

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT



US Environmental Protection Agency Office of Pesticide Programs

**April 23, 2009, Meeting with Daniel Kass, Assistant Commissioner,
New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene**

April 23, 2009

RECORD OF MEETING MEMORANDUM

**Subject: April 23, 2009, Meeting with Daniel Kass, Assistant Commissioner,
New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene**

**From: Jim Roelofs, Government and International Services Branch
Field and External Affairs Division, Office of Pesticide Programs**

Mr. Kass is a co-signer of the petition received by EPA on March 12, 2009 asking the Agency to classify total release foggers (TRFs) for restricted use. Meeting was chaired by Bill Diamond, Director of OPP's Field and External Affairs Division, and attended by 10 EPA staff.

1. Purpose of Meeting

- Ensure that EPA understands the data used in the petition and the basis for the call to restrict TRFs.
- Give Mr. Kass a sense of type of analysis EPA has been doing since Fall of 2008.

2. Summary of petition by Mr. Kass:

- Work with public housing led to noticing lot of pesticide use and TRF incidents;
- Use and incidents are disproportionate for low-income minorities.
- Feels they are overused, and cheap availability encourages overuse.
- Feels they do not work on sequestering insects like roaches.
- Conclusion is that people are bearing risks without attendant benefits.
- Can not rely on the label because people do not read them.

3. EPA analysis and risk conclusions summary by Health Effects Division staff:

- Data EPA reviewed includes OPP's incident data system and nation poison control center data, as well as petition, Washington State Health Dept. report and CDC article of October 2008 (Kass was a co-author).
- All data sources are consistent in showing mostly minor symptoms.
- Comparing usage data to numbers of incidents, EPA would not characterize the data as showing widespread or frequent occurrence.
- EPA risk assessments are conservative (tending to overestimate risk), but in this case still show adequate margins of safety, even in small rooms.

4. General Discussion

- EPA described the risk/benefit standard and criteria in our statute for considering restricted use.
- Possible changes in labeling and packaging, as recommended in WA and CDC reports were discussed. Mr. Kass reiterated the belief that labels are not effective.

- Mr. Kass suggested calling in efficacy data; and possibly allowing TRFs for fleas and flying insects only.

5. Next Steps

- EPA informed Mr. Kass that we intended to continue our analysis of data, and would be meeting with industry in the near future.
- EPA would also continue to coordinate with states.
- A response to the petition would be developed.