

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES
6 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
7

8
9 PESTICIDE PROGRAM DIALOGUE

10 COMMITTEE MEETING
11

12
13 May 14-15, 2015
14

15
16
17
18 Conference Center - Lobby Level

19 2777 Crystal Drive

20 One Potomac Yard South

21 Arlington, VA 22202
22
23
24
25

P R O C E E D I N G S

- - - - -

MR. HOUSENGER: Good morning. Welcome back to day two. This morning's first session is going to be on school IPM, and Bob McNally, our Director of BPPD is going to chair this session. So, Bob.

MR. MCNALLY: Thanks, Jack. The first part will be an overview of what we talked about on Wednesday. Frank Ellis and Dawn Gouge are going to provide a quick overview of the key points from Wednesday's discussion. The second part will be a more full description of the Washington State School IPM pilot that the PPDC launched a couple years ago. So, most of the time will be devoted to that, but Frank wants to give an overview, sort of, of the EPA program at this point. So, let me turn it over to Frank.

MR. ELLIS: Thanks, Bob. Good morning, everyone. We want to take a few minutes to fill you in on our workgroup meeting that we had Wednesday. It was a really exciting meeting, well attended, lots of energy and enthusiasm from folks in this room and folks on the phone that participated remotely. So, we wanted to give you a flavor of some of the things that we talked about.

Our workgroup has a fairly broad charge around integrated pest management, but we focused this meeting

1 strictly on schools because we have a significant
2 investment of resources within the pesticide program on
3 school IPM, and within the regions as well.

4 So, some of the things that we've talked about,
5 which the workgroup members have been engaged with us
6 for, I'd say, several years now on the development of a
7 recognition program for schools, we talked about where we
8 are with that program and how that's moving along through
9 the process. We hope to have that program rolled out
10 within the next year.

11 We talked with them about and filled them in on
12 our resource investment, the FTEs that we have dedicated
13 at headquarters and within the regional offices to school
14 IPM and some of the challenges around that.

15 We also talked about our planning documents,
16 the regional work plans, our headquarters and center of
17 expertise work plans for this fiscal year. We spent
18 quite a bit of time talking about what our center has
19 been active in doing and promoting. You all may be
20 familiar with our school IPM webinar series. It's been
21 very successful. It's gotten lots of attention, lots of
22 attendance. So, there's been that effort.

23 There's been a number of outreach efforts. We
24 successfully revamped our website within the last couple
25 of weeks. We got that launched, so we have a better,

1 clearer presence on EPA's website about school IPM.

2 We talked a bit about our grants programs, our
3 ongoing grants, and we had a grants cycle in 2012 and
4 another in 2014. So, we filled in folks on the
5 accomplishments of the projects that are ending and gave
6 them updates on the projects that are underway.

7 We also spent quite a bit of time getting a
8 briefing that you all are going to get just in a few
9 minutes here on the Washington State pilot and the
10 accomplishments of that project and what their plans are
11 for the rest of this year.

12 So, I wanted to touch very briefly on our
13 overall school IPM strategy. You all have heard this
14 before, so I'll be very brief with it. Our effort is to
15 focus here within our resources on national and state
16 engagement.

17 We want to influence school districts and
18 school aid organizations, get those folks to help us
19 carry the message as well. The bottom line is we want to
20 make it easy for school administrators to say yes to IPM.
21 We want to give them the tools to be able to do that,
22 make a persuasive case as to why it's in their best
23 interest and generally make it easy for them.

24 We want to get school IPM in to the life blood
25 of schools to build it into the way that they do business

1 as pest management. So, it's not a person-specific
2 enterprise; it's something that is built into the way
3 that they manage their pests, regardless of who is in
4 what position within the organization.

5 As we've talked, our emphasis is more wholesale
6 rather than retail, so we have limited local investments
7 and local engagements there, but that is still a part of
8 several of our regional programs. They do have the
9 element of on-the-ground engagement with school
10 districts.

11 We have three basic groups that are doing this
12 within EPA at headquarters here. We're providing overall
13 guidance on the program, working to engage national
14 school-related organizations and get them to help in the
15 charge, and we manage the grants program here out of
16 headquarters. So, folks at the center, which is
17 physically based out of region 6 in Dallas, they're
18 providing information tools and technical assistance to
19 schools and helping spread the IPM message in general.

20 Our regions, as you know, are engaged with the
21 states and tribes and districts at that level, and
22 they're also very involved with the state level school
23 IPM working groups and also the state coalitions that are
24 in several states across the country.

25 So, with that, I want to turn it over to Dawn

1 Gouge and let her speak to kind of the outcomes of
2 Wednesday's meeting.

3 MS. GOUGE: Thank you. Good morning, ladies
4 and gentlemen. So, our workgroup really took a pretty
5 critical look at what was going on both nationally in
6 partnership with EPA and school IPM and what was being
7 achieved. We really came to a very strong consensus that
8 the EPA -- they're establishing effective tools to
9 facilitate IPM adoption and diffusion nationwide. We've
10 seen some considerable progress as a result of this, and
11 I'll show you some graphs in a minute.

12 They're effectively supporting change agent
13 capacity building. Of course, we can always do more of
14 this, and you always need more of this, but I would
15 encourage the agency to continue investments in capacity
16 building.

17 And then, expanding stakeholder engagement and
18 increasing awareness, I can't remember a time when I went
19 to every professional meeting and looked at all of the
20 association and organization newsletters and journals and
21 EPA, EPA, EPA, EPA. They're all present. They're
22 presenting. They're involved.

23 This has really been an incredible advantage
24 for us as academics leveraging our time to be involved in
25 school IPM implementation. It, of course, trickles down

1 to what's actually happening in the schools. So, we feel
2 that the EPA school IPM program is really being very
3 effective and causing a good deal of change at the ground
4 level.

5 Some findings as we investigated the nuts and
6 bolts of what was going on, we really hoped for a faster
7 route to a recognition program for schools. So, this is
8 school districts that are excelling in school IPM. We
9 wanted an instant award with an EPA plaque and a logo and
10 a letter and everything else. Of course, that just
11 doesn't happen overnight. It actually takes
12 approximately 18 months to 2 years. So, we're halfway
13 through that process now. The center staff and the
14 headquarter staff have worked to get all of that
15 paperwork in and through the process.

16 So, our anticipation is that this will be a
17 long-lived awards program. The IAQ program lasted 10
18 years. So, that's a pretty good outcome. We want to
19 double that for school IPM, at least. We reviewed the
20 different criteria and the different tiers of the
21 recognition program and found it to be just absolutely
22 excellent.

23 I believe there's going to be a public comment,
24 and some of our comments going in will be to encourage
25 the recognition system to build in something beyond

1 checklists, so something that will include evidence that
2 activities and impacts are being generated.

3 We did find that there was a need to accurately
4 reflect the FTE effort. This is something that probably
5 impacts all of us in the light of budget cuts and
6 catastrophic human resource cuts. People have several
7 jobs to do now. Although we have, in theory, a dedicated
8 FTE for school IPM in each region, the reality of it is
9 that those folks are having other things placed upon
10 their shoulders. Some of them are minimally able to
11 really address school IPM, some are heavily invested.
12 So, we'd like to make sure that we're not just saying
13 this number of people are generating this impact, but get
14 a handle on what the actual human investment really is.

15 We're really excited for what's happening next
16 year because there's so many things that will come to
17 fruition. We feel like all of these tools and activities
18 are culminating, and the next 12 to 18 months will be
19 really rather exciting.

20 So, we had some suggestions. We wanted to
21 encourage EPA to continue to share goals and objectives
22 and steps so that those of us that are working in the
23 trenches can help to facilitate the process and meet
24 those objectives and work in partnership with the agency.

25 We would encourage that the national change

1 agent corps, those folks out in the trenches, as well as
2 the PPDC subcommittee, be used as subject matter experts
3 whenever needed. So, we all sort of wanted to volunteer
4 our time to put in reviewing and strategizing.

5 We wanted to continue to encourage the agency
6 to support the retail end of things through effective
7 funding streams. That really makes an enormous -- it's
8 great to have a wholesale program, but it's rather
9 useless unless you have a retail end of it. That
10 typically is the rest of us.

11 One of the strongest recommendations I have
12 personally, please recognize the high-performing regions
13 for their dedication to school IPM. Anything that we can
14 do to encourage the regional school IPM folks to be
15 involved -- and we understand there are time constraints
16 and reality constraints, but we want to do everything we
17 can to recognize those who have invested time, energy,
18 and their lives.

19 More suggestions, continue to look for ways to
20 include environmental health professionals as well as
21 pest management professionals as partners in the process.
22 We do a fairly good job with the pest management
23 professionals, but there's always room for improvement
24 there. But environmental health professionals are really
25 a relatively large group of individuals who regularly go

1 into schools, inspect schools, and close schools because
2 of pest-related issues. So, we really wanted to make
3 sure that we were reaching out.

4 I'm glad Robin isn't here because she'd shoot
5 me. I didn't include, and I should have, school nurses.
6 We do have some programs specifically aimed at engaging
7 school nurses. We need to do more of that on the retail
8 end.

9 We wanted to recognize the Center of Expertise
10 for outstanding webinars, facilitating stakeholder and
11 change agent connections, the website establishment -- I
12 checked that out last night. That was really cool -- the
13 model contract that's being developed, the recognition
14 program, and the professional organization outreach
15 efforts that have been underway.

16 There's an enormous amount of time, agency
17 time, being invested in spending what little travel
18 dollars they have getting people to those very visible
19 places. I'm here to tell you it does make a difference,
20 so our thanks for that.

21 Now, I just wanted to shift into a very quick
22 overview of some of the things that the committee touched
23 on. This is kind of what the work force for school IPM
24 looks like nationally right now. You can see there is
25 investments from four NIFA IPM centers. We have the

1 Center of Expertise, and the regions, and the
2 headquarters staff involved in school IPM.

3 Then we have the boots on the ground, these
4 four working groups. Those are state-lead agency people,
5 they are pest management professionals, they are
6 university faculty, and a wide variety of different
7 individuals, also NGOs.

8 This is kind of the result. I don't want to
9 say this has happened in the last year; this has happened
10 over years. But I wanted to show you where we're at. We
11 took a very, very critical view of really what's going on
12 where, and this is the result. So, you can see that the
13 west coast is doing fairly fantastic.

14 We have pink bars in those states that have
15 very rigorous statewide school IPM efforts. That does
16 not mean that every school has a very perfect IPM program
17 at all. What it means is that there's an infrastructure
18 and a program and a statewide effort with multiple people
19 involved in providing support for that.

20 Of course, we do have some states that are less
21 engaged. The blue columns indicate expanding coalitions
22 where there is focal points of activity that are
23 expanding. Then, of course, unfortunately, we do have a
24 few states that aren't doing an awful lot. But those are
25 fewer and fewer.

1 We asked ourselves, are we empowered to
2 implement IPM in our schools. Well, clearly, I think we
3 have a system that is working and expanding fairly
4 rigorously. We know we need three things, competent
5 change agents and rock solid leadership.

6 We need to accept feedback from stakeholders.
7 I'm reminded of that every day. We need to allow
8 programmatic evaluation. Those of us involved in
9 translational research can confirm that things change
10 constantly. So, we need to be very willing to adapt to
11 that and roll with it as we discover more.

12 I wanted to say that we did identify some weak
13 points. We have very good education materials. We have
14 some training efforts. We have some national
15 coordination, but we do feel that we need some stronger
16 national coordination in order to drag those states that
17 showed little sign of life into joining the rest of us
18 that have rigorous IPM programs. That's what it's going
19 to take, is some really strong national leadership. And
20 more training because that is lacking. Some states do it
21 very, very well. That graph that I showed you with the
22 pink bars, those states do it phenomenally well.

23 Training and education, who thinks it's the
24 same thing? Anybody think it's the same thing? Nobody
25 thinks it's the same thing. I bet there's somewhere in

1 here -- okay, so it's not the same thing. I just want to
2 demonstrate this by saying that if you have a 12-year-old
3 and you get that paper from school saying do you allow
4 your child to attend sex education, you sign off on that
5 dotted line, would you sign if it said will you allow
6 your child to engage in sex training? It's different.
7 It's different.

8 Training is different. This is what training
9 looks like. I wanted to show some actual pictures. This
10 is IPM. This is training, not education. This is a
11 gopher. This is a rat of some kind. These are bugs.
12 These are real people walking around doing real IPM.
13 Same thing here. This kind of learning is not achieved
14 by sitting on your butts and watching PowerPoint. It's
15 training. It's on your feet, crawling around. It's
16 dirty and it hurts. This is what it looks like. If you
17 come out of a field and you're not filthy or in pain, you
18 need to go back and do it again.

19 So, just to wrap up school IPM, we have a brand
20 new revised pest management strategic plan. This is a
21 NIFA-supported document, and it's kind of our go-to
22 bible. It has pretty much everything you can possibly
23 imagine in it pertaining to school IPM. So that is just
24 about to be submitted, and it will be our third revision.
25 So, it really is a document worth taking a look at.

1 We have NPMA partners working stronger with us
2 now than ever before. We have some collaborative ties
3 and some common standards. So, that is super exciting.
4 We expect to make some significant progress because of
5 that.

6 School-related pesticide application
7 legislation is increasing nationally. This is always an
8 opportunity for engaging school districts on IPM
9 programs. It is an opportunity to expand their
10 understanding of IPM by way of making sure that they're
11 in compliance with their state laws.

12 We have had a reduction in change agent
13 workforce. We have fewer boots on the ground this year.
14 By next year, we will have fewer again. So, we need to
15 make sure that we are investing our time and energy and
16 funds to do those activities working with groups that
17 will provide things that will make a significant
18 difference in the next few years.

19 Other issues that were identified, we talked
20 about tribes and territories reporting desperate need for
21 pesticide safety training. This is nothing new, but in
22 light of catastrophic events lately, even more requests
23 are coming in. We don't expect that to abate anytime
24 soon.

25 Pesticide abuse is significantly evident. Bed

1 bugs, I note New York there was a few. (Inaudible) said,
2 oh, thank goodness, New York has fewer bed bugs. I'm,
3 like, no, it's not true. It might be in New York. I
4 don't know. I don't live there. But it's not true
5 anywhere else, I can tell you that. So, bed bugs are
6 still increasing, still a problem. It's directly related
7 to the absolutely terrible low-income family abuse and
8 misuse of pesticides in homes.

9 I will wrap up with that. Thank you very much.

10 MR. McNALLY: Any questions, maybe one or two
11 questions, before we turn to the description of where we
12 are on the Washington State School IPM project?

13 Mark.

14 MARK: Actually, more by way of comment. Over
15 time, this is in the last 18 years, we should recognize
16 that has happened, which has gone from 6 percent of
17 states in 1996 to 60 percent of the states in 2015. This
18 last large increase is, in no small way, because of the
19 school integrated pest management initiative from the
20 agency and what they've done.

21 Probably, the two things I want to make sure
22 that are out there again is the fact that if we really
23 want to take it all away, we're going to need more
24 accountable participation from all the regions. That
25 needs to be happening. It's a difficult thing for

1 headquarters to deal with, I admit that. But I do want
2 to say that that in fact is the reality.

3 Furthermore, strategic planning is something
4 that most units hate to do because they don't know how to
5 do it. But if we don't have transparent objectives with
6 strategies to reach goals to share with the partners that
7 are out there and with the quality control/quality
8 assurance with that, then again, we won't have a
9 sustainable program, which is what we would like to do
10 working our way out of that job. Thank you.

11 MR. MCNALLY: Ray.

12 RAY: What it sounds to me like is you're
13 connecting a lot of activity, measuring a lot of
14 activity, but is the control of pests and disease vectors
15 and disease organisms in schools actually improving as a
16 result of EPA's efforts? How is this being measured?

17 MR. MCNALLY: I think the data at this point,
18 Ray, is very anecdotal. I think one thing we might want
19 to take a look at in a more structured way is seeing what
20 that looks like. Obviously, at the end of the day, we
21 want to see a reduction in pest pressures and
22 appropriately a reduction in the use of pesticides and
23 only use them when they're needed. But at this point, I
24 don't think there's a comprehensive study that could
25 demonstrate a before and after look at what those numbers

1 might look like.

2 RAY: So, what's the evidence of overuse of
3 pesticides in schools?

4 MR. MCNALLY: There's not so much evidence of
5 overuse. I think what we're saying is it's a pragmatic
6 approach. You use pesticides when you need to, but if
7 you maintain cleanliness and do other things around the
8 school, the need to have someone coming in and applying
9 pesticides is reduced accordingly. So, we think there's
10 a time and a place for it, but not as a routine measure
11 to try to address the pest pressure problem.

12 RAY: Okay.

13 MR. MCNALLY: Nichelle.

14 NICHELLE: I'm sure I must have missed it,
15 maybe in the first presentation, but how many schools are
16 involved in the program? Then, my second quick question
17 is, I know parents tend to like to be involved in what
18 their kids eat in the school and what sort of products
19 are being used in the school. So, is the PTA involved in
20 these efforts?

21 MR. ELLIS: I would say that the number of
22 schools varies by state and locale as far as which have
23 IPM programs. Some of the grants that we funded are
24 working specifically with school districts in certain
25 areas. But nationally, I can't say we can put a number

1 on that right now.

2 To your point about the PTA, that's one
3 organization that we are interested in improving our
4 partnership with, because we feel that they have a good
5 outreach opportunity to schools, and something that we
6 are certainly pursuing.

7 MR. MCNALLY: Just a follow up, when you
8 hear about the pilot from the folks in Washington State,
9 they can give you some sense of how things are going with
10 different schools throughout the State of Washington in
11 terms of acceptance and how they've made some inroads
12 over the last year and a half to build coalitions
13 throughout the state.

14 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: To answer both of the
15 questions from Ray and from Nicole (sic), actually,
16 coincidentally, yesterday an article came out in the
17 Journal of Environmental Health which actually does
18 provide some of those statistics regarding the number of
19 schools and also illustrates a few cases with regard to
20 vector pest management and integrated pest management
21 around schools.

22 The simple metrics, Ray, is that if we can have
23 fewer pest problems, pest complaints, documented pest
24 complaints when we don't use pesticides, then because we
25 were able to eliminate conducive conditions, then those

1 pesticides that were being used on a regular basis before
2 those remediations took place were unnecessary.

3 MS. GOUGE: I just wanted to clarify a couple
4 of things. To respond to Ray, many of us track data
5 fairly rigorously. I couldn't say that we track every
6 single school with regard to pest incidents and all the
7 pesticide use, but our aim is to reduce pests. That is
8 our aim. We go in and we're focused on reducing pests,
9 not reducing anything else. We're reducing pests. We
10 track that most rigorously of all.

11 We'll use pilot sites to make sure that what
12 we're doing is, in fact, reducing pests. So, I did want
13 to clarify that. I would say that all of the school IPM
14 change agent corps do that to some extent within their
15 own states. Also, the overuse of pesticides was not
16 actually in schools. That was particularly focused on
17 low-income housing. That is data that was drawn from a
18 survey that was conducted the end of last year, beginning
19 of this one.

20 Also, in response to Nichelle, we changed our
21 newsletter from a school IPM newsletter to a school and
22 home because so much of the information was going home.
23 We were getting so many requests from parents that they
24 wanted to know what was going on. So, there's definitely
25 room for improvement, certainly, but many of us actually

1 do generate events as well as outreach materials that are
2 focused on parents and guardians, as well as school
3 managers. Thank you.

4 MR. MCNALLY: Let me move the agenda along. We
5 have Juliann Barta and Carrie Foss. Juliann is from
6 Region 10; Carrie is from Washington State. They wanted
7 to give you a status report on where we stand on the
8 school IPM pilot in Washington State, which the PPDC
9 launched about a year and a half ago. So, Juliann and
10 Carrie.

11 MS. BARTA: Thank you. I'm Juliann. I work
12 out of EPA's Region 10 in Seattle. Region 10 covers the
13 states of Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington, and the
14 tribes within. I am also the school IPM coordinator for
15 that region. So, we'll be talking today about the
16 Washington State School IPM pilot project, which has been
17 an idea that was formed through PPDC, and it's about
18 trying to implement a statewide school IPM program and
19 increasing school IPM implementation statewide with our
20 school districts.

21 Standing next to me is Carrie Foss. I'll let
22 you introduce yourself really quickly.

23 MS. FOSS: I'm with Washington State
24 University, based in Puyallup. I'm the urban
25 IPM director at Washington State University. One of my

1 charges is school IPM.

2 MS. BARTA: So, I'll just get started and tell
3 you how we structured this program. We have these
4 different components that we've used throughout this past
5 year. So, this is an 18-month project, and we're about a
6 year into it. So, we're more than halfway through. How
7 we structured it is we decided we wanted to first do some
8 focus group meetings at school districts to kind of get a
9 handle on actually what are the needs that the school
10 districts have and how they would like support from folks
11 like extension and EPA.

12 We've also worked on making sure that we're
13 working really closely with our partner organizations and
14 expanding partnerships, finding new ways to connect with
15 organizations within Washington State.

16 Another way we've handled this issue is we've
17 looked at encouraging peer mentoring. So, rather than
18 having someone from the government providing information
19 on IPM to a school, we're trying to have the school
20 districts encourage each other and share lessons learned
21 and successes with each other. So, we're using a peer
22 mentoring model.

23 Another way that we're trying to encourage
24 implementation is through recognition. We have a few
25 different recognition programs available to school

1 districts. I'll talk a little bit about that later.

2 Then, finally, documenting progress and lessons
3 learned, so trying to track everything that we've been
4 doing this past year. So, again, the focus group is
5 primarily to get a handle on what the school districts
6 are looking for in terms of resources and support, rather
7 than trying to guess what that is. We've done that
8 through a number of meetings.

9 We've brought together our champion school
10 districts. These are school districts that are IPM star
11 certified, which Carrie will talk a little bit about, but
12 it's one of our recognition programs. That's through the
13 IPM Institute of North America. We got input
14 from them.

15 We've also done it through some of our
16 conferences. We have a Washington Association of
17 Maintenance and Operations administrators, which school
18 facility managers attend, and we also had a
19 coalition event recently. We kind of had an informal
20 focus group meeting on that, too.

21 Through this, we discovered some of the
22 materials that really were requested. We found that
23 simple one pagers for different audiences within a school
24 district were something that was wanted. Also, looking
25 at outdoor IPM, a lot of resources available are related

1 to indoor IPM. So, that was something else that came out
2 of these meetings.

3 Something that we found is that many of these
4 materials are already out there online, but we are
5 working on making sure that people know they're available
6 and bringing them to events and, when appropriate,
7 expanding our web site, particularly the Washington State
8 University School IPM website.

9 Something else that we found through the focus
10 group meetings is they provided a lot of input on ways to
11 get mileage out of EPA's recognition program, which, as
12 you've heard, is still under development. A lot of it
13 has to do with branding, so making sure that the parents
14 know about this program. They see this logo and it's
15 recognizable. So, some of that is input we've been
16 providing to EPA headquarters about ways to make this a
17 more successful recognition program.

18 So, next I'm going to talk about how we've been
19 working with our partners within Washington State. I'll
20 let Carrie talk about UPEST.

21 MS. FOSS: Well, first of all, let me thank you
22 for inviting us to present on our project. I'd like to
23 thank the PPDC IPM workgroup for suggesting the project
24 and EPA for supporting it, because what we've seen is
25 some of the intent of our project is to take what we know

1 works to get school IPM implemented at the ground level,
2 but to also increase our partnership between EPA Region
3 10 and WSU.

4 There has been a committee in Washington State
5 since 1994 that's had a focus on school IPM for about the
6 last 16 years. It's called UPEST. It stands for Urban
7 Pesticide Education Strategy Team. We're educators. We
8 try to provide resources. I've worked with school
9 districts a long time, but the last few projects,
10 including this project, have really helped us improve
11 what we're doing and get a lot more work done. It's been
12 fantastic.

13 One of the suggestions that came out of the
14 PPDC IPM workgroup specifically for this project in
15 Washington State was to expand UPEST for all of these
16 years it's been in existence. It's an interagency
17 committee. We've had representation from Department of
18 Health, EPA Region 10, Washington State University,
19 Washington State Department of Agriculture, industry, and
20 Washington State Department of Ecology.

21 But, as a result of this project, we were
22 encouraged to expand and reach other partners. We've
23 actually brought in some folks. For example, we have a
24 health professional now on the committee. We have
25 representation from our state's Department of Education

1 that connect with all the school superintendents.
2 They've been a great asset. And then, also we have
3 brought in just a couple other folks. But one of them is
4 one of the ESD representatives. So, that's helped us
5 with this project in different ways. We'll kind of touch
6 on those as we go about it.

7 We are bringing in guest speakers. We're
8 having NCAP, and I think there might be representation
9 here from NCAP. They'll be talking to us a little bit
10 more about their school IPM efforts so that we can work
11 together better and have a better result.

12 MS. BARTA: So, one of the things I've been
13 trying to do for this project is look at what other
14 states and regions have done and use their successes.
15 EPA Region 2 in New York put together a letter of support
16 that they sent out to their New York school districts.
17 It was interagency, so they had multiple organizations
18 sign this letter. It's just a letter that states we
19 strongly support school IPM, here are some resources, and
20 has some high-level signatures.

21 So, we did something similar in Washington
22 State. We had the Department of Education for Washington
23 State, OSPI, the Department of Health, Washington State
24 University Extension, and EPA Region 10 all draft this
25 letter and sign it. It was sent through OSPI, through

1 our Department of Education, to all our K-12 Washington
2 public school districts.

3 Some of the benefits that came out of this is
4 it really helped us make connections with these different
5 organizations, particularly the Department of Education.
6 It also increased requests to join Washington State
7 University's distribution list, e-mail distribution list,
8 so there was more interest in the program.

9 Oftentimes at these events, we hear from the
10 school district facility managers that they're really
11 interested in implementing an IPM program, but they want
12 support from their administration. So, we found that
13 providing this letter could be a good tool that they
14 could use. It's something that I've been personally
15 bringing to these events and handing out, saying, use
16 this to get your principal or your superintendent on
17 board. So, I think it was a good exercise that came out
18 of this project.

19 We also are fortunate in Washington State in
20 that Washington State has a Department of Health, a
21 school environmental health coordinator. She's been a
22 great resource for us. She puts on these annual school
23 environmental health workshops. She had nine happening
24 this past year throughout the state and was able to allow
25 myself to come and present on IPM.

1 I provided some of the basics on IPM, but my
2 purpose mainly was to let the school districts know about
3 other resources, including Carrie being able to provide
4 technical assistance and then the resources available to
5 them online and the recognition programs available to
6 them.

7 Again, trying to reach the administration, the
8 Department of Health and myself are going to set up a
9 table and try to make some connections with the school
10 district administrators, the principals and the
11 superintendents. This one event has a huge attendance,
12 500 to 800 attendees, so I'm hoping this will be a good
13 way to make some inroads with the audience.

14 Also, in Washington State, EPA Region 10 has an
15 interagency agreement with the Indian Health Service, the
16 Portland area Indian Health Service, which covers tribes
17 within Washington, Idaho, and Oregon. Through a school
18 IPM project, what we've been able to do is provide
19 training to IHS Environmental Health and Safety officers.
20 These are folks who are already going to tribal schools
21 and doing environmental health and safety walkthroughs.

22 So, we're providing training in IPM and having
23 them do some IPM assessments, because they're already on
24 the ground visiting these schools. This has been a way
25 for us to reach to some of the schools that are within

1 Indian country. We're also trying to replicate this
2 project in other regions.

3 MS. FOSS: So, one of the activities in this
4 project is to build on what we've used before, models
5 that we know work. I've been doing coalition events for
6 a while. Basically, what a coalition event is, is an
7 opportunity to bring school districts together to talk to
8 each other, learn something, and for us to connect with
9 them so that we can find out who needs some help, who
10 wants recognition. Then we can actually get out there
11 into the school district to help them fully implement
12 their IPM program.

13 This model is based on Mark Lame's Monroe model,
14 diffusion model. Of course, I've tweaked it in
15 Washington State. But we decided, Juliann and I decided
16 to include four coalition events in this project. We've
17 already had two. Because it's a statewide project, we
18 had one in Spokane, which is eastern Washington, and
19 then, more recently, we had one in Federal Way.

20 We also wanted these to be peer mentoring
21 opportunities. So, in Spokane, we actually had a school
22 district that had gone through the IPM star evaluation
23 process -- I'll talk a little bit about that more -- come
24 and present on not only the process but on their IPM
25 program, which is wholly functioning. It's a great

1 opportunity for the other school districts to learn how
2 you go about this. They're doing parts of it.

3 How do you formalize a program? So, that's
4 what happened in Spokane as well as some other
5 presentations that we had. These are educational
6 opportunities and networking and peer mentoring, so it's
7 kind of team building within the state for the IPM
8 program. They're not training events usually, but we
9 will have one training event.

10 The second one we held in Federal Way. It was
11 such a great experience, because years of work and seeing
12 the school districts so enthusiastic and encouraged. We
13 had Dr. Tom Green come from the IPM Institute of North
14 America. He presented on the business case, all the
15 aspects of the business case related to school IPM,
16 liability, health, environmental protection, and money.
17 The school districts wanted to take that information back
18 to their administrators and encourage their
19 administrators in that way.

20 We also had Sherry Glick from the
21 Center of Expertise come and present as well. So, it was
22 an opportunity for EPA headquarters and centers to
23 connect more with the school districts in our state. But
24 the best part of the event was when the school districts
25 started giving us ideas and opportunities and helping

1 each other right there.

2 This event wasn't just for large school
3 districts or small school districts. The people in
4 attendance represented 18 percent of the student
5 population in Washington State. We have over a million
6 students in Washington State. We have 295 school
7 districts, yet the folks there were representing 17
8 percent of all of that. They were excited at the end,
9 and everybody wanted more help and more implementation.
10 That's what we want to see, and that's how we're moving
11 this project forward.

12 The third event that we're going to have will
13 be this summer. This is a training event. I've done it
14 a couple times already for the school districts in
15 Washington State. Thankfully, Bobby Corrigan was willing
16 to come out again this summer, do a two-day rodent
17 academy. It's hands on.

18 Our two number one pests in Washington State at
19 schools are rodents, we have a lot of rat problems, and
20 weeds. So, when Dr. Bobby Corrigan comes and I say, can
21 you put your hand up if you want to have this rodent
22 academy at your school district, because they know it is
23 hell for them, everybody puts their hand up. They're not
24 shy. We need help. So, he's coming and he's going to be
25 helping our school districts with hands-on training,

1 learning about inspections, learning about management,
2 learning about monitoring and reporting.

3 I'll just mention the final event will be for
4 recognition of the school districts that are IPM star
5 certified. IPM star is a certification program that is
6 offered through the IPM Institute of North America. It has an
7 interview process. You actually go into the schools and
8 look at their IPM programs and their pest problems. You
9 evaluate that. If they have an exemplary program, they
10 get an IPM star certification.

11 We have quite a few school districts in
12 Washington that have received this. We are going to have
13 several more this summer. It's not part of this project,
14 but it's just another way for us to connect with the
15 school districts and get more bang for our buck. So, in
16 the fall, as the final coalition event, we are going to
17 have a recognition program for EPA -- I think Juliann is
18 going to talk more about that -- if they pilot their
19 great stars as well as the IPM star certified. We will
20 have EPA there. We'll have Dr. Tom Green there. I know
21 the school districts will be excited.

22 One of the things that happened in Washington
23 State is because of these certification recognition
24 programs and the technical assistance, the school
25 districts are a little bit in competition. It's like

1 everybody wants to have it.

2 Because I've been using the IPM star
3 recognition program for a while, we have school districts
4 in our state that are very invested in school IPM.
5 They're willing to help other school districts. So, one
6 of the parts of this project was to develop a core of
7 champions. Our IPM certified school districts are our
8 core of champions. They're helping the other school
9 districts, willing to present at coalition events.

10 MS. BARTA: So, Carrie had mentioned the IPM
11 star program. You heard that EPA headquarters is
12 developing a recognition program. I actually got the
13 okay to pilot the first tier of the recognition program,
14 the Great Start Award program.

15 So, I'm currently offering this up to school
16 districts, for school districts who don't already have a
17 fully implemented program in place but they are
18 interested in putting one in place. So, this is a way to
19 recognize school districts that are taking those first
20 steps. They include things like putting together an IPM
21 policy and making sure that there's someone in the school
22 district who is designated as the IPM coordinator and is
23 receiving training. This is something that I'm currently
24 offering and hoping to get some school districts on board
25 for.

1 Something we've been trying to do throughout
2 this project is just trying to document progress and show
3 which school districts that we've been able to have some
4 impact on. I'm really keeping track of what school
5 districts have attended events and our EPA webinars. If
6 they have a policy or plan, if we have that information,
7 we're tracking that.

8 Whether they've received any information from
9 us, including follow-up information. At all these
10 events, we always have a follow-up form, and we ask
11 people what topics they're interested in and provide
12 follow up for them. So far, we've reached over 75
13 Washington school districts through all these events and
14 through all this outreach. At the end of this project,
15 we will provide much more detailed information on the
16 impact.

17 MR. MCNALLY: Excuse me, Juliann. Let me just
18 do a time check. I think we're probably a little bit
19 over. We've had more questions for the earlier part. We
20 need to finish up in the next several minutes so we keep
21 on schedule. Thank you.

22 MS. BARTA: I think I have just a few more
23 slides. We are doing a survey in Washington State to see
24 the progress that school districts have made in terms of
25 IPM and whether they have a policy or an IPM coordinator.

1 Those were a few of the things that the survey is asking.
2 So, that will also help us with reporting out.

3 So, really briefly, just on the lessons learned
4 that I've taken away this past year, the first one might
5 seem obvious but it's really important to emphasize, and
6 that's how critical it is to have strong partnerships.
7 For us in Washington State, we've really been able to use
8 the Department of Education capabilities to reach out to
9 their school districts, as well as the Department of
10 Health events and expertise to help us.

11 Some other things, from the focus group, they
12 really gave us a good handle on when is the best time to
13 have these events, because the school district facility
14 managers have a lot on their plate, and just recognizing
15 that the timing of the events is critical for
16 participation.

17 We want to reach as many students as possible,
18 but it's also important to take into account the small
19 school districts and the rural school districts because
20 they can be great change agents and they can help us with
21 diffusing school IPM to other districts.

22 Something that I've heard is that EPA is
23 considered a regulatory agency. When we do a walk
24 through in a school, oftentimes there's this concern or
25 fear that that's going to be associated with an

1 inspection or a fine. So, just being aware of that and
2 letting folks know we're here for education, for
3 technical assistance. I am not an inspector. So, that's
4 something that's come out of this.

5 In terms of measurements, on a state scale,
6 it's pretty easy to track outputs, but you guys know
7 outcomes can often be more difficult, such as the
8 decrease in pest complaints. That's why it's really
9 important to have a few pilot schools where you can track
10 more of that detailed information.

11 MS. FOSS: I'll wrap this up. I told the IPM
12 workgroup the other day that I can spend a half hour on
13 this slide, but I won't. In fact, Dawn did such a great
14 job with her slide, we just appreciate USDA's support and
15 involvement in school IPM, as well as EPA's, and all of
16 our partners throughout the country within the state and
17 the materials and support that EPA has provided through
18 the Center of Expertise, as well as the projects. Like,
19 Dawn is working on a national curriculum project.
20 There's going to be a national resource website.

21 So, we are connecting and using all those
22 materials as we go forward. Thank you.

23 MR. MCNALLY: So, I think we'll be around at
24 the break, the EPA people, to talk about our program in
25 general. I think some of the research that Mark and Dawn

1 have done, if you want to talk to them about the
2 effectiveness of school IPM programs, feel free to ask
3 any questions of them at the break or at other times
4 during the day. So, thank you very much.

5 MR. HOUSENGER: Thank you very much.

6 Our next session is on the endocrine disruption
7 screening program. David Dix isn't able to be with us
8 today, but his deputy, Steve Knott, is. For anybody who
9 has been following the EDSP, they know it's been a long
10 time coming. It was required in 1996 by FQPA. I think
11 what we're going to talk about today is how far it's come
12 and how fast it's going at this point. So, I'll turn it
13 over to Steve.

14 MR. KNOTT: Thanks, Jack. I wanted to thank
15 the PPDC for this opportunity to provide an update on the
16 endocrine disruptor screening program. There are really
17 exciting changes that are taking place in the science for
18 the program.

19 As Jack said, my name is Steve Knott.
20 Actually, I'm the Director of the Exposure Assessment
21 Coordination and Policy Division in the Office of Science
22 Coordination and Policy in EPA's Office of Chemical
23 Safety and Pollution Prevention. Our office of Science
24 Coordination and Policy has the lead for coordinating on
25 the science behind or underlying the endocrine disruptor

1 screening program.

2 Just a very brief recap of the history of the
3 EDSP. It is a statutory program established under the
4 Food Quality Protection Act and amendments to the Safe
5 Drinking Water Act, both in 1996. Subsequent to the
6 passage of those acts, the agency sought the advice of
7 outside scientific advisors, the Endocrine Disruptor
8 Screening and Testing Advisory Committee, and established
9 the program in 1998 really to address both human health
10 and ecological effects from interactions with the
11 estrogen, antigen, and thyroid pathways.

12 From the beginning of the program, it was
13 envisioned as a three-phase program, the first phase
14 being a prioritization step to identify those chemicals
15 that we need further evaluation, the second being a
16 screening step to identify those chemicals that have
17 bioactivity or potential to interact with the endocrine
18 system, and then the third phase being longer term,
19 multigeneration studies to collect data that would be
20 necessary for risk assessment.

21 The expectation was that fewer and fewer
22 chemicals would proceed through each of these phases of
23 the program. So, the quote I have up there is from the
24 (inaudible) committee. I wanted to point out that they
25 envision the prioritization step as including

1 consideration of both bioactivity and exposure
2 information. At that time, around 1998 or 1999, the
3 agency brought the available tools to the joint meeting
4 of the Scientific Advisory Panel and Science Advisory
5 Board.

6 At that time, the science advisors found that
7 those tools were not quite ready, not even for use in
8 prioritization. But we've come a long way since that
9 time period. We are now at the point where we can use
10 these tools in what we're calling an integrated
11 bioactivity exposure ranking approach.

12 Just a very brief overview of what the approach
13 is, the IBER, the integrated bioactivity exposure
14 ranking, approach really makes use of three primary data
15 streams. There's science throughput, bioactivity
16 information from programs such as the agency's ToxCast
17 program, there's high throughput exposure information,
18 and again, there's the agency's ExpoCast program, and
19 then there's also high throughput toxicokinetic
20 information or also reverse toxicokinetic information.
21 I'll talk a little bit more about each of those data
22 streams on future slides.

23 So, the need for taking this approach is pretty
24 straightforward. There's a lot of chemicals that risk
25 assessors and risk managers need to consider. There's

1 approximately 84,000 chemicals in the TSCA inventory, about 1,000
2 registered pesticides. For the endocrine disruptor screening program
3 itself, approximately 10,000 chemicals have been identified as
4 needing to be considered or addressed in some way.

5 The approach that has been taken thus far has
6 only identified 174 chemicals in the first two lists to
7 potentially move into screening. So, many of these
8 chemicals have limited available information, so we
9 really need a more strategic approach to targeting data
10 collection and further assessment.

11 Again, just expanding a little further on the
12 need, I mentioned list one and list two. They're based
13 primarily on exposure consideration. I pointed out a
14 number of times that these are not presumed to interfere
15 with the endocrine systems of humans or wildlife. They
16 were selected primarily on exposure considerations. So,
17 the key point there is that other chemicals in the
18 universe could have higher priority if we were looking at
19 both bioactivity and exposure together.

20 As I'll go into a little more later, the
21 toxicity information is available for some of those list
22 one and list two chemicals, the 174, and it demonstrates
23 what we've seen so far. It demonstrates that yes, when
24 these two components are considered together, some of

1 these chemicals maybe should have had a lower priority.

2 Just kind of to recap, the first two lists, 174
3 chemicals, of those, 52 have gone through the lower
4 throughput existing tier one screening. It's obvious
5 that continuing through that process is going to take
6 many decades to get through the screening of the EDSP
7 universe of chemicals.

8 So, a more strategic approach was needed. As I
9 mentioned previously, there have been a lot of
10 advancements in science of high throughput tools,
11 particularly since the original peer review of the SEP,
12 SAB. We really realized that it reached a point, a
13 turning point or a pivot, in the science that's available
14 to us for the EDSP.

15 In 2011, the agency developed a work plan
16 entitled the EDSP21 Work Plan. This is available on our
17 website, which is listed here. It basically describes an
18 iterative step-wise approach to incorporating these high
19 throughput tools into the program. We're now, I believe,
20 well into the second phase here where we are really
21 poised to begin to use high throughput tools as an
22 alternative to some of the existing lower throughput
23 assays.

24 The third phase that we're working toward would
25 be to ultimately be able to use these high throughput

1 tools for the screening and to make decisions about which
2 chemicals need more detailed testing and appear to type
3 multigeneration study to develop information for risk
4 assessment.

5 To expand a little further on the integrated
6 bioactivity and exposure approach, basically, the dose
7 response information from high throughout bioactivity
8 assays is converted to a putative human bioactive dose
9 using the reverse toxicokinetic information. Then these
10 doses are compared with information from high throughput
11 exposure estimates to yield some ranking or priorities
12 among the chemicals that we're looking at.

13 So, in this case, for instance, the lower 95
14 percent competence interval on dose and the upper 95
15 percent competence interval on exposure, we look at that
16 distance to give us some indication across the large
17 group of chemicals as to what rank or order or priority
18 they should have.

19 So, to demonstrate this approach, the agency
20 developed a white paper this past year based on the
21 information that's available thus far. There's
22 bioactivity information out of Toxcast for approximately
23 1,800 chemicals. The Expocast, the early, I believe
24 it's referred to the second generation, results are
25 approximately 8,000 chemicals. Then, the sort of limit

1 at this point is in the reverse toxicokinetic
2 information. At the time of the white paper, there was
3 information available for about 239 chemicals.

4 So, in the white paper, we present the early --
5 in these high throughput bioassays to identify
6 bioactivity, they get a concentration of chemical that is
7 bioactive in that in vitro, in the test system. What
8 they do is take analyst studies and some cell-based
9 studies to convert that to what might be a concentration
10 in human or another animal target species in the blood
11 that might also be bioactive. So, it's trying to, in a
12 sense, scale up from the in vitro bioactivity to what
13 might be happening in an organism. It doesn't mean
14 that it's bioactive in the organism; it's just an attempt
15 to scale it up so we're making a more appropriate
16 comparison to the exposure estimates.

17 So, these are the preliminary results that were
18 presented in the white paper for the 239 chemicals. It
19 just shows the type of output for this. Again, the
20 ranking in this case is simply just the ratio of, again,
21 the lower limit on bioactive dose to the upper limit on
22 exposure.

23 Given that we were taking that kind of ratio,
24 things are a little bit turned around here in some sense
25 in that the lower lefthand corner of the plot is actually

1 the higher priority or an indication of higher priority.
2 So, these are the lower IBER scores or integrated
3 bioactivity exposure rankings. The lower ones in this
4 case are the higher priority. The upper part of the
5 curve is the higher scores.

6 It basically indicates that these would have
7 maybe lower priority for doing further evaluation or
8 testing. You can see that as I mentioned earlier -- it's on the
9 list one and list two chemicals for which information was
10 available. You can see that many of them are falling at
11 that upper portion of the curve, or maybe their
12 priority should have been a little lower.

13 So, an important part of bringing these tools
14 into the program is building our scientific competence.
15 A critical component of that is scientific peer review.
16 So, this past year, the agency held two FIFRA
17 scientific advisory panels to review white papers,
18 develop different aspects of the program. The first one
19 was in July dealing with the exposure models and then,
20 most recently, in December dealing with some of the
21 bioactivity information and this integrated bioactivity
22 exposure approach.

23 In the July SAP meeting, there were really two
24 primary focuses for the charge. One relates to what is
25 known as the systematic empirical evaluation of models

1 framework, which is being used in the Expocast program to
2 sort of optimize and calibrate the high throughput exposure models and
3 then, also, the reverse toxicokinetics that we were just
4 talking about. The charge is focused primarily on those
5 two areas in July. We also asked about some future
6 directions, including being able to begin to think about
7 extrapolations, ecological targets.

8 One thing I would never do is try to summarize
9 the recommendations of the FIFRA SAP in one slide, but
10 here it is. I would just encourage everyone to visit the
11 website, definitely look at the SAP documents, and the
12 full minutes from the meeting to get a good sense of the
13 overall recommendations and discussion from the panel.

14 I have tried to capture some of the highlights
15 from the July meeting here. We basically found that the
16 themed framework was scientifically sound and suitable
17 for the purpose that we were looking at. They did
18 recommend that further work be conducted to evaluate the
19 variability and uncertainty in the models. This was kind
20 of a recurring theme in the cross, I think, of both
21 meetings that we had this year.

22 Again, with respect to the first toxicokinetics
23 work, the panel felt that this was going in the right
24 direction. Really, there's no other viable approach to
25 doing this. Again, there were some technical aspects

1 that they felt we needed to continue to look at,
2 including that the model didn't necessarily predict the
3 steady state concentrations in vivo. They had some
4 comments along those lines. They also felt additional
5 chemicals would be useful. There was no consensus at
6 that point on this particular application of the reverse
7 toxicokinetics.

8 For the December SAP meeting, the charges
9 focused on, again, three areas primarily, the estrogen
10 receptor bioactivity model, the antigen receptor
11 bioactivity model, and then the overall integrated
12 approach. Again, taking the risk of summarizing it in
13 one slide, I'll encourage you to look at the panel's
14 report.

15 The panel is very positive about the overall
16 approach. They believe the agency was capturing worst
17 case scenarios in an attempt to account for variability
18 and uncertainty. They also felt that even though this is
19 a complex model, it was simple enough so that it's still
20 transparent and would be very usable in a broader community.
21 They felt this was a very good starting point for the
22 direction that the agency is headed.

23 Again, a lot of the comments focused on
24 variability and uncertainty, collecting more data,
25 particularly bioactivity data and exposure data. They

1 did express some concern about how well the models were
2 capturing specific human populations, agricultural
3 workers, chemical formulators, pregnant women. So, there
4 were a number of technical comments related to those
5 groups.

6 The agency is considering the recommendations
7 that we received this past year from the SAP. I just
8 highlighted a few areas where I believe work is moving
9 out already, looking at next generations of the exposure
10 models, including, for example, a high throughput version
11 of the SHEDS model, which is the (inaudible) human exposure
12 simulation model.

13 Looking at other areas like groundwater,
14 drinking water, dermal and inhalation exposures, the
15 steady state issue in relation to exposures, and I also
16 mentioned future areas of extrapolations to ecological
17 species, also expanding the number of chemicals for
18 biomonitoring, and also doing additional reverse
19 toxicokinetics work. Again, that, thus far, is sort of
20 the limiting step in the number of chemicals that we're
21 looking at.

22 So, with that, I just want to acknowledge that
23 there are many, many folks across the agency and also
24 other federal partners in this work. So, I've provided
25 an acknowledgment here of the different offices and our
26 partners at NIH that have been most directly involved

1 with the work over the past year, in particular.

2 With that, I'll entertain any questions.

3 MR. HOUSENGER: Thanks, Steve. We can take
4 questions, but just to kind of put this in perspective a
5 bit, when we went out with our first list, one chemical
6 (inaudible) was 67 chemicals, of which we took 52 after
7 registrants cancelled some pesticides or inerts. From
8 the time that we issued the test order to the time that
9 we completed our weight of evidence was about five years.

10 So, that's 52. You can do the math and see how
11 long it would take us to get through 10,000 of these.
12 We've been talking about Tox 21 for a long time, but this
13 really is exciting in terms of the resource savings, the
14 identification of which chemicals are bioactive and need
15 further testing. I never thought I'd see it before I
16 retired, so maybe now I can retire.

17 Cheryl.

18 CHERYL: So, this is just a real simple point
19 of clarification. Since we are in the PPDC, the
20 pesticide discussions are what we've been listening to
21 for a day and a half. Your slide on page 4, I just want
22 to clarify for the whole audience it says limiting and
23 existing available data for many chemicals is next to nil
24 for new substances. We're talking about the broad range
25 of all chemicals. We are not talking about pesticides,

1 because pesticides have a whole set of data that all come
2 in from new registrations. I just want to clarify
3 because of the venue we're in. Thank you.

4 MR. HOUSENGER: Mae.

5 MAE: Hi, thanks. I was just wondering of your sense of
6 time line going forward for, say, the three chemicals and
7 tier two things coming out?

8 MR. KNOTT: One thing I'll note with respect to
9 tier two, you may be aware that we just closed the
10 comment period on draft guidelines for the three tier two
11 studies. I believe it closed the end of March. So,
12 we're working through the comments we received on those.
13 We're hoping over the next several months to be able to
14 move forward with the guideline documents reflecting the
15 comments that we received.

16 With respect to future lists, I'm not really in
17 the position to comment. We're focusing in my division
18 on the underlying science. We're working toward
19 expanding the use of these tools, looking at this larger
20 group of chemicals. Again, as I mentioned, we have the
21 239 as sort of the basis for the white paper in December.
22 We're looking to expand that and continue to expand the
23 number of tools that we're bringing into the program.
24 Working really toward future implementation and
25 scientific peer reviews, of that information.

1 MR. HOUSENGER: Liz.

2 LIZ: It wasn't apparent to me, maybe you said
3 it, but I'm interested in list one and the status of the
4 weight of evidence documents.

5 MR. HOUSENGER: So, those are currently being
6 completed. We expect them out in June.

7 Mark.

8 MARK: Really valuable and certainly focused on
9 the future this research and this approach that the
10 agency is taking. I have a lot of respect for what
11 you've done. The question I have relates to predictive
12 confidence into the future and routine application
13 thereabout.

14 MR. KNOTT: I think that is an important
15 point. It's sort of iteratively building confidence in
16 these available tools. Going back to that EDSP 21
17 diagram that sort of maps out the division for the
18 program, it was very iterative and stepwise. The key
19 part of that is getting peer review, building confidence
20 in our applications.

21 So, that third phase is a little bit longer
22 term phase where the point we hope to get to is where the
23 high throughput available information can be used to make
24 decisions about which chemicals really need more detailed
25 study, for instance, in a multigeneration study to

1 collect information for risk assessment.

2 So, I don't know if that addresses your
3 question, but I agree it's an iterative process, and
4 we're building confidence and making sure that we bring
5 these tools to peer review as we bring more tools into
6 the program.

7 MR. HOUSENGER: Nichelle.

8 NICHELLE: This is an incredible amount of work
9 that guys are doing. Just a quick question that you
10 probably just touched on, but maybe you could just
11 clarify for me. As we move forward reviewing these tiers
12 of chemicals, would the results that you guys have
13 determined be incorporated in registration review as the
14 chemicals come up for review? Or, do we wait until the
15 decade long process is done before we see those data
16 incorporated in risk assessment?

17 MR. HOUSENGER: I think certainly we'll know
18 which chemicals exhibit bioactivity. Then, requiring
19 tier two testing is a longer process, if they go into
20 tier two. So, I'm not sure how that works out in terms
21 of reg review, which is supposed to conclude in 2022. I
22 think it's a decision of whether to go forward and get
23 mitigation on things that you know are posing an issue
24 today versus waiting for everything to be wrapped up
25 neatly. So, I think part of that is the estrogen

1 component of this is a lot farther along than the
2 androgen, which is pretty close, and then the thyroid is
3 a little further out.

4 So, how that all matches up, I don't know. I
5 think it makes sense to take action on chemicals, put
6 mitigation measures in place when you know there's a risk
7 rather than wait for it to all be perfect and do it then.

8 Pat.

9 PAT: Obviously, the animal welfare groups have
10 been following the EDSP for quite a few years. When the
11 program first came out, there was a potential with 10,000
12 chemicals for millions upon millions of animals to be
13 used in the testing. The 52 chemicals that were tested
14 in tier one, we did the calculation and we came up with
15 about 30,000 rats, frogs, and fish that were used just
16 for those 52 alone.

17 So, we are really ecstatic about the success
18 that has been demonstrated with the ToxCast data, how you
19 guys have been handling it. I think at one of the more
20 recent SAPs, the relationship between the ToxCast data
21 and what was found in vivo was exceptional. They found
22 that the ToxCast assays were very highly predictive. In
23 some cases, there was thought that they actually were
24 superior to some of the in vivo tests.

25 So, I just wanted to just make that comment,

1 that we are very supportive and give a lot of praise to
2 EPA on this work. Hope it continues. I don't know if it
3 will get applied to list two, but certainly going forward
4 from there. Thanks.

5 MR. HOUSENGER: Ray.

6 RAY: EPA has put forth a tremendous effort and
7 a very deliberate scientific approach to the question of
8 endocrine disruption. We applaud the agency for that
9 work. You're the world leader. There's a lot of
10 interest worldwide in this, particularly in Europe where,
11 for some reason, they haven't seen the need to apply much
12 science to the effort. They're proceeding with
13 identifying endocrine disruptor criteria without any
14 testing or science behind it.

15 What's the level of dialogue with your European
16 colleagues on their efforts, because we're hoping that
17 they're going to follow your lead?

18 MR. KNOTT: Well, speaking on the science side,
19 we do have engagement through OECD, primarily. We have,
20 actually, all along in the program, including with the
21 development of the original tier one assays. There's the
22 validation management group for nonanimal, which I
23 believe is an area to engage on these approaches. At
24 least on the science side, we are continuing to engage,
25 primarily through OECD.

1 MR. HOUSENGER: Sue.

2 SUE: I know it may not be possible, but I was
3 just wondering, based on your -- you've already looked at
4 some of the list one and list two chemicals through your
5 IBER approach. You acknowledge that some of them really
6 should have been given a low priority. Are you going to
7 use that information to revise this too before you go out
8 with test orders for the full battery of screening
9 assays?

10 MR. KNOTT: I don't think I'm in a position to
11 comment fully on that, but I will say that what I've
12 shown was a demonstration of the approach that was
13 brought to the Scientific Advisory Panel back in
14 December. So, we still have to take those
15 recommendations under consideration and continue to work
16 on the models.

17 MR. HOUSENGER: I think some of that is
18 dependent on how fast the science progresses and where we
19 are and do we really want to issue test orders or do we
20 want to wait for this to catch up. Those are things that
21 we're considering as we're moving forward.

22 All right, thanks, Steve.

23 Let's take a quick break, seven minutes. I
24 know how well everyone adheres to these time frames.

25 (Whereupon, a brief recess was

1 taken.)

2 MR. HOUSENGER: Our last topic for today is
3 from Bill Jordan on regulatory retrospective review.

4 MR. JORDAN: Of course, because Jack knew that
5 this would be the most fascinating topic, he put it last
6 on the agenda. Because I know I'm going to do such a
7 fabulous job and because we take schedules very
8 seriously, I'm anticipating that you will not have any
9 questions and that you all allow me to complete this
10 presentation in under 15 minutes so that we can get back
11 on schedule.

12 There are two pieces of paper in the folder
13 that relate to this particular session. The first is one
14 page, one sheet, a copy of the different slides that I'm
15 using here. The other is a letter authored by our own
16 PPDC member, Ray McAllister, that was sent out in
17 response to the webinar that we had before this PPDC
18 meeting in person, in which I invited people to send us
19 additional ideas about regulatory retrospective reviews.
20 I just wanted everybody to have Ray's letter because it
21 shows the kind of breadth of thinking in terms of topics
22 that might be taken up and considered in the regulatory
23 retrospective review process.

24 So, a little bit of background and history
25 here. In 2011, President Obama signed an executive order

1 that went to all federal agencies directing us to take a
2 hard look at the way we do business, our regulations and
3 our processes, so that we could make changes to those
4 regulations and processes that would increase efficiency,
5 that would reduce burden or improve effectiveness of our
6 responsibilities as government public servants.

7 It has sort of two parts to it. The first is
8 to reach out to the public and ask for ideas, because the
9 public, you all, are the ones who are affected by our
10 work in government. Then the second piece is to evaluate
11 those ideas. Once it seems like they have a lot of
12 promise, to follow through and work on them and make our
13 regulations more streamlined or repeal those that we
14 don't need or modify them in order to make them more
15 efficient, and so on.

16 We did that. We had a public engagement
17 process including talking to PPDC and we got a lot of
18 different suggestions, as you can see in the CropLife
19 letter, which renewed the recommendation that we look at
20 a number of different things. As a whole, EPA identified
21 35 particular projects that we wanted to work on. OPP
22 had five of them.

23 I'll quickly identify the five that we had.
24 One was modernizing science and technology methods in
25 regulation, reducing whole animal testing, reducing

1 costs, improving efficiencies. The second is online
2 reporting of health and safety data. The third, working
3 on our export notification requirements for chemicals and
4 pesticides. The fourth, integrating pesticide
5 registration reviews. The fifth, strengthening the
6 certification of pesticide applicators.

7 So, we've been working on those five. I'll
8 sort of summarize where we have landed on them in a
9 moment, but I just want to let you know that one of the
10 things that's in the executive order is that this is not
11 a one-shot deal. This is not once and done, but rather
12 something that we should be doing on an ongoing basis.
13 So, that's the reason I'm back here talking with you
14 today about soliciting more ideas for making our work
15 better.

16 We have a docket, which you see identified on
17 the slide, that covers all of the regulatory
18 retrospective reviews. We post a progress report every
19 six months on our website. You can see the link address
20 on this slide for that.

21 In January of 2015, the status of our efforts
22 were that EPA had completed 21 of the 35 retrospective
23 reviews, but we announced that we were adding 5 more, 2
24 of which come from the Office of Pesticide Programs. So,
25 that means that we now have 19 currently underway, and

1 we're open to looking at ideas about adding more.

2 The two that were added from 2014 are our work
3 on the confidential statement of product specifications,
4 also known as confidential statement of formula, and the
5 FIFRA pesticide import revision rule. So, the two that
6 we have finished are the one dealing with the export
7 notification. We issued a final rule that addressed
8 recommendations from our Office of Inspector General. We
9 realized that we had a wording problem with it, so we
10 rushed through a final regulation that amended that. So,
11 I think we now have a more effective export notification
12 program that's still streamlined.

13 Then, the second one that we have dealt with is
14 the integrated pesticide registration reviews. This is
15 the effort to bring chemicals that are similar in their
16 biological effects and similar in their use patterns
17 together. We've done that through the registration
18 review program.

19 We are also trying to streamline that process
20 by introducing the focus group meetings and very early in
21 the process clarifying use patterns and identifying
22 particular concerns and trying to make sure that our work
23 moves ahead in an efficient manner, both for the external
24 stakeholder community and for ourselves.

25 Just a quick word about our continuing efforts

1 modernizing science and technology methods. You just
2 heard about the work that we're doing on endocrine
3 disruptors. That is an important and exciting piece of
4 that work. Online reporting, we have established a
5 portal for submission of materials for applications for
6 registration and amended registration electronically.

7 Kevin Keaney talked yesterday about the
8 certification of pesticide applicators. That regulation
9 is an old one. We're proposing amendments that build off
10 of the experience in the state programs. It should be
11 out as a proposal this summer.

12 The confidential statement of product
13 specifications, also known as CSF, is something that
14 we're working on jointly with our colleagues in Canada,
15 so that a single submission of the CSF will satisfy both
16 US EPA and Canada PMRA requirements, a saving score of
17 the people who do business regulatory-wise. But also,
18 importantly, capturing that electronic form that will
19 allow us to keep better records and manipulate them much
20 more quickly.

21 Then, the FIFRA pesticide import rule revisions
22 are part of a larger effort across the entire government
23 to move to an electronic processing of import information
24 and make the trip through customs and border protection
25 at our ports much easier. We know from our experience

1 in the pesticide world that reviewing notices of arrival
2 is a process that creates a lot of work for our regional
3 offices. If we can figure out ways, and we have, we
4 believe, come up with some very important ideas to
5 streamline that process and make it more efficient.

6 So, all of those are showing a lot of promise
7 in the regulation changes that accompany that for the
8 automated customs environment (ACE). It should be out toward
9 the end of this year.

10 So, in 2015, we're reaching out again to you
11 all to hear ideas. We want to find ways not only to
12 change regulations but also to focus on our business
13 processes and reduce things that are unnecessary or
14 burdensome, modernize our regulatory program. Our
15 continued emphasis on IT upgrades is one of those areas.

16 When you respond to this, we'll look hard at
17 your comments. We'll select the ones that seem like they
18 have the biggest bang for the buck in terms of using your
19 taxpayer dollars wisely. So, that means that we won't be
20 able to do everything on the list, but that doesn't mean
21 those are bad ideas. We want to hear them, and we'll get
22 to them as we can.

23 The last thing is that it's not just you all we
24 want to hear from. State partners, reach out to your
25 colleagues, small businesses, general public in terms of

1 access to information, and things like that. So, we are
2 asking for your feedback by June 26th. That's a little
3 bit over a month. Send your submissions to our docket
4 number that you see listed on the slide here. You reach
5 that docket through www.regulations.gov. Then we'll be
6 busy over the coming months thinking about which ones we
7 are going to tackle.

8 So, there you go, Jack.

9 MR. HOUSENGER: Well, you made that more
10 interesting than it sounded.

11 MR. JORDAN: It sounded, what, boring?

12 MR. HOUSENGER: Well, more interesting than the
13 title would indicate.

14 Are there any comments or questions?

15 Sue.

16 SUE: Just one. I know you said, Bill, that
17 this wasn't meant to be a one-off exercise; this would be
18 something that would be ongoing. In fact, an executive
19 order can be a one-off. So, let's say the executive
20 order in the next administration is repealed. Is this
21 something that you're looking to institute, basically, as
22 general EPA policy in the future?

23 MR. JORDAN: You know, I think whether there's
24 an executive order or not, we, in the pesticide office,
25 have been open to suggestions from all quarters about how

1 can we do our business better. The PRIA process
2 improvement group is a fertile source of suggestions and
3 ideas. So, too, are the PPDC. Some of the things that
4 have come up in PPDC conversations have sparked us into
5 reworking our activities. So, I think I can't make a
6 promise on behalf of the whole agency, but knowing the
7 culture of OPP, I think I can say yes, we'll still keep
8 listening.

9 MR. HOUSENGER: Mark.

10 MARK: When I look at a perspective like this
11 and the retrospective aspects of it, and begin to think
12 about what about the future, what about how EPA deals
13 with certain drivers and change agents, probably the most
14 significant thing happening in the United States today is
15 invasive species.

16 In terms of pesticides, redirecting pesticides,
17 increasing spray programs, et cetera, I think two really
18 good examples are the brown marmarade (phonetic) stink
19 bug and the spotted wing drasopahlla (phonetic). From the
20 standpoint of pest management, everything is changing in
21 an invasive world.

22 So, when you look at this kind of activity and
23 you talk about trade and you talk about basically making
24 it I don't want to say easier, more electronically-based
25 importation process, I know that checking up on invasives

1 isn't part of the EPA's responsibility, but it is part of
2 the EPA's responsibility in terms of controlling these
3 guys and having materials to be able to do that.

4 I see this moving, accelerating, and becoming a
5 much more significant push back on government and the
6 agency is going to live that. It's going to be a lot of
7 pressure. I just wondered if we could have a comment on
8 that, and maybe think about how to integrate that whole
9 subject arena into the next meeting or something that we
10 could explore some ways of dealing with these major
11 drivers across this country.

12 MR. JORDAN: Thanks. In the next session,
13 we'll talk about possible topics for the next meeting.
14 So, that's one that I think goes on the list. In terms
15 of the retrospective review, I encourage you to send in a
16 letter and particularly think about what would we in the
17 pesticide office need to do differently from the way
18 we're doing things now; for example, in the emergency
19 exemption program or in the IR-4 program or something
20 like that. So, help us understand the implications of
21 increasing pressure from invasive species.

22 Cheryl.

23 CHERYL: Thank you, Bill, for that enthralling
24 talk. I have a follow-up question now. All of this
25 makes great sense. You're saying you don't need an

1 executive order to make process improvements. Good,
2 good, good. I'm just struck at, again, the type of
3 things that have been picked off are really big and
4 broad. It looks like they take a lot of time. They're
5 comprehensive, which is all great, but they don't get
6 down to some of the specifics, say, to the letter that
7 Ray sent in. They could be rolled up in there somewhere.

8 I'm wondering if there's something behind the
9 scenes that's kind of driving that. If you're looking to
10 have a less cumbersome process, do you have a less
11 cumbersome streamline process to address specific things
12 or do they all have to roll up into these big mega things
13 that take a long time? Is that partially being driven
14 some way kind of -- is there budget money set aside to
15 pick these projects off?

16 MR. JORDAN: Thank you for saying it was
17 enthralling. I'm pleased. That's a great question.
18 When the president sends out a memo saying make
19 government work better, the kinds of things that they're
20 looking for in the White House and at the higher levels
21 of EPA management are not small projects. They want
22 things that are big and impactful.

23 That said, that leads us to put forward the
24 kinds of things that you see on the list. Then, there's
25 a person who carefully tracks all of that stuff and makes

1 sure that we're continuing to move ahead on all of those
2 fronts.

3 We're still looking, and we understand and
4 appreciate the fact that smaller changes, a lot of small
5 changes, will actually add up to major improvements. So,
6 the reality that things don't make it onto the list
7 doesn't mean that we're ignoring them. So, if there's
8 some smaller change that we can make and not even go
9 through the White House and administrator level tracking,
10 we can do that and are eager to do that.

11 CHERYL: Is there a budget implication in some
12 of this that if you get on the list, you get -- are the
13 agencies fighting to get on the list so they can do this
14 so they have time and money, or you have to do this in
15 addition to everything else?

16 MR. JORDAN: This is, generally speaking, in
17 addition to everything else.

18 MR. HOUSENGER: All right, Ray.

19 RAY: You sound reluctant there. I find the
20 administrative process of contributing to this docket a
21 bit confusing, and I'm supposed to be an expert. It
22 appears that the docket is under the Office of Air, and
23 yet it's got that word pesticides just kind of hidden
24 there. The docket is closed. How do we contribute to
25 it?

1 MR. JORDAN: The docket is under the Office of
2 the Administrator, Administrator not Air. I think the
3 docket is opening up or it's always open, but we'll check
4 on that and get back to all of you.

5 MR. HOUSENGER: Thanks, Bill.

6 So, the final session we'd like to hear about
7 topics we can talk about at our next PPDC meeting in
8 October. We're going to treat this as just kind of a
9 brainstorming of ideas because October is a ways away.
10 We realize that things change. Also, the membership is
11 going to change somewhat between now and then.

12 So, anybody have topics they want to consider?
13 We'll do it by e-mail to solicit other comments when it
14 becomes closer and nail down the agenda.

15 Valentin.

16 VALENTIN: Just a couple of comments and then
17 my suggestions for topics. First of all, I want to thank
18 EPA for continuing to work in improving WPS. Also, I
19 want to thank the incident workgroup yesterday who did a
20 wonderful job in sharing what work needs to be done. I
21 think with the WPS' implementation, workers will be
22 better off, will have more knowledge and will be able to
23 identify potential health exposure incidents.

24 So, I think that it's important that we
25 streamline our current pesticide exposure reporting

1 incidents system. So, I volunteer myself. I may or may
2 not be in the PPDC group, but I volunteer myself to be
3 part of the incident reporting workgroup.

4 MR. HOUSENGER: Thank you.

5 Dawn.

6 DAWN: Thank you. I have two items for
7 consideration. I'm not really sure if either of them
8 could be addressed at the next meeting, but here's my
9 ideas. I was on a NIFA meeting just recently where
10 we discussed specifically California ag pesticide use
11 trends. There has been, over time, quite a dramatic
12 reduction in reproductive toxends, cholinesterase,
13 inhibitors, groundwater contaminants.

14 Carcinogen use has just started. There's no
15 change, decrease or increase. Fumigants look like
16 they're actually increasing as opposed to decreasing.
17 So, I'm just wondering if there is a way of having a
18 discussion on those findings. That was just a snapshot
19 of things that I remember in my brain out of a huge
20 report that's being compiled. But that might be relevant
21 information for discussion.

22 My second point was the issue of cannabis
23 growing. I'm not even sure if I can say that. Pseudo-
24 legal cannabis growing and the fact that unregistered
25 pesticides or unlicensed applicators and pretty dramatic

1 issues are emerging as a result of that. Thank you.

2 MR. HOUSENGER: Mark.

3 MARK: Of course I'm going to say school IPM.
4 I think that the agency has made some investments. I
5 think it's clear that we're at a tipping point and to
6 follow that through with the activities of particularly
7 the Center and where we're going. So, that's obvious
8 that I would say that.

9 The other thing that I was thinking about is
10 something that came up yesterday, global climate change.
11 I am curious with regard to what the office is doing
12 regarding pesticides in a proactive sense regarding
13 global climate change and its effects. So, it would be
14 nice to hear what's going on, and I assume something is.
15 So, I personally would like to hear about that. I think
16 it's probably a pretty important thing.

17 MR. HOUSENGER: Cynthia.

18 CYNTHIA: We would like to hear from the
19 Economic Analysis Division about their work. In a
20 couple of examples, we were quite impressed by EPA's
21 analysis of neonic treated seeds and wondering sort
22 of how you can continue to do that sort of work without
23 being hauled in front of congress.

24 Secondly, as part of that, we'd be interested
25 in hearing how OPP is quantifying the value of ecosystem

1 services from the Economics Analysis Division.

2 MR. HOUSENGER: Beth.

3 BETH: Thank you. Two topics to suggest. One
4 would be from an international activities update, in
5 particular, our members are always interested in finding
6 out where do we stand in terms of harmonizing
7 requirements with Canada, in particular.

8 The second topic, I think some time ago, there
9 was a Federal Register notice that talked about the 25B
10 rulemaking, but it was part of like a two or three part
11 process. There's going to be a product performance
12 standard that I think needed to come out before you
13 actually moved forward with the 25B rulemaking. So, just
14 an update on where all of that stands would be very
15 helpful. Thank you.

16 MR. HOUSENGER: Ray.

17 RAY: I'd like to echo Beth's concern about the
18 international activities update. I would like to see a
19 fairly in-depth discussion of the range of international
20 activities that OPP is involved in and has responsibility
21 for. I'm sure the agency recognizes the importance of an
22 international role, but I'm not sure you all appreciate
23 the full extent of your influence worldwide and its
24 impact on U.S. businesses. You're the leader in many
25 respects.

1 Years ago, I was in a meeting with
2 international colleagues where they did a rating of
3 pesticide regulatory agencies around the world and gave
4 this list of things they were rated on, things we always
5 criticize you for.

6 MR. HOUSENGER: We appreciate that, Ray.

7 RAY: In that rating, EPA came out on top in
8 every respect. We want to recognize that. In that
9 respect, you are an example to everybody else. It's
10 important to maintain that example and to maintain the
11 effort that goes into that example.

12 So, I'd like to see you explain to us what you
13 see your roles and responsibilities are and us have an
14 opportunity to explain to you what we see as your roles
15 and responsibilities in the international area.

16 MR. HOUSENGER: Matt.

17 MATT: I'm going to agree with Ray there. I
18 know, Ray, you and I don't always agree, but in this case
19 I think having myself lived in various countries
20 overseas, the importance of EPA and how pervasive the way
21 you think, the way you do things, affects small
22 governments that can't afford to do them the way you do
23 them is amazing. It's just truly amazing. So, I
24 definitely support that because I think it's very
25 important.

1 The other thing I wanted to mention was this.

2 I had the experience a little while ago of attending a
3 meeting where the people from the Wisconsin agricultural
4 support office talked about minority farmers in Wisconsin
5 and talked particularly about the Mung
6 population but other populations as well.

7 One of the questions they asked was, well, what
8 kind of advice do they get on pesticides and where do
9 they get their pesticide information, because they're
10 selling those products at farmers markets and people are
11 buying those products, oftentimes with the assumption
12 that these are nicely organically grown products.

13 The response I got was that oftentimes the
14 nonliterate farming population will ask their children
15 who are literate to go in and read the labels for them
16 and tell them what to use. Now, most of what they're
17 going to get is off the shelf, the kind of stuff that
18 you'd have in a garden store, but there's no pre-harvest
19 intervals stated on those things. So, my concern is that
20 there may be an excessive amount of pesticides that ends
21 up in farmers markets.

22 I don't know what EPA has done at looking at
23 that question, but it's a concern of mine. If it's done,
24 great. But it seems to me to be something we should pay
25 attention to, because community supported agriculture and

1 farmers markets are so pervasive and highly esteemed at
2 this point for their health contributions. Of course, I
3 won't be there to talk about this.

4 MR. HOUSENGER: You can always come as a guest.
5 Nichelle.

6 NICHELLE: So, USGS spends a lot of time
7 tracking pesticides in waterways. Maybe we can look at
8 how to improve EPA's monitoring of that sort of data and
9 how we can better use that data in risk assessments.

10 MR. HOUSENGER: You assume we don't, but we can
11 talk about that.

12 Mark.

13 MARK: I just want to bring up, I guess, in
14 this section the issue of invasives and its impact on
15 pesticide use, particularly close to harvest, as a key
16 driver of massive change in many of the states.

17 MR. HOUSENGER: Steve.

18 STEVE: I guess I'll state the obvious, managed
19 pollinators, especially in light of the White House
20 report that's supposed to come out in the next two weeks.
21 By October, we should know what wheels have started
22 turning and where we are.

23 MR. HOUSENGER: It's a good bet that will be
24 one of the topics.

25 Liz.

1 LIZ: I have just a little suggestion. As a
2 result of the comparative efficacy claims report we heard
3 yesterday, I would like to suggest that it actually
4 become a part of the comparative safety statements
5 workgroup.

6 MR. HOUSENGER: Gabrielle.

7 GABRIELLE: A couple of dittos. The
8 international one is a ditto. I was also going to say
9 the same thing that Steven just said. I think the other
10 thing that would be good is to get a more detailed update
11 on where EPA is on the actual risk assessment side for
12 pollinators, because there's been a lot going on there.
13 I don't think this group has been briefed on it or had a
14 chance to provide input on it.

15 I just want to say one thing that I keep
16 saying. As you are structuring this meeting, make sure
17 that if it's really something for feedback, that you give
18 us time. As I said the first time I came here, I don't
19 really care what we talk about, I just care about that
20 it's something where we can make a meaningful difference.
21 I'm not always convinced that's happening. So, I just
22 want to say that.

23 There are some really complicated issues,
24 especially in the risk assessment, especially in the
25 environmental risk assessment arena, that haven't really

1 been brought forward to this group. Maybe I missed one
2 or two, but for some really serious admittedly
3 controversial discussions.

4 Certainly, right now we're looking at how is
5 EPA using epidemiological data in their assessments.
6 When is it appropriate, when not, how do you use that. I
7 also ditto on how can the modeled drinking water or has
8 the modeled levels in water -- because that goes into
9 different parts of the risk assessment -- relate to
10 actual monitoring data, because there's a real big issue
11 there? So, there's a lot of details going on and a lot
12 of changes being made.

13 I made the mistake, and I'm not sure it was the
14 right thing to attend the environmental risk assessment
15 meeting a couple weeks ago here, which was totally off
16 the deep end for me. But it was helpful for me just to
17 see there's a lot going on there with some really serious
18 consequences for how you're doing that part of the risk
19 assessment.

20 My very first thing I ever did in DC and PPDC,
21 that is something I expect to be brought to this group,
22 even if it's sciency. I'm not talking about the SAP kind
23 of stuff. We're willing to give you feedback, so here's
24 some things to think about in that process. That's not
25 easy stuff, I know that.

1 So, that would be my other plug, make sure we
2 have meat to chew on. Make sure there's protein for us
3 to chew on.

4 MR. HOUSENGER: Louis.

5 LOUIS: I would like to simply raise my
6 support for two things that have been mentioned. First
7 is the point Matt raised about EPA continuing or to
8 initiate in a better way how to monitor the use of
9 pesticides by, I will say, small farmers, not just the
10 minority farmers, because there are a lot of small
11 farmers who are not minority. They do things in pretty
12 much the same way. We have done a lot of surveys and
13 pretty much know where to get the advice for pesticide
14 usage from.

15 But I think if you look at violations, they're
16 among the group that would violate a lot more than anyone
17 else, because the eye is not on them. They figure well,
18 they can do things a little different. But I think it
19 would be helpful to try to monitor that process among the
20 small growers a little more than is being done at the
21 moment.

22 The other point I'd like to raise support is
23 Mark's mention of the brown marmorated stink bug. That has repercussions
24 on pesticide usage because it started out with fruits and
25 a lot of vegetables that are grown by small growers.

1 Their first tendency would be to spray them. So, they're
2 related, pesticide usage on invasive pests, as well as
3 other pests.

4 Of course, a lot of them claim to be organic
5 farmers until you go to the farmers market and collect
6 some samples and do some assessments of them and you find
7 a lot of pesticide residue on some of those, as we have
8 found.

9 So, those are two areas that I certainly would
10 give my support.

11 MR. HOUSENGER: Nichelle.

12 NICHELLE: So, as Louis raised that point with
13 these invasive pests that we are to deal with, maybe EPA
14 can give us some feedback on the use of section 18
15 exemption and how that's being used by EPA in some states
16 to address some of these emerging pressures, and how we
17 also tackle resistance and using section 18 to sort of
18 tackle resistance as they pop up.

19 MR. HOUSENGER: Valentin.

20 VALENTIN: Aside from the incident reporting
21 discussion, one thing that just occurred to me is that
22 I'd like to be able to hear EPA's strategy or plan to
23 roll out the WPS improvement. What's your plan to try to
24 make sure that you reach from the small growers to
25 minority growers?

1 MR. HOUSENGER: Dawn.

2 DAWN: I would be remiss if I didn't ask for an
3 update from the public health group, specifically with
4 regard to residents, low-income residents and bed bug
5 issues, and any kind of improvement in the guidance that
6 the proportion of society can access on what's likely to
7 help the situation as opposed to make it worse.

8 MR. HOUSENGER: Doug.

9 DOUG: I would suggest, too, that we continue
10 on MRL issues. I know Lois did a lot of work on that.
11 We should continue to monitor and study those, both
12 domestically and import.

13 MR. HOUSENGER: Tommy.

14 TOMMY: I'd like to have a discussion around
15 worker protection standards and how EPA shares that
16 responsibility with OSHA. So, where does one pick up
17 where the other drops off?

18 MR. HOUSENGER: Sharon.

19 SHARON: I'd like to have a discussion on the
20 Endangered Species Act consultation process and where EPA
21 is at at that time.

22 MR. HOUSENGER: Okay, I think that's it. I had
23 a couple requests. In a quick session yesterday on
24 updates, the eight updates, people wanted to provide
25 comments. You can either do that by writing directly to

1 the presenter or providing them through Dea. We'll get
2 them either way.

3 Then, recognizing that this is the last time
4 for some of you, I just wanted to thank you for your
5 service here.

6 It's only my second PPDC meeting chairing in
7 person, at least, and I heard a lot of good feedback from
8 this, anywhere from our website to pollinator plans,
9 which I think draws a lot of attention always, and just
10 highlights to me how difficult a subject it is to figure
11 out what the right thing to do is.

12 I think when our plan finally comes out for
13 comment, I encourage everyone to comment on it. It's not
14 an easy thing to put together to say this is definitely
15 the right way or not. But I think what we've done is
16 given it our best shot. We need input from you people.

17 Whenever one of these meetings happens, it's
18 always a lot of work by a lot of people here at the
19 agency to put the presentations together. Hopefully,
20 they are things that you wanted to hear. We're always
21 looking for topics and topics that hit a lot of different
22 people, not just single topics that someone is interested
23 in.

24 I know this time we had a little trouble
25 getting topics. I know a lot will be going on. At that

1 point, the pilots will be out for ESA. The pollinators,
2 we will be rolling that out. The endocrine decisions
3 will be out. So, there's certainly a lot that's going to
4 be pertinent at that point.

5 Finally, thanks to every one of you who I know
6 takes out time to come review the information, give us
7 feedback. It's hard to sit in Washington and know that
8 you're doing the right thing. So, it's always good to
9 hear from real people, not that these people aren't.
10 Anyway, I just wanted to thank everyone.

11 We have time for some public comments. I think
12 we only have one person that has signed up, and that is
13 Pat Risotto from BNA.

14 MS. RISOTTO: No, no, no, I was just signing
15 in.

16 MR. HOUSENGER: Oh, you were just signing in.
17 Well, then, we have no one. So, I would suggest that you
18 say something.

19 Do we have any comments from the phones?

20 MR. GRAGG: Yes, this is Richard Gragg at
21 Florida A&M University. My comment is for today's session, which was
22 very interesting, like yesterday. One, I agree with the
23 need to collect data on the effectiveness of the school
24 IPM activities. Number two, I have a question on how
25 does the EDSP screen for mixtures, and are the ESDP

1 results integrated into cumulative risk assessment
2 protocols and guidance?

3 And on the future discussions, I would like to
4 hear about how the OPP is addressing environmental
5 justice issues, the EJ Plan 2014, the upcoming EJ 2020,
6 and the EJ screen tool, and the new technical guidance
7 for assessing environmental justice in regulatory
8 analysis.

9 And then I think another future discussion is
10 are there any type of -- I think there needs to be a
11 discussion about pesticide usage in urban and community
12 gardening. Is there a need for any type of MP or other
13 type of management practices for these users? Thank you.

14 MR. HOUSENGER: Thank you.

15 Gabrielle, I think it's the 22nd or 23rd of
16 October.

17 Julie.

18 JULIE: Really quick, and this is just in
19 addition to the suggestion on invasive species. We might
20 also want to consider the effects of invasive species on
21 endangered species and the role that the control of
22 invasive species has in protecting endangered species.

23 MR. HOUSENGER: So, with that -- Mark, did you
24 have something?

25 MARK: It was just a question about -- I've got

1 the dates down for next time. I do want to speak my very
2 strong preference for face-to-face meetings rather than
3 webinar. I know that things had to be done a certain way
4 and that you did the best under the circumstances. But
5 it makes a huge difference. So, I would certainly want
6 to put that preference out there.

7 MR. HOUSENGER: Yes, we heard that loud and
8 clear, especially after the second webinar. But it is a
9 good opportunity to meet face to face and you get a lot
10 more done. So, we plan on two a year and letting people
11 know well in advance so you can plan for it.

12 SUE: We were kind of talking
13 about it out on the street yesterday. You tend to have
14 these Thursday and Friday afternoon. Friday's flights
15 are expensive and it's extremely busy at the airport. Is
16 there a chance you can consider doing it like a Wednesday
17 and Thursday morning to keep everybody away from that
18 expensive and hectic travel time on Fridays?

19 MR. HOUSENGER: One of the problems is getting
20 this room because it's booked. Usually, Fridays are open
21 so we only have to jockey for one day.

22 Dawn.

23 DAWN: Really quickly and hopefully Florida A&M
24 is still on the phone. We have extensive data regarding
25 school IPM practices going back 15 years, and we're still

1 compiling datasets. Every time we incorporate a new
2 element and we modify something, we track it. If we
3 didn't collect data, none of us employed by universities
4 would have a job for very long.

5 MR. HOUSENGER: All right, now we're done.
6 Thank you very much. Have safe travels home.

7 (Whereupon, the meeting was
8 concluded.)
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPTIONIST
3

4 I, Marilyn H. McNulty, do hereby certify that
5 the foregoing transcription was reduced to typewriting
6 via audiotapes provided to me; that I am neither counsel
7 for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to
8 the action in which these proceedings were transcribed;
9 that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or
10 counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially
11 or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.
12
13
14

15 MARILYNN H. McNULTY

16 Transcriptionist
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25