. My deadline is Friday, end-of-day.

Thanks,
Johnathan Hettinger
Investigative Reporter
Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting
217-493-9791

Message

From: Overbey, Dian [Overbey.Dian@epa.gov]
Sent: 1/29/2021 4:16:09 PM
To: Aubee, Catherine [Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov]; Rosenblatt, Daniel [Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov]; Echeverria, Marietta [Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov]
CC: Herrick, Jacquelyn [Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov]; Saunders, Jennifer [Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

<!--[if lte mso 15 || CheckWebRef]-->

Overbey, Dian has shared a OneDrive for Business file with you. To view it, click the link below.

Response - Seresto.docx

<!--[endif]-->

Hope I did it right!

Dian

From: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 11:00 AM
To: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>
Cc: Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Hi Dian – could you please put the current draft Q's and responses in a OneDrive/Sharepoint/Teams document to facilitate editing?

Thanks!

Best,
Catherine

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 8:57 AM
To: Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Also, attached are the data the reporter had received and the aggregate data (Excel) I received from ISB.

From: Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 8:51 AM
To: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Dian – these need some work to me. How did these answers come together? For instance – did the team clear these and also PRD members?

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 8:39 AM
To: Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting
Importance: High

Hi All.

Below is the draft response to a press inquiry that is due today. I would appreciate your review and edit by noon today so I can forward it on in the lo-o-o-ng review chain!

According to a records request of EPA documents, there have been at least 75,000 incident reports involving pets, including 1,698 deaths. Is this a high number? Why is it still sold? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

It is my understanding that these incidents do not include the main incident reporting system, which likely has additional incidents. Do you have more information about the number of incidents?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

California toxicologists said the Bayer studies the EPA relied on to approve the collars underestimated the harm to adult dogs and cats. However, the EPA approved them. What science is there to support these registrations? How can customers know that these are safe to use?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

There have been at least 907 human-related incidents since 2013, according to EPA data. Is this a high number? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

It is my understanding that Bayer knew about these incidents for years, prior to selling dog collars to Elanco. Did Bayer make Elanco aware of these issues when selling the product to Elanco?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

From my understanding talking with former EPA staff, Health Canada denied to approve Seresto because of the incident data. Do you have any response to this?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Background

The law under which EPA regulates products for pests of pets is the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA). Under the law, EPA must make a determination that the product will not cause "unreasonable adverse effects on the environment," defined in FIFRA 2(bb) as (in part) "any unreasonable risk to man or the environment, taking into account the economic, social, and environmental costs and benefits of the use of any pesticide." Thus, the benefits of a product must be weighed against the risks.

No pesticide is completely without harm, but EPA ensures that there are measures on the product label that reduce risk. The product label is the law, and applicators must follow label directions. Some pets, however, like some humans, are more sensitive than others and may experience symptoms.

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP) Evaluations for pet products like shampoos, collars, and spot-ons rely upon data on companion animal safety, efficacy, and safety for humans who may be exposed as a result of product use. **Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)**

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

As stated above, manufacturers are required by law to report adverse incident information to EPA. Individuals may report incidents potentially associated with use of an EPA-registered product by contacting the product manufacturer, their state lead pesticide agency, the National Pesticide Information Center, or by contacting EPA directly.

Thanks. Looking forward to hearing from you.

Dian

From: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 4:09 PM
To: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>; OPS CSID CB <OPS_CSID_CB@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Hi all, Please see inquiry below. Deadline EOD Friday.

Thanks,

Ken

From: Johnathan Hettinger <jhettinger@investigatemidwest.org>
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 4:05 PM
To: Press <Press@epa.gov>; Daguillard, Robert <Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov>; Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>; Jones, Enesta <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>
Subject: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Hello,

I'm a reporter with the Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting, a nonprofit newsroom based in Champaign, Illinois, that covers agribusiness. I am working on a story about EPA incident data surrounding Seresto collars. It is my understanding that there have been a significant amount of incidents surrounding the pesticides in the collars, and I had some questions.

According to a records request of EPA documents, there have been at least 75,000 incident reports involving pets, including 1,698 deaths. Is this a high number? Why is it still sold? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

It is my understanding that these incidents do not include the main incident reporting system, which likely has additional incidents. Do you have more information about the number of incidents?

California toxicologists said the Bayer studies the EPA relied on to approve the collars underestimated the harm to adult dogs and cats. However, the EPA approved them. What science is there to support these registrations? How can customers know that these are safe to use?

There have been at least 907 human-related incidents since 2013, according to EPA data. Is this a high number? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

It is my understanding that Bayer knew about these incidents for years, prior to selling dog collars to Elanco. Did Bayer make Elanco aware of these issues when selling the product to Elanco?

From my understanding talking with former EPA staff, Health Canada denied to approve Seresto because of the incident data. Do you have any response to this?

If possible, I would very much like to speak to someone for this story. Please let me know if you would have some time. My deadline is Friday, end-of-day.

Thanks,
Johnathan Hettinger
Investigative Reporter
Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting
217-493-9791

Message

From: Overbey, Dian [Overbey.Dian@epa.gov]
Sent: 1/29/2021 1:56:47 PM
To: Rosenblatt, Daniel [Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov]; Echeverria, Marietta [Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov]; Aubee, Catherine [Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting
Attachments: EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0031-0031.pdf; Aggregate Incident Summary Report for EPA Reg No 11556-155 1-1-2012 to 6-16-2020.pdf; 11556-155 AggregateSummary Mar 2012-Present.xls

Also, attached are the data the reporter had received and the aggregate data (Excel) I received from ISB.

From: Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 8:51 AM
To: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Dian – these need some work to me. How did these answers come together? For instance – did the team clear these and also PRD members?

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 8:39 AM
To: Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting
Importance: High

Hi All.

Below is the draft response to a press inquiry that is due today. I would appreciate your review and edit by noon today so I can forward it on in the lo-o-o-ng review chain!

According to a records request of EPA documents, there have been at least 75,000 incident reports involving pets, including 1,698 deaths. Is this a high number? Why is it still sold? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

It is my understanding that these incidents do not include the main incident reporting system, which likely has additional incidents. Do you have more information about the number of incidents?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

California toxicologists said the Bayer studies the EPA relied on to approve the collars underestimated the harm to adult dogs and cats. However, the EPA approved them. What science is there to support these registrations? How can customers know that these are safe to use?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

There have been at least 907 human-related incidents since 2013, according to EPA data. Is this a high number? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

It is my understanding that Bayer knew about these incidents for years, prior to selling dog collars to Elanco. Did Bayer make Elanco aware of these issues when selling the product to Elanco?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

From my understanding talking with former EPA staff, Health Canada denied to approve Seresto because of the incident data. Do you have any response to this?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Background

The law under which EPA regulates products for pests of pets is the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA). Under the law, EPA must make a determination that the product will not cause "unreasonable adverse effects on the environment," defined in FIFRA 2(bb) as (in part) "any unreasonable risk to man or the environment, taking into account the economic, social, and environmental costs and benefits of the use of any pesticide." Thus, the benefits of a product must be weighed against the risks.

No pesticide is completely without harm, but EPA ensures that there are measures on the product label that reduce risk. The product label is the law, and applicators must follow label directions. Some pets, however, like some humans, are more sensitive than others and may experience symptoms.

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP) Evaluations for pet products like shampoos, collars, and spot-ons rely upon data on companion animal safety, efficacy, and safety for humans who may be exposed as a result of product use. Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

As stated above, manufacturers are required by law to report adverse incident information to EPA. Individuals may report incidents potentially associated with use of an EPA-registered product by

contacting the product manufacturer, their state lead pesticide agency, the National Pesticide Information Center, or by contacting EPA directly.

Thanks. Looking forward to hearing from you.

Dian

From: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 4:09 PM
To: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>; OPS CSID CB <OPS_CSID_CB@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Hi all, Please see inquiry below. Deadline EOD Friday.

Thanks,

Ken

From: Johnathan Hettinger <jhettinger@investigatemidwest.org>
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 4:05 PM
To: Press <Press@epa.gov>; Daguillard, Robert <Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov>; Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>; Jones, Enesta <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>
Subject: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Hello,

I'm a reporter with the Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting, a nonprofit newsroom based in Champaign, Illinois, that covers agribusiness. I am working on a story about EPA incident data surrounding Seresto collars. It is my understanding that there have been a significant amount of incidents surrounding the pesticides in the collars, and I had some questions.

According to a records request of EPA documents, there have been at least 75,000 incident reports involving pets, including 1,698 deaths. Is this a high number? Why is it still sold? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

It is my understanding that these incidents do not include the main incident reporting system, which likely has additional incidents. Do you have more information about the number of incidents?

California toxicologists said the Bayer studies the EPA relied on to approve the collars underestimated the harm to adult dogs and cats. However, the EPA approved them. What science is there to support these registrations? How can customers know that these are safe to use?

There have been at least 907 human-related incidents since 2013, according to EPA data. Is this a high number? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

It is my understanding that Bayer knew about these incidents for years, prior to selling dog collars to Elanco. Did Bayer make Elanco aware of these issues when selling the product to Elanco?

From my understanding talking with former EPA staff, Health Canada denied to approve Seresto because of the incident data. Do you have any response to this?

If possible, I would very much like to speak to someone for this story. Please let me know if you would have some time. My deadline is Friday, end-of-day.

Thanks,
Johnathan Hettinger
Investigative Reporter
Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting
217-493-9791

Message

From: Saunders, Jennifer [Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/12/2021 2:36:26 PM
To: Aubee, Catherine [Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov]; Echeverria, Marietta [Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: Recent Seresto Incident Reports
Attachments: I033905.pdf; I033906.pdf; I033907.pdf; I033908.pdf; I033909.pdf; I033910.pdf; I033911.pdf; I033912.pdf; I033913.pdf

FYI

From: Miller, Robert <Miller.Robert@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2021 9:34 AM
To: Fletcher, Rachel <fletcher.rachel@epa.gov>; Recore, Shanna <Recore.Shanna@epa.gov>; Britton, Cathryn <Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov>; Bloom, Jill <Bloom.Jill@epa.gov>; Rossmeisl, Colleen <Rossmeisl.Colleen@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Eagle, Venus <Eagle.Venus@epa.gov>; Joyner, Shaja <Joyner.Shaja@epa.gov>; Rate, Debra <Rate.Debra@epa.gov>; Smith, Kimberly <Smith.Kimberly@epa.gov>
Subject: Recent Seresto Incident Reports

Hi All:

OPP has received a number of incident reports involving Seresto since the USA Today article (see attachments). Also, Elanco submitted 6(a)(2) Seresto incident data for the first time since acquiring Bayer Animal Health. The Elanco data still needs to be entered into the Incident Data System.

Take care,

Bob

Message

From: Messina, Edward [Messina.Edward@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/10/2021 10:21:52 PM
To: Overbey, Dian [Overbey.Dian@epa.gov]; Goodis, Michael [Goodis.Michael@epa.gov]; Ozmen, Shamus [Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov]; Layne, Arnold [Layne.Arnold@epa.gov]
CC: Siedschlag, Gregory [Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov]; Dinkins, Darlene [Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov]; Echeverria, Marietta [Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: OPP IO review: Snopes follow-up on Seresto data

OK. I am tracking now. I think Michal should be made aware of that.

Ed Messina, Esq.
Acting Office Director
Office of Pesticide Programs
Office of Chemical Safety & Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C.
p: (703) 347-0209

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2021 5:21 PM
To: Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>; Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>
Cc: Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: OPP IO review: Snopes follow-up on Seresto data

We felt it Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

I'm open to any suggestions.

Dian

From: Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2021 5:14 PM
To: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>; Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>
Cc: Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: OPP IO review: Snopes follow-up on Seresto data

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)?

Michael L. Goodis, P.E.
Acting Deputy Director for Programs
Office of Pesticide Programs

Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C.
571-309-5497 (cell)

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2021 5:04 PM
To: Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>; Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>
Cc: Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: OPP IO review: Snopes follow-up on Seresto data

There was a FOIA request in June of 2020 for the Seresto incident data. The report sent to the requestor and picked up from the FOIA Library by the reporter from the Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting covered the period from Jan. 1, 2012, to the date the report was compiled -- June 16, 2020. That report does not contain years or quarters at all. The dates in the year-over-year report match the dates in the aggregate report. **Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)**
Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

I'm sure the next questions will be about more recent data.

Dian D. Overbey
Communications Branch
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Potomac Yard S-8927
(703) 305-5018 (O)
(571) 302-0764 (OC)
(202) 460-4875 (Personal Cell)

From: Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2021 4:52 PM
To: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>; Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>
Cc: Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: OPP IO review: Snopes follow-up on Seresto data

Some questions as I am a bit confused.

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Dian – not sure I understand your comment – can you explain?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP) Should this be noted in the attached?

Michael L. Goodis, P.E.
Acting Deputy Director for Programs
Office of Pesticide Programs

Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C.
571-309-5497 (cell)

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2021 4:38 PM
To: Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>; Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>
Cc: Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: OPP IO review: Snopes follow-up on Seresto data

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Dian

From: Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2021 4:37 PM
To: Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>; Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>
Cc: Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: OPP IO review: Snopes follow-up on Seresto data

Does this reflect the new information about the paper incident reporting backlog?

Ed

Ed Messina, Esq.
Acting Office Director
Office of Pesticide Programs
Office of Chemical Safety & Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C.
p: (703) 347-0209

From: Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2021 4:26 PM
To: Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>; Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>
Cc: Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Subject: OPP IO review: Snopes follow-up on Seresto data

Hi – For your review is the response (below and attached) to follow-up questions from Snopes.

INCOMING:
Thank you. I see the attachment, but is there year-over-year data, meaning the number of Seresto incidents broken out by year for 2012, 2013, 2014, etc? Or is this document chronological from past to present, but it just doesn't have a date column?

RESPONSE:

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

From: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 8, 2021 12:23 PM
To: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>; OPS CSID CB <OPS_CSID_CB@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Please see reporters clarifying question.

From: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Sent: Monday, March 8, 2021 11:51 AM
To: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Cc: Press <Press@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hi Ken,

Thank you. I see the attachment, but is there year-over-year data, meaning the number of Seresto incidents broken out by year for 2012, 2013, 2014, etc? Or is this document chronological from past to present, but it just doesn't have a date column?

Best,
Jordan Liles
Operations Editor, Snopes.com

On Mon, Mar 8, 2021 at 6:58 AM Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:

> Hi Jordan,
>
> Please see the attached and our response below:
>
> 1. **Can the EPA provide year-over-year data that shows the numbers of submitted reports about Seresto collars?**

The incident data is attached.

2. **Are there any known established links between death and exposure to the active ingredients contained in Seresto?**

The active ingredients in Seresto are flumethrin and imidacloprid. As part of EPA's regular 15-year review of pesticide active ingredients, EPA completed an interim registration review decision for flumethrin in March 2020 and published a proposed interim registration review decision for imidacloprid in January 2020. During registration review, the Agency looks at each active ingredient to ensure that it continues to meet the legal standard for registration under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and other applicable statutes. Pet incidents are discussed in the Imidacloprid Proposed Interim Registration Review Decision and the Flumethrin Interim Registration Review Decision.

3. **The Elanco spokesperson told us that if a pet was wearing a Seresto collar and experienced any sort of adverse event, the collar would be mentioned in the EPA's reporting (the documents linked by USA Today). The EPA's documents showed that 1,698 pets had died. Did 1,698 pets die because of the Seresto pet collars, or is that number misleading? Can you shed more light on what that number means?**

EPA logs incidents into its Incident Data System (IDS) by EPA registration number, so all of the incidents in our IDS under EPA are for the Seresto collar. Registrants are not required under FIFRA 6(a)(2) to investigate incidents or to gather additional information. While some incidents are well investigated and reported in such a way as to establish a strong link between the adverse effect and the exposure, many other do not include enough facts to clearly demonstrate causation. Many of the reports are anecdotal, with no indication of whether the user followed label use instructions or used a product appropriate for the pet type and size. Generally, however, there is no process for verifying the information in reports.

4. **How would you advise concerned pet owners trying to decide if it's safe to use Seresto products?**

EPA encourages pet owners to discuss with their veterinarian whether flea and tick control is needed for their pets, which type of control product they should use if one is needed, to read the entire label before using the recommended pesticide product, and to follow all directions carefully, including monitoring the pet after application to see if side effects occur. If side effects develop, the label tells the consumer to consult the pet's veterinarian immediately.

From: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 5, 2021 2:45 PM
To: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Cc: Press <Press@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hi Jordan,

We're aiming for COB today. If that changes, I'll definitely circle back with you. We appreciate your continued patience.

Many Thanks,

Ken

From: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Sent: Friday, March 5, 2021 2:37 PM
To: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hi Ken,

Good afternoon. Do you mind providing us when you believe you may be able to provide answers to our questions that we sent over Wednesday afternoon?

Thank you again,

Jordan Liles

Operations Editor, Snopes.com

On Thu, Mar 4, 2021 at 10:09 AM Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:

> "According to EPA"
>
> ---
>
> **From:** Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
> **Sent:** Thursday, March 4, 2021 11:13 AM
> **To:** Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
> **Subject:** Re: Questions about Seresto pet collars story
>
> Hi Ken,

12:00 p.m. east coast time tomorrow (Friday). Do you mind clarifying what you meant by "background"? Does that mean we can attribute that information to the EPA, but just not to a specific person?

Thank you,

Jordan Liles

Operations Editor, Snopes.com

On Thu, Mar 4, 2021 at 5:39 AM Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:

Hi Jordan,

What's your deadline on these additional questions?

From: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 6:33 PM
To: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hi Ken,

I appreciate the information. We also emailed Bayer, who forwarded our email to Elanco. Elanco provided detailed answers.

Based on what they told us, we have some more questions.

1. Can the EPA provide year-over-year data that shows the numbers of submitted reports about Seresto collars?

2. Are there any known established links between death and exposure to the active ingredients contained in Seresto?

3. The Elanco spokesperson told us that if a pet was wearing a Seresto collar and experienced any sort of adverse event, the collar would be mentioned in the EPA's reporting (the documents linked by USA Today). The EPA's documents showed that 1,698 pets had died. Did 1,698 pets die because of the Seresto pet collars, or is that number misleading? Can you shed more light on what that number means?

4. How would you advise concerned pet owners trying to decide if it's safe to use Seresto products?

Thank you,

Jordan Liles
Operations Editor, Snopes.com

On Wed, Mar 3, 2021 at 9:21 AM Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:

Good afternoon, Jordan:

Statement:

Under the Biden-Harris Administration EPA has returned to its core mission, which includes protecting our pets' health. We take every incident reported seriously and review these data to see whether action is necessary. EPA encourages pet owners to read the entire label before using the pesticide product and follow all directions carefully, including monitoring your pet after application to see if side effects occur. If side effects develop, the label tells the consumer to consult the pet's veterinarian immediately. **– EPA Spokesperson**

Background

Under FIFRA, EPA must make a determination that the product will not cause "unreasonable adverse effects on the environment," defined in FIFRA 2(bb) as (in part) "any unreasonable risk to man or the environment, taking into account the economic, social, and environmental costs and benefits of the use of any pesticide." To reach a registration decision and inform the label language, the data that EPA requires includes data on pesticide residues, toxicology, companion animal safety, and efficacy. EPA then independently reviews those data to inform the registration decision. EPA uses this information to determine if and how a product may be used. Evaluations for pet products like shampoos, collars and spot-ons rely upon data on companion animal safety, efficacy and safety for humans who may be exposed as a result of product use.

The product label is the law, and applicators must follow label directions. Some pets, however, like some humans, are more sensitive than others and may experience adverse symptoms after treatment. Manufacturers are required under law to report adverse incident information to EPA. Individuals may report incidents potentially associated with use of an EPA-registered product by contacting the product manufacturer, their state lead pesticide agency, the National Pesticide Information Center, or by contacting EPA directly through its Incident Data System.

From: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 11:46 AM
To: Press <Press@epa.gov>
Subject: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hello,

I am a reporter with Snopes.com. We are looking to verify some information about a story pertaining to Seresto pet collars. We would like to ask some questions about this article from USA Today and Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting: https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/investigations/2021/03/02/seresto-dog-cat-collars-found-harm-pets-humans-epa-records-show/4574753001/.

1. Did the EPA make efforts to investigate the matter of there being 1,698 reported deaths from Seresto pet collars? The deaths are numbered here in EPA documents: https://beta.documentcloud.org/documents/20473296-aggregate-incident-summary-report-for-epa-reg-no-11556-155-1-1-2012-to-6-16-2020.

2. What criteria are sought after by the EPA when deciding whether or not to issue a warning about a product like a pet collar?

3. Does the EPA have a statement on the matter?

Thank you,
Jordan Liles
Operations Editor, Snopes.com

Message

From: Overbey, Dian [Overbey.Dian@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/10/2021 10:05:40 PM
To: Goodis, Michael [Goodis.Michael@epa.gov]; Messina, Edward [Messina.Edward@epa.gov]; Ozmen, Shamus [Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov]; Layne, Arnold [Layne.Arnold@epa.gov]
CC: Siedschlag, Gregory [Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov]; Dinkins, Darlene [Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov]; Echeverria, Marietta [Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: OPP IO review: Snopes follow-up on Seresto data

Yes, it is.

Dian

From: Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2021 5:04 PM
To: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>; Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>
Cc: Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: OPP IO review: Snopes follow-up on Seresto data

Right – so isn't this new attachment responsive?

Michael L. Goodis, P.E.
Acting Deputy Director for Programs
Office of Pesticide Programs
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C.
571-309-5497 (cell)

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2021 4:58 PM
To: Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>; Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>
Cc: Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: OPP IO review: Snopes follow-up on Seresto data

That is what was previously provided. This reporter from Snopes wanted the information year over year.

Dian

From: Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2021 4:57 PM
To: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>; Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>
Cc: Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: OPP IO review: Snopes follow-up on Seresto data

My understanding is that the attached is what was previously provide.
Is this what request was about?

Michael L. Goodis, P.E.
Acting Deputy Director for Programs
Office of Pesticide Programs
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C.
571-309-5497 (cell)

From: Goodis, Michael
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2021 4:52 PM
To: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>; Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>
Cc: Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: OPP IO review: Snopes follow-up on Seresto data

Some questions as I am a bit confused.

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP) ?

Dian – not sure I understand your comment – can you explain?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP) ?

Michael L. Goodis, P.E.
Acting Deputy Director for Programs
Office of Pesticide Programs
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C.
571-309-5497 (cell)

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2021 4:38 PM
To: Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>; Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>
Cc: Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: OPP IO review: Snopes follow-up on Seresto data

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Dian

From: Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2021 4:37 PM
To: Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>; Layne, Arnold

<Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>
Cc: Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: OPP IO review: Snopes follow-up on Seresto data

Does this reflect the new information about the paper incident reporting backlog?

Ed

_____

Ed Messina, Esq.
Acting Office Director
Office of Pesticide Programs
Office of Chemical Safety & Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C.
p: (703) 347-0209

From: Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2021 4:26 PM
To: Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>; Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>
Cc: Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Subject: OPP IO review: Snopes follow-up on Seresto data

Hi – For your review is the response (below and attached) to follow-up questions from Snopes.

INCOMING:
Thank you. I see the attachment, but is there year-over-year data, meaning the number of Seresto incidents broken out by year for 2012, 2013, 2014, etc? Or is this document chronological from past to present, but it just doesn't have a date column?

RESPONSE:

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

From: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 8, 2021 12:23 PM

To: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>; OPS CSID CB <OPS_CSID_CB@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Please see reporters clarifying question.

From: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Sent: Monday, March 8, 2021 11:51 AM
To: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Cc: Press <Press@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hi Ken,

Thank you. I see the attachment, but is there year-over-year data, meaning the number of Seresto incidents broken out by year for 2012, 2013, 2014, etc? Or is this document chronological from past to present, but it just doesn't have a date column?

Best,
Jordan Liles
Operations Editor, Snopes.com

On Mon, Mar 8, 2021 at 6:58 AM Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:

Hi Jordan,

Please see the attached and our response below:

1. **Can the EPA provide year-over-year data that shows the numbers of submitted reports about Seresto collars?**

   The incident data is attached.

2. **Are there any known established links between death and exposure to the active ingredients contained in Seresto?**

The active ingredients in Seresto are flumethrin and imidacloprid. As part of EPA's regular 15-year review of pesticide active ingredients, EPA completed an interim registration review decision for flumethrin in March 2020 and published a proposed interim registration review decision for imidacloprid in January 2020. During registration review, the Agency looks at each active ingredient to ensure that it continues to meet the legal standard for registration under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and other applicable statutes. Pet incidents are discussed in the Imidacloprid Proposed Interim Registration Review Decision and the Flumethrin Interim Registration Review Decision.

3. **The Elanco spokesperson told us that if a pet was wearing a Seresto collar and experienced any sort of adverse event, the collar would be mentioned in the EPA's reporting (the documents linked by USA Today). The EPA's documents showed that 1,698 pets had died. Did 1,698 pets die because of the Seresto pet collars, or is that number misleading? Can you shed more light on what that number means?**

EPA logs incidents into its Incident Data System (IDS) by EPA registration number, so all of the incidents in our IDS under EPA are for the Seresto collar. Registrants are not required under FIFRA 6(a)(2) to investigate incidents or to gather additional information. While some incidents are well investigated and reported in such a way as to establish a strong link between the adverse effect and the exposure, many other do not include enough facts to clearly demonstrate causation. Many of the reports are anecdotal, with no indication of whether the user followed label use instructions or used a product appropriate for the pet type and size. Generally, however, there is no process for verifying the information in reports.

4. **How would you advise concerned pet owners trying to decide if it's safe to use Seresto products?**

EPA encourages pet owners to discuss with their veterinarian whether flea and tick control is needed for their pets, which type of control product they should use if one is needed, to read the entire label before using the recommended pesticide product, and to follow all directions carefully, including monitoring the pet after application to see if side effects occur. If side effects develop, the label tells the consumer to consult the pet's veterinarian immediately.

From: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 5, 2021 2:45 PM
To: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Cc: Press <Press@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hi Jordan,

We're aiming for COB today. If that changes, I'll definitely circle back with you. We appreciate your continued patience.

Many Thanks,

Ken

From: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Sent: Friday, March 5, 2021 2:37 PM
To: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hi Ken,

Good afternoon. Do you mind providing us when you believe you may be able to provide answers to our questions that we sent over Wednesday afternoon?

Thank you again,

Jordan Liles

Operations Editor, Snopes.com

On Thu, Mar 4, 2021 at 10:09 AM Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:

"According to EPA"

From: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 4, 2021 11:13 AM
To: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hi Ken,

12:00 p.m. east coast time tomorrow (Friday). Do you mind clarifying what you meant by "background"? Does that mean we can attribute that information to the EPA, but just not to a specific person?

Thank you,

Jordan Liles

Operations Editor, Snopes.com

On Thu, Mar 4, 2021 at 5:39 AM Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:

Hi Jordan,

What's your deadline on these additional questions?

From: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 6:33 PM
To: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hi Ken,

I appreciate the information. We also emailed Bayer, who forwarded our email to Elanco. Elanco provided detailed answers.

Based on what they told us, we have some more questions.

1. Can the EPA provide year-over-year data that shows the numbers of submitted reports about Seresto collars?

2. Are there any known established links between death and exposure to the active ingredients contained in Seresto?

3. The Elanco spokesperson told us that if a pet was wearing a Seresto collar and experienced any sort of adverse event, the collar would be mentioned in the EPA's reporting (the documents linked by USA Today). The EPA's documents showed that 1,698 pets had died. Did 1,698 pets die because of the Seresto pet collars, or is that number misleading? Can you shed more light on what that number means?

4. How would you advise concerned pet owners trying to decide if it's safe to use Seresto products?

Thank you,
Jordan Liles
Operations Editor, Snopes.com

On Wed, Mar 3, 2021 at 9:21 AM Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:

> Good afternoon, Jordan:
>
> **Statement:**
>
> Under the Biden-Harris Administration EPA has returned to its core mission, which includes protecting our pets' health. We take every incident reported seriously and review these data to see whether action is necessary. EPA encourages pet owners to read the entire label before using the pesticide product and follow all directions carefully, including monitoring your pet after application to see if side effects occur. If side effects develop, the label tells the consumer to consult the pet's veterinarian immediately. **– EPA Spokesperson**

Background

Under FIFRA, EPA must make a determination that the product will not cause "unreasonable adverse effects on the environment," defined in FIFRA 2(bb) as (in part) "any unreasonable risk to man or the environment, taking into account the economic, social, and environmental costs and benefits of the use of any pesticide." To reach a registration decision and inform the label language, the data that EPA requires includes data on pesticide residues, toxicology, companion animal safety, and efficacy. EPA then independently reviews those data to inform the registration decision. EPA uses this information to determine if and how a product may be used. Evaluations for pet products like shampoos, collars and spot-ons rely upon data on companion animal safety, efficacy and safety for humans who may be exposed as a result of product use.

The product label is the law, and applicators must follow label directions. Some pets, however, like some humans, are more sensitive than others and may experience adverse symptoms after treatment. Manufacturers are required under law to report adverse incident information to EPA. Individuals may report incidents potentially associated with use of an EPA-registered product by contacting the product manufacturer, their state lead pesticide agency, the National Pesticide Information Center, or by contacting EPA directly through its Incident Data System.

From: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 11:46 AM
To: Press <Press@epa.gov>
Subject: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hello,

I am a reporter with Snopes.com. We are looking to verify some information about a story pertaining to Seresto pet collars. We would like to ask some questions about this article from USA Today and Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting: https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/investigations/2021/03/02/seresto-dog-cat-collars-found-harm-pets-humans-epa-records-show/4574753001/.

1. Did the EPA make efforts to investigate the matter of there being 1,698 reported deaths from Seresto pet collars? The deaths are numbered here in EPA documents: https://beta.documentcloud.org/documents/20473296-aggregate-incident-summary-report-for-epa-reg-no-11556-155-1-1-2012-to-6-16-2020.

2. What criteria are sought after by the EPA when deciding whether or not to issue a warning about a product like a pet collar?

3. Does the EPA have a statement on the matter?

Thank you,
Jordan Liles
Operations Editor, Snopes.com

Message

From: Messina, Edward [Messina.Edward@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/10/2021 9:42:14 PM
To: Overbey, Dian [Overbey.Dian@epa.gov]; Ozmen, Shamus [Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov]; Goodis, Michael [Goodis.Michael@epa.gov]; Layne, Arnold [Layne.Arnold@epa.gov]
CC: Siedschlag, Gregory [Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov]; Dinkins, Darlene [Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov]; Echeverria, Marietta [Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: OPP IO review: Snopes follow-up on Seresto data

Mike is going to reach out.

Ed Messina, Esq.
Acting Office Director
Office of Pesticide Programs
Office of Chemical Safety & Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C.
p: (703) 347-0209

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2021 4:38 PM
To: Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>; Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>
Cc: Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: OPP IO review: Snopes follow-up on Seresto data

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Dian

From: Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2021 4:37 PM
To: Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>; Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>
Cc: Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: OPP IO review: Snopes follow-up on Seresto data

Does this reflect the new information about the paper incident reporting backlog?

Ed

Ed Messina, Esq.
Acting Office Director
Office of Pesticide Programs
Office of Chemical Safety & Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C.

p: (703) 347-0209

From: Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2021 4:26 PM
To: Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>; Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>
Cc: Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Subject: OPP IO review: Snopes follow-up on Seresto data

Hi – For your review is the response (below and attached) to follow-up questions from Snopes.

INCOMING:
Thank you. I see the attachment, but is there year-over-year data, meaning the number of Seresto incidents broken out by year for 2012, 2013, 2014, etc? Or is this document chronological from past to present, but it just doesn't have a date column?

RESPONSE:

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

From: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 8, 2021 12:23 PM
To: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>; OPS CSID CB <OPS_CSID_CB@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Please see reporters clarifying question.

From: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Sent: Monday, March 8, 2021 11:51 AM
To: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Cc: Press <Press@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hi Ken,

Thank you. I see the attachment, but is there year-over-year data, meaning the number of Seresto incidents broken out by year for 2012, 2013, 2014, etc? Or is this document chronological from past to present, but it just doesn't have a date column?

Best,
Jordan Liles
Operations Editor, Snopes.com

On Mon, Mar 8, 2021 at 6:58 AM Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:

Hi Jordan,

Please see the attached and our response below:

1. **Can the EPA provide year-over-year data that shows the numbers of submitted reports about Seresto collars?**

The incident data is attached.

2. **Are there any known established links between death and exposure to the active ingredients contained in Seresto?**

The active ingredients in Seresto are flumethrin and imidacloprid. As part of EPA's regular 15-year review of pesticide active ingredients, EPA completed an interim registration review decision for flumethrin in March 2020 and published a proposed interim registration review decision for imidacloprid in January 2020. During registration review, the Agency looks at each active ingredient to ensure that it continues to meet the legal standard for registration under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and other applicable statutes. Pet incidents are discussed in the Imidacloprid Proposed Interim Registration Review Decision and the Flumethrin Interim Registration Review Decision.

3. **The Elanco spokesperson told us that if a pet was wearing a Seresto collar and experienced any sort of adverse event, the collar would be mentioned in the EPA's reporting (the documents linked by USA Today). The EPA's documents showed that 1,698 pets had died. Did 1,698 pets die because of the Seresto pet collars, or is that number misleading? Can you shed more light on what that number means?**

EPA logs incidents into its Incident Data System (IDS) by EPA registration number, so all of the incidents in our IDS under EPA are for the Seresto collar. Registrants are not required under FIFRA 6(a)(2) to investigate incidents or to gather additional information. While some incidents are well investigated and reported in such a way as to establish a strong link between the adverse effect and the exposure, many other do not include enough facts to clearly demonstrate causation. Many of the reports are anecdotal, with no indication of whether the user followed label use instructions or used a product appropriate for the pet type and size. Generally, however, there is no process for verifying the information in reports.

4. **How would you advise concerned pet owners trying to decide if it's safe to use Seresto products?**

EPA encourages pet owners to discuss with their veterinarian whether flea and tick control is needed for their pets, which type of control product they should use if one is needed, to read the entire label before using the recommended pesticide product, and to follow all directions carefully, including monitoring the pet after application to see if side effects occur. If side effects develop, the label tells the consumer to consult the pet's veterinarian immediately.

From: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 5, 2021 2:45 PM
To: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Cc: Press <Press@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hi Jordan,

We're aiming for COB today. If that changes, I'll definitely circle back with you. We appreciate your continued patience.

Many Thanks,

Ken

From: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Sent: Friday, March 5, 2021 2:37 PM
To: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hi Ken,

Good afternoon. Do you mind providing us when you believe you may be able to provide answers to our questions that we sent over Wednesday afternoon?

Thank you again,

Jordan Liles

Operations Editor, Snopes.com

On Thu, Mar 4, 2021 at 10:09 AM Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:

"According to EPA"

From: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 4, 2021 11:13 AM
To: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hi Ken,

12:00 p.m. east coast time tomorrow (Friday). Do you mind clarifying what you meant by "background"? Does that mean we can attribute that information to the EPA, but just not to a specific person?

Thank you,

Jordan Liles

Operations Editor, Snopes.com

On Thu, Mar 4, 2021 at 5:39 AM Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:

> Hi Jordan,
>
> What's your deadline on these additional questions?
>
> ---
>
> **From:** Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
> **Sent:** Wednesday, March 3, 2021 6:33 PM
> **To:** Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
> **Subject:** Re: Questions about Seresto pet collars story
>
> Hi Ken,
>
> I appreciate the information. We also emailed Bayer, who forwarded our email to Elanco. Elanco provided detailed answers.
>
> Based on what they told us, we have some more questions.

1. Can the EPA provide year-over-year data that shows the numbers of submitted reports about Seresto collars?

2. Are there any known established links between death and exposure to the active ingredients contained in Seresto?

3. The Elanco spokesperson told us that if a pet was wearing a Seresto collar and experienced any sort of adverse event, the collar would be mentioned in the EPA's reporting (the documents linked by USA Today). The EPA's documents showed that 1,698 pets had died. Did 1,698 pets die because of the Seresto pet collars, or is that number misleading? Can you shed more light on what that number means?

4. How would you advise concerned pet owners trying to decide if it's safe to use Seresto products?

Thank you,
Jordan Liles
Operations Editor, Snopes.com

On Wed, Mar 3, 2021 at 9:21 AM Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:

Good afternoon, Jordan:

Statement:

Under the Biden-Harris Administration EPA has returned to its core mission, which includes protecting our pets' health. We take every incident reported seriously and review these data to see whether action is necessary. EPA encourages pet owners to read the entire label before using the pesticide product and follow all directions carefully, including monitoring your pet after application to see if side effects occur. If side effects develop, the label tells the consumer to consult the pet's veterinarian immediately. **– EPA Spokesperson**

Background

Under FIFRA, EPA must make a determination that the product will not cause "unreasonable adverse effects on the environment," defined in FIFRA 2(bb) as (in part) "any unreasonable risk to man or the environment, taking into account the economic, social, and environmental costs and benefits of the use of any pesticide." To reach a registration decision and inform the label language, the data that EPA requires includes data on pesticide residues, toxicology, companion animal safety, and efficacy. EPA then independently reviews those data to inform the registration decision. EPA uses this information to determine if and how a product may be used. Evaluations for pet products like shampoos, collars and spot-ons rely upon data on companion animal safety, efficacy and safety for humans who may be exposed as a result of product use.

The product label is the law, and applicators must follow label directions. Some pets, however, like some humans, are more sensitive than others and may experience adverse symptoms after treatment. Manufacturers

are required under law to report adverse incident information to EPA. Individuals may report incidents potentially associated with use of an EPA-registered product by contacting the product manufacturer, their state lead pesticide agency, the National Pesticide Information Center, or by contacting EPA directly through its Incident Data System.

From: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 11:46 AM
To: Press <Press@epa.gov>
Subject: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hello,

I am a reporter with Snopes.com. We are looking to verify some information about a story pertaining to Seresto pet collars. We would like to ask some questions about this article from USA Today and Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting: https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/investigations/2021/03/02/seresto-dog-cat-collars-found-harm-pets-humans-epa-records-show/4574753001/.

1. Did the EPA make efforts to investigate the matter of there being 1,698 reported deaths from Seresto pet collars? The deaths are numbered here in EPA documents: https://beta.documentcloud.org/documents/20473296-aggregate-incident-summary-report-for-epa-reg-no-11556-155-1-1-2012-to-6-16-2020.

2. What criteria are sought after by the EPA when deciding whether or not to issue a warning about a product like a pet collar?

3. Does the EPA have a statement on the matter?

Thank you,
Jordan Liles
Operations Editor, Snopes.com

Message

From: Kraft, Erik [Kraft.Erik@epa.gov]
Sent: 11/10/2020 3:40:45 PM
To: Aubee, Catherine [Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov]; Echeverria, Marietta [Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov]; Rosenblatt, Daniel [Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov]
CC: Coleman, Anita [Coleman.Anita@epa.gov]; Herrick, Jacquelyn [Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov]
Subject: Seresto
Attachments: Proposed Seresto - Flumethrin + Imidacloprid Mitigation Briefingv2.pptx

Hi RD IO,

Attached is the draft Seresto presentation. We are still waiting on a few final edits from PRD, but I wanted to send to you the draft as it currently stands, as my detail ends this week. It outlines the issues, history, and suggested paths forward.

Thanks
Erik

Message

From: Miller, David [Miller.DavidJ@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/5/2021 6:26:16 PM
To: Overbey, Dian [Overbey.Dian@epa.gov]
CC: Vogel, Dana [Vogel.Dana@epa.gov]; Akerman, Gregory [Akerman.Gregory@epa.gov]; Wilbur, Donald [Wilbur.Donald@epa.gov]; Reaves, Elissa [Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov]; Britton, Cathryn [Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov]; Rosenblatt, Daniel [Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov]; Herrick, Jacquelyn [Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov]; Miller, David [Miller.DavidJ@epa.gov]; Echeverria, Marietta [Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov]; Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov> [Ozmen]; Ozmen, Shamus [Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: Draft responses to Snopes press inquiry -- DUE today
Attachments: Aggregate Incident Summary Report for EPA Reg No 11556-155 1-1-2012 to 6-16-2020.pdf

Importance: High

<!--[if lte mso 15 || CheckWebRef]-->

Miller, David has shared a OneDrive for Business file with you. To view it, click the link below.

Draft Responses to Snopes Press Inquiry on Seresto.docx

<!--[endif]-->

This one looks good and I have no suggested edits/changes.

David

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 05, 2021 11:21 AM
To: Vogel, Dana <Vogel.Dana@epa.gov>; Akerman, Gregory <Akerman.Gregory@epa.gov>; Wilbur, Donald <Wilbur.Donald@epa.gov>; Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Britton, Cathryn <Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>; Miller, David <Miller.DavidJ@epa.gov>
Cc: Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>
Subject: Draft responses to Snopes press inquiry -- DUE today
Importance: High

Hi All,

This is the second press inquiry on Seresto that is due by COB today (Friday, Mar. 5). This one is from Snopes. The draft responses are attached and shared below. Also attached is the document that will be sent in response to the first question.

Again, I'm out this afternoon from about 2:30, so please keep Shamus in the loop.

Snopes

Can the EPA provide year-over-year data that shows the numbers of submitted reports about Seresto collars?

See attached. This is the document that the reporter who wrote the USA Today article received.

Are there any known established links between death and exposure to the active ingredients contained in Seresto?

The active ingredients in Seresto are flumethrin and imidacloprid. As part of EPA's regular 15-year review of pesticide active ingredients, EPA completed an interim decision for flumethrin in March 2020 and published a proposed decision for imidacloprid in Jan. 2020. No link was found between exposure to either active ingredient and death in animals or humans. [More about kinds of effects may be expected with these two a.i.s?]

The Elanco spokesperson told us that if a pet was wearing a Seresto collar and experienced any sort of adverse event, the collar would be mentioned in the EPA's reporting (the documents linked by USA Today). The EPA's documents showed that 1,698 pets had died. Did 1,698 pets die because of the Seresto pet collars, or is that number misleading? Can you shed more light on what that number means?

EPA logs incidents into its Incident Data System (IDS) by EPA registration number, so all of the incidents in our IDS under EPA are for the Seresto collar.

How would you advise concerned pet owners trying to decide if it's safe to use Seresto products?

EPA encourages pet owners to discuss with their veterinarian whether flea and tick control is needed for their pets, which type of control product they should use if one is needed, to read the entire label before using the recommended pesticide product, and to follow all directions carefully, including monitoring the pet after application to see if side effects occur. If side effects develop, the label tells the consumer to consult the pet's veterinarian immediately.

Dian D. Overbey
Communications Branch
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Potomac Yard S-8927
(703) 305-5018 (O)
(571) 302-0764 (OC)
(202) 460-4875 (Personal Cell)

Message

From: Reaves, Elissa [Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/5/2021 4:29:36 PM
To: Overbey, Dian [Overbey.Dian@epa.gov]; Vogel, Dana [Vogel.Dana@epa.gov]; Akerman, Gregory [Akerman.Gregory@epa.gov]; Wilbur, Donald [Wilbur.Donald@epa.gov]; Britton, Cathryn [Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov]; Rosenblatt, Daniel [Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov]; Herrick, Jacquelyn [Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov]; Miller, David [Miller.DavidJ@epa.gov]
CC: Echeverria, Marietta [Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov]; Ozmen, Shamus [Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Draft responses to Snopes press inquiry -- DUE today

A couple of edits in the attached onedrive file. Thanks

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 5, 2021 11:21 AM
To: Vogel, Dana <Vogel.Dana@epa.gov>; Akerman, Gregory <Akerman.Gregory@epa.gov>; Wilbur, Donald <Wilbur.Donald@epa.gov>; Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Britton, Cathryn <Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>; Miller, David <Miller.DavidJ@epa.gov>
Cc: Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>
Subject: Draft responses to Snopes press inquiry -- DUE today
Importance: High

Hi All,

This is the second press inquiry on Seresto that is due by COB today (Friday, Mar. 5). This one is from Snopes. The draft responses are attached and shared below. Also attached is the document that will be sent in response to the first question.

Again, I'm out this afternoon from about 2:30, so please keep Shamus in the loop.

Snopes

Can the EPA provide year-over-year data that shows the numbers of submitted reports about Seresto collars?

See attached. This is the document that the reporter who wrote the USA Today article received.

Are there any known established links between death and exposure to the active ingredients contained in Seresto?

The active ingredients in Seresto are flumethrin and imidacloprid. As part of EPA's regular 15-year review of pesticide active ingredients, EPA completed an interim decision for flumethrin in March 2020 and published a proposed decision for imidacloprid in Jan. 2020. No link was found between exposure to either active ingredient and death in animals or humans. [More about kinds of effects may be expected with these two a.i.s?]

The Elanco spokesperson told us that if a pet was wearing a Seresto collar and experienced any sort of adverse event, the collar would be mentioned in the EPA's reporting (the documents linked by USA Today). The EPA's documents showed that 1,698 pets had died. Did 1,698 pets die because of the Seresto pet collars, or is that number misleading? Can you shed more light on what that number means?

EPA logs incidents into its Incident Data System (IDS) by EPA registration number, so all of the incidents in our IDS under EPA are for the Seresto collar.

How would you advise concerned pet owners trying to decide if it's safe to use Seresto products?

EPA encourages pet owners to discuss with their veterinarian whether flea and tick control is needed for their pets, which type of control product they should use if one is needed, to read the entire label before using the recommended pesticide product, and to follow all directions carefully, including monitoring the pet after application to see if side effects occur. If side effects develop, the label tells the consumer to consult the pet's veterinarian immediately.

Dian D. Overbey
Communications Branch
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Potomac Yard S-8927
(703) 305-5018 (O)
(571) 302-0764 (OC)
(202) 460-4875 (Personal Cell)

Message

From: Overbey, Dian [Overbey.Dian@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/5/2021 4:21:05 PM
To: Vogel, Dana [Vogel.Dana@epa.gov]; Akerman, Gregory [Akerman.Gregory@epa.gov]; Wilbur, Donald [Wilbur.Donald@epa.gov]; Reaves, Elissa [Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov]; Britton, Cathryn [Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov]; Rosenblatt, Daniel [Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov]; Herrick, Jacquelyn [Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov]; Miller, David [Miller.DavidJ@epa.gov]
CC: Echeverria, Marietta [Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov]; Ozmen, Shamus [Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov]
Subject: Draft responses to Snopes press inquiry -- DUE today
Attachments: Aggregate Incident Summary Report for EPA Reg No 11556-155 1-1-2012 to 6-16-2020.pdf

Importance: High

<!--[if lte mso 15 || CheckWebRef]-->

Overbey, Dian has shared a OneDrive for Business file with you. To view it, click the link below.

Draft Responses to Snopes Press Inquiry on Seresto.docx

<!--[endif]-->

Hi All,

This is the second press inquiry on Seresto that is due by COB today (Friday, Mar. 5). This one is from Snopes. The draft responses are attached and shared below. Also attached is the document that will be sent in response to the first question.

Again, I'm out this afternoon from about 2:30, so please keep Shamus in the loop.

Snopes

Can the EPA provide year-over-year data that shows the numbers of submitted reports about Seresto collars?

See attached. This is the document that the reporter who wrote the USA Today article received.

Are there any known established links between death and exposure to the active ingredients contained in Seresto?

The active ingredients in Seresto are flumethrin and imidacloprid. As part of EPA's regular 15-year review of pesticide active ingredients, EPA completed an interim decision for flumethrin in March 2020 and published a proposed decision for imidacloprid in Jan. 2020. No link was found between exposure to either active ingredient and death in animals or humans. [More about kinds of effects may be expected with these two a.i.s?]

The Elanco spokesperson told us that if a pet was wearing a Seresto collar and experienced any sort of adverse event, the collar would be mentioned in the EPA's reporting (the documents linked by USA Today). The EPA's documents showed that 1,698 pets had died. Did 1,698 pets die because of the Seresto pet collars, or is that number misleading? Can you shed more light on what that number means?

EPA logs incidents into its Incident Data System (IDS) by EPA registration number, so all of the incidents in our IDS under EPA are for the Seresto collar.

How would you advise concerned pet owners trying to decide if it's safe to use Seresto products?

EPA encourages pet owners to discuss with their veterinarian whether flea and tick control is needed for their pets, which type of control product they should use if one is needed, to read the entire label before using the recommended pesticide product, and to follow all directions carefully, including monitoring the pet after application to see if side effects occur. If side effects develop, the label tells the consumer to consult the pet's veterinarian immediately.

Dian D. Overbey
Communications Branch
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Potomac Yard S-8927
(703) 305-5018 (O)
(571) 302-0764 (OC)
(202) 460-4875 (Personal Cell)

Message

From: Aubee, Catherine [Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/4/2021 6:04:01 PM
To: Goodis, Michael [Goodis.Michael@epa.gov]
CC: Vogel, Dana [Vogel.Dana@epa.gov]; Wilbur, Donald [Wilbur.Donald@epa.gov]; Akerman, Gregory [Akerman.Gregory@epa.gov]; Echeverria, Marietta [Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov]; Rosenblatt, Daniel [Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov]; Reaves, Elissa [Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov]; Kiely, Timothy [Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov]; Messina, Edward [Messina.Edward@epa.gov]; Dinkins, Darlene [Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov]; Saunders, Jennifer [Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Seresto incident data
Attachments: Registrant Mtg Seresto 2019-07-16.pptx; Seresto Update on AE Rates.pdf

Attached for reference – from 2019.

Best,
Catherine

From: Aubee, Catherine
Sent: Thursday, March 04, 2021 12:49 PM
To: Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>
Cc: Vogel, Dana <Vogel.Dana@epa.gov>; Wilbur, Donald <Wilbur.Donald@epa.gov>; Akerman, Gregory <Akerman.Gregory@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Seresto incident data

Sounds good. Will forward the old Seresto slides before 3pm and coordinate with PRD, HED on the upcoming briefing on pet products.

Best,
Catherine

From: Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 04, 2021 12:46 PM
To: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Cc: Vogel, Dana <Vogel.Dana@epa.gov>; Wilbur, Donald <Wilbur.Donald@epa.gov>; Akerman, Gregory <Akerman.Gregory@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Seresto incident data

Yes please provide the slides you currently have – understand they are not up to date and not sharing.
We have a check-in at 3 pm today so this may come up.

Also FYI – Michal asked for a briefing on pet products and incidents as a result of this recent article.
Again this mostly new to her, so an overview of the products registered, how they are assessed, incidents, and specific info on Seresto to start.
It is added to the list of briefings for her – **Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)**

Michael L. Goodis, P.E.

Acting Deputy Director for Programs
Office of Pesticide Programs
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C.
571-309-5497 (cell)

From: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 04, 2021 12:21 PM
To: Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>
Cc: Vogel, Dana <Vogel.Dana@epa.gov>; Wilbur, Donald <Wilbur.Donald@epa.gov>; Akerman, Gregory <Akerman.Gregory@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Seresto incident data

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Best,
Catherine
Associate Director
OPP Registration Division
US Environmental Protection Agency

On Mar 4, 2021, at 12:07 PM, Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov> wrote:

Michal I asking to see information on the incident data. Do we have something that can be shared that can help explain the information?
The attached documents were provided as part of the FOIA request by the journalist that published the article. The incident summary report was from June 2020.

Michael L. Goodis, P.E.
Acting Deputy Director for Programs
Office of Pesticide Programs
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C.
571-309-5497 (cell)

From: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 03, 2021 3:55 PM

To: Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>
Cc: Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>
Subject: seresto incident data

Michal asked yesterday as part of her approval on a press inquiry about seeing the actual incident data. Is this something your team can provide to her?
<EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0031-0031.pdf>
<Aggregate Incident Summary Report for EPA Reg No 11556-155 1-1-2012 to 6-16-2020.pdf>

Message

From: Echeverria, Marietta [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=36C56B7169144626BD6AADEA25992D4E-MARIETTA ECHEVERRIA]
Sent: 3/2/2021 10:13:54 PM
To: Aubee, Catherine [Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov]; Britton, Cathryn [Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov]; Reaves, Elissa [Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov]; Overbey, Dian [Overbey.Dian@epa.gov]; Biscoe, Melanie [Biscoe.Melanie@epa.gov]
CC: Rosenblatt, Daniel [Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov]; Saunders, Jennifer [Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov]; Herrick, Jacquelyn [Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

I am good with the re-write. Thanks Catherine and Cathryn!

From: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 2, 2021 4:56 PM
To: Britton, Cathryn <Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov>; Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Biscoe, Melanie <Biscoe.Melanie@epa.gov>
Cc: Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

I circulated a shared document for us to rework the proposed response. I'm finished and I saw Cathryn's edits (hopefully resolved all editing conflicts). Reattaching if needed.

Best,
Catherine

From: Britton, Cathryn <Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2021 4:33 PM
To: Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Biscoe, Melanie <Biscoe.Melanie@epa.gov>
Cc: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

I'm looping Catherine in too, I thought Dian mentioned a 2 PM deadline, but am not sure of the status.

From: Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2021 4:25 PM
To: Britton, Cathryn <Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Biscoe, Melanie <Biscoe.Melanie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Sorry, I am just finishing meetings and have not had time to review. Did this go forward already?

From: Britton, Cathryn <Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 1, 2021 1:25 PM
To: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Biscoe, Melanie <Biscoe.Melanie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

I'm done with it now. I think Elissa is still looking at this.

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2021 1:18 PM
To: Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Britton, Cathryn <Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov>; Biscoe, Melanie <Biscoe.Melanie@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting
Importance: High

Please let me know when you've finished with (and closed) the document, so I can review and send forward. I need to move on by 2:00 pm.

Thanks,

Dian D. Overbey
Communications Branch
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Potomac Yard S-8927
(703) 305-5018 (O)
(571) 302-0764 (OC)
Ex. 6 PP – personal phone (Personal Cell)

From: Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2021 11:47 AM
To: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>
Cc: Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

I will loop in the leads on the pet incident team and will do the best we can given the timeframe.

From: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 1, 2021 11:44 AM
To: Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>
Cc: Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

This is a draft press response on Seresto (the incoming is at the bottom of this email chain). It came to the RD IO on Friday; we think PRD has equity in the response. Dian received an extension to today.

Best,
Catherine

From: Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2021 11:40 AM
To: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>

Cc: Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Not sure what is being asked here. First we are being looped in. Please direct where specifically you need input. Looks like the deadline was last Friday.

From: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 1, 2021 11:34 AM
To: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>; Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>
Cc: Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Revised here to reflect the Reg Review language. This is not my lane, so Tim and Elissa, please review and revise as needed. Please let Dian or me know if you have trouble with the file.

Best,
Catherine

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 11:16 AM
To: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>
Cc: Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Hope I did it right!

Dian

From: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 11:00 AM
To: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>
Cc: Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Hi Dian – could you please put the current draft Q's and responses in a OneDrive/Sharepoint/Teams document to facilitate editing?

Thanks!

Best,
Catherine

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 8:57 AM
To: Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Also, attached are the data the reporter had received and the aggregate data (Excel) I received from ISB.

From: Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 8:51 AM
To: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Dian – these need some work to me. How did these answers come together? For instance – did the team clear these and also PRD members?

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 8:39 AM
To: Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting
Importance: High

Hi All.

Below is the draft response to a press inquiry that is due today. I would appreciate your review and edit by noon today so I can forward it on in the lo-o-o-ng review chain!

According to a records request of EPA documents, there have been at least 75,000 incident reports involving pets, including 1,698 deaths. Is this a high number? Why is it still sold? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

It is my understanding that these incidents do not include the main incident reporting system, which likely has additional incidents. Do you have more information about the number of incidents?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

California toxicologists said the Bayer studies the EPA relied on to approve the collars underestimated the harm to adult dogs and cats. However, the EPA approved them. What science is there to support these registrations? How can customers know that these are safe to use?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

There have been at least 907 human-related incidents since 2013, according to EPA data. Is this a high number? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

It is my understanding that Bayer knew about these incidents for years, prior to selling dog collars to Elanco. Did Bayer make Elanco aware of these issues when selling the product to Elanco?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

From my understanding talking with former EPA staff, Health Canada denied to approve Seresto because of the incident data. Do you have any response to this?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Background

The law under which EPA regulates products for pests of pets is the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA). Under the law, EPA must make a determination that the product will not cause "unreasonable adverse effects on the environment," defined in FIFRA 2(bb) as (in part) "any unreasonable risk to man or the environment, taking into account the economic, social, and environmental costs and benefits of the use of any pesticide." Thus, the benefits of a product must be weighed against the risks.

No pesticide is completely without harm, but EPA ensures that there are measures on the product label that reduce risk. The product label is the law, and applicators must follow label directions. Some pets, however, like some humans, are more sensitive than others and may experience symptoms.

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP) Evaluations for pet products like shampoos, collars, and spot-ons rely upon data on companion animal safety, efficacy, and safety for humans who may be exposed as a result of product use. **Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)**

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

As stated above, manufacturers are required by law to report adverse incident information to EPA. Individuals may report incidents potentially associated with use of an EPA-registered product by contacting the product manufacturer, their state lead pesticide agency, the National Pesticide Information Center, or by contacting EPA directly.

Thanks. Looking forward to hearing from you.

Dian

From: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 4:09 PM
To: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>; OPS CSID CB <OPS_CSID_CB@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Hi all, Please see inquiry below. Deadline EOD Friday.

Thanks,

Ken

From: Johnathan Hettinger <jhettinger@investigatemidwest.org>
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 4:05 PM
To: Press <Press@epa.gov>; Daguillard, Robert <Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov>; Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>; Jones, Enesta <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>
Subject: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Hello,

I'm a reporter with the Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting, a nonprofit newsroom based in Champaign, Illinois, that covers agribusiness. I am working on a story about EPA incident data surrounding Seresto collars. It is my understanding that there have been a significant amount of incidents surrounding the pesticides in the collars, and I had some questions.

According to a records request of EPA documents, there have been at least 75,000 incident reports involving pets, including 1,698 deaths. Is this a high number? Why is it still sold? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

It is my understanding that these incidents do not include the main incident reporting system, which likely has additional incidents. Do you have more information about the number of incidents?

California toxicologists said the Bayer studies the EPA relied on to approve the collars underestimated the harm to adult dogs and cats. However, the EPA approved them. What science is there to support these registrations? How can customers know that these are safe to use?

There have been at least 907 human-related incidents since 2013, according to EPA data. Is this a high number? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

It is my understanding that Bayer knew about these incidents for years, prior to selling dog collars to Elanco. Did Bayer make Elanco aware of these issues when selling the product to Elanco?

From my understanding talking with former EPA staff, Health Canada denied to approve Seresto because of the incident data. Do you have any response to this?

If possible, I would very much like to speak to someone for this story. Please let me know if you would have some time. My deadline is Friday, end-of-day.

Thanks,
Johnathan Hettinger
Investigative Reporter
Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting
217-493-9791

Message

From: Aubee, Catherine [Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/2/2021 9:56:10 PM
To: Britton, Cathryn [Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov]; Reaves, Elissa [Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov]; Overbey, Dian [Overbey.Dian@epa.gov]; Biscoe, Melanie [Biscoe.Melanie@epa.gov]
CC: Echeverria, Marietta [Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov]; Rosenblatt, Daniel [Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov]; Saunders, Jennifer [Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov]; Herrick, Jacquelyn [Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

<!--[if lte mso 15 || CheckWebRef]-->

Aubee, Catherine has shared a OneDrive for Business file with you. To view it, click the link below.

DRAFT Seresto press response 2021-03-02.docx

<!--[endif]-->

I circulated a shared document for us to rework the proposed response. I'm finished and I saw Cathryn's edits (hopefully resolved all editing conflicts). Reattaching if needed.

Best,
Catherine

From: Britton, Cathryn <Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2021 4:33 PM
To: Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Biscoe, Melanie <Biscoe.Melanie@epa.gov>
Cc: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

I'm looping Catherine in too, I thought Dian mentioned a 2 PM deadline, but am not sure of the status.

From: Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2021 4:25 PM
To: Britton, Cathryn <Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Biscoe, Melanie <Biscoe.Melanie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Sorry, I am just finishing meetings and have not had time to review. Did this go forward already?

From: Britton, Cathryn <Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 1, 2021 1:25 PM
To: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Biscoe, Melanie <Biscoe.Melanie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

I'm done with it now. I think Elissa is still looking at this.

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2021 1:18 PM
To: Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Britton, Cathryn <Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov>; Biscoe, Melanie

<Biscoe.Melanie@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting
Importance: High

Please let me know when you've finished with (and closed) the document, so I can review and send forward. I need to move on by 2:00 pm.

Thanks,

Dian D. Overbey
Communications Branch
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Potomac Yard S-8927
(703) 305-5018 (O)
(571) 302-0764 (OC)
(202) 460-4875 (Personal Cell)

From: Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2021 11:47 AM
To: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>
Cc: Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

I will loop in the leads on the pet incident team and will do the best we can given the timeframe.

From: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 1, 2021 11:44 AM
To: Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>
Cc: Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

This is a draft press response on Seresto (the incoming is at the bottom of this email chain). It came to the RD IO on Friday; we think PRD has equity in the response. Dian received an extension to today.

Best,
Catherine

From: Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2021 11:40 AM
To: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>
Cc: Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Not sure what is being asked here. First we are being looped in. Please direct where specifically you need input. Looks like the deadline was last Friday.

From: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 1, 2021 11:34 AM
To: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>; Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>
Cc: Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Revised here to reflect the Reg Review language. This is not my lane, so Tim and Elissa, please review and revise as needed. Please let Dian or me know if you have trouble with the file.

Best,
Catherine

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 11:16 AM
To: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>
Cc: Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Hope I did it right!

Dian

From: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 11:00 AM
To: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>
Cc: Herrick, Jacquelyn <Herrick.Jacquelyn@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Hi Dian – could you please put the current draft Q's and responses in a OneDrive/Sharepoint/Teams document to facilitate editing?

Thanks!

Best,
Catherine

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 8:57 AM
To: Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Also, attached are the data the reporter had received and the aggregate data (Excel) I received from ISB.

From: Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 8:51 AM

To: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Dian – these need some work to me. How did these answers come together? For instance – did the team clear these and also PRD members?

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 8:39 AM
To: Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Due TODAY: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting
Importance: High

Hi All.

Below is the draft response to a press inquiry that is due today. I would appreciate your review and edit by noon today so I can forward it on in the lo-o-o-ng review chain!

According to a records request of EPA documents, there have been at least 75,000 incident reports involving pets, including 1,698 deaths. Is this a high number? Why is it still sold? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

It is my understanding that these incidents do not include the main incident reporting system, which likely has additional incidents. Do you have more information about the number of incidents?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

California toxicologists said the Bayer studies the EPA relied on to approve the collars underestimated the harm to adult dogs and cats. However, the EPA approved them. What science is there to support these registrations? How can customers know that these are safe to use?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

There have been at least 907 human-related incidents since 2013, according to EPA data. Is this a high number? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

It is my understanding that Bayer knew about these incidents for years, prior to selling dog collars to Elanco. Did Bayer make Elanco aware of these issues when selling the product to Elanco?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

From my understanding talking with former EPA staff, Health Canada denied to approve Seresto because of the incident data. Do you have any response to this?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Background

The law under which EPA regulates products for pests of pets is the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA). Under the law, EPA must make a determination that the product will not cause "unreasonable adverse effects on the environment," defined in FIFRA 2(bb) as (in part) "any unreasonable risk to man or the environment, taking into account the economic, social, and environmental costs and benefits of the use of any pesticide." Thus, the benefits of a product must be weighed against the risks.

No pesticide is completely without harm, but EPA ensures that there are measures on the product label that reduce risk. The product label is the law, and applicators must follow label directions. Some pets, however, like some humans, are more sensitive than others and may experience symptoms.

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP) Evaluations for pet products like shampoos, collars, and spot-ons rely upon data on companion animal safety, efficacy, and safety for humans who may be exposed as a result of product use. **Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)**

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

As stated above, manufacturers are required by law to report adverse incident information to EPA. Individuals may report incidents potentially associated with use of an EPA-registered product by contacting the product manufacturer, their state lead pesticide agency, the National Pesticide Information Center, or by contacting EPA directly.

Thanks. Looking forward to hearing from you.

Dian

From: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 4:09 PM
To: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>; OPS CSID CB <OPS_CSID_CB@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Hi all, Please see inquiry below. Deadline EOD Friday.

Thanks,

Ken

From: Johnathan Hettinger <jhettinger@investigatemidwest.org>
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 4:05 PM
To: Press <Press@epa.gov>; Daguillard, Robert <Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov>; Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>; Jones, Enesta <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>
Subject: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Hello,

I'm a reporter with the Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting, a nonprofit newsroom based in Champaign, Illinois, that covers agribusiness. I am working on a story about EPA incident data surrounding Seresto collars. It is my understanding that there have been a significant amount of incidents surrounding the pesticides in the collars, and I had some questions.

According to a records request of EPA documents, there have been at least 75,000 incident reports involving pets, including 1,698 deaths. Is this a high number? Why is it still sold? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

It is my understanding that these incidents do not include the main incident reporting system, which likely has additional incidents. Do you have more information about the number of incidents?

California toxicologists said the Bayer studies the EPA relied on to approve the collars underestimated the harm to adult dogs and cats. However, the EPA approved them. What science is there to support these registrations? How can customers know that these are safe to use?

There have been at least 907 human-related incidents since 2013, according to EPA data. Is this a high number? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

It is my understanding that Bayer knew about these incidents for years, prior to selling dog collars to Elanco. Did Bayer make Elanco aware of these issues when selling the product to Elanco?

From my understanding talking with former EPA staff, Health Canada denied to approve Seresto because of the incident data. Do you have any response to this?

If possible, I would very much like to speak to someone for this story. Please let me know if you would have some time. My deadline is Friday, end-of-day.

Thanks,
Johnathan Hettinger
Investigative Reporter
Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting
217-493-9791

Message

From: Dennis, Allison [Dennis.Allison@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/4/2021 4:34:27 PM
To: Goodis, Michael [Goodis.Michael@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: seresto incident data
Attachments: EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0031-0031.pdf; Aggregate Incident Summary Report for EPA Reg No 11556-155 1-1-2012 to 6-16-2020.pdf

Sorry, I was confused. The Midwest Center for investigative Reporting reporter sent us these two documents he was looking at as part of his story.

From: Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 4, 2021 9:51 AM
To: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: seresto incident data

Hi Allison – are you able send the info from the FOIA?

Michael L. Goodis, P.E.
Acting Deputy Director for Programs
Office of Pesticide Programs
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C.
571-309-5497 (cell)

From: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 03, 2021 4:24 PM
To: Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>
Cc: Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: seresto incident data

I can share with you what was shared with Midwest per a FOIA if helpful.

From: Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 4:23 PM
To: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>
Cc: Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: seresto incident data

I can check with the team – not sure how readily available it is though.

Michael L. Goodis, P.E.
Acting Deputy Director for Programs
Office of Pesticide Programs
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C.
571-309-5497 (cell)

From: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 03, 2021 3:55 PM
To: Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>
Cc: Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>
Subject: seresto incident data

Michal asked yesterday as part of her approval on a press inquiry about seeing the actual incident data. Is this something your team can provide to her?

Message

From: Dennis, Allison [Dennis.Allison@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/3/2021 9:51:31 PM
To: Freedhoff, Michal [Freedhoff.Michal@epa.gov]; Messina, Edward [Messina.Edward@epa.gov]; Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]; Goodis, Michael [Goodis.Michael@epa.gov]
CC: Ozmen, Shamus [Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov]; Siedschlag, Gregory [Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov]; Rust, Mary [Rust.Mary@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: For Michal/Ed/Rick Approval; Midwest Center; Seresto Followup; DDL Today

I defer to Mike and Ed on your q.

From: Freedhoff, Michal <Freedhoff.Michal@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 4:07 PM
To: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>
Cc: Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>; Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Rust, Mary <Rust.Mary@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: For Michal/Ed/Rick Approval; Midwest Center; Seresto Followup; DDL Today

That is fine w me if fine w OPP. What can we say about the incident data that is getting raised in these pieces?

Michal Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Acting Assistant Administrator
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Freedhoff.michal@epa.gov

From: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 3:53 PM
To: Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal <Freedhoff.Michal@epa.gov>; Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>
Cc: Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>; Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Rust, Mary <Rust.Mary@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: For Michal/Ed/Rick Approval; Midwest Center; Seresto Followup; DDL Today

Good call. Send updated statement below in highlights for approval.

FYI: We are getting more press inquiries on this matter which we responding to with our general statement developed yesterday. We are also getting citizen inquires through the regions, NPIC, and our pesticidequestions@epa.gov.

From: Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 3:32 PM
To: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal <Freedhoff.Michal@epa.gov>; Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>
Cc: Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>; Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Rust, Mary <Rust.Mary@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: For Michal/Ed/Rick Approval; Midwest Center; Seresto Followup; DDL Today

Should we add information about how to report. Mary has that.

Ed Messina, Esq.
Acting Office Director
Office of Pesticide Programs
Office of Chemical Safety & Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C.
p: (703) 347-0209

From: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 3:30 PM
To: Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal <Freedhoff.Michal@epa.gov>; Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>
Cc: Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>; Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>
Subject: For Michal/Ed/Rick Approval; Midwest Center; Seresto Followup; DDL Today
Importance: High

All, How's this as a response back to the Midwest Center? He asked:

1. I was wondering what that means about the Biden-Harris administration taking pet health seriously. Is the agency planning to take action on Seresto?
2. Also, in the statement, the agency says people should follow the label. Is there a problem with people not following the label in these incidents?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

From: Johnathan Hettinger <jhettinger@investigatemidwest.org>
Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 11:28 AM
To: Daguillard, Robert <Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov>
Cc: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>; Press <Press@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Robert,

I wanted to follow-up on my Seresto story. I saw the statement that the agency provided to the New York Post. https://t.co/DnvhOr34Fk?amp=1

I was wondering what that means about the Biden-Harris administration taking pet health seriously. Is the agency planning to take action on Seresto?

Also, in the statement, the agency says people should follow the label. Is there a problem with people not following the label in these incidents?

Thanks,
Johnathan

From: Daguillard, Robert <Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2021 8:42 AM
To: Johnathan Hettinger <jhettinger@investigatemidwest.org>; Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Cc: Press <Press@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Good morning Jonathan,

For attribution to "an EPA Spokesperson," please:

1. **According to a records request of EPA documents, there have been at least 75,000 incident reports involving pets, including 1,698 deaths. Is this a high number? Why is it still sold? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?**

2. **California toxicologists said the Bayer studies the EPA relied on to approve the collars underestimated the harm to adult dogs and cats. However, the EPA approved them. What science is there to support these registrations? How can customers know that these are safe to use?**

Combined Response to the above questions:

The active ingredients in the Seresto collar are flumethrin and imidacloprid. Both have undergone registration review (examination of active ingredients every 15 years to make sure they continue to meet the FIFRA standard for registration), On the basis of current information, both have been found eligible for continued registration. During the registration and registration review processes, the Agency uses the best available science to reach its decision. This includes articles in peer-reviewed journals in addition to the studies submitted by the registrant.

EPA takes every incident reported seriously. If any pesticide is found to present unreasonable adverse effects on the environment as defined in the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), or is found not to be safe under the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, the Agency would take appropriate regulatory action. Any such action would, again, need to be supported by the best-available, peer-reviewed science Regulatory action might include anything from changing the label instructions for use to cancelling the registration.

On the Registration process: Under FIFRA, EPA must make a determination that the product will not cause "unreasonable adverse effects on the environment," defined in FIFRA 2(bb) as (in part) "any unreasonable risk to man or the

environment, taking into account the economic, social, and environmental costs and benefits of the use of any pesticide." Thus, the benefits of a product must be weighed against the risks.

To reach a registration decision and inform the label language, the data that EPA requires includes data on pesticide residues, toxicology, companion animal safety, and efficacy. EPA then independently reviews those data to inform the registration decision. EPA uses this information to determine if and how a product may be used. Evaluations for pet products like shampoos, collars and spot-ons rely upon data on companion animal safety, efficacy and safety for humans who may be exposed as a result of product use.

No pesticide is completely without harm, but EPA ensures that there are measures on the product label that reduce risk. The product label is the law, and applicators must follow label directions. Some pets, however, like some humans, are more sensitive than others and may experience adverse symptoms after treatment.

3. **It is my understanding that these incidents do not include the main incident reporting system, which likely has additional incidents. Do you have more information about the number of incidents?**

Manufacturers are required under law to report adverse incident information to EPA. Individuals may report incidents potentially associated with use of an EPA-registered product by contacting the product manufacturer, their state lead pesticide agency, the National Pesticide Information Center, or by contacting EPA directly through its Incident Data System.

4. **There have been at least 907 human-related incidents since 2013, according to EPA data. Is this a high number? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?**

As stated in the Flumethrin: Tier I Update Review of Human Incidents and Epidemiology for
Proposed Interim Decision, dated Sept. 17, 2019, there was a total of 626 incidents in EPA's Main and Aggregate IDSs. While some major incidents were reported (including dermal and neurological symptoms), the vast majority of the incidents were classified as moderate or lower in severity.

EPA also conducted a larger epidemiological analysis of human incident data associated with pyrethroids (Pyrethroids: Tier II Epidemiological Report, dated April 30, 2019) and found little substantive evidence to suggest a clear, associative or causal relationship between exposure to pyrethroids and adverse effects. EPA will continue to evaluate incident data in future cycles of registration review. EPA may initiate action at any time to address concerns if unreasonable adverse effects are identified. Such actions can range from mandatory label changes to cancellation of the registration.

5. **It is my understanding that Bayer knew about these incidents for years, prior to selling dog collars to Elanco. Did Bayer make Elanco aware of these issues when selling the product to Elanco?**

EPA does not have information on communications between Bayer and Elanco.

6. **From my understanding talking with former EPA staff, Health Canada denied to approve Seresto because of the incident data. Do you have any response to this?**

EPA cannot speak to Health Canada's decisionmaking process related to the Seresto collar. While the Seresto collar is not registered in Canada, it is registered in most countries in the European Union and Australia.

Best, R.

Robert Daguillard
Public Affairs Officer
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, DC
+1 (202) 564-6618 (o)
+1 (202) 360-0476 (m)

From: Johnathan Hettinger <jhettinger@investigatemidwest.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 09, 2021 11:43 AM
To: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Cc: Press <Press@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Ken,

I wanted to circle back. USA Today Network is republishing this, and my editors there are really wanting me to get a response from the EPA. They also want me to reach out to senators/house members on the issue, so I'll be doing that.

One question they wanted me to make sure I ask: Is there any way to compare the complaints/incidents for Seresto versus other common flea collars?

Thanks,
Johnathan

On Tue, Feb 2, 2021 at 8:11 AM Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:

> Hi Johnathan,
>
> Still working to be responsive on this for you. We appreciate your continued patience. Will circle back with you when I have something.
>
> Thanks,

Ken

From: Johnathan Hettinger <jhettinger@investigatemidwest.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 10:08 AM
To: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Cc: Press <Press@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Just wanted to follow-up on this. Thanks!

On Fri, Jan 29, 2021 at 9:54 AM Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:

> We appreciate your flexibility, Johnathan. Thank you.
>
> **From:** Johnathan Hettinger <jhettinger@investigatemidwest.org>
> **Sent:** Friday, January 29, 2021 10:58 AM
> **To:** Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
> **Cc:** Press <Press@epa.gov>
> **Subject:** Re: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting
>
> Yes, we can wait until COB Monday. That is fine. Thank you.
>
> > On Jan 29, 2021, at 7:34 AM, Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:
> >
> > Hi Johnathan,
> >
> > We're working on being responsive to your inquiry, however will require more time. Can you extend your deadline? COB Monday perhaps? If you cannot extend, will you update with our response once it's received?

-Ken

From: Johnathan Hettinger <jhettinger@investigatemidwest.org>
Sent: Thursday, January 28, 2021 3:32 PM
To: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Cc: Press <Press@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Ken,

For those numbers, I'm citing the attached document on aggregate incidents. But if you look at the human incident report in the other document, there is an aggregate IDS and a main IDS. From my understanding, the aggregate is not all of the incidents.

Does that make sense? You can give me a call at 217-493-9791 if that helps.

Thanks,

Johnathan

On Thu, Jan 28, 2021 at 12:14 PM Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:

> Hi Johnathan,
>
> I'd like some clarification on what you mean by, "It is my understanding that these incidents do not include the main incident reporting system, which likely has additional incidents."
>
> More information on this would help us be responsive to your inquiry. Please advise.

Thanks,

Ken

From: Johnathan Hettinger <jhettinger@investigatemidwest.org>
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 4:05 PM
To: Press <Press@epa.gov>; Daguillard, Robert <Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov>; Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>; Jones, Enesta <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>
Subject: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Hello,

I'm a reporter with the Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting, a nonprofit newsroom based in Champaign, Illinois, that covers agribusiness. I am working on a story about EPA incident data surrounding Seresto collars. It is my understanding that there have been a significant amount of incidents surrounding the pesticides in the collars, and I had some questions.

According to a records request of EPA documents, there have been at least 75,000 incident reports involving pets, including 1,698 deaths. Is this a high number? Why is it still sold? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

It is my understanding that these incidents do not include the main incident reporting system, which likely has additional incidents. Do you have more information about the number of incidents?

California toxicologists said the Bayer studies the EPA relied on to approve the collars underestimated the harm to adult dogs and cats. However, the EPA approved them. What science is there to support these registrations? How can customers know that these are safe to use?

There have been at least 907 human-related incidents since 2013, according to EPA data. Is this a high number? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

It is my understanding that Bayer knew about these incidents for years, prior to selling dog collars to Elanco. Did Bayer make Elanco aware of these issues when selling the product to Elanco?

From my understanding talking with former EPA staff, Health Canada denied to approve Seresto because of the incident data. Do you have any response to this?

If possible, I would very much like to speak to someone for this story. Please let me know if you would have some time. My deadline is Friday, end-of-day.

Thanks,

Johnathan Hettinger

Investigative Reporter

Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

217-493-9791

Message

From: Ozmen, Shamus [Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/5/2021 9:33:07 PM
To: Goodis, Michael [Goodis.Michael@epa.gov]; Messina, Edward [Messina.Edward@epa.gov]; Layne, Arnold [Layne.Arnold@epa.gov]
CC: Siedschlag, Gregory [Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov]; Dinkins, Darlene [Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov]; Overbey, Dian [Overbey.Dian@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: OPP IO Review: 2 sets of Seresto inquiries; Snopes and VIN; DDL - COB

Many thanks Mike. We will remove the last sentence and will try to quickly get the PID?ID of the two Ais before 5pm.

From: Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 5, 2021 3:39 PM
To: Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>
Cc: Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: OPP IO Review: 2 sets of Seresto inquiries; Snopes and VIN; DDL - COB

For Snopes #1 – ot sure **Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)**
is needed for the Q.
Moreover, **Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)**
I would be helpful **Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)** if there is time.

Michael L. Goodis, P.E.
Acting Deputy Director for Programs
Office of Pesticide Programs
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C.
571-309-5497 (cell)

From: Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 05, 2021 3:10 PM
To: Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>; Layne, Arnold <Layne.Arnold@epa.gov>
Cc: Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Subject: OPP IO Review: 2 sets of Seresto inquiries; Snopes and VIN; DDL - COB
Importance: High

HI - We received two press inquiries on Seresto that is due by COB today (Friday, Mar. 5). One inquiry is from Snopes and the second is from Snopes. Both are below so you can compare and see the themes.

Snopes asked for the data which is attached but please let us know if there are any issues with sharing this (would this have to be another FOIA like the original FOIA request that broke this story).

From SNOPES:

1. **Can the EPA provide year-over-year data that shows the numbers of submitted reports about Seresto collars?** The incident data is attached.

2. **Are there any known established links between death and exposure to the active ingredients contained in Seresto?**

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

3. **The Elanco spokesperson told us that if a pet was wearing a Seresto collar and experienced any sort of adverse event, the collar would be mentioned in the EPA's reporting (the documents linked by USA Today). The EPA's documents showed that 1,698 pets had died. Did 1,698 pets die because of the Seresto pet collars, or is that number misleading? Can you shed more light on what that number means?**

EPA logs incidents into its Incident Data System (IDS) by EPA registration number, so all of the incidents in our IDS under EPA are for the Seresto collar. Registrants are not required under FIFRA 6(a)(2) to investigate incidents or to gather additional information. Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

4. **How would you advise concerned pet owners trying to decide if it's safe to use Seresto products?**

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

****

From VIN:

1. **Can you describe what incident reports are? Can anyone file them? Is there any process for verifying the information in reports?**

Incident reports are accounts of unexpected or unintended outcomes after using a pesticide. Anyone can file an incident report, and EPA encourages pesticide users to do so. For incidents related to pets: (https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-incidents/report-pesticide-exposure-incidents-affecting-pets-or-domestic-animals). For general pesticide incidents: https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-incidents/introduction-pesticide-incidents

Section 6(a)(2) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act requires pesticide registrants to report any factual information regarding unreasonable adverse effects on the environment of a pesticide to EPA. Registrants report incidents to EPA on a quarterly basis. They are not required under FIFRA 6(a)(2) to investigate the incident to gather additional information.

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

2. **What happens after incident reports are filed?**

EPA logs the incidents into the EPA Incident Data System. The information is reviewed periodically to determine whether additional regulatory action is necessary. It is routinely used during EPA's review of pesticide active ingredients to ensure that they continue to meet the FIFRA standard of no unreasonable risk to human health and the environment.

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

3. **Can you confirm or refute the claim that these collars have the highest or unusually high number of incident reports for a pesticide pet product?**

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

4. **There has been some discussion that the collars in question are counterfeit collars, does the EPA know if the collars associated with incident reports are legitimate?**

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

If a possible illegal use of a pesticide is suspected, EPA encourages contacting the appropriate state pesticide regulatory agency. State enforcement officials are responsible for investigating possible pesticide misuse violations.

Message

From: Ozmen, Shamus [Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/5/2021 8:10:09 PM
To: Messina, Edward [Messina.Edward@epa.gov]; Goodis, Michael [Goodis.Michael@epa.gov]; Layne, Arnold [Layne.Arnold@epa.gov]
CC: Siedschlag, Gregory [Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov]; Dinkins, Darlene [Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov]; Overbey, Dian [Overbey.Dian@epa.gov]
Subject: OPP IO Review: 2 sets of Seresto inquiries; Snopes and VIN; DDL - COB
Attachments: FW: Questions about Seresto pet collars story; FW: Question from VIN News Service; Aggregate Incident Summary Report for EPA Reg No 11556-155 1-1-2012 to 6-16-2020.pdf

Importance: High

HI - We received two press inquiries on Seresto that is due by COB today (Friday, Mar. 5). One inquiry is from Snopes and the second is from Snopes. Both are below so you can compare and see the themes.

Snopes asked for the data which is attached but please let us know if there are any issues with sharing this (would this have to be another FOIA like the original FOIA request that broke this story).

From SNOPES:

1. **Can the EPA provide year-over-year data that shows the numbers of submitted reports about Seresto collars?**
The incident data is attached.

2. **Are there any known established links between death and exposure to the active ingredients contained in Seresto?**

The active ingredients in Seresto are flumethrin and imidacloprid. As part of EPA's regular 15-year review of pesticide active ingredients, EPA completed an interim registration review decision for flumethrin in March 2020 and published a proposed interim registration review decision for imidacloprid in January 2020. During registration review, the Agency looks at each active ingredient to ensure that it continues to meet the legal standard for registration under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and other applicable statutes. Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

3. **The Elanco spokesperson told us that if a pet was wearing a Seresto collar and experienced any sort of adverse event, the collar would be mentioned in the EPA's reporting (the documents linked by USA Today). The EPA's documents showed that 1,698 pets had died. Did 1,698 pets die because of the Seresto pet collars, or is that number misleading? Can you shed more light on what that number means?**

EPA logs incidents into its Incident Data System (IDS) by EPA registration number, so all of the incidents in our IDS under EPA are for the Seresto collar. Registrants are not required under FIFRA 6(a)(2) to investigate incidents or to gather additional information. Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

4. **How would you advise concerned pet owners trying to decide if it's safe to use Seresto products?**

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

****

From VIN:

1. **Can you describe what incident reports are? Can anyone file them? Is there any process for verifying the information in reports?**

Incident reports are accounts of unexpected or unintended outcomes after using a pesticide. Anyone can file an incident report, and EPA encourages pesticide users to do so. For incidents related to pets: (https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-incidents/report-pesticide-exposure-incidents-affecting-pets-or-domestic-animals). For general pesticide incidents: https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-incidents/introduction-pesticide-incidents

Section 6(a)(2) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act requires pesticide registrants to report any factual information regarding unreasonable adverse effects on the environment of a pesticide to EPA. Registrants report incidents to EPA on a quarterly basis. They are not required under FIFRA 6(a)(2) to investigate the incident to gather additional information.

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

2. **What happens after incident reports are filed?**

EPA logs the incidents into the EPA Incident Data System. The information is reviewed periodically to determine whether additional regulatory action is necessary. It is routinely used during EPA's review of pesticide active ingredients to ensure that they continue to meet the FIFRA standard of no unreasonable risk to human health and the environment.

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

3. **Can you confirm or refute the claim that these collars have the highest or unusually high number of incident reports for a pesticide pet product?**

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

4. **There has been some discussion that the collars in question are counterfeit collars, does the EPA know if the collars associated with incident reports are legitimate?**

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

If a possible illegal use of a pesticide is suspected, EPA encourages contacting the appropriate state pesticide regulatory agency. State enforcement officials are responsible for investigating possible pesticide misuse violations.

Message

From: Ozmen, Shamus [Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov]
Sent: 2/2/2021 3:24:08 PM
To: Goodis, Michael [Goodis.Michael@epa.gov]; Overbey, Dian [Overbey.Dian@epa.gov]; Siedschlag, Gregory [Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov]; Messina, Edward [Messina.Edward@epa.gov]
CC: Dinkins, Darlene [Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: OPP IO REVIEW: Response - Seresto.docx
Attachments: Response - Seresto updated 2-2 cleaned.docx; Response - Seresto updated 2-2 tracked.docx

Thanks Mike and Dian. I'll move this forward to Allison.

From: Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 10:15 AM
To: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>
Cc: Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: OPP IO REVIEW: Response - Seresto.docx

That works – thanks

Michael L. Goodis, P.E.
Acting Deputy Director for Programs
Office of Pesticide Programs
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C.
571-309-5497 (cell)

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, February 02, 2021 10:06 AM
To: Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>; Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>
Cc: Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: OPP IO REVIEW: Response - Seresto.docx

Hi.

Would Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)?

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Dian

From: Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2021 5:27 PM
To: Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>
Cc: Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: OPP IO REVIEW: Response - Seresto.docx

Thanks Greg

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

No other comments - this was not an easy one to prepare. Thanks

Michael L. Goodis, P.E.
Acting Deputy Director for Programs
Office of Pesticide Programs
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C.
571-309-5497 (cell)

From: Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2021 3:31 PM
To: Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>
Cc: Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>; Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>
Subject: OPP IO REVIEW: Response - Seresto.docx
Importance: High

Hi Ed and Mike,

Press inquiry on pet collars attached. Deadline is COB, so please review at your earliest convenience. Apologies for the short notice.

Thanks,
Greg

Message

From: Siedschlag, Gregory [Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov]
Sent: 2/1/2021 8:30:42 PM
To: Messina, Edward [Messina.Edward@epa.gov]; Goodis, Michael [Goodis.Michael@epa.gov]
CC: Dinkins, Darlene [Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov]; Overbey, Dian [Overbey.Dian@epa.gov]; Ozmen, Shamus [Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov]
Subject: OPP IO REVIEW: Response - Seresto.docx
Attachments: Response - Seresto.docx

Importance: High

Hi Ed and Mike,

Press inquiry on pet collars attached. Deadline is COB, so please review at your earliest convenience. Apologies for the short notice.

Thanks,
Greg

Message

From: Kaiser, Sven-Erik [Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/16/2021 7:13:44 PM
To: Richmond, Jonah [Richmond.Jonah@epa.gov]; Hanley, Mary [Hanley.Mary@epa.gov]; Cyran, Carissa [Cyran.Carissa@epa.gov]; Dinkins, Darlene [Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov]; Messina, Edward [Messina.Edward@epa.gov]; Goodis, Michael [Goodis.Michael@epa.gov]; Knapp, Kristien [Knapp.Kristien@epa.gov]
Subject: Rep. Krishnamoorthi Oversight Letter on Seresto Pet Collars
Attachments: 2021-03-16.RK to Regan-EPA re Pet Collars.pdf; Sanders.Incoming.Seresto Flea Collar.pdf

Flag: Follow up

Pet Collar team - heads up on a new letter from Rep. Krishnamoorthi on Seresto pet collars (AL-21-000-2340). It includes document requests and is being handled by my colleague Kristien Knapp who heads the OCIR Oversight team. This is the second hill letter on Seresto – we also have Sen. Sanders (AL-21-000-2227), and we'll need to sort out handling the two letters. Please let Kristien or me know if any questions. Thanks,
Sven

Sven-Erik Kaiser
Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-566-2753
kaiser.sven-erik@epa.gov

Message

From: Dennis, Allison [Dennis.Allison@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/11/2021 6:32:43 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
CC: Ozmen, Shamus [Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov]; Siedschlag, Gregory [Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov]
Subject: For Rick review: Snopes; Seresto data; DDL: Flx
Attachments: FOIA Request Seresto, by year -- 3-9-2021.pdf; Aggregate Incident Summary Report for EPA Reg No 11556-155 1-1-2012 to 6-16-2020.pdf

+ Rick

Rick,

See below where Shamus did a tremendous job with explaining the previous media inquiry and the latest inquiry from Snopes re: Seresto pet incident data. Let us know if you have any concerns with our proposed response. Also, do you think Michal would want to see this year by year data breakdown now as a FYI via her binder OR should we go ahead and send this to OPA, knowing that OPP will catch Michal up very soon on the seresto data? Thanks! -Allison

---

From: Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2021 9:50 AM
To: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>
Cc: Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>; Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Subject: for review: Snopes follow-up on Seresto data

Hi Allison,

As you know, Snopes inquired twice about the Seresto and we'd like to be clear about the relationship between the two inquiries and the responses.

1. The first Snopes inquiry was for a copy of the raw Seresto data report that originally acquired from the FOIA Library by the reporter from the Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting.

- The report 1) covered the **period from Jan. 1, 2012, to the date the report was compiled -- June 16, 2020** and 2) listed the incidents individually, **without the years** indicated.
- See attached file: "Aggregate Incident Summary Report..."

2. The second Snopes inquiry is now asking for the **year-over-year version of the same data** provided in the first inquiry which stopped at June 16, 2020.

- By showing the data by year, we feel it is important to provide context of the first (2012) and last year (2020) as they have nuances compared to the middle (2013-2019) years. See the bulleted information below in the proposed response.
- See attached file: "FOIA Request Seresto, by year..."

3. In preparing this response Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

4. The response stays within the scope of the inquiry and does not introduce this issue of data since June 2020 which is quickly being resolved.

Michal and Rick should be made aware of the how the two inquiries are related and why a different version of the same data is being provided.

****

INCOMING:
Thank you. I see the attachment, but is there year-over-year data, meaning the number of Seresto incidents broken out by year for 2012, 2013, 2014, etc? Or is this document chronological from past to present, but it just doesn't have a date column?

RESPONSE:

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

From: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 8, 2021 12:23 PM
To: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>; OPS CSID CB <OPS_CSID_CB@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Please see reporters clarifying question.

From: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Sent: Monday, March 8, 2021 11:51 AM
To: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Cc: Press <Press@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hi Ken,

Thank you. I see the attachment, but is there year-over-year data, meaning the number of Seresto incidents broken out by year for 2012, 2013, 2014, etc? Or is this document chronological from past to present, but it just doesn't have a date column?

Best,
Jordan Liles
Operations Editor, Snopes.com

On Mon, Mar 8, 2021 at 6:58 AM Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:

Hi Jordan,

Please see the attached and our response below:

1. **Can the EPA provide year-over-year data that shows the numbers of submitted reports about Seresto collars?**

The incident data is attached.

2. **Are there any known established links between death and exposure to the active ingredients contained in Seresto?**

The active ingredients in Seresto are flumethrin and imidacloprid. As part of EPA's regular 15-year review of pesticide active ingredients, EPA completed an interim registration review decision for flumethrin in March 2020 and published a proposed interim registration review decision for imidacloprid in January 2020. During registration review, the Agency looks at each active ingredient to ensure that it continues to meet the legal standard for registration under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and other applicable statutes. Pet incidents are discussed in the Imidacloprid Proposed Interim Registration Review Decision and the Flumethrin Interim Registration Review Decision.

3. **The Elanco spokesperson told us that if a pet was wearing a Seresto collar and experienced any sort of adverse event, the collar would be mentioned in the EPA's reporting (the documents linked by USA Today). The EPA's documents showed that 1,698 pets had died. Did 1,698 pets die because of the Seresto pet collars, or is that number misleading? Can you shed more light on what that number means?**

EPA logs incidents into its Incident Data System (IDS) by EPA registration number, so all of the incidents in our IDS under EPA are for the Seresto collar. Registrants are not required under FIFRA 6(a)(2) to investigate incidents or to gather additional information. While some incidents are well investigated and reported in such a way as to establish a strong link between the adverse effect and the exposure, many other do not include enough facts to clearly demonstrate causation. Many of the reports are anecdotal, with no indication of whether the user followed label use instructions or used a product appropriate for the pet type and size. Generally, however, there is no process for verifying the information in reports.

4. **How would you advise concerned pet owners trying to decide if it's safe to use Seresto products?**

EPA encourages pet owners to discuss with their veterinarian whether flea and tick control is needed for their pets, which type of control product they should use if one is needed, to read the entire label before using the recommended pesticide product, and to follow all directions carefully, including monitoring the pet after application to see if side effects occur. If side effects develop, the label tells the consumer to consult the pet's veterinarian immediately.

From: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 5, 2021 2:45 PM

To: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Cc: Press <Press@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hi Jordan,

We're aiming for COB today. If that changes, I'll definitely circle back with you. We appreciate your continued patience.

Many Thanks,

Ken

From: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Sent: Friday, March 5, 2021 2:37 PM
To: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hi Ken,

Good afternoon. Do you mind providing us when you believe you may be able to provide answers to our questions that we sent over Wednesday afternoon?

Thank you again,

Jordan Liles

Operations Editor, Snopes.com

On Thu, Mar 4, 2021 at 10:09 AM Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:

> "According to EPA"

From: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 4, 2021 11:13 AM
To: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hi Ken,

12:00 p.m. east coast time tomorrow (Friday). Do you mind clarifying what you meant by "background"? Does that mean we can attribute that information to the EPA, but just not to a specific person?

Thank you,

Jordan Liles

Operations Editor, Snopes.com

On Thu, Mar 4, 2021 at 5:39 AM Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:

> Hi Jordan,
>
> What's your deadline on these additional questions?
>
> **From:** Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
> **Sent:** Wednesday, March 3, 2021 6:33 PM
> **To:** Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
> **Subject:** Re: Questions about Seresto pet collars story
>
> Hi Ken,
>
> I appreciate the information. We also emailed Bayer, who forwarded our email to Elanco. Elanco provided detailed answers.
>
> Based on what they told us, we have some more questions.
>
> 1. Can the EPA provide year-over-year data that shows the numbers of submitted reports about Seresto collars?
>
> 2. Are there any known established links between death and exposure to the active ingredients contained in Seresto?

3. The Elanco spokesperson told us that if a pet was wearing a Seresto collar and experienced any sort of adverse event, the collar would be mentioned in the EPA's reporting (the documents linked by USA Today). The EPA's documents showed that 1,698 pets had died. Did 1,698 pets die because of the Seresto pet collars, or is that number misleading? Can you shed more light on what that number means?

4. How would you advise concerned pet owners trying to decide if it's safe to use Seresto products?

Thank you,
Jordan Liles
Operations Editor, Snopes.com

On Wed, Mar 3, 2021 at 9:21 AM Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:

Good afternoon, Jordan:

Statement:

Under the Biden-Harris Administration EPA has returned to its core mission, which includes protecting our pets' health. We take every incident reported seriously and review these data to see whether action is necessary. EPA encourages pet owners to read the entire label before using the pesticide product and follow all directions carefully, including monitoring your pet after application to see if side effects occur. If side effects develop, the label tells the consumer to consult the pet's veterinarian immediately. **– EPA Spokesperson**

Background

Under FIFRA, EPA must make a determination that the product will not cause "unreasonable adverse effects on the environment," defined in FIFRA 2(bb) as (in part) "any unreasonable risk to man or the environment, taking into account the economic, social, and environmental costs and benefits of the use of any pesticide." To reach a registration decision and inform the label language, the data that EPA requires includes data on pesticide residues, toxicology, companion animal safety, and efficacy. EPA then independently reviews those data to inform the registration decision. EPA uses this information to determine if and how a product may be used. Evaluations for pet products like shampoos, collars and spot-ons rely upon data on companion animal safety, efficacy and safety for humans who may be exposed as a result of product use.

The product label is the law, and applicators must follow label directions. Some pets, however, like some humans, are more sensitive than others and may experience adverse symptoms after treatment. Manufacturers are required under law to report adverse incident information to EPA. Individuals may report incidents potentially associated with use of an EPA-registered product by contacting the product manufacturer, their state lead pesticide agency, the National Pesticide Information Center, or by contacting EPA directly through its Incident Data System.

From: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 11:46 AM
To: Press <Press@epa.gov>
Subject: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hello,

I am a reporter with Snopes.com. We are looking to verify some information about a story pertaining to Seresto pet collars. We would like to ask some questions about this article from USA Today and Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting: https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/investigations/2021/03/02/seresto-dog-cat-collars-found-harm-pets-humans-epa-records-show/4574753001/.

1. Did the EPA make efforts to investigate the matter of there being 1,698 reported deaths from Seresto pet collars? The deaths are numbered here in EPA documents: https://beta.documentcloud.org/documents/20473296-aggregate-incident-summary-report-for-epa-reg-no-11556-155-1-1-2012-to-6-16-2020.

2. What criteria are sought after by the EPA when deciding whether or not to issue a warning about a product like a pet collar?

3. Does the EPA have a statement on the matter?

Thank you,
Jordan Liles
Operations Editor, Snopes.com

Message

From: Dennis, Allison [Dennis.Allison@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/8/2021 2:07:17 PM
To: Freedhoff, Michal [Freedhoff.Michal@epa.gov]; Malloy, Ruth [malloy.ruth@epa.gov]
CC: Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]; Richmond, Jonah [Richmond.Jonah@epa.gov]; Diaz, Catherine [Diaz.Catherine@epa.gov]; Tyler, Tom [Tyler.Tom@epa.gov]; Siedschlag, Gregory [Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov]; Ozmen, Shamus [Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov]
Subject: For Michal Binder as FYI only: Recent responses on Seresto pet collars

Hi Michal- Here are two recent responses regarding Seresto collars that I thought you might be interested in seeing:

Veterinary Information Network:

1. **Can you describe what incident reports are? Can anyone file them? Is there any process for verifying the information in reports?**

Incident reports are accounts of unexpected or unintended outcomes after using a pesticide. Anyone can file an incident report, and EPA encourages pesticide users to do so. For incidents related to pets: (https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-incidents/report-pesticide-exposure-incidents-affecting-pets-or-domestic-animals). For general pesticide incidents: https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-incidents/introduction-pesticide-incidents

Section 6(a)(2) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act requires pesticide registrants to report any factual information regarding unreasonable adverse effects on the environment of a pesticide to EPA. Registrants report incidents to EPA on a quarterly basis. They are not required under FIFRA 6(a)(2) to investigate the incident to gather additional information.

EPA also receives incident reports directly from consumers and the National Pesticide Information Center (NPIC), which, in addition to receiving reports from consumers, has a portal for veterinarians' reports. Some incidents are well investigated and reported in such a way as to establish a strong link between the adverse effect and the exposure. On the other hand, many other reports do not include enough facts to clearly demonstrate causation. Many of the reports are anecdotal, with no indication of whether the user followed label use instructions or used a product appropriate for the pet type and size. Generally, however, there is no process for verifying the information in reports.

2. **What happens after incident reports are filed?**

EPA logs the incidents into the EPA Incident Data System. The information is reviewed periodically to determine whether additional regulatory action is necessary. It is routinely used during EPA's review of pesticide active ingredients to ensure that they continue to meet the FIFRA standard of no unreasonable risk to human health and the environment.

If the aggregate report appears to indicate a problem, OPP's product managers are consulted on their knowledge of the product, such as its use, sales volume, risk issues considered during the application process, etc. The product manager will then contact the registrant to request additional information or further analysis of the incidents.

3. **Can you confirm or refute the claim that these collars have the highest or unusually high number of incident reports for a pesticide pet product?**

EPA cannot confirm or refute the claim that Seresto collars have the highest number of incident reports of pet pesticide products or that the number of incident reports for Seresto is unusually high. Other factors, such as number of units sold/used and whether a user applied the product in manner directed on the label, would have to be factored into the equation. Raw numbers of incidents are not comparable across products.

4. **There has been some discussion that the collars in question are counterfeit collars, does the EPA know if the collars associated with incident reports are legitimate?**

To date, EPA does not have any information about possible counterfeiting of Seresto collars. Generally, EPA is unable to draw conclusions on the legitimacy of a product from FIFRA 6(a) incident reports. An overview of the incident data might

identify where there might be counterfeiting or other problems and serves as the first step in a process of gathering more information about the products or chemicals.

If a possible illegal use of a pesticide is suspected, EPA encourages contacting the appropriate state pesticide regulatory agency. State enforcement officials are responsible for investigating possible pesticide misuse violations.

Snopes.com

1. **Can the EPA provide year-over-year data that shows the numbers of submitted reports about Seresto collars?**
   The incident data is attached.

2. **Are there any known established links between death and exposure to the active ingredients contained in Seresto?**

The active ingredients in Seresto are flumethrin and imidacloprid. As part of EPA's regular 15-year review of pesticide active ingredients, EPA completed an interim registration review decision for flumethrin in March 2020 and published a proposed interim registration review decision for imidacloprid in January 2020. During registration review, the Agency looks at each active ingredient to ensure that it continues to meet the legal standard for registration under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and other applicable statutes. Pet incidents are discussed in the Imidacloprid Proposed Interim Registration Review Decision and the Flumethrin Interim Registration Review Decision.

3. **The Elanco spokesperson told us that if a pet was wearing a Seresto collar and experienced any sort of adverse event, the collar would be mentioned in the EPA's reporting (the documents linked by USA Today). The EPA's documents showed that 1,698 pets had died. Did 1,698 pets die because of the Seresto pet collars, or is that number misleading? Can you shed more light on what that number means?**

EPA logs incidents into its Incident Data System (IDS) by EPA registration number, so all of the incidents in our IDS under EPA are for the Seresto collar. Registrants are not required under FIFRA 6(a)(2) to investigate incidents or to gather additional information. While some incidents are well investigated and reported in such a way as to establish a strong link between the adverse effect and the exposure, many other do not include enough facts to clearly demonstrate causation. Many of the reports are anecdotal, with no indication of whether the user followed label use instructions or used a product appropriate for the pet type and size. Generally, however, there is no process for verifying the information in reports.

4. **How would you advise concerned pet owners trying to decide if it's safe to use Seresto products?**

EPA encourages pet owners to discuss with their veterinarian whether flea and tick control is needed for their pets, which type of control product they should use if one is needed, to read the entire label before using the recommended pesticide product, and to follow all directions carefully, including monitoring the pet after application to see if side effects occur. If side effects develop, the label tells the consumer to consult the pet's veterinarian immediately.

Message

From: Keigwin, Richard [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=151BAABB6A2246A3A312F12A706C0A05-RICHARD P KEIGWIN JR]
Sent: 3/11/2021 9:41:45 PM
To: Dennis, Allison [Dennis.Allison@epa.gov]
CC: Ozmen, Shamus [Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov]; Siedschlag, Gregory [Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov]
Subject: Re: For Rick review: Snopes; Seresto data; DDL: Flx

I don't have any comments.

Rick Keigwin
Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Management
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Phone: 202-564-2910
Sent from my iPhone (Please excuse typos!)

On Mar 11, 2021, at 1:32 PM, Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov> wrote:

+ Rick

Rick,

See below where Shamus did a tremendous job with explaining the previous media inquiry and the latest inquiry from Snopes re: Seresto pet incident data. Let us know if you have any concerns with our proposed response. Also, do you think Michal would want to see this year by year data breakdown now as a FYI via her binder OR should we go ahead and send this to OPA, knowing that OPP will catch Michal up very soon on the seresto data? Thanks! -Allison

From: Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2021 9:50 AM
To: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>
Cc: Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>; Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Subject: for review: Snopes follow-up on Seresto data

Hi Allison,

As you know, Snopes inquired twice about the Seresto and we'd like to be clear about the relationship between the two inquiries and the responses.

1. The first Snopes inquiry was for a copy of the raw Seresto data report that originally acquired from the FOIA Library by the reporter from the Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting.

- The report 1) covered the **period from Jan. 1, 2012, to the date the report was compiled -- June 16, 2020** and 2) listed the incidents individually, **without the years** indicated.
- See attached file: "Aggregate Incident Summary Report..."

2. The second Snopes inquiry is now asking for the **year-over-year version of the same data** provided in the first inquiry which stopped at June 16, 2020.

- By showing the data by year, we feel it is important to provide context of the first (2012) and last year (2020) as they have nuances compared to the middle (2013-2019) years. See the bulleted information below in the proposed response.
- See attached file: "FOIA Request Seresto, by year..."

3. In preparing this response Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

4. The response stays within the scope of the inquiry and does not introduce this issue of data since June 2020 which is quickly being resolved.

Michal and Rick should be made aware of the how the two inquiries are related and why a different version of the same data is being provided.

****

INCOMING:
Thank you. I see the attachment, but is there year-over-year data, meaning the number of Seresto incidents broken out by year for 2012, 2013, 2014, etc? Or is this document chronological from past to present, but it just doesn't have a date column?

RESPONSE:

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

From: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 8, 2021 12:23 PM
To: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>; OPS CSID CB <OPS_CSID_CB@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Please see reporters clarifying question.

From: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Sent: Monday, March 8, 2021 11:51 AM

To: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Cc: Press <Press@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hi Ken,

Thank you. I see the attachment, but is there year-over-year data, meaning the number of Seresto incidents broken out by year for 2012, 2013, 2014, etc? Or is this document chronological from past to present, but it just doesn't have a date column?

Best,
Jordan Liles
Operations Editor, Snopes.com

On Mon, Mar 8, 2021 at 6:58 AM Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:

Hi Jordan,

Please see the attached and our response below:

1. **Can the EPA provide year-over-year data that shows the numbers of submitted reports about Seresto collars?**

The incident data is attached.

2. **Are there any known established links between death and exposure to the active ingredients contained in Seresto?**

The active ingredients in Seresto are flumethrin and imidacloprid. As part of EPA's regular 15-year review of pesticide active ingredients, EPA completed an interim registration review decision for flumethrin in March 2020 and published a proposed interim registration review decision for imidacloprid in January 2020. During registration review, the Agency looks at each active ingredient to ensure that it continues to meet the legal standard for registration under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and other applicable statutes. Pet incidents are discussed in the Imidacloprid Proposed Interim Registration Review Decision and the Flumethrin Interim Registration Review Decision.

3. **The Elanco spokesperson told us that if a pet was wearing a Seresto collar and experienced any sort of adverse event, the collar would be mentioned in the EPA's reporting (the documents linked by USA Today). The EPA's documents showed that 1,698 pets had died. Did 1,698 pets die because of the Seresto pet collars, or is that number misleading? Can you shed more light on what that number means?**

EPA logs incidents into its Incident Data System (IDS) by EPA registration number, so all of the incidents in our IDS under EPA are for the Seresto collar. Registrants are not required under FIFRA 6(a)(2) to investigate incidents or to gather additional information. While some incidents are well investigated and reported in such a way as to establish a strong link between the adverse effect and the exposure,

many other do not include enough facts to clearly demonstrate causation. Many of the reports are anecdotal, with no indication of whether the user followed label use instructions or used a product appropriate for the pet type and size. Generally, however, there is no process for verifying the information in reports.

4. **How would you advise concerned pet owners trying to decide if it's safe to use Seresto products?**

EPA encourages pet owners to discuss with their veterinarian whether flea and tick control is needed for their pets, which type of control product they should use if one is needed, to read the entire label before using the recommended pesticide product, and to follow all directions carefully, including monitoring the pet after application to see if side effects occur. If side effects develop, the label tells the consumer to consult the pet's veterinarian immediately.

From: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 5, 2021 2:45 PM
To: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Cc: Press <Press@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hi Jordan,

We're aiming for COB today. If that changes, I'll definitely circle back with you. We appreciate your continued patience.

Many Thanks,

Ken

From: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Sent: Friday, March 5, 2021 2:37 PM
To: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hi Ken,

Good afternoon. Do you mind providing us when you believe you may be able to provide answers to our questions that we sent over Wednesday afternoon?

Thank you again,

Jordan Liles

Operations Editor, Snopes.com

On Thu, Mar 4, 2021 at 10:09 AM Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:

"According to EPA"

From: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 4, 2021 11:13 AM
To: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hi Ken,

12:00 p.m. east coast time tomorrow (Friday). Do you mind clarifying what you meant by "background"? Does that mean we can attribute that information to the EPA, but just not to a specific person?

Thank you,

Jordan Liles

Operations Editor, Snopes.com

On Thu, Mar 4, 2021 at 5:39 AM Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:

Hi Jordan,

What's your deadline on these additional questions?

From: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 6:33 PM
To: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hi Ken,

I appreciate the information. We also emailed Bayer, who forwarded our email to Elanco. Elanco provided detailed answers.

Based on what they told us, we have some more questions.

1. Can the EPA provide year-over-year data that shows the numbers of submitted reports about Seresto collars?

2. Are there any known established links between death and exposure to the active ingredients contained in Seresto?

3. The Elanco spokesperson told us that if a pet was wearing a Seresto collar and experienced any sort of adverse event, the collar would be mentioned in the EPA's reporting (the documents linked by USA Today). The EPA's documents showed that 1,698 pets had died. Did 1,698 pets die because of the Seresto pet collars, or is that number misleading? Can you shed more light on what that number means?

4. How would you advise concerned pet owners trying to decide if it's safe to use Seresto products?

Thank you,
Jordan Liles
Operations Editor, Snopes.com

On Wed, Mar 3, 2021 at 9:21 AM Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:

> Good afternoon, Jordan:
>
> **Statement:**

Under the Biden-Harris Administration EPA has returned to its core mission, which includes protecting our pets' health. We take every incident reported seriously and review these data to see whether action is necessary. EPA encourages pet owners to read the entire label before using the pesticide product and follow all directions carefully, including monitoring your pet after application to see if side effects occur. If side effects develop, the label tells the consumer to consult the pet's veterinarian immediately. **– EPA Spokesperson**

Background

Under FIFRA, EPA must make a determination that the product will not cause "unreasonable adverse effects on the environment," defined in FIFRA 2(bb) as (in part) "any unreasonable risk to man or the environment, taking into account the economic, social, and environmental costs and benefits of the use of any pesticide." To reach a registration decision and inform the label language, the data that EPA requires includes data on pesticide residues, toxicology, companion animal safety, and efficacy. EPA then independently reviews those data to inform the registration decision. EPA uses this information to determine if and how a product may be used. Evaluations for pet products like shampoos, collars and spot-ons rely upon data on companion animal safety, efficacy and safety for humans who may be exposed as a result of product use.

The product label is the law, and applicators must follow label directions. Some pets, however, like some humans, are more sensitive than others and may experience adverse symptoms after treatment. Manufacturers are required under law to report adverse incident information to EPA. Individuals may report incidents potentially associated with use of an EPA-registered product by contacting the product manufacturer, their state lead pesticide agency, the National Pesticide Information Center, or by contacting EPA directly through its Incident Data System.

From: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 11:46 AM
To: Press <Press@epa.gov>
Subject: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hello,

I am a reporter with Snopes.com. We are looking to verify some information about a story pertaining to Seresto pet collars. We would like to ask some questions about this article from USA Today and Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting: https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/investigations/2021/03/02/seresto-dog-cat-collars-found-harm-pets-humans-epa-records-show/4574753001/.

1. Did the EPA make efforts to investigate the matter of there being 1,698 reported deaths from Seresto pet collars? The deaths are numbered here in EPA documents: https://beta.documentcloud.org/documents/20473296-aggregate-incident-summary-report-for-

epa-reg-no-11556-155-1-1-2012-to-6-16-2020.

2. What criteria are sought after by the EPA when deciding whether or not to issue a warning about a product like a pet collar?

3. Does the EPA have a statement on the matter?

Thank you,
Jordan Liles
Operations Editor, Snopes.com

<FOIA Request Seresto, by year -- 3-9-2021.pdf>
<Aggregate Incident Summary Report for EPA Reg No 11556-155 1-1-2012 to 6-16-2020.pdf>

Message

From: Keigwin, Richard [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=151BAABB6A2246A3A312F12A706C0A05-RICHARD P KEIGWIN JR]
Sent: 3/5/2021 10:33:55 PM
To: Dennis, Allison [Dennis.Allison@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: For Rick Review: Snopes; Seresto; DDL 3/5

I don't have any comments. If we have provided the information to one outside group already, I'm fine with providing the same information in this instance.

From: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 05, 2021 4:59 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>
Subject: For Rick Review: Snopes; Seresto; DDL 3/5

Another one for your review! Again, let me know if you think Michal should see this too OR if I should FYI to her just for learning purposes. If we want to provide the data as requested in Q.1, it is attached and is the same as referenced by Midwest/USA Today. -Allison

1. **Can the EPA provide year-over-year data that shows the numbers of submitted reports about Seresto collars?**
   The incident data is attached.

2. **Are there any known established links between death and exposure to the active ingredients contained in Seresto?**

The active ingredients in Seresto are flumethrin and imidacloprid. As part of EPA's regular 15-year review of pesticide active ingredients, EPA completed an interim registration review decision for flumethrin in March 2020 and published a proposed interim registration review decision for imidacloprid in January 2020. During registration review, the Agency looks at each active ingredient to ensure that it continues to meet the legal standard for registration under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and other applicable statutes. Pet incidents are discussed in the Imidacloprid Proposed Interim Registration Review Decision and the Flumethrin Interim Registration Review Decision.

3. **The Elanco spokesperson told us that if a pet was wearing a Seresto collar and experienced any sort of adverse event, the collar would be mentioned in the EPA's reporting (the documents linked by USA Today). The EPA's documents showed that 1,698 pets had died. Did 1,698 pets die because of the Seresto pet collars, or is that number misleading? Can you shed more light on what that number means?**

EPA logs incidents into its Incident Data System (IDS) by EPA registration number, so all of the incidents in our IDS under EPA are for the Seresto collar. Registrants are not required under FIFRA 6(a)(2) to investigate incidents or to gather additional information. While some incidents are well investigated and reported in such a way as to establish a strong link between the adverse effect and the exposure, many other do not include enough facts to clearly demonstrate causation. Many of the reports are anecdotal, with no indication of whether the user followed label use instructions or used a product appropriate for the pet type and size. Generally, however, there is no process for verifying the information in reports.

4. **How would you advise concerned pet owners trying to decide if it's safe to use Seresto products?**

EPA encourages pet owners to discuss with their veterinarian whether flea and tick control is needed for their pets, which type of control product they should use if one is needed, to read the entire label before using the recommended pesticide product, and to follow all directions carefully, including monitoring the pet after application to see if side effects occur. If side effects develop, the label tells the consumer to consult the pet's veterinarian immediately.

From: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 4, 2021 12:52 PM
To: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>; OPS CSID CB <OPS_CSID_CB@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Please see follow up questions. Deadline tomorrow COB

From: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 6:33 PM
To: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hi Ken,

I appreciate the information. We also emailed Bayer, who forwarded our email to Elanco. Elanco provided detailed answers.

Based on what they told us, we have some more questions.

1. Can the EPA provide year-over-year data that shows the numbers of submitted reports about Seresto collars?

2. Are there any known established links between death and exposure to the active ingredients contained in Seresto?

3. The Elanco spokesperson told us that if a pet was wearing a Seresto collar and experienced any sort of adverse event, the collar would be mentioned in the EPA's reporting (the documents linked by USA Today). The EPA's documents showed that 1,698 pets had died. Did 1,698 pets die because of the Seresto pet collars, or is that number misleading? Can you shed more light on what that number means?

4. How would you advise concerned pet owners trying to decide if it's safe to use Seresto products?

Thank you,
Jordan Liles
Operations Editor, Snopes.com

On Wed, Mar 3, 2021 at 9:21 AM Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:

> Good afternoon, Jordan:
>
> **Statement:**
>
> Under the Biden-Harris Administration EPA has returned to its core mission, which includes protecting our pets' health. We take every incident reported seriously and review these data to see whether action is necessary. EPA encourages pet owners to read the entire label before using the pesticide product and follow all directions carefully, including monitoring your pet after application to see if side effects occur. If side effects develop, the label tells the consumer to consult the pet's veterinarian immediately. **– EPA Spokesperson**

Background

Under FIFRA, EPA must make a determination that the product will not cause "unreasonable adverse effects on the environment," defined in FIFRA 2(bb) as (in part) "any unreasonable risk to man or the environment, taking into account the economic, social, and environmental costs and benefits of the use of any pesticide." To reach a registration decision and inform the label language, the data that EPA requires includes data on pesticide residues, toxicology, companion animal safety, and efficacy. EPA then independently reviews those data to inform the registration decision. EPA uses this information to determine if and how a product may be used. Evaluations for pet products like shampoos, collars and spot-ons rely upon data on companion animal safety, efficacy and safety for humans who may be exposed as a result of product use.

The product label is the law, and applicators must follow label directions. Some pets, however, like some humans, are more sensitive than others and may experience adverse symptoms after treatment. Manufacturers are required under law to report adverse incident information to EPA. Individuals may report incidents potentially associated with use of an EPA-registered product by contacting the product manufacturer, their state lead pesticide agency, the National Pesticide Information Center, or by contacting EPA directly through its Incident Data System.

From: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 11:46 AM
To: Press <Press@epa.gov>
Subject: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hello,

I am a reporter with Snopes.com. We are looking to verify some information about a story pertaining to Seresto pet collars. We would like to ask some questions about this article from USA Today and Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting: https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/investigations/2021/03/02/seresto-dog-cat-collars-found-harm-pets-humans-epa-records-show/4574753001/.

1. Did the EPA make efforts to investigate the matter of there being 1,698 reported deaths from Seresto pet collars? The deaths are numbered here in EPA documents: https://beta.documentcloud.org/documents/20473296-aggregate-incident-summary-report-for-epa-reg-no-11556-155-1-1-2012-to-6-16-2020.

2. What criteria are sought after by the EPA when deciding whether or not to issue a warning about a product like a pet collar?

3. Does the EPA have a statement on the matter?

Thank you,
Jordan Liles
Operations Editor, Snopes.com

Message

From: Dennis, Allison [Dennis.Allison@epa.gov]
Sent: 2/8/2021 3:24:22 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
CC: Ozmen, Shamus [Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: For Rick Review: Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting Response
Attachments: Response - Seresto updated 2-2 cleanedAD (003).docx

Here you go.

From: Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 8, 2021 10:24 AM
To: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>
Cc: Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: For Rick Review: Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting Response

I'm getting an error message when I tried to open the Word file. Can you resend?

From: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, February 05, 2021 2:07 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>
Cc: Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>
Subject: For Rick Review: Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting Response

Rick,

We've received an inquiry from the Midwest Center for investigative Reporting regarding incident data and Seresto collars. Our prepared responses for your approval are attached. Please note that the reporter sent us these two documents he was looking at as part of his story. I think Michal would want to review for approval these response but let me know if you disagree.

Message

From: Dennis, Allison [Dennis.Allison@epa.gov]
Sent: 2/5/2021 7:06:45 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard [Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov]
CC: Ozmen, Shamus [Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov]
Subject: For Rick Review: Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting Response
Attachments: EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0031-0031.pdf; Aggregate Incident Summary Report for EPA Reg No 11556-155 1-1-2012 to 6-16-2020.pdf

<!--[if lte mso 15 || CheckWebRef]-->

Dennis, Allison has shared a OneDrive for Business file with you. To view it, click the link below.

Response - Seresto updated 2-2 cleanedAD (003).docx

<!--[endif]-->

Rick,

We've received an inquiry from the Midwest Center for investigative Reporting regarding incident data and Seresto collars. Our prepared responses for your approval are attached. Please note that the reporter sent us these two documents he was looking at as part of his story. I think Michal would want to review for approval these response but let me know if you disagree.

Message

From: Keigwin, Richard [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=151BAABB6A2246A3A312F12A706C0A05-RICHARD P KEIGWIN JR]
Sent: 2/8/2021 3:31:14 PM
To: Dennis, Allison [Dennis.Allison@epa.gov]
CC: Ozmen, Shamus [Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: For Rick Review: Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting Response
Attachments: Response - Seresto updated 2-2 cleanedAD RPK.docx

Thanks. A few questions.

From: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2021 10:24 AM
To: Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>
Cc: Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: For Rick Review: Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting Response

Here you go.

From: Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 8, 2021 10:24 AM
To: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>
Cc: Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: For Rick Review: Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting Response

I'm getting an error message when I tried to open the Word file. Can you resend?

From: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, February 05, 2021 2:07 PM
To: Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>
Cc: Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>
Subject: For Rick Review: Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting Response

Rick,

We've received an inquiry from the Midwest Center for investigative Reporting regarding incident data and Seresto collars. Our prepared responses for your approval are attached. Please note that the reporter sent us these two documents he was looking at as part of his story. I think Michal would want to review for approval these response but let me know if you disagree.

Message

From: Dennis, Allison [Dennis.Allison@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/5/2021 9:57:07 PM
To: Ozmen, Shamus [Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov]
CC: Messina, Edward [Messina.Edward@epa.gov]; Siedschlag, Gregory [Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov]; Overbey, Dian [Overbey.Dian@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: for review: FW: Questions about Seresto pet collars story; DDL 3/5

This is also really good. Thanks. -Allison

From: Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 5, 2021 4:55 PM
To: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>
Cc: Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Subject: for review: FW: Questions about Seresto pet collars story; DDL 3/5

Hi Allison – For your review below is Snopes' follow-up Seresto inquiry. If we want to provide the data as requested in Q.1, it is attached and is the same as referenced by Midwest and USA Today.

1. **Can the EPA provide year-over-year data that shows the numbers of submitted reports about Seresto collars?**
The incident data is attached.

2. **Are there any known established links between death and exposure to the active ingredients contained in Seresto?**

The active ingredients in Seresto are flumethrin and imidacloprid. As part of EPA's regular 15-year review of pesticide active ingredients, EPA completed an interim registration review decision for flumethrin in March 2020 and published a proposed interim registration review decision for imidacloprid in January 2020. During registration review, the Agency looks at each active ingredient to ensure that it continues to meet the legal standard for registration under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and other applicable statutes. Pet incidents are discussed in the Imidacloprid Proposed Interim Registration Review Decision and the Flumethrin Interim Registration Review Decision.

3. **The Elanco spokesperson told us that if a pet was wearing a Seresto collar and experienced any sort of adverse event, the collar would be mentioned in the EPA's reporting (the documents linked by USA Today). The EPA's documents showed that 1,698 pets had died. Did 1,698 pets die because of the Seresto pet collars, or is that number misleading? Can you shed more light on what that number means?**

EPA logs incidents into its Incident Data System (IDS) by EPA registration number, so all of the incidents in our IDS under EPA are for the Seresto collar. Registrants are not required under FIFRA 6(a)(2) to investigate incidents or to gather additional information. While some incidents are well investigated and reported in such a way as to establish a strong link between the adverse effect and the exposure, many other do not include enough facts to clearly demonstrate causation. Many of the reports are anecdotal, with no indication of whether the user followed label use instructions or used a product appropriate for the pet type and size. Generally, however, there is no process for verifying the information in reports.

4. **How would you advise concerned pet owners trying to decide if it's safe to use Seresto products?**

EPA encourages pet owners to discuss with their veterinarian whether flea and tick control is needed for their pets, which type of control product they should use if one is needed, to read the entire label before using the recommended pesticide product, and to follow all directions carefully, including monitoring the pet after application to see if side effects occur. If side effects develop, the label tells the consumer to consult the pet's veterinarian immediately.

From: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 4, 2021 12:52 PM
To: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>; OPS CSID CB <OPS_CSID_CB@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Please see follow up questions. Deadline tomorrow COB

From: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 6:33 PM
To: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hi Ken,

I appreciate the information. We also emailed Bayer, who forwarded our email to Elanco. Elanco provided detailed answers.

Based on what they told us, we have some more questions.

1. Can the EPA provide year-over-year data that shows the numbers of submitted reports about Seresto collars?

2. Are there any known established links between death and exposure to the active ingredients contained in Seresto?

3. The Elanco spokesperson told us that if a pet was wearing a Seresto collar and experienced any sort of adverse event, the collar would be mentioned in the EPA's reporting (the documents linked by USA Today). The EPA's documents showed that 1,698 pets had died. Did 1,698 pets die because of the Seresto pet collars, or is that number misleading? Can you shed more light on what that number means?

4. How would you advise concerned pet owners trying to decide if it's safe to use Seresto products?

Thank you,
Jordan Liles
Operations Editor, Snopes.com

On Wed, Mar 3, 2021 at 9:21 AM Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:

> Good afternoon, Jordan:
>
> **Statement:**
>
> Under the Biden-Harris Administration EPA has returned to its core mission, which includes protecting our pets' health. We take every incident reported seriously and review these data to see whether action is necessary. EPA encourages pet owners to read the entire label before using the pesticide product and follow all directions carefully, including monitoring your pet after application to see if side effects occur. If side effects develop, the label tells the consumer to consult the pet's veterinarian immediately. **– EPA Spokesperson**

Background

Under FIFRA, EPA must make a determination that the product will not cause "unreasonable adverse effects on the environment," defined in FIFRA 2(bb) as (in part) "any unreasonable risk to man or the environment, taking into account the economic, social, and environmental costs and benefits of the use of any pesticide." To reach a registration decision and inform the label language, the data that EPA requires includes data on pesticide residues, toxicology, companion animal safety, and efficacy. EPA then independently reviews those data to inform the registration decision. EPA uses this information to determine if and how a product may be used. Evaluations for pet products like shampoos, collars and spot-ons rely upon data on companion animal safety, efficacy and safety for humans who may be exposed as a result of product use.

The product label is the law, and applicators must follow label directions. Some pets, however, like some humans, are more sensitive than others and may experience adverse symptoms after treatment. Manufacturers are required under law to report adverse incident information to EPA. Individuals may report incidents potentially associated with use of an EPA-registered product by contacting the product manufacturer, their state lead pesticide agency, the National Pesticide Information Center, or by contacting EPA directly through its Incident Data System.

From: Jordan Liles <jordan@snopes.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 11:46 AM
To: Press <Press@epa.gov>
Subject: Questions about Seresto pet collars story

Hello,

I am a reporter with Snopes.com. We are looking to verify some information about a story pertaining to Seresto pet collars. We would like to ask some questions about this article from USA Today and Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting: https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/investigations/2021/03/02/seresto-dog-cat-collars-found-harm-pets-humans-epa-records-show/4574753001/.

1. Did the EPA make efforts to investigate the matter of there being 1,698 reported deaths from Seresto pet collars? The deaths are numbered here in EPA documents: https://beta.documentcloud.org/documents/20473296-aggregate-incident-summary-report-for-epa-reg-no-11556-155-1-1-2012-to-6-16-2020.

2. What criteria are sought after by the EPA when deciding whether or not to issue a warning about a product like a pet collar?

3. Does the EPA have a statement on the matter?

Thank you,
Jordan Liles
Operations Editor, Snopes.com

Message

From: Ozmen, Shamus [Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov]
Sent: 2/2/2021 3:28:54 PM
To: Dennis, Allison [Dennis.Allison@epa.gov]
CC: Messina, Edward [Messina.Edward@epa.gov]; Siedschlag, Gregory [Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov]; Overbey, Dian [Overbey.Dian@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting
Attachments: Response - Seresto updated 2-2 cleaned.docx

Hi Allison – Attached for your review is the response to the inquiry. Thanks.

From: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 11:19 AM
To: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Cc: Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Deadline extended to Monday COB

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 9:30 AM
To: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Cc: Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Monday, COB, if possible.

Dian

From: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 9:27 AM
To: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Cc: Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Do you know how long of an extension is needed?

From: Overbey, Dian <Overbey.Dian@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2021 9:21 AM
To: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Cc: Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting
Importance: High

Hi Ken,

The division of OPP under which this falls would like to know if an extension of the deadline is possible. They feel it's a tricky set of questions.

Dian D. Overbey
Communications Branch
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Potomac Yard S-8927
(703) 305-5018 (O)
(571) 302-0764 (OC)
Ex. 6 PP – personal phone (Personal Cell)

From: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 4:09 PM
To: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>; OPS CSID CB <OPS_CSID_CB@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Hi all, Please see inquiry below. Deadline EOD Friday.

Thanks,

Ken

From: Johnathan Hettinger <jhettinger@investigatemidwest.org>
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 4:05 PM
To: Press <Press@epa.gov>; Daguillard, Robert <Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov>; Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>; Jones, Enesta <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>
Subject: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Hello,

I'm a reporter with the Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting, a nonprofit newsroom based in Champaign, Illinois, that covers agribusiness. I am working on a story about EPA incident data surrounding Seresto collars. It is my understanding that there have been a significant amount of incidents surrounding the pesticides in the collars, and I had some questions.

According to a records request of EPA documents, there have been at least 75,000 incident reports involving pets, including 1,698 deaths. Is this a high number? Why is it still sold? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

It is my understanding that these incidents do not include the main incident reporting system, which likely has additional incidents. Do you have more information about the number of incidents?

California toxicologists said the Bayer studies the EPA relied on to approve the collars underestimated the harm to adult dogs and cats. However, the EPA approved them. What science is there to support these registrations? How can customers know that these are safe to use?

There have been at least 907 human-related incidents since 2013, according to EPA data. Is this a high number? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

It is my understanding that Bayer knew about these incidents for years, prior to selling dog collars to Elanco. Did Bayer make Elanco aware of these issues when selling the product to Elanco?

From my understanding talking with former EPA staff, Health Canada denied to approve Seresto because of the incident data. Do you have any response to this?

If possible, I would very much like to speak to someone for this story. Please let me know if you would have some time. My deadline is Friday, end-of-day.

Thanks,
Johnathan Hettinger
Investigative Reporter
Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting
217-493-9791

Message

From: Messina, Edward [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=95521FBF4E34496A879E364FAF7E5AA8-MESSINA, EDWARD]
Sent: 3/4/2021 8:23:31 PM
To: Michael Goodis (Goodis.Michael@epa.gov) [Goodis.Michael@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: Seresto incident data
Attachments: Pet Incidents from Pet Products Overview.pptx

I'll let you clear whatever needs to go up on this. No need to loop me in.

Ed

Ed Messina, Esq.
Acting Office Director
Office of Pesticide Programs
Office of Chemical Safety & Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C.
p: (703) 347-0209

From: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 4, 2021 1:46 PM
To: Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>
Cc: Vogel, Dana <Vogel.Dana@epa.gov>; Wilbur, Donald <Wilbur.Donald@epa.gov>; Akerman, Gregory <Akerman.Gregory@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Britton, Cathryn <Britton.Cathryn@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Seresto incident data

And a broader overview from a previous PRD briefing (thanks, Cathryn!). I think this was from 2018 … ?

Best,
Catherine

From: Aubee, Catherine
Sent: Thursday, March 04, 2021 1:04 PM
To: Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>
Cc: Vogel, Dana <Vogel.Dana@epa.gov>; Wilbur, Donald <Wilbur.Donald@epa.gov>; Akerman, Gregory <Akerman.Gregory@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Seresto incident data

Attached for reference – from 2019.

Best,
Catherine

From: Aubee, Catherine
Sent: Thursday, March 04, 2021 12:49 PM
To: Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>
Cc: Vogel, Dana <Vogel.Dana@epa.gov>; Wilbur, Donald <Wilbur.Donald@epa.gov>; Akerman, Gregory <Akerman.Gregory@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Seresto incident data

Sounds good. Will forward the old Seresto slides before 3pm and coordinate with PRD, HED on the upcoming briefing on pet products.

Best,
Catherine

From: Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 04, 2021 12:46 PM
To: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Cc: Vogel, Dana <Vogel.Dana@epa.gov>; Wilbur, Donald <Wilbur.Donald@epa.gov>; Akerman, Gregory <Akerman.Gregory@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Seresto incident data

Yes please provide the slides you currently have – understand they are not up to date and not sharing.
We have a check-in at 3 pm today so this may come up.

Also FYI – Michal asked for a briefing on pet products and incidents as a result of this recent article.
Again this mostly new to her, so an overview of the products registered, how they are assessed, incidents, and specific info on Seresto to start.
It is added to the list of briefings for her – currently it is lower on the list.

Michael L. Goodis, P.E.
Acting Deputy Director for Programs
Office of Pesticide Programs
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C.
571-309-5497 (cell)

From: Aubee, Catherine <Aubee.Catherine@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 04, 2021 12:21 PM
To: Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>
Cc: Vogel, Dana <Vogel.Dana@epa.gov>; Wilbur, Donald <Wilbur.Donald@epa.gov>; Akerman, Gregory <Akerman.Gregory@epa.gov>; Echeverria, Marietta <Echeverria.Marietta@epa.gov>; Rosenblatt, Daniel <Rosenblatt.Dan@epa.gov>; Reaves, Elissa <Reaves.Elissa@epa.gov>; Kiely, Timothy <Kiely.Timothy@epa.gov>; Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>; Saunders, Jennifer <Saunders.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Seresto incident data

The attachment is the IDS report of the incident data. We have some slides from a couple of years ago that may be helpful - let me know if I should forward.

The IVB1 team has also been working on an options briefing for OPP management. That work predates the recent press but the materials are not quite ready. (I asked Jenn to prioritize this.)

This also relates directly to the EPA FDA jurisdictional issue, which we would like to continue pursuing.

Best,
Catherine
Associate Director
OPP Registration Division
US Environmental Protection Agency

On Mar 4, 2021, at 12:07 PM, Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov> wrote:

Michal I asking to see information on the incident data. Do we have something that can be shared that can help explain the information?
The attached documents were provided as part of the FOIA request by the journalist that published the article. The incident summary report was from June 2020.

Michael L. Goodis, P.E.
Acting Deputy Director for Programs
Office of Pesticide Programs
Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C.
571-309-5497 (cell)

From: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 03, 2021 3:55 PM
To: Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>
Cc: Dinkins, Darlene <Dinkins.Darlene@epa.gov>
Subject: seresto incident data

Michal asked yesterday as part of her approval on a press inquiry about seeing the actual incident data. Is this something your team can provide to her?
<EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0031-0031.pdf>
<Aggregate Incident Summary Report for EPA Reg No 11556-155 1-1-2012 to 6-16-2020.pdf>

Message

From: Messina, Edward [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=95521FBF4E34496A879E364FAF7E5AA8-MESSINA, EDWARD]
Sent: 3/3/2021 8:31:04 PM
To: Rust, Mary [Rust.Mary@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: For Michal/Ed/Rick Approval; Midwest Center; Seresto Followup; DDL Today

Importance: High

Ed Messina, Esq.
Acting Office Director
Office of Pesticide Programs
Office of Chemical Safety & Pollution Prevention
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D.C.
p: (703) 347-0209

From: Dennis, Allison <Dennis.Allison@epa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 3:30 PM
To: Messina, Edward <Messina.Edward@epa.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal <Freedhoff.Michal@epa.gov>; Keigwin, Richard <Keigwin.Richard@epa.gov>; Goodis, Michael <Goodis.Michael@epa.gov>
Cc: Ozmen, Shamus <Ozmen.Shamus@epa.gov>; Siedschlag, Gregory <Siedschlag.Gregory@epa.gov>
Subject: For Michal/Ed/Rick Approval; Midwest Center; Seresto Followup; DDL Today
Importance: High

All, How's this as a response back to the Midwest Center? He asked:

1. I was wondering what that means about the Biden-Harris administration taking pet health seriously. Is the agency planning to take action on Seresto?
2. Also, in the statement, the agency says people should follow the label. Is there a problem with people not following the label in these incidents?

Statement:

Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)

From: Johnathan Hettinger <jhettinger@investigatemidwest.org>
Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 11:28 AM
To: Daguillard, Robert <Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov>
Cc: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>; Press <Press@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Robert,

I wanted to follow-up on my Seresto story. I saw the statement that the agency provided to the New York Post. https://t.co/DnvhOr34Fk?amp=1

I was wondering what that means about the Biden-Harris administration taking pet health seriously. Is the agency planning to take action on Seresto?

Also, in the statement, the agency says people should follow the label. Is there a problem with people not following the label in these incidents?

Thanks,
Johnathan

From: Daguillard, Robert <Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2021 8:42 AM
To: Johnathan Hettinger <jhettinger@investigatemidwest.org>; Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Cc: Press <Press@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Good morning Jonathan,

For attribution to "an EPA Spokesperson," please:

1. **According to a records request of EPA documents, there have been at least 75,000 incident reports involving pets, including 1,698 deaths. Is this a high number? Why is it still sold? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?**

2. **California toxicologists said the Bayer studies the EPA relied on to approve the collars underestimated the harm to adult dogs and cats. However, the EPA approved them. What science is there to support these registrations? How can customers know that these are safe to use?**

Combined Response to the above questions:

The active ingredients in the Seresto collar are flumethrin and imidacloprid. Both have undergone registration review (examination of active ingredients every 15 years to make sure they continue to meet the FIFRA standard for registration), On the basis of current information, both have been found eligible for continued registration. During the registration and registration review processes, the Agency uses the best available science to reach its decision. This includes articles in peer-reviewed journals in addition to the studies submitted by the registrant.

EPA takes every incident reported seriously. If any pesticide is found to present unreasonable adverse effects on the environment as defined in the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), or is found not to be safe under the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, the Agency would take appropriate regulatory action. Any such action would, again, need to be supported by the best-available, peer-reviewed science Regulatory action might include anything from changing the label instructions for use to cancelling the registration.

On the Registration process: Under FIFRA, EPA must make a determination that the product will not cause "unreasonable adverse effects on the environment," defined in FIFRA 2(bb) as (in part) "any unreasonable risk to man or the environment, taking into account the economic, social, and environmental costs and benefits of the use of any pesticide." Thus, the benefits of a product must be weighed against the risks.

To reach a registration decision and inform the label language, the data that EPA requires includes data on pesticide residues, toxicology, companion animal safety, and efficacy. EPA then independently reviews those data to inform the registration decision. EPA uses this information to determine if and how a product may be used. Evaluations for pet products like shampoos, collars and spot-ons rely upon data on companion animal safety, efficacy and safety for humans who may be exposed as a result of product use.

No pesticide is completely without harm, but EPA ensures that there are measures on the product label that reduce risk. The product label is the law, and applicators must follow label directions. Some pets, however, like some humans, are more sensitive than others and may experience adverse symptoms after treatment.

3. **It is my understanding that these incidents do not include the main incident reporting system, which likely has additional incidents. Do you have more information about the number of incidents?**

Manufacturers are required under law to report adverse incident information to EPA. Individuals may report incidents potentially associated with use of an EPA-registered product by contacting the product manufacturer, their state lead pesticide agency, the National Pesticide Information Center, or by contacting EPA directly through its Incident Data System.

4. **There have been at least 907 human-related incidents since 2013, according to EPA data. Is this a high number? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?**

As stated in the Flumethrin: Tier I Update Review of Human Incidents and Epidemiology for
Proposed Interim Decision, dated Sept. 17, 2019, there was a total of 626 incidents in EPA's Main and Aggregate IDSs. While some major incidents were reported (including dermal and neurological symptoms), the vast majority of the incidents were classified as moderate or lower in severity.

EPA also conducted a larger epidemiological analysis of human incident data associated with pyrethroids (Pyrethroids: Tier II Epidemiological Report, dated April 30, 2019) and found little substantive evidence to suggest a clear, associative or causal relationship between exposure to pyrethroids and adverse effects. EPA will continue to evaluate incident data in future cycles of registration review. EPA may initiate action at any time to address concerns if unreasonable adverse effects are identified. Such actions can range from mandatory label changes to cancellation of the registration.

5. **It is my understanding that Bayer knew about these incidents for years, prior to selling dog collars to Elanco. Did Bayer make Elanco aware of these issues when selling the product to Elanco?**

EPA does not have information on communications between Bayer and Elanco.

6. **From my understanding talking with former EPA staff, Health Canada denied to approve Seresto because of the incident data. Do you have any response to this?**

EPA cannot speak to Health Canada's decisionmaking process related to the Seresto collar. While the Seresto collar is not registered in Canada, it is registered in most countries in the European Union and Australia.

Best, R.

Robert Daguillard
Public Affairs Officer
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, DC
+1 (202) 564-6618 (o)
+1 (202) 360-0476 (m)

From: Johnathan Hettinger <jhettinger@investigatemidwest.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 09, 2021 11:43 AM
To: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Cc: Press <Press@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Ken,

I wanted to circle back. USA Today Network is republishing this, and my editors there are really wanting me to get a response from the EPA. They also want me to reach out to senators/house members on the issue, so I'll be doing that.

One question they wanted me to make sure I ask: Is there any way to compare the complaints/incidents for Seresto versus other common flea collars?

Thanks,
Johnathan

On Tue, Feb 2, 2021 at 8:11 AM Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:

> Hi Johnathan,
>
> Still working to be responsive on this for you. We appreciate your continued patience. Will circle back with you when I have something.

Thanks,

Ken

From: Johnathan Hettinger <jhettinger@investigatemidwest.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 10:08 AM
To: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Cc: Press <Press@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Just wanted to follow-up on this. Thanks!

On Fri, Jan 29, 2021 at 9:54 AM Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:

> We appreciate your flexibility, Johnathan. Thank you.
>
> **From:** Johnathan Hettinger <jhettinger@investigatemidwest.org>
> **Sent:** Friday, January 29, 2021 10:58 AM
> **To:** Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
> **Cc:** Press <Press@epa.gov>
> **Subject:** Re: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting
>
> Yes, we can wait until COB Monday. That is fine. Thank you.
>
> > On Jan 29, 2021, at 7:34 AM, Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:
> >
> > Hi Johnathan,
> >
> > We're working on being responsive to your inquiry, however will require more time. Can you extend your deadline? COB Monday

perhaps? If you cannot extend, will you update with our response once it's received?

-Ken

From: Johnathan Hettinger <jhettinger@investigatemidwest.org>
Sent: Thursday, January 28, 2021 3:32 PM
To: Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>
Cc: Press <Press@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Ken,

For those numbers, I'm citing the attached document on aggregate incidents. But if you look at the human incident report in the other document, there is an aggregate IDS and a main IDS. From my understanding, the aggregate is not all of the incidents.

Does that make sense? You can give me a call at 217-493-9791 if that helps.

Thanks,

Johnathan

On Thu, Jan 28, 2021 at 12:14 PM Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov> wrote:

> Hi Johnathan,
>
> I'd like some clarification on what you mean by, "It is my understanding that these incidents do not include the main incident reporting system, which likely has additional incidents."

More information on this would help us be responsive to your inquiry. Please advise.

Thanks,

Ken

From: Johnathan Hettinger <jhettinger@investigatemidwest.org>
Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 4:05 PM
To: Press <Press@epa.gov>; Daguillard, Robert <Daguillard.Robert@epa.gov>; Labbe, Ken <Labbe.Ken@epa.gov>; Jones, Enesta <Jones.Enesta@epa.gov>
Subject: Seresto - Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

Hello,

I'm a reporter with the Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting, a nonprofit newsroom based in Champaign, Illinois, that covers agribusiness. I am working on a story about EPA incident data surrounding Seresto collars. It is my understanding that there have been a significant amount of incidents surrounding the pesticides in the collars, and I had some questions.

According to a records request of EPA documents, there have been at least 75,000 incident reports involving pets, including 1,698 deaths. Is this a high number? Why is it still sold? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

It is my understanding that these incidents do not include the main incident reporting system, which likely has additional incidents. Do you have more information about the number of incidents?

California toxicologists said the Bayer studies the EPA relied on to approve the collars underestimated the harm to adult dogs and cats. However, the EPA approved them. What science is there to support these registrations? How can customers know that these are safe to use?

There have been at least 907 human-related incidents since 2013, according to EPA data. Is this a high number? Is there any sort of threshold for removing the collar from the market?

It is my understanding that Bayer knew about these incidents for years, prior to selling dog collars to Elanco. Did Bayer make Elanco aware of these issues when selling the product to Elanco?

From my understanding talking with former EPA staff, Health Canada denied to approve Seresto because of the incident data. Do you have any response to this?

If possible, I would very much like to speak to someone for this story. Please let me know if you would have some time. My deadline is Friday, end-of-day.

Thanks,

Johnathan Hettinger

Investigative Reporter

Midwest Center for Investigative Reporting

217-493-9791

Message

From: Liu, Linda [Liu.Linda@epa.gov]
Sent: 3/4/2021 6:31:48 PM
To: Hopkins, Yvette [Hopkins.Yvette@epa.gov]
CC: Terada, Derrick [Terada.Derrick@epa.gov]; Schulze, Chad [Schulze.Chad@epa.gov]; Miller, Robert [Miller.Robert@epa.gov]
Subject: Re: [news article] Popular flea collar linked to almost 1,700 pet deaths
Attachments: RE: US Today Article Critical of EPA on Flea Collars Related to Pet Deaths

Thank you, Yvette, for the attachment which contains contacts information! I did not know about the contacts but perhaps others in the Region did. Here a suggestion: send an email to all EPA Regions about who to contact, just in case there are lots of inquiries.

Have a great Thursday!
Linda

From: Hopkins, Yvette <Hopkins.Yvette@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 4, 2021 10:19 AM
To: Liu, Linda <Liu.Linda@epa.gov>; Terada, Derrick <Terada.Derrick@epa.gov>; Miller, Robert <Miller.Robert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: [news article] Popular flea collar linked to almost 1,700 pet deaths

Did you get the directions from HQ on questions? See attached.

From: Liu, Linda <Liu.Linda@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 4, 2021 1:11 PM
To: Terada, Derrick <Terada.Derrick@epa.gov>; Miller, Robert <Miller.Robert@epa.gov>; Hopkins, Yvette <Hopkins.Yvette@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: [news article] Popular flea collar linked to almost 1,700 pet deaths

Hi – Just an FYI.
Linda

From: Toby K Primbs <tprimbs@oda.state.or.us>
Sent: Thursday, March 4, 2021 8:40 AM
To: Schulze, Chad <Schulze.Chad@epa.gov>; Liu, Linda <Liu.Linda@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Popular flea collar linked to almost 1,700 pet deaths

FYI

From: Matt Haynes <mhaynes@oda.state.or.us>
Subject: Popular flea collar linked to almost 1,700 pet deaths
Date: March 4, 2021 at 8:37:46 AM PST
To: pesticide-all pesticide-all <pesticide-all@oda.state.or.us>

Imidacloprid & flumethrin:

https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/investigations/2021/03/02/seresto-dog-cat-collars-found-harm-pets-humans-epa-records-show/4574753001

Message

From: Miller, Robert [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BB7A864DD08445B0A59A63FA36836677-ROBERT MILLER]
Sent: 3/3/2021 5:33:06 PM
To: Coldsnow, Kayla [Coldsnow.Kayla@epa.gov]
CC: Graham, Stephen [Graham.Stephen@epa.gov]; Karn, Elizabeth [Karn.Elizabeth@epa.gov]; Rekully, Cameron [Rekully.Cameron@epa.gov]; Harwood, Douglas (Ethan) [harwood.douglas@epa.gov]; Nicholas Mastrota [Mastrota.Nicholas@epa.gov]
Subject: Incident I033873-001
Attachments: I033873.pdf

Hi Kayla,

I033873-001 is assigned the exposure severity code W-A because it involves the endangered San Joaquin kit fox. Even though there were no reported side-affects for Seresto pet collars place on the kit foxes any incident involving endangered species receives a W-A severity code. The Endangered Species Act is very strongly worded so assign the W-A severity code. Having a drop down list or buttons identifying an endangered specie or threatened might be helpful. I can guarantee the EFED Incident Coordinator will be asked about endangered and threaten species.

Take care,

Bob

Message

From: Miller, Robert [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BB7A864DD08445B0A59A63FA36836677-ROBERT MILLER]
Sent: 12/10/2020 5:19:44 PM
To: Fletcher, Rachel [fletcher.rachel@epa.gov]
CC: Rossmeisl, Colleen [Rossmeisl.Colleen@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Flumethrin Incidents

Hi Rachel,

For the most part the spreadsheets are mutually exclusive, but is impossible to tell for sure. A member of the public may send us report involving flumethrin that we treat as an individual report. A registrant may report the same incident as an aggregate. There is so little data contained in aggregate incident summaries we are unable to match an aggregate report with the individual report. It probably doesn't happen often, but it probably does occur.

Hope that helps.

Take care,

Bob

From: Fletcher, Rachel <fletcher.rachel@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, December 10, 2020 10:27 AM
To: Miller, Robert <Miller.Robert@epa.gov>
Cc: Rossmeisl, Colleen <Rossmeisl.Colleen@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Flumethrin Incidents

Hi Bob,

Thanks again for the new flumethrin incidents. Are the spreadsheets mutually exclusive? Are the incidents in the "Major Incident" spreadsheets included in the "Aggregate summaries" spreadsheets?

Thanks!

Rachel

From: Rossmeisl, Colleen <Rossmeisl.Colleen@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, December 10, 2020 8:01 AM
To: Fletcher, Rachel <fletcher.rachel@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Flumethrin Incidents

Hi Rachel –

Sorry just getting back to you. Do you know from Bob if these spreadsheets are mutually exclusive? I just need to know if the incidents in the "Major Incident" spreadsheets are already included in the "Aggregate summaries" spreadsheets, or if they should be added to them.

Thanks!
Colleen

From: Fletcher, Rachel <fletcher.rachel@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, December 03, 2020 5:22 PM

To: Rossmeisl, Colleen <Rossmeisl.Colleen@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Flumethrin Incidents

Hi Colleen,

Here is what Bob sent me. Please let me know if this is not what you need.

Thank again!

Rachel

From: Miller, Robert <Miller.Robert@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, December 1, 2020 9:56 AM
To: Fletcher, Rachel <fletcher.rachel@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Flumethrin Incidents

Good morning Rachael:

Robert A. Miller
6(a)(2) Coordinator
U.S. EPA/OPP/RD/ISB
(703) 347-8012

From: Fletcher, Rachel <fletcher.rachel@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, November 30, 2020 2:38 PM
To: Miller, Robert <Miller.Robert@epa.gov>
Subject: Flumethrin Incidents

Good morning Rachael:

I queried 23,5444 incidents involving flumethrin for the given time periods. Almost, if not all, the incidents involve the product Seresto. We've received over 70,000 Seresto incidents since it came on the market in 2014.

Take care,

Bob

Hi Bob,

Recently I have received a lot of questions on flumethrin incidents. NPIC is pulling data for me but I was wondering if you could help with IST data? Could you help me confirm the number of flumethrin incidents from Oct 2018-Oct 2019 and Oct 2019-Oct 2020?

Thanks!

Rachel

Message

From: Miller, Robert [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BB7A864DD08445B0A59A63FA36836677-ROBERT MILLER]
Sent: 12/1/2020 8:27:30 PM
To: Fletcher, Rachel [fletcher.rachel@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Flumethrin Incidents

You're welcome!

From: Fletcher, Rachel <fletcher.rachel@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, December 01, 2020 2:58 PM
To: Miller, Robert <Miller.Robert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Flumethrin Incidents

Thanks!

From: Miller, Robert <Miller.Robert@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, December 1, 2020 9:56 AM
To: Fletcher, Rachel <fletcher.rachel@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Flumethrin Incidents

Good morning Rachael:

Robert A. Miller
6(a)(2) Coordinator
U.S. EPA/OPP/RD/ISB
(703) 347-8012

From: Fletcher, Rachel <fletcher.rachel@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, November 30, 2020 2:38 PM
To: Miller, Robert <Miller.Robert@epa.gov>
Subject: Flumethrin Incidents

Good morning Rachael:

I queried 23,5444 incidents involving flumethrin for the given time periods. Almost, if not all, the incidents involve the product Seresto. We've received over 70,000 Seresto incidents since it came on the market in 2014.

Take care,

Bob

Hi Bob,

Recently I have received a lot of questions on flumethrin incidents. NPIC is pulling data for me but I was wondering if you could help with IST data? Could you help me confirm the number of flumethrin incidents from Oct 2018-Oct 2019 and Oct 2019-Oct 2020?

Thanks!

Rachel

Message

From: Miller, Robert [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BB7A864DD08445B0A59A63FA36836677-ROBERT MILLER]
Sent: 12/1/2020 2:55:45 PM
To: Fletcher, Rachel [fletcher.rachel@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Flumethrin Incidents
Attachments: Flumethrin Aggregate Incident Summaries Oct 1 2018 - Sept 30 2019.xls; Flumethrin Aggregate Incident Summaries Oct 1 2019 - Sept 30 2020.xls; Flumethrin Major Incident Reports Oct 1 2018 - Sept 30 2019.xls; Flumethrin Major Incident Reports Oct 1 2019 - Sept 30 2020.xls

Good morning Rachael:

Robert A. Miller
6(a)(2) Coordinator
U.S. EPA/OPP/RD/ISB
(703) 347-8012

From: Fletcher, Rachel <fletcher.rachel@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, November 30, 2020 2:38 PM
To: Miller, Robert <Miller.Robert@epa.gov>
Subject: Flumethrin Incidents

Good morning Rachael:

I queried 23,5444 incidents involving flumethrin for the given time periods. Almost, if not all, the incidents involve the product Seresto. We've received over 70,000 Seresto incidents since it came on the market in 2014.

Take care,

Bob

Hi Bob,

Recently I have received a lot of questions on flumethrin incidents. NPIC is pulling data for me but I was wondering if you could help with IST data? Could you help me confirm the number of flumethrin incidents from Oct 2018-Oct 2019 and Oct 2019-Oct 2020?

Thanks!

Rachel

Message

From: Miller, Robert [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BB7A864DD08445B0A59A63FA36836677-ROBERT MILLER]
Sent: 3/10/2021 3:27:16 PM
To: Kang, Ji Yeon [Kang.Joyce@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: [External] Complaint about Seresto

Hi Joyce,

I'm sorry Joyce but here is another Seresto incident report.

Thanks,

Bob

Robert A. Miller
6(a)(2) Coordinator
U.S. EPA/OPP/RD/ISB
(703) 347-8012

From: Rust, Mary <Rust.Mary@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 05, 2021 12:41 PM
To: Miller, Robert <Miller.Robert@epa.gov>
Cc: Hopkins, Yvette <Hopkins.Yvette@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: [External] Complaint about Seresto

Hi Bob,
Here is another seresto incident that was reported to NC.

Scroll WAY down, I added in *italics "Here is the description of the incident"*.

FYI.

From: Sturdivant, Donnette <Sturdivant.Donnette@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 5, 2021 11:35 AM
To: Annicella, Alan <Annicella.Alan@epa.gov>
Cc: Hopkins, Yvette <Hopkins.Yvette@epa.gov>; Livingston, Pat <Livingston.Patricia@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: [External] Complaint about Seresto

Alan:

I am not certain, but I have copied Pat Livingston, our coordinator for NC, who may be able to provide additional information on NC's response.

Donnette

From: Annicella, Alan <Annicella.Alan@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 5, 2021 11:29 AM

To: Sturdivant, Donnette <Sturdivant.Donnette@epa.gov>
Cc: Hopkins, Yvette <Hopkins.Yvette@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: [External] Complaint about Seresto

Hi Donnette, thank you for sharing. With regards to the matter contained in the email below, it sounds like this is really early in the process. And as you already know, OECA or ECAD likely wouldn't be publishing much if anything on any on-going matters. Are you aware if NC DACS has begun an investigation?

I am looping in Yvette for awareness in OECA.

Thank you,
Alan

Alan A. Annicella, Chief
Pesticides Enforcement Section
Chemical Safety and Land Enforcement Branch
Enforcement and Compliance Assurance Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency - Region 4 - Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center
61 Forsyth St, SW
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
Office phone: 404.562.8610
Fax 404.562.8566

From: Sturdivant, Donnette <Sturdivant.Donnette@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 5, 2021 9:48 AM
To: Annicella, Alan <Annicella.Alan@epa.gov>
Cc: Livingston, Pat <Livingston.Patricia@epa.gov>; Dominy, Randy <Dominy.Randy@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: [External] Complaint about Seresto

FYI. There appears to be a complaint that NC shared with us regarding Seresto, the flea & tick collar which we regulate under FIFRA. An article came out in USA Today indicating that numerous complaints have been made and that EPA has not responded. I do not know if OECA is aware, but we are likely to receive more inquiries from the public. If OECA has any guidance on how we should respond, that would be helpful. Also, you will note that our external affairs office is also requesting information on complaints received most likely to coordinate any public statements with HQ as needed. If you have any questions, let me know.

Regards,
Donnette

From: Livingston, Pat <Livingston.Patricia@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 5, 2021 6:33 AM
To: Jenkins, Brandi <Jenkins.Brandi@epa.gov>
Cc: Sturdivant, Donnette <Sturdivant.Donnette@epa.gov>; Corbett, Richard <Corbett.Richard@epa.gov>; Merritt, Alex <Merritt.Alex@epa.gov>; Yeley, Megan <Yeley.Megan@epa.gov>; Dominy, Randy <Dominy.Randy@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: [External] Complaint about Seresto

Good Morning, Brandi: below is the information from NC regarding the complaint about Seresto. Sydney Ross (NC Department of Agriculture & Consumer Services) asked if someone from EPA could respond to Ms. Calvert.
Pat

From: Ross, Sydney <Sydney.Ross@ncagr.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 4, 2021 3:37 PM
To: Livingston, Pat <Livingston.Patricia@epa.gov>
Cc: Jones, Patrick <patrick.jones@ncagr.gov>
Subject: FW: [External] Complaint about Seresto

Hi Pat,

Here is all of the info I have from the complainant I spoke with yesterday. This is the information I sent to our toxicologists at DHHS. DHHS may reach out to her to answer some of her toxicology questions. If there is someone at EPA who would also be willing to speak with her or any of our other complainants about this issue, please let me know and I can direct them to that individual. Thank you for your help and hope you are well!

Yesterday an article was published on USA Today's Website https://apple.news/A78_uo4GjQWq_FP9GTVxg9w about the potential of Seresto Flea & Tick Collars causing harm to both animals and humans exposed to them. I have added the pesticide label for the Small or Large Seresto Dog Collar below. The active ingredients in these collars are imidacloprid (neonicotinoid) and flumethrin (pyrethroid) and they are produced by Bayer Animal Health.

Here is the description of the incident:

Today we received a call from NC resident Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) with serious concerns about the collars. Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) has been using the collars on her dogs for the last few years since she moved to NC from FL. She had a dog that passed away from 'unknown circumstances', skin issues and ultimately a tumor, that she used the collars on. She currently has been using a large dog Seresto Flea & Tick Collar on her 2 year old dog. She purchased the current collar from 1-800-petmeds. Her dog has vomited several times and often has, as she described it, a 'glazed look in it's eyes' and is unresponsive. She removed the collar from her dog's neck today after reading the article above. She also sleeps with her dog while the dog is wearing the collar and mentioned that she is often touching the dog's neck with her own while she is asleep. For this past two months she has been experiencing serious headaches when she wakes up and has had a few blood vessels pop in her brain. She went to see her doctor and a cardiologist and they have not been able to find the origin of her headaches. She has another doctor's appointment on March 11, 2021, but she has some questions she needs answered about the effects this chemical may have on her and her dog and whether or not exposure could be causing her health issues. She would also like to know what types of medical tests she should have done to see if she has been exposed. If possible, please contact Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) to answer her questions, her phone number is Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP). She requested that you leave a voice message if she does not answer.

https://images-na.ssl-images-amazon.com/images/I/71lB5mIPrgL.pdf
https://fleascience.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Product-Label-for-Bayer-Seresto-Collar-for-Dogs.pdf

Sydney L. Ross
Pesticide Operations Specialist
North Carolina Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services
Structural Pest Control & Pesticides Division
1090 Mail Service Center

Raleigh, NC 27699-1090
(919) 857-4151
http://www.ncagr.gov/SPCAP/index.htm

From: Jones, Patrick <patrick.jones@ncagr.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 4, 2021 3:26 PM
To: Livingston, Pat <Livingston.Patricia@epa.gov>; Ross, Sydney <Sydney.Ross@ncagr.gov>
Subject: Re: [External] Complaint about Seresto

Hey Pat. Sydney has that information. Thank you for your help!
Get Outlook for iOS

From: Livingston, Pat <Livingston.Patricia@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 4, 2021 3:08 PM
To: Jones, Patrick
Subject: [External] Complaint about Seresto

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you verify. Send all suspicious email as an attachment to Report Spam.

Hi there! Well, the wheels at EPA are starting to turn on this Seresto issue. We were notified today that if we got any tips/complaints we should notify our External Affairs office (like media and press). I did contact someone in that office just a bit ago and told them that you had reported getting a complaint. Would you be willing to share the details of your complaint with me/us? If yes, please just send an email with the pertinent info. If not, just let me know that.
Thanks!
Pat

Message

From: Miller, Robert [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BB7A864DD08445B0A59A63FA36836677-ROBERT MILLER]
Sent: 3/10/2021 3:25:51 PM
To: Rust, Mary [Rust.Mary@epa.gov]
CC: Recore, Shanna [Recore.Shanna@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: [External] Complaint about Seresto

Hi Mary,

Thanks for the incident report.

Bob

From: Rust, Mary <Rust.Mary@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 05, 2021 12:41 PM
To: Miller, Robert <Miller.Robert@epa.gov>
Cc: Hopkins, Yvette <Hopkins.Yvette@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: [External] Complaint about Seresto

Hi Bob,
Here is another seresto incident that was reported to NC.

Scroll WAY down, I added in *italics "Here is the description of the incident"*.

FYI.

From: Sturdivant, Donnette <Sturdivant.Donnette@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 5, 2021 11:35 AM
To: Annicella, Alan <Annicella.Alan@epa.gov>
Cc: Hopkins, Yvette <Hopkins.Yvette@epa.gov>; Livingston, Pat <Livingston.Patricia@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: [External] Complaint about Seresto

Alan:

I am not certain, but I have copied Pat Livingston, our coordinator for NC, who may be able to provide additional information on NC's response.

Donnette

From: Annicella, Alan <Annicella.Alan@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 5, 2021 11:29 AM
To: Sturdivant, Donnette <Sturdivant.Donnette@epa.gov>
Cc: Hopkins, Yvette <Hopkins.Yvette@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: [External] Complaint about Seresto

Hi Donnette, thank you for sharing. With regards to the matter contained in the email below, it sounds like this is really early in the process. And as you already know, OECA or ECAD likely wouldn't be publishing much if anything on any on-going matters. Are you aware if NC DACS has begun an investigation?

I am looping in Yvette for awareness in OECA.

Thank you,
Alan

Alan A. Annicella, Chief
Pesticides Enforcement Section
Chemical Safety and Land Enforcement Branch
Enforcement and Compliance Assurance Division
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency - Region 4 - Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center
61 Forsyth St, SW
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
Office phone: 404.562.8610
Fax 404.562.8566

From: Sturdivant, Donnette <Sturdivant.Donnette@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 5, 2021 9:48 AM
To: Annicella, Alan <Annicella.Alan@epa.gov>
Cc: Livingston, Pat <Livingston.Patricia@epa.gov>; Dominy, Randy <Dominy.Randy@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: [External] Complaint about Seresto

FYI. There appears to be a complaint that NC shared with us regarding Seresto, the flea & tick collar which we regulate under FIFRA. An article came out in USA Today indicating that numerous complaints have been made and that EPA has not responded. I do not know if OECA is aware, but we are likely to receive more inquiries from the public. If OECA has any guidance on how we should respond, that would be helpful. Also, you will note that our external affairs office is also requesting information on complaints received most likely to coordinate any public statements with HQ as needed. If you have any questions, let me know.

Regards,
Donnette

From: Livingston, Pat <Livingston.Patricia@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, March 5, 2021 6:33 AM
To: Jenkins, Brandi <Jenkins.Brandi@epa.gov>
Cc: Sturdivant, Donnette <Sturdivant.Donnette@epa.gov>; Corbett, Richard <Corbett.Richard@epa.gov>; Merritt, Alex <Merritt.Alex@epa.gov>; Yeley, Megan <Yeley.Megan@epa.gov>; Dominy, Randy <Dominy.Randy@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: [External] Complaint about Seresto

Good Morning, Brandi: below is the information from NC regarding the complaint about Seresto. Sydney Ross (NC Department of Agriculture & Consumer Services) asked if someone from EPA could respond to Ms. Calvert.
Pat