





























































staff within the Environmental Fate and Effects Division to determine if further data and analysis are needed to account for potential risks through inhalation.

**Aquatic Life Benchmarks:** In response to requests from FIFRA state lead agencies and state water quality agencies, EPA published 112 additional “benchmark” values for pesticides that can be used to interpret monitoring data and to identify and prioritize sites for further monitoring. The benchmarks, which are based on the most sensitive aquatic toxicity data, are estimates of the concentrations below which pesticides are not expected to harm aquatic life. The Agency has made benchmark values for 260 pesticides available to the public by posting them on its [Aquatic Life Benchmark](#) Web site and has developed a public docket providing easier access to the full ecological risk assessments for these pesticides. The Aquatic Life Benchmarks have been used by federal agencies, states, and others in interpreting monitoring data and in planning future monitoring efforts. EPA plans to update the webpage and accompanying docket annually, and to add to the number of chemicals represented. Information concerning these benchmarks can be found at the following web site:

[http://www.epa.gov/oppfead1/cb/csb\\_page/updates/2007/aquatic-life.htm](http://www.epa.gov/oppfead1/cb/csb_page/updates/2007/aquatic-life.htm).

**OPP/OW Harmonization of Aquatic Life Assessments:** In response to concerns raised by states and other stakeholders, EPA’s Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) together with the Office of Water (OW) and the Office of Research and Development (ORD) developed documents that describe their initial thinking on a harmonized approach for assessing aquatic toxicity data in OPP and OW. In FY 2010, the three offices held six regional stakeholder meetings to solicit input from the public regarding methods, tools, and approaches for developing a consistent and common set of effects characterization methods for both programs. After the regional stakeholder meetings, the three EPA offices developed three white papers that explored methods for estimating aquatic toxicity data, approaches for deriving community-level benchmarks, and procedures for better integrating plant effects into community-level assessments. These white papers were presented at a national stakeholders meeting in Washington, D.C. on December 1, 2010. Input from the regional and national meetings will be used to develop an OPP/OW harmonized approach for assessing aquatic toxicity data. Additional information about this topic is available on the following web site:

[www.epa.gov/oppfead1/cwa\\_fifra\\_effects\\_methodology/index.html](http://www.epa.gov/oppfead1/cwa_fifra_effects_methodology/index.html)

**Drift Reduction Technologies:** In FY 2010, the pesticide program continued to work with EPA’s National Risk Management Research Laboratory (NRMRL) to identify and verify effective pesticide spray drift reduction technologies (DRTs). Under the Environmental and Sustainable Technology Evaluation (ESTE) program, EPA developed a draft verification protocol (DRT). The DRT testing protocol was adapted from standard test methods and regulatory methods used in other countries and describes the testing approach that will be used to generate high-quality, peer-reviewed data for DRTs, including test design and quality assurance aspects. Both low-speed and high-speed wind tunnel tests were completed this year using a reference nozzle and two test nozzles to evaluate the performance of the generic DRT testing protocol. By the summer of 2011, EPA plans to finalize this testing protocol based on the test results attained by EPA and stakeholders. As a next step, EPA intends to encourage equipment manufacturers to voluntarily use the protocol for testing their equipment. Additional information is available on the following web site: [http://www.epa.gov/etop/etc\\_at\\_psd.html](http://www.epa.gov/etop/etc_at_psd.html).

**Atrazine Monitoring Issues:** In April 2010, OPP scientists participated in a FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel meeting that focused on issues related to the Agency's review of mammalian *in vivo* and *in vitro* studies and approaches for evaluating drinking water monitoring frequency for atrazine. During the meeting, OPP scientists presented their approaches for evaluating water sampling strategies and frequency of monitoring, and statistical evaluation of sampling performance for estimating maximum concentrations of atrazine of different durations. They also presented the agency's artificial neural network modeling of atrazine occurrence patterns. Other issues that were presented and a summary of the meeting can be found at the following web site: <http://www.epa.gov/scipoly/sap/meetings/2010/091410meeting.html>.

In FY 2010, the Agency continued its efforts to incorporate tools in its aquatic risk and exposure assessments that will enable the Agency to identify specific geographic spatially explicit locations where risks may occur. As part of this effort, the Agency acquired and developed data, including the national-level SSURGO (Soil Survey Geographic) soils data, updating its land use data with the 2007 NLCD (National Land Cover Database), and deriving hydrograph data sets from the national NHD (National Hydrography Dataset) – as well as improving its tools to provide more accurate and relevant information about the potential effects of pesticides in the environment. These data and tools, which are being used in the Agency's risk assessments, allow EPA to more quickly identify the landscapes and water bodies that are most vulnerable to pesticide impacts on drinking water sources and on aquatic species, including endangered species. EPA plans to expand the use of these tools and data to endangered species assessments in 2011.

#### **Human Health Risk Assessments**

**Science review committees.** The Residues of Concern Knowledgebase Subcommittee (ROCKS) continues to lead the application of predictive [Tox 21 tools](#) for metabolites, residues, and environmental degradation products. In calendar year 2010, the Dose Adequacy Review Team (DART) met eighteen times on seventeen different chemicals. The Cancer Assessment Review Committee (CARC) met seven times on numerous chemicals, and the Toxicology Science Advisory Council (ToxSAC) met thirteen times in order to discuss and determine end-points of concern on thirteen different chemicals.

**Integrative Testing and Assessment:** A NAFTA Joint [Integrative Testing and Assessment \(IATA\)](#) Project has been formalized to include use of computational tools such as (Q)SAR and MetaPath. Included in this NAFTA project is the development of a guidance document for use of (Q)SAR in pesticide risk assessments. This is an on-going project which includes collaboration between EPA, PMRA, and FDA. The [MetaPath project](#) has been formally adopted as an OECD joint project under the Pesticide Working Group. A MetaPath Users Group (MUG) has been established to further explore opportunities to use MetaPath in global pesticide risk assessments and continue its database development, along with the customization of the MetaPath DER Composer. Current international collaborators include: Health Canada, PMRA, the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), the Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines Authority (APVMA), France, and Germany.

Many other projects reported in the FY 2009 report continued in FY 2010.

## **Other Activities**

### **Use of Outside Reviewers**

The Agency continued its work-sharing efforts with Canada's PMRA, APVMA, and the European Union (EU). In global and joint reviews, EPA makes its own registration decision while sharing the study reviews and the risk assessment work and harmonizing its regulatory decisions with other national authorities. One new conventional active ingredient was registered in FY 2010 after a global review and ten others were in review. Six actions were completed as work-share projects with PMRA in FY 2010. In addition, Japan and Brazil began participating in the joint review process, increasing the number of joint review partners. Eight new biopesticide active ingredient joint PMRA/EPA reviews were pending at the end of FY 2010. An additional five are expected to begin in FY 2011.

In FY 2010, PMRA and EPA also implemented a work-share process for minor uses for those chemicals/crops that can not be completed as a joint review. Three minor use actions on six commodities were completed as part of the NAFTA work-share program. Two joint reviews were completed in FY 2010 for seven commodities. Nine additional active ingredient minor use chemicals (11 commodities) are expected to be evaluated under the NAFTA joint review program and four chemicals (6 commodities) are expected to be evaluated as work-share projects.

The Biopesticides and Pollution Prevention Division developed an internal Standard Operating Procedure for its staff on various aspects of the joint review process and how to approve a NAFTA label and established a work plan for these reviews. The document, "Updated Procedures for the Joint Review of Biopesticides" will inform applicants and other interested groups about the joint review process for microbial and biochemical pesticides.

EPA also continued working with the California Department of Pesticide Regulation (CDPR) to expand capacity to review residue chemistry studies and conduct dietary risk assessments in support of registration decisions. In FY 2010, CDPR reviewed the residue chemistry studies for two active ingredients and 10 representative commodities or crops.

### **Performance-Based Contracts**

Contractors tasked with the review of hazard and exposure data continued to assist the Agency in the selection of endpoints and characterization of hazards for human health and ecological risk assessment. These contractor services enhanced the production of the Agency's risk assessments. The level of contractor support in FY 2010 was approximately the same as in past fiscal years under PRIA 2, and approximately 80% of the Pesticide Program's active contracts or work assignments were performance-based, the same as FY 2009. Performance based contracts tend to be contracts with routine and predictable work assignments. Areas covered by these contracts include information management, records management, on-site computer leasing and support, outreach, and as appropriate, data review and risk assessment.

**Table I – PRIA Funded Pesticide Safety Education & Worker Protection Activities FY 2010**

<b>Recipient &amp; Mechanism</b>	<b>Activity and Accomplishments</b>	<b>FY 2010 PRIA Funds</b>
<p><b>U.S. Department of Agriculture</b> - interagency agreement to pass funds to state cooperative extension services</p>	<p>PRIA funds provide partial support for state level pesticide applicator safety training (classroom, manuals, on line media) to develop competency for existing and future certified pesticide applicators in using restricted use pesticides safely. The training focuses on a population of applicators (approximately 900,000 commercial and private applicators) who can suffer high exposure and risk themselves, or subject others to high exposure and risk, if not trained to meet competency standards that help ensure safe pesticide applications.</p> <p>Through an interagency agreement with USDA, we transferred funds to state cooperative extension programs. The funds are distributed by formula based on the numbers of certified applicators reported by the states. With \$800,000 in appropriated funds and \$500,000 in PRIA funds, the national total to help support this activity was \$1,300,000. The funds were allocated to state cooperative extension services by formula based on the number and type of certified applicators reported by the state regulatory agencies. The PRIA funding provides every state extension program with predictable additional resources to support their programs and help ensure that pesticide applicators receive adequate training to competently use restricted-use pesticides.</p>	<p>\$500,000</p>
<p><b>U.S. Department of Labor</b> - interagency agreement</p>	<p>PRIA monies funded the analysis of data and development of focused reports on the National Agricultural Workers Survey (NAWS), which contains the most comprehensive demographic information on agricultural workers.</p> <p>To assist with worker regulatory development and risk assessments, questions were developed on worker exposure for inclusion in the next extensive NAWS survey. PRIA funds help support the development of pesticide worker safety survey questions for the National Agricultural Workers Survey, as well as focused reports from the survey that aid in regulatory development and training materials development.</p>	<p>\$100,00</p>
<p><b>Association of Farmworker Opportunity Programs (AFOP)</b> - cooperative agreement</p>	<p>PRIA funds support a variety of the national affiliates of AFOP for pesticide worker safety training, education and outreach for farmworkers and farmworker families. This work increases protection for communities with environmental justice issues. These communities have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a potential for high pesticide exposure, high risk</li> <li>• low literacy, non-English speakers, low income</li> <li>• high mobility</li> <li>• children at risk from take-home exposure</li> </ul> <p>A cooperative agreement with AFOP (supported by PRIA funds) helps support the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project HOPE (Health and Outreach with Pesticide Education). AFOP has trained over 250 farm worker community outreach workers at 22 sites around the country on how to conduct pesticide worker safety training. These outreach workers are a main source of free safety training for workers.</li> </ul>	<p>\$410,000</p>

**Table I – PRIA Funded Pesticide Safety Education & Worker Protection Activities FY 2010**

Recipient & Mechanism	Activity and Accomplishments	FY 2010 PRIA Funds
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project SAFE (Saving American Farmworkers Everywhere). Through an EPA / AFOP / AmeriCorps Program, AFOP trains AmeriCorps members as pesticide worker safety trainers. AmeriCorps members work in 15 AFOP affiliate sites and conduct hands-on, interactive training for farm workers and their families. Often the AmeriCorps members are adult children of migrant farm workers.</li> <li>• Project LEAF (Limiting Exposures Around Families). In response to research demonstrating higher levels of pesticides in farm workers’ children and the effectiveness of simple mitigation measures, AFOP is delivering a program to prevent take-home pesticide exposure to farm worker children.</li> <li>• Spanish Radio Campaign to Protect Farmworker Children. AFOP works with Hispanic Communications Network to create a variety of radio messages on how to prevent pesticide exposure to farm worker children. The national radio campaigns, aimed at farm worker parents, cover 245 Spanish language radio stations that reach over 14 million listeners.</li> <li>• The Building Bridges Program. AFOP has partnered with Farmworker Justice to develop a project to assess pesticide safety training programs and other pesticide worker protection programs in Florida. The project works with key farm worker, grower and state stakeholder groups to develop model pesticide safety training programs to be used by farmers or agricultural service organizations.</li> <li>• Students Action with Farmworkers (SAF). AFOP worked with SAF (Duke University) to train 75 interns on how to conduct interactive pesticide safety education for farm workers and farm worker families.</li> </ul>	
<b>Abt, Associates - contract</b>	<p>Abt Associates, through an EPA contract, is conducting economic cost/benefit analyses and other regulatory analyses that are necessary to support the proposed amendments to the agricultural worker protection regulation and the pesticide applicator certification rule. Because of Executive Order requirements, Paperwork Reduction Act, and the Regulatory Flexibility Act, these analyses are required to quantify cost and benefits of the proposed regulatory changes.</p> <p>Abt provided analyses that supported the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act (SBREFA) panel analysis and report and developed new methodology to assess the benefits to be realized from the regulations’ amendments. Their new methodology will be used in this analysis. Planned work includes aggregating the line item costs into total societal costs, performing sensitivity analyses and addressing the various regulatory analyses required by executive order and the Regulatory Fairness Act (RFA).</p>	\$490,000
	<b>2010 Total</b>	<b>\$1,500,000</b>



**Table II – Partnership Grants – Funding and Accomplishments**

FY 2008 – Partnership Grants (approximately \$970K in grants (\$750K in PRIA2 fees and additional appropriated funds) to fund five projects FY 2008 projects ran from October 2008 to September 2010)		
Recipient	Project Title and Accomplishments	Funding
California Department of Pesticide Regulation (Sacramento, CA):	<p><b>“Reducing Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Pesticide Use in Nuts and Tree Fruit Orchards in California’s San Joaquin Valley.”</b></p> <p>This two-year project, concluded in September 2010, applied PRIA funds to a reduction of pesticides in surface water runoff and volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions from almond, peach, and walnut orchards in California. Funding supported a multi-agency and grower group team of 12 organizations as project partners, project team meetings, development of a new <a href="#">Conservation Management Practices guide (CMP)</a>, development and demonstration of a Web-based “VOC Calculator” to end users. Team members gave seventeen presentations to over 500 farmers on how to use the CMP in conjunction with year-round IPM plans to reduce VOC emissions and pesticides in water runoff. They distributed 3700 copies of the CMP to 14 sites including California state and county agencies, USDA, and grower associations. Nineteen sessions to over 750 attendees demonstrated the use of the Web-based <a href="#">VOC Emissions Calculator</a> for nonfumigant agricultural-use pesticides. The potential benefit of the CMP guide and VOC Calculator will extend to over 300,000 acres in California producing almonds, peaches, and walnuts.</p>	\$159,494
IPM Institute of North America (Madison, WI)	<p><b>“High-level IPM in All U.S. Schools by 2015.”</b></p> <p>This ongoing project supports establishing and verifying the adoption of integrated pest management (IPM) in public kindergartens through high schools across the country. This project promotes increased use of IPM tools by teaching IPM managers about pest biology, inspection and monitoring for both pests and pest-conducive conditions, and prevention through education, sanitation, and maintenance techniques. Two new measures (cockroach allergen levels and student absenteeism) will help evaluate the effectiveness of pest management practices. A national network of four regional work groups established 13 school demonstration sites (affecting 19,365 staff and 139,398 students) in seven states to promote IPM. The project’s initial goal of establishing four new self-expanding coalitions to further expand IPM resulted in 13 new state coalitions (affecting 13,287 staff and 244,745 students). Work on identifying and measuring allergens in schools is continuing, as is an effort to build a network database of contacts that presently includes over 11,000 administrators, teachers, facility and grounds, food service, health care, and school business professionals. As a result of PRIA funding, IPM measures are now in place at a growing number of new school locations.</p>	\$250,000

<b>Table II – Partnership Grants – Funding and Accomplishments</b>		
<p>University of Florida, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (Gainesville, FL)</p>	<p><b>“Reduced Pesticide Use for <i>Bermisia tabaci</i> and Greenhouse Whiteflies (GHWF) on Greenhouse Tomato using Protected Culture, IPM Techniques, Parasitic Wasps, and Papaya Banker Plants.”</b></p> <p>PRIA funds are promoting research, education, and adoption of a biological pest management system that reduces use of pesticides in greenhouses. Banker plants serve as a home base for parasitic wasps and predatory arthropods. In the case of Papaya banker plants, wasps feed on whiteflies, which are greenhouse pests of tomato plants. To achieve the project goal of demonstrating efficacy and adoption into production greenhouses, the presence of other pest species necessitated incorporation of additional biocontrol systems. The biocontrol of whiteflies is now being coordinated with the use of an expanded suite of similar banker plant biocontrol methods for aphids, mites, and thrips. Funds support demonstrating IPM approaches for controlling these pests and mitigating the spread of viral diseases using banker plants in greenhouses at five vegetable grower demonstration sites in Florida (4 cooperator owned, 1 University). Participants installed unique banker plant systems for mites, thrips and aphids, successfully demonstrating the banker plant approach. The project’s success and outreach efforts have prompted University Extension agents to request development of systems for homeowners to help manage pest arthropods in vegetable gardens and landscapes. The potential impact for future use of biocontrols in tomato production includes greenhouse grown tomatoes representing 17% of the fresh market volume and 37% of grocery store sales in the United States.</p>	<p>\$246,418</p>
<p>Michigan State University (East Lansing, MI)</p>	<p><b>“Increasing Adoption of Reduced-Risk Pest Management Practices in Midwest Blueberries to Prepare for FQPA Implementation.”</b></p> <p>PRIA funds helped prepare the Great Lakes’ blueberry industry for the phase-out of an organophosphate pesticide, azinphos-methyl (AZM), by increasing the adoption of reduced-risk alternatives and IPM methods. This two-year project, concluded September 2010, demonstrates the greater rain-fastness of alternative pesticides when compared to AZM. Thus, use of the alternatives leads to reductions in the number of pesticide applications during the growing season. Demonstration control programs at four commercial blueberry farms in Michigan successfully replaced AZM and pyrethroid based insecticides with reduced-risk alternative pesticides, achieving comparable or better control. Each year, workshops on IPM approaches were presented to groups of 50 to 75 attendees (including growers, crop consultants, and industry representatives). The weekly newsletter, <i>The Blueberry IPM Update</i>, had over 250 subscribers during each growing season. The Michigan Blueberry IPM Update Web page also updated project information for its readers. The Fruit and Vegetable Expo in Grand Rapids, Michigan offered the region’s blueberry growers presentations of project results in 2009. Participants at the North American Blueberry Research and Extension Workers meeting also saw results from this research and education project. The impacts of this project continue as the principal investigators present talks on Blueberry IPM in 2011 at industry-led grower meetings, the next Fruit and Vegetable Days, and at the MSU Horticulture</p>	<p>\$91,508</p>

**Table II – Partnership Grants – Funding and Accomplishments**

	Days.	
<p>Central Coast Vineyard Team (CCVT) (Paso Robles, CA):</p>	<p><b>“Reducing Pesticide Risk through the Adoption of Integrated Farming Practices in Central Coast Vineyards and Marketing Certified Sustainable Products.”</b></p> <p>PRIA funding initiated the adoption and implementation of IPM practices through CCVT’s grower self assessment and the “Sustainability in Practice Vineyard Certification Program (SIP).” The program is now fully operational: for 2010 the results of 86 Self Assessments were sent back to participating growers. Funds also supported field research to demonstrate effective alternatives to pesticides currently used in vineyards. Participants installed 200 Argentine ant bait stations at four grower-cooperator research stations and worked with a grower cooperator to implement an IPM bait-station strategy to control mealybugs. CCVT delivered outreach programs to educate and guide growers on the use of integrated farming systems using “Certified Sustainable Standards” and educated the public and wine trade about the environmental and economic benefits of products that are “Certified Sustainable.” As a result, SIP™ Certified labeled wines are a growing presence in the marketplace. Each label is evidence that IPM and stewardship practices are in use, growing grapes for wine. The team conducted workshops on pest identification (attended by 100 Spanish speaking participants) and training sessions in support of the SIP. Initially, twenty new vineyards applied to the SIP certification program in 2009. During 2010, CCVT engaged in outreach events with some 260 participants, including a Vineyard Pest and Disease Seminar, workshops on Irrigation and Water Management, Biodiversity and Conservation in the Vineyard, and an Oak Habitat Conservation Field Day. CCVT also worked with a bait-station grower-cooperator and other organizations to host a field day on ant and mealybug control. While this two year project ended in September 2010, the impact of PRIA funding continues as SIP reaches a broader audience.</p>	<p>\$225,000</p>

**Table II – Partnership Grants – Funding and Accomplishments**

**FY 2009 – Partnership Grants**  
 (approximately \$1.3 million awarded (\$750K in PRIA 2 Fees with additional funds from EPA’s Office of the Science Advisor) to fund six projects,  
 FY 2009 projects run from October 2009 to September 2011)

Recipient	Project Title and Accomplishments	Funding
University of California (Berkeley, CA)	<p><b>“Implementing reduced risk alternatives for management of codling moth in walnuts”</b></p> <p>This ongoing project includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) a resistance management program for navel orangeworm and codling moth in walnuts;</li> <li>2) reducing organophosphate and pyrethroid insecticide use by over 50%; and</li> <li>3) demonstrating the effective use of a biopesticide (a pheromone that interferes with moth mating habits), currently used for apples, to replace azinphos methyl and other pesticides commonly used in growing walnuts. A reduction in the use of these pesticides also addresses concerns about water quality and runoff and resistance management in relation to controlling codling moth. Field research has been expanded to include three more cooperating partners, making a total of six orchards located in two different growing regions of California.</li> </ol> <p>Future impacts will come with:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) the final development and registration of new pheromone delivery options for walnuts, currently grown on 240,000 acres in the US,</li> <li>2) an increase in adoption in terms of total acres of walnuts using pheromone mating disruption, and</li> <li>3) a corresponding reduction in use of organophosphates and pyrethroids in walnut systems.</li> </ol>	\$249,687
University of Wisconsin (Madison, WI)	<p><b>“Expanding and Improving the Use of IPM in Midwest Fruit Production”</b></p> <p>PRIA funds are supporting adoption of IPM practices for apples, cherries, and grapes in Wisconsin and other nearby states to address water quality and runoff issues. The project team has trained 55 participants, including new IPM coaches, in how to use low-cost modifications to airblast sprayers to help growers in Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois, and Iowa use pesticides more efficiently and to reduce drift, risk, and water runoff. Impacts of the training will be assessed through a survey that compares prior year pesticide use to use in the year following the training. Up to 20 new coaches will be trained each year. In past performance this grantee has shown that adding new coaches leads to a reduction in pesticide risk by 50% and increased IPM adoption by 78% within 3 years. An extensive, four part IPM training course is under development for the second year of the project. This training promotes the use of reduced risk pesticides as well as biopesticides and pheromone technologies and will help growers and the Natural Resources Conservation Service with their IPM and Conservation Activity Plans for specialty fruit crops.</p>	\$202,027

<b>Table II – Partnership Grants – Funding and Accomplishments</b>		
Baltimore City Health Department (Baltimore, MD)	<p><b>“Safe Pest Management for Health (SPMH): An Initiative to Reduce Community Pesticide Use, Increase Integrated Pest Management (IPM), and Improve Environmental Health in Baltimore Through Public and Private Partnerships”</b></p> <p>PRIA funds are supporting use of multiple IPM approaches that improve human health by controlling pests in residences, schools, day care facilities, and homeless service centers in Baltimore, Maryland. The Baltimore City Health Department is developing IPM training and site plans for target sites; developing and administering the nation’s first IPM subsidization program for low-income families; coordinating pest control with six partner organizations; and implementing an educational IPM program for Baltimore’s Latino community. They have leveraged their funds using a separately funded weatherization program to further incorporate IPM into urban structures. This project is ongoing and will train 5,450 persons (including, residents and city staff) and anticipates up to 75% reduction in pesticide uses. First year accomplishments include training for 400 city employees, action plans provided to 30 school sites, training for 275 school staff members, training for 25 weatherization assessors and contractors, completion of a model for subsidized IPM services for pest control to low-income families, 215 Latino community members trained in IPM, and 775 of the planned 2000 home visitations for IPM education.</p>	\$250,000
The Pennsylvania State University (University Park, PA)	<p><b>“Collaborative Design &amp; Delivery of a Unified Training Platform for IPM in Buildings.”</b></p> <p>PRIA funds support a Penn State project to increase IPM in urban structures through a pilot training program and a collaborative network of housing entities in the Philadelphia metropolitan area that perform contract work in housing and commercial and public buildings. Funds support the development of educational modules for “IPM in Buildings;” first for the Philadelphia area and later for dissemination nationally via an internet-based training program. The modules, designed for service providers and their clients, address IPM in diverse building types and management systems. The ongoing pilot program will train 80 owners, 500 health outreach professionals, and 400 occupants. Accomplishments to date include successfully completing 5 cycles of the Urban IPM training for 60 entry-level employees (10 of whom are now IPM technicians and practitioners for local pest management companies in low-income neighborhoods of Philadelphia). A series of educational programs and materials were developed to educate students, parents, and building staff and management on bed bug control as part of a Penn State Campus IPM Team-initiated Centre County Bed Bug Coalition. To date, 60 people involved in housing on &amp; off campus were educated through the Coalition. IPM training for School Facilities Managers resulted in 25 individuals educated to deal with bed bugs and to use this information to support Pennsylvania laws mandating IPM education in public schools. To date 20 Community Health Workers have received IPM training. Additional training for community housing is planned.</p>	\$249,770
University of Rhode Island (Kingston, RI)	<p><b>“ Web-Based Decision Support Tools for Risk-Appropriate Tick-Bite Protection and Disease Prevention”</b></p>	\$142,320

**Table II – Partnership Grants – Funding and Accomplishments**

	<p>Ticks are the main vectors for some of the most common vector-borne diseases affecting people in the U.S. Many effective tick control and tick-bite prevention strategies exist, but few effective decision support tools are available to guide people at risk in taking risk-appropriate actions. Funded by Advanced Monitoring Initiative funds (AMI funds from the Office of the Science Advisor), this project will develop a suite of unique, multi-media health promotion tools with customized action plans to support decisions for preventing tick-transmitted infections such as Lyme disease, human babesiosis, and human anaplasmosis. Expected products include a Tick Encounter risk calculator for homeowners and state and local decision-makers, which gives a quantitative measure of risk and tailored guidelines for minimizing and preventing risk, and training programs in Rhode Island and Massachusetts. As a result of this program, investigators expect to build homeowner demand for high quality, least toxic tick control. New IPM practices can be implemented at homes and in public areas.</p>	
<p>Washington University (St. Louis, MO)</p>	<p><b>“Landscape Design Guidelines for Mitigating Human Risk of Exposure to Lone-Star Tick-Associated Pathogens”</b></p> <p>Funded by Advanced Monitoring Initiative funds (AMI funds from the Office of the Science Advisor), this interdisciplinary study examines the consequences of landscape change on the emergence of tick-borne diseases in the St. Louis, MO metropolitan area. The objective is to explicitly quantify the effects of environmental changes on human health, and directly compare the level of risk between landscapes with varying degrees of man made change. Data will be integrated in a Geographic Information Systems framework to quantify the impacts of specific landscape changes and to develop predictive models of the potential impacts of future landscape change on human health. These tools will help generate recommendations for sustainable land management to mitigate human disease risk in Midwestern ecosystems. Project outputs will include a predictive risk model that can be used by land use planners to inform land management practices and community planning that benefits the environment and public health; and, new knowledge on disease risk dynamics that can inform the management of tick-borne diseases.</p>	<p>\$237,439</p>

**Table II – Partnership Grants – Funding and Accomplishments**

**FY 2010 – Partnership Grants**  
 (approximately \$1 million awarded (\$500,000 from PRIA 2 Fees and the remainder from of the Office of the Science Advisor) to fund five projects,  
 FY 2010 projects run from October 2010 to September 2012)

Recipient	Project Title and Accomplishments	Funding
IPM Institute of North America (Madison, WI)	<p><b>“Healthy School Communities Through IPM And Expanded Partnerships: Reducing Pest And Pesticide Risks, Improving Asthma Outcomes And Furthering Environmental Justice”</b></p> <p>PRIA funds will address environmental justice concerns on many fronts, expanding the previous IPM Institute PRIA project (FY08) that established and verified adoption of integrated pest management (IPM) in public kindergartens through high schools across the United States. The FY 2010 project will: 1) expand self-sustaining school IPM coalitions in all states, where experienced school professionals recruit and mentor peers at other districts; 2) focus on childhood asthma and asthma triggers associated with cockroaches, rodents, and dust mites; 3) affect more than 49 million students served by 6.1 million staff including 3.1 million teachers in 14,383 public school districts in the US; and 4) expand a national working group to build effective new partnerships in fifteen target states. The project will develop a comprehensive set of metrics and online performance reporting for participating school districts, deliver fifteen new coalitions, deliver take-home educational materials about asthma and IPM in homes, develop a written business case for coalitions, provide training for site inspections in participating schools, produce monthly pest newsletters, support a listserv, produce presentations and webinars. Overall, this project will significantly expand use of advanced IPM methods in US schools.</p>	\$250,000
Michigan State University (East Lansing, MI)	<p><b>“Effective Soil-Based Biopesticide And Nutrient Delivery In Orchard Ecosystems”</b></p> <p>PRIA funds will be applied to develop a biological IPM approach, through a beneficial nematode and compost system, to support the phase-out of the organophosphate azinphos methyl (AZM) and control the plum curculio; which is a pest of pome (apple) and stone (cherry) fruit found in the eastern US and in Utah. The project is based in the Great Lakes Basin where fruit growers rely on extensive broad-spectrum pest control methods that affect both target pests and nontarget insects, including many endangered species. PRIA funding is providing critical support to refining and further developing the biocontrol approach for plum curculio in the absence of alternatives because there are still no other organophosphate alternatives providing apple and cherry growers with adequate control of this pest comparable to AZM. The research and extension team will report the results of research projects to the tree fruit grower community and give them on-farm demonstrations, training workshops, internet, printed material, and weekly IPM updates. The project is expected to lead to a 25% increase in cherry and apple grower adoption of IPM, as well as a 50% reduction in chemical pesticides used to control plum</p>	\$249,939

<b>Table II – Partnership Grants – Funding and Accomplishments</b>		
	curculio on approximately 10,000 acres.	
Cary Institute of Ecosystem Studies	<p><b>“Landscape Epidemiology And Integrated Mgmt Of Tick-Borne Diseases”</b></p> <p>Funded by Advanced Monitoring Initiative funds (AMI funds from the Office of the Science Advisor), this study will develop predictive models of landscape-level variation in the risk of Lyme disease, human anaplasmosis and human babesiosis; test how well ecological metrics of disease risk correlate with actual human incidence of tick-borne diseases; and use landscape variables to assess the likely impacts of development and land-use planning scenarios on the human risk of tick-borne diseases. These models can lead to the design of environmentally sound (non-chemical) strategies to reduce infectious disease transmission as part of an IPM strategy that also helps to minimize the use of pesticides (and their accompanying contamination of air, land, and water). Models will also inform forest ecosystem valuation and support management of forested landscapes, which can benefit public health.</p>	\$299,998
University of Washington	<p><b>“Pests, Predators, And Multiple Stressors In Agroecosystems”</b></p> <p>Funded by Advanced Monitoring Initiative funds (AMI funds from the Office of the Science Advisor), this project will investigate the combined effects of pesticide use, land-use change, and climate change on working agricultural ecosystems in California’s Central Valley. The main product will be a spatially-explicit population model to assess the effects of altered precipitation regimes, and land-use change on population size and distribution of rodent pests and a sensitive non-target species, the San Joaquin kit fox (natural predators of the rodent pests). The model will be used to prioritize lands for pesticide use under IPM and to inform guidance for IPM implementation.</p>	\$100,000
Oregon State University	<p><b>“Willamette Valley Pesticide Risk: an Alternative Futures Approach to Integrated Pest Management”</b></p> <p>Funded by Advanced Monitoring Initiative funds (AMI funds from the Office of the Science Advisor), this project will develop a model-based tool to facilitate assessments of integrated pest management (IPM) strategies under a changing climate. The primary question is: How will the broad adoption of IPM strategies influence non-target pesticide concentrations and ecological risk? To connect the research results to IPM users, the team will coordinate the modeling work with a USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture funded Extension-IPM program to quickly develop a mechanism to present results to a group of interested growers and other stakeholders. These presentations will be developed as part of already planned stakeholder meetings focused on IPM strategies.</p>	\$97,065



**Table III – Number of PRIA Actions Completed in fiscal year 2008, 2009, and 2010**

**Key to the table**

- R - Conventional Pesticides
- A - Antimicrobial Pesticides
- B - Biopesticides
- EUP - Experimental Use Permit
- PIP - Plant-Incorporated Protectants
- SAP - FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel
- SCLP - Straight Chain Lepidopteran Pheromones

*Table III – Number of PRIA Actions Completed in fiscal year 2008, 2009, and 2010*

PRIA Category	Description of Category	FY 2008		FY 2009		2010	
		Number of Completed PRIA Decisions	Average Decision Time in Days	Number of Completed PRIA Decisions	Average Decision Time in Days	Number of Completed PRIA Decisions	Average Decision Time in Days
R01	New Active Ingredient, Food Use	34	824	15	648	3	1106
R010	New Active Ingredient, Food Use			6	570		
R02	New Active Ingredient, Food Use, Reduced Risk	12	446				
R05	New Active Ingredient, Food use submitted after an EUP	12	175				
R06	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use, outdoor	1	541	1	753	4	1433
R060	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use, outdoor			1	245	29	686
R07	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use, outdoor, Reduced Risk	1	530				
R09	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use, outdoor, EUP submitted before application for registration	2	74				
R10	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use, outdoor, submitted after EUP					3	1199
R120	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; indoor; reduced risk					2	755
R124	Conditional Ruling on Preapplication Study Waivers; applicant-initiated	1	100	15	153	2	179
R130	First food use; indoor; food/food handling	3	325				
R14	New Use, Additional food use, indoor Food/Food handling	2	627				
R15	New Use, First Food Use	7	776	9	642		

**Table III – Number of PRIA Actions Completed in fiscal year 2008, 2009, and 2010**

PRIA Category	Description of Category	FY 2008		FY 2009		2010	
		Number of Completed PRIA Decisions	Average Decision Time in Days	Number of Completed PRIA Decisions	Average Decision Time in Days	Number of Completed PRIA Decisions	Average Decision Time in Days
R16	New Use, First Food Use, Reduced Risk			3	555		
R17	New Use, Each Additional New Food Use	186	575	21	714	4	1146
R170	New Use, Additional food use	2	272	71	440	105	453
R18	New Use, Each Additional New Food Use, Reduced Risk	9	636	2	381		
R180	New Use, Additional food use; reduced risk			12	361	13	336
R19	New Use, Additional New Food Uses, Bundled, 6 or more	73	491	11	661	10	1829
R190	New Use, Additional food uses; 6 or more submitted in one application			23	419	36	464
R20	New Use, Additional New Food Uses, Bundled, 6 or more, Reduced Risk	3	1274				
R200	New Use, Additional food uses; 6 or more submitted in one application; reduced risk			14	336	19	324
R21	New food use, With EUP and temporary tolerance	1	360				
R220	New Use, Additional food use; EUP; crop destruct basis; no credit toward new use registration	1	96	3	108	1	181
R23	New use, Non-food, outdoor	15	447	3	402		
R230	New Use, Additional use; non-food; outdoor	1	285	14	372	13	441
R24	New use, Non-food, outdoor, Reduced Risk	6	403				
R240	New Use, Additional use; non-food; outdoor; reduced risk			5	331		
R25	New use, Non-food, outdoor with EUP (no credit toward new use registration)	1	180				
R250	New Use, Additional use; non-food; outdoor; EUP; no credit toward new use registration			1	182	4	158
R26	New Use, Non-food, indoor	1	361				
R260	New use; non-food; indoor			2	352	4	491
R270	New use; non-food; indoor; reduced risk					1	258
R272	Review of Study Protocol; applicant-initiated; excludes DART, pre-registration conferences, Rapid Response review, DNT protocol review, protocols needing HSRB review	12	82	48	68	20	64
R273	Additional use; seed treatment; limited uptake into Raw Agricultural Commodities; includes crops with established tolerances (e.g., for soil or foliar application); includes food or non-food uses					8	373
R274	New Uses, Additional uses; seed treatment only; 6 or more submitted in one application; limited uptake into Raw Agricultural Commodities; includes crops with established tolerances (e.g., for soil or foliar application);			1	359	2	586

Table III – Number of PRIA Actions Completed in fiscal year 2008, 2009, and 2010

PRIA Category	Description of Category	FY 2008		FY 2009		2010	
		Number of Completed PRIA Decisions	Average Decision Time in Days	Number of Completed PRIA Decisions	Average Decision Time in Days	Number of Completed PRIA Decisions	Average Decision Time in Days
	includes food and/or non-food uses						
R28	Import tolerance, New Active Ingredient or first food use					1	1155
R280	Establish import tolerance; new active ingredient or first food use			1	637		
R29	Import tolerance, Additional new food use	3	1000	1	1000		
R290	Establish import tolerance; additional food use			1	432	5	480
R292	Amend an established tolerance (e.g., decrease or increase); domestic or import; applicant-initiated	7	221	16	329	22	399
R293	Establish tolerance(s) for inadvertent residues in one crop; applicant-initiated			3	317		
R295	Establish tolerance(s) for residues in one rotational crop in response to a specific rotational crop application; applicant-initiated					1	506
R30	New Product, Me-Too, Fast Track	103	75				
R300	New product; identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; no data review or only product chemistry data; cite-all data citation, or selective data citation where applicant owns all required data, or applicant submits specific authorization letter from data owner. Category also includes 100% re-package of registered end-use or manufacturing-use product that requires no data submission nor data matrix.	169	74	239	76	277	84
R301	New product; identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; registered source of active ingredient; selective data citation only for data on product chemistry and/or acute toxicity and/or public health pest efficacy, where applicant does not own all required data and does not have a specific authorization letter from data owner.	21	116	43	122	36	123
R31	New Product, Non-Fast Track (includes review of product chemistry, acute toxicity, public health pest efficacy)	193	204	2	873		
R310	New end-use or manufacturing-use product; requires review of data package within RD; includes reviews and/or waivers of data for only: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• product chemistry and/or</li> <li>• acute toxicity and/or</li> <li>• public health pest efficacy</li> </ul>	100	166	236	194	167	204
R311	New product; requires approval of new food-use inert; applicant-initiated; excludes approval of safeners					2	406
R313	New product; requires amendment to existing inert tolerance exemption (e.g., adding post-harvest use);			4	416	1	654

Table III – Number of PRIA Actions Completed in fiscal year 2008, 2009, and 2010

PRIA Category	Description of Category	FY 2008		FY 2009		2010	
		Number of Completed PRIA Decisions	Average Decision Time in Days	Number of Completed PRIA Decisions	Average Decision Time in Days	Number of Completed PRIA Decisions	Average Decision Time in Days
	applicant-initiated						
R32	New Product, Non-Fast Track, new physical form (excludes selective citations)	14	349	3	513	1	797
R320	New product; new physical form; requires data review in science divisions	1	141	9	346	17	347
R33	New manufacturing-use product, Old Active Ingredient, Selective Citation	18	461	1	551		
R330	New manufacturing-use product; registered active ingredient; selective data citation			3	386	8	360
R331	New Product; repack of identical registered end-use product as a manufacturing-use product; same registrant uses only			1	77	4	72
R34	Amendment, Non-Fast Track (includes changes to precautionary label statements, source changes to an unregistered source)	64	119	1	421		
R340	Amendment requiring data review within RD (e.g., changes to precautionary label statements, or source changes to an unregistered source of active ingredient)	95	100	200	111	162	113
R35	Amendment, Non-Fast track (changes to REI, PPE, PHI, rate and number of applications, add aerial application, modify GW/SW advisory statement)	48	255				
R350	Amendment requiring data review in science divisions (e.g., changes to REI, or PPE, or PHI, or use rate, or number of applications; or add aerial application; or modify GW/SW advisory statement)	15	184	59	215	81	266
R37	Cancer Reassessment, applicant initiated	6	536			1	1185
A41	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use, outdoor, other uses	3	1252				
A42	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use, indoor, FIFRA sec. 2(mm) uses	2	998	2	920		
A44	New Use, First food use, with exemption	3	739	2	682		
A46	New Food Use, with exemption	3	470	2	492		
A460	Additional Food use; establish tolerance exemption			6	199	5	620
A470	New Food use, Additional food use; establish tolerance			1	436		
A48	New use, Non-food, outdoor FIFRA sec. 2(mm) uses	3	262				
A480	New use, Additional use; non-food; outdoor; FIFRA §2(mm) uses	1	20	1	391	3	356
A49	New use, Non-Food, outdoor, other uses	2	460				
A490	New use, Additional use; non-food; outdoor; uses other than FIFRA §2(mm)			3	454	1	363

Table III – Number of PRIA Actions Completed in fiscal year 2008, 2009, and 2010

PRIA Category	Description of Category	FY 2008		FY 2009		2010	
		Number of Completed PRIA Decisions	Average Decision Time in Days	Number of Completed PRIA Decisions	Average Decision Time in Days	Number of Completed PRIA Decisions	Average Decision Time in Days
A50	New use, Non-food, indoor FIFRA sec. 2(mm) uses	11	412	1	1002		
A500	New use, Additional use; non-food; indoor; FIFRA §2(mm) uses	3	228	22	263	19	309
A510	Additional use; non-food; indoor; uses other than FIFRA section 2(mm)					1	496
A520	Experimental Use Permit application			2	181	1	321
A521	Review of public health efficacy study protocol within AD; per AD Internal Guidance for the Efficacy Protocol Review Process; applicant-initiated; Tier 1	3	146	1	342	4	208
A522	Review of public health efficacy study protocol outside AD by members of AD Efficacy Protocol Review Expert Panel; applicant-initiated; Tier 2			1	234	3	797
A53	New Product, Me-too, Fast Track	25	102				
A530	New product; identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; no data review or only product chemistry data; cite-all data citation, or selective data citation where applicant owns all required data, or applicant submits specific authorization letter from data owner. Category also includes 100% re-package of registered end-use or manufacturing-use product that requires no data submission nor data matrix.	45	73	49	95	57	97
A531	New product; identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; registered source of active ingredient; selective data citation only for data on product chemistry and/or acute toxicity and/or public health pest efficacy, where applicant does not own all required data and does not have a specific authorization letter from data owner.	4	90	12	151	8	124
A532	New product; identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; registered active ingredient; unregistered source of active ingredient; cite-all data citation except for product chemistry; product chemistry data submitted	12	66	19	156	19	124
A54	New Product, Non-Fast Track, FIFRA sec. 2 (mm) uses	44	224	3	446	1	1261
A540	New end use product; FIFRA §2(mm) uses only	25	110	70	139	65	190
A55	New Product, Non-Fast Track, other uses	5	222	1	615		
A550	New end-use product; uses other than FIFRA §2(mm); non-FQPA product	2	172	4	180	1	270
A56	New Manufacturing use product, old active ingredient, selective citation	5	470				
A560	New manufacturing-use product; registered active ingredient; selective data citation	2	176	3	349	2	530

**Table III – Number of PRIA Actions Completed in fiscal year 2008, 2009, and 2010**

PRIA Category	Description of Category	FY 2008		FY 2009		2010	
		Number of Completed PRIA Decisions	Average Decision Time in Days	Number of Completed PRIA Decisions	Average Decision Time in Days	Number of Completed PRIA Decisions	Average Decision Time in Days
A57	Amendments, Non-Fast Track	55	115	1	454		
A570	Label amendment requiring data submission	78	105	136	123	120	145
B59	New Active Ingredient, Food Use, with exemption, Microbial/Biochemical	3	737			8	914
B590	New active ingredient; food use; establish tolerance exemption, Microbial/Biochemical			3	487	18	634
B60	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use, Microbial/Biochemical	6	980	6	732		
B600	New active ingredient; non-food use, Microbial/Biochemical			7	385	6	392
B61	EUP, Food Use with temporary tolerance exemption, Microbial/Biochemical	2	349				
B610	Food use; EUP; establish temporary tolerance exemption, Microbial/Biochemical			6	286	2	222
B620	Non-food use; Experimental Use Permit application			4	127		
B621	Extend or amend EUP, Microbial/Biochemical	3	62	3	101		
B63	New Use, First Food Use, with tolerance exemption Microbial/Biochemical,	8	459	4	541		
B630	First food use; establish tolerance exemption, Microbial/Biochemical			2	313		
B631	Amend established tolerance exemption, Microbial/Biochemical	1	270	3	242	1	471
B650	New use; Non-Food, Microbial/Biochemical			2	239		
B66	New Product, Me-Too, Fast Track, Microbial/biochemical	4	94				
B660	New product; identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; no data review or only product chemistry data; cite-all data citation, or selective data citation where applicant owns all required data, or applicant submits specific authorization letter from data owner. Category also includes 100% re-package of registered end-use or manufacturing-use product that requires no data submission nor data matrix. Microbial/biochemical	9	79	6	73	11	106
B67	New Product, Non-Fast Track, Microbial/Biochemical	23	282	1	895		
B670	New product; registered source of active ingredient; all Tier I data for product chemistry, toxicology, non-target organisms, and product performance must be addressed with product specific data or with request for data waivers supported by scientific rationales, Microbial/Biochemical	7	161	9	282	11	188
B671	New product; food use; unregistered source of active ingredient; requires amendment of established tolerance or tolerance exemption; all Tier I data requirements for product chemistry, toxicology, non-target organisms, and product performance must be addressed with product-specific data or with request for data					7	529

Table III – Number of PRIA Actions Completed in fiscal year 2008, 2009, and 2010

PRIA Category	Description of Category	FY 2008		FY 2009		2010	
		Number of Completed PRIA Decisions	Average Decision Time in Days	Number of Completed PRIA Decisions	Average Decision Time in Days	Number of Completed PRIA Decisions	Average Decision Time in Days
	waivers supported by scientific rationales, Microbial/Biochemical						
B672	New product; non-food use or food use having established tolerance or tolerance exemption; unregistered source of active ingredient; no data compensation issues; all Tier I data requirements for product chemistry, toxicology, non-target organisms, and product performance must be addressed with product-specific data or with request for data waivers supported by scientific rationales, Microbial/Biochemical			12	280	11	404
B68	Amendment, Non-Fast Track, Microbial/Biochemical	7	115				
B680	Label amendment requiring data submission, Microbial/Biochemical	4	195	9	129	12	169
B681	Label amendment; unregistered source of active ingredient; supporting data require scientific review			3	244	7	227
B682	Protocol Review; applicant-initiated; excludes time for HSRB review (pre-application)			1	89	1	84
B690	SCLP, New active ingredient; food or non-food use	1	180	2	231	5	167
B700	SCLP, Experimental Use Permit application; new active ingredient or new use			1	134		
B710	SCLP, New product; identical or substantially similar in composition and use to a registered product; no data review or only product chemistry data; cite-all data citation, or selective data citation where applicant owns all required data, or applicant submits specific authorization letter from data owner. Category also includes 100% re-package of registered end-use or manufacturing-use product that requires no data submission nor data matrix	3	93	5	94	1	92
B72	SCLP, New Product Non-Fast Track	2	194				
B720	SCLP, New product; registered source of active ingredient; all Tier I data for product chemistry, toxicology, non-target organisms, and product performance must be addressed with product specific data or with request for data waivers supported by scientific rationales			7	143	3	107
B721	SCLP, New product; unregistered source of active ingredient					5	185
B730	SCLP, Label amendment requiring data submission			3	72	2	129
B740	Plant-Incorporated Protectants (PIP), EUP; registered active ingredient; non-food/feed or crop destruct basis; no Scientific Advisory Panel (SAP) review required			2	135		
B75	PIP, EUP, with Temporary Tolerance or Exemption, No SAP review	1	269				
B77	PIP, EUP, New Active Ingredient, Set Temporary Tolerance or Exemption, SAP	2	517				
B771	Experimental Use Permit application; new active ingredient; establish temporary tolerance or tolerance					2	370

**Table III – Number of PRIA Actions Completed in fiscal year 2008, 2009, and 2010**

PRIA Category	Description of Category	FY 2008		FY 2009		2010	
		Number of Completed PRIA Decisions	Average Decision Time in Days	Number of Completed PRIA Decisions	Average Decision Time in Days	Number of Completed PRIA Decisions	Average Decision Time in Days
	exemption; no SAP review required						
B772	Amend or extend EUP; minor changes to experimental design; established temporary tolerance or tolerance exemption is unaffected	1	96	3	76		
B800	New active ingredient; establish permanent tolerance or tolerance exemption based on temporary tolerance or tolerance exemption; no SAP review required					1	357
B81	PIP, Register New Active Ingredient, Temporary Tolerance or Exemption Exists, SAP	3	539	3	587		
B810	New active ingredient; establish permanent tolerance or tolerance exemption based on temporary tolerance or tolerance exemption; SAP review required	1	538				
B84	PIP, Register New Active Ingredient, Set Tolerance or Exemption, SAP					2	1052
B86	PIP, EUP, Food Use, Amendment	5	208				
B880	PIP, New product; no SAP review required			2	382	20	395
B881	PIP, New product; SAP review required					1	697
B900	Amendment (except #B890); No SAP review required; (e.g., new IRM requirements that are applicant initiated; or amending a conditional registration to extend the registration expiration date with additional data submitted)	2	176	14	176	1	181
B904	Import tolerance or tolerance exemption; processed commodities/food only			1	103		
	TOTAL	1677		1570		1517	



**Table IV– Number of PRIA Decisions Pending at the End of Fiscal Year (FY 2008 - 2010)**

**Key to the table**

- R - Conventional Pesticides
- A - Antimicrobial Pesticides
- B - Biopesticides
- EUP - Experimental Use Permit
- PIP - Plant-Incorporated Protectants
- SAP - FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel
- SCLP - Straight Chain Lepidopteran Pheromones

<i>Table IV – Number of PRIA Decisions Pending at the End of Fiscal Year (FY 2008 - 2010)</i>				
Progress in Meeting Decision Times – Number of PRIA Decisions Pending at End of Fiscal Year				
PRIA Category	Description of Category	Number of PRIA Decisions Pending at the End of Fiscal Year		
		2008	2009	2010
<b>R01</b>	New Active Ingredient, Food Use	24	5	1
<b>R010</b>	New Active Ingredient, Food Use	14	29	78
<b>R02</b>	New Active Ingredient, Food Use, Reduced Risk	6		
<b>R020</b>	New Active Ingredient, Food use; reduced risk		4	4
<b>R040</b>	Food use; Experimental Use Permit application; establish temporary tolerance; submitted before application for registration; credit \$326,025 toward new active ingredient application that follows			2
<b>R05</b>	New Active Ingredient, Food use submitted after an EUP	1		
<b>R06</b>	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use, outdoor	5	3	
<b>R060</b>	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use, outdoor	11	45	2
<b>R10</b>	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use, outdoor, submitted after EUP	3	3	
<b>R110</b>	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; indoor		3	3

**Table IV – Number of PRIA Decisions Pending at the End of Fiscal Year (FY 2008 - 2010)**

Progress in Meeting Decision Times – Number of PRIA Decisions Pending at End of Fiscal Year				
PRIA Category	Description of Category	Number of PRIA Decisions Pending at the End of Fiscal Year		
		2008	2009	2010
<b>R120</b>	New Active Ingredient, Non-food use; indoor; reduced risk	2	2	
<b>R123</b>	New Active Ingredient, Seed treatment only; includes non-food and food uses; limited uptake into Raw Agricultural Commodities	2	2	
<b>R124</b>	Conditional Ruling on Preapplication Study Waivers; applicant-initiated	11	2	2
<b>R13</b>	New Use, First food use, indoor food/food handling	2	2	2
<b>R14</b>	New Use, Additional food use, indoor Food/Food handling	3		
<b>R140</b>	Additional food use; Indoor; food/food handling			6
<b>R15</b>	New Use, First Food Use	11	2	2
<b>R150</b>	New Use, First food use			11
<b>R16</b>	New Use, First Food Use, Reduced Risk	3		
<b>R17</b>	New Use, Each Additional New Food Use	67	31	11
<b>R170</b>	New Use, Additional Food Use	112	135	131
<b>R18</b>	New Use, Each Additional New Food Use, Reduced Risk	2		
<b>R180</b>	New Use, Additional food use; reduced risk	13	17	13
<b>R19</b>	New Use, Additional New Food Uses, Bundled, 6 or more	31	20	3
<b>R190</b>	New Use, Additional food uses; 6 or more submitted in one application	34	60	58
<b>R200</b>	New Use, Additional food uses; 6 or more submitted in one application; reduced risk	11	19	9
<b>R21</b>	New food use, With EUP and temporary tolerance	1		
<b>R210</b>	New Use, Additional food use; EUP; establish temporary tolerance; no credit toward new use registration	2		2
<b>R220</b>	New Use, Additional food use; EUP; crop destruct basis; no credit toward new use registration	2		
<b>R23</b>	New use, Non-food, outdoor	7	3	1
<b>R230</b>	New Use, Additional use; non-food; outdoor	25	23	25
<b>R240</b>	New Use, Additional use; non-food; outdoor; reduced risk	4		
<b>R250</b>	New Use, Additional use; non-food; outdoor; EUP; no credit toward new use registration	1	5	
<b>R26</b>	New Use, Non-food, indoor	1		















## **Appendix A: Decision Review Times for Actions Completed During FY 2010**

As required by FIFRA Section 33(k), the following table (an Excel file) provides the decision times for each decision (application) completed during FY 2010. Decisions with a two digit PRIA code are PRIA 1 decisions (received by EPA between March 23, 2004, and September 30, 2007), while those with a three digit PRIA code are PRIA 2 decisions (received on and after October 1, 2007). Negative decision times occur when decisions are completed before the Agency has received full confirmation of payment or a fee waiver or exemption was granted. Completion of a registration action before payment is received typically occurs in situations where a voluntary fee payment has been offered for an application that was pending with the Agency prior to March 23, 2004 (the PRIA effective date), or the Agency anticipates approval of a fee waiver based on past fee waiver approvals during the same maintenance fee cycle. If a decision number appears in the column, “Primary decision”, the decision is a “secondary decision” dependent upon the primary decision in some manner.

Mandatory decision time frames depend on the year the application was received. Mandated time frames can be found in the fee schedules published in the Federal Register Notice on March 17, 2004, titled [Pesticides; Fees and Decision Times for Registration Applications](#) for PRIA 1 actions and for PRIA 2 decisions, and on October 30, 2007, titled [Pesticides; Revised Fee Schedule for Registration Applications](#). As EPA improves its reporting capabilities, the Agency may update this table, as necessary.

[Table of completed actions for FY 2010](#) Excel, 276 KB) ([Microsoft Excel Viewer](#) EXIT Disclaimer is needed to view this file.)