



US Environmental Protection Agency Office of Pesticide Programs

EPA Plan for Addressing the Recommendations of the Spray Drift Work Group October 17, 2007

INTRODUCTION

EPA's Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) and Office of Water (OW) established the Spray Drift Workgroup (SDWG or Workgroup) under the auspices of the Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee (PPDC) to seek stakeholder input on how to mitigate risks to water from pesticide spray drift. The Workgroup met multiple times to discuss this topic and develop recommendations for EPA.

In May 2007, EPA received a report from the Workgroup. A copy is available at: <http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/ppdc/2007/may2007/session1-spraydrift.pdf> In this report, the Workgroup made numerous recommendations in the following areas:

- Labeling
- Education, Training, and Stewardship Programs
- Promoting the Development and Use of Drift Mitigation Technology
- Regulatory Strategies (i.e., the role of "design" and "performance" standards and tailoring requirements to address local conditions)
- How to Determine the Real World Impact of Pesticide Labeling
- CWA / FIFRA Overlap

The Workgroup's recommendations and EPA's plans to address these recommendations are summarized below. After considering feedback from the PPDC, EPA will refine this plan of actions by setting priorities, developing milestones and schedules, and assigning responsibilities. EPA's detailed workplan will include outreach to stakeholders and opportunities for involvement by the general public.

WORKGROUP RECOMMENDATIONS AND EPA PLANS

Summary:

Workgroup Topics	Workgroup Recommendations	EPA Actions
Scope	No specific recommendations. The SDWG focused on labeling to mitigate spray drift; education, training, and stewardship; practices and equipment to mitigate drift. EPA decided that issues regarding the NPDES rulemaking and volatilization fell outside the scope of the SDWG charge.	
Labeling	EPA should standardize labeling statements for mitigation of spray drift. Statements should use shorter, clearer, enforceable language	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •□ Develop draft Pesticide Registration Notice on spray drift labeling and implementation approach for public comment •□ Develop internal SOP to incorporate spray drift into regulatory risk assessments when appropriate •□ Develop and conduct a process for OW and OPPTS to coordinate on review of spray drift labeling •□ Develop guidance for state lead agencies for implementing new spray drift labeling
	EPA should consider more far-reaching changes to pesticide labeling to ensure that provisions concerning spray drift receive sufficient prominence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •□ Develop a systematic, comprehensive approach to improve pesticide labeling, including consideration of web-based distribution of labeling •□ Investigate options for a generic process for external review and comment on key label statements concerning application directions
Education, Training and Stewardship	Federal funding for training and education programs should be continued or expanded	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •□ Explore mechanisms for evaluating the effectiveness of spray drift mitigation training and identifying gaps •□ Provide updates on EPA efforts to enhance applicator training •□ Explore with stakeholders how to promote voluntary site-specific Drift Management Plans (e.g., through model plans or other mechanisms) •□ Develop Citizen's Guide, providing basic information on spray drift and

Workgroup Topics	Workgroup Recommendations	EPA Actions
		describing what a person might do if involved in a spray drift incident
Technologies to Mitigate Drift	<p>Continue support of the Drift Reduction Technology (DRT) project, and initiate testing of technologies; assess the efficacy and economic impacts of adoption of new technology.</p> <p>Explore establishing performance standards for equipment and practices and encourage the use of such equipment and practices.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <input type="checkbox"/> Continue DRT project (handout) • <input type="checkbox"/> Explore opportunities to work with and share ideas and activities with other domestic and foreign agencies and organizations, such as the California Department of Pesticide Regulation and Canada’s Pest Management Regulatory Agency, the Organization for Economic Cooperation & Development, etc.
Design Standards vs. Performance Standards	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <input type="checkbox"/> Address this issue in the draft spray drift PRN
Tailoring Regulatory Restrictions to Local Conditions	EPA should work with States and applicators to explore mechanisms that tailor regulatory requirements to local conditions. EPA should evaluate effective methods to communicate local conditions to applicators (e.g., TMDL model, county bulletins, use of GIS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <input type="checkbox"/> Continue to work with OW to improve coordination of FIFRA decisions with TMDL programs and to get better monitoring data for future registrations • <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluate the effectiveness of the regulatory action involving atrazine, which triggers local mitigation measures based on monitoring, and how it could be adapted to other situations • <input type="checkbox"/> Discuss with state lead agencies when to address local conditions at the federal level and what mechanisms are most appropriate • <input type="checkbox"/> Explore the value of a pilot program to disseminate voluntary local “Best Management Practices” (BMPs) to reduce spray drift, e.g., with a regional or crop focus
Real-World Impacts of Labeling	EPA should strengthen the collection, use, and public availability of information regarding real world effects of its regulatory approaches, especially labeling, including: 1) collecting objective monitoring data of water quality and other environmental receptors, 2) information on enforcement actions by state regulatory agencies, 3) incident databases, 4) assessments of users’ understanding of label statements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <input type="checkbox"/> EPA is reviewing a range of technical, scientific, and management issues associated with the existing incident data systems and will make a presentation to a future PPDC meeting on our proposals for improving their role in the regulatory process. • <input type="checkbox"/> EPA is developing a systematic approach to labeling and will use this project as an opportunity to obtain feedback on user response to labeling

Workgroup Topics	Workgroup Recommendations	EPA Actions
	<p>EPA should emphasize the collection of data that are valid, robust, and publicly available. EPA should evaluate whether the data demonstrate that existing regulatory requirements are being successful in preventing harm from spray drift. If harm is occurring, EPA should attempt to discern the reasons that the existing regulatory requirements have failed to produce the expected levels of protection. Depending on the results of this inquiry, EPA should take action to strengthen its program to address the reason(s) for the break-down in protection.</p>	
CWA/FIFRA Overlap	<p>Develop water quality criteria (WQC) for current use pesticides for adoption by the States as water quality standards. EPA should continue or expand resources for monitoring of current use pesticides in water bodies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •□ OPP has worked with State pesticide programs and OW to identify high priority pesticides for consideration by OW as candidates for the next rounds of WQC development. OPP will coordinate with OW during their deliberations. Address how OPP can support the development of water quality benchmarks with OW •□ OPPTS and OW will continue to coordinate on risk management actions/decisions affecting water quality •□ As described in a November 2006 letter to SFIREG, OPP will continue to make its aquatic risk assessment benchmark values on pesticides available for potential use by state water regulators to help in monitoring activities.