

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

Azinphosmethyl Transition Strategy for Washington State Apple Production

Currently the only pest targeted for control by **azinphosmethyl (AZM)** is the codling moth, *Cydia pomonella* (L.). Codling moth is the key pest in western apple production, meaning that pest control programs in apple are centered on its control. With the phase-out for AZM scheduled for 2012, leadership in the Washington apple industry recognized the need to help growers adopt new technologies for pest control. To this end \$550,000 dollars was appropriated by the Washington State legislature for this purpose. The AZM transition strategy focuses on the production of fresh market apples in Washington State but could be relevant to apple production in other states within the western region, especially the Pacific Northwest.

The project builds on the fact that adoption of AZM replacement technologies is already occurring within a segment of the apple industry, and that understanding the benefits (e.g. lower risk to farmers and orchard workers) and problems (e.g. sometimes more complex treatment timing and lack of MRLs in export markets) faced by these growers will help others in the adoption process. The pesticides identified for use in the transition are registered by the EPA and noted by the agency as alternatives in the recently concluded AZM phase-out decision. Soon to be registered alternatives will be evaluated in research conducted in support of the project. In addition to pesticides, considerations regarding biological control of non-target pests and heightened sanitation efforts on the part of local pest control boards are and will be incorporated into the strategy. Various approaches for transitioning apple pest management programs have been developed based on research conducted at the Washington State University Tree Fruit Research and Extension Center. These approaches have been summarized at a web site - <http://entomology.tfrec.wsu.edu/op-alternative/>.

As part of an evaluation the project will measure: 1) crop protection (efficacy of pest control), 2) conservation of beneficial insects; 3) economics of production practices; 4) progress toward MRL establishment in key export markets; 5) perceptions of farm workers and growers and; 6) reduction of economic and environmental risk.

Development of the strategy continues.

Ohio Parsley AZM Transition Strategy

Update

May 9, 2007

The Ohio Parsley AZM Transition Strategy team consists of Barbara VanTil, US EPA R5; Jeff Zellers, K.W. Zellers and Sons (Ohio parsley grower); William Keene, K.W Zellers and Sons (Ohio parsley pest management specialist); and Adam Sharp, Ohio Farm Bureau, (other?).

A draft plan has been developed for Ohio parsley and has been circulated for comment to the Transition Issues Workgroup. While we're off to a good start, we have a long way to go to ensure that AZM transition provides meaningful options for affected parsley growers. The current draft is a first cut that attempts to begin capturing general cropping information, production practices, crop value, pest identification, potential pest management tools, other cultural practices, and tasks and timelines.

Much additional work and input to the document is needed. Including, but limited to:

- Cost, availability, review status, and effectiveness of current and potential alternative pest management tools
- Identification to all barriers of adoption for potential alternative pest management tools
- Information regarding the practical realities and impacts of any alternative's REI's and PHI's.
- Further development of timelines and needed activities section
- Development of an education and outreach program

The group will continue to develop the plan and will have a second draft ready for circulation in the near future. Only a couple sets of comments have been received to date. We look forward to receiving any additional comments on this first draft as soon as possible.

Thanks.

PPDC AZM Transition Issues Workgroup

Report-Out for PPDC Meeting
May 9, 2007

Today's report-out includes:

- Overview of AZM decision
- Formation of workgroup
- Mission statement
- Progress to-date
- Next steps

When was and why has this workgroup been formed?

- November 2006
 - EPA announced decision to phase-out Azinphos methyl (AZM)
 - Jim Jones announced the formation of a PPDC Workgroup on Transition Issues to help EPA and USDA carry out the planned AZM phase-out

Overview of AZM decision:

- November 16, 2006 -- EPA issued final decision on AZM to phase-out remaining uses by September 30, 2012 – according to this schedule:
 - By September 30, 2007, phase out:
 - Brussels sprouts
 - Nursery stock
 - By October 30, 2009, phase out:
 - Almonds
 - Pistachios
 - Walnuts

Overview of AZM decision (continued):

- AZM phase-out schedule (continued):

- By September 30, 2012, phase out:

- Apples
- Blueberries
- Cherries
- Parsley
- Pears

All other uses have been voluntarily cancelled by the manufacturer.

Overview of AZM decision (continued):

- EPA final AZM decision AZM includes implementation of mitigation measures during phase-out:
 - Mandatory ratcheting down of annual application rates
 - Larger buffer zones around water bodies
 - Buffers around houses and other occupied structures

Overview of AZM decision (continued):

- Phase-out mitigation measures (continued):
 - Gradual elimination of the few remaining aerial applications
 - Post-application worker stewardship program

Overview of AZM decision (continued):

- EPA final AZM decision includes “transition to alternatives” component:
 - Growers of AZM crop uses expected to successfully transition to available safer alternative pesticides
 - To facilitate transition, hold periodic meetings during phase-out to discuss available alternatives and newer/pipeline pesticides
 - EPA and USDA lead
 - Discuss at PPDC meetings

What are the affiliations of workgroup members?

- Co-chairs are EPA (Rick Keigwin) and USDA (Allen Jennings)
- Workgroup members include:
 - Agriculture/farmer representatives
 - Environmental/consumer/farmworker representatives
 - Academia/public health/public foundation representatives
 - Food processor/distributor representative
 - Pesticide companies/trade association representatives
 - Cal-DPR representative
 - NAFTA partners from Canada's PMRA are observers

*Workgroup includes several members of the PPDC

What is the workgroup's "charge"?

- Provide advice, through PPDC, to EPA and USDA on implementation EPA decision to phase-out remaining AZM uses, with the following objectives and goals:
 - Identifying framework for reasonable transition
 - Identifying ways to improve understanding of critical grower needs and perspectives of all stakeholders regarding the transition

What is the workgroup's "charge"?

- Workgroup objectives and goals (continued):
 - Identifying programs/mechanisms to provide reduced-risk pest management strategies and techniques to growers
 - Recommending ways to assist growers in their good faith efforts as they try AZM alternatives and feasible, cost-effective techniques

What is the workgroup's "charge"?

- Workgroup objectives and goals (continued):
 - Fostering transparency and public participation in decision-making
 - Providing process recommendations to ensure that AZM transition progress is tracked and assessed and reported back to PPDC

What is the workgroup NOT charged with?

- Revisiting the EPA final AZM decision
- Discussing rationale for AZM decision
- Discussing pending litigation

What has the workgroup accomplished thus far?

- Workgroup (public) meeting held March 6, 2007
- Day of brainstorming resulted in rough outline of basic transition strategy with components addressing four areas of concern:
 - Trade
 - Regulatory issues
 - Research and implementation
 - Impact assessment (to include economics, resistance management, sustainability...)

What has the workgroup accomplished thus far?

- Two groups volunteered to draft case-studies:
 - Ohio parsley
 - Washington apples
- Two short workgroup teleconferences held along with many e-mail-exchanges
- Two matrices under development:
 - Crop/alternate approaches to pest management matrix
 - Regulatory matrix

What is the status of the matrices and case-studies?

- Draft matrices in workgroup review
- Draft case-studies being revised after first-round review/comment

What does the Ohio parsley case-study currently consist of?

- General cropping information
- Production practices
- Crop value
- Pest identification
- Potential pest management tools and cultural practices
- Tasks
- Timelines

What other input is anticipated into the Ohio parsley case-study?

- Cost, availability, review status, effectiveness of alternate pest management tools
- Identification of barriers of adoption
- Practical realities and impacts of alternate approaches
- Necessary activities
- Education and outreach program

What does the Washington apples case-study include?

- Focuses on production of fresh market apples in Washington State
- Builds on adoption of AZM replacement technologies already occurring within segment of apple industry
- Articulates understanding of benefits and problems faced by growers

What does the Washington apples case-study include?

- Identifies current available potential alternatives
- Discusses needed research

What are other expectations of the Washington apples case-study?

- Transition evaluation through measurement of:
 - Crop protection
 - Conservation of beneficials
 - Economics
 - Progress toward harmonized export markets
 - Farm worker and grower perceptions

What are workgroup's next steps?

- Hold another workgroup meeting to:
 - Flesh out case-studies
 - Further develop matrices
 - Work to reach consensus on components, and contents of, and plan for, transition strategies
- Present case-studies and propose advice (for USDA and EPA) to PPDC

Questions?

Thank you