

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

PESTICIDE PROGRAM DIALOGUE COMMITTEE MEETING

October 29, 2020

11:00 a.m., Eastern Standard Time

Day Two

1 APPEARANCES:
2 Walter Alarcon
Ruben Arroyo
3 Amy Asmus
Manojit Basu
4 Steven Bennett
Carol Ramsey Black
5 Taja Blackburn
Jasmine Brown
6 Lori Ann Burd
Douglas Burkett
7 Bill Chism
Alexandra Dapolito Dunn
8 Iris Figueroa
Jim Fredericks
9 Joseph Grzywacz
Gary Halvorson
10 Gina Hilton
Komal Jain
11 Shannon Jewell
Mark Johnson
12 Patrick Johnson
Sheryl Kunickis
13 Daniel Kunkel
Dominic LaJoie
14 Charlotte Liang
Amy Liebman
15 Aaron Lloyd
Lauren Lurkins
16 Tim Lust
Daniel Markowski
17 Gary Prescher
Caleb Ragland
18 Damon Reabe
Karen Reardon
19 Alan Reynolds
Charlotte Sanson
20 Steve Schaible
Carolyn Schroeder
21 David Shaw
Christina Stucker-Gassi
22 Carla Theriault
Mily Trevino-Sauceda
23 Cathy Tortorici
Liza Fleeson Trossbach
24 Tim Tucker
Edward Wakem
25 Nina Wilson

P R O C E E D I N G S

- - - - -

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MS. DUNN: -- so I'm just going to start my webcam here. Can you hear me and see me?

MR. MESSINA: Yes, you're good.

MS. DUNN: Okay, great. Good morning, everyone, and welcome to day 2 of your meeting. I wanted to come on this morning to give you announcements regarding the publication in today's Federal Register of application exclusion zone rules. It's important for me to let you all know this directly since obviously you are highly interested in this matter, and you are meeting while this final decision that we are announcing today, or published today, in the Federal Register, the final AEZ rule, potentially the rule makes I would say three primary changes to the 2015 rule.

The three primary changes are to clarify the distances that go along with the AEZ, instead of requiring droplet size and other fairly complicated, as we heard, factors. It goes with clear 25 foot for ground and I believe 100 foot for aerial. It's very, very clear requirements, which we have been asking for clarity on this.

The second change is with regard to areas of control. So one of the issues had to do with the

1 ability to have people leave property where there was no
2 property control. And so we clarified that the AEZ
3 requirement to ask people to leave the zones applied in
4 the area where the grower has control over the property.
5 So they can't ask someone to leave their neighbor's
6 property, for example.

7 The third sort of significant change is with
8 regard to the family members of the grower and whether
9 they can remain in the house for, you know, in the AEZ,
10 essentially, during applications. And we did clarify
11 that family members can remain, assuming that the
12 applicator has been informed that the family members are
13 there and it's clear that the grower wants his or her
14 family members to remain in the home.

15 So those are the three sort of major changes,
16 and they're major depending on your perspective, but
17 what I will say is we believe this rule remains as
18 protective as the prior rule because there remains the
19 do-not-contact regulation which always prevails, and the
20 AEZ is an additional area of protection that travels, as
21 you all know, with the application of the pesticides.

22 So I did want to come on this morning and make
23 sure that I let you all know that this was in today's
24 Federal Register. Maybe some of you wake up and check
25 the Federal Register early, but that is the news that I

1 wanted to share with you this morning, and that we were
2 putting -- the administrator is in North Carolina right
3 now and at I believe about 11:15 or 11:30 announcing
4 this. So I did want to share that with you all.

5 And, Ed, I might turn it back to you. I didn't
6 have formal remarks, again, I just wanted to make sure
7 that I got on and gave you this information directly
8 from me because the administrator would be announcing
9 this shortly and it was in this morning's Federal
10 Register.

11 MR. MESSINA: We appreciate that, Alex. Thank
12 you so much. Did you want to take any questions or we
13 can go right into our agenda, if you like.

14 MS. DUNN: I'm happy to take a question or two.
15 I always think that that's important for an official to
16 be available to take questions.

17 MR. MESSINA: Great. So if folks have questions
18 and you want to type something in the chat to let us
19 know, or unmute your phone, pressing #6. We've got a
20 couple of minutes, we can take some questions from Alex.
21 And maybe if folks want to just give us a comment in the
22 chat that we're coming through loud and clear. I see
23 some folks typing, yes.

24 MS. DUNN: Okay, good. Well, today I'm joining
25 you from my office and not from Dulles Airport, so

1 hopefully it's a little smoother.

2 MS. LIEBMAN: Should I go ahead with my question?

3 MR. MESSINA: Sure, Amy, thank you.

4 MS. LIEBMAN: Hi, good morning, everyone. This
5 is Amy Liebman from Migrant Clinicians Network, and
6 thank you for sharing the news with us, Alex, that's
7 appreciated; however, I am really concerned that the EPA
8 has taken this direction, and I just wanted to bring up
9 a couple of points and a question.

10 One question is, what will the EPA do to protect
11 and ensure that farmworkers are protected with this
12 change? And then the other question is a little bit of
13 a process question, and that is this group, the
14 Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee, had a really
15 interesting discussion early on about the AEZ, and
16 during that meeting, there was consensus among the group
17 that we did not need to actually change the rule, but
18 that we could, you know, maybe help with a little bit of
19 guidance from the EPA, and the consensus during that
20 meeting was ignored.

21 The EPA went ahead and decided to make the
22 changes in the rule, and as a PPDC member, it's
23 frustrating because I'm not quite sure of the usefulness
24 of our presence here.

25 So I feel like there's a lot of process issues

1 that should be addressed, but more importantly is, what
2 will the EPA do to ensure that farmworkers are protected
3 from pesticide exposure given this big change in the
4 rule?

5 MS. DUNN: Well, Amy, thank you so much for your
6 comment. I know it's heartfelt. I can absolutely tell
7 you that our staff, who worked on this rule, feel very
8 confident that there is no change to protection at all.
9 There is no change to protection. What the change is to
10 ensuring, frankly, that this rule can be properly
11 implemented by the pesticide applicators.

12 We had many, many inputs from stakeholders
13 beyond the farmworkers that felt that what was the prior
14 metric added, there was a complicated mathematical
15 formula that had to be used to determine the size of the
16 AEZ. It had an acronym that is escaping me now, but it
17 was so complicated that right after the rule came out,
18 we were asked is there anything we can do to clarify it.

19 We did take comments. The Migrant Clinicians
20 Network did comment, and we did consider all comments.
21 There is a robust response to comments that accompanies
22 our final rules, and I would, you know, encourage you to
23 take a look at that to see where we address any comment
24 around the level of protection. And I can assure you
25 that we believe that with the AEZ, which is, again,

1 additional protection on top of the do-not-contact
2 provision in FIFRA. People cannot be contacted. That
3 is a violation. And the AEZ is additional protection.

4 So I actually hope that the implementation of
5 this rule will result in greater protection because the
6 rule will be more enforceable and easier to implement by
7 the growers.

8 MS. LIEBMAN: Well, thank you, but I'll
9 respectfully disagree with that response. And MCN and
10 other farmworker advocates did submit lengthy comments
11 that were not taken into account.

12 MS. DUNN: Okay, I hope in our response, I am
13 certain that there will be a direct response to what you
14 provided us, and so we'll take a look at that. And
15 certainly with the PPDC, in terms of your role, it is an
16 extremely valued perspective. And as you'll see in the
17 response to comment, we received several thousand --
18 thousands of comments, I believe, on the AEZ proposed
19 rule, and we are required to evaluate all of them. And
20 the input of the PPDC was certainly considered as well.

21 So, yes, I know that we'll agree to sort of
22 disagree this morning, and I won't try to persuade you
23 to a different position, but I do want to say that we do
24 feel that there has been no reduction in worker
25 protections.

1 MR. MESSINA: Thank you, Alex. Yes, and as Alex
2 mentioned -- I'm sorry, were you still talking? You're
3 on mute.

4 MS. DUNN: No.

5 MR. MESSINA: As Alex mentioned, in the release
6 with the press materials there's going to be a fairly
7 robust Q&A document, and actually some of the questions
8 that you have asked on the phone and also that are
9 coming in the chatbox are addressed in those Qs and As.
10 And I think Alex mentioned the do-not-contact provisions
11 that still exist, and there is a question on the 12
12 inches or below, and then when applicators can resume
13 spraying. And then as well as the do not contact and
14 who gets to remain in the residences when the activities
15 are undertaken.

16 And when you also think of some of the other
17 things that we could have changed in this rule, this was
18 a targeted change to a well number of the provisions of
19 the rule as well. To add to Alex's comments.

20 All right, anything else, Alex, or from the
21 group?

22 MS. DUNN: No, I have another meeting to head
23 to, so I'm going to let you get to your agenda. Thank
24 you so much for allowing me to come on and we will
25 continue to stay in touch and the door is always open.

1 So, thanks, everyone.

2 MR. MESSINA: Thank you for delivering that news
3 personally, Alex. Appreciate it.

4 All right. So with that, Shannon, can we put
5 the agenda on the screen and then we will get into our
6 COVID-19 response presentation. So for today's agenda,
7 we have the COVID-19. We're a little behind, but I can
8 get us back on schedule.

9 MS. JEWELL: Can you hear me?

10 MR. MESSINA: Yes.

11 MS. JEWELL: Okay. So you wanted to review the
12 agenda quickly?

13 MR. MESSINA: Yes. And you have it on the
14 screen, which is great. I'm doing that right now. Is
15 there a question?

16 MS. JEWELL: Oh, no, no. Sorry. I'm trying to
17 change the screens and the system seems just a little
18 bit bogged down, but if you can see the agenda, great.
19 I'm not seeing it.

20 MR. MESSINA: Yeah, it's up. I'm seeing it.
21 Hopefully others are, but if they aren't, please go to
22 the PPDC website where you can pull up the agenda on
23 your own.

24 So 11:00 we're going to do the COVID update, so
25 I will start that right away, as soon as I'm done

1 walking through the agenda. We have our emerging
2 pathogens workgroup, developing workgroup members and
3 charge questions. We have time for public comment.
4 Please, as yesterday, send an email to Shannon if you
5 would like to make a public comment.

6 We have a lunch break. Then we have our
7 farmworker and clinician training workgroup with our
8 session chairs, developing workgroup members and charge
9 questions. Then we'll get some training on the new PPDC
10 online communication platform that Carla is going to
11 walk us through. And then we'll just sort of do a
12 wrapup session on moving forward, some topics for what
13 our future PPDC meeting could look like. I think we'll
14 review all of the charge questions, make sure we're all
15 in a good place on that and then any other topics that
16 folks would like to talk about. We'll have public
17 comments again, and then we'll adjourn.

18 Okay, so any questions on the agenda? And you
19 can start pulling up the COVID-19 slides, Shannon.

20 MS. JEWELL: It looks like I might have to try a
21 different tactic here. Hold on just a sec.

22 MR. MESSINA: Somebody took care of it for you,
23 so it looks like they're on. All right. So as you can
24 imagine, we've been working pretty hard on the
25 Government's response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Our

1 role in that is approving the pesticides which are
2 specifically the disinfectants that are effective
3 against treating the SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes
4 COVID-19, on surfaces.

5 So if you look at the websites that we have, and
6 our record on this, you'll see that as early as January,
7 EPA and OPP specifically activated what was called the
8 emerging viral pathogens guidance, and what this told
9 registrants was that we are open for business, we know
10 that there's a potential crisis coming. If you have
11 test data that we have in-house that shows that your
12 disinfectants work against harder to kill viruses, we
13 will approve your product or your ability to make
14 statements that your product is effective against
15 SARS-CoV-2, based on the hierarchy of killing
16 properties.

17 SARS-CoV-2 is a large envelope virus, so
18 fortunately, it is one of the easier to kill viruses on
19 surfaces. And there are harder to kill viruses and
20 pathogens going from up the chain to tuberculocides that
21 are able to kill tuberculosis, which is another list
22 that we have. There are prions, which are kind of at
23 the highest level of harder to kill.

24 So in January, we activated a policy that
25 allowed registrants to say, guess what, we have data

1 already that proves that this product will work against
2 SARS-CoV-2, a large envelope virus, because we've tested
3 it against other coronaviruses and harder to kill
4 viruses.

5 And so folks were able to make that claim pretty
6 early in January as part of this emerging viral pathogen
7 activation, and folks did take advantage of that because
8 we put up our list in early January, List N, which has
9 now become very popular for farming products that are
10 effective against SARS-CoV-2, and we know we started
11 with about 85 products and these are the products that
12 are known to be effective against large envelope
13 viruses, coronaviruses, harder to kill viruses, and
14 pretty quickly we had about 85 products on there.

15 We now have about 500 products on there, on List
16 N. The site has been viewed about 20 million times. We
17 also launched a List N web app which is mobile-friendly,
18 and that mobile version has been hit about a million
19 times. And to date we have, you know, over 500 white
20 sprays, products that are effective against SARS-CoV-2
21 that may demonstrate effectiveness against the actual
22 virus. There's about 50 of them that have been tested
23 on SARS-CoV-2, where they demonstrated effectiveness
24 against the harder to kill pathogen or they demonstrated
25 effectiveness against a different human coronavirus. So

1 that's what the current list of List N products entails.
2 And we've been working very hard to add products and
3 review data to make sure we have safe and effective
4 products to address this current pandemic.

5 You'll notice that by finding products on List
6 N, you look at the registration number that's on the
7 product. Because of the supplemental distribution
8 numbers, you just need to look at the first two sets of
9 numbers and you'll know that those products are safe and
10 effective. There are, within the website, residence
11 times that tell you how long a product needs to be
12 applied, and we've put out info, graphics and training
13 and videos that show folks how to use disinfectants
14 appropriately.

15 One of the things that I've learned in my
16 experience is it's important to keep the surface of the
17 countertop or disinfectant surface wet for a period of
18 time before you wipe it. It isn't just sort of spray it
19 and then wipe it quickly. When you look at the
20 directions of use for particular products, some have
21 residence times of up to 10 minutes. Some are generally
22 in the order of like 30 seconds to 45 seconds, on
23 average you can get, you know, two minutes, but two
24 minutes is a long time when you think about it when
25 you're leaving that surface wet and you want to make

1 sure it's adequately wet before you start wiping off the
2 disinfectant. And even before that, you want to make
3 sure you undertake a cleaning process, you know, using
4 warm, soapy water to pretreat and get rid of the dirt in
5 the places where the virus can hide.

6 So we've been doing a lot of education in
7 addition to providing products available for treatment
8 against SARS-CoV-2 on surfaces. Then we have
9 jurisdiction with FDA, right, so people ask, well, what
10 about disinfectants from people that are sort of your
11 hand sanitizers, right? So if the product is working on
12 a person, or medical device, then we have FDA
13 jurisdiction. If it's on a general surface, like in
14 your home or even, you know, countertop at a hospital,
15 in waiting rooms, then that's EPA jurisdiction. And
16 we've been closely coordinating with CDC, with FDA, with
17 other federal agencies that are part of the Government's
18 response to COVID-19.

19 We also are understanding that folks can't
20 necessarily find some of these products in the stores,
21 as has been widely reported. And to address the supply
22 chain shortages, we've created some flexibilities as a
23 result of the COVID-19 pandemic and have allowed
24 suppliers to change their inert ingredient, their active
25 ingredient, manufacturing suppliers because of a lack of

1 those sort of supply chains being disrupted.

2 And so certain active or inactive ingredients we
3 have been able to allow companies to change suppliers
4 without having to go through the normal processes that
5 take a longer period of time sometimes.

6 We've also expedited a lot of the registrations
7 and where the process, as you know, from the pre-action,
8 sometimes takes anywhere from four to six months. We've
9 been compressing that time down to four to six weeks and
10 I've got a graph that shows sort of the numbers of
11 different time frames and how robust our counter
12 workload is.

13 And so we've expedited the review of several
14 processes, renewed processes, streamlined them, and in
15 March we announced flexibilities that we would be
16 expediting the review process for emerging viral
17 pathogen claims to add products to List N, and in May we
18 expanded and expedited the review to include new
19 products as well as amendments to existing products.

20 So first we addressed the data that we had
21 in-house and took care of those products and then we
22 tell folks how to submit data and then we'll look
23 forward in our product processing system where we could
24 get to act on those products much more quickly. We've
25 been doing a lot of streamlining there.

1 And so you can see from this chart the total
2 number of actions pending, which has been climbing,
3 which is the gray bar, but also the total number of
4 completed actions, you can see we've been just
5 completing way more actions per time frames within the
6 two-week time frames, but we still have an increasing
7 level of pending actions, even though we are increasing
8 the number of throughput.

9 To give you a statistic, we're getting about six
10 times the number of requests for preregistration
11 meetings or information, you know, questions about
12 registrations, and we've had about a 40 percent increase
13 in the number of registrations over this time last year.

14 The Antimicrobials Division, we've deployed
15 additional resources to the Antimicrobials Division from
16 across the office, from across EPA, to help us manage
17 just the incredible influx of workload to improve
18 products that are effective against SARS-CoV-2.

19 You know, one of the things that I've focused on
20 personally is I feel like we're very good at the
21 disinfectant space on the surface counter than on the
22 traditional disinfectants, but if we're going to make a
23 dent in the transmission of this virus, which we know is
24 largely airborne, but there are some surface contact
25 transmissions, we kind of need some game-changer

1 technologies.

2 So spending and carving out some time to focus
3 on what some of these game-changer technologies could
4 be. So, for example, products that have longer lasting
5 claims and longer lasting efficacy. If a product lasts
6 for seven days or longer and you don't need to
7 continuously re-apply a disinfectant after, you know,
8 you wipe the surface clean and then all of the sudden
9 there's transmission that occurs because it's been
10 re-infected right after that, you're not potentially
11 making a dent in the transition space.

12 So we are working hard to work with registrants
13 and work with states to make sure that if there are
14 novel products that are out there that are going to help
15 in the disinfectant space, that we're devoting time to
16 working with those registrants. And working in
17 partnership with our Office of Research and Development,
18 who is testing some of these novel products that are
19 currently in-house, and also working or we have a lab,
20 OPP, which is our BEAD lab, which has been doing a lot
21 of testing to develop a protocol.

22 So we didn't really have a protocol out there
23 prior to this pandemic that said, if you want to make a
24 long-lasting claim for a surface coating, here's what
25 you do, here's how many times you abrade the surface,

1 here's how many times you spray the surface.

2 So there needed to be lab development, protocol
3 development, which we just recently put out, to tell
4 registrants if you want to make a claim, a long-lasting
5 claim, here's how you go about developing the studies to
6 do that. And so that's been a lot of our work in the
7 sort of space protocol development.

8 We also know that there's new application
9 technologies that might help. So electrostatic sprayers
10 are a potential tool that can be used to apply the
11 pesticide that creates a negatively charged particle
12 that then bonds better to the surface. And so we didn't
13 have much guidance on how to add electrostatic sprayers
14 to a label, and so in July, we began to expedite those
15 applications to add directions for use with
16 electrostatic sprayers to products intended to kill
17 SARS-CoV-2, and that's been increasing interest, and so
18 we're working on that as well.

19 And then as folks have probably read in the
20 paper along those lines, because of the emergency
21 situations that exist, Texas approached us with a
22 different Section 18 request to allow a product called
23 SurfaceWise 2 be applied on airplanes and airline
24 facilities that had demonstrated effectiveness for
25 longer lasting claims.

1 And so the Section 18 allows those products to
2 be sprayed and they don't need to be reapplied for a
3 period of seven days, providing longer lasting
4 protection. We have a number of products, again,
5 in-house that we're testing with our Office of Research
6 and Development, working with registrants to get more
7 products approved along these sort of novel product
8 lines.

9 And then new data development, October, we just
10 put out the new guidance and test methods for products
11 to make long-lasting claims or coatings. We had some on
12 surfaces that were part of the material, like copper
13 surfaces, and we have protocols for impregnated surfaces
14 and surface coatings as well. And working with the
15 companies and providing guidance to companies about how
16 they can come and quickly register.

17 We also issued temporary guidance outlining
18 approaches to address the availability of respiratory
19 protections for workers, for ag workers. Certain ag
20 workers need the PPE in the field. So what do you do
21 when there's a shortage? What do you do when you can't
22 get your fit testing done in a timely manner? You know,
23 can you reuse the PPE? Does that increase any sort of
24 health issues that we should be aware about from
25 workers?

1 So we issued, in accordance and in line with the
2 OSHA standards, we weren't doing anything outside the
3 box here, because OSHA had issued some guidelines as
4 well. We extended some of those OSHA flexibilities to
5 the FIFRA agricultural workers under the agricultural
6 worker protection standards. And so it outlines sort of
7 the hierarchy that you would go about for how to address
8 where there is the unavailability of PPE.

9 We've also talked about training. Many of the
10 certification and training rules under WPS, and training
11 requirements under WPS, and in response we issued
12 guidance to inform our agricultural handlers and workers
13 about the flexibilities available under the WPS, given
14 the current emergency situation and conditions that
15 allows continued protection of those employees and
16 agricultural production to continue. So that was
17 another area that we were working on.

18 And then we also worked on, with states and
19 tribes, an ability to potentially offer training and
20 what counted as training where there was not input,
21 classroom training, could virtual training be allowed,
22 and so we put out guidance for state and local counties
23 and our, you know, state counterparts were implementing
24 the WPS and the CNT programs for what training might
25 look like and how they could address those requirements

1 that were in the current regulations given the current
2 pandemic situation.

3 So lastly, we've definitely been doing a lot of
4 coordination, we get a lot of Congressionals, we get a
5 lot of state requests, and are taking lots of meetings
6 nowadays to really help folks understand the process,
7 continue to get products on List N, to continue to
8 develop resources to exploring novel products that could
9 potentially make a difference in addressing transmission
10 of this virus.

11 So we're spending a lot of time working with our
12 industry partners, our state partners, our NGOs, on
13 areas that need to be addressed for the SARS-CoV-2, and
14 it's a lot of work, but it's rewarding work. You know,
15 folks within EPA are some of the best scientists in the
16 world, and we are working hard to address our piece of
17 trying to solve this puzzle.

18 So future efforts, now that we've released
19 guidance from registrants seeking long-lasting, we're
20 going to continue to expedite registration decisions.
21 Working with ORD, EPA, our lab, our Fort Meade lab
22 currently undergoing biosafety level 3, which we are
23 approved for, to begin testing on the actual SARS-CoV-2
24 virus to confirm the suitability of other human
25 coronaviruses as cellular organisms. Again, a lot of

1 what the lab work does is, you know, work on protocols
2 and SOPs for registrants to help them understand what
3 data is acceptable to demonstrate effectiveness and
4 safety. And so our lab is -- and ORD continues to
5 support that development.

6 So with that, I'm about five minutes over into
7 the next session, so I probably have questions, for
8 maybe one or two, and then we can move into our next
9 session. So thank you for your time.

10 And I see Liza is typing.

11 MS. JEWELL: And, Ed, I don't know if you saw
12 above that, Komal had a question.

13 MR. MESSINA: I did not. So are there any
14 pending questions? Oh, are there any pending Section 18
15 exemption requests? Yes. Well, we always have pending
16 Section 18 requests, Komal. Are you asking about COVID?
17 And the answer is yes, we do have some in-house.

18 And, Liza, question?

19 MS. TROSSBACH: Thank you. Regarding the
20 Section 18 requests, I know there are a number -- I'm
21 sorry. I understand that there are some other states
22 that there are a number of pending Section 18 requests
23 for disinfectants very similar to Texas with the
24 extended efficacy.

25 And I am curious, is there a mechanism, given

1 that we are in a pandemic, a worldwide pandemic, and
2 that states are experiencing the same issues, is there a
3 mechanism or way that a Section 18 would be applied
4 across the country thereby leveraging the work that's
5 already been done as opposed to having to have those
6 considered on a state-by-state basis?

7 Just for an example, some states have received
8 requests that cover a billion square feet of indoor
9 space. And so just the volume of work, obviously
10 emergency exemptions are very specific, but given this
11 particular situation, is that a possibility? Thank you.

12 MR. MESSINA: Yeah, great question, Liza. So
13 the Section 3 is probably, you know, the preferred way
14 to go, but given that this is an emergency situation,
15 Section 18 is suited to doing that. And what's required
16 is a sponsor of that Section 18, which is normally a
17 state, right?

18 So we're very familiar with the Section 18
19 process as relates to agricultural crops, right? You
20 have an outbreak of a particular aphid in a, you know,
21 vineyard, and there's no other products available, and
22 we are talking about a discrete location where an
23 emergency exists, but this pandemic is different in that
24 it's sort of everywhere.

25 And then once you've demonstrated that existing

1 tools are not getting the protection that is desired,
2 then you're sort of -- you already made the decision
3 that, well, this should probably work everywhere, right?

4 I mean, we did get questions, which is, you
5 know, why Texas? Why only on these airlines? And the
6 answer to that question is because that's who asked.
7 And that's who the sponsor was.

8 If we were going to do a national Section 18
9 approval, we would need another agency to sort of take
10 that on, and there have been discussions, but I don't
11 know how far they've gotten where companies and states
12 have been talking to, you know, for example, you know,
13 the National Transportation Agency or the FAA, and I
14 haven't been privy to those conversations, but I've
15 understood that they may have taken place.

16 And so if we did get a larger request, we could
17 do a larger Section 18. But then that raises the
18 question, well, if you're doing a Section 18 for the
19 entire country, isn't that a Section 3? And then within
20 Section 3, there is conditional registrations,
21 potentially, that could be available when those Section
22 3(c)(7) conditions are met.

23 So FIFRA, like, you know, we talked about
24 emerging technologies and our emerging piece, there are
25 some nuances to the regulations and statutes that were

1 written that didn't contemplate this type of situation.
2 So where we are in some instances, you know, trying to
3 fit, you know, the round peg into the square hole. But
4 that being said, and I've said this in the past with
5 states, we are willing to work with states where they're
6 getting these questions, devote time to hold submission
7 meetings over Section 18 requests, to help the states
8 manage and to make their own decisions about where they
9 would like these products to be applied within their
10 state.

11 While EPA is vigorously pursuing the Section 3
12 registration for these products, you know, we can then
13 have them be available on a wider scale, right, which is
14 the ultimate goal.

15 So hopefully that answers your questions, but,
16 Liza, I'm happy, again, to talk offline and work with
17 the states about what's the possible path forward,
18 knowing that it's not a perfect solution. So thank you
19 for your question.

20 Let's see, there's the wastewater question.
21 Yeah, I did have -- so, thank you, Lori Ann Burd. Yeah,
22 and actually, I have had a conversation with some water
23 quality folks about whether they're starting to see any
24 increase in -- you know, for the treatment plants. You
25 know, a lot of people are using disinfectants, is that

1 having an effect. And so there have been some initial
2 conversations around that. I haven't seen any data,
3 though, to suggest that.

4 So if you're aware of data that exists, we would
5 love to see it and to evaluate it. So thank you for
6 that point.

7 We do get questions, maybe this is related to
8 your question, Lori Ann, we do get questions about, you
9 know, I'm spraying all these disinfectants, is that
10 causing health issues, because of the increased use of
11 disinfectants. And we do have a Q&A on this.

12 And, you know, the good news is when we evaluate
13 the spraying of those disinfectants, you know, we apply
14 safety factors, we do a thorough analysis for health and
15 safety. And I don't believe -- I think we have looked
16 at our protocols to say, well, okay, you know, we did
17 think the inputs were different for maybe how people are
18 using them, maybe they're using them more frequently.
19 And I don't think we've decided that the change is
20 needed or warranted because of the levels of protections
21 that already exist and the safety factors that are
22 already built into our analysis.

23 So thank you for that question, Lori Ann.

24 All right, with that, I think we'll go into our
25 next session. Sorry for eating into the time, but I

1 think this is probably a topic of great interest to many
2 and I wanted to spend some time and a whole separate
3 discussion on it and on a different day from the whole
4 OPP update because I thought folks would be interested.

5 And again, as always, if you have further
6 questions, would like to talk offline, or have some
7 ideas on how the agency could be more successful in this
8 area, we're all open to hearing about that.

9 So thank you for your time, and with that, I'll
10 pass it on to our emerging pathogens workgroup, which is
11 a great transition for the Antimicrobials Division for
12 the setup regarding SARS-CoV-2 and the fact that the
13 emerging viral pathogen policy was developed because of
14 prior emerging viral pathogens that existed, knowing
15 that there would be future ones, for which we are
16 currently living in one of those right now and there's
17 possibly going to be some future ones as well.

18 So how are we best prepared for these emerging
19 pathogens in general. So thank you for your time. And
20 with that, I'll turn it over to the next group.

21 MS. JEWELL: Thank you, Ed.

22 Taja, are you on the line?

23 MS. BLACKBURN: I am here.

24 MS. JEWELL: Great. Okay. I will advance your
25 slides, so just let me know when.

1 MS. BLACKBURN: Perfect. Thank you so much,
2 Shannon. Good morning, my name is Taja Blackburn and
3 I'm one of the co-chairs for the emerging pathogens
4 workgroup. This amazing concept was proposed by the
5 other co-chair, Komal Jain, who is the executive
6 director for the Center for Biocide Chemistry.

7 Next slide, please.

8 This morning I will provide a condensed overview
9 of the emerging viral pathogens guidance, the
10 cornerstone for this workgroup, introduce the workgroup
11 charge questions while allowing remaining time,
12 sufficient time, for open discussions to include
13 suggestions and recommendations for the workgroup.

14 Next slide, please.

15 So let's briefly walk through the 2016 emerging
16 viral pathogens guidance, to include the process, an
17 example, and finally, end this discussion with the
18 current, ongoing culminating event, COVID-19 and List N.

19 Next slide.

20 Development of this guidance began during my
21 initial tour at the EPA and has evolved nicely into the
22 2016 guidance documents that detail the process for
23 making claims against emerging viral pathogens not on
24 EPA-registered disinfectant labels. Release of this
25 guidance was followed by a 30-day public comment period,

1 and a response to comments document.

2 Next slide.

3 For most of 2020, we have experienced and lived
4 a clear example of the increasing public health impact
5 caused by emerging viral pathogens. The foreshadowing
6 of this pandemic captured the need for EPA-registered
7 disinfectants against these inevitable public health
8 threats, but there exist unique challenges to
9 meeting this goal.

10 The first one, the lack of commercially
11 available sources to contain the emerging virus; and
12 secondly, the lack of standard methods for efficacy
13 testing.

14 Next slide.

15 Also, it is important to note that the addition
16 of these emerging viral pathogens to existing product
17 registrations is difficult at best in the absence of
18 product-specific efficacy data. Therefore, the
19 development of the emerging viral pathogens guidance,
20 EVP, is a bridge to address these challenges.

21 The EVP guidance provides a voluntary, two-step
22 process that enables the use of EPA registered products
23 against emerging viral pathogens not present on the
24 accepted product labels.

25 So, how is this process accomplished? As I

1 mentioned, it's a two-stage process. Ideally, step 1
2 occurs before the outbreak. This is when registrants of
3 eligible disinfectant products request to add the
4 emerging viral pathogens designated statements to the
5 master label and additional terms to the product
6 registration.

7 While stage 2 occurs during the outbreak when
8 registrants with previously approved emerging viral
9 pathogen claims, those are the claims that are approved
10 during stage 1, are allowed to use the designated
11 statement in all label communication.

12 Next slide.

13 To be considered a viable product, the product
14 has to be EPA registered, hospital health care, or broad
15 spectrum disinfectant for use on hard porous or
16 nonporous surfaces. The accepted product label should
17 have a disinfectant efficacy claim against at least one
18 of the following viral pathogen groups.

19 So, for an example, for an emerging viral
20 pathogen that is, let's say, a large nonenvelope virus,
21 the product should be approved to inactivate at least
22 one small nonenvelope virus.

23 Next slide.

24 So just as a refresher, what is meant by small
25 nonenvelope virus, large nonenvelope virus, et cetera?

1 A small nonenvelope virus at less than 30 nanometers in
2 size is viewed as the most difficult to inactivate.
3 These viruses lack a lipid envelope, and examples of
4 these viral classes are listed.

5 Large nonenvelope viruses range in between 50 to
6 100 nanometers, are less resistant to an inactivation
7 group than small nonenvelope viruses. And again, those
8 viral classes are listed on the slide as well.

9 Envelope viruses are least resistant to
10 inactivation, possess a lipid envelope, but it's
11 important to note that these viruses are ineligible to
12 support EVP claims.

13 Next slide.

14 So let's get back to the process. To add an EVP
15 claim to an eligible registered product, the registrant
16 should do the following: They should submit an action,
17 either STPA, or a PRIA label amendment, and the
18 submission should include the terms of registration for
19 their product.

20 For an efficient review of the information, the
21 efficacy evaluation team recommends a cover letter.
22 That cover letter should detail the request,
23 descriptions of how the product meets eligibility
24 requirements, and identification of all viruses from the
25 product label to support the EVP claims. Additionally,

1 the current data matrix should be included, the proposed
2 master label, including the EVP claims.

3 Next slide.

4 The trigger to go live happens in stage 2, when
5 the following three criteria must be met: The first
6 one, the emerging viral pathogen is listed by either the
7 CDC or WHO OIE list; number two, the CDC or OIE has
8 identified the taxonomy and provides a notice to the
9 public of the identity of the emerging virus that is
10 responsible for the outbreak; and lastly, the virus can
11 be transmitted via environmental surfaces, that is
12 nonvector transmission, and the environmental surface is
13 recommended by CDC, OIE or EPA.

14 Next slide.

15 So let's look at a hypothetical situation with
16 our hypothetical product. EPA registered disinfectant
17 Imitation Oxide. The product has existing claims for:
18 Influenza A, that's an envelope virus; rotavirus, a
19 large nonenvelope virus; and rhinovirus, a small
20 nonenvelope virus. The registrant wants to add emerging
21 viral pathogen claims, so they submit the terms of
22 registration letter, the cover letter indicating the
23 viruses to add, the data matrix, and the proposed label
24 to add the claims.

25 Next slide.

1 Upon receipt, the efficacy evaluation team
2 reviews the supporting studies and the label claims with
3 an acceptable submission, the following language is
4 approved with the standard acceptable claims. So the
5 language is standardized to support the EVP claims.

6 Next slide.

7 So for our product, our Imitation Oxide product,
8 our hypothetical situation, sufficient information was
9 provided to support the EVP claims for that product.
10 The information was provided by the registrant, reviewed
11 by the efficacy evaluation team, and it resulted in an
12 approved master label and the terms and registration
13 were updated. The accepted claims are reflected on the
14 slide and these claims are consistent with the standard
15 acceptable label language that was mentioned in this
16 slide and the previous slide.

17 Next slide.

18 So all the foreshadowing and preparation in the
19 past has been tested in this current climate. So to
20 recap the current situation, on January 29th, 2020, the
21 trigger that stage 2 was activated. At that time,
22 registrants with prequalified emerging viral pathogen
23 designations could include efficacy statements, standard
24 language in technical literature, for health care
25 facilities, to physicians, nurses, public health

1 officials, nonlabel related websites, consumer
2 information services, and social media sites.

3 On March 5th, 2020, List N was started with
4 approximately 90 products. A couple of weeks ago, we
5 crossed the mark of 500 products on List N, and as
6 recently as Sunday, October 25th, 2020, we had 504
7 products on List N with greater than 330 of those
8 products supporting the emerging viral pathogens claim.

9 Not only was the emerging viral pathogens
10 guidance instrumental in building this list, but
11 additional instructions for expediting these claims was
12 published in March 2020 and in May 2020 to ensure timely
13 review of these activities.

14 Next slide.

15 So now that we better understand the cornerstone
16 that is the emerging viral pathogens guidance of the
17 workgroup, let's introduce the charge question.

18 Question number 1: What are the strengths and
19 weaknesses of EPA's first use of the emerging viral
20 pathogens EVP guidance during the COVID pandemic?

21 Question number 2, what lessons can be drawn
22 from inaugural use of the emerging viral pathogens
23 guidance for COVID-19? Should any modifications to the
24 guidance be considered based on lessons learned?

25 Number 3, are there educational outreach

1 opportunities or stewardship programs that should be
2 considered to help the public understand the EVP
3 guidance to include feedback challenges faced by end
4 users.

5 The fourth question, are there flexibilities
6 that EPA should put in place during the public health
7 emergency that should be made permanent? And, lastly,
8 are there flexibilities that still should be considered
9 at this time?

10 We will now open the chat for any suggestions or
11 recommendations regarding the workgroup and the proposed
12 charge questions that have been listed.

13 MS. JEWELL: Thank you so much for that, Taja.
14 Looks like no questions have come in yet, but I'm sure
15 that folks are in the process of developing them.

16 MS. BLACKBURN: And while the questions are
17 coming in. I can just talk about administratively what
18 we're considering at the moment, what we're envisioning.
19 We're considering a cross-section of federal partners,
20 academia, to regulate the antimicrobial industries,
21 states, tribes, territories, health care user groups to
22 complement or to build the workgroup. We anticipate or
23 we expect and we want to put a cap on the maximum number
24 of participants and limit it to 20 individuals with a
25 meeting frequency to be determined, but I anticipate

1 maybe monthly.

2 MS. JEWELL: And just to remind our committee
3 members, what we're looking for feedback, what folks'
4 reactions are about these charge questions, and just
5 general thoughts on these charge questions. Thanks.
6 People are also welcome to talk about the work that Taja
7 just discussed. I didn't mean only the charge
8 questions, but just the general topic, but especially we
9 want to make sure that we get members' feedback on these
10 topics. Thanks.

11 So, Taja, just for everyone out there, members
12 of the public, if you could read the question and then
13 provide the answer, that would be really helpful.

14 MS. BLACKBURN: Okay, it seems we have a
15 question regarding the unclear guidance on COVID-19
16 mitigation in the farmworker community, and that was a
17 challenge. And large outbreaks in the community and how
18 this would be addressed via the workgroup.

19 That is something definitely I guess we can
20 address via the strengths and weaknesses of the guidance
21 documents, and possibly with the educational outreach
22 opportunities for stewardship programs. Were you
23 thinking of anything in particular, Joe?

24 MS. JEWELL: And, Joe, please feel free to
25 unmute and talk on the phone if you would like.

1 MR. GRZYWACZ: All right. Am I coming through
2 now?

3 MS. JEWELL: You are.

4 MR. GRZYWACZ: All right, thank you. So the
5 issue that's at play here is there was a lot of
6 confusion in how to mitigate COVID-19, especially in the
7 farmworker community, especially in light of both the
8 owners/operators and their ability to make
9 transportation and communal housing safe, as well as
10 then the opportunities for the farmworkers to actually
11 do what people were suggesting, including groups like
12 the EPA.

13 So with different groups operating at different
14 levels and with different pieces of information, the
15 farmworkers board, the consequences of that with high
16 levels of infection in that specific population, that
17 suggests that there's a dramatic need for better
18 educational outreach opportunities in the work of your
19 group. So that, you know, what does the workgroup
20 anticipate, you know, using an example such as that, or
21 enhancing future responses to future outbreaks?

22 MS. BLACKBURN: That's an excellent point, and I
23 would like to know, I guess specifically, was it an
24 issue with dissemination of information or was it an
25 issue in being able to translate what was available to

1 how to use it in those circumstances and situations? So
2 I'm thinking from the standpoint of was it, you know, a
3 lot of the products that were being used, were they just
4 limited to hard nonporous surfaces, and how do we
5 translate these to the porous surface type of issues?
6 But were there any, like, specific issues that we can
7 address or you want to propose that we address?

8 MR. GRZYWACZ: I would actually call folks like
9 Amy Liebman into this particular conversation, but from
10 my point of view, I've heard examples of each of what
11 you've described. I've heard examples of using the
12 wrong materials in cleaning up the buses in between
13 transporting workers to and from the fields. I've heard
14 issues of the poor translation or mistranslation of
15 information from EPA or other guidance-providing
16 entities. And I've heard examples of barriers for
17 people to actually implement some of the recommended
18 behaviors.

19 So I don't think it's a one or the other, I
20 think it's a both-and kind of situation.

21 MS. BLACKBURN: This is especially helpful, and,
22 too, if possible, if others want to chime in, we can
23 build a list of these challenges so that when we address
24 these questions, they have some utility and, you know,
25 they can translate timely into modifications,

1 potentially, to what we're doing.

2 MS. LIEBMAN: Hi, this is Amy Liebman. Can I
3 speak?

4 MS. BLACKBURN: Yes.

5 MS. LIEBMAN: Great. I just wanted to back up
6 what Joe was saying, and reinforce that, in that this is
7 a really important issue in the farmworker community.
8 And, you know, trying to figure out the misuse component
9 of this and how it plays out on the ground when they go
10 into effect is really important. And we are looking at
11 a number of, you know, vulnerable populations that are
12 negatively impacted as a result of trying to figure out
13 the best ways to use these products.

14 MS. BLACKBURN: Thank you, Amy, I appreciate it.

15 And, Komal, I know I've kind of dominated the
16 topic, but if you have anything to add to this, if you
17 want to introduce yourself, by all means, feel free.

18 MS. JAIN: Taja, can you hear me?

19 MS. BLACKBURN: Yes.

20 MS. JAIN: Hi, all right, thanks, everyone, this
21 is Komal, I'm the executive director of the CBC. First
22 of all, I'll just state thanks to Taja and EPA for
23 accepting this proposal on the workgroup. As we can
24 hear from the questions that are being posed or the
25 points being made today, this is an incredibly important

1 topic, and I really do appreciate the perspective of
2 some communities that we -- you know, I haven't been as
3 mindful of as we've been thinking about these charge
4 questions.

5 I will say that I think this first draft of
6 charge questions are really strong. They are pretty
7 broad in scope and, you know, I have at least a page and
8 a half of subset questions that could fall under each
9 one of these categories, but they really are from the
10 registrant perspective versus the users.

11 So I think that we will definitely benefit from
12 participation of other key stakeholders in this
13 workgroup. I would really encourage somebody from
14 the -- you know, from the farmworker community, perhaps
15 somebody from, you know, other less represented
16 communities to participate, because we just simply don't
17 have that perspective, at least top of mind.

18 And I think, Taja, you already addressed this,
19 but I think it would be helpful to have, you know, state
20 representation as well. I believe you listed that as
21 one of our goals on who to participate in this workgroup
22 with us.

23 I'm happy to answer any questions directly or
24 further support some answers, Taja, as you field
25 questions.

1 MS. BLACKBURN: Amy, can you just sort of go over
2 how interested people, persons, I guess contact you
3 regarding membership to the workgroup, because a lot of
4 folks I think on this call may have missed yesterday's
5 call.

6 MS. JEWELL: Absolutely. Yeah, thank you for
7 that, Taja. So what we are going to do is have them
8 send an email to me and to you as well, and then we will
9 collect the names -- we're going to collect all of the
10 names. We're asking that folks have all of the names to
11 us before the Thanksgiving holiday. And then we will
12 begin to field and see kind of the balance that we have,
13 the expertise that we have coming in.

14 And as a reminder, PPDC members are
15 automatically on the working group. No more than 20
16 PPDC members, no more than half of the committee. And
17 depending on the number of community folks that want to
18 be on a workgroup, there may be a need to have an
19 additional couple of people for expertise. And it's
20 also possible to consult outside of the working group
21 for expertise.

22 So I will put your name in the email address, or
23 your email address in the chatbox here for members, and
24 then when we go to break today, I will put up a sheet, a
25 PowerPoint, essentially, that has the names and email

1 addresses of all of the workgroup chairs, as well as
2 myself, so that people can email us. If in doubt, just
3 email me, my name is in the Federal Register with my
4 email address. It's also on the PPDC website.

5 So we will be compiling lists together of the
6 names, but if in doubt, if you have a problem locating
7 Taja's email address for any reason, please just email
8 me. And then --

9 MS. BLACKBURN: And consistent with Amy's
10 comments, that if you can think of other potential
11 groups that have not been considered in my list of the
12 composition of the workgroup, by all means, feel free to
13 send me an email with that information and I'll try to
14 reach out to those groups as well so that we can have
15 that adequate representation.

16 MS. JAIN: Taja, could you go through your list
17 of identified stakeholders just as a reminder?

18 MS. BLACKBURN: Well, we're considering the
19 regulated industry, academia, federal partners, states,
20 tribes, territories, and the user groups. We're saying
21 user group, maybe the health care communities that
22 actively use these products, but I'd like expanding that
23 list to communities outside of that realm as well. So
24 consistent with Amy's suggestion and it just adds
25 additional information to maybe groups we haven't even

1 considered.

2 So if it's a scenario where you believe maybe
3 your expertise don't satisfy the workgroup charge goals,
4 then just as far as recommending or suggesting a
5 potential group that we may need to consider, that is
6 helpful as well.

7 MS. JEWELL: I'll also mention, Taja, in terms
8 of folks emailing us, we are looking for standard
9 information, name, contact information, your
10 organization, and a statement of interest. If, however,
11 we need more information from you, we will certainly
12 reach out to get that.

13 MS. BLACKBURN: Yeah, that sounds great. Thank
14 you.

15 MS. JEWELL: And do you have a sense, Taja, are
16 there ideas that you would like to throw out for what
17 you think the optimal number of members might be or is
18 that something that you would like committee members to
19 chime in on, and how frequently you imagine this group
20 might meet?

21 MS. BLACKBURN: We were trying to cap it at 20
22 persons, simply because we wanted a manageable group
23 that, you know, we can move kind of seamlessly through
24 the charge questions and, you know, the subset of charge
25 questions that are going to be added to this.

1 If it comes to the scenario where, you know, we
2 reached our 20 but, you know, there are other groups
3 that we haven't considered that we think their
4 representation would be useful, then I don't see why we
5 couldn't expand that number, but still potentially keep
6 it very manageable.

7 And then the frequency of the meetings is
8 definitely something I want the workgroup to chime in
9 on, but I think with the volume of questions that we
10 have and the deadline associated with reporting out, and
11 then, too, I think it's critically important to mention
12 that this is information that's so timely now, and we're
13 in the middle of this, and this is just to me the
14 opportune time to gather information and really have a
15 good path forward because I think the information that
16 we collect will really help inform timely, you know, how
17 we move forward going with this pandemic and, you know,
18 may potentially reshape or better inform what we're
19 doing. I think meeting once a month would be a good
20 time frame.

21 MS. JEWELL: Okay, great. Great. That's good
22 to know.

23 It looks like Gary Prescher has a question.
24 Would you like to unmute, Gary?

25 MR. PRESCHER: Yes. Can you hear me now?

1 MS. JEWELL: Yeah.

2 MR. PRESCHER: Can you hear me okay? Yeah, I
3 was just sitting here wondering if this workgroup would
4 have any other perspective on how some of the other
5 potential emerging pathogens would affect different
6 stakeholders out here. A couple of examples I thought
7 of would be, you know, the avian influenza type
8 situation or African swine fever situation, those, or
9 even chronic wasting in the deer population and how that
10 would affect different stakeholders.

11 So I'm just kind of wondering out loud how the
12 workgroup maybe could take a look at different threats
13 versus different stakeholders.

14 MS. BLACKBURN: I don't see why that wouldn't be
15 something we could not include in our workgroup, and
16 just maybe do an outreach to see what other emerging
17 pathogens we may need to consider. Right now that
18 guidance is limited to viral pathogens, and I know what
19 you've mentioned fall well into that category, but just
20 expanding that landscape, should we possibly consider
21 other microorganisms and, you know, their scope as it
22 relates to this workgroup.

23 So by no means, Gary, I definitely think it's
24 something that we should consider as we think about
25 lessons learned, and then, you know, possibly adapting

1 it to those other scenarios as well.

2 So I will definitely take note of that. Thank
3 you.

4 MS. JEWELL: Taja, this is Shannon. Just give
5 it as long as you would like for additional questions
6 and then if we don't have any, then we may just take a
7 little bit of a break, if you would like, until the next
8 session.

9 MS. BLACKBURN: Sounds good. Thank you,
10 Shannon, and thank you, everyone. And I am really
11 excited about moving forward with this workgroup. And
12 again, if you have questions, suggestions and
13 recommendations, or if you're interested in joining the
14 group, please just, you know, follow Shannon's
15 instructions and I look forward to working with you
16 guys. Thank you.

17 MS. JEWELL: Thank you, Taja.

18 MR. MESSINA: Great job and thank you for all
19 your work on the COVID-19 response.

20 Shannon, did we get any requests for public
21 comment today?

22 MS. JEWELL: We have not, no, thank you. Sorry,
23 it's not a session next, but it would be the public
24 comments and then the lunch break. We actually have not
25 gotten any requests for public comments for this

1 session, Ed.

2 MR. MESSINA: Okay. So do you suggest we
3 reconvene at 2:00?

4 MS. JEWELL: I believe so, yeah, so that folks
5 that want to tune in on time for the farmworker and
6 clinician training group can do so.

7 MR. MESSINA: Okay. All right. Thanks,
8 everyone, for the morning session. And as always,
9 follow up with Shannon and Taja if you're interested in
10 adding members to the workgroup, and I appreciate the
11 charge questions and the comments that we received this
12 morning. So have a great afternoon until 2:00 p.m.

13 MS. JEWELL: Thank you, Ed. Thank you, all.

14 (Whereupon, a lunch recess was taken.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 AFTERNOON SESSION

2 MR. MESSINA: Hi, everyone. I see we have folks
3 joining in for our next session. We'll start in a
4 couple minutes. It looks like our list of attendees has
5 stabilized. So it's 2:01. We'll get our next PPDC
6 session under way. I'm going to introduce our
7 presenters and set up the topic.

8 So if you look on your agenda, we are on the
9 farmworker and clinician training workgroup session.
10 Our session chairs are Carolyn Schroeder, chief of the
11 Certification and Worker Protection Branch, and Steve
12 Schaible, who is your Pesticide Registration Improvement
13 Act coordinator. And the goals for the session are to
14 discuss background on the current issues regarding
15 farmworker and clinician training, and to consider how
16 training for farmworkers, pesticide applicators and
17 clinicians can be cooperatively addressed, and to hear
18 from all the PPDC members about specific charge
19 questions for this group and how that will promote the
20 most impactful contributions possible for this
21 workgroup. And then also talking about individuals who
22 could join to help advise.

23 Steve and Carolyn are going to introduce
24 themselves, and we're going to run through a little bit
25 of a presentation, because some of the overlap with our

1 PRIA, Pesticide Registration Improvement Act, metrics,
2 as part of PRIA 4, we have some statutory obligations
3 under that statute. So as a first opportunity for
4 discussions and charge questions from an agency
5 perspective, that's something we're interested in
6 learning about and how we can collect metrics and
7 understand farmworker communities impacts.

8 And so it seems like a good start, but that's by
9 no means the only projects or questions we're asking
10 this workgroup to think about, but it's certainly, we
11 think, could be a good first place to start.

12 So, with that, we hope for a great, lively
13 conversation on this topic. So we have until 3:15 for
14 this session. So with that, I will hand it over to
15 Carolyn and Steve.

16 MR. SCHAIBLE: Carolyn, do you want to start,
17 introduce yourself?

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Sure. Hi, everyone. This is
19 Carolyn Schroeder, with the Certification and Worker
20 Protection Branch in the Office of Pesticide Programs.
21 The Certification and Worker Protection Branch is
22 charged with two of the regulations that we'll be
23 talking about a little bit today. It's with the worker
24 protection standards, which covers the agricultural
25 workers and handlers, that would include the farmworkers

1 and the pesticide handlers, and what the employers are
2 required to do to protect them from pesticide exposure.

3 In addition, we have the certification -- the
4 CPA we call it, the Certification of Pesticide
5 Applicators Rule, and that one is more about the
6 restricted use pesticides and what the state and tribal
7 and federal programs that do certify pesticide
8 applicators, what type of competency standards they need
9 to follow.

10 And with that, we have Steve who will cover a
11 lot of the PRIA requirements, but I just wanted to
12 introduce that we do also implement these rules through
13 our cooperative agreements and with other engagement
14 with stakeholders and we'll get into those in more
15 detail as we go through the specifications.

16 MR. SCHAIBLE: Okay. And I'm Steve Schaible, I
17 am the PRIA coordinator for OPP, for the Office of
18 Pesticide Programs, and as such, I am the internal and
19 external point of contact for pretty much all inquiries
20 or processes related to PRIA. PRIA is the Pesticide
21 Registration Improvement Act. It was passed back in
22 2004 and there has been three reauthorizations since
23 then, the most recent PRIA 4 that was passed in March of
24 2019.

25 So my intersect with this workgroup has to do

1 with the reporting requirements that were introduced in
2 PRIA 4, and that is a point of focus for what we're
3 hoping to get out of this workgroup, and we recognize
4 that there's other elements that this workgroup may want
5 to focus on as well.

6 So just as far as the reporting, the way that
7 that reporting manifests is that EPA posts an annual
8 report each year, usually around March, and that lists
9 out all of the different reporting requirements and
10 EPA's responses to those requirements. And so we're
11 looking for feedback on how best to address those
12 requirements. So I'm going to move on.

13 Next slide.

14 So the session's goals, this is pulled from the
15 agenda, and this very much harkens to the information
16 that Mily proposed back in the spring meeting for the
17 workgroup idea. We received this idea, EPA does support
18 the formation of this workgroup and I think that we are
19 looking forward to hearing your feedback on the charges
20 of the workgroup.

21 Again, I think our primary goal at this point in
22 time, for what we're hoping to get out of the workgroup,
23 is to get some better guidance on how to establish a
24 framework whereby we have a common understanding of what
25 is intended or, you know, how should we be responding

1 under the reporting requirements, and a structure for
2 how to reach out and get the information from
3 stakeholders to be able to capture it in our annual
4 report.

5 Moving to the next slide.

6 So just these are the reporting requirements
7 that relate to the PRIA setasides. So just to go
8 through the setaside, the first bullet, these are
9 setasides that preceded PRIA 4, and basically in our
10 annual reports for quite a while now we've provided this
11 description of what are the different grants and
12 activities that are funded by the PRIA setasides, and we
13 described sort of what were the amounts going into the
14 setaside and what were the activities that went into the
15 setasides. The setasides in the next slide is going to
16 go into more detail on the setasides.

17 The last three bullets are the PRIA 4 new
18 reporting requirements, and the first is the evaluation
19 of the appropriateness and the effectiveness of
20 activities, grants and programs. So specifically, these
21 are going to be worker protection activities under the
22 one setaside, partnership grants, and then the Pesticide
23 Safety Education Program.

24 The second reporting requirement is the EPA has
25 provided a description of how stakeholders are engaged

1 in decisions to fund the worker protection activity, the
2 partnership grant and the Pesticide Safety Education
3 Program, or PSEP.

4 And so these two are what EPA is providing
5 itself. And then the third requirement is that with
6 respect specifically to the worker protection
7 activities, the first setaside, EPA is to provide a
8 summary of analyses provided by stakeholders, including
9 from worker community-based organizations on the
10 appropriateness and effectiveness of those activities.
11 So this is EPA gathering information provided externally
12 from stakeholders and summarizing that information.

13 So this is a description of the three setasides
14 in PRIA. The Section 33(c)(3)(B) of FIFRA establishes
15 three setasides. The first of these is for worker
16 protection activities and it says, for PRIA 4 purposes,
17 through fiscal year 2023, EPA shall apply approximately
18 1/17th of the PRIA fund, but not less than \$1 million,
19 to enhance scientific and regulatory activities related
20 to worker protection with an emphasis on field worker
21 populations in the United States. So that's \$1 million
22 or greater depending on what our fee collections are in
23 a given year.

24 The second setaside is for \$500,000, and this is
25 for the partnership grant cooperative agreements. And

1 the third is also \$500,000, and that's for the Pesticide
2 Safety Education Program. And these are exact amounts.
3 And so the final is \$2 million in all for these three
4 different activities.

5 It is worth noting that the cooperative grants
6 that we establish and fund with these setasides are not
7 fully funded from the setasides, and appropriations are
8 also put towards some of these cooperative agreements,
9 and it's not a constant year to year on how we use the
10 money. It's sort of a fluid pot of money between the
11 appropriations and the PRIA money.

12 With that, I'm going to turn it over to Carolyn.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Thanks, Steve. And I'll just
14 add one note to this, that all of these agreements, we
15 use the term "grant and cooperative agreements" fairly
16 interchangeably, but as a cooperative agreement, it is a
17 subtype of grant and there's a little bit more of a
18 partnership with EPA on them. They all run five years
19 and they're in five-year cycles and then they go through
20 a recompetition.

21 The next slide.

22 I'm going to go into a little bit more detail of
23 things we do with the actual projects, and those would
24 be relevant as we're moving forward. The National
25 Farmworker Training Program is a program, a national

1 training program, the AFOP administers and it supports a
2 national network of the pesticide safety trainers that
3 provide the pesticide worker safety training that the
4 worker protection -- [technical difficulties] -- is to
5 protect their families and offer handler training.

6 Just as an example of the types of outputs that
7 they do, in 2019, AFOP trained over 37,000 farmworkers
8 and delivered 10 Train-the-Trainer courses, and that's
9 to train up the actual trainers of the worker protection
10 standard safety trainers. They also have some pesticide
11 training for children, over a thousand of them, and
12 that's with using a Jose Aprende, it's Jose Learns About
13 Pesticides module that was developed. And they also had
14 some pesticide exposure in pregnancy training to
15 workers.

16 In addition, they have this limited exposure
17 around families curriculum, and that's the trainers
18 educate the families on how to reduce or eliminate
19 potential exposure to pesticide residues.

20 I wanted to hang here just for a second to let
21 you know that this one was recently recompleted. As of
22 last fall, it went through a competition process.
23 They're called request for applications, and it was
24 issued last fall, it's pending announcement of the new
25 agreement. It's the current agreement is in a no-cost

1 extension, which means that they weren't receiving funds
2 from PRIA this year because they had some delays due to
3 COVID in their training and spending of their funds, so
4 that allowed them to extend the program a little longer
5 in order to spend down the funds and get more trainings
6 implemented.

7 That current agreement, I wanted to bring up the
8 PRIA recording a little bit here, because to address
9 some of the evaluation issues that were brought up and
10 that are in the PRIA 4 reporting. They have added some
11 PRIA post tests to evaluate whether or not the trainings
12 are effective. And then to be responsive to some of the
13 stakeholder input, when we were developing the
14 training -- when we were doing the recompetition at the
15 end of the five years, it's timely to add some changes.
16 So we developed some new criteria in the RFA in order to
17 have more of the evaluation about the appropriateness
18 and effectiveness of it.

19 And so when we're reviewing those applications,
20 we were looking for more of that criteria. And as far
21 as the -- then those criteria contain specific project
22 design and scope requirements to evaluate the
23 appropriateness and acceptance of the activities
24 performed under the new agreement.

25 Let's go to the next slide.

1 So another one of the worker protection
2 activities is covered under what we call PERC, that's
3 the Pesticide Education Research Collaborative, and that
4 is an agreement with UC Davis and Oregon State. The
5 goal of this agreement is to develop and facilitate the
6 availability of pesticide safety education materials.
7 Most of these were worker protection standard related,
8 and they have an advisory board, and that advisory board
9 includes pesticide state agencies, cooperative extension
10 service, some farmworker advocacy groups, the tribal
11 community, and a pesticide applicator business.

12 We also have this one under current
13 recompetition as well. This one was initiated in the
14 spring and the requestor applications closed in
15 mid-September and we are currently reviewing those
16 applications. We also included the same type of
17 criteria for evaluating the appropriateness and
18 effectiveness into this RFA as well, similar to what we
19 did for the AFOP competition.

20 In addition, we wanted to address some of the
21 stakeholder engagement that we've been hearing, and we
22 added a component for the award recipient to administer
23 subawards to community-based projects in then improving
24 the health and safety of farmworkers, the agricultural
25 pesticide handlers and their families and their

1 communities.

2 Next slide, please.

3 This is just a list of some of -- not even
4 comprehensive -- of some of the materials that have been
5 developed under the current agreement, which is nearing
6 its end. It ends in December and also will likely be an
7 in-cost extension for a few months.

8 Just to give an example, there are some resource
9 materials that were developed in other languages.
10 There's essential posting posters that were developed
11 also in some other languages. There's an image library
12 for pesticide safety educators. And you can see the
13 rest of them on the slides. I won't go through all of
14 them.

15 Next slide, please.

16 And then the third project that's been covered
17 under that \$1 million for the worker safety activities
18 is the Pesticide Education and Research Collaborative
19 for medical professionals. We call it PERC-med. It's
20 with UC Davis and Oregon State University. This is what
21 we consider the health care initiative, and it covers
22 clinician trainings and interaction engagement with the
23 health care environment.

24 It aims to educate the medical community on how
25 to prevent, mechanize and treat pesticide-related --

1 excuse me, pesticide-related health conditions, and they
2 also have an advisory board of medical professionals,
3 toxicologists, occupational health officials and
4 university professors to help achieve that goal. They
5 are updating existing and developing new materials and
6 resources for the health care community.

7 And then to the next slide.

8 MR. SCHAIBLE: Carolyn, I think we're a slide
9 ahead of you actually.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Oh, sorry.

11 MR. SCHAIBLE: Yeah, that's what you just
12 finished. The second PERC-med should be.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you for noticing. I was
14 going through my document, obviously. There we go.
15 There we go. That's it. And this one also just has a
16 list of different things that were developed. I won't
17 go through all of them, but just to give you an idea of
18 the type of materials, but I think that the PRIA
19 requirements we're going to get to, I'm wanting to
20 understand and make sure that they are appropriate and
21 effective. So that's why, you know, we gave this kind
22 of laundry list just to give you an idea of the type of
23 materials that we think are of interest here.

24 Next slide.

25 This is the National Pesticide Information

1 Center. This is a different part of the setasides.
2 This is \$500,000 for what we call the partnership
3 grants. The National Pesticide Information Center,
4 which we call NPIC, responds to public inquiries
5 regarding the pesticide information it issues. There's
6 a call center, a phone number that you can call. They
7 also make a lot of resources like these fact sheets and
8 they really try to respond to current events of what's
9 happening in the pesticide world out there to make sure
10 they're helping inform the public.

11 They also have a help desk to help the public
12 understand what type of incidents, so as those calls
13 come in, they share that information publicly.

14 And then the next slide.

15 And this one is the eXtension Foundation
16 cooperative agreement, it's also a \$500,000 setaside and
17 it supports the pesticide safety education. These end
18 up going to the extension services, and in FY19, 50 of
19 57 PSEPs, as they're called, were funded. It encourages
20 this collaboration and among the coordinators, working
21 in the same subject area, such as respirator education,
22 protecting pollinators, these are just a few examples.
23 And this has worked out as a subaward because they apply
24 and receive some money that helps leverage their
25 programs.

1 And that brings us to the next slide. So you
2 would have seen a slide already in the beginning, this
3 is bringing us back to it because this is really
4 important to us. It's the PRIA 4 reporting
5 requirements, and the ones that we just went through are
6 part of these, and when we're talking about carrying out
7 the activities related to worker protection, we went
8 through those three grants that we have currently, an
9 award partnership, which is NPIC, in carrying out the
10 pesticide safety education, which has the PSEP
11 subawards.

12 If we can go to the next slide.

13 Through those setasides, the funding of those
14 agreements, and beyond, we are working to address some
15 of the PRIA 4 reportings, but we think we still need
16 help. We want to understand this more. We have been
17 undertaking various steps for satisfying the PRIA 4
18 reporting, and that all started about midyear in FY19.

19 I already covered a few of those actions as I
20 was going through the PRIA setaside funds, especially in
21 evaluation and appropriateness of the AFOP agreement and
22 the PERC agreements and the recompetition of those. In
23 the cooperative agreements, they do have metrics that
24 they have to report to the EPA and that already exists.

25 There's grants requirements as well as our

1 program that will be key requirements of what they need
2 to report back to us. And it's usually done on a
3 quarterly basis, but we are trying to bolster that up
4 and doing that through when we initiate the new
5 agreement to add more robust requirements toward we want
6 them to -- we were evaluating the application based on
7 how they were evaluating the appropriateness and
8 effectiveness.

9 And then I also wanted to just bring up that we
10 have some outreach and training. The WPS outreach and
11 training. Now this does overlap with the agreements,
12 because a lot of them are developed through that, but in
13 addition, we do have two contracts that we have been
14 developing materials with and that's with The CauseWay
15 Agency, and also the Hispanic Communications Network.

16 So in the last year, we were looking for ways to
17 gather a more formalized input from the development of
18 these worker protection standard resources. We have a
19 new WPS pesticide safety poster, and that's done on our
20 website, and the contractor, The CauseWay Agency, sought
21 input from several NGOs on the design, including the
22 Migrant Clinicians Network, who I know is on the call.

23 Subsequently, the contractor held also
24 OMB-approved focus group sessions with farmworkers
25 directly on those three poster options. And then this

1 is just one of the examples, we've been trying to
2 implement that more. And then we've been really trying
3 to dial up how we're engaging with stakeholders. You
4 know, we have had contact, but there's always room for
5 improvement and we're really enjoying some additional
6 engagement.

7 We initiated our first virtual community visit.
8 We had done some years ago where we went into the field
9 and it's been some time. We did try to initiate one of
10 them in March, but then COVID came along and all of our
11 field trips got cancelled, unfortunately. So we had a
12 virtual Florida farmworker visit, and that one -- we're doing it
13 in a three-part series. We have had guests from the
14 Farmworker Association Foundation, and actually they've
15 been partnering to help us build the agendas to have a
16 bunch of organizations from Florida that work with
17 farmworkers. And also a couple of farmworkers
18 themselves to give some testimonies. So that's just one
19 example of the community visits.

20 And in addition we've initiated and Steve
21 Schaible organizes and works to have approximately a
22 quarterly meeting with some farmworker organizations
23 that we're meeting again tomorrow to discuss some of the
24 topics that are of interest to the farmworker community.
25 And also we are -- you know, we have been seeking some

1 input from NGOs on some focus groups, as I just
2 mentioned, and are trying to put that into wherever we
3 can at this moment, given, you know, what are our
4 resources.

5 Let's see, and I think we're now to our charge
6 questions. I will introduce them, and, Steve, please
7 hop on as needed. What we would like to do is we plan
8 to address how training for farmworkers pesticide
9 applicators and clinicians can be cooperatively
10 addressed through the PRIA requirements. And so PRIA 4
11 requires OPP to report on the appropriateness and
12 effectiveness of activities, the grants, programs, and
13 include summary analysis of stakeholders, including the
14 farmworker NGOs. There are some other requirements that
15 we read off a little earlier.

16 So what we would like to do is the first charge
17 is to evaluate farmworker and clinician training, how
18 it's funded, in part through the PRIA setasides. So let
19 me restate that. We are looking to help use the inputs
20 from the stakeholders here to evaluate farmworker and
21 clinicians training. As part of the setasides we have,
22 as we already introduced, we have the PERC-med
23 currently, we have AFOP, and we have the PERC agreement.
24 Those three go through a cycle of recompetes, and we
25 would like to -- those are funded in part by these PRIA

1 setasides, and so we think this is an opportune time
2 with the PRIA reporting to come up with a more
3 methodical way to make sure we are implementing this.

4 With that in mind, we're interested in the
5 workgroup exploring how OPP could meet these PRIA 4
6 requirements.

7 Steve, did you have anything to add with that
8 before we go on? We can just read them and then open it
9 up for discussion.

10 MR. SCHAIBLE: Yeah, that's great. I think that
11 was a great summary. Basically I think we've described
12 sort of what are the requirements, what are the
13 activities which we currently fund and sort of what are
14 the ways that we've tried to change our practices in a
15 way to be responsive to what we perceived as the
16 requirements to be pointing us towards, which I think at
17 a high level is how we're defined as outcomes rather
18 than outputs.

19 And we're interested in getting feedback from
20 this workgroup over the next year, and so let's go into
21 the charge questions that we have, and then open up for
22 others, or modifications to these charge questions.

23 So to start off, overarching charge question
24 should be simply how should EPA go about addressing
25 these new requirements under PRIA 4 for the three

1 different setasides.

2 And next slide.

3 So more specifically, the first setaside has to
4 do with EPA's evaluation of appropriateness and
5 effectiveness, so I think we're looking for some
6 feedback on what are ways that stakeholders -- you know,
7 I think we would like to have a common understanding
8 going into this of what's the thinking on what is
9 appropriate and effective. I think they might be
10 different, depending on what is seen by the other
11 stakeholders, but I think that we should be having that
12 discussion.

13 Secondly, how should EPA engage stakeholders in
14 decisions to fund such activities, the worker protection
15 activities, the grants and the program? And then
16 finally, how should we reach out to stakeholders and
17 also when should we reach out to stakeholders to gather
18 those analyses.

19 Again, as I mentioned before, we have our
20 once-a-year posting of the PRIA annual report, that is
21 the way that we would be sharing or, you know, publicly
22 providing our addressing of the requirements. And so
23 sort of going into the logistics really is what we're
24 looking at. You know, who are the stakeholders, how can
25 we reach out, and when should we reach out, when should

1 that information come back to the EPA.

2 So with that, I think we're ready to open it up
3 to the group. I see, Iris, you have a question? You
4 want to hit #6.

5 MS. FIGUEROA: Oh, there it goes. Hi, so my
6 question -- and we're happy, and I have some thoughts in
7 answer to these charge questions, but I had a better
8 question about this workgroup, whether it's just going
9 to be focused on PRIA reporting related to worker
10 protection and clinician training, or are we also
11 possibly looking at broader topics related to workers
12 and clinicians?

13 MS. SCHROEDER: I would say it's limited to PRIA
14 4, but it's pretty broad, because that is where the bulk
15 of our implementation, where the funding goes. So it
16 goes to the agreements. That said, it doesn't mean we
17 can't take some of the activities and such and come up
18 with a methodology of appropriateness. As I mentioned,
19 the contracts, for example, that, you know, if we're
20 going to do focus groups and such, we definitely would
21 be able to look at -- if it's not something that we
22 could implement through a setaside, then yes, it could
23 be considered broader, but being able to make sure we
24 can make effective and appropriate worker protection
25 activities, the clinician training, as well as see where

1 the feedback comes in for the funding activities before
2 we're initiating new agreements.

3 We think it's a fairly large charge and it also
4 includes the pesticide applicators with the
5 certification rule as well. So it's a pretty broad
6 scope, but I would be interested to hear more if you're
7 having ideas off the top of your head here or you think
8 there's something that we're missing.

9 MS. FIGUEROA: Yeah, well, I think I have a
10 couple of recommendations on the PRIA recording, which I
11 think apply more broadly just to the workup that the
12 agency does more generally. So one thing is language
13 aspects. You touched upon that a little bit and that
14 has been an ongoing thing that we've had discussions
15 about, just making sure that the evaluation materials,
16 there's focus groups, et cetera, are planned in such a
17 way that people who are not native English speakers,
18 which happens to be the majority of farmworkers, are
19 able to engage in a meaningful way.

20 So, you know, having that as a pretty
21 fundamental feature of whatever evaluation activities
22 you're doing. More contact, and again, you touched upon
23 this a little bit, with farmworker communities directly
24 and, you know, we're kind of assigning ourselves a
25 little bit of work to some of the farmworker

1 representative folks here, and again, this has been an
2 ongoing theme of just making sure that there's more on
3 the ground, obviously COVID-permitting, but other
4 creative ways of being in touch with the farmworker
5 community because the regularity of contact has not
6 always been the same as with the core community.

7 And then I had a question about something, I
8 don't think you've mentioned, which is E.O. 12898, which
9 is the environmental justice executive order that
10 exists. I believe it's supposed to inform, you know,
11 the agency's overall approach. I was wondering if
12 there's any agency sort of guidance or principles based
13 on that E.O. that might be helpful as we're thinking
14 about this reporting.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: I think you bring up a really
16 good point about the environmental justice. We are in
17 touch with our Environmental Justice Office fairly
18 regularly, but as far as whether there's a guidance
19 specifically related to this or such, I think it's
20 something worth inquiring about just to see, but I think
21 that we should be carrying that through.

22 And as we're considering it, I think I gave some
23 examples, but I didn't say the word environmental
24 justice, but we're looking at what the AFOP is
25 implementing with their training program, making sure

1 that they actually are addressing in a way beyond what
2 the worker protection standard says strictly, that it
3 does reach into the families, it has some children
4 training, it has some training for vulnerable
5 populations, including pregnant women and their
6 families.

7 The farmworkers themselves having materials in
8 Spanish and such. And our other agreements do that as
9 well, but do we do that consistently, do we do that
10 well, is it meeting its needs? I think that's where we
11 really do need stakeholder input to make sure that we
12 are doing it as best we can, and I think there is a lot
13 of value to these workers to do that, and with that
14 environmental justice in mind. So I think that's a
15 really good comment, thank you.

16 Are there any other questions?

17 MS. JEWELL: Thanks. Well, this is Shannon, and
18 I was just going to say, folks can enter their names
19 into the presenter chat for you to call on them, or it
20 looks like for now, at least, we're safe for folks just
21 to unmute and ask questions.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: I see some questions coming in.

23 MS. TREVINO-SAUCEDA: Hi, this is Mily from
24 Alianza Nacional de Campesinas. Can you hear me?

25 MR. SCHAIBLE: Yeah, we can.

1 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes, we can.

2 MS. TREVINO-SAUCEDA: I'm using my phone, so I
3 can't see your face. I just wanted to have an idea if
4 there is going to be other people that will be joining
5 this group, and maybe make sure that we start getting
6 together soon. I mean, I understand we're dealing right
7 now with some charging questions, which I like to hear,
8 but I want to know who else is going to be joining.
9 Gracias.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Hi, Mily, this is Carolyn. I
11 think we were -- we can get to that for sure, and I
12 think that is possible, because if I recall -- Shannon,
13 please jump in if I have it right. We do want a good
14 representation of who is on the PPDC, but if there's
15 others outside of PPDC, they can join, and I think that
16 would be something that we actively would do, like you
17 said, quickly, because my understanding is that to move
18 forward with the reporting, it is required on an annual
19 basis.

20 We're already due again for more reporting. We
21 would want to move quickly and start implementing those
22 things at a faster pace, and if we're settled on some
23 charge questions early on, I think that allows us to get
24 to work quicker. So I think we're in agreement on that.

25 I don't know if you have anything to add, Steve

1 or Shannon.

2 MR. SCHAIBLE: Yeah, I think we want to capture
3 an appropriate spectrum of stakeholders and be really
4 able to have the voices involved that will help us to
5 sort of arrive at an understanding around
6 appropriateness and effectiveness. You know, who are
7 the people who are impacted, what are the factors that
8 go into being able to gather the information, those
9 sorts of things.

10 Yeah, so I think having the appropriate
11 stakeholders is crucial to the success of the worker.

12 MS. JEWELL: That's right, guys. This is
13 Shannon. So PPDC members can automatically be members
14 of the working groups, up to a maximum of half the
15 committee. And then it looks like the consensus is that
16 workgroups thrive at approximately 20 members.

17 So depending on how many PPDC members are
18 looking to join and what balance is needed from the
19 outside, that will determine the makeup from the group,
20 or makeup of the group, and we're looking for
21 suggestions for members from PPDC members and outside.

22 So we're hoping that, Mily, you and others might
23 recommend some folks or have them email us to express
24 interest in the group. And then once we have a list of
25 folks who are interested, then we'll be able to make up

1 the group. We're asking that we please have people's
2 applications by Thanksgiving break, so by Wednesday, the
3 25th, at latest, we'll want those applications.

4 I will put the email addresses of Steve, Carolyn
5 and myself in our text chat here, and what we've been
6 doing is putting those up between breaks. So we had the
7 names and the email addresses up during the lunch break.
8 We can post those again after the meeting or maybe we'll
9 go ahead and just post those now after we had had a
10 conversation about -- actually, why don't I just put
11 those in the chat for now, just in case we need to
12 reference the charge questions.

13 But worst case scenario, people can find my
14 email address on the PPDC website, and in the Federal
15 Register notice announcement for this meeting. And so
16 you can always just email me, that's absolutely fine.
17 What we're asking to have sent to us is really the
18 standard information, people's name, organization, a
19 brief statement of interest, and their ability to serve.

20 So that's something that is another good
21 reminder that folks who join the workgroup, we really
22 hope that they'll bring to the workgroup a capacity to
23 spend some time doing the work required for the group.
24 So thank you.

25 MS. SCHROEDER: Thanks, Shannon. There's

1 another question. I also, before we get to the next
2 question, I wanted to clarify a point I was making with
3 the first question asking just about whether it kind of
4 restricted to the PRIA, and I think I answered it
5 correctly by saying it was the PRIA requirements, but I
6 think it might have been misleading in my example
7 because it sounded like we weren't able to address
8 something outside of the PRIA setaside, essentially.

9 Because the PRIA setasides go to funding certain
10 agreements, and a lot of that is our material
11 development, and then also it includes like a mention of
12 the partnership grant as well as the PSEP funding;
13 however, you know, I did give a lot of examples. I
14 think there's other ways to address just the request for
15 applications, and that was the example I gave where
16 we're going through some of our contract and adding in
17 some focus groups.

18 Also stakeholder engagement I think is a real
19 opportunity. And it's already been highlighted to us,
20 and some of the groups that might be on the call here
21 today, that, you know, increasing our stakeholder
22 engagement does open up opportunities to gather input as
23 well. Knowing about certain things about how to
24 formalize and how to make it a little bit more
25 constructive, but adding in some farmworker engagement,

1 community engagement, farmworker organization engagement
2 and such. So I just wanted to elaborate on that a
3 little bit more.

4 And I think there's a question from Carol Black.

5 MS. BLACK: Yeah, Carolyn, this is Carol Black
6 with the Washington State University and the American
7 Association of Pesticide Safety Educators. I think as I
8 look at this draft charge that I would send out to our
9 organization with the workgroup title being farmworker
10 and clinician training, it looks like it's really
11 exclusive of pesticide applicator training and it really
12 is looking at the farmworker, probably even handler end
13 for the worker protection standard, and then the
14 clinician training.

15 And so as I look at trying to reach out to my
16 group to say who might be a really good fit to serve on
17 this workgroup, if it wasn't me, by looking at the
18 charges, it kind of brings those in, but not by the
19 title of the workgroup.

20 And so I guess my question to you is are you
21 really wanting to be exclusive of applicator training,
22 and really look at farmworker handler and clinicians, or
23 is it more than that?

24 MS. SCHROEDER: I think you bring up a really
25 excellent question, Carol. For us, you know, we're

1 looking for EPA input on all three, you know, the
2 reporting requirements that is inclusive of pesticide
3 applicators, which would be inclusive of the Pesticide
4 Educator Program. And that is not just agriculture,
5 right? It goes beyond that.

6 So I would say yes, it could be expanded;
7 however, I'll caveat in that the proposal and initial
8 discussions that led to the development of this
9 workgroup were more narrowly -- well, we mentioned
10 pesticide applicators, but I think it may or may not
11 have been intended to be beyond agriculture.

12 And I think that is something that is exactly
13 what this session can be for right now, is to discuss
14 that a little further, and really invite people on the
15 line to please chime in to see where that scope is,
16 where we should shut that off. And I mean, a narrower
17 scope probably means that we can accomplish more, but
18 yet it's really PSEP is part of that and it's not -- I
19 think there is a lot going on with our certification
20 applicator rules as well, with all the new plans, and I
21 would be remiss if I didn't mention that there's a lot
22 of education changes happening with exams and materials
23 and there's even with more agricultural about the
24 noncertified applicator training and go on and on and
25 on.

1 I mean, this could be huge, right, which is why
2 they want to at least stay in the parameters of the PRIA
3 4 to make it more manageable, but I would love to hear
4 the input.

5 And, Carol, if you want to chime in personally,
6 if you're still on the line, that would be great.

7 MS. BLACK: I agree, I think the certification
8 rule is vague.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah.

10 MS. BLACK: And so efforts on how and what we
11 move forward, but again, I think from a PPDC workgroup
12 area, I think a fair amount of the CNT work is going to
13 be ongoing and those dialogues will be happening
14 potentially in other forums. And so maybe not focusing
15 on that within this PPDC workgroup might be appropriate,
16 because you have some of the agreements in place for
17 those focus groups and for rolling out some of that
18 information.

19 So I'm not trying to sell you on the fact that
20 applicator certification should be in here, but I think
21 if it is, it needs to be articulated, because I have a
22 feeling if it is included, it's going to potentially end
23 up a significant area, which may then distract from
24 handler training and farmworker training. So I'm just
25 putting that on the table.

1 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, thank you for the
2 comments. And like I mentioned, initial proposals could
3 include applicators, and anyone who is involved with the
4 initial proposal, it's your intent to include it beyond
5 agriculture would be really helpful. And I see there's
6 quite a few questions and comments coming in. Let me
7 see if I can help manage this here.

8 Let me get to the next -- I do see -- Jim, did
9 you have a different question or did you want to chime
10 in regarding this? Jim Fredericks?

11 MR. FREDERICKS: Hi, Carolyn, Jim here. Yeah, I
12 think as I was formulating my question, Carol was asking
13 it, but I think just to build on that, I guess as I
14 think about this group, if it is going to be, you know, a
15 focused workgroup on farmworker and clinician training
16 that I think we just need to make sure that scope is
17 well defined.

18 In that case, I think there are many
19 stakeholders that maybe would decide not to be involved
20 in that workgroup, but if it is going to include, you
21 know, applicators outside of farmworkers and, you know,
22 commercial applicators, pest control workers, you know,
23 my area of focus, I think it opens up that whole CNT
24 world that we would definitely want to be involved in.

25 So I think the question for this group I guess

1 is should it be defined or should it be refined to be
2 very specifically defined, or is it more broad. And I
3 think that will help to, you know, guide where that
4 workgroup goes and who all is involved with it.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you for that. And I think
6 the interpretation of the PRIA 4 reporting may be up
7 for -- the interpretation of the statute might be
8 different than the intent of the language of the statute
9 and that might be something for us as a workgroup to
10 dive into a bit more.

11 Steve, did I interrupt you?

12 MR. SCHAIBLE: No, that's fine. And Shannon can
13 chime in on this. But yeah, so the charge questions,
14 the draft charge questions that we're proposing, that's
15 something the EPA is looking to get feedback on, it's
16 something that would be really helpful to our being able
17 to successfully respond to those reporting requirements.

18 I think Shannon can speak, I heard during one of
19 yesterday's sessions around when the workgroup is
20 supposed to wrap up and frequency of meetings. I think
21 the charge questions proposed should be in the context
22 of what we might actually be able to get feedback on,
23 and I believe it's by the fall meeting in 2021. Is that
24 correct, Shannon?

25 MS. JEWELL: That is correct, yeah. So we'll

1 get the groups to report out on progress in May, at our
2 May meeting, date to be determined. And then we are
3 hoping to have final products by the fall meeting, and
4 the date of that is to be determined, too, but probably
5 approximately one year from now.

6 MR. SCHAIBLE: So to speak, I think either Carol
7 or Jim, to the extent the activities are ongoing and,
8 you know, there is other venues for this discussion that
9 aren't time limited, we can have a discussion sort of
10 around what would be the value of having it taken up by
11 this particular workgroup. Do they match up well,
12 basically.

13 MS. JEWELL: And do you have a sense, Carolyn and
14 Steve, of about how often you think this workgroup would
15 need to meet to be able to accomplish the charges within
16 about a year? Are you thinking monthly? That seems to
17 be generally the amount people are thinking.

18 MR. SCHAIBLE: That sounds about right.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: If you had me throw out
20 something, that's what I would have thrown out.

21 MS. JEWELL: Okay, so we've got some comments in
22 the presenter chat, and in the interest of making sure
23 that all members of the public are also privy to what's
24 being written in the presenter chat, I'm going to read
25 Dr. Grzywacz's -- Dr. Joe's comment here quickly.

1 All stakeholders --

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Do you want me to?

3 MS. JEWELL: Please.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: I was thinking, I just scrolled
5 through them. There is a comment from Amy Liebman and I
6 think we want to have Joe also comment regarding that
7 worker protection AEZ.

8 MS. JEWELL: Um-hmm.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Would that be helpful, Joe, to
10 comment directly? But if you want to read it instead,
11 if you thought that might be easier, there's multiple
12 comments.

13 MR. GRZYWACZ: I realized that as well.

14 MS. JEWELL: That would be great. Dr. Joe,
15 would you mind speaking your comments so that members of
16 the public can be privy to them as well? You might need
17 to read from --

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Before Joe jumps on, I do see a
19 lot of comments related to the CNT. I'm not sure it's
20 consensus and it's something we can talk about with the
21 workgroup by people volunteer, but it seems to be a lot
22 of keeping certification separate, given all of the
23 groups and work being done separately with the states,
24 and we will definitely take that feedback into account.
25 And then there's also some suggestions of keeping the

1 pesticide applicators in there, but more on the worker
2 protection standard at the handlers, which our
3 farmworkers sometimes do do the handler materials. So
4 there's some noncertified applicator trainings and such
5 that we consider a little overlap, but those are some of
6 the feedback I'm seeing regarding the initial thing.

7 As far as Joe's comments, if you guys can go
8 into chat, if you would like to join in. Oh, he's just
9 waiting to get connected by phone, so we will delay a
10 second.

11 So earlier, if you were on the sessions this
12 morning, there was an announcement regarding the worker
13 protection standard application exclusion zone
14 rulemaking that went final, and it was announced today
15 and will be published tomorrow. He said he took some
16 time over the lunchtime to review it a little farther,
17 and it was regarding the stakeholder engagement. And so
18 I think he would like to jump on.

19 So I'm watching the chat there. I hope that's
20 okay, Shannon, I just jumped in there with a summary. I
21 was familiar with the topic.

22 MS. JEWELL: That's great. And the comments
23 here will be part of the public record. So if folks
24 would like to see them, they will be available.

25 MR. GRZYWACZ: Yes, so I just got on. Sorry

1 about that. I didn't mean to interrupt the discussion
2 on this focus group, I just wanted to get this message
3 out there. And I just simply wanted to comment that as
4 I was going through the ruling that's available in
5 advance, you know, I got the impression, I could be
6 wrong, because I wasn't recording it, but I got the
7 impression from the AD this morning that there was sort
8 of full buy-in into the revised rule, but it was
9 striking to see that, you know, out of 126 public
10 comments, 110 opposed the revision, and only 16 approved
11 of the revision.

12 And then the EPA's response back, frankly,
13 sounded a little bit pedantic. The EPA seemed to
14 overlook the reality that the primary -- the primary
15 focus of the AEZ has always been the issue of drift, and
16 I put in the chat there a recent paper that just came
17 out in 2020 that demonstrates that drift is affecting
18 children's acetylene administration inhibition upwards
19 to 500 meters away from where pesticides were being
20 applied.

21 So it's unfortunate that the ease of enforcement
22 precedent is taking priority over, you know, some of the
23 documented potential consequences of pesticide exposure
24 at a great distance.

25 So I just simply wanted that to be out there in

1 the record for people to be able to see.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Joe. I really
3 appreciate that and highlighting it. And it does have
4 some relevance to this discussion because it is a rule
5 of the worker protection standard is something that I
6 work with and my team works with in the Certification
7 Worker Protection Branch, and the PRIA 4, as a reminder,
8 not everyone on the call may be familiar, and Steve,
9 please jump in if I get the wording wrong, but there was
10 a prohibition on making any changes to the WPS or the
11 certification rule until October of 2021.

12 So a year from now, except for there was a
13 carved out exception for this worker protection standard
14 AEZ, there was some early input before the proposal was
15 even put out, there was a lot of feedback being received
16 that it was difficult to enforce, difficult to comply
17 with.

18 And so along with some other reasons and
19 discussions early on, I know Amy Liebman brought it up
20 this morning about it wasn't discussed even at PPDC.
21 There was a lot of feedback about taking another look.
22 And so the agency did, and you're right, it's finalized
23 today with some changes, and I think it's something that
24 I just want to emphasize, it's just being released
25 today.

1 I think it would be wise for us to offer
2 sessions or discussions as needed to make sure we can
3 help walk people through the changes and I just want to
4 commit to that if that would be helpful to set up some
5 meetings with the groups here, even the PPDC if needed,
6 but the farmworker organizations especially.

7 I know we're meeting with them tomorrow, we can
8 see if we have -- it's not on the agenda, but I think we
9 can carve out some time to go over some of it and if
10 need be set up some separate meetings to make sure -- it
11 would be helpful to get some input on making sure that
12 we get the right outreach out there. And there are
13 also -- I do want to highlight that some of the training
14 that is in the worker protection standard, it still
15 emphasizes the do not contact as well as the AEZ
16 extending beyond, but as far as the enforceability of
17 the AEZ, it is within the boundaries of the property of
18 the farm establishment.

19 And I don't want to get too off track here with
20 the AEZ, but thank you for the comments, and I think if
21 it's all right with everyone, we will just move on to
22 some of the other comments that were on here.

23 Let's see, Shannon, I might have lost track on
24 where we are on there.

25 MR. SCHAIBLE: Is Liza the next one?

1 MS. JEWELL: I believe Liza is.

2 MS. TROSSBACH: Thank you. Carolyn, Steve, can
3 you hear me?

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

5 MS. TROSSBACH: Thank you. Just a quick
6 comment. I want to agree with one of the previous
7 commenters regarding this particular workgroup. I think
8 it would be in PPDC's best interest to focus
9 specifically on farmworkers and the workers and handlers
10 that are involved in agriculture production as opposed
11 to extending it to commercial applicators that, you
12 know, tend to probably get a little more attention with
13 date, travel and territorial regulatory programs. The
14 modified state certification plans focus heavily on
15 those particular workers, although it does, you know,
16 also impact noncertified applicators and private
17 applicators.

18 But I think your point is well taken, Carolyn,
19 that the more this group can be focused, perhaps further
20 along the group can get, and it appears like with
21 farmworkers there are a number of challenges, and I
22 think a more focused group, that, of course, includes
23 state travel and territorial pesticide regulatory
24 officials, you know, who can bring some insight into
25 their programs and discuss some of their challenges.

1 You know, I think that would be a good spend, you know,
2 of this group's time and be able to get some really good
3 work done during this period. So thank you.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Thanks for the comments.

5 And I think there was some additional comments
6 on the chat on that. And then I think Amy Liebman, you
7 also had a comment. I think Amy's next. It may take a
8 while because she has to dial in. There's multiple
9 steps. She's giving us it on chat, for those of you who
10 can't read it. Are you unmuted? Can you say something,
11 Amy?

12 MS. JEWELL: This is Shannon. I sometimes have
13 to do that on my phone a couple of times, I have to
14 press #6 a couple of times, which you might have, but
15 I'm wondering if maybe your regular phone is muted as
16 well.

17 MS. LIEBMAN: Can you hear me?

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes. Hi, Amy.

19 MS. LIEBMAN: Great. Yeah, there's sometimes a
20 little extra #6ing.

21 First of all, so I just wanted to thank Joe for
22 mentioning the AEZ and some of the concerns obviously
23 addressed is a huge issue and the EPA knows this quite
24 well, because they've talked about it quite a bit in the
25 WPS that was issued in 2015.

1 But in terms of this workgroup, and what some of
2 the draft questions are, I want to echo some of what
3 Christina is suggesting, and it sounds like we're
4 getting a growing consensus, I know that doesn't always
5 matter at PPDC as we know, sorry to be snarky, but it
6 sounds like we're getting some growing consensus that
7 this should have a real focus on the PRIA 4 components
8 of farmworker and needs regarding the WPS. And I'm sure
9 there will be lots of concerns about how to address
10 protecting farmworkers and farmworker education around
11 this more muddled AEZ that has just been put out.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Amy. And I do think
13 that you're getting the -- I think I mentioned it
14 briefly, but I do think that the workers could be an
15 opportunity, when we're talking about appropriateness
16 and effectiveness and engaging the stakeholders in
17 decisions, I know working with some specific pieces of
18 the provisions within the WPS, something like the AEZ
19 could be something that we -- maybe it's an example
20 piece that we do or something like that. We could
21 propose that. Some of the provisions have come up more
22 often, more often questions come up than not, and so
23 having some of the guidance and information I think that
24 you talked about this morning about a thought that
25 something could be worked out, I think that still could

1 be very valid in the current situation with the new
2 rule. Thank you.

3 MS. LIEBMAN: Thank you.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm catching up my reading.
5 It's awkward being on camera as you're reading the chat.

6 MR. SCHAIBLE: Yeah, I think Manojit had a
7 comment, if he wants to read that.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm reading backwards. I do see
9 quite a few comments that are bringing up the
10 noncertified applicators potential and but kind of that
11 could tie in with the agricultural handlers, the
12 handling training, but not getting really into that
13 certification fully.

14 And I do think there should be some
15 applicability, and if we keep it pretty narrowly
16 focused, and this is just me thinking after hearing your
17 comments, keep it more focused on the farmworker and the
18 clinician and maybe specifically some of these pesticide
19 handlers under the WPS, then there might be some good
20 lessons learned information that comes out of structure
21 that we could apply to other things that we're doing as
22 well, including the certified applicators, if there's
23 something that comes out of it that way. So I don't
24 think it has to be limiting that we start off with a
25 very focused charge. I think that would be helpful.

1 MS. JEWELL: Carolyn, can I jump in quickly?

2 This is Shannon.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Sure.

4 MS. JEWELL: Would you mind if I took the charge
5 questions down so that I can share my screen and members
6 of the public can see the chat as well?

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Absolutely. That's fine.

8 MS. JEWELL: Okay, great.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: And I think there's a question,
10 Ann, would you like to jump in?

11 MR. SCHAIBLE: Yeah, he's just typing.

12 UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: Yeah, am I unmuted?

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, no, I can hear you.

14 UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: So I actually had a
15 practical question about this workgroup, but about all
16 the workgroups that I'm not sure if we've addressed. I
17 am not the best at keeping track at PPDC membership and
18 sort of the waves of it. So is there within the time
19 frame that we're thinking of these workgroups, is there
20 possible turnover in the PPDC and is that something that
21 we should be planning for before it happens?

22 And then a similar comment about actually
23 possible turnover within EPA. I mean, we're having this
24 meeting a week before an election and regardless of the
25 result, there might be likely be some changes. We just

1 heard at the beginning of this meeting all the changes
2 that have happened even within, you know, a continuing
3 administration, so how are we going to set it up in a
4 way to make sure that if there is some stock turnover or
5 some member turnover, there's some consistency there and
6 things don't sort of fall through the cracks?

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Shannon, would you mind
8 answering the question about PPDC turnover? I think
9 that the membership is fairly new and it would not, but
10 I'm not entirely sure I'm up on that.

11 MS. JEWELL: Yeah, thanks. So we are, as of
12 this meeting, essentially a year into the membership of
13 the two-year membership. The membership of this group
14 will expire December 9th of 2021. So we have almost all
15 of 2021. We have a little over a year. There sometimes
16 is group turnover. It's not generally very significant.
17 PPDC membership turns over when someone leaves a job and
18 maybe they don't represent the same stakeholder
19 perspective anymore.

20 So say someone retires from their job, they're
21 not going to represent the grower perspective or the
22 farmworker perspective, et cetera. So as far as
23 turnover of the committee, that's really up to the committee
24 members.

25 With OPP, even with the turnover that you see

1 and I think that there will be a consistency of staffing
2 in general, so since Carolyn and Steve are the chairs,
3 it would be possible that one of them would be promoted
4 certainly, but that will not mean that the working group
5 won't go on.

6 We are really working on focusing on these
7 charge questions during this meeting because the intent
8 of working groups is to be very specific and to have
9 specific and achievable charges. And so that's one of
10 the reasons we set this meeting up the way we have to
11 get some of the stakeholder input on the charges because
12 we do want to find ways of having achievable charges.

13 So if we have a group that goes on for years,
14 say, it would need to get that charge done. So, again,
15 we hope to have groups report out on their progress at
16 the May meeting, the spring meeting, and then we hope
17 that they will be able to deliver their products at the
18 October meeting, October or November, whenever the
19 meeting is next year.

20 So by trying to have the distinct charge and not
21 have the working group go on for a very, very long time,
22 that's one way that we hope to keep the integrity of the
23 group and keep the workgroup on task and focused and to
24 achieve that charge.

25 Does that answer the question? That part of the

1 question?

2 UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: Yes, thanks.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Thanks, Shannon. And we weren't
4 thinking here of the practicality of the membership, but
5 actually, I feel like that just reinforces the length of
6 how long we work on the charge. I really would want to
7 keep the same crew as much as we can just to keep that
8 progress going and then not have a turnover with new
9 ideas at that point. It doesn't mean it can't be
10 reconsidered at some point, but I like that bound to
11 make sure that we stay within that year, then.

12 Are there any other people who have questions?
13 I see other comments. I think they're just comments,
14 but if you do, please let us know in the chat that you
15 have a question. We're nearing the end of the session,
16 but I don't want someone not to get a chance to voice
17 their initial reaction.

18 There's a question for whether we'll redefine
19 and send out. I think that's a really good question. I
20 think we can -- I think given the feedback, actually how
21 we have it titled is not so off track, because I don't
22 think we'll be expanding it to CNT. We still need to
23 report on the Pesticide Safety Education Program from
24 the reporting perspective, but I don't think that would
25 be something we would have as much focus on is my

1 understanding, given the input. I think we might be
2 able to take the lessons learned from what we're talking
3 about with the farmworker and clinician training and see
4 if it's applicable.

5 Steve, do you have some ideas on that? Because
6 I know we still do need, by statute, to report on the
7 PSEP, the appropriateness and effectiveness on that.

8 MR. SCHAIBLE: I really don't have any more to
9 add to that. You know, I think appropriateness and
10 effectiveness I think is sort of the overarching group
11 activities, but yeah, I think that should be part of the
12 conversation we have.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: I think it would be similar to
14 an NPIC as well, because we haven't discussed that here,
15 but that was also in there and didn't even come up, but
16 that one feels like it's a different charge as well. A
17 different piece of it.

18 So it sounds like we might want to -- I think,
19 Carol, you suggested a good idea as far as removing those pieces from it
20 to make the charge, and then I want to talk
21 offline with Steve about that and internally just try to
22 wrap our brains around where we want to go with the
23 other pieces, but I think what I'm hearing is that we're
24 going to scratch out anything with NPIC and the
25 partnership grant, and then also the PSEP grant for now

1 and really focus on the worker protection activities
2 which include the setasides.

3 But as Steve said, we do have other
4 appropriations there and we use some appropriations in
5 contracts, we talked about stakeholder engagement. Like
6 the activities don't have to be -- how we address it
7 doesn't have to be restricted to just the setaside
8 piece, but an overall looking at our program.

9 So that's what I'm hearing. I think if I'm
10 summarizing that all right. But we have a few more
11 minutes here, if someone wants to restate it or refine
12 it or give input on what I'm saying or refine it.

13 And, Shannon, now I see double of myself. Oh,
14 there we go. I'm just all over the place.

15 MS. JEWELL: Thank you both so much for your
16 talk and you are welcome to stay on for a few more
17 minutes or if it looks like questions have come to an
18 end, which it kind of is, then we can wrap up this
19 session and then we will resume at 3:15.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Great. How about I give it one
21 more minute just to make sure? I know there's some wave
22 connectivity issues, muting issues.

23 MR. SCHAIBLE: If you want to just unmute,
24 that's probably -- you don't need to type in the
25 question at this point, I'm just going to unmute to save

1 time.

2 MS. JEWELL: For sure.

3 MR. SCHAIBLE: To summarize, it sounds like
4 we're looking about once a month, we're looking for
5 membership recommendations coming to our addresses. You
6 said the week after Thanksgiving, Shannon?

7 MS. JEWELL: Yeah. So Wednesday before Thanksgiving will be our
8 cutoff.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: And looking for maybe 20 people, but definitely less than if
10 it's possible.

11 We're looking to expand outside
12 of PPDC, it sounds like that's actually a requirement or
13 encouraged for the workgroup. So if that's the case, we
14 may want more than 10 PPDC members it sounds like and we
15 can reach out to other groups. Is that correct? Do I
16 have that right?

17 MR. SCHAIBLE: No, I think it can be -- you
18 can't have more than half of the full PPDC membership
19 involved in a workgroup.

20 MS. JEWELL: Yeah.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Oh, the full membership. I did
22 misinterpret it.

23 MS. JEWELL: Right.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Call me out, that's good.

25 MR. SCHAIBLE: And then a final piece, we'll
26 send out the revised slide that sort of redefines the

1 scope of what we're talking about.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: As you said, meeting monthly for
3 about a year, we'll put end dates on there. And also, I
4 don't think this came up, but Shannon, is everyone
5 aware, then, that there will be a co-chair that's not
6 EPA?

7 MS. JEWELL: People are aware, I think, in
8 general, we have an end stop, but if you'd like to speak
9 to that, that would be fantastic.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. Well, we reached out to
11 Mily, and I'm putting her on the spot here, there are
12 three minutes left, to see if she would be co-chair with
13 us. So co- or tri-chairs. I don't know if you have any
14 parting words. We can discuss that. There's no
15 commitment at this point. We just reached out in
16 advance. The proposal was in part submitted on her
17 behalf and had a lot of where this originated. So it
18 seemed like a natural fit and we would be happy to have
19 her. And we'll see if she would like to be part of
20 that.

21 MS. TREVINO-SAUCEDA: Yes, I'm on board. Thank
22 you.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you. And there is one
24 more comment coming in here. And it was just a praise,
25 happy, happiness that Mily is going to be on board.

1 Excellent.

2 Really, this was really engaging, guys. I
3 appreciate everyone's participation, a large range of
4 feedback and I'm just astounded how well this platform
5 works. Thank you, Shannon, for your facilitation on
6 this.

7 MS. JEWELL: You are most welcome. Thank you so
8 much for speaking.

9 MR. SCHAIBLE: And we're looking forward to
10 working with both familiar faces and new faces.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: Yep. That's the only thing
12 missing is seeing everyone else.

13 MS. JEWELL: Yes. It will be nice when we can
14 all gather as a group again, for sure.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: It will. I don't think we have
16 anything else.

17 MS. JEWELL: Thank you both very, very much.
18 Have a great afternoon.

19 MR. MESSINA: All right, Shannon, I think it's
20 3:14, so we can make our transition into our next
21 session, which is going to be training for the members,
22 the new collaboration tools that we have put forward,
23 and then just to check in to see if we've had any
24 requests for public comments at 4:45.

25 MS. JEWELL: We have not had any requests for

1 public comments that I have seen so far. Unless
2 anything has come in in just the last few minutes that I
3 haven't seen. So let me review that quickly, Ed, while
4 we're waiting, and I will let you know if there is an
5 update.

6 MR. MESSINA: Great. And then for the moving
7 forward session after our training, we're going to
8 review sort of what we covered here, review any ideas
9 that the members have for making this more effective
10 meeting, and then talk about how we have some potential,
11 maybe new thoughts for how we would do the spring
12 meeting.

13 We would definitely have some report outs from
14 the workgroups, but maybe take a pulse of the larger
15 PPDC to see what we might want to build by way of an
16 agenda. I had some ideas around that I wanted to share
17 and it seems like others had some as well. So at 3:30,
18 come prepared to talk about that so we can make this
19 PPDC work for you and work for the agency as well.

20 So with that, we're at 3:15, and I'll introduce
21 Carla, who is the assistant PPDC designated federal
22 officer and she's going to demonstrate and discuss
23 Microsoft Teams, a tool that PPDC and its workgroup
24 members can use for their communications between
25 sessions and workgroup collaboration.

1 As an agency, we have moved over to Teams, and
2 as you can see from the first two presentations, we have
3 been finding it a very good collaboration tool, we have
4 been getting our work done through a lot of those
5 working sessions and team sites and Carla has been
6 responsible within our Office of Pesticide Programs for
7 setting up a number of team sites where we can engage in
8 collaboration internally within OPP. So we thought this
9 would be a good model to suggest for the PPDC members.

10 So with that, I will turn it over to Carla.

11 MS. THERIAULT: Good afternoon. Can everyone
12 see the PowerPoint presentation? I just want to make
13 sure, because I can't see it on my end.

14 MS. JEWELL: Oh, we can.

15 MR. MESSINA: With the big T on it, for Teams, I
16 assume? The first slide?

17 MS. THERIAULT: That's it.

18 MR. MESSINA: Yes.

19 MS. THERIAULT: Fantastic. So before I get
20 started, just a friendly note that you can enlarge the
21 presentation by using that top toggle in the top right
22 of the pod. It should be kind of up here in this area
23 somewhere. So four diagonal arrows facing in different
24 directions. So hopefully that will enlarge the screen
25 and make it easier for you to view.

1 Okay. So why are we talking about Teams? Well,
2 during the May 2019 PPDC a session was held to discuss
3 administrative improvements that could be made for the
4 workgroups to help them further their work, and one of
5 the pieces of feedback that we received was to create a
6 space for workgroups to collaborate in. Teams is an
7 obvious choice because it provides meeting space,
8 document management, collaboration in realtime when it
9 comes to meetings and chats, and working in documents.

10 So today, I'd like to talk to you about what
11 that would look like for the workgroups. So this is
12 really meant as an initial exposure and familiarization
13 to Teams. What I'm going to cover is how to access the
14 PPDC Teams site, show you how to navigate in Teams, and
15 cover a couple of the tools or features that we think
16 that you'll get the most use out of.

17 So let's go ahead and get started. To access
18 the 2020 PPDC Teams site, you're going to need to do
19 three things. The first thing is you need to have an
20 Office 365 account and a Teams account, but don't worry,
21 we will provide detailed instructions for how to get
22 both of those. Also note these are no-cost accounts.

23 The second thing we're going to need is for you
24 to email Shannon and me to give us that email address
25 that you used to sign up for 365 and Teams. That's

1 going to be the email address that we use to add you to
2 the Teams.

3 From there, you'll receive a Teams notification
4 when you've been added, and so the third thing that
5 we're going to need you to do is open the Teams
6 notification email and follow the link to the Teams
7 site. You'll be prompted to download the Teams app or
8 use Teams on the web. A helpful hint, though, if you
9 decide to use the web, bookmark the site so you don't
10 have to keep looking for the invite email.

11 All right, so let's go ahead and take a look at
12 Teams and we're going to start by taking a look at the
13 left navigation panel. In the left panel, there are
14 four icons: Activity, Chat, Teams and Files. This is
15 the primary place where you begin navigation in Teams.

16 The first tab is the Activity tab. It will
17 display all the activity such as conversations or when
18 you have been added to a team or a Teams channel. Note
19 that clicking on any activity in the display will take
20 you to where the activity took place. For example, the
21 activity highlighted here occurred in the general
22 channel in the PPDC team. And so you can see up at the
23 top, we're in the fall 2020 PPDC Teams site, abbreviated
24 F2, and we're in the general channel.

25 The Chat tab is pretty self explanatory and it

1 will list all of the chat history and meeting history
2 that occurs in your Teams, or in your channels.

3 The next tab is the Teams tab, and we're going
4 to skip over that and go to the Files tab and then we'll
5 come back to the Teams tab later.

6 Clicking on the Files tab will bring up the
7 option to choose from files located in Teams, downloads,
8 or a cloud storage, which you can add by clicking below,
9 add cloud storage. For search convenience, files can be
10 arranged by type, name, modified, modified by, or
11 location. All you have to do is click on one of those
12 and your documents will alphanumerically organize
13 themselves.

14 You can also refresh the page by clicking the
15 circular arrow on the far right. Clicking the ellipses
16 in the far right will bring up the option to edit in
17 Teams, browser or desktop app, and the option to
18 download or even get the link.

19 Let's go back to the Teams tab now. Clicking on
20 the Teams tab will display all the Teams and channels
21 that you are either an owner, member or guest in. And
22 speaking of teams and channels, let's take a look at how
23 the workgroups are organized in Teams. Every team has a
24 general channel and every owner, member or guest of that
25 team has access to it.

1 As you can see in the yellow box, for the fall
2 2020 PPDC team, each workgroup also has its own channel.
3 The channel's privacy settings are such that only a
4 member of a given workgroup can access them.

5 Let's visit the general channel. First, select
6 the Teams left tab. This will bring up the teams that
7 you're a member of. Next, under the fall 2020 PPDC team
8 channel, the team and channel will be right there at the
9 top. So if you lose sight of where you're at, just look
10 up and you'll see it.

11 Looking at the top navigation panel now of this
12 page, you can see that we're in the general channel in
13 the Post tab. You can tell which tab that you're in
14 because the tab is purple while all the others are gray.
15 The types of things that you can expect to see in the
16 Post tab are added or deleted channels, added tabs,
17 added members, comments and chat, and meetings that have
18 occurred.

19 I'd like to bring your attention now to the top
20 right. You can click the camera icon that says "Meet"
21 to start a meeting. From there, you can invite other
22 participants, and I actually just noticed today when I
23 was in Teams that if you're in one of your teams or
24 groups, and someone else is holding a meeting, it
25 literally says across that screen, "Meeting Now." So if

1 you wanted to jump into the meeting with your team, you
2 could also do that.

3 At the bottom of the screen, you'll notice
4 there's a button that says, "New Conversation." You can
5 initiate chat in Post of any new conversation. As a
6 helpful hint, you can hit the @ symbol and start typing
7 the name of the person who you would like to have a
8 conversation with, and their name will come up and you
9 can select it and then type your conversation.

10 Let's take a look at how to upload a file.
11 We're now looking at the Files tab, and as you can see,
12 Files is now purple, and all of the other tabs at the
13 top are gray. So that lets you know that you're in the
14 Files tab.

15 I've highlighted three ways to add a file to a
16 channel. You can select a new dropdown to add a new
17 folder or document, you can select the upload dropdown
18 to upload a folder or file from your computer. You can
19 also drag and drop a file in the general space below,
20 but please note that you cannot drag and drop from
21 emails. If you have a document that's in an email, what
22 you're going to want to do is grab that document, drop
23 it on your desktop and then drag it over to the file.
24 So it is kind of an extra step, but it's a really small
25 one.

1 It looks like a document has been added to the
2 general channel. Let's open it. We've opened the
3 document in Teams and I've selected the editing dropdown
4 by selecting the pencil icon. From there, we can select
5 either editing or reviewing. Select editing to add
6 content and select reviewing to add content and show a
7 markup.

8 What you're looking at now are two ways to
9 communicate in a document. Comment, which is
10 highlighted in yellow, or Conversation, which is
11 highlighted in blue. So what's the difference? When
12 you select the Comment icon, those comments show up in
13 the document. When you select the Conversation icon,
14 your comments appear in the conversation in Teams.

15 So let's take a look at this conversation in
16 Teams. The conversation that I initiated in the
17 document using the Conversation icon has appeared in the
18 Post tab of the general channel. Note that every
19 channel has its own Post and File tabs so the post will
20 show up in the channel where the document is located.
21 You can also respond to a post as shown here, and as a
22 reminder, type the @ symbol to mention someone.

23 I also want to point your attention to some of
24 the types of the ways that you can respond. You have
25 the ability to attach items. You can respond with an

1 emoji. You can also actually have a meeting as a
2 response.

3 So this pretty much concludes some of the basic
4 things that I wanted to cover. And before I open it up
5 to questions, I just want to let you know that, again,
6 this is just an introductory presentation to help you
7 get a little bit familiar with Teams. In the future, we
8 will be providing more tutorials for you. I'll have
9 office hours just to help you get comfortable and feel
10 confident in using this platform.

11 MS. JEWELL: So, hey, Carla, it looks like there
12 are a couple of questions. Dr. Grzywacz asked, does a
13 file placed in channels make its way to files for the
14 general team that channel is a member of?

15 MS. THERIAULT: Does the file placed in channel
16 make it to the general team.

17 MS. JEWELL: Does a file placed in a channel
18 file make its way to the files for the general team?

19 MS. THERIAULT: Oh, okay. So the general
20 channel is a separate channel from your workgroups. And
21 so if you want something to show up in a specific
22 workgroup, then what you'll end up doing is going to
23 that workgroup and dropping the file in there.

24 MR. MESSINA: And, Carla, each workgroup has
25 places where they can collaborate on documents and that

1 would be in your Files tab, correct?

2 MS. THERIAULT: Correct. Correct. Every single
3 workgroup has its own channel, and, please, if I can go
4 back to that post so I can give you a visual on that.
5 Let's see. Yep. Okay. So what you see at the top
6 here, we're in the general channel, we've got Post,
7 Files, Wiki, and actually I didn't even bring this up,
8 so I'll go ahead and add that, too. I've added the PPDC
9 site to this team, but yes, every single channel, every
10 workgroup has its own channel, and these are what you're
11 going to see at the top of that channel.

12 MR. MESSINA: And then, Carla, when they do
13 meetings, will they be able to have video meetings?

14 MS. THERIAULT: Yes. Yes. This meeting
15 function up here, once you click on it, it does open up
16 to a meeting space. And from there, you can add
17 invitees to your meeting, you have the option to add
18 audio, you can add video. So yeah. And that, again,
19 that's in every single -- [technical difficulties] --
20 general channel. It's not going to show up in, say, the
21 emerging pathogens channel, for instance.

22 MR. MESSINA: Only, only show up there, it will
23 show up everywhere.

24 MS. THERIAULT: Right, it will show up in --

25 MR. MESSINA: Or the meeting at least with

1 respect to that team. Yeah.

2 MS. THERIAULT: Exactly.

3 MR. MESSINA: Great. All right, well, it's
4 3:31. Should we agree to wrap this up or did we have
5 other topic questions? And we are going to do a further
6 briefing for folks as well.

7 MS. JEWELL: It looked like Charlotte Sanson has
8 a quick question, Ed.

9 MR. MESSINA: Yeah, let's take that last
10 question.

11 MS. SANSON: Yeah, thanks, very quick. I think
12 a number of us have been using the Teams platform and
13 find it to be very useful, so I'm pleased to see that
14 you guys have explored this for PPDC. And you may have
15 said it and I missed it.

16 So I'm assuming that this would not be an option
17 for the PPDC meetings itself in the spring? Are we
18 looking at that as a platform to replace the Adobe
19 Connect?

20 MR. MESSINA: Great question. And I think we
21 can even talk about it in our next session. So, but
22 let's ask Professor Grzywacz his question, what about
23 sharing files in between teams?

24 MS. THERIAULT: Okay. So there's a couple of
25 different ways to answer that. If you want to share

1 files in between teams, you can simply upload the file
2 into that team's files. So if you see up here, again,
3 in this general channel where it says, "Files," every
4 channel or workgroup will have their own files. And so
5 you can take that document and add it, but you're not
6 going to be able to -- if you add something, say, for
7 emerging pathogens, you're not going to see that file in
8 the resistance management channel, right? But if you do
9 post the file in the general channel, then every member
10 of the PPDC team will have access to that file. Does
11 that make sense?

12 MR. MESSINA: Yeah, that does. Bottom line is,
13 great, thank you, Professor Grzywacz responded, and so
14 yes, there is options.

15 So, Charlotte, to answer your question, there's
16 Teams and then there's actually Teams Live, which is the
17 ability to do what we're doing here through Adobe
18 Connect, and Carla actually has been trained on it, and
19 we're thinking about using it for larger sessions. It's
20 hard to use Teams for large presentations like we're
21 doing today, when you have external members and you have
22 internal members and you're trying to handle almost 200
23 people, but there is a Microsoft Teams Live sort of app
24 which probably could handle it.

25 And I think, Carla, if you want to talk about,

1 you know, how Carla got trained on it, because we've
2 used it internally here as well, and I would trust Carla
3 and Shannon to tell me which platform they think might
4 be better to use for the main meeting. We did talk
5 about potentially using it for this meeting, but it just
6 seemed like to learn that tool and have this meeting we
7 thought maybe was just a little bit too big of a
8 technological leap which I am perfectly comfortable
9 with.

10 MS. THERIAULT: I honestly think Shannon might
11 have a better handle on that, the Teams Live. The
12 training that I've taken is not the Live training.

13 MS. JEWELL: Yeah. So I have had a couple of
14 trainings on the Teams Live, and it does have a webinar
15 function, and it's supposed to be really good for
16 groups -- well, Teams itself peaks out at about 250
17 participants, and then Teams Live, you can have up to
18 thousands, I believe, and that is absolutely the
19 platform we're looking to move toward in May and we're
20 hoping that it will have a lot more modern
21 functionality.

22 And so we are moving in that direction,
23 absolutely. And hopefully that will dovetail nicely for
24 everyone with using Teams in the workgroups and some of
25 the Teams functions can also be used for PPDC, the main

1 committee, but only for administrative items. So when
2 we're looking at very administrative -- just regular
3 day-to-day business of maintaining the group, then that
4 will be an option for us, too.

5 So hopefully the software will wrap around
6 really well and we will all get used to it, and we will
7 have it for a long time to come and we will all become
8 familiar with it and know it well.

9 MS. SANSON: Thanks.

10 MS. THERIAULT: Thank you.

11 MR. MESSINA: Great question. All right, are we
12 ready? We've kind of moved into our next session, which
13 is good, it's exactly the conversation I wanted to have
14 in this next session, which is how do we do things
15 better, what are some new technologies, what are
16 questions?

17 So the one crazy thought I had for May, and we
18 thought about doing it for this session, but it just
19 seemed like a little bit too hard to pull off, but I
20 wanted to chat with the group of sort of the possibility
21 of doing something like this. And we also wanted to
22 save time for phone Q on the Teams work and getting this
23 set up and getting the charge questions and forming the
24 teams. So I think in May, we'll definitely have some
25 report outs from the team.

1 So I think we can spend some time on that. But
2 I was wondering, you know, whether it might be good to
3 just hear from each of the individual members of the
4 PPDC, you know, maybe five to 10 minutes to have you
5 bring issues to the group that you would like EPA to be
6 aware of and provide an opportunity for each member
7 who's agreed to be on this, you know, particular effort,
8 which is great.

9 And we thank you for your work to really just
10 give folks the individual opportunity to talk about
11 things that are of interest to them, that they think
12 would be of interest for the group, and that, you know,
13 maybe some things that EPA is doing well, things that we
14 should improve on, you know, in terms of priority
15 setting and work, through the lens of each of your
16 organizations.

17 So I kind of throw that out there to the group,
18 take the pulse and see how folks feel about adding
19 something like that to our future May PPDC meeting,
20 which will include, of course, some report outs from the
21 workgroups.

22 So thoughts? I've got one yes. And the other
23 thing is, you know, maybe we split it up, which is, you
24 know, we try to do 10 folks each session or something,
25 so 20 folks at once or, you know, what's the -- we

1 wouldn't have to do everyone, but anyone who wants to
2 talk, we give them sort of the floor.

3 Damon is typing. So if you would like to chime
4 in and hit #6 and give us your thoughts, please feel
5 free to do that.

6 MR. RAEBE: Ed, I just have a comment. My
7 comment isn't necessarily for or against the concept, it
8 would be that if this is agreed upon by the PPDC, that
9 there be strict timelines forwarded and adhered to, and
10 I'm kind of thinking back to a presentation where Liza
11 gave a presentation on drones, as well as myself, and
12 then we had a gentleman from DroneSeed, we were told we
13 would get 10 to 12 minutes and we sat through about an
14 hour and 10-minute long presentation.

15 So I just want to make sure there are some
16 strict timelines that are understood if this is pursued,
17 so that we don't get ourselves in the midst of something
18 we maybe don't have time for.

19 MR. MESSINA: Yeah. Thanks, great. And I
20 struggled with this one, too. I want to give an
21 opportunity, but at the same time, I'm wondering how
22 useful it will be and I think time limits, you know, I
23 was thinking, you know, five to seven to 10 minutes, you
24 know, at most. But really just giving folks an
25 opportunity.

1 So I'm not hearing a resounding yes, I'm hearing
2 one yes and one question. So maybe it's a bad idea. It
3 wouldn't be the first bad idea I've had. I've got
4 people typing. Multiple attendees are typing.

5 Yeah, so, Dan, that was one thing I struggled
6 with, sort of three hours with the 30 to 40 members, so
7 maybe we just do a subset, you know, at each meeting.
8 You know, we pick maybe 10 folks and they can provide
9 input and conversation.

10 So, yeah, I think that's three hours of
11 comments, if we were going to do, you know, go around --
12 but maybe that's, you know, part of what we do, as part
13 of those sessions. And then when it makes sense to
14 do -- this to be a perspective group.

15 Christina, can you sort of expand on that, if
16 you want to unmute.

17 MS. JEWELL: Christina, you may need to press #6
18 to unmute.

19 MR. MESSINA: Oh, that's a great idea, Amy. So
20 perhaps a few minutes comments for stakeholder group and
21 you guys can decide who you want to designate as your
22 speaker, and this way we could, you know, rather than
23 having 35 people speak, we could kind of have folks talk
24 amongst themselves and see who they would like to
25 represent each group so we don't have 35 folks talking.

1 So that's a great idea. So we've got another
2 person who thinks it's a good idea.

3 All right, so, Shannon, while we're waiting for
4 comments to roll in on that, why don't we talk about --
5 if you don't mind, we can put up -- just kind of scroll
6 through that working groups and the charge questions we
7 developed for the Teams sessions, and then also I think
8 we could talk about maybe some dates for meeting up
9 again, and then what our agenda might look like for May.

10 MS. JEWELL: Right.

11 MR. MESSINA: I see comments agreeing with Dan
12 that three hours would be too much. And I should say
13 thank you, everyone, for hanging with us for the last
14 two days, keeping focus. I know this medium can
15 sometimes be challenging, but I think we've had some
16 engaging presentations and good conversations that you
17 guys are hanging out until the very end. So thank you.

18 Also, Shannon, have you received any requests
19 for folks to be on the workgroups yet and maybe you can
20 highlight some folks who have agreed to join.

21 MS. JEWELL: Hi, Ed, can you hear me?

22 MR. MESSINA: Yes, I can hear you now. I think
23 we're getting some traction around the stakeholder idea.
24 Yeah, so -- and we're getting some comments against the
25 three-hour session idea. So, yeah. I'm good with that.

1 All right, so I think what we'll do is on the
2 next agenda, when we send out a draft agenda and talk
3 about it, let's put some time on for stakeholder open
4 sessions, we'll call it, and then we'll try to identify
5 speakers in advance and who that might be.

6 So here's our -- we compiled in one slide deck,
7 thank you, Shannon, for doing this, the various charge
8 questions we had for the group. I just wanted to give
9 the PPDC one last chance to weigh in and say, yep, we
10 think these are the right questions or, you know, we
11 definitely need some refinement, and there will be some
12 time to do that.

13 So the lead here are resistance management
14 questions. I thought there were some good feedback on
15 this session. I think incentives. Oh, we had elements.
16 So thank you, Shannon, that's my recollection.

17 Does anyone have any things that we think we
18 missed in this sort of charge group here? And then you
19 can just find the next one.

20 MS. JEWELL: Can you queue that up?

21 MR. MESSINA: I can't. Emerging technologies?
22 You had another file on this, right? I think we had
23 some changes to this, or some additions.

24 MS. JEWELL: Do you mean the member statements
25 or perhaps I need to go and get something else on this

1 one. I'll go to the next slide for a moment.

2 MR. MESSINA: Yes, there they are. Oh, no,
3 that's the emerging pathogens. Yeah, I thought we added
4 a couple of bullets to the emerging technologies, so we
5 can work through those.

6 MS. JEWELL: Ed, we had many that we added
7 through the chat.

8 MR. MESSINA: Yes. So you haven't had the
9 chance to pull them into that. Oh, they're down there.
10 There they are, great, thank you. Thank you. All
11 right.

12 MS. JEWELL: And there are a couple of more
13 screens here, too. We had a lot come in the chat, so
14 just FYI.

15 MR. MESSINA: Yeah. You want to run through
16 them. Yeah, that's what I remember, there being more
17 than just the workers, we had the turf workers, yeah,
18 great. Okay. Next slide.

19 And the visual determinations for workers.
20 Okay, great, thank you. I feel like that captured what
21 I heard in that session. Please let us know if there's
22 any additional things or something -- anything that we
23 missed on the emerging technologies workgroup.

24 Okay, next workgroup. Can we look at slide 8.
25 I want to see workers slide 8, please. Daniel has a

1 comment. Sure, go ahead, Daniel.

2 MR. KUNKEL: Yeah, thanks, Ed. Can we go to
3 slide -- [technical difficulties] -- please. Can we go
4 to slide 9, please.

5 MR. MESSINA: Slide 9? Sure. I think where
6 I -- oh, there it is.

7 MR. KUNKEL: We're missing a comment I made
8 yesterday about making sure the technology isn't being
9 definitive to a certain platform, and I don't recall how
10 it was worded yesterday, the charge question.

11 MR. MESSINA: Um-hmm.

12 MR. KUNKEL: For the technology we're referring
13 to, that could be very beneficial to agriculture and the
14 environment, may or may not be operated by an
15 autonomously driven vehicle, whether that be a ground
16 sprayer or an aircraft.

17 MS. JEWELL: So you're saying it may be
18 beneficial to the environment, and I'll look that up as
19 well, Damon, but I want to make sure that I get it here.
20 May be beneficial to the environment, but may not be
21 autonomous?

22 MR. RAEBE: In other words, I'm just using
23 unmanned aerial vehicle versus manned early vehicles,
24 much of the benefit or at least the perceived benefit,
25 anyway, would be the autonomy of the spray system, but

1 the aircraft itself, whether it's driven by a computer
2 or a pilot, is maybe less relevant.

3 And I think some of it's covered in some of the
4 other charge questions, but I think it's an important
5 point that we don't bypass -- and again, I think it
6 applied to ground equipment. I think that spray systems
7 are separate from driving systems, if that makes sense.
8 And it would be if there are advantages to autonomous
9 spraying systems that can be retrofitted through driven
10 machinery, there may be a lot of advantages to that.

11 And so I know I made that point yesterday and I
12 didn't see where that fell into any of these charge
13 questions.

14 MS. JEWELL: I will double check to make sure we
15 have that one.

16 MR. MESSINA: Okay, great. Thanks. All right,
17 Shannon, when you're ready, we can go to the next
18 workgroup. And the emerging pathogens, I think we had
19 some good comments on this. Were there any additions
20 that you recall? I think we were -- that was a fairly
21 tight charge question.

22 MS. JEWELL: I think that Taja took notes, Ed,
23 and we will have the many, many comments in our
24 recordings, but we didn't have a lot of those copied
25 into the presenter chat, and so we just haven't had the

1 chance to transcribe them yet.

2 MR. MESSINA: Okay, great. And then the last
3 one is our farmworker. And I think similarly probably
4 captured some of the concepts and thoughts that were
5 talked about. Okay.

6 So moving on, Shannon, did you want to talk
7 about some possible dates? I thought you were
8 throwing -- I think the first thing that was thrown out
9 was October of next year a good date for the fall
10 session, and picking our May date or reminding folks of
11 the May dates. And were we thinking of having a Teams
12 kickoff worker meeting as well?

13 MS. JEWELL: Thanks. Yeah. So a couple of
14 controls date-wise for the next couple of meetings that
15 I know are clearer on the OPP end are potentially May
16 12th and 13th, and October -- I think it's 20th and
17 21st. So I wanted to throw out those dates out there
18 and then members, if there's any major opposition,
19 please let me know really quickly. Otherwise, we'll go
20 ahead and send out invitations for those dates.

21 And then, sorry, what was the second part of
22 your question, Ed?

23 MR. MESSINA: Workgroup timing and setting those
24 up. I think you were mentioning December dates
25 potentially.

1 MS. JEWELL: Okay. So if we have a deadline of
2 having -- or are you talking about for report outs or
3 for formation of groups? Kickoffs, right?

4 MR. MESSINA: Kickoffs, formations, yeah, when
5 folks wanted to sort of do that piece, and are we
6 leaving here with any workgroup folks? Like when is the
7 next training and then when are we going to, you know,
8 let folks start developing the tools, you know, having
9 meetings on their own. And the chairs will obviously
10 schedule meetings on their own, it's sort of giving them
11 access to the technology and when should folks sort of
12 expect that.

13 MS. JEWELL: So the chairs probably will set up
14 their own kickoff meetings. We're asking to have the
15 names of all of the applicants for the workgroups by
16 Wednesday, November 25th. So that would put us
17 somewhere in December, potentially even early January,
18 though hopefully December, having the -- those kickoff
19 meetings.

20 And for Teams and Teams training, Carla and I
21 will begin to offer trainings, probably in a similar
22 time frame. So we'll try to have our first training set
23 up within -- by the third week in November, so the week
24 before Thanksgiving we'll be looking on having those
25 invitations and holding those trainings.

1 MR. MESSINA: Great. Thanks. Any other
2 logistical items that you think we should cover,
3 Shannon?

4 MS. JEWELL: I don't think so. Did you want to
5 poll and see if folks have other ideas for the agenda,
6 given all the discussion we've had, for our May meeting.
7 I know sometimes after the discussions, the ideas of the
8 meetings tend to fade. So it would be great just to get
9 feedback on members on are there things that you're
10 currently thinking, here at the end of this meeting,
11 that you would really like to maybe have sessions on at
12 our next meeting.

13 MR. MESSINA: Yeah, great. You read my mind.
14 That is my next topic, and also how do you think the
15 meeting went, and what are some areas where we can
16 improve upon as part of that. So that's the two
17 remaining items I wanted to cover now that we've got
18 those logistics out of the way. And we can continue to
19 talk about any of these topics.

20 So, Carol Black would like to add CNT update on
21 plan reviews. Okay. I think -- so in our May session,
22 we have a dashboard, because I'm a big fan of visual
23 management, so we created a visual dashboard that
24 Carolyn's group tracks to see where folks and states are
25 doing on the CNT plan reviews, and I can report out that

1 we've received all the plans we were expecting. And,
2 you know, we had the federal plan that was out there.

3 So we can probably at the next session put a
4 topic on the agenda for CNT plan reviews if folks are
5 interested in hearing about that.

6 So topics for the spring and feedback for the
7 meeting. Please feel free to unmute your phone.

8 MR. FREDERICKS: Hi, Ed, Jim Fredericks here.

9 MR. MESSINA: Hey, Jim.

10 MR. FREDERICKS: I have a topic and then some
11 feedback. First, with regard to topics, I'd love to
12 learn more about EPA's progress with regard to online
13 illegal pesticide sales. That's something I think that
14 is really important and I know EPA is working on it and
15 it's a huge issue, so I'd love to learn a little more
16 about any efforts there, if that's appropriate.

17 And then with regard to feedback, for the
18 meeting, I know as well as anybody that online meetings
19 like this are really tough, but I do think that it would
20 be good to transition to a different platform, something
21 else. This feels like a -- it feels like the
22 conversation was stifled a little bit, and in general,
23 online meetings tends to be -- people are a little bit
24 more hesitant to speak out. But I felt like it was less
25 of a dialogue, less conversation than ever. And this

1 group generally is not very quiet.

2 And so I'm not sure -- I don't know that I have
3 an answer or a solution to that, but my take away was
4 that this was -- it feels like it was tough for folks to
5 really engage in a way that was more productive. So not
6 so much a criticism, but an observation. I know it's
7 tough. And that's my feedback.

8 MR. MESSINA: Yeah, no, I share that view. So I
9 think, Shannon, we can make a note to see if we can
10 invite our enforcement folks, and also you should be
11 seeing additional news on that front, too, Jim. And I
12 agree, I was -- I share your perspective. I was hoping
13 for more dialogue and more conversation and, you know,
14 we've got the chatbox going for a little bit.

15 So maybe here's something interesting. I
16 think -- I think, Shannon, we should really try to use
17 the Teams Live for the next session, and what's
18 interesting is I think even the fact that the teams that
19 are forming, the workgroups, will be using Teams, and
20 people maybe will be getting used to that platform. And
21 when they're getting used to that platform, they're used
22 to turning on their videos, they're used to
23 collaborating. Maybe some of that energy that comes
24 from the workgroups, we can capture and it will roll
25 into the PPDC meeting.

1 So I would advocate that it's probably time to
2 switch technologies, given Jim's comments. Thank you,
3 Jim.

4 MS. JEWELL: Yeah, thank you, Jim, and agreed.
5 Absolutely agreed.

6 MR. MESSINA: So Lori Ann has questions about
7 how EPA can recognize significant harms to human health
8 and still register pesticides. Yeah. I think that's a
9 topic that is on my mind, too, and I put this under the
10 risk communication sort of banner, if you will. And I
11 think that's something we should talk more about.
12 Because, you know, as an agency, when we do register,
13 you know, our pesticides, right, everything you register
14 is a cide, a C I D E. And so, you know, as an
15 environmental agency, we are registering these cides,
16 and they're needed, right?

17 I mean, I think we had the conversations about
18 COVID-19, I think no one is talking about getting rid of
19 disinfectants, I don't think anyone is talking about
20 getting rid of the public health benefits for disease
21 transmission, you know, for vectoring populations, for
22 mosquito populations, and then certainly the weed and
23 pesticide pressures that growers face every day.

24 So and the statutes dictate what EPA needs to do
25 in that evaluation, in showing no unreasonable harm.

1 And I hope DCA and all the regulatory language and the
2 ESA that the agency is tasked with complying with. And
3 from my estimation, I think the agency does a phenomenal
4 job in balancing these multiple interests, and then
5 navigating the statutory criteria that we are designed
6 to follow. And then, of course, balancing multiple
7 stakeholder interests.

8 And so we certainly aren't going to be making
9 everybody happy with our decisions, because we have
10 to -- we have to draw the line somewhere and it's based
11 on science. We have a number of safety factors that we
12 employ. We are a risk-based agency and risk-benefit based
13 agency. So if there is harm, we balance the risks of
14 the harm, and the benefits under FIFRA. And then when
15 we're talking about setting tolerances, we're looking at
16 no harm. And we do that by having, you know, multiple
17 10X factors, right? So there's not just one 10X factor
18 of safety, there's sometimes multiple factors of safety
19 that we employ.

20 And I think it's a valid sort of question to ask
21 the agency, you know, what does this risk picture look
22 like. How do you balance the risks here? When this
23 chemical is designed to do harm, how are you ensuring
24 that it isn't doing any harm and having unintended
25 consequences? And, you know, the risk profiles and the

1 analysis we do to make sure that a child who is playing
2 on a lawn that was immediately treated afterwards isn't
3 suffering any undue risk. And that kind of goes with
4 our models of how often is that particular sensitive
5 population going to be playing on that field and doing
6 what are called mouthing activities where they're
7 potentially putting their fingers in their mouth after
8 being on a treated surface.

9 So there's lots of science and protocols that go
10 into making those decisions, and I think it's a fair
11 appraisal to say that we could do a better job of
12 articulating how the agency balances those risks and
13 what those risks mean for individuals. And it is a risk
14 balancing. So sometimes the benefits on the FIFRA side
15 are going to outweigh the risks, and sometimes there are
16 going to be risks that we need to mitigate and we do so
17 on a label.

18 So I think it's a great question that I think --
19 so, Shannon, I would put that on the next agenda, which
20 is risk communication, maybe, and EPA decisionmaking
21 with regard to pesticides. And maybe even, you know,
22 there's a subset of -- I don't know if you want to call
23 them maybe they're sort of publicly known pesticides.
24 You know, we know what are on folks' minds, it's
25 dicamba, it's chlorpyrifos, it's glufosif, it's

1 atrazine, those tend to be the subset of the thousands
2 of chemicals that we regulate that folks are having
3 questions about.

4 So I think it's a great question.

5 MS. JEWELL: Great, so that's risk communication
6 and decisionmaking, correct?

7 MR. MESSINA: Yeah. And I think if you read
8 Lori Ann's comments, she's referring to -- she's calling
9 them controversial pesticides, I think that's a term you
10 could possibly use. Or I think they're maybe
11 high-visibility pesticides.

12 And then Lori Ann is referring to how -- you
13 know, why is the U.S. different from Europe? We might
14 want to -- that's a question I think we should answer.
15 So I think that's a good question. And we are
16 different, and there are reasons. So I'm happy to
17 entertain that.

18 And, Amy, if you have comments, feel free to
19 chime in.

20 So Lauren is saying -- thank you, Lauren, for
21 the shout-out. Appreciate it. Yep, that's a great
22 shout-out from Lauren. Thank you very much. And I'm
23 just making sure. Models also look great, complexity of
24 science, assumed behavior, multiple exposures, et
25 cetera. Those are some things to think about.

1 I think that -- so, you know, again, we get
2 questions about -- and we can add this to the topic, you
3 know, what about synergistic applications of pesticides,
4 what about multiple exposure routes, and I would say, as
5 a science-based agency, we are taking into account the
6 cumulative effects of the risk cup. We don't only look
7 at the active ingredient, but we also look to see if
8 there are synergistic effects and where we find
9 synergistic effects, which we haven't, as of yet, in
10 many cases, we definitely take a look at those. So
11 that's a great question.

12 So what's in the -- so are these the notes,
13 Shannon, that you're sharing on the white board?

14 MS. JEWELL: Yeah. I'm jotting down topics for
15 the next meeting here on the white board.

16 MR. MESSINA: Great. And so Mano echoes the
17 risk communication piece. So I think we're on to
18 something here, which is good.

19 Okay. Any other topics? So we'll definitely
20 doing the workgroup report outs. We'll definitely do a
21 stakeholder round robin. We'll keep it, you know, maybe
22 to an hour and a half and two hours for -- that will be
23 the max it will be for whoever wants to have a
24 stakeholder comment session for the benefit of the PPDC.
25 And then I think we can do risk communication and we can

1 talk about illegal pesticides. So we've got the
2 beginnings of a great agenda for May.

3 Dan is suggesting a couple of case studies as
4 part of that communication. I think that's a great
5 idea. We can show folks how that's done. I think, you
6 know, for folks on this call, you know that there are
7 many steps along the way where we receive public
8 comment, particularly for the registration decision
9 actions. You know, there's three or four times where
10 the public gets to comment on the draft risk assessment,
11 the proposed interim decision, you know, the dockets,
12 and then on the new active ingredients, noticing those
13 that are out there.

14 And then, of course, there's the petition
15 process, where folks can petition us to take a look at
16 pesticides on a cash basis. So the public involvement
17 piece I think is an important one, and we'll take
18 seriously.

19 Will there be additional opportunities to adjust
20 topics for the next PPDC meeting? So, Manojit, yes, I'm
21 not going to disappear, I have no plans to go to the
22 moon, and you can make your comments through the new
23 Teams site and we'll all have an opportunity to operate
24 using that. Yeah, sure, but now would be a great time
25 to get it on the agenda if you like.

1 All right. Any other comments or topics?
2 Comments on how this meeting went or what you would like
3 to see in the next one? And anything else anyone else
4 would like to talk about in the time we have left?

5 And then, Shannon, do you think there will be a
6 need for the public comment session?

7 MS. JEWELL: No.

8 MR. MESSINA: All right. So we might be able to
9 adjourn? All right, so why don't we give it until 4:15
10 and then we can let folks go.

11 MS. JEWELL: Okay, great. We did have a couple
12 of more questions here in the thread that I did want to
13 address, Ed. So Amy Asmus had asked if we were leaning
14 toward making the meeting virtual long term.

15 MR. MESSINA: At some point I would like to be
16 together in a room. I'm -- I just tend to feel like
17 we'll have a better dialogue that way. I think we
18 should shoot for that. At this point, it's too early to
19 say what May will hold. So I feel like we'll probably
20 plan for a virtual meeting for May, and if we guess
21 wrong, we guess wrong, I think in the safer direction.
22 So let's just say at least for May, we're thinking
23 virtually.

24 MS. JEWELL: And Christina has a question about
25 whether I could introduce the defined stakeholder groups

1 by email. I'm not sure what that means, I'm afraid.
2 I'm wondering if maybe you could unmute and let me know.

3 MS. STUCKER-GASSI: Can you hear me?

4 MS. JEWELL: Yep.

5 MR. MESSINA: Your computer is giving us echo,
6 you might want to turn it down.

7 MS. STUCKER-GASSI: Yeah, I've got it.
8 Specifically, I recall that appointment to this body had
9 some certain defined stakeholder groups and I'm curious
10 if there has been the opportunity for those stakeholder
11 groups to have submeetings. I don't know how that could
12 be facilitated or if it's even happened or it's
13 something that we could look into if it hasn't, but an
14 idea I definitely wanted to bring up.

15 MS. JEWELL: Oh, after you, please.

16 MR. MESSINA: No, please.

17 MS. JEWELL: I want to make sure I understand
18 the question. So you're asking if the various members,
19 say from the registrant group, have had independent
20 meetings? I'm not hearing you if you're answering, but
21 I also, I don't know that that's happened. That's not
22 something I'm familiar with.

23 MR. MESSINA: And my response would be certainly
24 if folks want to meet outside of the PPDC to get
25 together on their own, that's something that we're not

1 going to prohibit. So feel free to meet with your
2 colleagues as you see fit. For purposes of PPDC, we do
3 have the defined workgroups that we're going to be
4 supporting with sort of the logistics around that. But
5 as everyone on the PPDC will have the general chat
6 functions, certainly the PPDC members will be able to
7 collaborate as a group as well. So hopefully that
8 answers your question.

9 MS. JEWELL: Thanks, Ed, and then also, yeah, I
10 did want to mention, too, with regards to the Federal
11 Advisory Committee Act, this being a federal advisory
12 committee, there are relatively strict rules that govern
13 the groups and the meetings of the groups. And so any
14 major motions of this committee are held or voiced
15 during public meetings such as this one.

16 And so while working group meetings might not be
17 open to the public, all of the products that would be
18 put forward to the agency will always be discussed in a
19 public meeting, such as this one. And so there are
20 working groups which are considered a tier 3 committee,
21 a more formal group, subcommittees, which are called a
22 tier 2 committee, and then the full PPDC as a tier 1
23 committee.

24 So we don't currently have any subcommittees,
25 but we are forming these working groups. And the

1 working groups, again, all of their work will pass
2 through the full committee in a public meeting before
3 it's recommended to the agency. And so groups like the
4 various perspectives would be very independent of FACA.
5 Thank you.

6 MR. MESSINA: Thank you, Shannon.

7 All right. I think we may be done. What do you
8 think, Shannon?

9 MS. JEWELL: I think --

10 MR. MESSINA: Can I close us out here?

11 MS. JEWELL: I think so, yeah. Thank you so
12 much, everyone, for participating, and if you have
13 additional feedback, please, please, please send it. We
14 really do consider all of your feedback and we do
15 appreciate it. And we are really glad that you've come
16 here to be part of this today and to partner with us in
17 a cooperative way and have these conversations. So
18 that's it for me. Thank you so much, and thank you, Ed.

19 MR. MESSINA: Thank you, and a round of
20 applause, Shannon and Carla and others, Jeremy, behind
21 the scenes, who made this meeting successful. All of
22 the -- not even just running the meeting, but all the
23 documents and the preparation and the briefings that
24 happened beforehand and the outreach. It was an amazing
25 list, and you did an amazing job. So congratulations,

1 team.

2 Thank you, everyone, for your comments and your
3 feedback and for agreeing to serve on this committee.
4 As you know, and hopefully as evidenced by Alex being
5 here and my attendance, we really take this seriously.
6 We want your feedback. We're not always going to agree,
7 and that's okay, but I think it's important that we
8 continue to listen and our feet are grounded in the
9 realities that exist outside the walls of EPA and we're
10 taking your feedback.

11 So stay safe, hopefully your families are doing
12 well during this current crisis, and again, if you have
13 any concerns, questions, or needs from OPP, hopefully
14 you'll pick up the phone or send us an email and give us
15 a shout. So, thank you, everyone, and take care.

16 (Whereupon, at 4:16 p.m., the meeting was
17 adjourned.)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25