

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

Wednesday, October 27, 2021

11:00 a.m.

DAY ONE

1 PARTICIPANTS

2 PESTICIDE PROGRAM DIALOGUE COMMITTEE ROSTER

3 October 2021

4	Walter Alarcon	Daniel Markowski
5	Ruben Arroyo	Gary Prescher
6	Amy Asmus	Caleb Ragland
7	Manojit Basu	Damon Reabe
8	Steven Bennett	Karen Reardon
9	Jasmine Brown	Charlotte Sanson
10	Lori Ann Burd	David Shaw
11	Douglas Burkett	Christina Stucker-Gassi
12	Douglass Cameron	Cathy Tortorici
13	Iris Figueroa	Mily Trevino-Sauceda
14	Joseph Gryzwacz	Lisa Fleeson Trossbach
15	Gary Halvorson	Tim Tucker
16	Gina Hilton	Edward Wakem
17	Komal Jain	Nina Wilson
18	Mark Johnson	John Wise
19	Patrick Johnson	
20	Dominic LaJoie	
21	Charlotte Liang	
22	Amy Liebman	
23	Aaron Lloyd	
24	Lauren Lurkins	
25	Tim Lust	

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 DAY ONE - OCTOBER 27, 2021

3 FACILITATOR: Good morning, everybody. We
4 have a lot of folks logging on kind of right here at
5 the top of the hour. So let's give it another minute
6 before Ed Messina opens the meeting for today. So
7 let's give it another minute or so. Thank you.

8 And maybe I could get a thumbs-up from
9 someone that you can hear me okay? Okay, thank you
10 very much.

11 MR. MESSINA: Yeah, we can hear you.

12 FACILITATOR: Thanks, Daniel. All right.

13 MR. MESSINA: And, Shannon, if you could let
14 me know -- oh, there's Jake.

15 Jake, you're on? You're here already? Thanks.

16 MR. LI: Yes. Thanks, Ed. I assume you can
17 hear me.

18 MR. MESSINA: I can hear you. I can't see
19 you. If you haven't turned your video on, that's
20 okay.

21 JAKE: I'm going to --

22 MR. MESSINA: We're going to do -- yeah,
23 we're going to toss it to you pretty quickly because
24 we're not going to do like a big agenda run-through.
25 We're going to have you be our keynote and --

1 Mr. LI: Oh, okay. You know, I've
2 never used Webex until now. I didn't realize we're on
3 Webex, so I'm actually trying to figure out how to
4 start the video and it's not quite working yet.

5 MR. MESSINA: Okay.

6 FACILITATOR: There's probably a button
7 towards the bottom of your screen, Jake, that might
8 say start or stop video.

9 MR. LI: Yeah, I've tried it multiple times.

10 FACILITATOR: Oh.

11 MR. LI: And it is not working. I'm going to
12 try it again.

13 MR. MESSINA: Maybe when you entered the
14 room, it asked whether to use the camera or What have
15 you.

16 MR. LI: Oh, fixed it.

17 MR. MESSINA: Oh, there you go. I see you
18 now.

19 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I was going to say mine
20 had a slight delay, but it caught up maybe 10 seconds
21 later.

22 MR. LI: Great. Okay. Well, it sounds like
23 I'll stay on mute until we're ready for me to speak.
24 Does that sound good?

25 MR. MESSINA: Yeah, sounds good.

1 MR. LI: Great, thank you.

2 MR. MESSINA: It will be pretty quick, you
3 know, within the 10-minute mark.

4 MR. LI: Okay, great. Thanks.

5 MR. MESSINA: Mm-hmm.

6 FACILITATOR: And, Jake, you're -- your
7 voice is a little bit low just in terms of a volume.
8 If you can maybe get a little bit closer to the mic,
9 it might help.

10 MR. LI: Okay. Let me -- how is this? Is
11 that better? Is this better?

12 FACILITATOR: Yeah, I think that's pretty
13 good. Can you folks hear Jake okay?

14 MR. MESSINA: Yeah.

15 MR. LI: Okay. I'm just going to try to
16 speak loud. This is my normal setup. So it may be
17 something with Webex where it's picking up my volume
18 differently.

19 FACILITATOR: Okay.

20 MR. LI: Okay. Thanks, Paul.

21 FACILITATOR: Sure thing.

22 And, Ed, we have about 130 people online
23 right now, which is a pretty good chunk of the
24 expected participation, and I'm showing 11:03. So if
25 you are ready, we could get started.

1 MR. MESSINA: Yeah, let's get rolling. So,
2 thank you, Paul. Thanks, Shannon, for all the
3 logistics in the background and the many folks that
4 are supporting us today.

5 Welcome, everyone, and good afternoon, good
6 morning to members of the public, our PPDC members,
7 workgroup members, and EPA and other stakeholders, the
8 many stakeholders that help EPA drive better policy
9 making decisions. So thank you for your participation
10 today.

11 And I'm really excited and I think we've got
12 a great agenda. We've had a lot of work happening in
13 the background before this meeting from the many
14 workgroups, which you are going to hear from over the
15 next couple of days. They're going to talk about the
16 reports that they would like to submit to the PPDC for
17 consideration to be submitted to EPA. And my initial
18 read of all those materials, which are online and have
19 been posted, is some pretty incredible work that's
20 been happening even before this meeting.

21 Members of the public can find all of the
22 meeting materials and documents today on the PPDC
23 website. We're going to be throwing links throughout
24 the sessions in the chat at the time that it is sort
25 of relevant to talk about them. And there's the

1 advisory committee sites or area where folks will post
2 that in the chat. You can see where the agenda is.
3 You can see where the various reports are throughout
4 the day.

5 We also have been renewing our PPDC charter
6 and it was renewed this month and that is also on the PPDC
7 website. And that link will be posted in the chat.

8 And then, lastly, we have been renewing the
9 PPDC membership as part of that normal cycle. The
10 proposed membership package is actually on its way to
11 the Administrator's office for final approval and for
12 the letters of invitation to serve on PPDC to be sent
13 out.

14 Thank you for all of our returning members.
15 Everyone came back that could come back. So we really
16 appreciate your continued dedication to this committee
17 and for your work and thoughtful comments that you've
18 provided as part of this.

19 So rather than going into kind of the
20 overview, the agenda, and kind of walk you through
21 that and all the logistics, we thought it might be
22 more fun to have our premier speaker up-front. I'm
23 really happy and proud to introduce Jake Li to talk to
24 us today with our opening remarks. Jake is the Deputy
25 Assistant Administrator for the Pesticide Programs

1 within the Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution
2 Prevention for which the Office of Pesticide Programs
3 is part of.

4 One of Jake's priorities, as he's come on
5 board, is to help EPA achieve its endangered species
6 protection goals related to pesticide decisions. He's
7 really been rolling up the sleeves talking with us in
8 OPP, talking with stakeholders, trying to build some
9 coalitions around how EPA can meet that obligation,
10 which we are committed to doing.

11 Immediately before joining EPA, Jake worked
12 for over a decade in the nonprofit sector on natural
13 resource conservation and chemical regulatory issues.
14 Jake has also represented the regulated community as
15 an environmental lawyer at the law firm of Latham &
16 Watkins, where his portfolio included chemical
17 regulation and endangered species matters.

18 Jake strives to bring his insight from
19 working with the private sector and environmental
20 groups to find practical, fair, efficient, and durable
21 solutions to how EPA regulates pesticide and other
22 chemicals. He's also published on the topic. He's
23 published recently. He's the co-editor Endangered
24 Species Act Law, Policy, and Perspectives, the third
25 edition, which was just published in 2021.

1 So please join me in welcoming Jake to the
2 stage for a presentation. And then after that, we'll
3 do introductions of PPDC membership, we'll go through
4 the agenda, and we'll cover some of the logistics.

5 So thank you for attending, Jake.

6 MR. LI: Great. Thanks so much, Ed, for the
7 kind introduction.

8 Can you all hear me just want to make sure?

9 MR. MESSINA: Yeah, you're coming in pretty
10 loud and clear.

11 MR. LI: Okay, fantastic.

12 So thanks again, Ed, and good morning,
13 everyone. It's really wonderful to be here with you
14 and to hear the updates from all of you about what's
15 happening on the PPDC recently. Thanks for inviting
16 me to speak today and share what the Office of
17 Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention has been
18 doing recently specifically to advance environmental
19 justice and our work under the Endangered Species Act.

20 I wanted to speak only for about six minutes.
21 So I'm going to constrain myself to these two topics
22 here. Throughout all of this work, our office really
23 believes that success requires collaboration between
24 EPA and our stakeholders. So I'm glad to be here
25 today to discuss ways that we can continue working

1 together on these issues.

2 Let me start with environmental justice. A
3 top priority of this administration is advancing
4 equity and justice for all communities, including
5 people of color, those who have been historically
6 underserved, marginalized, and harmed by persistent
7 poverty and inequity.

8 So across EPA, we're pursuing this priority
9 in several ways. Let me just sort of offer three as
10 examples. First is strengthening enforcement of
11 violations in communities overburdened by pollution;
12 second is incorporating environmental justice to our
13 work where it's not already considered; and third is
14 improving engagement with underserved communities. I
15 can say that in my four months here -- four months as
16 in tomorrow, we've had multiple meetings across
17 various offices in EPA to coordinate on environmental
18 justice. So I can confirm folks are rolling up their
19 sleeves, and I'm just personally really excited about
20 this work.

21 Within OCSPP specifically, we're committed to
22 making environment with justice, a critical component
23 of our work, especially by considering, in a FIFRA
24 risk assessment process, people who are
25 disproportionately affected by adverse health or

1 environmental effects from an exposure to pesticides.
2 So this includes farmworkers and tribes that have been
3 historically marginalized.

4 And as part of this focus, the Office of
5 Pesticide Programs is currently carrying out several
6 initiatives. Let me just offer two as examples. One
7 is they're looking into how to compare the location of
8 shallow, private drinking water wells with information
9 on underserved communities. And so this will help us
10 focus on farmworker populations and high agricultural
11 areas and urban settings. And this information will
12 then allow OPP to better understand pesticide exposure
13 through drinking water for these populations.

14 Let me offer a second example. OPP is also
15 working on a project to develop a new set of
16 groundwater modeling scenarios that consider a variety
17 of factors, including climate conditions, crop-
18 specific management practices, soil specific
19 properties and hydrology for areas across the country
20 where private drinking water wells overlap with
21 vulnerable communities.

22 And so I actually think this effort both
23 helps promote our environmental justice initiatives,
24 but also is relevant to our work on climate change,
25 right, and being more climate smart in our decisions.

1 And so with this additional information, OPP
2 is -- our goal is to consider farmworkers and other
3 environmental justice communities more effectively in
4 our pesticide evaluations. Also, EPA solicits
5 feedback from stakeholders on environmental justice
6 concerns as part of the public comment process for
7 various pesticide risk mitigation decisions.

8 So we will continue to welcome and appreciate
9 all public comments on environmental justice and all
10 other aspects of our pesticide decisions. I can say
11 that as a former stakeholder, I know how much time it
12 takes to write public comments and to do thoughtful
13 comments. So I really appreciate the time that you
14 all put in to write these comments and know that we
15 really do consider them.

16 So that's what I wanted to say briefly on
17 environmental justice. Now, let me move to the
18 Endangered Species Act. Another top priority for
19 OCSPP is for our FIFRA decisions to come into
20 compliance with the Endangered Species Act. We know
21 we have a lot of work to do to achieve this priority
22 and it will take many years, but we know that we do
23 have the goal of improving ESA compliance and we're
24 moving aggressively toward it.

25 My view is that we basically have to move

1 fast -- we have no other choice -- to build an ESA
2 FIFRA program that can complete the large number of
3 complex consultations that we have teed up in an
4 efficient manner that delivers real world benefits for
5 species, right, but is also fair, transparent, and
6 predictable for pesticide users, registrants, growers,
7 and so forth.

8 So please know, though, that this isn't going
9 to happen overnight, right? We can't sort of fix
10 several decades of challenges in sort of a blink of an
11 eye, but we are developing a work plan, which we hope
12 to release later this year to explain what
13 improvements we plan to pursue over the next decade
14 and how to connect all of those dots together.

15 So these improvements will include, just by
16 way of example, working with applicants and
17 registrants to incorporate early mitigation to protect
18 ESA species, developing more efficient ways to consult
19 with the services, upgrading our bulletins live to
20 interface so that it can really do the volume of
21 county or sub-county level labeling that we have in
22 mind, and increasing the efficiency and the number of
23 stakeholder engagement opportunities, especially when
24 it comes to getting better data from our stakeholders.

25 So I don't want to get too far ahead of

1 myself in this meeting, but I did want to convey that
2 we're actively working on the long-term plan and we're
3 going to use it to explain how again all the pieces of
4 our improved efforts fit together. So our hope is
5 that by the next PPDC meeting we'll actually have this
6 plan out for you. You can read it beforehand. We can
7 get into more details and answer your questions.

8 I also wanted to underscore briefly that
9 we're working not just internally on ESA FIFRA
10 improvements but across the federal family. On
11 October 15th, we had our first meeting of the ESA
12 FIFRA interagency working group of this
13 administration, with a focus on identifying overall
14 directions for improving the ESA FIFRA process. I
15 personally think it was a success and I'm excited to
16 share more with you soon. We're actually working on a
17 public statement that we expect will come out fairly
18 soon. And we have a lot more on ESA, but in the
19 interest of time, I wanted a preview just these few
20 items for all of you.

21 So in closing, I want to reiterate that EPA
22 really values the input from stakeholders. I
23 personally read a lot of those comments and letters,
24 and we look forward to strengthening these
25 relationships with all of you.

1 We'll have some time for questions and
2 answers, so if there are any really quick questions in
3 the next few minutes, I'm happy to take them. And
4 thanks again for inviting me to speak today.

5 MR. MESSINA: Thanks, Jake. So any questions
6 in the chat and I -- I'm not sure I can see the chat
7 function on my screen, I'm also -- I haven't used --
8 I've used Webex before, but I haven't used it in a
9 while.

10 So, Paul, and Shannon, if you want to let us
11 know if there are any questions.

12 MS. JEWELL: I don't see --

13 FACILITATOR: I don't see -- go ahead,
14 Shannon.

15 MS. JEWELL: Oh, sorry. Yeah, I was just
16 going to say I think the same. I don't see chats yet.
17 But, Paul, I'll leave it to you.

18 FACILITATOR: Well, I'm just looking at the
19 chat window. If you look in the lower right-hand side
20 of your screen, you'll probably see two buttons or two
21 words, one is participants and one is chat. And if
22 you click on the chat, it will open up a chat box
23 where you can see actually some welcomes, some links,
24 et cetera, and you also see a place there where you
25 can enter a chat message here. So that's where you

1 would insert your cursor and write a comment or a
2 question for Jake in this case.

3 And, also, just above that chat window is a
4 drop-down box that -- it should be set at everyone,
5 right? So it looks like, for example, Amy Asmus has
6 just asked a question in the chat box.

7 Jack Li, thank you for sharing with us today
8 your information and time. And that went to everyone.
9 So I just want to make sure -- so there's a thank you,
10 Jake.

11 MR. LI: Thanks, Amy, for the comment and for
12 relating it, Paul. This isn't your only chance to
13 obviously answer ask questions. So, you know, if
14 there's anything immediate you want to ask me, please
15 feel free to do so. If not, we can certainly continue
16 asking questions later on in this program if that's
17 correct.

18 MR. MESSINA: Certainly. All right.

19 FACILITATOR: Jake. I'm not sure if you can
20 see this, but --

21 MR. MESSINA: Well, going once, going twice.

22 FACILITATOR: There is a -- a question did
23 pop up, Ed. So if it's okay if I --

24 MR. MESSINA: Yeah.

25 FACILITATOR: -- in case people can't see it.

1 Everybody should be able to see it, but --

2 MR. MESSINA: Sure.

3 FACILITATOR: -- I think I saw one here with
4 a -- from Doug Burkett. With pending listing of
5 monarchs, how do you predict this will impact
6 labeling?

7 MR. LI: Yeah, good question. Monarchs is
8 sort of challenging, right, because it's a species
9 that's actually found -- it's almost everywhere,
10 right? It's one of these highly ubiquitous ESA listed
11 species. I'll be honest, we're still, I think,
12 thinking through how best to address monarch
13 conservation. Just really quickly, I can imagine
14 opportunities to broader sort of protections for
15 monarch, but also there's a lot of programs right now
16 to have that conservation and just improve habitat
17 more generally for monarchs. So there may be ways to
18 sort of incorporate all of that into our ESA FIFRA
19 program.

20 Ed, is there anything more specific you want
21 to add? I don't want to get too ahead of the service
22 in terms of listing and conservation decisions.

23 MR. MESSINA: Well, I think, as you
24 mentioned, Jake, it's a great question and it's
25 certainly something we've been giving some thought to.

1 So I agree.

2 FACILITATOR: And there's also a question --

3 MR. MESSINA: I'm just trying to look at the
4 questions. Yeah, we --

5 FACILITATOR: Can you see the questions, Ed?
6 Okay.

7 MR. MESSINA: Yeah. So a question from Mano
8 on is there a role for PPDC to play and support ESA
9 work, and I -- to Jake and I, and, Jake, since you're
10 new to PPDC I'll field that one. So certainly, and
11 for your information, we've had Endangered Species Act
12 topics on PPDC in the past. If you recall in the
13 spring session, we had services come talk to us about
14 their perspectives, we had registrants.

15 I do think, you know, possibly once the, as
16 Jake mentioned, the strategy is out and we put this as
17 a topic for the next spring meeting, we'll have some
18 further discussion and then see if the PPDC wants to
19 develop any sub-workgroup as a result of that. There
20 are other workgroups that are out there, as Jake
21 mentioned the interagency workgroup, so we can kind of
22 take that and see what the best processes for handling
23 how the agency can get advice on ESA.

24 Thank you, Jake. We look forward to the
25 process of your leadership and working together. Can

1 you give a high level overview of key farmworker
2 initiatives in view, and then bumblebees potentially
3 being listed on the ESA, also. Yeah, so basically
4 farmworker questions.

5 MR. LI: Do you want to cover that or is that
6 something --

7 MR. MESSINA: Yeah.

8 MR. LI: -- later in the agenda that we're
9 going to talk about?

10 MR. MESSINA: Yeah, I was just going to
11 mention that I've got a couple of slides on -- what I
12 get to do next is we're going to go through kind of a
13 high level overview of all the work that OPP has been
14 undertaking, including farmworker as a topic.
15 There's, you know, hundreds of things that have been
16 happening. It's a great -- I really enjoy the fall
17 meeting because it's after the end of the fiscal year
18 for the federal agency, and I get to be the
19 cheerleader for all the amazing work that our highly
20 qualified and dedicated public servants here at OPP
21 have been engaged in, and that is certainly a topic
22 we'll talk about.

23 MR. LI: Great. So I think that's my sort of
24 10 minutes. So I wanted to thank you all for inviting
25 me to be here. Thanks again, Ed, for the

1 introduction, and I will put myself on mute and turn
2 off on video for now so you all can move to the next
3 part of the agenda.

4 MR. MESSINA: Great. Thanks so much, Jake.
5 Appreciate you attending.

6 All right. So the next thing we were going
7 to have Shannon kind of run through and introduce --
8 and have folks introduce themselves as part of the
9 PPDC membership. Then I'm going to do the OPP
10 overview and then we're going to take a look at the
11 agenda and kind of talk about logistics.

12 So with that, I'll kick it over to Shannon.

13 MS. JEWELL: Thanks so much, Ed, and good
14 morning, everyone, and thank you for being here.

15 I want to first make an announcement and give
16 a special welcome to our newest PPDC member who will
17 be serving out the remainder of this term, which, for
18 the sake of meetings means this meeting, and that is
19 Cameron Douglas. Cameron has replaced Cheryl Kunickis
20 from USDA's Office of Pest Management Programs on the
21 committee for the remainder of this term. And, as I
22 say, he'll be introducing himself in just a moment.

23 Walter Alarcon. Would you like to introduce
24 yourself, Walter?

25 DR. ALARCON: Yes, this is Walter Alarcon. I

1 am an epidemiologist and I work for the Center of
2 Pesticide Programs in the CDC. Thank you.

3 MS. JEWELL: Thank you so much.

4 Ruben Arroyo.

5 (No response.)

6 MS. JEWELL: Okay, we'll come back to Ruben.

7 Amy Asmus.

8 MS. ASMUS: Hi, I'm Amy Asmus from North
9 Central Iowa. I'm a principal in Asmus Farm Supply.
10 We're growers. And I represent the Weed Science
11 Society in PPDC.

12 MS. JEWELL: Thank you, Amy.

13 Steven Bennett.

14 MR. BENNETT: Good morning. I am Steven with
15 the Household and Commercial Products Association. We
16 represent products in the antimicrobial and the
17 consumer space of conventional pesticides.

18 MS. JEWELL: Thank you, Steve.

19 Jasmine Brown.

20 MS. BROWN: Good morning, everyone. I'm
21 Jasmine Brown. I'm located in Montana in Region 8.
22 I'm the Salish and Kootenai Tribes pesticide program
23 manager. I also sit on the Tribal Pesticide Program
24 Council as the acting chairman. I do field and -- I
25 do field inspections and investigations on behalf of

1 EPA for several tribes here in Region 8, and happy to
2 be a part of the PPDC. So I guess you could say I'm
3 the boots on the ground, kind of working with
4 agricultural communities in regards to their chemicals
5 and their pollinator issues and crop issues and
6 things. So happy to be here. Thank you.

7 MS. JEWELL: Thank you, Jasmine.

8 Lori Ann Burd.

9 MS. BURD: Hi, I'm Lori Ann Burd. I'm the
10 environmental health director and a senior attorney at
11 the Center for Biological Diversity.

12 MS. JEWELL: Thank you, Lori Ann.

13 Doug Burkett.

14 MR. BURKETT: Yes, hey, good morning, PPDC.
15 I'm Doug Burkett. I'm with the Office of the
16 Secretary of Defense. I'm with an office called the
17 Armed Forces Pest Management Board. We have policy
18 and guidance for all things pest management, including
19 the training and certification program that we train
20 our forces. Thank you.

21 MS. JEWELL: Thank you, Doug.

22 And Cameron Douglas.

23 MR. DOUGLAS: Hey, good morning, everyone.
24 Thanks, Shannon, for the special introduction this
25 morning.

1 I am a agronomist and weed scientist in
2 USDA's Office of Pest Management Policy, which many of
3 you know represents not only USDA agencies doing pest
4 management work but also many minor and specialty crop
5 producers in the U.S. Thank you again.

6 MS. JEWELL: Thank you, Cameron.

7 Iris Figueroa.

8 MS. FIGUEROA: Good morning, everyone. Iris
9 Figueroa. I am the Director of Economic and
10 Environmental Justice at Farmworker Justice, a
11 national advocacy organization.

12 MS. JEWELL: Thank you.

13 Jim Fredericks.

14 MR. FREDERICKS: Hi, everyone. I'm Jim
15 Fredericks, the Vice President of Technical and
16 Regulatory Affairs with the National Pest Management
17 Association based in Fairfax, Virginia. We represent
18 the 20,000 or so pest control companies operating
19 across the United States.

20 MS. JEWELL: Thank you, Jim.

21 Joe Gryzwacz.

22 MR. GRYZWACZ: Hi, I'm Joe Gryzwacz. I'm at
23 Florida State University. I'm not sure who I
24 represent, but it's a pleasure for me to be here and
25 assist in this important work.

1 MS. JEWELL: Thank you so much.

2 Gary Halvorson.

3 MR. HALVORSON: Hi, I'm Gary Halvorson with
4 CPDA, Council of Producers and Distributors of
5 Agrotechnology. Our focus is working with companies
6 that produce both inerts going into formulation of
7 pesticides and adjuvants, and I'm very pleased to
8 participate here.

9 MS. JEWELL: Thank you, Gary.

10 Gina Hilton.

11 DR. HILTON: Hey, good morning. My name is
12 Dr. Gina Hilton and I am a toxicologist working for
13 PETA. That's People for the Ethical Treatment of
14 Animals. And I've been collaborating on several
15 initiatives working to advance new approach methods
16 and nonanimal methods specifically for regulatory
17 decision-making for biochemical safety assessment, and
18 it has been truly a pleasure to serve on this
19 committee. Thank you.

20 MS. JEWELL: Thank you, Gina.

21 Komal Jain.

22 MS. JAIN: Good morning, everyone. Komal
23 Jain, the Executive Director of the Center for Biocide
24 Chemistries, which is organized under the American
25 Chemistry Council. We are a trade association of

1 manufacturers and formulators of antimicrobial
2 pesticides.

3 MS. JEWELL: Thank you, Komal.

4 Mark Johnson.

5 MR. M. JOHNSON: Good morning, everyone. I'm
6 Mark Johnson, an Associate Director of Environmental
7 Programs at the Golf Course Superintendents
8 Association of America. We're the professional
9 association for education and training of more than
10 18,000 members, men and women who manage the golf
11 courses. I appreciate being here and this
12 opportunity. Thank you.

13 MS. JEWELL: Thank you, Mark.

14 Patrick Johnson.

15 MR. P. JOHNSON: I'm Patrick Johnson. I farm
16 in Tunica, Mississippi. That's in the northwest
17 corner of the state. We grow cotton, corn, rice,
18 soybeans. And I'm representing the National Cotton
19 Council on the committee. I look forward to our
20 meeting.

21 MS. JEWELL: Thank you, Patrick.

22 Dominic LaJoie.

23 MR. LAJOIE: Hi, good morning, everybody.

24 I'm Dominic LaJoie. I'm a fourth generation potato
25 farmer from Van Buren, Maine. And I'm on the PPDC

1 representing the National Potato Council.

2 MS. JEWELL: Thank you, Dominic.

3 Charlotte Liang. We'll have to come back to
4 Charlotte.

5 Amy Liebman.

6 MS. LIEBMAN: Hi, good morning. I'm trying
7 to -- there we go. Good morning. It's my pleasure to
8 be here with all of you today. My name is Amy
9 Liebman. I work for the Migrant Clinicians Network
10 where I head up their environmental health and worker
11 health and safety programs. Migrant Clinicians
12 Network is a national organization working to improve
13 healthcare access for immigrants and migrant workers.

14 And I think that this is my last PPDC
15 meeting, right, Shannon?

16 MS. JEWELL: That is true. That is true,
17 yes. Thank you so much for your now six years of
18 service.

19 MS. LIEBMAN: It's been a pleasure serving
20 for you.

21 MS. JEWELL: Aaron Lloyd. We'll have to come
22 back to Aaron.

23 Lauren Lurkins.

24 MS. LURKINS: Hello there. My name is Lauren
25 Lurkins. I am the Director of Environmental Policy at

1 Illinois Farm Bureau. I think there's my video.
2 Sorry about that. And I am the representative of
3 American Farm Bureau on this committee. Thank you.

4 MS. JEWELL: Thank you so much, Lauren.
5 Tim Lust.

6 MR. LUST: Lust Service CEO, National Sorghum
7 Producers, and represent sorghum farmers around the
8 United States.

9 MS. JEWELL: Thank you, Tim.

10 Sorry, this is a reversed here. Manojit
11 Basu, AKA Mano Basu.

12 DR. BASU: Thank you, Shannon. Good morning,
13 everyone. I'm Manojit Basu. I'm the managing
14 Director of Science Policy at Crop Life America. We
15 are a trade association representing the developers,
16 manufacturers, formulators, and distributors of
17 pesticide products. I appreciate the opportunity to
18 be at the PPDC. I'm looking forward to a great
19 meeting. Thanks, Shannon.

20 MS. JEWELL: Thank you, Mano.

21 Dan Markowski.

22 DR. MARKOWSKI: Hello, I'm Dan Markowski. I
23 work with Vector Disease Control International. We do
24 mosquito and tick management surveillance programs
25 throughout the U.S. I'm here representing the

1 American Mosquito Control Association and all of our
2 membership, and I'll keep my thing on mute because I
3 have a puppy that just got spayed yesterday and she's
4 not doing well. So...

5 MS. JEWELL: Well, thank you, Dan. Good luck
6 to your puppy.

7 Ed, of course needs no introduction.

8 Gary Prescher.

9 MR. PRESCHER: Good morning, everyone. Gary
10 Prescher. I live and farm in South Central Minnesota
11 and I represent the National Corn Growers Association.

12 MS. JEWELL: Thank you, Gary.

13 Caleb Ragland. Okay. We'll come back to
14 Caleb.

15 I don't think Damon was able to join this
16 morning. Damon, are you out there? I can't see all
17 the names at once. Okay. Damon is --

18 MR. REABE: You bet, Shannon, I'm here. It's
19 tomorrow the jury duty possibilities come into play.
20 Damon Reabe. I'm an aerial applicator from Wisconsin,
21 as well as an aerial application business owner, here
22 representing the National Agricultural Aviation
23 Association.

24 MS. JEWELL: Thanks you so much, Damon.

25 Karen Reardon.

1 MR. MESSINA: Damon, were you trying to do
2 all your government service in one day.

3 MR. REABE: I did point out that I'm on a
4 federally appointed committee and thought that that
5 might get me out of a day of jury duty, but it didn't
6 work.

7 MR. MESSINA: Oh, sorry.

8 MS. JEWELL: Karen Reardon. We'll come back
9 to Karen. Oh, actually, Karen -- sorry about that.
10 Karen is another one who has to join us this
11 afternoon.

12 Charlotte Sanson.

13 MS. SANSON: Hi, good morning. I'm Charlotte
14 Sanson. I work for ADAMA where I serve as head of
15 North American Regulatory Affairs, and on PPDC, I
16 represent the registrants of the Conventional Crop
17 Protection Industry. Thanks so much.

18 MS. JEWELL: Thanks, Charlotte.

19 David Shaw.

20 MR. SHAW: Good morning, everyone. David
21 Shaw. I'm at Mississippi State University, a weed
22 scientist by background and have been representing the
23 Weed Science Society of America. I'm the past chair
24 of the Herbicide Resistance Education Committee, so
25 research and teaching activities related to resistance

1 management.

2 MS. JEWELL: Thank you, David.

3 Christina Stucker-Gassi?

4 MS. STUCKER-GASSI: Good morning. This is
5 Christina Stucker-Gassi. (Inaudible) manager with the
6 Northwest Center for Alternatives to Pesticides.
7 (Inaudible).

8 MS. JEWELL: Thank you so much, Christina.
9 Just to let you know your audio was pretty low. I
10 think we could hear you, but just FYI going forward.

11 Cathy Tortorici?

12 (No response.)

13 MS. JEWELL: Mily Trevino-Sauceda?

14 MS. TREVINO-SAUCEDA: Okay, Mily Trevino-
15 Saucedo. I am the director of Alianza Nacional de
16 Campesinas, which means the National Alliance of
17 Farmworker Women. And I am right now in California,
18 but after our presentation I will take the phone and
19 do Bluetooth and be on the road because I have to go
20 to El Paso. Sorry, but I'll be here. Thank you.

21 MS. JEWELL: Thanks for sticking with us,
22 Mily.

23 Tim Tucker?

24 MR. TUCKER: Yes, I'm happy to be here today
25 and representing the beekeeping industry. I'm a

1 beekeeper of 30 years and a honey packer and
2 distributing honey here in Missouri, Kansas, and
3 Oklahoma. And once again, I'm happy to be here. And
4 I think this is my eighth meeting. Is this my last
5 meeting as well?

6 MS. JEWELL: I don't have you down as being
7 this last meeting, but let me check on that, Tim.
8 Thank you so much, yeah.

9 MR. TUCKER: Okay, thank you.

10 MS. JEWELL: Okay. Edward Wakem.

11 MR. WAKEM: Hi, I am a veterinarian with Ceva
12 Animal Health and I am here representing the American
13 Veterinary Medical Association, which is headquartered
14 in Schaumburg, Illinois.

15 MS. JEWELL: Thank you so much.

16 Nina Wilson?

17 MS. WILSON: Hi, my name is Nina Wilson --
18 sorry, I'm getting some feedback here. Thank you for
19 the opportunity to be here. And this is also my last
20 meeting. I represent the biological product industry
21 and I'm also the vice chair of the Biological Products
22 Industry Alliance.

23 MS. JEWELL: Thank you, Nina. Thank you to
24 you and Tim for all of your service.

25 Dr. John Wise let me know to send everyone

1 his regards. He's not going to be able to join as he
2 is chairing a meeting for the IR-4 Project that
3 conflicts with this one.

4 So with that, I turn it back to Ed and Paul.
5 Thank you all so much.

6 MR. MESSINA: Well, actually, I think you
7 were saving the best for last. So if Liza could
8 introduce herself.

9 MS. JEWELL: Oh, sorry, Liza. Thank you, Ed.

10 MS. FLEESON TROSSBACH: Good morning and
11 thank you, Ed. I'm Liza Fleeson Trossbach. I am the
12 program manager for the Office of Pesticide Services
13 with the Virginia Department of Agriculture and
14 Consumer Services. I am representing the Association
15 of American Pesticide Control Officials, or AAPCO. We
16 are an association comprised of the pesticide
17 regulatory officials for many of the 50 states, the
18 District of Columbia, and the U.S. territories.

19 I am also the President Elect of AAPCO and so
20 this will be my last meeting as I will be moving into
21 the presidency in March and we will be having a new
22 representative. So I did want to thank the group and
23 EPA for the opportunity. It has been a privilege and
24 a pleasure and I have learned a great deal. So thank
25 you so much.

1 MS. JEWELL: Thank you, Liza.

2 MR. MESSINA: The pleasure and privilege has
3 been ours, Liza. Thank you for your service.

4 Yeah, it's -- you know, I used to not give
5 this much thought, but, you know, in the current
6 climate, I'm just truly amazed at this group and what
7 it represents and just the cross-section of society
8 and each of your interests and each of you being a
9 leader in your field and bringing so much to the table
10 to advise EPA and really just how government should be
11 working.

12 We don't always agree, and you should
13 definitely feel free to challenge us and challenge
14 each other in these discussions, but I really just
15 think this is a -- at least an example that needs to
16 be pointed out of sort of how government can work and
17 how engagement can work. So I just really appreciate
18 all of your years of service for many of you who are
19 departing and for your thoughtful comments to the
20 agency.

21 So, with that, I think, Paul, we were going
22 to kind of kick it to me and then we're go through the
23 agenda.

24 All right, and you're on mute. I get to say
25 that to the facilitator.

1 FACILITATOR: Finally, finally. Thank you.
2 Yes, Ed, that is the right sequence. You're going to
3 you -- you take it now and then after you're done,
4 I'll take it from there.

5 MR. MESSINA: All right. So am I moving the
6 slides right now or just my own slides?

7 FACILITATOR: I think -- Sarah can chime in,
8 but I think we've got control and all you have to do
9 is say, next slide please, unless you've already
10 orchestrated that with Sarah to control your own
11 slides.

12 MR. MESSINA: So my view is on the org
13 structure. Is that what everyone else is saying?
14 Because I moved my slides.

15 MS. JEWELL: No, Ed, if you could just say
16 next slide, Sarah can just go through them for you.

17 MR. MESSINA: Okay, so let's go to the next
18 slide, which is the org structure.

19 MS. JEWELL: Perfect. We're all there.

20 MR. MESSINA: Oh, great, and I'm not. So how
21 do I do that? Yeah, I don't -- for some reason, I
22 don't see what slide you guys are on.

23 FACILITATOR: Hmm --

24 MR. MESSINA: So, let's see, it's
25 interesting.

1 All right. So we're on the org -- I'll name
2 them out as I go and then this way folks can kind of
3 see where we are.

4 All right. So I'm going to talk about all of
5 the work that's happened this past year, talk about
6 some of the new priorities for the agency and how that
7 matches up with OPP's priorities and kind of run
8 through some changes that have happened in the
9 organization.

10 So you got to meet Jake today. He's at the
11 top of that list there. He reports to Michal
12 Freedhoff, who was at our last PPDC meeting in the
13 spring. She's the Assistant Administrator. Jake is
14 not the newest political deputy that has arrived to
15 OCSPP. "Jennie" Romer or "Jeannie" Romer is the new
16 Deputy AA for Pollution Prevention and she arrived
17 just this week. So maybe we'll put her on the agenda
18 for the spring meeting of PPDC and you guys can get a
19 chance to meet her potentially.

20 Rick Kelgwin, who had the job that I'm in
21 now, as you all know, moved up to the Deputy Assistant
22 Administrator for Management. And Tom Tyler's our
23 Chief of Staff. We have the three offices that are
24 represented within OCSPP and then we have the regional
25 offices where we support generally the land, chemical,

1 and redevelopment divisions that are in the regions,
2 but we have our Office of Pollution Prevention and
3 Toxics, Office of Pesticide Programs and our Office of
4 Program Support.

5 And then within OPP, there's me there as the
6 director and then we have Arnold Layne as the
7 Management Deputy Director, and then Mike Goodis as
8 the Program Deputy Director.

9 Next slide.

10 Office of Pesticide Programs overview. We
11 have, for those of you are not familiar with OPP's
12 structure, on the left side is sort of the
13 registration divisions, Antimicrobials, Biopesticide
14 and Pollution Prevention Division, Registration
15 Division, which deals with our conventionals, and then
16 Pesticide Reevaluation Division, which deals with the
17 reevaluation of pesticide chemicals that are already
18 in the marketplace.

19 And on the right are sort of the science
20 divisions. We have the Health Effects Division, which
21 does human health reviews; Environmental Fate and
22 Effects Division, which is responsible for the
23 environmental reviews including ESA; and then the
24 Biological and Economic Analysis Division, which under
25 FIFRA provides the cost benefit analysis and risk

1 benefit analysis that occurs when we approve pesticide
2 products.

3 So now I'm going to talk a little bit about
4 the agency priorities. If you can go to the slide
5 that's got the draft 2022-2026 EPA strategic plan
6 framework. This is the new draft framework, which is
7 out for public comment, and a couple of notable
8 differences or things that have changed from prior
9 strategies that the agency has put out. So everyone
10 should be familiar with EPA's mission to protect human
11 health and the environment. Our principles that we
12 follow are following the science, following the law,
13 being transparent, and advancing justice and equality.

14 OCSPP'S goals, we fit under Goal 7 on the
15 right-hand bottom here, which is ensuring the safety
16 of chemicals and the people in the environment. Some
17 of the things that are different from this strategic
18 plan, emphasizing some of what Jake said, is for the
19 first time climate change is a standalone strategic
20 goal, and environmental justice and civil rights goals
21 are called out specifically in the agency core
22 principal goal of advancing justice and equity.

23 There's four cross-agency strategies, the
24 scientific integrity, which I've got a slide on later,
25 which is reemphasizing that in the priorities,

1 science-based decision-making, considering the health
2 of children in all stages of life, and including an
3 eye towards vulnerable populations.

4 And then advancing EPA's organizational
5 excellence and workforce equity, strengthening tribal
6 state and local partnerships, and enhancing
7 engagement. So some changes and some emphasis on the
8 new strategies that the current administration wants
9 to put forward.

10 So the next slide on the strategic goal on
11 ensuring chemical and pesticide safety, these are how
12 our goals roll up into the agency goals for the coming
13 2022 cycle. So it's protecting health of families,
14 communities, and ecosystems from the risk posed by
15 chemicals and pesticides under FIFRA and FQPA and
16 PRIA, protecting people in the environment for risks,
17 the pesticides reviewing and registering new
18 pesticides, evaluating the current market pesticides
19 for human health and ecological health, and then
20 Endangered Species Act and considering the effects
21 determinations or protections for federally
22 threatened and endangered species.

23 And along with these goals are actually some
24 metrics and measures that are called the long-term
25 performance goals. And so we have some specific goals

1 that we provide to OMB, including, for example, by
2 2026, completing 78 pesticide registration review
3 cases, considering the effects determinations or
4 protections of federally threatened and endangered
5 species, so increasing our engagement on that for new
6 active ingredients as well, as increasing protections
7 for species for registration review decisions. And we
8 have a baseline and we have a goal that we're trying
9 to meet.

10 And then, of course, as was asked in the
11 prior session, sort of, what is our work towards
12 farmworker protection, and we have our agricultural
13 worker protection standard where we're trying, as a
14 goal, to train about 20,000 farmworkers annually. And
15 that's an increase from the baseline of about 11,000
16 that we've trained annually under the past policies
17 related to that.

18 So next slide.

19 So our priorities, again OPP priorities as
20 they roll up to the strategic plan, federally
21 protected endangered species, environmental justice,
22 climate change, critical science, PRIA 5, registration
23 review program, working collaborating with the states
24 and other stakeholders and continuing employee
25 engagement, improving sort of office morale, process

1 improvements, we're still engaging in lean activities
2 where we can improve processes within OPP, and then we
3 have lots of IT improvements or digital
4 transformations that were undertaking.

5 So my slides sort of flow from these
6 priorities in the next slides in the deck. And so we
7 heard Jake talk about Endangered Species Act, so if we
8 can go to that slide, Slide 8.

9 We made a lot of progress on the scientific
10 analysis used to conduct biological evaluations.
11 Science is only one part of the equation. We are, as
12 Jake mentioned, pivoting with an eye towards trying to
13 get mitigation done early. We're focusing our work
14 with stakeholders and we're working with stakeholders
15 to realize the shared goal of protecting vulnerable
16 species.

17 And then on the next slide, this is
18 specifically some of the things that we have done this
19 past year. So a lot of work went into preparing
20 pretty lengthy biological evaluations. We released by
21 final biological evaluations for methomyl and
22 carbaryl. These are the first BEs to use the revised
23 method. We released draft biological evaluations for
24 atrazine, simazine, propazine and glyphosate. And
25 then we're releasing draft biological evaluations on

1 imidacloprid, thiamethoxam, and clothianidin. So
2 that's some of the work engaged on Endangered Species
3 Act, in addition to all the coordination work and new
4 thinking and strategy development that Jake mentioned
5 in his talk.

6 On environmental justice, another key agency
7 strategic goal, OPP is committed to making
8 environmental justice a critical component of our
9 work. An example that Jake provided was researching
10 how to compare shallow and private drinking water well
11 locations in high agricultural areas and urban
12 settings to better understand the pesticide exposure
13 of them, and then developing groundwater model
14 scenarios for areas across the country where private
15 drinking water wells overlap with vulnerable aquifers.

16 Next slide on climate change.

17 The agency in October released the agency's
18 climate adaptation plan, so very recently, and it
19 described the following steps for how we're going to
20 address climate change, an important aspect that we
21 are continuing to live with and see in our daily
22 lives. We are integrating climate change adaptation
23 and consideration of climate impacts into EPA's
24 programs. What that means specifically for OPP is we
25 are developing our own climate adaptation plan that

1 will play into the agency's climate plan.

2 Key elements so far that are in draft are
3 sort of doing vulnerability assessments. For example,
4 what does climate change mean for changing pests
5 complexes in terms of where they might be migrating,
6 novel disease vectors, changing practices and
7 priorities. Based on climate change, what type of
8 training and science needs are needed in order to
9 address climate change as part of our decisions? So
10 we are currently developing our climate change plan to
11 flow into the larger agency's plan.

12 Scientific integrity, OPP has always been an
13 office grounded in science. We have some of the best
14 and world renowned experts, PhDs, in areas like
15 toxicology and biology and economics, and they are
16 sought after from other parts of the world to talk
17 about these issues and frequently asked to speak at
18 sessions for their work. So we continue to make sure
19 that scientific integrity is part of our process.

20 Servicing differences in science, you know,
21 science is an amazing thing in that you sort of want
22 to follow the science and sometimes it doesn't always
23 give you one answer. The amazing and great thing
24 about science is it provides different scientific
25 studies, and some say one thing and other studies say

1 others. How do you balance that science and how do
2 you make good sound policy decisions in light of some
3 of the changing science, cutting-edge science, and
4 conflicting science that can somehow come out. So we
5 have a process for how we make sure that we are
6 servicing the best science and making sure that
7 dissenting opinions are, in fact, captured as part of
8 that process.

9 On the program support slide, Slide 13, this
10 is just to give you a sense of sort of the volume of
11 work that OPP has experienced in this past year. I'm
12 incredibly proud to lead an organization that was
13 really responsible for responding to the COVID
14 pandemic, along with our other federal partners. We
15 did the disinfection approvals. We did Section 18.
16 So we were working entirely remotely. We had a
17 crushing workload from COVID and we did it entirely in
18 a telework environment.

19 So it's pretty impressive the amount and
20 statistics that I tried to provide to show you that we
21 continue to work hard; we continue to receive and a
22 record number of submissions; and we continue to
23 produce a record number of decisions using that sound
24 science. So we got about 11,000 submissions to the
25 portal. That's not just small pieces of paper. Those

1 are studies that are pretty thick, applications that
2 are that are pretty thick. And we did about 5,000
3 registration actions completed. The 11,000 -- if
4 you're wondering oh, we only got to 5,000 out of
5 11,000, the 11,000 represents individual submissions.
6 It's about 7,000 sort of packages and so we completed
7 about 5- total.

8 Our ombudsman responded to about 5,000
9 messages from the public, a lot of them COVID-related.
10 Our center -- our IPM Center for Integrated Pest
11 Management responded to another 2,000 public
12 inquiries. And then we had about 100 congressional
13 inquiries this past year that we responded to.

14 Next slide.

15 On our PRIA completions, again, another
16 record year, we did about 2,400 PRIA completion
17 actions, 97 percent of them on time. And then we
18 registered 14 new active ingredients, which is another
19 area where we focus our attention and our priorities,
20 because these new active ingredients tend to be the
21 ones that are more targeted, specific to the pest,
22 have a lower risk profile, and so approving new tools
23 for growers is certainly something that we are focused
24 on.

25 Slide 15. We did 60 Section 18 emergency

1 exemption decisions, providing growers with tools to
2 control economically threatened pests where there were
3 emergencies, Asian citrus psyllid, foot and mouth
4 disease, weedy rice, palmer amaranth, coffee leaf
5 rust, brown stink bug, believe it or not, is reeking
6 havoc in certain areas, including vineyards, and other
7 bugs that were impacting rice a lot this year. So we
8 had a number of Section 18 emergency requests from the
9 states that we responded to pretty rapidly.

10 Next slide. New pesticides, including
11 conventional biochemicals, are listed here. If you're
12 interested in what those individual pesticide
13 registrations are, you can click on the link that
14 takes you to Pesticide News Stories, and these are
15 some of the new registrations that were issued.

16 And Slide 17 sort of shows, historically,
17 where EPA has been in terms of our resources. Anyone
18 who's working government knows that, in general,
19 resources have been declining. This is OPP's picture.
20 So we started almost with a 1,000 employees and we're
21 now down to about 600.

22 And on the next slide, you can see that the
23 work hasn't decreased. This is just a snapshot of the
24 PRIA completions from 2004 to 2020. So you can see
25 that for FY -- that last one in the FY section is

1 2020, and we did about 2,300 there. For 2021, as I
2 mentioned, we're about 2,400. So another record year
3 of completions, but another record year of
4 submissions.

5 The next slide is a metric that we keep an
6 eye on, which is our renegotiation rate. Our
7 renegotiation rate has been climbing since 2019. And
8 for 2021, it's been slightly coming down. We're
9 starting to mainly dig out of the volume of COVID work
10 that has been increasing. I've got a slide on that
11 later on.

12 Next slide, so RD, which is our Registration
13 Division, which deals with the conventionals, this
14 line shows you -- the blue line is the total number
15 received, the maroon line is completed, and the green
16 line is pending, which again demonstrates the record
17 number of submissions, the record number of
18 completions, and the fact that our pending is starting
19 to creep up, and we're not a trying to bend the curve
20 on addressing our pending actions. And you can see
21 that from RD's perspective, in 2014, they had a about
22 108 FTE and are down now to 87 FTE.

23 And then next slide for the non-PRIAs, that's
24 even sort of more dire in that our pendings are
25 increasing. We tend to focus on the PRIA actions

1 first rather than non-PRIA actions. The PRIA actions
2 have a time frame and we prioritize the work, given
3 the workload and resources and try to address the PRIA
4 actions first, which is why the non-PRIA actions have
5 been lagging.

6 Next slide. So hopefully folks know a lot
7 about all the incredible work and resources that were
8 devoted to responding to the COVID-19 pandemic. We
9 completed about 300 expedited actions in response to
10 COVID-19. We added over 500 products to List N. We
11 worked on novel products, like long-term surface
12 treatments, air treatments, put out protocols to
13 address novel products to help registrants do studies
14 and conduct studies to show efficacy of those products
15 for combating Sars-CoV-2, the virus that causes COVID-
16 19.

17 The next slide, our disinfectant policy
18 update. We're starting to move in the direction of
19 shifting resources away from COVID, or sort of
20 reprioritizing those resources back to kind of our
21 traditional work. And this is what that slide says.

22 If you click on the next slide, the PRIA
23 expedited COVID submissions and the chart here, this
24 shows basically the total number of submissions and
25 then what our pending was and completions, and you can

1 just see the incredible volume here graphically over
2 the months from when the pandemic started to
3 Antimicrobials Division's application and doing
4 expedited review, in many cases, beating the PRIA
5 timelines for COVID submissions. During FY 21, we
6 completed around 500 -- or 440, I think was the
7 number, expedited submissions, and we only have about
8 30 expedited submissions left in the queue. So we've
9 been working towards that.

10 And then the non-expedited COVID submissions,
11 we continue to complete a number, and the pending are
12 starting to come down. You can see the curve is
13 starting to bend on the PRIA non-expedited COVID
14 submissions, but there still are a decent number,
15 about 100 or so that are in the pipeline remaining to
16 complete for the non-COVID submissions.

17 So on registration review, Slide 26,
18 unbelievable amount of work. I mean, when you think
19 about completing 682 draft risk assessments, which
20 represents 94 percent of the 726 cases to complete by
21 2022, that just represents an enormous volume of work.
22 We did 610 proposed interim decisions, so that's about
23 at the 84 percent level, and then the final or interim
24 decisions were at 76 percent complete.

25 And this next slide shows on the -- that has

1 the preliminary work plan, final work plan, issuing
2 the generic data call-in, the draft risk assessment,
3 the proposed interim decision, the interim decision,
4 and the label changes as needed. This sort of shows
5 you the process of that registration review. And with
6 that, those blue dots are where we do public comments.
7 So, you know, transparency is key.

8 So we take all of the data, all the new
9 science that comes in, we do our review, we publish
10 our draft risk assessment, we put that out for public
11 comment, we put out our proposed mitigations, we put
12 that out for public comment, we take that comment and
13 we consider it and we arrive at a better decision. So
14 the notion that somehow there's secret science
15 happening is -- given this slide and given the process
16 that we run, I don't think it's credible in any way,
17 shape, or form.

18 The other thing is the amount of data that
19 comes in to review as part of registration review is
20 pretty incredible. We ask for product chemistry data,
21 product performance data, data to determine hazards in
22 companion animals, toxicity data to determine hazards
23 to humans, the residue chemistry data, applicator and
24 post-application exposure studies to determine
25 exposures for workers and homeowners, of course, the

1 environmental fate data, and then the data to
2 determine the hazard to the environment in general.

3 So the types of studies, the number of
4 studies that are submitted to support a registration
5 action and the science that's done to make sure that a
6 product is safe and effective is pretty incredible.

7 And then on the next slide, you know, what do
8 we do with that information and are we merely just
9 rubber stamping industries' requests for pesticide
10 registration? And to that I say that is also part of
11 a false narrative that I've heard, and the reason why
12 it's a false narrative is these are just the metrics.
13 So since 2007, 26 conventional chemicals have been
14 canceled and more than 70 percent of the conventional
15 chemical decisions have required human health and/or
16 ecological risk mitigation. That works out to about
17 30 percent for human health and 60 percent for
18 ecological risks, but 70 percent had at least and
19 required some form of ecological risk for human
20 health, in addition to the 26 conventional chemicals
21 that have been canceled.

22 And, you know, we really understand the
23 pressures that growers are under to provide food for
24 our tables and to do that in a safe and effective
25 manner. So when we do have new science that

1 demonstrates the inability to approve that chemical or
2 to continue that chemical in the marketplace, the
3 agency has worked with registrants where we have
4 negotiated the cancellation generally. Once we show
5 the science, the cancellation sort of happens and it
6 tends to be amicable and understanding. We first work
7 to reduce the mitigation -- or actually increase
8 mitigation to reduce exposure, and if that doesn't
9 work, then we go to cancellation.

10 So some of the registration review risk
11 reductions that are on our website include reductions
12 to bystander exposure for aerial applications,
13 improving worker protection, requiring additional
14 modifications, like personal protective equipment,
15 reducing application rates or eliminating uses
16 altogether. Reducing application restrictions, use
17 deletions, and increasing restricted entry intervals
18 are some of the other mitigation that's applied.

19 On the next slide, on reducing ecological
20 risks of pesticides, Slide 31. Where applicable,
21 we've also taken measures to reduce spray drift,
22 reduce risk to plants developing resistance to
23 herbicides, reducing potential risk to non-target
24 organisms by establishing maximum annual rates, and
25 then reducing risks to non-target organisms by

1 negotiating use deletions.

2 And then, of course, the dietary risk
3 reductions, basically including eliminating
4 applications to soil and making sure that uptake isn't
5 happening related to dietary risks.

6 What's interesting is FDA just came out with
7 its report showing that, you know, a high 90 percent
8 of the products that they tested for had residues well
9 below the tolerance level set by EPA for the vast
10 majority of the food supply, in the 96 to 98 percent
11 range. And I would refer you to the FDA report on
12 that that recently came out.

13 On some of the recent cancellations,
14 pentachlorophenol and irgarol, these are just a couple
15 of examples of what's recently been canceled in March
16 and April.

17 Next slide, chlorpyrifos, this was as a
18 result of a court decision, but the agency did take
19 steps to revoke all tolerances of chlorpyrifos. In
20 this current administration, we intend to follow that
21 with the Notice of Intent to Cancel. The tolerances
22 for chlorpyrifos are revoked in -- February 28th of
23 2022, six months after we published. That was, in
24 part, to address our World Trade Organization
25 requirements to allow international partners time to

1 adjust. And we have received some objections to that
2 final tolerance revocation rule and we are considering
3 considering those objections and we'll work through
4 the process related to chlorpyrifos.

5 Next slide, glyphosate and paraquat. Here
6 are some updates here, which I won't go into too much
7 detail, but glyphosate is on everyone's
8 radar. We have stood by our decision that glyphosate
9 is not likely to be carcinogenic. Paraquat, which is
10 a tool that growers need for a lot of burn down and
11 enables actually some ability to do no till was a --
12 but is also highly toxic to humans, we put in some
13 additional mitigation there to allow that use and
14 those limitations are listed here.

15 Next slide for carbaryl and sulfuric
16 fluoride, we released the draft human health and risk
17 assessment for the N-methyl carbamates insecticides,
18 and then for sulfuric fluoride, this is the reentry
19 interval for when you're fumigating a home necessary
20 to reduce pest infestations of homes, you know, are
21 the devices that measure those readings appropriate
22 and adequate, is the reentry interval appropriate
23 given what we know, and so we've made adjustments to
24 protect to the workers that are going in after and the
25 homeowners that are going in after SF applications.

1 Next slide on neonics. We've certainly done
2 a lot on the neonics registration review piece. We've
3 also, as I mentioned, released draft BEs for several
4 of the neonics. So continue to watch this space on
5 neonics.

6 Next slide, rodenticides and pyrethroids. We
7 did draft risk assessments for rodenticides, and
8 throughout 2020 and 2021, we published numerous
9 proposed interim decisions for pyrethroids, as well.
10 The remaining pyrethroids are going to come out in
11 2022, as well as the rodenticides.

12 We continue to advance science. Next slide.
13 As mentioned earlier, we are focused on reducing
14 animal testing where we can. This isn't just to
15 reduce testing to reduce testing. This is to reduce
16 duplicative testing. Where we have enough data and
17 information to provide for toxicity and circumstances
18 related to adverse effects, we are willing to wave
19 those studies because we have enough data to prove our
20 thesis in terms of the safety of that product, we will
21 wave those tests. And so we've advanced a number of
22 new guidance methodologies and models that help
23 advancing cutting-edge science for how to review
24 pesticide decisions.

25 Next slide, on the PFAS containers, folks are

1 aware of this and our response to this particular
2 aspect. Some good citizen science done by PEER
3 up in Massachusetts uncovered the potential
4 link of PFAS in pesticide containers. We worked with
5 the State of Massachusetts and our own lab to test
6 some of those products. It did appear that one of the
7 products did have some PFAS in the pesticide, but that
8 was related, and our hypothesis was it was related to
9 the fluorinated containers. We worked with that
10 particular company and they removed the fluorinated
11 containers from their supply chain and used a
12 different product.

13 We've been working with industry to make sure
14 they're examining their supply chains to remove any
15 harmful PFAS chemicals from their supply chains, and then
16 recently we put out a new protocol so that if others
17 would like to test pesticides -- you know, some of
18 this science again is cutting edge. There were really
19 no good test methods out there. We had to develop our
20 own, and we're asking that folks peer review that new
21 method and uncover where pesticides may be
22 contaminated with PFAS. But we continue to
23 investigate that working with our other federal
24 partners and get ahead of that.

25 Pet collars have also been in the news.

1 We've sought information from the various registrants
2 related to pet products to make sure that our pets are
3 safe. There have been a high number of incidents
4 related to pet deaths and pet incidents that we are
5 investigating. And as part of that, we put out a call
6 and took public comment on the petition for revoking
7 Seresto Pet Collars, in particular, which were one of
8 the pet collars that were specifically in the news
9 recently.

10 Dicamba, also an issue that folks are closely
11 tracking, a tool that growers use for pig weed and
12 palmer amaranth and breakthrough weeds. This chemical
13 has been reviewed a number of times. We've put a
14 number of mitigation processes in place with regard to
15 the labels. It's been through multiple litigation in
16 the courts. And, recently, we had been examining the
17 incidents that have been occurring with Dicamba and we
18 have done a data call-in related to the registrants
19 who own this product.

20 In some cases, the Dicamba, in some states,
21 there have not been reported incidents. In some
22 states, the incidents have remained the same. And in
23 some states, the incidents have been increasing.
24 So we are working with our growers, state agencies,
25 and other experts to evaluate the effectiveness and

1 the current incidents that have come up in some states
2 within the United States and -- you know, the Lower 50
3 that have access to this product, and we are
4 continuing to work through that issue.

5 AEZ -- this is my last couple of slides --
6 for folks that aren't aware, the AEZ is a rule again
7 that has worker protection at its heart. There were
8 some revisions made. In 2020, that rule was litigated
9 and the court stayed it until further notice. The
10 2015 WPS remains in effect as we continue to work
11 through how we would like to address the litigants'
12 claims in that case related to making sure that
13 agriculture worker protection standards remain full
14 and robust for workers.

15 Next slide on certification of pesticide
16 applicators rule, so very recently, I don't know if
17 you saw the OPP update, we provided information that
18 indicated we were going to seek an extension of the
19 due date for states to submit and to approve -- for us
20 to approve the new certification plans that were part
21 of the new rule that was published. There were
22 certainly many challenges along the way, COVID being
23 one of them, some of the litigation or prior -- sort
24 of statements from the prior administration on where
25 we were headed with the certification rule. You know,

1 the good news is we've completed the review of about
2 30 of the 60 state, territory, and tribal plans that
3 need to be completed.

4 So we have been doing a lot of work with the
5 regions, with states to have them submitted. All the
6 state plans were submitted on time, which is great.
7 It's just we think we need a little bit more time to
8 have those state plans be finally approved and run
9 through the process given some of the workload issues
10 and some of the issues associated with COVID. So we
11 put out a notice recently indicating our desire to try
12 to extend that deadline for states, given the
13 pressures that they're under.

14 And then my last slide is, as I mentioned, we
15 continue to look for ways to improve the way we are
16 approving pesticides, reevaluating pesticides. So we
17 are a bit of a lean organization within OPP. These
18 are some examples of the benefits of those lean
19 principles, which include really empowering employees
20 to find better ways to have processes implemented.
21 And so we've launched new process improvement efforts
22 and visual management.

23 Some of the slides that I showed you at the
24 beginning are some of that way that we're tracking
25 your work visually to better track the new pesticide

1 active ingredients and address common issues with
2 application packages, working with industry to provide
3 feedback on where applications are not successful and
4 the reasons why and creating a feedback loop so we can
5 get better applications to make it into the system so
6 that they are more successful in a more timely basis.
7 So we can kind of bend the curve for the work that
8 exists out there.

9 Other examples, we've converted the Gold Seal
10 Letters to fully electronic. We developed a device
11 determination tracking system. We reduced the backlog
12 of ecological incidents and the incident data system,
13 and we continue to deploy IT modernization and digital
14 transformation in our BPPD and Antimicrobials Division
15 to make sure that we're using the best technology and
16 the best processes to do the work that we need to do.

17 So in sum, hopefully, that shows you a little
18 bit of the work that OPP completed this past year.
19 It's quite voluminous. It's quite impressive. And my
20 hat and utter thanks goes to the incredibly dedicated
21 OPP employees that have worked tirelessly throughout
22 this pandemic remotely, in amazing conditions to
23 deliver sound science and products that growers need
24 and that helps get food on the table for American
25 citizens in a safe and effective way.

1 So thank you so much for your time and thank
2 you for listening to me be the biggest cheerleader and
3 advocate for the staff here in OPP.

4 So with that, we can go over to logistics.

5 FACILITATOR: Thank you, Ed. This is Paul.
6 I just want to -- it appears that we might actually be
7 -- let's see here -- ahead of schedule and I'm
8 wondering did you want to entertain any questions from
9 the PPDC on your presentation or are -- you want to
10 just go right into the (inaudible). If so, we might
11 break a little bit early for lunch. It's up to you.
12 I don't want to put you on the spot.

13 MR. MESSINA: Yeah, we can maybe take a
14 couple if we've got some time.

15 FACILITATOR: Shannon, would you agree that
16 we have a few minutes for some Q&A on the schedule?
17 I'm looking at the time block.

18 MS. JEWELL: Yes, that's right, that's right.
19 Ed's session is scheduled to end at 12:45.

20 FACILITATOR: Okay, and then that way we can
21 leave it --

22 MR. MESSINA: Yeah, one thing I could
23 probably talk about because it came up was the worker
24 protection stuff and I can take a little deeper dive

1 on that as well since that was a question from the
2 last session.

3 So one of the things we do for worker
4 protection is we have -- we fund about six cooperative
5 agreements, they're called PERC, AFOP, HCN,
6 CauseWay. It was about \$4 million. Each of the
7 funding vehicles result in implementation or outreach
8 regarding pesticide safety, and it's heavily -- a
9 heavy emphasis on occupational safety. So if folks
10 have heard, we've done some worker protection
11 standards. You know, that rule that's out there.
12 Radio messaging and training for farmworkers, we've
13 done it in Spanish as well in Spanish-speaking areas.

14 So we have a great partnership with our
15 cooperative agreements and the folks that implement
16 that I know we're going to hear and one of the
17 workgroup -- sub-workgroups was on this particular
18 issue and so we'll hear later today or tomorrow from
19 that group on some recommendations for how the agency
20 can even do a better job there. But there are lots of
21 efforts, including the CNT and the worker protection
22 standards that we focus on worker safety.

23 FACILITATOR: Thanks, Ed. I'm not sure if
24 you're tracking the chat, but if we go scroll up a
25 little bit, Jasmine Brown had a question. It says,

1 are registrants looking at PFAS in adjuvants.

2 MR. MESSINA: Yeah. So we've asked that --
3 great question. We've asked that industry look at
4 their entire supply chain for any PFAS potential
5 chemicals. I'll note that if you've been following
6 this space, the agency put out its recent new PFAS
7 action plan, which has some definitions around PFAS
8 and a plan for how we're going to address PFAS in
9 general. Our small piece of that is making sure that
10 there are no harmful PFAS chemicals in pesticides or
11 the containers or any products that travel along with
12 the pesticides. And we have had conversations with
13 registrants who have come in who have uncovered PFAS
14 compounds in their pesticides. It's a small, small
15 handful. It's like one or two so far.

16 And what's interesting is some of the places
17 they found them were like bind -- to your point, was
18 like a binding agent and it was only used in Europe.
19 It wasn't used in the U.S. That's one of the
20 examples. But, you know, when they were doing their
21 due diligence to examine whether they had PFAS
22 chemicals in their supply chain, that was an example
23 of where it's not necessarily potentially the
24 pesticide itself or the inactive or the inert
25 ingredient, it's, you know, some other binding agent

1 or adjuvant that can be associated and travel along
2 with that product.

3 MS. BROWN: Thank you, Ed. Thank you, Paul,
4 for asking that and thanks for answering that. We
5 look forward to designing policy or strategy as more
6 information comes out.

7 MR. MESSINA: Thank you.

8 FACILITATOR: Fantastic. Thanks. And we have
9 a couple more, Ed, if that's okay with you.

10 MR. MESSINA: Sure.

11 FACILITATOR: One from Charlotte Sanson. So
12 thanks for the update, Ed. Two questions. Question
13 1, where does OPP stand with regarding to staffing
14 needs given the increasing workload and associated
15 funding? Will additional staff be added and, if so,
16 to which divisions will the head count be allocated?

17 That's question one. I could pause there if
18 you want to address that or I can give you the second
19 half as well.

20 MR. MESSINA: I'll take the first question.

21 FACILITATOR: Okay.

22 MR. MESSINA: Yeah. So as a, you know,
23 federal official in the executive branch, I am almost
24 prohibited from asking people to lobby Congress for
25 resources. Right? So, that's a no-no. So don't

1 interpret anything I'm saying to say I'm asking for
2 more resources. My goal in providing information
3 about where we are is just to provide data to folks
4 who are wondering, you know, how does OPP get all of
5 the work that it gets done, and you saw the large
6 volume with the resources it had and what does that
7 resource picture look like.

8 When asked, my standard reply is, I support
9 the President's budget as a member of the executive
10 branch and we will adjust and cope with the resources
11 that we receive. And, again, the process improvements
12 and IT developments are part of our way to improve the
13 processes and efficiencies of the system to make
14 the resources that we do get go the farthest that it
15 can.

16 So I will let you draw your own conclusions
17 about the resources that OPP needs. I will say we are
18 internally doing more workforce analysis or workload
19 analysis and, to your second question, the new IT
20 system gives us a window into what our workflow looks
21 like in real time and what -- it actually uses some
22 predictive analytics to take all of the registration
23 packages and things that we need to do that are in-
24 house currently, matches it up with the resources and
25 tells us in the future where our trend lines might be

1 heading for renegotiations and decisions and
2 completion dates and days over PRIA.

3 So we are laser-focused on those processes
4 and the IT is designed to help us see that and have a
5 window and visual management into that. We're happy
6 to do demos where needed. The Antimicrobials
7 Division, the Pollution Prevention Division, and the
8 front end processing system are connected to this new
9 CRM, or customer relations management software system,
10 and we continue to develop that.

11 You know, some of the other technology
12 improvements that we're looking at that I didn't
13 mention like, the ECSF builder trying to get the
14 OPPEL label builder launched, trying to -- and it's not
15 just to increase our efficiency internally, it's
16 really to increase transparency, as well. So as we
17 collect this metadata and we're able to more rapidly
18 search for ourselves, you know, how many products are
19 effective on this particular pest on strawberries and
20 we kind of linked that up with PPLS, that's not as
21 smooth as it could be. And so as we collect this data
22 in a more manageable way, we'll be able to provide
23 that information to industry and to the public in the
24 way of dashboards and searchability for our systems
25 and the data that we have in-house for the pesticides

1 we have and the products and the pests that they
2 address.

3 So hopefully, that answered your question,
4 Charlotte.

5 FACILITATOR: Thanks, Ed. Can you see Mano's
6 question there? I'm not sure if you're actually
7 looking at the chat window. I just want to make sure.

8 MR. MESSINA: Let's see. Thanks, Ed. What
9 resources can change my (inaudible) perspective...

10 DR. BASU: And, Ed, it is a similar question
11 to Charlotte had.

12 MR. MESSINA: Yeah.

13 DR. BASU: So I think you have answered it
14 pretty much. We can move on to the next questions.
15 Thank you.

16 MR. MESSINA: Yeah. I'll add that, you know,
17 as the beginning of my presentation showed, there are
18 some new initiatives, including environmental justice,
19 climate change, Endangered Species Act. So as we try
20 to bring on these new priorities, the question is, you
21 know, where will we refocus. The good news is that
22 the administration is giving thought to where they are
23 asking for these new priorities. They are also asking
24 what additional resources you might need to do these
25 priorities. And so the hope is, depending on the

1 congressional budget that gets passed, there could
2 potentially be some additional resources provided to
3 address the new priorities that the administration has
4 articulated.

5 So that's a little bit more of a refined
6 answer to your specific question, Mano, hopefully.

7 DR. BASU: Thank you very much.

8 FACILITATOR: Thanks, Ed. Do you see Amy
9 Liebman's question?

10 MR. MESSINA: Amy --

11 FACILITATOR: It would have been right after
12 Mano's. Let me see here, thanks for the update, I'm
13 glad to see climate and environmental justice in the
14 strategic plan. Is there a reason the groupings do
15 not specifically mention workers and handlers.

16 MR. MESSINA: I think we consider workers and
17 handlers, and hopefully that came off in my chat as
18 part of the environmental justice piece. I would say
19 Amy, if you do think that the agency's strategic plan
20 should have more specific mention around that, I would
21 encourage you to submit comments to the draft plan.
22 And you can do so by submitting comments on EPA's
23 website. The comment period is open for the strategic
24 plan. But for our purposes for OPP as it translates
25 down into our strategy document, I certainly see that

1 connection. Hopefully my -- I think my slides
2 hopefully represented it. If they don't, I'm happy to
3 talk offline about how I can do a better job, sort of,
4 marrying those topics up and actually having the
5 slides reflect that.

6 FACILITATOR: And we probably had time for
7 one more. Do you see Cathy Tortorici's question?

8 MR. MESSINA: When will you be coming back to
9 NIMFS, how you are going to handle chlorpyrifos in the
10 ESA Section 7 perspective? I'm not sure I understand
11 that question specifically, given that the uses will
12 potentially, if the process runs through as part of
13 the NOIC and after the objections process from the
14 revocation of the tolerance so that those uses would
15 be canceled.

16 So, Cathy, do you want to maybe refine your
17 question?

18 FACILITATOR: And, Cathy, I'm not sure if
19 you're on mute or not. We don't hear you.

20 MR. MESSINA: I mean, presumably, again,
21 there's many steps that need to happen, but the first
22 thing we've done is we've revoked tolerances. The
23 next thing we would do after the objections process
24 and making decisions about the credibility of those
25 objections would be a notice of intent to cancel and

1 so those food uses would be canceled. So there would
2 be, at least for those uses, those uses would
3 disappear and that would address the ESA perspective.

4 The nonfood uses are also going through
5 registration review, but I imagine that's going to be
6 delayed until we work out the process related to the
7 food uses and devote the same team's resources to
8 responding to the multiple objections that have been
9 in place. But there is some work happening in
10 parallel related to the nonfood uses as well and sort
11 of reevaluating that as part of registration review.

12 MS. TORTORICI: Can you hear me now?

13 MR. MESSINA: Yes.

14 MS. TORTORICI: Okay.

15 MR. MESSINA: Did that answer your question?

16 MS. TORTORICI: Can you hear me now, Paul?

17 FACILITATOR: Yes, we can. Yes, I can hear
18 you.

19 MR. MESSINA: Yes.

20 FACILITATOR: I can hear you fine.

21 MS. TORTORICI: You can hear me? Okay,
22 great. Sorry, I've been having difficulty with this
23 this morning and I apologize to you all for the delay.

24 The reason I'm asking this question, Ed, is
25 that when we've talked to your staff earlier on in

1 this process, you were still making the decision, and
2 what you do from the human health standpoint -- we're
3 unclear how it then affects the environmental
4 standpoint from the standpoint of listed species. And
5 son we just need to hear from you, because, as, you
6 know, we're in the middle of a reinitiation action on
7 our 2017 biological opinion that involves
8 chlorpyrifos.

9 So it's important that we get a clear signal
10 from EPA on what they intend to do as we continue
11 those conversations on what to do regarding that
12 opinion. So I'm just putting that out there as a flag
13 that there was some confusion earlier about this and
14 we want to make sure that we understand what you guys
15 are doing, and then the direction you're taking in
16 relationship to that biological opinion.

17 MR. MESSINA: Okay, yeah, appreciate it. And
18 I'm happy to talk offline and make sure our staff for
19 getting you the information you need. I think the
20 issue there is we do need to work through the
21 objections, right? So for me to tell you, what's
22 going to happen next, I want to be respectful of the
23 objections process before I'd sort of say, you know,
24 what direction we're heading.

25 MS. TORTORICI: Sure.

1 MR. MESSINA: So we'll make sure staff reach
2 out and connect with you on that.

3 MS. TORTORICI: Thank you. I appreciate it
4 because we're under a court-ordered deadline and I
5 want to make sure that what we're saying in that
6 biological opinion is consistent with what you all are
7 deciding regarding this chemical. Thank you.

8 MR. MESSINA: Great. Thanks, Cathy.

9 What chemical pesticides were tested for in
10 the well water testing assessment. I'm not sure I
11 know all the specific chemicals for that. So,
12 Jeannie, we'll take that back and Shannon can provide
13 an answer.

14 There's so many pesticide classes. What is
15 the process to identify which pesticide to test for in
16 well water, especially...yeah, we'll take that one
17 back.

18 Mily, yeah, paraquat is an interesting one
19 and we could we could spend a whole session on
20 paraquat. And, you know, what I personally struggle
21 with paraquat is unfortunately it is being used and
22 I'm not -- I'm basically just parroting what the
23 incident data shows, I'm not endorsing this, or I
24 don't -- I almost don't want to call it out, but the
25 deaths related to paraquat are largely suicide

1 attempts and suicides using that -- unfortunately,
2 using the product. So a lot of our mitigation has
3 centered around making paraquat unavailable for people
4 to use it in that manner. And it's the way the
5 containers are formed, it's selling it and not selling
6 it in small amounts. So that's where a lot of the
7 mitigation revolves around.

8 It's also, you know, highly toxic and there's
9 certain mitigation around that. But when you think of
10 the farmworker, unfortunately, and there are
11 farmworkers using it, who are living in conditions
12 where they've sort of reached the end and they've made
13 a decision to use that chemical for ending their life.
14 And it's very unfortunate; it's troubling; it's an
15 emotional issue. So I would like to continue to talk
16 about it.

17 I think that the team did an excellent job in
18 really balancing those risks and the risks and the
19 needs for growers who are -- who, if you use this
20 product as intended and in a safe manner, it's an
21 effective product. It's just where that misuse is
22 happening that's causing some issues associated with
23 that product, and not to minimize it or brush it off,
24 it's very serious and our team I know gave a lot of
25 thought to how to mitigate that harm and that

1 potential. So thank you for that question and happy
2 to continue to talk about paraquat, Mily, if you'd
3 like.

4 MS. TREVINO-SAUCEDA: Can I just give a
5 response to that a little bit?

6 MR. MESSINA: Yeah, sure.

7 MS. TREVINO-SAUCEDA: In our community --

8 FACILITATOR: We have to be really quick. We
9 have to be quick on this, okay?

10 MS. TREVINO-SAUCEDA: I understand, but this
11 is this is about lives -- the livelihood of
12 farmworkers and in this -- I mean, we have seen much
13 more and we have not seen as many as has been talked
14 about, in terms of suicide or anything like that, it's
15 more of the way it's been used and misused and why
16 we're so concerned that you're still providing the
17 permission of the use of paraquat, and this is why
18 there's a lawsuit, you know.

19 So we can go on and on, but for the purpose
20 of I just want to bring it up that it's going to
21 continue harming workers and the communities around
22 there, any agriculture, and there's many more I wish
23 that we would have more enforcement instead of
24 just saying, you know, the excuse of it's people
25 misusing it, when it's companies misusing when they're

1 applying the chemicals and they use of is -- it's just
2 harming. Thank you.

3 MR. MESSINA: Thank you, Mily, for those
4 comments. I really appreciate it for this important
5 topic.

6 Okay. So, Paul, I will kick it over to you
7 and Shannon to walk through the agenda and then close
8 us out before lunch break. Thanks, everyone, for your
9 time.

10 FACILITATOR: Fantastic. Thank you, Ed.
11 Thanks very much for your presentation. Obviously,
12 considering the scientific and technical and
13 administrative and regulatory challenges that your
14 team faces it's no wonder you're very proud of these
15 accomplishments. So thanks very much.

16 Okay, let me just shift gears real quick.
17 and just join Ed and Jake and Shannon and the entire
18 EPA team in welcoming everybody today. My name is
19 Paul Aninos. I'm joined by Sarah Chadwick. We're
20 both with App Associates, a company that's been
21 serving EPA's mission for the past three decades,
22 including the Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution
23 Prevention. So we're happy to be here supporting your
24 meeting today.

25 You may remember us from the May meeting.

1 and this meeting is patterned almost exactly like the
2 May 2021 PPDC meeting. We will try to adhere to the
3 publicized agenda, which I'm sure you've been able to
4 download off of the PPDC website, and basically we'll
5 adhere to the time blocks, especially when we are
6 going to zero in on the public comment period, I
7 believe starting at 4:30 today. So we've got to get
8 through today's agenda by 4:30. I will help everybody
9 -- nudge everybody along on that.

10 A note to the PPDC members and the presenters
11 today, the presenters, of course, know already that we
12 are aiming to leave plenty of time at the end of their
13 presentation for PPDC members to ask questions, make
14 comments, et cetera, because the whole purpose of
15 today is to get the reactions and feedback from the
16 PPDC. So I'll make sure that happens with friendly
17 time alerts to our presenters, but this is just
18 another friendly reminder to all of our presenters to
19 leave that gap at the end for some good PPDC Q&A.

20 And then just at a very high level, in terms
21 of the agenda review, as you know, again, the agenda
22 is published. So you've all seen it. I won't go line
23 by line through it. We'll have four workgroup
24 presentations. The workgroups have been working hard
25 for a long, long time to develop these

1 recommendations. You saw draft recommendations six,
2 months ago in the May meeting. So here we have the
3 four workgroup final presentations over the next two
4 days.

5 Today, we'll hear from one of those, that's
6 the farmworker and clinician training workgroup.
7 Tomorrow, we'll hear from the remaining three. Also,
8 over the two days, we have scheduled three special
9 presentations, and today we have two of those and
10 tomorrow is one. The two today is on the sensor
11 program and on risk communications and the one
12 tomorrow is the introduction to good laboratory
13 practices. And then we conclude both days with a 30-
14 minute public comment period. And then the final day
15 we conclude with Ed's kind of looking forward comments
16 and discussion.

17 So let me turn it over to Sarah for a moment
18 because we want to just make sure you kind of
19 understand how the technology is operating here to
20 support the meeting. And I'll turn it over to Sarah
21 for a quick review of those items.

22 FACILITATOR 2: Thanks, Paul. As Paul
23 mentioned my name is Sarah Chadwick and I am helping
24 provide technology support for the meeting both today
25 and tomorrow. While I know many of you are already

1 familiar with Webex, I wanted to review a few
2 reminders for PPDC members.

3 First, we recommend that you connect to this
4 meeting using computer audio and a headset. If you
5 need to change your audio method at any time', during
6 the meeting, you can go to the audio and video menu
7 that's at the very top of your screen. You may also
8 turn on video if you would like, but it is not a
9 requirement, so to turn on video, you can use the
10 button that's on the bottom of your screen near the
11 mute and unmute button.

12 And on the topic of mute and unmute, please
13 mute yourself when you are not actively speaking. You
14 can tell if you are on mute if your microphone icon is
15 red with a slash through it. If your microphone is
16 green, it means that you are not muted and we can hear
17 you.

18 Lastly, an important reminder about using the
19 chat. PPDC members, please select everyone from the
20 drop-down menu when you are sending chat messages.
21 And this option is all the way down at the bottom of
22 the drop-down options. So you may need to scroll a
23 little bit, but it is there. Please do not use the
24 all attendees option. Again, the option you want is
25 everyone. And this will ensure that the other PPDC

1 members and the public are able to see your message.

2 So those are all the reminders I have, but
3 feel free to send me a message if you are having any
4 technology issues throughout the meetings.

5 Back to you, Paul.

6 FACILITATOR: Thank you, Sarah. Thanks very
7 much. And I think we actually are ready to take the
8 lunch break. There is a 30-minute lunch break. If I
9 can conclude my remarks quickly, it will be 32 minutes
10 for lunch. But what we're going to suggest to
11 everybody that's logged in to this call, this meeting,
12 is don't leave the meeting, don't X out of the meeting
13 and then try to log back in, just go on mute and stop
14 your video according to the instructions that Sarah
15 just gave. That way, we can't see you or hear you.

16 And then set a timer or an alarm or something
17 on your phone to return a couple minutes before 1:15,
18 if possible. That's 1:15 Eastern time. I'm sorry, I
19 realize we have people from many different time zones.
20 But please return a few minutes early -- a couple
21 minutes early from your lunch break so that we can
22 start properly at 1:15. And that's everything we
23 have for you. So I think you've earned three extra
24 minutes for your lunch break.

25 MR. MESSINA: Thanks, Paul. See everybody in

1 half an hour.

2 FACILITATOR: Yep.

3 MS. JEWELL: Thank you.

4 FACILITATOR: Thank you.

5 (Lunch break.)

6 FACILITATOR: Okay, so I think we're back and
7 I hope we're back.

8 Ed, I think before we get started we were
9 going to try something with the PPDC this time around
10 using a polling system to capture agreement on the
11 recommendations. Did you want to kind of review your
12 philosophy on that for a moment.

13 MR. MESSINA: Yeah, sure. So generally the
14 FACA rules are not entirely prescriptive on how to
15 record consensus, which is kind of what we're arriving
16 for here. Given that we're virtual, the way we had
17 proposed to do it today -- so we're going to have the
18 presentation, and after the presentation, in order to
19 sort of establish for the record what the PPDC
20 recommendation is to EPA on whether to adopt or not
21 the sub-workgroup's recommendation, what I'm going to
22 do is after the presentation, I'm going to ask the
23 PPDC if there's a motion to approve the
24 recommendations. I will then see if there's a motion.
25 I will ask for a second to the motion.

1 Once there's a second to that motion, I will
2 ask if there are any clarifying questions or a
3 discussion that the PPDC would like to have around the
4 presentation that was just given and the document that
5 is in the site, the full report, and I'll turn it over
6 to Paul and Sarah, and they're going to conduct a
7 polling piece, which will look for consensus or
8 majority vote to recommend that the report be
9 submitted to EPA, and if we need to record any
10 dissenting opinions either on the actual report or
11 pieces of the report. So we're really hoping for a
12 full and open discussion and questions regarding the
13 reports and the presentations that we're going to be
14 getting over the next couple of days.

15 So basically, I'll ask for a motion, a
16 second, clarifying questions, and then we'll take a
17 vote on whether the full PPDC recommends that the sub-
18 workgroup's documents and materials be forwarded on to
19 EPA.

20 FACILITATOR: Excellent. So it's a little
21 bit of a twist from from what we did last time, so
22 just giving the PPDC members like a heads-up.

23 And our first -- right out of the gate, we're
24 starting with the farmworkers and clinician training
25 workgroup. And so we will be kind of cutting our

1 teeth on this process, you know, with this first
2 workgroup. So bear with us as we make it through.
3 I'm sure once we get through this one, the other ones
4 will be -- you know, we'll have the process down a
5 little bit more superiorly.

6 So I wanted to kick off this segment of our
7 agenda, which is the farmworker and clinician training
8 workgroup report out. I'm going to introduce the co-
9 chairs and the first speaker in just a moment, but
10 just as a heads up since we're going to kind of chop
11 up this presentation into the two segments, one is the
12 farmworker training and the other is the clinician
13 training. And we're going to go through the
14 presentation on farmworker training first and then
15 we're going to -- followed by the Q&A, you know, so
16 the PPDC members can ask questions. Then we'll follow
17 that with the clinician training and it's Q&A, and
18 then we'll follow the entire workgroup segment with
19 the voting and polling that Ed just described. So
20 that's kind of the order of events.

21 So just as a reminder, the co-chairs of the
22 farmworker and clinician training workgroup are Mily
23 Trevino-Sauceda from Alianza Nacional de Campesinas;
24 Also Carolyn Schroeder and Steve Schaible, both with
25 the Office of Pesticide Programs.

1 I believe kicking off today's presentation is
2 Patsy Laird from Syngenta Corporation, and she's also
3 a member of the American Association of Pesticide
4 Safety Educators.

5 So if Patsy is ready, I think we're ready.

6 MS. LAIRD: Thanks, Paul. So I'm just going
7 to take a couple of minutes to introduce a quick
8 overview of our recommendations. First off, starting
9 with the members of the workgroup. As you can see,
10 it's a pretty diverse workgroup representing a lot of
11 nonprofits, a few industry people. So it's very, very
12 diverse.

13 And -- sorry.

14 The charge questions, you would all be
15 familiar with from last spring and I guess last fall,
16 but we're really talking about reporting requirements
17 for PRIA set-asides for farmworker protection
18 activities, specifically evaluating the
19 appropriateness and effectiveness of farmworker
20 protection activities, engaging stakeholders into
21 decisions to fund such activities, and EPA reaching
22 out to stakeholders.

23 We did make a change before this spring
24 meeting. The original charge questions referred to
25 workers, but we did, as a group, decide to narrow the

1 focus a little bit to farmworkers.

2 Oh, sorry. Not used to this
3 program. Little tiny things.

4 Okay. So I want to say a couple of things
5 here. One, these recommendations represent a
6 consensus across, like I said, a very diverse group.
7 And the consensus is built on whoever spoke up in the
8 meetings. So we didn't ever do any official polling
9 or voting and not everyone was comfortable speaking
10 up. So these are our best, in my opinion and I think
11 Mily and others would agree, this is as good a
12 consensus as we could come to.

13 For the farmworker training recommendations
14 in particular, these recommendations may address more
15 than one of the charge questions. Some of them are
16 going to be really easy, quick to implement. Some
17 others might be hard. And most of them, once
18 implementation begins, we foresee that they would be
19 ongoing over an extended period of time.

20 So, Mily Trevino-Sauceda is going to be
21 presenting the farmworker training recommendations.
22 Thanks, Mily.

23 MS. TREVINO-SAUCEDA: Thank you. Patsy.
24 Yeah, thank you to all the group -- workgroup that was
25 involved. There were many, many meetings, and some of

1 them I could not participate myself, but I was in tune
2 with all the notes and then I also provided my own
3 recommendations. And we have set up in terms of the
4 highest priority and then not that they're not
5 priority, some of the recommendations but we do have
6 them towards the end.

7 And the first recommendation is it's
8 important that EPA involved farmworkers, farmworker
9 organizations and worker protection -- the WPS
10 trainers and EPA-funded projects that design, develop,
11 review, and evaluate WPS training materials, and this
12 is including membership on advisory committees.

13 I'm going to read them, and then if there's
14 -- for anyone from the group that will like to share a
15 little bit more, you can do so, but just let me know.

16 Number two, incorporate evidence-based
17 approaches to design and evaluate effective training.

18 And number three is require that farmworker
19 training be provided in an appropriate engaging format
20 and revise the funding mechanism to support
21 development of training materials for diverse crop
22 systems and farmer communities, and this means
23 culturally and geographically relevant. And we
24 explained a little bit. It's very, very important to
25 work with in the cultural context of the workers, you

1 know. How they understand, how they really see things
2 or not, because some of them also might not be able to
3 read or write or really understand the language if
4 it's in Spanish. Results in better retention of
5 material presented. This information, Number 3, is in
6 the next slide. We're going to give more
7 recommendations onto that or more explanation.

8 Can we go to the next slide, please?

9 JEANNIE: Can I make a quick comment? This is
10 Jeannie --

11 MS. TREVINO-SAUCEDA: Yes.

12 JEANNIE: from the farmworker association.

13 MS. TREVINO-SAUCEDA: Yes, Jeannie.

14 JEANNIE: I just wanted to stress that in that
15 previous slide, that when it talks about involving
16 farmworkers, I want to stress the fact of farmworkers
17 need to be involved from the very beginning and not
18 later on in later stages, but in the very beginning.
19 They need to be part of the decision-making process as
20 full participants. Because of their personal
21 experience, you can't get any better than farmworkers'
22 personal experiences. And they need to be involved in
23 all steps of the process. That hasn't always happened
24 in the past.

25 And then, lastly, you have a wealth of

1 farmworker organizations that have been involved in
2 this that have been working with farmworkers for years
3 and decades. So you have a tremendous resource here
4 with all of the farmworker organizations. So please
5 use that expertise. Thanks.

6 MS. TREVINO-SAUCEDO: Thank you, Jeannie.
7 Thank you. And this means that -- at the same time
8 that training is provided in language the workers
9 understand, so we're going to have workers
10 participate. It's not the same thing here in this
11 section. We're saying that it's already required, but
12 most of the time it's very difficult to put it in
13 practice. Why? Because many workers have told us
14 that, at times, they are only given video to watch,
15 and if they have any questions, they might not
16 understand certain things, that's it, you're trained

17 So on (b), training method considers the
18 literacy level of the workers, and this is what I was
19 talking about earlier and this is what Jeannie is
20 mentioning because workers themselves can let us know
21 -- let EPA know how can they go about in terms of the
22 training, how can materials be prepared in a way that
23 it will get through in a very appropriate way
24 culturally, also a specific way, and uses more images
25 and fewer words. That means that if people cannot

1 read or write, you could be showing information, but
2 people will not be able to understand what's in front
3 of them unless they have images.

4 And the words are important, but at the same
5 time, if you're giving a training, you can go and
6 repeat what is there and the image will be giving more
7 information.

8 C) It's saying training acknowledges the
9 reality of some farmworker situations, that the
10 training really focuses on what is going on with
11 workers in the workplace and so that the workers can
12 really ask questions, what can they do if this happens
13 or what if this other thing is happening, and all this
14 gives workers more of an idea of what options do they
15 have.

16 D) Training incorporates relevant crop
17 pesticides and types of application instead of a just
18 one size fits all approach, and this is one training,
19 if it's done in a certain way, that doesn't mean that
20 it works with everybody, and we have seen that in our
21 own work. We have had a lot of lessons learned where
22 sometimes we train people -- for example, here in
23 California, we train people in one area and then we
24 realize that training people in another region of
25 California, it's not as relevant. So try not to see

1 it as one size fits all.

2 Then (E) is training takes into account
3 cultural characteristics of the workers, and this is
4 what I was just talking about earlier.

5 Next. Next slide.

6 JEANNIE: Can I make a quick comment again?

7 MS. TREVINO-SAUCEDA: Yes, quick.

8 JEANNIE: This is Jeannie again. I just want
9 to say that it's really important just because
10 farmworkers might have limited literacy ability does
11 not mean that they're not bright and intelligent and
12 very knowledgeable. So I think it's really important
13 for people that are creating these trainings to
14 recognize and acknowledge the knowledge and
15 intelligence level of the workers and make sure that
16 they are involved in the process.

17 MS. TREVINO-SAUCEDA: Yes, yes. Thank you,
18 Jeannie. This is very, very important and thank you
19 for highlighting that. We have, in our own
20 organizations, like Jeannie's, the Farmworker
21 Association, and Alianza Nacional de Campesinas, we
22 have many, many farmworker women and their families, which
23 are also farmworkers, that are -- you know, literacy
24 level is low, but very, very smart people and very
25 experienced in terms of what they do.

1 So it's important that we don't we don't ask
2 -- we're talking about people not knowing how to read
3 or write, that doesn't mean that they're not capable
4 or not intelligent. So thank you.

5 So number 4 as a recommendation is it's
6 important to conduct a pre-training needs assessment
7 and follow up on any earlier needs assessments if they
8 have been done before, prior to developing requests
9 for proposals (RFPs). Why? Because it's more related
10 to -- let's not see it within the agency just
11 perspective, but in terms of the field perspective
12 when you're trying to put together the request for
13 proposals.

14 Number 5 is include farmworkers, farmworker
15 organizations, and WPS trainers in needs assessments,
16 also, as part of the people that could be helpful in
17 putting together the RFP.

18 Number 6 is test effectiveness of different
19 methods of communicating to employers the benefits of
20 WPS training for them and their workers.

21 Next slide, please. And I'll try to hurry up
22 because I know it's -- we have very little time.

23 Other training recommendations are consider
24 requiring EPA-funded programs that are focused on
25 serving farmworker community and that have advisory

1 committees to serve 25 up to 50 percent for
2 farmworkers and provide adequate to result in their
3 full participation. And there's different ways and we
4 can talk about that later in terms of how -- in terms
5 of get their -- the support that they need. We're
6 working, we're getting support from our organizations
7 to be part of this, but workers do not.

8 Number 2 is commit to continuing, regular
9 quarterly meetings with farmworker organizations to
10 receive feedback on farmworker issues related to WPS
11 training.

12 I'm just going to continue reading. Three,
13 target farmworker groups when seeking proposals for
14 WPS training materials. We need to target the
15 farmworker groups. It's so important.

16 Four, require transparency from funded
17 programs in the development of training materials.

18 And is there anything that either Jeannie or I
19 or the group wants to say -- could we go to the next slide
20 -- thank you.

21 Number five, require programs that serve
22 farmworkers to have farmworkers evaluate their
23 activities.

24 Encourage or require refresher training for
25 non-licensed trainers. This is so, so important. We

1 have had a lot of feedback from workers in terms of
2 the non-licensed trainers.

3 Number 7, emphasize that (a) training is to
4 be conducted where workers are comfortable and (b)
5 questions and discussions are to be encouraged during
6 the training. So people will ask questions and people
7 will have discussions if they're in a very comfortable
8 and safe place, and this is related to how people will
9 feel at times asking certain questions if certain
10 people are there that might not like what they ask.

11 Number 8, increase WPS training for
12 pesticides inspectors to better equip them for
13 enforcement. This is so crucial for us. We need to
14 make sure that inspectors are really trained to really
15 understand how to do follow-up, the investigations and
16 also the enforcement.

17 Number 9, assess the level of compliance with
18 WPS training, and this is an ongoing, but possibly out
19 of scope for this workgroup.

20 Next, I think that was it.

21 JEANNIE: Can I make a quick comment about
22 number 7? If you could go back to the previous slide
23 number.

24 MS. TREVINO-SAUCEDA: Yes.

25 JEANNIE: Number 7 is really important. I was

1 with a group that was taking a training at a local
2 nursery in Central Florida, an ornamental plant
3 nursery, and while the video was being -- well, first
4 of all, the owner of the nursery really downplayed the
5 importance of showing the video. It was basically a
6 routine -- a thing that he said he felt compelled --
7 you know, he was required to do. But the people that
8 were watching the training had to stand up in a small
9 space and the training was, I think, like 20 minutes
10 long. So they were not comfortable standing in one
11 place having to watch the video. So they were
12 fidgety.

13 And then while the training was going on some
14 equipment at the nursery was started up so that the
15 sound drowned out parts of the training. And for the
16 trainings to be effective they have to be given with
17 serious consideration to the people that are taking
18 the training. I know that that is -- I think that
19 needs to be stressed, too, as part of the training,
20 that trainings need to be conducted in a way that is
21 conducive to people learning and listening to them.
22 Because in this particular situation and it happens
23 other places as well, the workers don't know why
24 they're taking the training, they don't give any
25 context to it. There was nobody there to answer

1 questions. And, again, key parts of the training were
2 drowned out by loud noises in the facility. And I was
3 there with them watching the training and it was very
4 uncomfortable to be standing in one, small area with,
5 I think, about 15 other people having to stand up and
6 watch the whole thing.

7 So that's really important. Thanks.

8 MS. TREVINO-SAUCEDA: So the environment is
9 very, very important and that means it's not just
10 thinking that workers are going to be comfortable, but
11 at the same time, if people are being trained in 115
12 degrees and they're outside, is there shade, is there
13 many other things aside from what Jeannie is talking
14 about. So, yeah, yeah. Thank you, Jeannie.

15 So I don't know, we can -- are we going to
16 open up for questions at this point in time, Paul?

17 MS. BROWN: I have a comment.

18 MS. TREVINO-SAUCEDA: Uh-huh.

19 FACILITATOR: So I'm sorry, who was that?

20 MS. BROWN: Oh, Jasmine Brown.

21 MS. TREVINO-SAUCEDA: Jasmine?

22 MS. BROWN: Yeah.

23 FACILITATOR: Jasmine, are you on the
24 workgroup?

25 MS. BROWN: No.

1 MS. TREVINO-SAUCEDA: No.

2 FACILITATOR: Okay. This portion of the
3 agenda -- feel free to put your thought into the chat,
4 but this portion of the agenda, we're transitioning
5 very rapidly to the PPDC. The PPDC, a week ago,
6 received all these recommendations and much more
7 thorough, you know, explanations of those and have had
8 that opportunity to review these recommendations.

9 Ms. JEWELL: Paul, I'm so sorry to
10 interject, Paul. Jasmine isn't on the workgroup, but
11 she as a PPDC member, yeah.

12 FACILITATOR: Oh, sorry, I'm sorry. Okay.

13 MS. BROWN: No worries.

14 FACILITATOR: I don't know everybody's name
15 and which workgroup they're on. Yes. So the answer
16 is we're opening for Q&A to the PPDC members. And,
17 Jasmine, you're number one.

18 MS. BROWN: I am fine putting my comment in
19 the chat box. On the previous slide of
20 recommendations, I just wanted to point out when I'm
21 interviewing workers to see if they've received
22 training, it's -- one of their comments -- I mean,
23 some of these workers don't like to be stopped or
24 taken out of work for very long to be interviewed.
25 And so there's quite a few requirements that you have

1 to check for and ask them and I try to get it done
2 within 10 or 15 minutes with them.

3 But just to be cognizant of that, when we're
4 putting forth these recommendations that, yeah, we
5 want them to be comfortable in things, but a lot of
6 times they don't actually want to stop work to -- but
7 the one thing I have seen is that everyone -- the
8 consistency of like central notification posting areas
9 and stuff, all workers know that these sites should
10 have one of those. And so I think -- I don't really
11 like the one-size-fits-all approach, but that
12 consistency has been super effective.

13 MS. TREVINO-SAUCEDA: When you say
14 consistency, what are you talking about? Maybe I can
15 also remind everybody that most of the time, if
16 workers are going to be paid so they can respond, if
17 you're an inspector, they'll be more than willing, and
18 if they're not going to be blacklisted after saying
19 if there's any issues happening in the workplace.
20 They don't like to be stopped because they're afraid
21 to talk, they're afraid to be pointed out as you're a
22 whistleblower or whatsoever. Most of the time that is
23 what's going on. And this is what -- when we're
24 talking about it's so important that inspectors are
25 being more equipped for enforcement and to really

1 understand that in asking people in front of their
2 bosses questions about what is going on, can you tell
3 us if there's any issues or whatsoever, workers will
4 not want to speak with you, not even with us.

5 And they've told us before don't ask us
6 questions when we're in the workplace, we can talk
7 after work, we can talk any other time, and if the
8 company does not know that I'm sharing information
9 about what's going on.

10 FACILITATOR: Thank you, Mily. And thank
11 you, Jasmine. Again, we're entertaining questions
12 from the PPDC only and I noticed Liza, you have a
13 question here, are we asking questions regarding the
14 recommendations and any comments should be added to
15 the chat. I think this would be a perfect opportunity
16 since we have an interaction going on here, is to
17 limit this to questions and then throw comments into
18 the chat because we'll capture all of that. But this
19 is a good chance to ask a question for clarification
20 relating to the specific recommendations.

21 And, Liza, if you -- I'm sorry, I don't know
22 how to pronounce your first name, "Leeza" or Liza, but
23 if you have a question, I'll let you go, and then Joe
24 will follow.

25 MS. FLEESON TROSSBACH: Thank you. I just

1 have a comment, so thinking about our time, I will add
2 it to the chat. So thank you for the clarification.

3 FACILITATOR: Okay, thanks very much.

4 Joseph, you have a question.

5 DR. GRYZWACZ: Yeah, thank you very much for
6 that. Thanks for the work of this group. Really my
7 question is primarily, you know, there's a lot of
8 variables out there that that that contribute to
9 farmworkers being very distinctive, including crop
10 variation and regional variation and that sort of
11 thing, you know, clearly, that all can't be done sort
12 of simultaneously. So did this workgroup come up with
13 a more finite number of attributes to begin with in
14 terms of how to essentially tailor some of the
15 different trainings to make them more useful to move
16 away from the one size fits all?

17 MS. TREVINO-SAUCEDA: Well, we did talk about
18 different ways of how some of our groups -- some
19 farmworker organizations groups have done. We use
20 theater, we use art, we use different things to be
21 able to do trainings. So there's different ways. Not
22 until -- I mean, we did give -- we did talk about
23 that. It's not placed in here, but I don't know.

24 Amy, did you want to add a little bit more on
25 this.

1 MS. LIEBMAN: I did. So, Joe, we did think a
2 lot about different components, such as, you know, the
3 geographic or the region, the types of crops, and we
4 also thought about sort of the -- one thing that we're
5 concerned about is also the type of pesticide. So
6 there's a lot of very specific things that we talked
7 about. We also did talk about sort of the evidence-
8 based practices being incorporated into the training.
9 So when there are, for example, NIOSH-funded studies
10 that show a type of training being more effective than
11 another type of training. We want that to be
12 incorporated as we move forward. So we're continually
13 adding the evidence. So we did talk very specifically
14 about ways to make the training appropriate and
15 relevant to workers.

16 DR. GRYZWACZ: Great. Thanks for that, Amy.
17 And it really gets to the heart of my question and
18 that is, I think these recommendations are great, but
19 because there's so much work in that end being able to
20 begin with sort of a targeted set of items. You know,
21 so what goes against advocated practices? Well, the
22 precepts of humoral medicine, for example, would be a
23 good one that operates at counter-purposes with
24 washing your hands or taking a shower immediately
25 after work. So being able to address that element in

1 training, I would argue is essential.

2 You know, the fact that piece rate
3 compensation is why they don't want to take time out
4 to answer questions, much less do something else
5 again, that's something that needs to be taken head-on
6 in an effective training kind of system. So I would
7 really encourage this workgroup to maybe identify some
8 low-hanging fruit as far as where to get started on
9 some specific items and then we can add to it over
10 time.

11 MS. BUHL: Thanks for that. I'd like to add
12 something. I was a member of this workgroup as well
13 and I'm also a deputy director of PERC, which is one
14 of the cooperative agreement Ed mentioned earlier on.
15 We developed the EPA WPS video. Early on in the
16 cooperative agreement, we did a big broad needs
17 assessment and we heard this same feedback that more
18 tailored pieces of training material would be more
19 effective and, in fact, we identified something like
20 eight sectors of vineyards, row crops, orchards,
21 greenhouses, but the resources were not sufficient to
22 do that many training pieces, at least in video. But
23 other organizations have stepped up and created one
24 for greenhouses, created different versions that are
25 available. Just sharing that.

1 But I get your question how many, because we
2 could certainly do hundreds of pieces of training
3 material that were very, very tailored, but how many
4 could we do that meet the broadest possible needs.

5 FACILITATOR: Yes, thank you, Kaci.

6 PPDC members, other questions for the
7 workgroup?

8 (No response.)

9 FACILITATOR: We will need to transition
10 quickly to the clinician training, but -- and I'm also
11 prepared, given the fact that we had to split into two and
12 that we have voting at the end, I'm prepared that we
13 will go a little bit over on our time allocation for
14 this, which means, Kaci, you might be thinking about a
15 reduced schedule on your end. Just giving everybody
16 a heads-up.

17 MS. BUHL: Understood.

18 FACILITATOR: Okay, thank you.

19 DR. GRYZWACZ: I didn't get in the
20 queue, but I'll just simply throw out that I think
21 these recommendations are really very important. I
22 mean, a group recently released some results that
23 suggest and totally reinforce what this group is
24 acting for, that is, engaged and interactive and
25 culturally and contextually tailored is the only

1 results that produce behavior change and knowledge
2 retention.

3 Unfortunately, the video as it's currently
4 created results in changes in knowledge, but that
5 knowledge, just like any college student who's taken
6 -- who's studied for an exam, they dump that knowledge
7 shortly thereafter and it shows up in the EPA. So I
8 really want to reinforce the importance of these
9 recommendations.

10 MS. TREVINO-SAUCEDA: Thank you.

11 MS. LAIRD: Paul, if it's okay with
12 you, I'm going to go ahead and introduce Amy Liebman
13 from Migrant Clinicians Network who's going to be
14 talking us through the clinician training
15 recommendations.

16 FACILITATOR: Perfect. Thank you.

17 MS. LAIRD: Go ahead. Knock it
18 out, Amy.

19 MS. LIEBMAN: Next slide.

20 So we had a lot of discussion about ways to
21 best train clinicians and the focus on conditions is
22 really important because the EPA is very reliant on
23 the reports from clinicians so that they understand
24 what's happening once the registered pesticides are
25 put in use and what the health consequences of them

1 are. So it's really important that clinicians have an
2 understanding of and be able to recognize and manage
3 pesticide poisonings and that also includes
4 understanding how to report them.

5 So our first recommendation comes to really
6 recommending that we have a national pesticide
7 incident reporting system since that data is so
8 critical to inform and evaluate any of the worker
9 protection activities that are going on, and
10 recognizing that there might be some challenges to
11 getting that done immediately, we do think it can be
12 done, but in the near term at a minimum we are looking
13 to establish some very standardized case definitions
14 for at least acute pesticide poisoning incidences and
15 then in the long term using those definitions as part
16 of a national incident reporting system.

17 Walter's going to speak later about a sensor
18 system, but just so everyone knows there is no
19 national system right now that people report to. It's
20 a very state-by-state basis and not all states require
21 it and not all states have a surveillance system.

22 Looking for ways to expand and improve
23 incident reporting, encouraging interagency
24 collaboration. The EPA along, with the Centers for
25 Disease Control and the National Institute for

1 Occupational Safety and Health, are -- it's very
2 important that they continue to work together to
3 address these recommendations.

4 Next slide.

5 We also wanted to make sure that when we're
6 looking at clinician training that we're targeting a
7 wide range of clinicians that are going to be involved
8 in anything to do with pesticide safety. So that
9 means that we're really defining that clinician very
10 broadly from the community health worker all the way
11 up until the specialized clinician, or any individual
12 that may be involved in the health-related concerns
13 regarding pesticides.

14 And then, also, sort of we're thinking about
15 clinicians and we know that clinicians serve all kinds
16 of people and different types of groups that are
17 exposed, really thinking about what are the common
18 elements that can be relevant through the clinical
19 lens, and then, you know, figuring out how to make it
20 relevant broadly to clinicians, but this is also going
21 to sort of go into a next recommendation that in
22 addition to sort of broadly thinking about all the
23 clinicians, we also want to make sure that we're
24 tailoring it to clinicians that are serving certain
25 occupation groups.

1 Next slide.

2 So one of the really important pieces, we
3 know that workers -- all kinds of workers, from
4 farmworkers to handlers to anyone using pesticides as
5 part of their work, the occupation becomes very
6 important in the recognition and management a
7 pesticide poisonings. So the idea that for a
8 clinician to understand the importance of occupation
9 and pediatric cases or cases involving a child being
10 exposed, making sure that that parental occupation is
11 taken into consideration and really looking at
12 evaluating our PRIA-funded activities related to
13 clinician training so that occupation is included.

14 And there were several examples of how to do
15 that, emphasizing some case studies, providing
16 accurate materials. The Recognition and Management of
17 Pesticide Poisonings at the EPA, I believe it's in
18 sixth edition, but it is a great resource for
19 clinicians, but it does always need to be up-to-date,
20 and creating apps with specific pesticide training.

21 Again, sort of that training -- there's a
22 basic part of clinician training that focuses on
23 history taking. Thinking about occupation and
24 thinking about environmental screening and history
25 taking are really key components and being able to

1 recognize and manage pesticide poisonings.

2 Next slide.

3 Another really important point, and just like
4 the farmworkers, to really make sure that clinicians
5 are consulted and we get their input, including with
6 various pilots and testing of training materials so
7 that they can be a part of designing and evaluating
8 interventions. I think we can sit in a room and think
9 of great interventions for clinicians, but if they're
10 not involved and not piloting it and not giving
11 feedback, it may not be as effective and it may not be
12 used. And so it's really important to take that in
13 mind.

14 Also really thinking about the clinician's
15 time and other challenges, recognizing that we might
16 -- the recommendations that we make for clinicians, we
17 really need to recognize that they may not have a ton
18 of time with patients. So what are the other parts of
19 training that need to happen? How can they help sort
20 of work with outreach workers or other groups?

21 And then what is the most effective material
22 that -- for clinicians and also thinking about what
23 are sources, you know, that they currently use that
24 you can weave in pesticide-related information and
25 education about.

1 Next slide, please.

2 This was to talk about a lot, increasing the
3 support and coordination and outreach to promote
4 awareness about reporting among clinicians. So this
5 goes back to one of our earlier recommendations, but
6 really in order for clinicians to be able to take part
7 in any kind of reporting system, they need to be made
8 aware of that system.

9 So if it's a requirement in your state -- and
10 I believe there are about 31 states that require
11 clinicians to report pesticide poisonings, clinicians
12 actually need to know that and they need to know where
13 they're supposed to report, and then also -- and
14 that's going to also involve sort of looking at sort
15 of how the current electronic health records and how
16 health electronic health records systems are set up
17 and also really understanding the International
18 Classification of Disease, the ICD codes, and perhaps
19 even expanding some of those codes, but really sort of
20 making sure that clinicians are are aware and know how
21 and where to report.

22 Next slide. Target and incentivize
23 clinicians and staff and federally qualified health
24 centers to receive training and resources on
25 pesticide-related health issues. So there are several

1 thousand sites across the country where federally
2 qualified health centers and their clinics serve
3 patients. By and large, they're serving -- they're
4 the safety net health centers. They serve our
5 underserved populations, including farmworkers who are
6 an overexposed population to pesticides. So they're a
7 group of clinicians in particular that's really
8 important to make sure that they receive training and
9 they receive the resources on pesticide-related health
10 issues.

11 So wanting to make sure that when we're
12 looking at PRIA-funded activities that we're
13 increasing and improving the inclusion of the
14 clinicians and staff at these centers in pesticide
15 trainings, that we're helping to -- and be able to
16 show that there's an increase in pesticide-related
17 knowledge, but not only that -- and this goes back to
18 our other recommendations with electronic health
19 records -- that we're really thinking about ways to
20 help the clinical systems to improve their practices
21 in order to be able to recognize and manage the
22 pesticides exposures.

23 And all of this, both within this
24 recommendation and with our other recommendation is
25 recognizing that clinicians and healthcare staff are

1 not well prepared to recognize and manage pesticide
2 exposures. The National Academy of Sciences and other
3 organizations have done numerous studies documenting
4 the amount of time that your average clinician spends
5 getting trained in environmental health and
6 occupational health and safety, and it's very limited,
7 in some cases as little as as seven hours, and
8 sometimes that's just talking about lead and maybe
9 acute organic phosphate poisoning.

10 Next slide.

11 Invest in needs assessment activities related
12 to pesticides -- related to clinicians and their
13 knowledge, their competencies and training
14 opportunities. So really prior -- again, and this
15 goes back to some of, you know, getting the clinician
16 input, but really thinking about sort of what
17 clinicians know, what resources they have, how do we
18 dump pesticide training and resources into those
19 opportunities is really important.

20 Next slide.

21 Partnering with professional societies and
22 organizations to which clinicians belong in order to
23 help promote the pesticide reporting and also the
24 recognition management of pesticide-related illness
25 and injury. So really again, just like we're trying

1 to go to the clinician and think about, you know, what
2 is the clinician's knowledge, what are the resources
3 that they use, you know, going to places where
4 clinicians are going to get their training and
5 information.

6 So looking at some of the organizations to
7 which they belong, whether it's the Association of
8 Nurse Practitioners, the Academy of Family Physicians,
9 the American College of Medical Toxicology, National
10 Association of Community Health Centers, all of these
11 are examples of organizations to which clinicians
12 belong, where we can partner with them to help promote
13 the resources and the training needed for the
14 recognition and management of pesticide poisoning.

15 Next slide.

16 And then also really thinking about
17 specifying in any of the cooperative agreements that
18 EPA does to include groups that have frontline
19 relationships and expertise and grounding with the
20 clinicians. So by that, we're looking at, you know,
21 in particular, you know, clinicians that might work
22 with farmworkers and other occupational exposures to
23 pesticides, really making sure that when we are doing
24 pesticide training that we're targeting the right
25 folks and that we're making sure that they're

1 intimately involved in these agreements either as
2 trainees or helping to develop the trainees with those
3 that have the expertise and grounding in frontline
4 relationships with clinicians.

5 Next slide.

6 Okay. So we can go back and open it up for
7 clarification and questions.

8 FACILITATOR: Thank you, Amy. Thanks very
9 much. And I just put it in the chat, we're open to
10 PPDC member questions and the workgroup members.

11 MS. LIEBMAN: I see that Jasmine put a
12 comment in there about the national reporting system
13 should allow clinicians to report pesticide-related
14 illnesses that are both occupation -- it just moved --
15 that are both occupation -- that are not occupation-
16 related.

17 Yes, we need to have reporting of pesticides,
18 that is true. But when we're looking at PRIA-funded
19 resources, there is a piece in there where we really
20 are focused on workers, but, you know, we also want to
21 know that if a family that's living near a field
22 that's being sprayed is exposed, we want that to be
23 reported as well.

24 MS. BROWN: Yeah, the only reason I commented
25 that is because a lot of reservations lease a lot of

1 their land out for farming. It might not be their
2 occupation, but they live there or they have
3 homesteads there or are nearby or they're collecting
4 or doing activities in the area. So, you know, they
5 may show up at a hospital with a pesticide exposure,
6 but it might not get triggered into the system because
7 it's not their day job.

8 So that's why I just think it should
9 encompass all pesticide-related illnesses, and I think
10 this is really something that's been needed for a long
11 time. I've responded to even five-year-old kids that
12 have had exposures from glyphosate in softball fields
13 and places -- and parks and things. So just wanted to
14 keep that in mind.

15 The other comment I was going to say is I
16 believe hospitals coding, it just goes in as chemical
17 exposure and so it doesn't actually filter down from
18 there what the chemicals are, or you know, if it's a
19 heavy metal or a pesticide or -- and maybe Kaci knows
20 more about that than I do, but that was my
21 understanding.

22 MS. BUHL: But there are several codes in the
23 ICD-10 that are related to pesticides. They even
24 break it down by chemical class. I was just looking
25 to see if we had that fact sheet up on our website yet

1 but we do not. It's still in draft form. There are
2 several codes, but they certainly could be expanded to
3 be more specific and clinicians could stand to be
4 trained on those codes.

5 MS. BROWN: That would be excellent. I also
6 want to say I think it's easily confused with other
7 illnesses. That might be part of the problem as well.

8 MS. LIEBMAN: Yeah, that is that is a long-
9 known concern about acute pesticide poisoning and that
10 is in part why by the training is so important and
11 also the confusion sort of is the result we think of
12 the lack of preparation and training sometimes and
13 that's why, for instance, if someone does come in with
14 flu-like symptoms, understanding the type of work that
15 they do becomes all that much more important.

16 FACILITATOR: Great. Thank you. Thank you,
17 Jasmine. Thank you, Kaci, on that point. I know
18 Joseph is in the queue for a question.

19 DR. GRYZWACZ: Excellent, Thanks. I've got
20 three questions, and the first one may actually be
21 answered in Walter's presentation, so you can just
22 defer me on that one if it's relevant. But question
23 number one is essentially to what extent could a
24 national system actually be built off -- a national
25 surveillance system actually be built off the state

1 level system. So that's the first question.

2 The second question is I noticed that
3 noticeably missing from your list of potential
4 partners where the AHEC system, and it seems to me
5 that sort of that central -- or I didn't recall seeing
6 it. It seems to me that centralized bodies, you know,
7 that are responsible for health education for
8 clinicians might be able to be more responsive and
9 more nimble to local conditions, such as this. And
10 then the last one that -- so that's a question is AHEC
11 involved in that?

12 And then the last question is whether or not
13 your group considered or if there's value in
14 considering largely a data informatics kind of
15 recommendation. I mean, ultimately there's going to
16 be no universal electronic medical record and so being
17 able to abstract data from across different medical --
18 electronic medical records systems is going to be the
19 answer to being able to -- at least being able to
20 monitor things. And so it seems as though some kind
21 of a large data informatics kind of recommendation at
22 a government level would make some sense to me. So
23 those are my few questions. Thanks, Amy.

24 MS. LIEBMAN: So let's see. On your first
25 question, I think that's the discussion that I would

1 suggest that we might have after we hear Walter talk
2 about the sensor program, because I do think that the
3 sensor programs have been thought out and there's a
4 lot that we can learn from them as we think about sort
5 of what this could look like on the national level.
6 And there's lots of nuances that it may have to be
7 that every state simply has a sensor program because
8 it has to be state based, but there's lots of nuances.
9 But for sure I think we could touch on that with
10 Walter, but that's something to think about.

11 The second question, I believe that was your
12 AHEC question. And so the types of organizations, I
13 just think we were giving examples, Joe, but I do
14 think -- like we didn't put Migrant Clinicians Network
15 in there, which would be a great organization to be
16 involved with this because of our 10,000-plus
17 constituents that are actually taking care of
18 farmworkers and other immigrant workers. So AHEC,
19 other organizations that are involved with clinician
20 training, that's open. But our point was to really
21 take into consideration that we don't want to silo
22 this pesticide training. We want to make sure that
23 we're thinking about ways and places and resources
24 where clinicians get their information, where they get
25 their training, where they go to for information, and

1 we're considering them and making sure we're making
2 those appropriate linkages.

3 MS. BUHL: And if I could just add something
4 about the electronic health records, I'm also involved
5 with PERC-med, which is another cooperative agreement
6 with EPA, and we've been working hard on the
7 electronic health records angle and trying to work
8 with companies who contract with hospitals and
9 healthcare providers to add sections and reportable
10 conditions for pesticide poisoning. So we're in
11 agreement with you there, but it is a tough nut to
12 crack. So we're working on it.

13 MS. LIEBMAN: And I agree with Kaci. We've
14 worked really hard and long on that, but I think the
15 point that's being made with your informatics
16 suggestion, what Kaci is saying is that the electronic
17 health records are actually really important in terms
18 of the clinical systems, they're intimately tied to
19 the training. So if you go in and you talk to a
20 clinician about the ways to recognize and manage a
21 pesticide poisoning, that clinician is going to need
22 sort of the cues when it comes up on on the electronic
23 health record on some questions to ask. There should
24 be some questions in there that should always be
25 asked. And then there should be ways to help that

1 clinician report that using their electronic health
2 record system.

3 That is very, very hard to do, but in order
4 for training to be effective, when you're actually
5 looking at the practicing clinician, making sure that
6 the electronic health record actually compliments that
7 training is critical. It's a little like teaching to
8 the test when you take a standardized test, right?
9 You know, you don't want to be teaching things that
10 aren't going to be on the standardized tests, and so
11 put it on that standardized test with the EHR being
12 that that test. You want to make sure it's there.

13 FACILITATOR: Thank you, Kaci. Thank you,
14 Amy. Thank you, Joseph, for that question, getting
15 that spun up.

16 We have time for maybe one or two other PPDC
17 member questions for this sub-workgroup.

18 MS. LIEBMAN: Joe, I see your --

19 FACILITATOR: Amy, you -- oh, go ahead.

20 MS. LIEBMAN: I see your note in the chat
21 related to the National Library of Medicine. Thank
22 you for that.

23 FACILITATOR: Amy, Mily, thank you for your
24 very succinct and very kind of focused presentations
25 on the two training areas. I think what we're going

1 to do now, we've still got 15 or 20 minutes left, but
2 I'm a little bit -- in order to stay on track, I'm a
3 little bit nervous about our voting process, because I
4 don't know exactly how much discussion it's going to
5 generate.

6 And so I think that the process here is that
7 as Ed mentioned before we kicked off, he would be
8 looking for -- the overall intent is that the EPA
9 would like to see from the PPDC an agreement that
10 they're sending on the recommendations for EPA's
11 consideration and to use his term -- and he can jump
12 in and correct me if I'm mischaracterizing -- but to
13 use his term of consensus, these are recommendations
14 that aren't perfect, there aren't recommendations that
15 all hold equal weight, they aren't recommendations
16 that every single person is 100 percent behind them,
17 but we're looking for a consensus. In other words,
18 can we live with the suite of recommendations that
19 have now been passed by these sub-workgroups onto PPDC
20 and the PPDC through a motion to approve and a second
21 to that motion to approve and then opening for a
22 little discussion and then voting yes or not.

23 It's not a -- we're not going to break it
24 down by, you know, 20 different recommendations, and
25 taking one at a time, right? And so let's just

1 discuss that for a moment and make sure -- Ed, you and
2 I need to be in sync about what we're trying to
3 accomplish.

4 MS. LIEBMAN: I just have a quick clarify
5 clarifying question that we had some interesting
6 discussion after our our presentations where like Joe
7 added a couple of recommendations. So I think we can
8 look at these, but I think the part of what the
9 workgroups are doing, this is the first time we're
10 presenting them to PPDC. So it's good to get that
11 feedback. And, I mean, I'm fine with going ahead and
12 voting, but I want to make sure that some of the --
13 maybe if we want to just put in some of that language,
14 or if it's just at least kept in the notes for this
15 meeting that those recommendations were made because
16 Joe, for instance, wasn't on this committee, neither
17 was Jasmine.

18 MR. MESSINA: Yeah, I think --

19 MS. LIEBMAN: And then somebody -- there were
20 some other pieces in here, too, from Liza.

21 MR. MESSINA: Yeah, I think a couple of
22 things. I think the comments we can add as a
23 collection and an addendum to what's submitted to EPA,
24 along with the -- assuming the presentations are
25 approved. And then, you know, my third question is

1 going to be -- and I know some workgroups have given
2 thought to this -- does the workgroup continue or does
3 the workgroup feel like they've completed their work.
4 And if we could hear from the workgroup there, and
5 then I will entertain a motion by the PPDC to have the
6 workgroup continue and then I get seconded and then
7 voting on that.

8 But for the first thing, I would -- since
9 we've finished with the clinician training piece, I
10 will ask if there is a member of the PPDC who would
11 like to make a motion that the recommendations for the
12 clinician training workgroup recommendations be passed
13 to EPA, and I'd like to see if there's a motion to do
14 that currently.

15 MS. LIEBMAN: I'll motion.

16 MR. MESSINA: Is there a second?

17 MS. BROWN: I'll second.

18 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'll second. Oh,
19 sorry, someone else, too.

20 MR. MESSINA: Great. So we have a second.
21 So then I'll ask Paul if we could account for voting
22 on whether the clinician training recommendations
23 should be forwarded to the EPA by the full PPDC, if we
24 could take a vote on that.

25 FACILITATOR: Okay, Ed, I think that -- and

1 then I'm assuming we'll do the same with the
2 farmworker as a separate poll, correct?

3 MR. MESSINA: Correct.

4 FACILITATOR: We had planned on doing it as
5 one poll, but we'll divide it up. Sarah, I think can
6 post the poll question. It's kind of -- we've kind of
7 built it to be fairly generic, so it applies to any of
8 the segments that we're using. So if you can read
9 this in your chat -- or, sorry, you'll see a new -- an
10 actually new device that's shown up in your -- on the
11 right-hand side of your screen probably. It says PPDC
12 members only. If you support the motion to approve
13 the recommendations, please vote yes. If you do not
14 support the recommendations, please vote no. It's
15 binary and a vote means that you
16 have to click on the yes or no and then hit the submit
17 button in the lower right-hand corner of that window.

18 Does anybody have a question or not see the
19 poll? Anybody on the PPDC, does anybody not see the
20 poll question and the two options for an answer and
21 the submit button? Speak up.

22 DR. GRYZWACZ: So I have a question, I can
23 see the poll, but I thought earlier on there was going
24 to be the opportunity for some discussion before we
25 actually went to the voting. So has that changed a

1 bit?

2 MR. MESSINA: No, if we need discussion -- I
3 thought we were done with the discussion. It seemed
4 like it was winding down, but --

5 FACILITATOR: Right. So this would be
6 discussion specifically on the --

7 MR. MESSINA: Clinicians.

8 FACILITATOR: -- you know, whether we approve
9 or don't approve, right? And so, Joe, do you have
10 something on just [connection issue].

11 DR. GRYZWACZ: Just sorry, it could just
12 simply be my lack of familiarity with, you know, kind
13 of the rules of -- Robert's Rules of running a
14 meeting, right?

15 I thought that discussion was not just on the
16 motion, but I thought it was around broader elements
17 and I saw that there was at least a couple of other
18 questions that were asked that were raised in the
19 chat, people saying I've got questions.

20 MR. MESSINA: Oh, okay.

21 DR. GRYZWACZ: And so I just thought it was
22 worthwhile to hear what those questions were before we
23 went on to a vote. That's all.

24 MR. MESSINA: Yeah, well, thanks for pointing
25 that out. I thought we were done with the discussion,

1 but that was my fault. Sorry, Paul, I --

2 FACILITATOR: So, okay, I think I see one of
3 those from Lauren Lurkins.

4 MR. MESSINA: Okay, Lauren, you're up.

5 MS. LURKINS: Thank you. I'm not sure when
6 to ask this question now that I have the little mic
7 here. I guess when I was reading and preparing the
8 information in PDF, particularly on the farmworkers --
9 so I'm sorry, if I'm out of order -- I had understood
10 that these recommendations were a priority and then
11 like other. And so I had -- I'm a little bit shocked
12 that it's all out here in a slightly different format
13 to take in whole and I just don't understand really
14 the process moving forward. So I think there may be
15 some differences between what we were given to prepare
16 and then the bulk of of material today. That's all I
17 wanted to offer.

18 MR. MESSINA: So let me ask this question,
19 because we thought about this as well. Do you feel
20 like there's a need to vote on each of the individual
21 recommendations because some of the recommendations
22 you agree with and some of that you might vote
23 differently on?

24 MS. LURKINS: You know, my personal opinion
25 is, yes, I think -- you know, we were told in the

1 beginning of at least the farmworker that these -- you
2 know, even the workgroup itself sort of had a really
3 robust dialogue but did not come to unanimous
4 agreement, and so it is a collection of of things.
5 I know that slows us down and messes up our agenda.
6 But I do think there are some very -- you know,
7 there's things that we can coalesce around most likely
8 on this list, but probably not 100 percent of it.

9 MR. MESSINA: Mm-hmm.

10 MS. BROWN: And, also, since this is the
11 first time the full group is seeing this, I wonder --
12 I mean, I agree, although we may be in mostly
13 consensus of a majority of these, I do feel like there
14 could be some more refining of some of these areas now
15 that we've all seen it and we can discuss it a little
16 bit further before we provide it to EPA.

17 MR. MESSINA: So is that on the farmworker,
18 on the clinician, or on both?

19 MS. BROWN: I would say on both, but if
20 you're looking for an action today then, you know,
21 we'll just make that action today.

22 MR. MESSINA: Well, I mean, it's really up to
23 the PPDC. So, you know, as the chair, I can entertain
24 how folks would like to proceed and we can really run
25 it from there. So I'm hearing from the sub-workgroup

1 that there may not have been consensus, which leads me
2 to believe we probably do want to do, you know, at
3 least a voice vote or a voting on each of the
4 recommendations.

5 My first thought is does the subcommittee
6 feel like you would like to do a vote on whether to
7 continue to develop this because you are recommending
8 to the PPDC that you would like to do further
9 development? And I think we can entertain that motion
10 and vote on that, because there's many ways we can
11 handle this.

12 DR. GRYZWACZ: Well, one thing that I would
13 throw out -- and again, I don't -- I'm not good at
14 these sorts of things, but, I mean, quite honestly,
15 the thing that I find most compelling is -- I get the
16 idea is we want to vote on the spirit that's behind
17 the recommendations. The part that was surprising to
18 me, as I was going through them in advance and then
19 hearing Amy and Mily talk through them, is just simply
20 the large amount of recommendations.

21 And sort of I personally would like to have
22 an up or down vote about how are you with the spirit
23 of these recommendations, but then the final
24 recommendations actually going forward I think they
25 need to be prioritized in some way perhaps by the

1 committee themselves, given that the larger PPDC has sort
2 of given them a thumbs-up on, yes, we agree with the
3 spirit of this, but perhaps to have a snowball's
4 chance in hell of making some impact, maybe we need to
5 prioritize some of them in a meaningful way within the
6 group.

7 MR. MESSINA: Okay. Would you like to make a
8 motion around that Joe and then see if it's seconded?

9 DR. GRYZWACZ: I would make that motion, if
10 anybody else wanted to -- you know, were willing to
11 follow through.

12 MS. LIEBMAN: I actually am -- I am finding
13 this whole sort of voting on this thing, Ed, a little
14 strange from previous PPDC processes. There was a ton
15 of work to get to where we are with these
16 recommendations. I don't think that everyone's going
17 to be 100 percent on board with every single one, but
18 that was -- the job of the workgroup is to come up
19 with some consensus that we all agreed upon. I don't
20 want to go back and spend hours like we did diving
21 through each one of these, prioritizing them. No way.
22 I'm not getting paid enough to do that. You guys get
23 paid the big bucks to do that.

24 I think, you know, EPA is seeing a workgroup
25 of, you know, that reach consensus, whether you want

1 them or not, great, you know. And farmworker
2 advocates will continue to advocate for improved
3 farmworker training and clinician training and
4 industry might have issue with certain things that
5 we're saying, you know, that's going to be the nature
6 of the game.

7 So I really don't want to go back to the
8 drawing board and start picking these apart. That's
9 not the role of the workgroup.

10 MR. MESSINA: Okay, that's fair. And really,
11 again, PPDC pretty informal, having a conversation,
12 building consensus trying to operate in a remote
13 environment to kind of do that and how to kind of
14 record, you know, what folks are doing. But the task
15 at hand is really up to PPDC, at this point, the
16 members to decide what, if anything, they would like
17 to do with these two reports and whether they feel
18 like these reports should be forwarded to EPA for
19 consideration. That's kind of the ask for today,
20 however we want to record that or do that.

21 MS. WILSON: I'm sorry, Ed, can I make a
22 comment? This is Nina Wilson.

23 MR. MESSINA: Yeah.

24 MS. WILSON: I'm just listening to the
25 overall and what the forward -- going forward with the

1 -- I mean, I'm listening to everybody and I think
2 they're good comments. I've heard what Amy says. I
3 would agree with that. But, I mean, if we agree, like
4 someone said, with the spirit of these recommendations
5 and pull them forward, what I think I personally might
6 want to see is EPA's comment point by point on that as
7 to how doable, what the timeline, you know, where they
8 see the importance. I mean, that might be -- I mean,
9 I know there were EPA people involved in that, but,
10 you know, it's sort of more of a specific point-by-
11 point comment to each of the recommendations.

12 MR. MESSINA: Yeah, I mean, my reaction, but,
13 you know, before we sort of get the full report,
14 right, or it gets forwarded to EPA -- and we did have
15 co-chairs on the workgroups -- there's 18
16 recommendations. It seems like, you know, that is a
17 lot. I think we would need to prioritize them. Some
18 of them I feel like, as Kaci mentioned, there's things
19 we're already doing and so maybe there's some
20 refinement.

21 So I'm certainly pleased with the reports as
22 I've seen them. And I agree with sort of the spirit
23 versus like, yes, once you forward it to EPA, we're
24 going to agree to get working on every single one of
25 these recommendations, right? I can't promise that,

1 but we're certainly going to look at them and where we
2 can make changes to the work that we have, we're
3 definitely going to take them into consideration. So
4 I don't know if that's helpful feedback for you, Nina.

5 MS. WILSON: Well, I mean, I guess maybe just
6 reading between the lines then, I would assume that
7 EPA then would take them and prioritize them and just
8 say, here's our -- that's all because I'm hearing,
9 yes, there's a lot of recommendations, there's a lot
10 of work involved in them, prioritization doesn't sound
11 like something that the workgroup can or will do, EPA
12 is the one who's actually got to do the
13 recommendations on them and maybe -- I mean, if the
14 workgroup is not going to prioritize, right, it would
15 be EPA's, I guess, call to prioritize them.

16 MR. MESSINA: Yep, fair point. And then
17 Carolyn's note is important as well. As I mentioned
18 the EPA co-chairs were there to sort of facilitate the
19 workgroup discussion for you guys to recommend to us.
20 So, you know, at the same time, I don't want to -- you
21 know, this is PPDC recommending to EPA what we should
22 do. I'm sort of chairing that process, but I don't
23 want to sort of -- and the co-chairs were told to kind
24 of help provide input, provide resources, answer
25 questions, really not to kind of steer the workgroup

1 in a direction because then it's sort of EPA steering
2 back to itself on its own recommendations.

3 So it looks like Liza has a comment.

4 MS. FLEESON TROSSBACH: Thank you, Ed. I
5 just wanted to add on to what Joe said or to support
6 his thoughts as far as voting on the spirit of the
7 recommendations. I think we all support worker safety
8 and certainly the spirit of these. I think it would
9 be valuable to have that vote. And then as EPA has an
10 opportunity to review those recommendations, determine
11 the feasibility how they fit into current activities,
12 and then, also, which outside stakeholder groups would
13 be appropriate to help work on those. It may come
14 back to PPDC in the future, maybe another workgroup to
15 work on a a specific portion. I think that would
16 absolutely, you know, be appropriate and AAPCO would
17 certainly support that going forward. So thank you.

18 MR. MESSINA: Thanks, Liza. Jasmine?

19 MS. BROWN: My only comment is I would like
20 to share these recommendations with the TPPC. I do
21 agree with most of the recommendations and spirit of
22 moving forward with these, but I would hope there
23 would still be further discussion on it. I personally
24 don't know -- I'm not 100 percent comfortable agreeing
25 with all of these without presenting it to the TPPC,

1 which is the seat I sit on on behalf of at the PPDC.

2 MR. MESSINA: Okay, fair point. Thank you,
3 Jasmine. Iris?

4 MS. FIGUEROA: Yeah, I had a question/comment
5 about process. So I know that in the past there have
6 been other PPDC workgroups. So I guess what would be
7 helpful to know is, you know, once these
8 recommendations are approved, what's sort of the next
9 steps once the ball is in the EPA's court? What does
10 that look like? Because that might, also, I think,
11 maybe resolve some of people's concerns of knowing
12 what that process is going to be like.

13 MR. MESSINA: Yeah. So if the
14 recommendations are forwarded EPA, they're like any
15 recommendations that we get and we would prioritize
16 them and act on them. So examples of where that's
17 happened in the past is the emerging viral pathogen
18 policy that was developed as a result of the
19 recommendation by the full PPDC to EPA. So you would
20 probably start to see us taking this document,
21 examining our work and seeing where we could fit in
22 the recommendations to when we're delivering grants or
23 requiring that grantees provide a work plan,
24 sprinkling some of that in there, you know. So those
25 are examples of where these recommendations could show

1 up.

2 The question would be, you know, would we
3 entertain supporting and finding funding for a
4 national system? You know, that's a bigger lift. So
5 that's kind of, you know, different ends of the
6 spectrum and how we might use these recommendations.

7 Does that answer your question?

8 MS. LIEBMAN: Ed, historically, I served on a
9 workgroup for the PPDC a long time ago on the worker
10 protection standard and we spent a lot of time coming
11 up with recommendations for how the worker protection
12 standard should be improved and changed, and EPA also
13 did a number of stakeholder groups, you know. It was
14 multifaceted in terms of the input that EPA took. By
15 no means did you take all the recommendations that
16 that workgroup came out with, unfortunately, but you
17 did what you wanted with them.

18 And so that's why I'm feeling like just keep
19 us sort of in big picture because that's what you do
20 with it anyway, rather than waste -- not wasting our
21 precious time, but like we do have precious time and
22 to sort of to get into the wordsmithing and the
23 nitpicking when, at the end of the day, you guys do
24 what you want to do.

25 MR. MESSINA: Yeah, it's a great point, Amy.

1 So maybe what I'm hearing, is there a motion
2 by somebody on the PPDC to put forward -- and I want
3 to make sure I capture the words correctly -- the
4 spirit of --

5 MS. BUHL: Joe actually put an alternative
6 motion in the chat.

7 FACILITATOR: I didn't hear that. What was
8 that?

9 MS. BUHL: Joe put an alternative motion into
10 the chat to accept the spirit of the committee's
11 recommendations under the expectation that OPP will
12 prioritize recommendations for advancing to EPA more
13 broadly, and it looks like Liza seconded.

14 MR. MESSINA: Great perfect. Thanks, Kaci.

15 So it sounds like we have a second to that.
16 So can we put the poll up and the poll will be --

17 MS. TREVINO-SAUCEDA: Ed, can I (inaudible)?
18 This is Mily. Can you hear me?

19 MR. MESSINA: Yep.

20 MS. TREVINO-SAUCEDA: There's a motion in
21 place, there was a second, and then there was
22 discussion. So what happened to the motion?

23 MR. MESSINA: Yeah, the first motion --

24 MS. TREVINO-SAUCEDA: My concern is the first
25 motion needs to -- we need to have a vote unless the

1 people that did the motion, you know (inaudible) and
2 say, you know, decline, there's no more motion. But
3 you can't do a motion when there's another motion that
4 is in place right now. So I'm kind of concerned that
5 we don't know if the majority feel the same way that
6 the people that are speaking up.

7 MR. MESSINA: Yeah.

8 MS. TREVINO-SAUCEDA: What's going to happen
9 (inaudible)?

10 MR. MESSINA: So that's a fair point. So
11 there was the prior motion. That motion was solely
12 for the clinician training recommendations. So, Paul,
13 did you have -- did we tally the votes for whether
14 that motion passed?

15 FACILITATOR: That vote never really even
16 opened, Ed. That vote didn't actually happen. So
17 because we went right into the discussion and we never
18 said the vote is open, so the -- you know, if -- I'm
19 not sure about -- I'm just going to throw this out as
20 an independent observer who's worked on FACAs before.
21 So I'm not sure FACA (inaudible) Robert's Rules of
22 Order according to some kind of very structured
23 regulatory enabled process. I think that whoever made
24 that motion last time could withdraw their motion,
25 okay, just verbally right now withdraw it and we have

1 another motion on the floor, a motion to approve the
2 spirit -- to accept the spirit of the committee's
3 recommendations and we vote on that.

4 And I would recommend that we combine both
5 clinician and farmworker in one vote. You know, it's
6 -- we have four workgroups, let's have four votes. I
7 mean, again, I don't know if this is -- if I'm
8 presenting something that's controversial, but there
9 was a reason that farmworker and clinician training
10 were combined. So let's combine the vote. It's a
11 combined report. Let's combine the vote and ask the
12 question, because I don't believe you're under strict
13 Robert's Rules of Order for this event.

14 MR. MESSINA: Yeah, we're not.

15 FACILITATOR: To be honest with you.

16 MR. MESSINA: Yeah, we're not. We know that.
17 We checked with the FACA folks. It is just general
18 consensus.

19 FACILITATOR: Okay, okay.

20 MR. MESSINA: It is informal consensus
21 building.

22 FACILITATOR: If the intent is to get a
23 consensus, a general consensus that the intent of
24 these recommendations is acceptable to the PPDC,
25 that's what we want to vote on. We realize, of

1 course, that EPA has to address all of these
2 recommendations, rack and stack them, allocate
3 resources, do some of them, ignore others.

4 MR. MESSINA: So, Mily, are you comfortable
5 with the fact that the prior vote didn't actually
6 happen and we can move on to the next vote, which
7 would be the Joe Gryzwacz language that's here to have
8 the motion to accept the spirit of the committee's
9 recommendation on the expectation that OPP will
10 prioritize recommendations for advancing at EPA more
11 broadly? And that's been seconded --

12 MS. TREVINO-SAUCEDA: Well, I just want us to
13 be congruent with processes. If Paul is saying
14 certain things and -- I mean, I agree with what Amy
15 was talking about. You know, we were not used to
16 following certain processes in terms of what's
17 happening right now. But if the two people that did
18 the motion are going to withdraw, then they need to --
19 we need to hear it, and that's fine. That's fine. I
20 mean, we want to go ahead and -- I mean, we did spend
21 a lot of time, a lot of time --

22 MS. LIEBMAN: I think I heard -- I think I
23 was one of the owners so I un-motion or whatever we
24 need to do to get the vote for the spirit of it.

25 MS. TREVINO-SAUCEDA: All right, great.

1 MR. MESSINA: Thanks, Amy. Thanks, Mily.

2 MS. BROWN: I seconded the previous motion to
3 put forward the clinician recommendations, which I put
4 in chat. I'll withdraw or rescind that second on that
5 previous motion. So now we can move forward with
6 Joe's motion.

7 MR. MESSINA: Great, thank you.

8 DR. GRYZWACZ: That's correct.

9 MR. MESSINA: And because the vote never
10 actually --

11 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: And I would second this
12 motion.

13 FACILITATOR: By the way that Joe's
14 presented, I'm going to -- Joe can correct me. I'm
15 not going to modify his motion, but can we make this
16 motion a friendly amendment, meaning we're combining
17 both the farmworker and clinician recommendations into
18 one cluster as the product of this workgroup?

19 DR. GRYZWACZ: I'm happy to support that. To
20 me, that makes sense.

21 FACILITATOR: Okay.

22 MR. MESSINA: So do we have a second for
23 that? So Joe's language would be to apply to both the
24 clinician and the farmworker training recommendations.

25 MS. FLEESON TROSSBACH: Yes, you have a

1 second. This is Liza.

2 MR. MESSINA: Thank you, Liza.

3 All right, let's open the voting. Paul?

4 FACILITATOR: So Sarah can -- so again, we've
5 genericized it. We didn't know exactly how this
6 conversation was going to take place. If you support
7 this motion, which is in the chat, okay, that we've
8 documented, if you support the motion, then you click
9 on yes and you hit submit. If you don't support that
10 motion, which is again in the spirit of the
11 recommendations, then you click no and you hit submit.
12 So I think the vote is open unless I'm wrong. Sarah, tell me.

13 FACILITATOR 2: No, it is open.

14 FACILITATOR: Okay. And this was PPDC
15 members only not workgroup members that aren't PPDC
16 members. So if we end up with 70 votes, we'll know we
17 have a problem. We'll have to do an audit afterwards.

18 (Pause.)

19 MR. MESSINA: Okay, Paul, do you want to move
20 to the next session and then we can report out on the
21 vote at the end of the day.

22 FACILITATOR: Sure, we can do that. I
23 just want to make sure of that -- I don't know if
24 there's like an opening and closing of the vote, so I
25 want to --

1 MR. MESSINA: Yes.

2 FACILITATOR: -- a last call, if possible.

3 Sounds good. Yeah, after we give last call, we'll
4 give what, another minute where the polling is open.

5 Okay. Sarah, have you gotten a surge of
6 votes or is it just one at a time coming in?

7 FACILITATOR 2: No, we did get a surge and it
8 looks like it's slowing down.

9 FACILITATOR: Okay, I'm going to give one
10 more minute for voting. Because I know that Sarah has
11 to transition to advancing slides, Ed, so I can't have
12 her doing the poll and the slides at the same time.

13 MR. MESSINA: Sounds good. Thanks, Paul.

14 FACILITATOR: Okay, thank you.

15 (Pause.)

16 FACILITATOR: All right. I think we've given
17 the PPDC enough time to make a yes or no vote on this
18 motion. So, Sarah, I think you can close that vote.
19 And I'm not sure if it's automatically going to
20 display the results or not, but if there's a little
21 mini dashboard that pops up. So oh, I see. No answer
22 would be all the non-PPDC members.

23 FACILITATOR 2: Correct, yes, anyone who did
24 not vote.

25 FACILITATOR: Okay, so we got 30 responses

1 basically from the PPDC.

2 FACILITATOR 2: Correct.

3 FACILITATOR: So I'm a little bit -- okay, so
4 I guess this no answer thing is messing up the
5 proportions. We really only need -- we really only
6 want to hear -- well, it's 29 to 1, that much we can
7 conclude. It's 29 yeas, 1 no, and if there were 9
8 other PPDC members that are -- 10 other PPDC members
9 that did not vote for some reason, then that's just
10 the way it is, either they stepped away from their
11 desk or they decided not to vote.

12 Okay. Ed, are we good?

13 MR. MESSINA: Yes. Do you know who voted for
14 what?

15 FACILITATOR: That's a good question.

16 Sarah, do we know in the background?

17 FACILITATOR 2: Oh, we will after the fact.

18 I don't have the names of who voted which way right in
19 front of me at the moment.

20 MR. MESSINA: Okay, so we can confirm that --

21 FACILITATOR: The answer is yes.

22 MR. MESSINA: Great. So we can confirm
23 what --

24 FACILITATOR: The answer is we can do it,
25 yes.

1 MR. MESSINA: Yeah, so we can just make sure
2 that the people that voted were PPDC members and only
3 count the PPDC member votes. But it looks like we
4 have a majority. So we'll confirm officially whether
5 the motion passed later in the day once we have them
6 do the audit. But thank you for voting. I think
7 we're ready to move on.

8 FACILITATOR: Okay, thanks, Ed, and thanks,
9 everybody, for your patience on this. It's actually a
10 complex topic and so that's why we took the time to do
11 it.

12 MR. MESSINA: And, Paul, for the next call,
13 can we do an abstain.

14 FACILITATOR: We can certainly add a third
15 option, I think, Sarah. Is that right? We can add
16 any number of choices we want. So we can do yes, no,
17 and abstain.

18 FACILITATOR 2: Mm-hmm.

19 FACILITATOR: Does everybody know what an
20 abstain means? Does an abstain mean I don't have
21 enough information to make that choice, I don't want
22 to vote? Is there a way to interpret what an
23 abstention means? Does it mean I'm conflicted, I have
24 a conflict of interest? What does it mean?

25 Mano, you're the one that suggested it. What

1 does the extension mean to you?

2 DR. BASU: It is -- I don't know which way to
3 vote, and to be honest, I wasn't even sure what we are
4 waiting for what we are voting for. We were voting
5 for just combining the recommendation for both the
6 farmworker and clinician training, were we voting for
7 the recommendations that were made. I couldn't find
8 it in the chat because the chat was moving fast. I
9 couldn't even find what the motion was, but that could
10 be just me. So I decided not to vote at all one way
11 or the other because I wasn't sure what the motion is.

12 MR. MESSINA: All right, it looks like you're
13 one of the folks that didn't vote, which is good,
14 which is okay, so that's your abstention. And sorry
15 that the -- it was moving fast, but we said it -- and
16 sorry, Mano, if you missed it. But, yes, it was Joe's
17 language in the chat, which is to move both the
18 farmworker and the clinician recommendations to accept
19 the spirit of the committee's recommendation under the
20 expectation that OPP will prioritize recommendations
21 for advancing to EPA more broadly for both. That was
22 what was what the vote was for.

23 DR. BASU: Okay, thank you.

24 MR. MESSINA: Okay.

25 FACILITATOR: We treated the workgroup as one

1 workgroup with one set of recommendations.

2 DR. BASU: Okay.

3 FACILITATOR: That was --

4 DR. BASU: And the full PPDC to accept, adopt
5 the recommendation and spirit for OPP to consider.

6 MR. MESSINA: Yes.

7 FACILITATOR: Correct. That's exactly right.

8 DR. BASU: Okay.

9 MR. MESSINA: So we'll try to be clear --
10 more clear on the next one and so thank you. And it
11 looks like you were able to abstain by not voting and
12 then having the polling close. I just wanted Sarah to
13 confirm that.

14 DR. BASU: Yes.

15 MR. MESSINA: Sarah, can you confirm that
16 that's kind of the way to abstain?

17 FACILITATOR 2: Yes. And I can add an option
18 for the next vote that specifically has that as an
19 option.

20 MR. MESSINA: Okay, great. All right. Well,
21 let's -- thank you for that good discussion. I agree
22 there's sort of more discussion needed. I think at
23 the wrap up at the end of the day tomorrow, we can
24 talk about, you know, continuation of any of the
25 workgroups and what the recommendations are there. So

1 we can continue kind of having this discussion.

2 With that, I'll kick it back to you, Paul.

3 FACILITATOR: Okay, thank you. Thank you,
4 Ed. Thanks, everybody. And thanks for the great work
5 that the farmworker and clinician training, workgroup
6 did.

7 We're moving now to one of the three special
8 presentations that we have over this next couple of
9 days. I'd like to introduce Dr. Walter Alarcon, who
10 is from CDC and NIOSH, the National Institute for
11 Occupational Safety and Health. And he's going to be
12 talking about the SENSOR Program.

13 And before you start, Walter, you know, we
14 had scheduled you from 2:30 to 3:00. We're still
15 going to give you that 30-minute block, which also
16 includes leaving time for PPDC questions and comments.

17 So we'll be starting -- Kaci, we'll be
18 starting with you at 3:15. If Walter takes his entire
19 slot, we'll be starting with you at 3:15 and you will
20 have from 3:15 to 4:30.

21 So Walter, you're up.

22 DR. ALARCON: Good afternoon. Sound check,
23 can you hear me well?

24 FACILITATOR: Yes.

25 DR. ALARCON: Good afternoon. Thank you for

1 the opportunity to share with you, a number of you, of
2 the CDC-NIOSH SENSOR-Pesticides Program. SENSOR
3 stands for Sentinel Event Notification System for
4 Occupational Risks, and I am the current point
5 (inaudible) for this program.

6 Next slide, please.

7 The goals for this session are to provide an
8 overview of pesticide-related surveillance activities
9 conducted with NIOSH, how the SENSOR-Pesticide Program
10 obtains the data, how quality assurance and quality
11 control are conducted, and then to share with you some
12 results.

13 Next slide.

14 This is technically the definition of public
15 health surveillance as described by Thacker and
16 Berkelman. Public health surveillance is the ongoing
17 systematic collection, analysis, and interpretation of
18 data that is closely integrated with the timely
19 dissemination of this data to those responsible for
20 preventing and controlling disease and injury. The
21 purpose of public health surveillance is to empower
22 decision-makers so they can make well-informed
23 decisions, or in other words, the purpose of public
24 health surveillance is to provide data for action.

25 Next slide.

1 It's (inaudible) that one of the main
2 problems in public health is acute pesticide poisoning
3 in humans. This slide shows some reasons why we need
4 to conduct pesticide poisoning surveillance. There
5 are ongoing concerns about pesticide toxicity and pre-
6 market testing of pesticides is not fully
7 comprehensive. Pesticide poisoning surveillance is
8 useful for identifying emerging pesticide hazards and
9 for assessing the root causes of acute pesticide
10 poisonings. When root causes are identified, public
11 health practitioners can apply lessons learned to
12 prevent future cases.

13 Next slide.

14 To conduct public health surveillance, we use
15 the SENSOR methods. As described in the title of this
16 presentation, SENSOR stands for sentinel event
17 notification system for occupational risk. Using
18 these methods, the program conducts identification of
19 sentinel cases, follow up on those cases, and they are
20 reporting the cases to a public health surveillance
21 system. By identifying sentinel cases, public health
22 authorities can assist the root causes and then apply
23 lessons learned to prevent the future cases.

24 One of the injuries and illnesses supported
25 under the SENSOR program is acute occupational

1 pesticide-related illnesses and injury.

2 So what is the SENSOR-Pesticides Program and
3 how does the SENSOR-Pesticides Program obtain data?

4 Next slide.

5 The goal of the SENSOR-Pesticides Program is
6 to protect workers from exposure to pesticides. To do
7 so, the program determines the extent and root cause
8 or causes of pesticide poisonings in the workplace and
9 uses this knowledge to prevent these exposures. Our
10 program's mission is to build and maintain
11 occupational illness and injuries surveillance
12 capacity within the state health departments. NIOSH
13 provides cooperative agreement funding and technical
14 support to (inaudible) of the (inaudible) states. The
15 EPA uses data for risk assessments and provides
16 technical support and funding for pesticides poisoning
17 surveillance.

18 In summary, the SENSOR-Pesticides program is
19 a partnership among state programs, NIOSH, and the
20 EPA. Next slide shows the names of the states that
21 have participated in the SENSOR-Pesticides Program
22 since its inception. There were three states at the
23 beginning back in 1997. Most of the states have
24 participated consistently in the program. Some of
25 them are funded and several of them receive funding

1 from the Federal Government. Recently, NIOSH has
2 awarded cooperative agreement funding to California,
3 Michigan, and Illinois for fiscal years 22 to 26.
4 These three states are highlighted here.

5 The NIOSH Office of External Programs will
6 update its webpage and will post a press release with
7 this information soon.

8 Next slide shows the geographic distribution
9 of the states that participate and have participated
10 in the SENSOR-Pesticides Program. These are colored
11 in blue. The states that have been awarded NIOSH
12 cooperative agreements for fiscal year 22 to 26 are
13 colored in dark green.

14 Next slide answers the question where do the
15 data come from. State programs received most of the
16 data from poison control centers, reports or referrals
17 from government agencies, physicians and other health
18 care providers, and from workers' compensation
19 systems. State programs conduct case ascertainment
20 using a standardized set of variables and procedures.
21 These variables and procedures are described in detail
22 in the standardized variable documents.

23 The program is also (inaudible) SPIDER.
24 SPIDER standards for SENSOR Pesticide Incident Data
25 Entry and Reporting. SPIDER is a free tool and is

1 being used by some of the states. SPIDER also has
2 built-in validation rules to ensure the data is
3 entered properly. The state programs can also use
4 other data management systems, such as Access or their
5 own systems.

6 Next slide, please.

7 This slide is very busy, but we thought it
8 would be important for us to see how a case was
9 investigated by state program.

10 Can you see my mouse here? No? Okay.

11 MS. JEWELL: I don't think so.

12 Sorry.

13 DR. ALARCON: That's fine. The case
14 investigation process starts when the state program
15 receives the reports of a pesticide poisoning, at the
16 top of the slide. Using an initial screening form,
17 the investigator would respond to the question, is
18 this a pesticide poisoning. If the response is no,
19 then the process stops.

20 If the response is yes, an investigator will
21 do several activities, interview the case or proxy,
22 complete the main questionnaire, and if medical care
23 was sought, request medical records. With this
24 information, the investigator would answer the
25 question, does the exposure meet field follow-up

1 criteria. If the response is now, then the
2 investigator will classify the case using standardized
3 procedures and enter information in SPIDER.

4 If the response is yes, meaning that exposure
5 meet field followup criteria, then the investigator
6 would conduct a field investigation and contact
7 appropriate regulatory agencies, if applicable. Then
8 the investigator will classify the case using
9 standardized procedures and enter the information in
10 the SPIDER. Further guidance is provided in the how
11 to guide book.

12 Next slide, please.

13 We will now look at how the SENSOR-Pesticides
14 Program forum conducts quality assurance and quality
15 control.

16 Next slide, please.

17 The standardized variables for state
18 surveillance of pesticide-related illness and injury
19 is at the heart of pursuing procedures to ensure
20 the quality of the data. State programs conduct case
21 ascertainment and initiate quality assurance and
22 control following these standardized procedures. When
23 the data are shared with NIOSH, NIOSH conducts in-
24 depth quality assurance and control procedures,
25 following standardized procedures. If differences are

1 found, NIOSH works with the state programs to review
2 the data for accuracy. An aggregated data set is
3 being shared with the EPA project officer in EPA's
4 Health Effects Division.

5 The Health Effects Division project officer
6 analyzes the data and if further clarification are
7 needed, EPA and NIOSH work with state programs to
8 review the data for accuracy again. The Health
9 Effects Division project officer in EPA is well-
10 trained in analyzing the SENSOR-Pesticides Program
11 data and in summarizing the data for EPA's risk
12 assessments.

13 The SENSOR-Pesticides Coding Committee plays
14 a key role in obtaining the standardized variable
15 documents. The Coding Committee is led by the most
16 experienced state programs and includes the project
17 officers in NIOSH and the EPA. The Coding Committee
18 gets together regularly to solve coding issues and to
19 discuss current and future research plans.

20 The SENSOR-Pesticides Program organizes two
21 workshops every year for all participating states.
22 Case scenarios are provided and each participant codes
23 those cases beforehand. We summarize the results, the
24 responses and discuss the responses together. This
25 practice improves coding accuracy among our SENSOR-

1 Pesticides colleagues.

2 Next slide, please.

3 We have described that the program conducts
4 case ascertainment and quality assurance and control
5 following standardized procedures. This standardized
6 approach allows the program to maintain consistency
7 across systems and allow for some comparisons. The
8 standardized variables and procedures were developed
9 through collaboration with federal agencies, including
10 NIOSH, EPA, NCEH, this is in CDC, and non-federal
11 agencies, CSTE or the Council State and Territorial
12 Epidemiologists, the Association of Occupational and
13 Environmental Clinics, and the state health
14 departments or their designees.

15 Here, we list some key values. One,
16 pesticide product information including EPA
17 registration number, product name, active ingredients.
18 Two, the industry, occupation, exposure source, and
19 activity performed by the person at the time of
20 exposure. Three, how to code health effects and
21 severity. The program uses a flow diagram and a table
22 of signs and symptoms by severity category (inaudible)
23 to each case. Instructions on how to code
24 contributing factors, also known as prevention codes
25 are also included. We will present some of this in

1 the following slides.

2 Next slide, please.

3 The case definition is a key element for
4 conducting surveillance. To achieve a balance between
5 sensibility and specificity, the case definition
6 requires that two new acute health effects resulting
7 from exposure to a pesticide product to be present.
8 This may include systemic signs or symptoms,
9 dermatologic lesions, and/or ocular lesions.

10 The program is required to consist of three
11 parts: Evidence of pesticide exposure, evidence of
12 two new health effects, and evidence of a causal
13 relationship between pesticide exposure and the health
14 effects. We will look at how these criteria are
15 applied in the next slide.

16 Next slide, please.

17 This is a little bit complex, but let me try
18 to explain. Reports received and investigated by
19 state programs are scored on three classification
20 criteria, A, B, and C, and the scores are either one,
21 two, three, or four. And these are assigned based on
22 all available evidence.

23 First, we'll look at A, Documentation of
24 Pesticide Exposure. A score of one is assigned when
25 there is laboratory, clinical, or environmental

1 evidence that corroborates exposure. Four is when
2 there isn't sufficient data to corroborate that
3 exposure.

4 Next, we'll look at B, Documentation of
5 Adverse Health Effects. A score of one is assigned
6 when two or more new post-exposure abnormal signs,
7 test or laboratory findings were reported by a
8 licensed health care professional, or a score of four
9 is assigned when there is insufficient data. A score
10 of four includes having only one new post-exposure
11 abnormal sign, symptoms or test or laboratory finding.

12 Finally, we'll look at C. C is Evidence
13 Supporting a Causal Relationship Between Pesticide
14 Exposure and Health Effects. A score of one is a sign
15 when the findings is documented and the health effects
16 in tier B, we just saw them, are, one, characteristic for
17 a pesticide and/or are consistent with an exposure
18 health effect relationship. (inaudible) used when
19 there is insufficient toxic (inaudible) information.

20 Using these metrics, the case is classified
21 with a status. Status could be a definite or also
22 suspicious and other three categories. Only definites
23 (inaudible) suspicious cases are reportable to the
24 national surveillance system.

25 Next slide, please.

1 Severity index. Severity is quoted only for
2 cases that meet the case definition. That is to say
3 two new symptoms following exposure to a pesticide
4 product and there is a causal relationship between the
5 symptoms and the pesticide. The program uses a flow
6 chart and a table of signs and symptoms, and we
7 usually refer to the EPA Recommendation and Management
8 of Pesticides Handbook. There is another slide
9 showing the flow chart and an example for the table I
10 provided at the end of presentation. If we have time,
11 we can go over those.

12 For now, we can -- in summary, cases can be
13 of low, moderate, high severity, or death. Most
14 severity cases are not trivial and should not be
15 dismissed as unimportant. No case of pesticide
16 poisoning should be unaccepted regardless of the
17 severity. Low severity cases usually resolve without
18 treatment and when there is lost time from work or
19 normal activities less than three days. In moderate
20 severity cases usually treatment is provided. Time
21 lost from work or normal activities is from three to
22 five days. No residual impairment is present,
23 although effects might be persistent.

24 The high severity cases, the poisoning is
25 life threatening and typically requires treatment,

1 substantial loss of time greater than five days from
2 regular work or normal activities is sustained. The
3 person may sustain permanent functional impairments.

4 And death, this category is described as a
5 human fatality resulting from exposure to one or more
6 pesticides.

7 Next slide, please.

8 Contributing factors are also known as
9 prevention codes. These are the factors contributing
10 to the pesticide illness or injury and can point to
11 the root causes of the poisoning. By identifying
12 contributing factors to the pesticide poisonings, we
13 can develop intervention strategies that can trace the
14 root causes of the pesticide poisoning. The system
15 currently has 21 of these codes.

16 Here's an example when a contributing factor
17 can be coded with number 04, or early reentry. In
18 this example, the narrative describes REI, reentry
19 interval was four hours, but workers report that they
20 followed the spray rig along the row.

21 Another example reads, Label states keep
22 unprotected persons out of the area until the sprays
23 are dry, but vegetation is still wet when worker began
24 pulling out the sprayed plants.

25 Next slide, please.

1 The SENSOR-Pesticides Program has been
2 recognized for providing critical information for
3 occupational and public health. We will describe some
4 of these impacts in the following slides.

5 Next slide, please.

6 Changes in federal regulations to reduce
7 pesticide-related health risks. In September 2015,
8 the U.S. EPA, announced final
9 rules to the Worker Protection Standard, WPS, the
10 federal regulation to reduce pesticide-related health
11 risks among agricultural workers. This was the first
12 major WPS revision 20 years. SENSOR-Pesticides data
13 are extensively cited in the revised rules.

14 Next slide.

15 Changes in proposed federal regulations to
16 improve the training and certification of pesticide
17 applicators. In December 2016, EPA announced final
18 revised regulations for certification and training of
19 pesticide applicators to ensure the competent use of
20 restricted use pesticides. This was the first major
21 revision to these regulations in 40 years. Findings
22 from SENSOR-Pesticides are extensively cited in the
23 announcement. EPA stated that the proposed new
24 requirements will provide benefits to the pesticide
25 applicators, agriculture workers, and the public.

1 Next slide, please.

2 Safer pest control in schools. The SENSOR-
3 Pesticides Program published an article in the JAMA
4 describing the national incidence of pesticide
5 poisoning at schools. After this article was
6 published, five states have passed laws requiring
7 schools to control pests using methods with the least
8 possible health hazards.

9 Next slide, please. Next slide, please.

10 The program has developed guidance and
11 provided technical assistance on conducting acute
12 pesticide poisonings. The standardized variables
13 document has already been (inaudible). The
14 standardized pesticides program has also developed a
15 how-to guide to assist the state-based organizations.
16 States can use this information to build their own
17 surveillance products.

18 The product results go to SPIDER. SPIDER is
19 a free data entry and reporting system. By using
20 these tools, the state programs collect and manage
21 data in a standardized manner. This also promotes
22 credibility of data across the states.

23 Next slide.

24 Please visit our website to know more about the
25 SENSOR-Pesticides Program.

1 Thank you.

2 FACILITATOR: Thank you very much, Dr.
3 Alarcon. I appreciate it. And we do have a couple
4 minutes here for PPDC members. So stay on the stay on
5 the line, sir, and we'll see if PPDC members have
6 questions that they want to either unmute themselves
7 and ask directly or through the chat.

8 MS. FLEESON TROSSBACH: This is Liza
9 Trossbach, representing AAPCO. And I have a question
10 regarding this particular SENSOR program.

11 DR. ALARCON: Mm-hmm.

12 MS. FLEESON TROSSBACH: How are state
13 agencies that are responsible -- I mean, or state
14 OSHAs, how are they aware of this opportunity to
15 participate or is that something that's offered
16 regularly to them?

17 DR. ALARCON: The states programs are aware
18 of this program. If you're asking about funding
19 opportunities, NIOSH Office of External Programs
20 (inaudible) regularly (inaudible) evaluate those
21 findings for support. If that was the question.

22 On the other hand, we can say that the
23 SENSOR-Pesticides Program regularly shares information
24 via their website, our Listserv, and also when we
25 attend meetings of the Council of the State and

1 Territorial Epidemiologists. I hope this response
2 answered the question.

3 MS. FLEESON TROSSBACH: Yes, thank you so
4 very much.

5 DR. ALARCON: Thank you.

6 FACILITATOR: Iris, was that you or did
7 someone else you have a question?

8 MS. FIGUEROA: Yeah, I had a question. Thank
9 you so much for that presentation. So just -- I think
10 you covered it, but I just want to make sure we're all
11 clear. In terms of where the program is operating
12 right now, you mentioned that there's funding for
13 Michigan and California and Illinois. So could you
14 just let us know what other states are sort of
15 currently in the program?

16 DR. ALARCON: Can you please show us slide
17 number 9? Can you please back up to slide 9?

18 FACILITATOR: Sarah, can you back up to slide
19 9? I don't see the slide numbers, but maybe --

20 FACILITATOR 2: Yeah, I don't have those
21 slide numbers, so just --

22 DR. ALARCON: I am trying to move the slides.
23 Is it working?

24 FACILITATOR 2: No, I have control of the
25 slides at the moment.

1 DR. ALARCON: So there is a map showing the
2 states that are participating in the program. It's a
3 big map. It's slide number -- this is slide number 9.

4 Yeah, that's the one. Those are the states
5 that are currently working with the program.

6 MS. FIGUEROA: So for those who are blue,
7 they're just receiving different funding than NIOSH
8 funding. That's the distinction, correct?

9 DR. ALARCON: Or not funded.

10 MS. FIGUEROA: So they're participating, but
11 they're not funded?

12 DR. ALARCON: The reason is they don't
13 receive federal funding. Now they run studies and
14 they fund it through their own states.

15 MS. FIGUEROA: Got it. Thank you.

16 DR. ALARCON: Thank you.

17 MS. BROWN: Dr. Walter, this is jasmine
18 brown. I had a question. As you know, there are
19 several tribes in the United States and they have
20 their own clinics or hospitals and they may be in
21 states that aren't receiving funding or aren't
22 currently participating. Is there a way for them to
23 participate in the SPIDER or SENSOR programs?

24 DR. ALARCON: Yes, we usually work through a
25 state health department, but a tribe is not -- is an

1 organization not within this state or current
2 system, we can work with them and share
3 the resources we have and they could start their own
4 programs. And then once the data meets the required
5 quality we require from the states, we could use those
6 data and then enter it in the national system.

7 MS. BROWN: Okay, thank you.

8 DR. ALARCON: Thank you.

9 FACILITATOR: We have time for one more.

10 DR. ALARCON: In our --

11 FACILITATOR: Oh, go ahead, Dr. Alarcon.

12 DR. ALARCON: And the way a state --
13 interested organization can contact us is in our
14 website, there's an email that can -- the way you can
15 reach to us and we can respond to their request.

16 FACILITATOR: Thank you. I think we have
17 time for one more question for Dr. Alarcon.

18 (Pause.)

19 FACILITATOR: Okay. Listen, I think that
20 might be it then. Thank you very, very much for your
21 presentation, Dr. Alarcon.

22 DR. ALARCON: Thank you.

23 FACILITATOR: Thank you very much.

24 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you so much.

25 FACILITATOR: And we're going to move to the

1 final item on our agenda before the public segment of
2 the meeting and this -- and now so we're turning it
3 over to Kaci Buhl. Kaci is the Assistant Director at
4 the National Pesticide Information Center and is going
5 to talk to us about risk communications.

6 Kaci, you're up.

7 MS. BUHL: Absolutely. Thank you so much,
8 Paul. And thank you for inviting me to be part of
9 this illustrious meeting. I am honored to get a
10 chance to speak with so many members of the PPDC on
11 such an important topic.

12 Often when I ask groups do you do risk
13 communication, don't know what I'm talking about. But
14 basically this is answering the question, is it safe?
15 This is a really hard question to answer, especially
16 given the wide range of stakeholders that we have and
17 how very specific and limiting that word is, "safe."

18 All right. So first, I want to mention where
19 I get my street cred on this topic. Right out of grad
20 school, I came to work at the National Pesticide
21 Information Center, which is also a cooperative
22 agreement with EPA, in addition to PERC, PERC-MED, and
23 some other things we've mentioned today. It has been
24 housed at Oregon State University for over 25 years
25 now and it is competitively renewed on every three-to-

1 five-year basis. We answer questions from around the
2 nation about pesticides, over 10,000 inquiries a year.
3 We also answer email inquiries within one business
4 day.

5 Now before we jump in, I want you to ask
6 yourself real quickly, would you want to take calls
7 like this from the nation? Do you think it would be
8 difficult to take these questions cold from people who
9 may have very strong opinions one way or the other?

10 It is very difficult. And over time, over
11 the last 10 years that I've been involved with the
12 center, 15 really, we have changed and grown the
13 training program based on sound science about risk
14 communication and also psychology. I studied
15 pesticides in school, but I did not study psychology.
16 So I had to learn all that after taking on the role.

17 The Pesticide Information Center has a huge
18 website. This is important for all of you to be aware
19 because it's a resource for you. We've written topics
20 on -- over 700 pages on different topics that we've
21 been asked about at the center. If it becomes a
22 frequently asked question, we talk about it as a
23 group, we hit the literature, make sure we're getting
24 the most up-to-date and sound science, and we write a
25 fact sheet or a web page about it. Those are all

1 available to you as talking points, as summaries, and
2 we also include links to all the references we use.
3 So we're actually relying on a lot of state-based
4 resources to answer questions. There's an A to Z
5 index, an easy search box. We encourage you to use
6 that.

7 Over 25 years, the inquiries we receive have
8 come from across the nation, reflecting the dense
9 populations in some states compared to others. We do
10 get more inquiries from Oregon than we should just
11 because people know we exist here more than they do in
12 other places. Many of the people who call our center
13 find our number on pesticide labels or they're
14 Googling to find pesticide information, they're
15 Googling or using Bing or some other search engine to
16 find us.

17 And notice our hours are only four hours a
18 day. I'd love to see that go back up to eight hours a
19 day, or when I started, we did ten hours a day, seven
20 days a week. I'd love to see the service level
21 increase again.

22 Over those 25 years answering a lot of
23 inquiries, we have developed a wide range of
24 educational materials to help people get answers to
25 their questions when the phone service is not open.

1 Also notice there's a generational difference in how
2 people like to use the phone. I don't know about you,
3 but I hear from younger generations they do not like
4 getting phone calls or making phone calls. So they're
5 going to look for their information in a different
6 way, on websites, on social media. We need to put
7 that information in the path of where people are
8 already going to be instead of expecting them to come
9 get that information from us.

10 All right. Based on all of that learning and
11 growing and writing over 25 years, we've built a
12 strong understanding of what risk perception is and it
13 is personal. There is a whole issue of environmental
14 health perspectives published on this topic about how
15 many different factors go into the idea of individual
16 risk assessment. Most of our risk perception is based
17 on fast, intuitive feelings. This is based on books
18 written by Malcolm Gladwell and others about those
19 intuitions that jump into our brains immediately when
20 we hear about a risky thing.

21 Those quick, intuitive feelings serve us very
22 well to protect us from bad stuff. That's the quick
23 intuitive feeling that tells you to run if you
24 interact with the bear or a tiger, but those quick
25 intuitive feelings may not be as well informed. We

1 need to understand this risk perception before we can
2 understand how to communicate about these risks.

3 First, I need to make the case to you that
4 risk does not exist out there independent of our minds
5 and cultures, waiting to be measured. It is not a
6 hard and fast thing. I've heard plenty of
7 toxicologists say the risk is negligible, the risk is
8 low, but they're talking about the probability of
9 harm.

10 Risk is a different thing. Risk involves a
11 whole population for us professionals. We invented
12 this concept to help us understand the uncertainties
13 in life. We now understand, better than we did 20
14 years ago, that many communities perceive risks
15 differently. And trauma can inform our risk
16 perception, those internal calculations. If an
17 individual has been misled in the past, they're much
18 more likely to distrust information coming in the
19 future.

20 When professionals say risk, I mentioned this
21 in the last slide, we're often thinking about
22 probability. We measure it at a population level, the
23 percent of population impacted by a thing, and this is
24 what we mean when we say the risk is high, moderate,
25 or low, we're talking about the probability of harm in

1 the population. But we're not even using -- like this
2 word is defined differently by members of the general
3 public. Instead, they're not thinking about a graph
4 or a gradation. They think of risk as being a
5 binomial. It's either risky or it's not; it's either
6 dangerous or it's not. They're not thinking about a
7 population; they're thinking about themselves and
8 their family. It's understood at an individual level,
9 not a population level.

10 With that idea of the binomial, I hope I can
11 make the case to you to stop saying that things are
12 safe. Let's all just stop saying it. And if we can
13 convince the media to stop saying it, that would be a
14 big help, too, because safety is yes or no. If
15 something is safe, then no precautions are necessary,
16 and safe is safe for everyone. It's easy to explain.
17 But risk is more complicated. It ranges from low risk
18 to high risk. We know precautions reduce risks, but
19 it is harder to explain.

20 I'll make the case for this. I've heard
21 callers on the phone say, to me, the pest control
22 operator said that it was safe, but he was wearing
23 gloves so it's obviously not safe. What? I bet you
24 didn't know that your credibility could be hurt by
25 such a thing, but it absolutely can because people

1 think of safety as a binomial.

2 I'll give you one more example of the
3 impression of safety leading to careless behaviors. I
4 spoke to a caller once who called and was very upset
5 that their dog was sick after eating a slug bait
6 product. The slug bait label said safe to use around
7 kids and pets.

8 Well, she came home from grocery shopping the
9 day before with her arms full and her kids pulling on
10 her clothes and she noticed that the bag of slug bait
11 had fallen off a high shelf in the garage and the dog
12 was eating it. All of it. I mean, slug baits can be
13 formulated with delicious things like molasses. So
14 she thought, whew, it's a good thing I picked the slug
15 bait that's safe for dogs. That led to careless
16 behaviors and a lack of vigilance, which led to
17 increased risk. Telling people that something is safe
18 really can increase the risk of that thing. So let's
19 instead talk about risk and ways to affect it.

20 Just a little meme to make you laugh at the
21 end of the day. Hope it made you laugh.

22 Instead, let's rephrase the safe question.
23 When they ask, is it safe, talk about the risk. Tell
24 me about your specific concerns, ask the question.
25 Someone is not asking is it safe unless they are

1 concerned, right? So first, listen to their specific
2 concerns. I've been shocked hearing very valid and
3 unique exposure scenarios from people that were not
4 necessarily considered in risk assessments. So we
5 need to ask a question.

6 For example, they might say they've got an
7 elderly family member in the house with a compromised
8 immune system. That's a different case than just
9 saying follow the label and you wouldn't expect to
10 have any adverse effects. There might be additional
11 mitigation steps that could be taken once we hear
12 about those additional concerns.

13 All right. Now, when communicating about
14 risk, I have to start at the basics. I learned in
15 school that risk is made of two things, toxicity and
16 exposure. The toxicity is relative to the
17 toxicological space that I work in, but you could also
18 use it as hazard, ladder safety, mine safety, other
19 issues, it's the hazard. And the other factor is how
20 much exposure do you have to that hazard.

21 So when someone asks on the call center phone
22 line is it safe, we always cover issues about the
23 toxicity of the thing they're asking about it. We
24 might talk about the toxicology of the active
25 ingredient, the product signal word, the dose

1 estimate, something from that list that's appropriate,
2 and then we would also talk about exposure. How will
3 you be exposed, by what route?

4 Maybe it's relevant to talk about the
5 physical chemical properties of the active ingredient.
6 For example, some of them can pass through the skin,
7 some of them cannot very readily pass through the
8 skin. We would want to talk to them about duration,
9 frequency of exposure, how to keep that as short as
10 possible. Minimizing exposure minimizes risk, and
11 that's a pretty clear statement across the board.

12 For toxicity, we might mention the relevant
13 route of exposure. This is an example tox box that
14 you'll find in any of NPIC's technical fact sheets. I
15 encourage you to check these out if you haven't seen
16 them. This is basically communicating that
17 glyphosate, just an example AI that I picked, active
18 ingredient, is low or very low in toxicity when eaten,
19 inhaled, on the skin, or for primary eye and skin
20 irritation, but that is only taking into account acute
21 exposures that are high-dose, short-term exposures,
22 but useful to be aware of.

23 But even with something that is low toxicity,
24 here's something I learned on the phone lines, there
25 is no acceptable risk in the absence of benefit. This

1 is a brain thing. Let me tell you something about --
2 this is a piece of research done by Paul Slovic at the
3 University of Oregon. He asked people to rank these
4 risks on a scale of one to five. Up at the top, we
5 have two different ways of being exposed to radiation.
6 With nuclear power, it was described to the
7 participants as living in a community where nuclear
8 power is used and the ambient radiation would be
9 comparable to the amount received from sunlight. They
10 ranked the benefit low and the risk high.

11 With exposure to x-rays, the dose is much
12 higher. They ranked the benefit high and the risk
13 low. From a risk assessor's standpoint, those of you
14 who have a toxicology background on this webinar today
15 know very well that the risk -- the probability of
16 harm is much higher with x-rays because the dose is
17 higher. The nurse leaves the room. But see how it's
18 connected to benefit in like a teeter-totter fashion.
19 If the benefit is low, then the risk is high. If the
20 benefit is high, then the risk is low.

21 The same thing was borne out with exposure to
22 chemicals. The participants in the study had this
23 part described to them as low levels of pesticides as
24 a result of legal use on commodities, so the same kind
25 of low level residues that we experience in the diet

1 today. They ranked the benefit low and the risk high.
2 But another way of being exposed to chemicals is
3 through prescription drugs. The dose is much higher
4 in some cases. The duration and frequency of exposure
5 is much higher in those cases, but they ranked the
6 benefit high and the risk lower. And you can see how
7 that benefit is uniquely tied to it.

8 So what to get from this information, risks
9 are less likely to be acceptable if the benefits are
10 hidden from view or if those benefits are not fairly
11 distributed among those who bear the risks. So for
12 example, if a commercial entity gets all the benefits
13 and the surrounding community is sharing the risk,
14 sometimes that's reason enough to find the risk
15 unacceptable.

16 So we need to not be silent about the
17 benefits of pesticides. I picked three pictures just
18 to represent that. This is a Christmas tree
19 plantation here in Oregon that's been taken over by an
20 invasive species called Scotch broom, making it very
21 difficult to grow those trees. Pesticides are also
22 used in a variety of natural settings to control
23 invasive weeds and insects that can be incredibly
24 important to protecting the habitat for wildlife. I
25 went to college with a lot of individuals who cared a

1 lot about environmental science, including myself
2 obviously, and a bunch of my friends now work in
3 settings where they're applying pesticides, they're
4 applying herbicides to protect those natural areas.
5 Not something they anticipated, but they are critical
6 tools in the protection of wild areas.

7 All right. I've talked about benefit, now
8 I'm going to talk about control. These are two
9 concepts that we have found are very inextricably
10 linked to risk perception. Risk denial increases with
11 perceived control. If we think we're in control of
12 it, then it's not so risky because we trust ourselves
13 more than we trust other entities, and trust is a key
14 component to risk perception. I put those thumbs
15 there because that's who I trust the most, myself, and
16 that's probably true of most individuals on the trust
17 scale.

18 How do we handle that at the center? Well,
19 we give people something they can control, ways to
20 minimize exposure. This list is not intended to be
21 read in detail. I know the type is very small. At a
22 staff meeting for NPIC, I asked the staff, what are
23 some ways to minimize exposure that you talk to
24 callers about when they're having a liquid applied in
25 a residential setting. Well, there's lots of things

1 that people can do to take control of the situation.
2 Use appropriate PPE if that's what you're doing, don't
3 track in residues on your shoes, a lot of different
4 things that you can do to take control of the
5 situation to minimize exposure. Giving people
6 something they have control over is an important part
7 of making sure they can take steps to protect
8 themselves.

9 All right. So putting that together, about
10 five years into my time at NPIC, at the Pesticide
11 Information Center, I came to understand and built
12 this into the training that the informed risk
13 decision-making includes toxicity and exposure. Those
14 are the pillars. But it's not a solid picture until
15 the individual understands the benefit and items in
16 their own control, who controls the situation.

17 I'm going to go further, there's more about
18 this psychology business.

19 All right. I'm going to show you several
20 studies in the next few slides that I think are really
21 helpful to understanding risk perception.

22 Trust is critical: hard won, easily lost.

23 Risk and risk assessment are subjective and
24 value-laden. I'll make the case for that. If you
25 think you're doing your best job to be objective, I

1 applaud you and that is a great pursuit, but we have
2 to acknowledge that there are subjective judgments in
3 those processes. Sometimes if you define risk one
4 way, the best solution might be this; if you define
5 right another way, it might be that.

6 Let me show you an example. If you were to
7 ask the question is coal mining getting safer, well,
8 you could measure it one way, accidental deaths per
9 million tons of coal. It sure looks like mining is
10 getting safer when you look at that first graph. Way
11 fewer accidental deaths. Well, you could look at it a
12 different way and look at it per thousand coal miner
13 -- coal mine employees. Sounds like they've been
14 doing more mechanization, there's fewer employees.
15 This graph actually makes it look like mining is
16 getting more dangerous. Who decides how we measure
17 this?

18 And let me point out, both of those we're
19 counting fatalities, and there are certainly other
20 ways to define adverse impacts. Sublethal impacts,
21 impacts on fertility, impacts on neuro development,
22 impacts on literacy, and that all leads to societal
23 impacts that are not necessarily considered in these
24 risk assessments.

25 This is what I learned from my public health

1 interns because I didn't take public health classes.
2 There's a thing called the deficit model, and I think
3 we have all been stuck in it, at least in the
4 pesticide world, for a while. That's the idea that
5 the general public or the people we serve are at a
6 deficit. They just don't know as much as we do.

7 The idea that the expert has knowledge and
8 the nonexperts don't have knowledge, well, what does
9 this lead to? Well, it leads us to doing, like here,
10 have another fact sheet, another video. They just
11 don't get it. I can't help it if people don't
12 understand science. I can't tell you how many times
13 I've heard this from regulators, from educators, from
14 registrants. It's a very difficult one, but let me
15 make the case. Here's what we're doing wrong.

16 Instead of communicating to people, we need
17 to communicate with people. It has to be two-way.
18 They can't accept our messages if they don't feel
19 heard in the first place. And this is true for us,
20 too. No one's different. We want to be heard before
21 we accept alternative recommendations.

22 This is just a new mechanism. I've been
23 studying about environmental health literacy. First,
24 I learned in recent years that health literacy,
25 knowing words like "cancer" and "cholesterol" does not

1 translate directly into environmental health literacy.
2 So we have people in the community that know medical
3 terms really well, but they don't know environmental
4 health terms well, like exposure and a number of other
5 terms in environmental health. So someone might be very
6 savvy about some environmental health topics and be
7 completely at a loss at another one of these.

8 It's also helpful to know that people think
9 of these as all different dangers and not all coming
10 under the realm of environmental health. It's kind of
11 a new thing in the zeitgeist that people are still
12 trying to define.

13 Another study I want to show you is about gut
14 feelings. Our feelings about outcomes and feelings
15 about probabilities are often confused. We call this
16 probability neglect. It basically means if the
17 outcome is super scary or super happy, then we will be
18 super scared or super happy instead of paying
19 attention to the probability.

20 Here is the study. Essentially, Paul -- oh,
21 I explained that already. Paul Slovic asked a group
22 of toxicologists to rank the risks from a low exposure
23 to a low cancer risk thing and they made the risk low.
24 High exposure to a carcinogen, they raised it up.
25 Exposure makes a big difference for toxicologists when

1 they're assessing risk. Look at how flat this line is
2 for the public. It says, if they're saying to us, if
3 a large exposure is bad, then a small exposure is also
4 bad, if we're talking about cancer, it is a dreaded
5 effect, it does not matter. Probability does not
6 matter in cases like this. I found this out the hard
7 way on the phone when you talk about toxicological
8 data with someone, it may not be compelling at all if
9 they have strong emotions about the negative outcome.

10 It works the same way in the opposite
11 direction like winning the lottery. Winning the
12 lottery sounds so awesome. Some of us buy tickets
13 even though we understand the probability is
14 vanishingly small.

15 All right. Another study I'd like to share
16 with you, I'm a nerd for this stuff. This is also
17 from Paul Slovic at Oregon State University. In this
18 study, people with different world views were asked
19 about their attitudes toward nanotechnology before and
20 after being given information. They were given a
21 paragraph. Everybody in the study was given a
22 paragraph about nanotechnology that talked about its
23 potential benefits and its potential risks. These
24 different world views ranged from things like this.

25 So first, the researchers asked the

1 participants how much they agreed or disagreed with
2 these statements, and by doing that, they could lump
3 them into groups of individualists or communitarians,
4 egalitarians, hierarchists. There are lots of
5 different ways to break people down into clubs. This
6 is just one that talks about the world view and I
7 think importantly how people feel about the role of
8 government. Interesting.

9 Now, remember, they were asked about the
10 risks and benefits of nanotech before and after
11 reading the paragraph. Before they read the
12 paragraph, they're all bunched up here in the middle
13 ranking the benefits and risks between 2.6 and 2.7 out
14 of 5. That's really bunched up together. But after
15 reading the paragraph about nanotech -- and they all
16 read the same thing -- the individuals and hierarchs
17 decided the benefits were greater than the risks.
18 Full speed ahead. But the egalitarians and
19 communitarians decided after reading the same
20 material, the risks were greater than the benefits.
21 Reasonable people on both sides of this read the same
22 information and their values came in.

23 We need to remember this when people disagree
24 with our risk assessments, that it could be a world
25 view difference. It may not be that they just don't

1 understand science. It could be that they see the
2 world in a different way and they see those risks as
3 being more problematic than others do.

4 There's more. We have already talked about
5 benefit and control. If one increases the perceived
6 benefit or the perceived control, it has an effect of
7 decreasing the perceived risk, but these are not the
8 only what Paul Slovic calls outrage factors. Each one
9 of these lines represents an outrage factor. If
10 things are on the left, we perceived lower risk. This
11 is based on his body of research. If things are on
12 the right side of the screen, we perceived those risks
13 to be higher. You can see how benefit and control are
14 included, but there are also outreach factors
15 related to whether something is voluntary, whether
16 something is natural, whether something affects
17 children, and whether something is familiar. That
18 bottom one is a very strong driver.

19 We perceive things to be a higher risk in
20 general if we don't trust the entity who's describing
21 the risk to us. You can become a more trusted entity
22 by giving people the room to make up their own minds
23 about these risks.

24 All right. As we discussed the framework,
25 this is what to say in response to the question, is it

1 safe. First, we reframe it as a question about risk.
2 Make sure you discuss the toxicity of the thing,
3 exposure to the thing. If applicable, the benefit of
4 the thing -- sometimes if it was a spill, there is no
5 benefit so you don't mention that, but control, items
6 in the person's control, that's what to say. Now, in
7 the next section, I'm going to talk about how to say
8 it.

9 All right. This is a proposed checklist.
10 It's not a hard and fast way to approach these
11 conversations, but it has been helpful to a number of
12 our trainees. A number of trainees at the center
13 actually print this out, put it under the blotter, the
14 clear blotter on their desk so they can check off and
15 remember that they've covered each one of these
16 things.

17 This last piece, where to get more
18 information, that's really important to making you a
19 trusted entity that you're not just saying to the
20 individual, trust me and go away. You're instead
21 giving them information, but you're also giving them a
22 source where they can get more information. You're
23 welcome to give out the center's contact information
24 if you're not sure who else to include at the bottom
25 of this risk conversation.

1 Now, how to say it, I encourage each one of
2 you, if you do this kind of work to go read the
3 Debunking Handbook. It's only about 20 pages long.
4 It was prepared by the Union of Concerned Scientists
5 in response to climate change science, helping us
6 understand why people reject certain messages. First,
7 we are guilty of the backfire effect, of overkill. If
8 we try to address a myth with too many facts, the
9 person walks away remembering the myth. If we can do
10 the work to get our facts down to size, there is a
11 chance to the person may walk away with the fact.

12 When I explained this to trainees, I know
13 this is kind of a weird way of explaining it, but in
14 order to pluck a myth out of someone's mental map, you
15 have to replace it with something about the same size.
16 This is hard work, getting all the information down to
17 fewer words while maintaining accuracy. It will take
18 your experts to do this work, making that strong case.

19 There's another backfire effect. Yes, did I
20 skip it? No, I just showed it twice. Sorry about
21 that.

22 The other backfire effect has to do with
23 mentioning the myth too many times when you're trying
24 to debunk it. Every time you mention a myth or
25 describe it or talk about -- just name it in its

1 entirety, you're making that myth more familiar to
2 your audience. If they're halfway checked out,
3 they're just getting that myth confirmed in their head
4 every time you mention it. So if you're trying to
5 debunk a myth try to not mention it specifically or if
6 you have to say the myth isn't true, say the myth, and
7 then say again what I just said isn't true. So you're
8 book-ending it by making sure people hear that that
9 myth is not the case.

10 One more on this, a piece of neuroscience
11 that I am fascinated by, finding the sweet spot in our
12 risk messaging. For example, I like to use the idea
13 of public health messaging around smoking. If you
14 were to make a public health message around smoking
15 that was focused on threatened danger, then you would
16 talk about how it destroys your lungs, you're going to
17 smell bad, threat danger, you're going to die. But if
18 you focused instead on reward and benefit, you might
19 talk about the benefits, you're going to feel better,
20 you'll have more stamina, you're going to smell
21 better, et cetera.

22 It turns out to maximize learning, we need to
23 put our messages on the reward and benefits side. It
24 turns out if our brains are focused too much on
25 threat, learning shuts down because the brain is busy

1 focusing on that threat and that's more important than
2 learning new information that may not be exactly
3 relevant to that threat. Pretty interesting, I think.

4 Let's focus on what to do. So we've actually
5 taken this into the NPIC website very strongly.
6 Instead of saying what not to do, we try to focus on
7 what to do, we try to focus on the benefits of doing
8 it the right way.

9 So in summary, some suggestions in yellow, we
10 talked about chemical risk assessment measures, the
11 probability of harm and how personal risk assessment
12 is actually variable based on world views, strength of
13 emotion, and perceived benefit. We have to address
14 the motions first. Then people may be able to
15 consider probability. When you address emotions
16 first that means you ask about their specific concerns
17 and listen. Being heard is one of the most important
18 parts to addressing emotion.

19 We talked about how the benefits often inform
20 our risk perception more than the probability of harm
21 and how defining risk is in act of power and how safe
22 is not a safe word.

23 So my suggestions at the bottom don't be
24 silent about the benefits when you talk about risk.
25 Don't define risk for people. Let them make up their

1 own minds. Sometimes on the phones people would ask
2 me, well, what do you think, you sound smart about
3 this, just tell me what I should think. And I often
4 would -- I would tell them, it's not important what I
5 think, I'm not in the situation, I'm not going to be
6 exposed, what matters is what you think. If you still
7 need more information to make up your mind, I'm happy
8 to look that up for you, anything I can do.

9 And, last, discuss risk, ways to reduce it,
10 empower people. In case you didn't get a chance to
11 take a picture of the fine proposed checklist so that
12 I can give you one more chance, frame it as risk
13 rather than safety, ask questions and listen. Make
14 sure we cover the hazard of the toxicity. What could
15 happen? Does it cause cancer? Is it highly toxic to
16 the eye? Provide exposure information. How might you
17 be exposed and how can you prevent that? Discuss the
18 benefits of the thing, if applicable. Discuss action
19 items in the person's control and where to get more
20 information.

21 I put my email address down here at the
22 bottom. It's a little bit hard to read. It is
23 Kaci.Buhl@oregonstate.edu.

24 I sure appreciate the opportunity to share
25 some of the things that we've learned over time at

1 NPIC when we've been trying to discuss risk with
2 thousands and thousands of people over time. I think
3 this model is moving well into the modern era where
4 people want to make up their own minds, they don't
5 want to be told by the government, by industry, by
6 anyone, what the risk actually is. We need to just
7 get more transparent and we need to get better at
8 describing these risks with fewer words. We have to
9 do the work.

10 Okay. I sounded awfully preachy. I did not
11 stop to entertain questions. If there are questions,
12 I'm happy to respond to those. I'm not sure if I've
13 gone over time.

14 FACILITATOR: You are well within your time
15 frame, Kaci. Thank you very much.

16 MS. BUHL: You're very welcome.

17 FACILITATOR: Great --

18 MS. BUHL: I see in the chat that Charlotte
19 has a question.

20 FACILITATOR: There you go.

21 MS. SANSON: Yeah, thanks, Kaci. That was
22 really -- it wasn't just informative, but it was very,
23 very helpful, so I really appreciate your perspective
24 on this. And so I can imagine some of the calls, the
25 types of calls that you receive. So I was just kind

1 of curious, when you were talking about myths, what
2 would you say is the most common myth that you or --
3 maybe it's not just, one maybe there's a few -- most
4 common myths that you hear coming through the lines?
5 I'm kind of just curious in terms of your thoughts
6 about how, you know, proactively as the agriculture
7 community, what we can do. Obviously, education is a
8 big piece of this, too. So, anyway, I'll let you
9 talk. Thank you. Thank you again.

10 MS. BUHL: Absolutely. One important myth I
11 want to talk about that's timely for right now,
12 homemade mixtures of weed killers and insect killers,
13 the recipes are all over Pinterest, and it's a
14 problem. Especially with vinegar and weed killers,
15 the poison control center is seeing a higher rate of
16 eye exposures with vinegar. I've been doing a lot of
17 education around this, just encouraging people to use
18 registered products or 25(b) products that have been
19 evaluated in some way. People can salt the earth,
20 they can hurt themselves very, very much by mixing up
21 toxic combinations of stuff at home, especially if
22 they're mixing things like ammonia, ammonium and
23 bleach.

24 So homemade mixtures, people call them
25 nonpesticides, nonchemicals. That is definitely a

1 myth.

2 And another one I have to mention not so
3 agricultural, but the biggest incident we hear about
4 all the time is moth ball misuse. Moth balls are
5 supposed to be used in airtight containers, not
6 closets, not car cabins. People getting headaches,
7 people not understanding the label directions on moth
8 balls is another big one.

9 The rest of the myths I'm sure would sound
10 familiar to you as well, a myth that agricultural
11 pesticides are more toxic by nature than consumer
12 products. That's not necessarily the case. That
13 products used by professionals are inherently more
14 toxic than products available to the public, also, not
15 a generalization we can make. I could go on, but I
16 have been talking too long.

17 Is there another question? I guess there's
18 not. Okay.

19 FACILITATOR: Let's do a little pause. You
20 covered a lot of material. Let's make sure
21 PPDC members and even workgroup members who aren't
22 PPDC members can unmute themselves and ask a question
23 or toss a question into the chat.

24 Here we go, let's see. Can you see the chat,
25 Kaci?

1 MS. BUHL: I can. So this one comes from
2 Manojit. I'm not sure I pronounced it correctly, I'm
3 sorry.

4 FACILITATOR: Yes, Mano Basu.

5 MS. BUHL: Mano Basu. Thank you.

6 Great presentation. One major variable in
7 risk communication is misinformation and myth. What
8 are your thoughts on managing misinformation versus
9 individual perception?

10 Well, managing misinformation is a mass media
11 problem, right? So one of the ways that we can
12 address that is by putting accurate information that
13 competes with the misinformation, the accurate
14 information has to be just as snappy and cool to share
15 as the misinformation. So NPIC is doing a hero's job
16 on social media, I think, by putting that information,
17 the accurate information out in the path where
18 consumers can see it at a time of year that it's
19 applicable. So in the fall, we hear a lot about head
20 lice and rodents, so we're putting out accurate how to
21 do it right information out in the fall about head
22 lice and rodents. So you have to put it in their path.
23 Managing misinformation is a huge (inaudible) --

24 FACILITATOR: Damon has a question.

25 MS. BUHL: Okay.

1 MR. REABE: Yeah, thanks. Excellent. That
2 was an excellent presentation. I really appreciated
3 it. I'm an aerial applicator from Wisconsin, and so
4 as an aerial applicator, we're very visible and we
5 receive a lot of calls from concerned neighbors about
6 our activities and this presentation is really
7 helpful, a real helpful tool for communicating with
8 people who are worried about what we're doing.

9 Given this group there, this committee is
10 advising OPP on policy, what do you see that the OPP
11 can do to help on this subject of risk communication?

12 MS. BUHL: That's a great question. I'm
13 trying to prioritize my answer. Pesticide labels are
14 a big part of it that EPA actually has some authority
15 over. I understand that there's a workgroup right now
16 focusing on pesticide label content that may or may
17 not be misleading. I think the font of pesticide
18 labels is misleading. It gives people the impression
19 that it's small print and it's not important to read.
20 Making that print larger would put more information in
21 the hands of the consumers so they could make up their
22 own minds. The precautionary statements need to be
23 large enough print to give the user the impression
24 that it's important. And we need to do the work to
25 bring those statements down to an 8th grade reading

1 level.

2 What else? Oh, here's one. I've been trying
3 this for a long time. You know how on the side of
4 your box of crackers or spaghetti it has that standard
5 thing with all the nutrition information, so if you're
6 tracking your fiber or your sodium intake, you can see
7 you can easily find that information on the label. I
8 think pesticide labels should have a similar kind of
9 panel that makes it easy for consumers to find all the
10 most important information very quickly, the EPA
11 registration number, the precautionary statements, the
12 first aid statements. Something like that with the
13 standard format, I think would improve consumers'
14 access to that information that's so critical to using
15 products correctly.

16 MR. REABE: Do you think that there would be
17 any space for OPP to communicate benefits?

18 MS. BUHL: Well, when communicating risks, it
19 is part of the equation in our brain. So it does bear
20 some discussion. We're not -- we don't have anything
21 to balance that risk against if we don't understand
22 the benefit and who benefits and how much. And we
23 might even look at how those benefits could be used to
24 address some of the risks.

25 MR. REABE: Thank you very much.

1 MS. BUHL: Yeah. So I see another question,
2 is the reference to NPIC contact information a label
3 requirement? You said that was the way most people
4 find you. Well, it is a label requirement that an 800
5 number or a toll-free number needs to be on the
6 pesticide label for questions. Larger registrants
7 tend to have their own phone center and they use their
8 own 800 number.

9 Smaller registrants often choose to use NPIC
10 as the 800 number. They're welcome to do that. They
11 need to make sure they're saying for nonemergency
12 information, call NPIC. Sometimes those labels say
13 for emergency medical treatment information, that's a
14 terrible thing because we're only open four hours a
15 day and that's only on weekdays. So look to the label
16 review manual. There is this section in there that
17 talks about how to include NPIC's phone number on the
18 label and what language to include with it.

19 You are welcome, Lauren.

20 I'm so honored that you guys stuck with it
21 and hung out for the whole presentation even here at
22 the end of the day. If there are follow-up questions
23 or how do you handle this or that, I am more than
24 happy to take follow-up emails.

25 FACILITATOR: Thank you, Kaci. Again, if

1 there are any other questions out there, please
2 signify so. Either speak up or throw it in the chat.

3 MS. JEWELL: Kaci, this is Shannon.

4 FACILITATOR: Okay. Well, thank you very
5 much.

6 MS. BUHL: Oh, wait.

7 FACILITATOR: Oh, go ahead, go ahead.

8 MS. JEWELL: Oh, I was just going to say you
9 said the label review manual, right? I'll try to chat
10 out a link to that for everyone, too.

11 MS. BUHL: Yes, please. Thanks.

12 MR. MESSINA: Thanks for the presentation,
13 Kaci. And I'll note, you know, in keeping with do we
14 follow PPDC recommendations, your presentation is
15 happening, because the PPDC asked that there be more
16 presentations related to risk communication. And
17 having seen you deliver this in the past and knowing
18 it is one of the best presentations I've seen on this
19 topic, really engaging, provocative, and it gets you
20 thinking about how we can do a better job for EPA at
21 communicating risks. It was great to have you
22 present. So I see that echoed in the chat. So thanks
23 for presenting again.

24 FACILITATOR: Great. Thank you very much.

25 And we are about a half-hour ahead of

1 schedule so that surprises me a little bit, but that's
2 okay.

3 What I probably should ask is we're -- the
4 next segment of the agenda is the public comment
5 period and we have five people preregistered, not
6 necessarily five people on the line at the moment, but
7 we have five people preregistered for making public
8 comments today during the public comment period. And
9 so we have a couple of choices. We can -- I have to
10 think about what the rules are about that. If you
11 published a public comment period, I believe it's
12 legitimate if that period of the agenda shows up a
13 little bit early, that people should be ready. But
14 maybe if there's more of a process-oriented person on
15 the line that can say -- maybe, Shannon, do you know
16 if we advertised it at 4:30, does it have to be at
17 4:30 or could it be at 4:00?

18 MS. JEWELL: I would say if not everyone is
19 here to ask those questions that they should be
20 provided that opportunity at 4:30, absolutely. But
21 maybe a couple of them are, if you want to start that
22 way, Ed.

23 MR. MESSINA: Well, let me yeah, I was going
24 along the same lines. Are all the presenters that
25 have signed up here currently? Because then I think

1 we would have no problem just starting the public
2 comment period.

3 FACILITATOR: Right. I got the impression
4 through a quick set of chats with Sarah that maybe
5 not. So, Sarah, maybe you could look at the people
6 that are live as participants and compare that to our
7 list of five, who's here and who is not or how many
8 are here.

9 FACILITATOR 2: Yeah, everyone -- not
10 everyone is on the line right now, although a few
11 folks that have signed up, I haven't seen throughout
12 the meeting. So we also -- they also -- a few people
13 signed up to speak tomorrow, so they may be speaking
14 tomorrow instead of today. But the short answer is,
15 no, not all of the public commenters are on the line
16 right now.

17 MR. MESSINA: Okay.

18 FACILITATOR: How many are on the line?

19 MR. MESSINA: Yeah. That was my next
20 question.

21 FACILITATOR 2: I believe only two of five
22 are on the line currently.

23 MR. MESSINA: Yeah, and the other thing is
24 it's a public meeting for the entire day and we're
25 here. So I don't see an issue with putting -- having

1 folks -- and we have this as part of the record, as
2 well. So it will be part of the published record for
3 PPDC. So I don't see an issue with going forward a
4 little bit earlier assuming that we have folks that
5 are ready to present.

6 FACILITATOR: Okay.

7 MR. MESSINA: And if there's a way to get in
8 touch with the folks that had suggested -- would like
9 to participate, if you can send them a note to let
10 them know where we're getting started earlier and see
11 if that works for them. And if it doesn't, we're
12 happy to have them -- I think by the time we're
13 finished, we'll be right at 4:30 anyway and they won't
14 have been prejudiced by starting early because we will
15 make sure we get to their comments. How does that
16 sound?

17 FACILITATOR: That's a very good point.

18 Yeah, that seems to work for me. So why don't we at
19 least get started now on whoever -- with whoever is
20 here and whoever joins us in the next few minutes
21 while the first one or two speakers are on the line.

22 And, Sarah, we'll just play this one moment
23 at a time, okay?

24 So I can make some opening -- let me see
25 here. I could make some opening comments about what

1 this public comment period is just for everybody's
2 sake. We are now in the public comment period, will
3 be until we've kind of exhausted the number of people
4 that have preregistered and are here. But there's
5 about a 30-minute limit on this segment. It's an
6 opportunity to hear from members of the public on any
7 issue associated with the PPDC's work, the work of the
8 subgroups, any kind of pesticide-related programs that
9 they would like to comment on. I think EPA is all
10 ears.

11 We've got five people preregistered, okay.
12 And I'll call each of them in the order that Sarah
13 tells me to. I think she's got probably a slide with
14 the five name on it in a certain order, but we'll be
15 basically taking kind of first come, first served
16 here.

17 Each person, you know, generally speaking, we
18 like to limit comments, you know, three to four
19 minutes, on the outside five, but three to four
20 minutes. You can always provide written comments to
21 the record by contacting EPA, you can also send
22 comments directly to Shannon. I believe that is
23 jewell.shannon@epa.gov. Did I get that right,
24 Shannon?

25 MS. JEWELL: That's right, that's right. And

1 I'll put that in the chat as well. Thank you, Paul.

2 FACILITATOR: Okay, very good. And let's see
3 here, if for some reason, you've preregistered and
4 decide not -- you've decided not to speak today, you
5 can just speak up when you get your name called and
6 let me know that by saying I have no comment.

7 And if you have not preregistered and are on
8 this call and would like to make a public comment, I
9 think if we have time, we'll permit that.

10 And with that, I think we can go ahead and
11 get started. I know who's on my list first, I'm going
12 to I'm going to name the name and see if this person's
13 here. That first person is Abdajali Makowi
14 (phonetic). Sorry, it's Abdajaleel Makowi (phonetic).

15 FACILITATOR 2: It does not look like they're
16 on the line.

17 FACILITATOR: Okay. How about Anamika
18 Gulotti (phonetic).

19 FACILITATOR 2: Same for them. It doesn't
20 appear that they're online.

21 FACILITATOR: Okay. All right. How about
22 Ashwath Fason (phonetic).

23 FACILITATOR 2: They are not online either.

24 FACILITATOR: Okay. How about William
25 Jordan?

1 FACILITATOR 2: It looks like they are
2 online. So, William, I will go ahead and unmute your
3 line.

4 FACILITATOR: Great. And, William, if you'd
5 introduce yourself and the organization that you are
6 affiliated with, if there is one.

7 MR. JORDAN: Thanks. I'm William Jordan.
8 I'm affiliated with the Environmental Protection
9 Network. And I have four or five points I'd like to
10 address.

11 First of all, I am really encouraged by the
12 priorities that Ed Messina talked about for the
13 agency. Climate change and environmental justice, in
14 my opinion, should be at the top of the list. I'm
15 also encouraged that the Office of Pesticide Programs
16 is playing a role in working on it. Certainly the
17 changing distribution of pests in the country will be
18 a big factor, the big question that comes out of
19 climate change.

20 But I'm disappointed that Ed didn't mention
21 what I see as being the most direct and obvious and
22 significant consequences of climate change for
23 pesticide regulation and that is that as the climate
24 warms more and more agricultural workers/farmworkers
25 will be experiencing heat stress, and to the extent

1 that EPA relies on personal protective equipment to
2 reduce exposure to pesticides, that compounds heat
3 stress.

4 So I think that EPA needs to take a long,
5 hard, serious look at its strategies with regard to
6 PPE and how they're going to deal with that going
7 forward under increasingly rising temperatures. And,
8 further, heat stress and toxicity of pesticides have
9 been shown in some limited research to interact and so
10 heat stress may be a factor that's not fully
11 considered in the risk assessments.

12 Second point I want to cover is the SENSOR
13 program. I am delighted to see that the SENSOR
14 program goes on. I think that the recommendations
15 coming out of the farmworker clinician program to have
16 a comprehensive national reporting incident system is
17 essential for EPA because EPA actually operates in the
18 pesticide world on an assumption that people follow
19 the label. But as we just heard from Kaci Buhl,
20 people do not. And there is ample evidence outside of
21 the examples that she gave that there is really a lot
22 of noncompliance with pesticide labeling.

23 To the extent that that's the case, it will
24 show up as incidents where people are getting poisoned
25 and having to seek medical attention. That's why EPA

1 really needs to expand the scope of SENSOR beyond the
2 three states that are participating right now. The
3 SENSOR information that was gathered into the older
4 system with a far larger number of states
5 participating was actually very important in helping
6 to fashion regulatory controls as we heard and EPA is
7 short-changing itself in ignoring an important source
8 of information by not funding SENSOR not only at the
9 full -- at the previous level, but more fully so it
10 would cover more states than before.

11 The third thing that I want to talk about is
12 the recommendation that Kaci Buhl made with regard to
13 standardizing pesticide label formats. This is an
14 area where I have ample experience and feedback from
15 the user community that labels are hard to follow and
16 so basically people don't look at them very closely,
17 and standardizing the format would give people an
18 easier access to the information they need. So that's
19 something that really needs to be examined
20 systematically and looked at from the standpoint of
21 how to communicate effectively with users to reduce
22 the kind of misuse that she has reported and that's
23 evident in lots of other areas.

24 The fourth thing to talk about is I'm really
25 heartened by the excellent work that EPA has done on

1 the registration review program, but the statistics
2 that Ed Messina reported, 555 final and interim
3 decisions made representing about 75 percent of the
4 active ingredients while great, the vast majority of
5 those are interim decisions and don't include
6 consideration of the endocrine disruptor mandate in
7 Section 408(p) of the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act and
8 don't include assessments of impacts on endangered and
9 threatened species.

10 I think EPA really needs to pay attention to
11 and figure out what they're going to do to finish that
12 essential work, and this agency should seek out and
13 interact with a range of stakeholders to figure the
14 most sensible efficient path forward to do the work
15 that the statutes require them to do.

16 Last point I want to cover is the 2016
17 certification and training rule and the information in
18 the report that EPA is considering a rule-making to
19 extend the deadline. I've got to say that that is
20 very disappointing. The rule came out, as noted, in
21 2016. It gave a very clear timeline to the states.
22 The states have been working on it and five years
23 ought to have been enough for them to implement the
24 changes that their systems required in order to come
25 into compliance with the rule.

1 So we understand and I appreciate the impact
2 that COVID has had on states' ability to get the work
3 done, but certainly hope that EPA will keep this
4 extension as short as they possibly can.

5 Thanks for the opportunity to comment, and I
6 continue to be impressed by EPA's excellent work, but
7 that work is something that still needs to go on and
8 still has some important areas to address. Thank you.

9 FACILITATOR: William, thank you very much
10 for your comments and for getting those into the
11 record. We really appreciate it.

12 There is another speaker that I obviously
13 skipped over. I was working off a list that was
14 ordered a little bit differently. Sorry. Ray
15 McAllister from CropLife America.

16 Is Ray present?

17 FACILITATOR 2: He is on the line. He asked
18 to give his comments tomorrow instead of today.

19 FACILITATOR: Okay, okay. Ray, we'll add you
20 -- you may already be registered for tomorrow, so that's
21 fine.

22 And then let me do just another quick request
23 to Abdajaleel Makowi, Anamika Gulotti, or Ashwath
24 Hassan. Have any of them joined us?

25 FACILITATOR 2: Not that I see.

1 MR. MESSINA: And, Paul, Jeannie indicated in
2 the chat that she has signed up. So I don't know if
3 you have her name.

4 FACILITATOR: Oh, okay. Hang on one second.
5 Sorry, I had moved off to the chat and I was in the
6 participant box.

7 So okay, here we go, Jeannie Economos.
8 Okay, yes, I didn't -- I don't see -- Jeannie, I don't
9 see you on that list, but that doesn't matter. We're
10 ready to receive your comments.

11 MS. ECONOMOS: Okay, great. Thank you very
12 much.

13 I want to say thank you to all the presenters
14 today. It was really informative and I really learned
15 a lot and really appreciate the time and effort that
16 everyone put into all the presentations.

17 I want to address my question to the SENSOR
18 program. I have a couple of questions and kind of a
19 story. So my question is we did have a funded SENSOR
20 program in Florida in the past, and I just wonder if
21 the SENSOR program is taking into consideration
22 underreporting and how the program addresses the
23 underreporting, especially related to farmworkers and
24 agriculture. So that's part of the question.

25 The second part of the question is regarding

1 suspicious or suspected cases of pesticide exposure.
2 So my understanding in Florida is that cases of
3 suspected pesticide exposure are supposed to get
4 documented even if they are not confirmed or are not a
5 direct, a definite exposure.

6 One example is in Florida we have a couple
7 whose home is surrounded on three sides by orange
8 groves and they've been living there for a couple of
9 decades in the same place. And this past summer, for
10 the first time, right after the spring of the orange
11 groves, this couple both received very severe acute
12 health symptoms. I have photographs of the woman
13 whose face and hands and feet swelled up. In fact,
14 she had to -- including her genital organs. She had
15 to stay in the bathtub for two days because she was so
16 swollen. She had extreme itching.

17 Both of them, the husband and the wife, both
18 had loss of appetite. The husband lost a lot of
19 weight because he had loss of appetite. They did
20 recover, but they had the symptoms for close to two
21 weeks and the symptoms were consistent with
22 streptomycin exposure. And the fields -- the citrus
23 groves in Florida were approved for use of
24 streptomycin as a pesticide. And we did report that
25 to the Department of Agriculture and the Department of

1 Health. And after their initial investigation, they
2 said that they could not document it as even a
3 suspected case of exposure.

4 So I'm very concerned about that because the
5 symptoms were consistent with streptomycin exposure
6 and their symptoms did happen immediately after the
7 spraying very close to their home on three sides of
8 the citrus groves. So I say that example because I
9 just -- I'm concerned that there is -- I have other
10 examples as well, including of farmworkers -- but I'm
11 just concerned that there's a vast underreporting.
12 And I will also say that that underreporting is often
13 because farmworkers are afraid to speak.

14 The other case that we have, which I won't
15 take your time unless you ask, is a farmworker who has
16 serious acute health symptoms from exposure to ZeroTol
17 2.0., and her symptoms are consistent with that. And
18 we have been asking her to -- we made a report, but
19 she is afraid, she's getting harassment and
20 retaliation at work. So she is afraid to come forward
21 and be interviewed regarding her symptoms.

22 So I'm just really concerned about how the
23 SENSOR program addresses, takes into consideration or
24 has some kind of estimate of the underreporting of
25 pesticide exposure incidents.

1 Thanks.

2 FACILITATOR: Jeannie, thank you very much.

3 Thanks for your comments.

4 And again, not to sound like we're trying to
5 just eat up time here, but just, Sarah, I'm looking at
6 the I'm looking at the participant list. I don't see
7 Abdajaleel, Anamika or Ashwath, unless you do.

8 FACILITATOR 2: No, I do not see them on the
9 line.

10 FACILITATOR: Okay.

11 MR. MESSINA: So, Paul, we can maybe take a
12 15-minute break and then pick up with the regularly
13 scheduled time at 4:30.

14 MS. ECONOMOS: Excuse me, that was not just a
15 comment. That was a question.

16 MS. JEWELL: Oh, well, is Dr. Alarcon
17 still on the line. Would you like to speak to that?

18 DR. ALARCON: Yes, I am on the line and I can
19 respond to that question. Jeannie, thank you very
20 much for your question. And to address the first
21 question about underreporting, yes, we are aware that
22 the system, SENSOR-Pesticides, is severely
23 underreporting the cases. We don't have an estimate
24 of how much is underreporting, but in our
25 publications, we mentioned several reasons, and the

1 ones you have cited are the ones we included in our
2 system.

3 MS. ECONOMOS: (Inaudible).

4 DR. ALARCON: So that will be a response to
5 underreporting. And conducting a study for
6 underreporting would be really complicated and we have
7 decided to enter (inaudible) into looking at cases we
8 have available and try to find solutions for -- common
9 solutions for those cases.

10 (Background talking.)

11 FACILITATOR: Hey, folks, we have some folks
12 that are speaking but they're not on mute. If you can
13 please put yourselves on mute, that would be awesome.

14 DR. ALARCON: So I hope that addresses the
15 first question, and we agree with your statements.

16 Regarding suspicious case statement, the
17 system, SENSOR-Pesticides receives suspicious cases
18 into our system. And the reason is, as we are working
19 in a surveillance system, oftentimes, additional
20 information may come to the public. For example,
21 there may be new publications regarding symptoms that
22 were not previously included in -- as symptoms with
23 direct or causal relationship between exposure and the
24 pesticide and effects, and then we review those cases
25 regularly.

1 When we do our analysis publications, we go
2 and check every single suspicious cases to verify that
3 there's no additional information. And as we have
4 described in our system, we require two things -- just
5 two new symptoms will be present to include as a case.
6 So special cases sometimes have only one case and
7 that's one of the reason why they are qualified as
8 suspicious.

9 Now, we are looking at the -- how the data in
10 SENSOR is being submitted, it is the state's program
11 (inaudible) that is going to analyze -- that
12 (inaudible) do the first step in case ascertainment.
13 There may be problems and what do we are trying to
14 improve is when we do our clinical exercises,
15 we focus on the case definition so we can improve
16 cases of (inaudible). I hope that clarifies the
17 question as well.

18 MS. ECONOMOS: Thank you.

19 FACILITATOR: Thank you, Dr. Alarcon.

20 Let's see, I just wanted to address Damon's
21 question in the chat about allowing the public to ask
22 questions. So the public comment period, the official
23 public comment period is to get comments only. It's
24 not for an interaction with EPA. It's to present a
25 stance or an opinion or provide information that might

1 be useful to EPA. It can be a rhetorical question,
2 but it's not intended for an interaction, a public
3 interaction with EPA.

4 So that's your question, right, Damon? Is
5 the public allowed to ask questions? It's an
6 important question, but might be a difficult policy to
7 allow for a future meeting, I'm just not sure if this
8 is a question that belongs in a public hearing where
9 we're -- they're taking comments -- EPA is taking
10 comments on the documents and the presentations that
11 have been made recently.

12 MR. REABE: Yeah, thanks, Paul. She asked a
13 really great question, and I'm glad it was answered.
14 I'm just bringing it up because there will be public
15 comment period again tomorrow and all subsequent
16 meetings and so just making sure we're all aware that
17 that's the policy. So when somebody provides public
18 comment and they have -- they can ask a rhetorical
19 question, but not to expect their question to be
20 answered as it -- and, again, I don't mind at all. I
21 think it was a great question and it was some great
22 follow-up information, but it could unravel quite
23 quickly if that becomes the typical the way that the
24 public comment period is handled.

25 FACILITATOR: Exactly. It caught me by

1 surprise that Dr. Alarcon responded to that question,
2 but I didn't want to interrupt him. I felt like it
3 wasn't -- no damage was done as the result of that.
4 But I just want to make it clear to everybody that's
5 on this call that the public comment period is not for
6 a Q&A with EPA. It's just to present thoughts, ideas,
7 considerations, rhetorical questions, concerns, and
8 making those available to EPA in this particular
9 forum. There may be other fora where you can interact
10 with EPA in different ways, but not today on this --
11 in this forum.

12 MS. JEWELL: Thank you so much for that.
13 And my apologies. I just wanted to get the question
14 answered, but that was a slip on my part. So thank
15 you so much.

16 FACILITATOR: Not a problem. I don't think
17 we -- there was no damage done here. So I just wanted
18 to set the record straight and that -- maybe for
19 anybody that's on the call today that plans on
20 speaking tomorrow, again, those same rules apply.

21 And, Sarah, I'm assuming we have nobody else
22 that's at least preregistered for today that's joined
23 us.

24 FACILITATOR 2: That is correct.

25 FACILITATOR: Okay. I'm not used to being

1 this far ahead of schedule. That's why -- so 4:30 was
2 the published -- let me see. Yeah. Was it 4:30 was
3 the published time.

4 MR. MESSINA: Yeah, it's 4:30. I think we
5 can give people, you know, a quick bio break and pick
6 up at 4:30 and do the announcement and see who has
7 shown up.

8 FACILITATOR: Yeah, that's what we should do.
9 I agree with that, Ed. And so don't leave the
10 meeting, just don't exit out, just like you did for
11 lunch. Just put us on mute and close your video and
12 we'll see you again in eight minutes. How's that?

13 MS. BROWN: Sounds great. I have a question.
14 Did I hear you correctly saying you were opening it up
15 to all of public for comments or just the
16 preregistered because I thought I heard you say to all
17 anyone who wants to provide public comment?

18 FACILITATOR: Yes, that's usually up to EPA.

19 MS. BROWN: Okay.

20 FACILITATOR: But my feeling was that if
21 there was time permitting -- like let's say we had a
22 30-minute public comment period, and we had four
23 preregistered and there was maybe someone who arrived
24 at the meeting and wants now to make a comment, time
25 permitting, we would allow that.

1 MS. BROWN: Okay, gotcha.

2 FACILITATOR: I believe. Usually in a
3 nonvirtual environment, you would have walked over to
4 the registration desk and signed up, right, to be a
5 speaker at a public comment period.

6 MS. BROWN: Right, right.

7 FACILITATOR: So just correct me if I'm
8 wrong, Shannon, it feels like we would be -- we would
9 allow that, but we wouldn't necessarily go late into
10 the night entertaining comment after comment. So does
11 that answer your question, Jeannie? Do you -- it's no
12 problem, time permitting, within that 4:00 to 4:30
13 time block for a member of the public that hasn't
14 preregistered. We'll capture their name, we'll
15 capture their affiliation and we'll take their
16 comment.

17 MS. BROWN: It was Jasmine, and I guess,
18 Jeannie --

19 FACILITATOR: It will be a comment, but not
20 questions. It's not like a Q&A. Did that answer your
21 question? I'm sorry.

22 MS. BROWN: Yes, sir. Thank you.

23 FACILITATOR: Okay, sure thing.

24 All right. See everybody at 4:30.

25 (Brief break.)

1 FACILITATOR: Hello. Okay, it's about 4:31.
2 And, hopefully, folks have taken just a quick break
3 and now are returning to the meeting. And the reason
4 that we are back is we had a public comment period
5 scheduled for 4:30 p.m. today. We finished the rest
6 of our agenda slightly ahead of time. So we did hear
7 from two individuals, so that's -- three individuals,
8 but we also have three on the list that we haven't
9 heard from yet. So if they preregistered, they needed
10 to be available at 4:30. So we're going to ask now --
11 I'm thinking -- just a minute ago, I asked Sarah and
12 she said that none of the three have appeared. I just
13 want to confirm that with her.

14 FACILITATOR 2: Yes, that's correct.

15 FACILITATOR: Okay. And I'll ask one more
16 time, is there any member of the public, and that
17 would be like everybody on this call, that would that
18 would like to make a comment as part of this public
19 comment period?

20 (No response.)

21 FACILITATOR: Okay. And then hearing that --
22 or not hearing that, Ed, I think we're really at the
23 end of the day and I think you maybe just wanted to
24 wrap up the day and get us ready for tomorrow.

25 MR. MESSINA: Sounds good. Let me turn on my

1 video.

2 So I thought today was really great, and if
3 you thought today was great, stick around for
4 tomorrow. We've got some excellent sessions on tap
5 for you. To kind of show you the -- or just kind of
6 walk through quickly the agenda, so tomorrow on day
7 two, on the 28th, we're going to start at 11:00 a.m.
8 as we did today. We have the emerging pathogens
9 workgroup report out, session chair, Komal Jain and
10 Tajah Blackburn was the EPA co-chair of that. The
11 materials are on the PPDC website, so you can read the
12 full document and then any presentations. We'll have
13 our lunch lunch break from 12:20 to 1:00.

14 Then we'll have our emerging technologies
15 workgroup report out. Mano Basu chaired and I co-
16 chaired that session as well. So a pretty long and
17 extensive document and slides that we'll go through
18 tomorrow from 1:00 to 2:15. A good laboratory
19 practice in inspection introduction.

20 I wonder, Shannon, have slides been loaded
21 for that yet? I know they were sort of working on
22 them. Have they finally been uploaded?

23 MS. JEWELL: They have, yes. I just got them
24 on the website, in fact, and I will be sending those
25 to the members and I can chat the link right this

1 second. Thank you.

2 MR. MESSINA: Thank you so much, Shannon.

3 And then 2:45 to 4:00, resistant management
4 workgroup report out. David Shaw and Bill Chism were
5 our co-chairs, I believe. And so they're going to
6 talk about the resistance management workgroup report
7 out with their presentation and recommendations.
8 We'll talk a little bit about moving forward from 4:00
9 to 4:30 tomorrow. We'll have public comments from
10 4:30 to 5:00, and then we'll adjourn at 5:00.

11 On the moving forward piece, I think one of
12 the remaining questions to talk about in that session
13 would be what are some topics that PPDC members would
14 like to hear at the next session in the spring and
15 then what is our stance and our goals and
16 recommendations for the workgroups to either continue
17 working or are they sort of done and we're releasing
18 them to go on and do other things. So that's one of
19 the -- sort of two of the issues that I'd like to
20 cover on that close-out session is sort of agenda for
21 the next session, any topics people would like to
22 raise, and then the status of the workgroups moving
23 forward once we've kind of entered in the
24 presentations that we want to enter in or not,
25 depending on how the voting goes.

1 So thanks so much for your time today, for
2 your great questions, for your great points. I really
3 appreciate the interaction here. And with that, I'll
4 kick it back to you, Paul.

5 FACILITATOR: I think that's it. We're
6 giving you the final word, Ed.

7 MR. MESSINA: All right.

8 FACILITATOR: So the agenda is done and
9 we'll see everybody tomorrow. Thanks, everybody, for
10 your attention today.

11 MR. MESSINA: Take care so much.

12 MS. JEWELL: Thank you so much, everyone.

13 MR. MESSINA: Thanks, Shannon. Thanks for
14 all the logistics. Bye, everyone.

15 (The meeting was adjourned.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25