

Summary and Conclusions for PPDC Public Health Workgroup Meeting of November 30, 2017

Meeting Summary

The meeting convened at 9:00 a.m. on November 30, 2017. During the meeting the workgroup discussed each of the three potential action items: 1) Communications; 2) Emergency Action Plan; and 3) Resistance Management Plan. There was discussion about the need for responsive and targeted communication, especially during times of emergency. The group determined that the Communications item could be merged with the Emergency Action Plan item. After extensive discussion of the items, the workgroup determined to focus on the Emergency Action Plan (with communications being part of the plan).

The group felt that, while resistance is growing across many sectors of pesticides used to control public health pests (both microbial and insecticidal), the issue was already being addressed by a number of very skilled user and research groups. Nearly all members of the workgroup felt that EPA resources would best be used to develop an action plan. All in the group were highly supportive of the efforts to address or minimize the development of resistance.

Meeting Conclusions, Decisions and Next Steps

The workgroup determined that the next steps would be to develop a list of items for EPA to include in an action plan. During the meeting, the group determined that a good action plan would:

- Recognize and work with existing resources and response plans
- Address incentives for pesticides, when toolboxes are inadequate
- Make plan available before it is needed
- Be broad enough, detailed enough and comprehensive enough to use in any type of situation (naturally occurring or events caused by human actions)
- Identify partners for EPA
- Determine whether policy changes might be necessary (articulate needs, such as expediting the section 18s)
- Provide a broad scaffold regarding land management plans, NEPA, and ESA. Stafford Act exempts from NEPA, but not ESA

For the communications portion of the action plan, the group determined that good communications would:

- Better communicate the thoroughness of pesticide reviews

- Provide consistent messaging across the government
- Use pictographs whenever possible
- Be more inclusive of non-pesticide forms of control. Use the words “control products” instead of “pesticides” to be more inclusive of non-traditional pesticides, such as the In-2-Care traps, GMO mosquitos, and Wohlbachia mosquitos.