

Region 2
State-FIFRA Issues Research and Evaluation Group (SFIREG) Conference Call
October 23, 2018

A Pre-SFIREG conference call was held on October 23, 2018 with United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Region 2 and the Region 2 States and Territories (states). The Region 2 states on the call included New York, New Jersey, the US Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico.

The following are some of the topics discussed during this call:

Pollinator Protection Plan Metrics

Liza Fleeson Trossbach, Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services provided information on the background associated with the federal pollinator protection efforts and the development of guidance for state pollinator protection plans. She also discussed USEPA's desire to measure the success of the state plans. Although there are similarities to many of the plans there are also differences that may make them difficult to measure.

To develop measures USEPA asked the Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee (PPDC) for assistance. The PPDC recommended that metrics be developed using a survey to measure outputs and outcomes. This information will allow for an assessment that provides flexibility in measuring the success of the state plans. It is anticipated that the survey will be 28 questions which will focus on critical plan elements and state specific components. The Association of American Pesticide Control Officials and SFIREG may distribute the survey and provide the data to USEPA.

USEPA Product Registration

The states asked about a potential backlog associated with the pesticide product registration process at USEPA. There was a concern about pesticide labels not being processed at USEPA, with some label amendments taking over a year. If labels are not being processed on a regular basis it could lead to a situation where state registration programs could be overwhelmed if USEPA decides to process multiple label amendments all at once.

Dan Rosenblatt, USEPA's Office of Pesticide Programs discussed this matter during the call. Due to staffing levels USEPA must focus their resources to meet the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act (PRIA) deadlines, which they have been meeting. The non-PRIA actions will not be the focus at USEPA but will be processed as resources allow. USEPA has asked companies to highlight non-

PRIA actions that they would like USEPA to concentrate on. The possibility of states sharing some of the registration burden by amending the USEPA registration process was also discussed.

Neonicotinoid Registration Review/Pollinator Risk Assessment Update

Steven Snyderman, USEPA's Office of Pesticide Programs provided an update on the pollinator risk assessments and interim decisions for Neonicotinoids. These documents will be released for public comment by USEPA in spring 2019. When the process is complete pesticide labels will need to be amended to reflect USEPA's decision. The USEPA assessment on the use of Neonicotinoids is of interest to several of the states since there have been requests by environmental organizations for states to evaluate the continued use of Neonicotinoids.

Pesticide Inert Ingredient Disclosure

Anthony Lamanno, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation discussed SFIREG's role in the development of USEPA's Inert Ingredient Disclosure Guidance. During the June 2018 Full SFIREG meeting an overview of the inert ingredient disclosure concept was provided by USEPA and pesticide registrants. This concept involves the placement of inert ingredients on the pesticide label to accommodate a request by retailers and to satisfy a California law. Since the June meeting a SFIREG workgroup has had several conference calls with USEPA on this matter. SFIREG offered feedback on the placement this information on pesticide labels and discussed some of the regulatory issues that the state registration programs may need to address.

The workgroup expressed regulatory concerns to USEPA about various aspects of the inert ingredient disclosure concept. Aside from the difficulty of fitting this information on existing labels, the idea of partial disclosure, as allowed by the California Law, could be misleading. The California Law only requires disclosure of certain ingredients and not full disclosure. There was also concern about the chemical names used in listing the inert ingredients and how they would relate to the Confidential Statement of Formula for the product. In addition, states were concerned about the potential workload to register the labels and potentially verify the inert ingredient information on the label is correct. USEPA intends to incorporate this guidance into a Pesticide Registration notice and will consider SFIREG's concerns during the development of the notice.

Certification Plan and Reporting database (CPARD) Update

Jeanne Kasai, USEPA's Office of Pesticide Programs gave a status update for CPARD. CPARD is currently operational and the state programs are entering the pesticide applicator totals. CPARD has been updated to allow for multiple users per state. USEPA is working with technical services to develop the next version of CPARD and will eventually transition to an updated system when it is

available. There was also a discussion regarding the need for states to comply with the Cross Media Electronic Reporting Rule (CROMERR).

USEPA Grant Reporting Data Analysis

Helene Ambrosino, USEPA's Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance gave a presentation about the use of the grant reporting data from the 5700 form. This data has been analyzed since 2014 and USEPA uses it to determine if grant commitments are met and to evaluate compliance and enforcement trends for the regions and the national pesticide program.

Sandra O'Neil, USEPA's Office of Pesticide Programs continued this reporting topic by presenting on the use of the data that the Office of Pesticide Programs collects as part of the grant reporting requirements. This is the first year an analysis has been completed using this data. This data is reviewed to determine if the cooperative agreement, national program managers guidance, worker protection standard, and pollinator protection goals are met. It is also reviewed to determine if there are any trends or observations associated with the program that will be beneficial to the regions.