

STATE FIFRA ISSUES RESEARCH & EVALUATION GROUP (SFIREG)
FULL COMMITTEE MEETING
December 3-4, 2018
U.S. EPA, POTOMAC YARDS, CRYSTAL CITY, VA
MEETING MINUTES

Called by: Liza Fleeson Trossbach, VA, SFIREG Chairperson
Minutes by: Amy Sullivan, AAPCO Executive Secretary

Monday December 3, 2018, 8:00 am

U.S. EPA OFFICE OF PESTICIDE PROGRAMS UPDATE

Yvette Hopkins, EPA, OPP, FEAD

Report on status of relevant activities of OPP impacting state pesticide regulatory programs.

1. EPA Announces Federal Register Notice Regarding the Availability of Worker Protection Training Materials

www.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-announces-federal-register-notice-regarding-availability-worker-protection-training

EPA published in the Federal Register a notice stating the pesticide safety training materials with the expanded content required by the 2015 FIFRA Worker Protection Standard (WPS) are available for use. The notice of availability is in docket EPA-HQ-OPP-2011-0184 on www.regulations.gov.

The training materials with expanded content have been available at the Pesticide Education Resources Collaborative (PERC) and were developed through an EPA cooperative agreement. EPA also approved training materials developed by other organizations, some of which are available on PERC's website. Updated training materials must be used 180 days after the publication of the notice in the Federal Register.

EPA revised the WPS to implement more protections from pesticide exposure incidents for agricultural workers, handlers, and their families.

Note that EPA has initiated a process to revise certain requirements in the WPS. EPA plans to publish a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking later in 2018 to solicit comments on proposed revisions to the WPS requirements for minimum ages, designated representatives, and application exclusion zones. If the changes to the requirements are finalized, these safety training materials will be amended to reflect such changes. Until such time, all requirements are in effect. For more information on the WPS, visit www.epa.gov/pesticide-worker-safety/agricultural-worker-protection-standard-wps.

2. New Frequently Asked Questions on Honeybee Toxicity Testing for Registrants and Contract Laboratories

STATE FIFRA ISSUES RESEARCH & EVALUATION GROUP (SFIREG)
FULL COMMITTEE MEETING
December 3-4, 2018
U.S. EPA, POTOMAC YARDS, CRYSTAL CITY, VA
MEETING MINUTES

www.epa.gov/pesticides/new-frequently-asked-questions-honeybee-toxicity-testing-registrants-and-contract

The Environmental Protection Agency has posted new frequently asked questions for registrants and contract laboratories conducting honeybee toxicity testing. These FAQs are made up of responses to inquiries EPA commonly receives about protocols used to generate honeybee toxicity data for submission in support of pesticide registration. Additionally, these FAQs are meant to complement the Agency's existing Pollinator Risk Assessment Guidance and increase the transparency and clarity of the risk assessment process.

EPA encourages the regulated community to submit questions not found in the FAQs or risk assessment guidance to oppollinatortesting@epa.gov.

OFFICE OF ENFORCEMENT AND COMPLIANCE ASSURANCE (OECA) UPDATE

Helene Ambrosino, EPA, OECA

Report on status of relevant activities of OECA impacting state pesticide regulatory programs.

Section 7 update - 60% of the regulated community reported electronically with SSTS in 2018 and we are hoping that percentage continues to increase. We will continue to post all EPA registered pesticide establishments on our website and we hope to update the list quarterly.

A workgroup has been convened to advance the concept of focused WPS inspections.

EPA has been working on revisions to the FIFRA Inspection Manual and will be seeking comments on those revisions from SFIREG.

A question had been raised as to whether the "Interim Policy on Inspection Report Timeliness and Standardization" applies to states conducting federal inspections – it doesn't.

OC participated in several pre-SFIREG meetings to share an analysis of grantee data submitted at EOY on 5700 forms.

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN PESTICIDE CONTROL OFFICIALS (AAPCO) REPORT

Tony Cofer, AL, AAPCO President

Cofer began by explaining AAPCO's oversight of SFIREG, which is a standing committee of AAPCO, and is supported by a 5-year funding agreement with EPA.

One of Cofer's priorities as president has been to strengthen the association and to that end the Board of Directors have been reviewing and updating policy and procedures, providing strong liaisons to our partners, initiated a summer in-person board meeting to review strategic

STATE FIFRA ISSUES RESEARCH & EVALUATION GROUP (SFIREG)
FULL COMMITTEE MEETING
December 3-4, 2018
U.S. EPA, POTOMAC YARDS, CRYSTAL CITY, VA
MEETING MINUTES

planning and assessing progress on issues. AAPCO now has a formal Finance Committee that meet quarterly with the treasurer.

Currently AAPCO is accepting nominations for one full-term board member and one at-large board member. Cofer requested that the SFIREG representatives engage their states in sending in nominations, as the close date is December 14th.

AAPCO also is forming a Technology workgroup. They will look at issues related to unmanned aerial vehicles, but also other developments such as the use of robotics. The 25(b) workgroup is doing well. Cofer thanked Creger for his leadership of the Certification and Training workgroup and mentioned the workgroup's newsletter updates. Cofer also thanked Fleeson Trossbach for her strong liaison role on PPDC.

The AAPCO Spring Meeting will be March 3-6, 2019 in Alexandria, Va and the board is busy planning the conference.

PESTICIDE OPERATIONS AND MANAGEMENT (POM) WORKING COMMITTEE REPORT

Timothy Drake, SC, POM Chairperson

The fall EQI/POM Joint Working Committees meeting was planned for September 17-18, 2018, and an agenda was developed by Gary Bahr, Tim Drake, Liza Fleeson-Trossbach, and the Committees. The agenda was reviewed by Yvette Hopkins and other leadership at EPA Headquarters.

Following this process, a very powerful Category 4 hurricane developed, and was forecast to move in over the gulf coast of Florida and subsequently sweep through Alabama, Georgia, the Carolinas, and on up to Virginia and Washington, DC. The predicted date of impact to the Washington, DC area coincided with the scheduled JWC meeting days.

A phone conference was held on September 12th, and it was decided to cancel the JWC meeting because a state of emergency had been declared in the greater Washington, DC area by that time. The committee chairs and SFIREG chair felt it would be unwise to bring people to an area where dangerous weather conditions would be likely to occur. The meeting was not rescheduled for a later date because of ongoing hurricane response in several states in September and October, and the difficulty of finding a time this late in the year that would be suitable to all JWC members.

Current SLA members of the Pesticide Operations and Management Committee are: Jesse Cuevas (CA), Tim Drake (SC), Irene King (NM), Derrick Lastinger (GA), Megan Patterson (ME),

STATE FIFRA ISSUES RESEARCH & EVALUATION GROUP (SFIREG)
FULL COMMITTEE MEETING
December 3-4, 2018
U.S. EPA, POTOMAC YARDS, CRYSTAL CITY, VA
MEETING MINUTES

Robby Personette (WI), Robin Schoen-Nessa (WA), Dwight Seal (NC), and Matthew Sunseri (MN). There are no vacancies on the Committee at this time.

Several topics/issues that would have been addressed by the group at this meeting will be carried over to the spring JWC Meeting if not resolved prior to it. These are:

-The desire of AAPCO to have the JWC Meeting held in a location other than Crystal City for one of the two meetings each year. This would give the committees an opportunity to travel to a location that is dealing with an issue or issues of concern.

-The desire of AAPCO/SFIREG for POM to interact on a routine basis with EPA during the label review process and to serve as a resource for the EPA when making decisions related to label language, problematic labels, etc.

-Re-visit the structure of the meetings to determine if the current joint committee meetings still are beneficial or if the committees need to spend more time in separate committee (POM and EQI) meetings.

The POM Committee will have a series of conference calls in January and February to finish work on several tasks that are in-process and were to be finalized during the September meeting.

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ISSUES (EQI) WORKING COMMITTEE REPORT

Gary Bahr, WA, EQI Chairperson

EQI continues to work on the plant back restrictions and cover crops issue, and just finished a national survey.

The POINTS database is not supported any longer by EPA, but the reporting is still required in the grant guidance. EQI is hoping to pursue alternative options for the reporting and sharing of water quality information among states.

Regarding the Biological Opinions for chlorpyrifos, malathion and diazinon, EQI is trying to understand how to move forward and prepare for the potential RPA, RPM, the creation of pesticide stewardship efforts, and the use of the EPA ESA Bulletins Live.

EQI is working with EPA OPP and the USGS to utilize state surface water pesticide data in the water quality predictive models called SEAWAVEQ to assist in predicting concentrations in surface water and drinking water.

EQI is also asking EPA to review the current benchmarks to ensure they don't require updating.

STATE FIFRA ISSUES RESEARCH & EVALUATION GROUP (SFIREG)
FULL COMMITTEE MEETING
December 3-4, 2018
U.S. EPA, POTOMAC YARDS, CRYSTAL CITY, VA
MEETING MINUTES

BIOSTIMULANTS

Cary Giguere, VT

Biostimulants do not fit well into the current framework for pesticides or fertilizers, but seem to be a bit of both. Giguere is participating on a national workgroup trying to resolve the definition and regulatory issues. Some of the labels were shown to the committee.

Kachadoorian added that these products are increasing worldwide and that regulators are having difficulty classifying them.

Right now plant growth regulators are typically registered as pesticides.

Brian Verhougstraete, MI, reminded the committee that EPA was developing guidance related to biostimulants but the draft guidance hasn't been released yet. EPA's biostimulant guidance may be released within the next 90 days.

Drake questioned why these products are considered pesticides, and Kachadoorian clarified that while they may include nutrients (fertilizers) they also include plant growth regulators (pesticides) and microbes (pesticides). That is why they are difficult to classify.

Julie Spagnoli asked who organized the workgroup and it was clarified that USDA APHIS had brought the issue to the regulated community in an attempt to define the products. The US House of Representatives version of the Farm Bill also includes a definition and directs USDA to study the products.

DICAMBA – 2018 GROWING SEASON & 2019 REGISTRATION DECISION

Dan Kenny, EPA, OPP

Kenny began by stating that the registration has included many difficult decisions, and that EPA worked with a very diverse group of stakeholders. He summarized that 2016-2018 included many issues with off-target movement, and that the 2017 and 2018 seasons provided the most useful information needed to assess damage, scope, patterns, etc., and the difficulty of linking off-target movement to various factors.

EPA worked with farmers, researchers, registrants and the state regulators. They did site visits to many states including AR, IA, NE, GA, and TN.

EPA also heard of the need for and benefits of the technology.

Kenny stated that EPA regretted not being able to collaborate further with the states prior to having the registration decision finalized. He added that EPA was receiving information until

STATE FIFRA ISSUES RESEARCH & EVALUATION GROUP (SFIREG)
FULL COMMITTEE MEETING
December 3-4, 2018
U.S. EPA, POTOMAC YARDS, CRYSTAL CITY, VA
MEETING MINUTES

the last minute, and because of the complexity of the registration they missed their goal of making the decision earlier in the year.

EPA has extended the registration for two years, until December 2020. Kenny reviewed the changes to the labels. He also discussed the Bulletins Live component of the labels.

Upcoming research should focus on volatility, or the combination of volatility and drift; impacts to woody species, including long term damage; affects of pH on secondary movement; set up monitoring requirements; and effects on non-soybean crops and plants.

Kenny thanked the states for their partnership and emphasized that the agency wants to continue working closely together.

Tim Creger, NE, SFIREG Region 7 Representative

Creger began by offering up some questions from the Region 7 states. The Endangered Species buffer is new and the states in that region have not had labels that required using Bulletins Live before. Creger mentioned that the system does not tell the applicator the species or habitat being protected by the bulletin. That makes education efforts with the applicators more difficult. Kenny responded that the bulletins must be used if applicable regardless of species. The buffer must be adhered to no matter what. This is an overarching restriction. Creger stated that the question has come up because the applicators know that there are no listed plant species in the geographical boundaries of the bulletins, but there are insect species. Leslie Smith, TX, added that this same concern had been brought forward in Texas. Kenny responded that all organisms were assessed, although he thought that the bulletins were protecting plants. He said he would follow up with the EPA's endangered species staff.

Creger questioned the language on the labels regarding sensitive sites. He thought it would be the same language as on the previous labels, but it is not. It appears there are two standards, one addressing sites/areas, and one addressing sensitive crops.

Smith added that they have had trouble getting to the county level on the bulletins. In trying other web browsers it also took a very long time to download the county information (about 15 minutes) in an area with excellent service. This will likely be a difficult area for attaining compliance for users. She also added that the growers say 60 days on cotton is not long enough. She asked if Special Local Need registrations could allow longer application periods. Kenny responded that he wasn't sure but would talk with OPP staff.

Verhougstraete added that it was currently confusing if mixers and loaders needed to be certified, and would like EPA guidance. Kenny responded yes, they need to be certified.

STATE FIFRA ISSUES RESEARCH & EVALUATION GROUP (SFIREG)
FULL COMMITTEE MEETING
December 3-4, 2018
U.S. EPA, POTOMAC YARDS, CRYSTAL CITY, VA
MEETING MINUTES

Tony Cofer, AL, AAPCO President

Dicamba is an example of a product where the states flagged serious concerns prior to the EPA's registration of the product. It is frustrating when the registration is granted federally and then the concerns come to pass. This causes states to be in a reactionary position.

SFIREG is forming a workgroup with EPA, both OPP and OECA, to work on the undefined and imprecise language on the labels.

Cofer also added that the late registration decision means it will be difficult for states to accommodate the new information into the training season, including bulletins live training.

Cofer thanked the states for their dedication in providing information, especially in such a busy time. We will be asking for more money, including laboratory support.

Leo Reed, IN, added that investigating Dicamba cases had cost the state \$1.2 million dollars in staff time alone. This requires a reevaluation of the involvement of the states. Creger said that NE spent \$0.5 million dollars, which was not in the budget. Aside from the significant financial impacts, Creger stated the bigger issue moving forward was how to manage the issue. This situation erodes the credibility of the programs also, because routine inspections and other normal enforcement activities have not been occurring. Some states are wondering if they should begin ignoring Dicamba issues, as they cannot continue as they have the past couple of years, and have other important work to accomplish. Missouri is having similar issues, and lost half of their inspection staff this past season. The states want OECA to be involved because they need a National Enforcement Strategy.

Tom Gere, SD, echoed Creger, stating that about 2.5 million acres of soybeans were planted in South Dakota. There was a lot of protective planting. They spent over \$0.5 million dollars working on enforcement of the label, and assessing crop stage was especially difficult. The costs in both time and money take away from other programs, the inspectors are fatigued and they can't fulfill their commitments to other program areas. In South Dakota they have support from the Governor, Ag Retail Association, and the Soybean Board for a cut-off date to address the difficulty in assessing crop stage from an enforcement perspective.

Fleeson Trossbach let the committee know that the Dicamba Workgroup would begin the following week. They will be working on language definitions, impacts to programs, clarification of label vagueness, the Certified Applicators Only issues with mixing and loading (the Ag Retailers Association expressed support for this issue as well), and other issues. They will prioritize the issues and will likely divide the issue areas among workgroup members to facilitate moving forward as quickly as possible.

STATE FIFRA ISSUES RESEARCH & EVALUATION GROUP (SFIREG)
FULL COMMITTEE MEETING
December 3-4, 2018
U.S. EPA, POTOMAC YARDS, CRYSTAL CITY, VA
MEETING MINUTES

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL (OIG) REPORT – MEASURES AND MANAGEMENT CONTROLS NEEDED TO IMPROVE EPA’S PESTICIDE EMERGENCY EXEMPTION PROCESS

Bo Davis, EPA, OPP, RD

There was an Office of the Inspector General audit of the Section 18 program, with a report in July 2018. The agency has responded to the 8 recommendations and they are under internal review. Davis would like a lot more dialogue to make sure proposals meet the state’s needs, and wants to increase decision transparency in communication with the states.

1. Revise Section 18 website to include more detail on how to submit
2. Revise Section 18 database. This would include conversation with the states to determine if their needs are currently being met with the existing database and what revisions should occur.
3. The End-of-Year letter will continue, but Davis would like dialogue to determine if it needs changes.

Davis is hoping that the corrective actions will be signed off on, and then they can have dialogue with the states to determine how to implement the actions. Cofer added that the End-of Year letter is very helpful, and Drake requested that the webpage be easy to find on the EPA website.

When the corrective actions have been signed off on, Fleeson Trossbach will send them out to the SFIREG representatives to solicit comments.

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN PESTICIDE SAFETY EDUCATORS (AAPSE) REPORT

Kerry Richards, AAPSE President

AAPSE has a Sound Science and Decision Making committee that is focused on issues such as Dicamba.

They are reviewing their liaisons and other committee commitments at this time, and looking forward to the reorganization of CTAG. AAPSE’s Executive Committee and Board of Directors are meeting monthly now, and the minutes are posted on the website. AAPSE is currently considering if they should alternate annual meetings with PACT meetings.

Richards asked folks to reach out to her to discuss involvement on workgroups, and if there are other areas in which AAPSE should be involved.

SPECIAL LOCAL NEED REGISTRATIONS REVISED GUIDANCE

STATE FIFRA ISSUES RESEARCH & EVALUATION GROUP (SFIREG)
FULL COMMITTEE MEETING
December 3-4, 2018
U.S. EPA, POTOMAC YARDS, CRYSTAL CITY, VA
MEETING MINUTES

Tawanda Maignan, EPA/OPP and Rose Kachadoorian, OR

Kachadoorian began by detailing the timeline of the revision effort, starting in 2012. There have been a lot of conversations regarding transitions in the state agencies and the need for clear guidance.

Kachadoorian and Maignan would like comments on the structure of the document; the flow of the presentation of information; whether the content is valuable or too redundant; should there be more explanations of topic areas; is another appendix needed? Also, regarding tolerances, do the states need more definitions; more information on crop groupings and tolerances; do states understand general tolerances or regional tolerances?

The appendices describe types of special registrations, definitions, how to identify locations for 24(c)s, and how to get data to support the registrations.

The question of a 5-year expiration date was brought up and Maignan clarified that having a 5-year expiration date is policy but not regulation.

They have received comments from Nebraska and Colorado already. The cut off date for Kachadoorian to receive comments is December 18, 2018. She will then compile the comments and provide them to Maignan on January 2, 2019. Maignan is slated to discuss the guidance at the March AAPCO Annual Meeting.

The states in attendance expressed appreciation of the work put into the guidance, and thankfulness to have a resource like this. It was uniformly considered to be well constructed, needed, and useful.

FIFRA CONTINUING ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAM GRANT – DATABASE DEMONSTRATION

Dea Zimmerman, EPA, OPP, FEAD and Sandra O’Neill, EPA, OPP, FEAD

The effort to develop a better system for grant reporting began in 2011 to help streamline the Cooperative Agreement process. Since 2017 Zimmerman and O’Neill have been working on turning the current Excel file into a web-based system. So far they have had some beta testing done by states and received positive feedback. This web system is only for reporting, not for grant applications.

In the web-based system users will be able to copy existing data into a new project plan, and static reports will be available to print out. The platform used is CDX.

STATE FIFRA ISSUES RESEARCH & EVALUATION GROUP (SFIREG)
FULL COMMITTEE MEETING
December 3-4, 2018
U.S. EPA, POTOMAC YARDS, CRYSTAL CITY, VA
MEETING MINUTES

Production goes live on January 11, 2019 for use on FY20 reporting. There will be training, including 2 webinars for the states, and a recorded webinar for folks that can't make the live webinars. Regional offices will also be trained and will be the point of contact for states in each region. A user manual will also be available.

FEDERAL CERTIFICATION OF PESTICIDE APPLICATORS RULE

Tim Creger, NE, SFIREG Region 7 Representative

Creger is chairing AAPCO's C&T workgroup, with state members representing each of EPA's 10 regions. They are trying to put together guidance on the rule for both PSEPs and SLAs. They still need an appropriate set of guidelines and policy for interpretation of the final rule. They are also considering how state constraints play into EPA's review.

Jeanne Kasai, EPA/OPP added that there is an EPA workgroup consisting of the Office of General Counsel, OECA, OPP, and EPA regions and they are talking through the process. They are developing a template that addresses regulator requirements, reference documents, and a FAQs document. These materials are on their way to the Assistant Administrator's office for review. It is hoped that the materials will be available to states by the end of January 2019.

Anne Overstreet, who has replaced Kevin Keaney at EPA, added that a checklist with old and new regulatory language will also be available.

LaScola emphasized that the states need these materials as soon as possible, and Verhougstraete asked that this be an action item to request the release of the documents. Creger and Cofer will coordinate a letter to EPA to that end. Creger stated that this late date means that some states will not have necessary regulations in place, adding that some states will not develop and submit plans until they have all of the information provided by EPA. Kasai further clarified that when states submit their intentions, EPA needs a timeline of milestones, but does not require that the state regulations be in place at that point.

The process will be that an overview of changes will be submitted to the regions by the states. This should be completed by the end of the year. The states will work with the regional C&T lead. The Regional Administrator will ultimately approve the plans. Fleeson Trossbach emphasized that the regions should approach this process as uniformly as possible across the country.

When the documents are released Kasai will share them with AAPCO for posting on the website.

**STATE FIFRA ISSUES RESEARCH & EVALUATION GROUP (SFIREG)
FULL COMMITTEE MEETING
December 3-4, 2018
U.S. EPA, POTOMAC YARDS, CRYSTAL CITY, VA
MEETING MINUTES**

There will also be a PREP course on this coming up. The PREP course will accept all 50 states and a representative from each of the 10 EPA regions, and will focus on revision of plans.

PESTICIDE REGULATORY EDUCATION PROGRAM (PREP) REPORT

Carol Black, WSU

See attached report

REGIONAL REPORTS

SFIREG Committee Members

See attached reports

ASSOCIATION OF STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL REGULATORY OFFICIALS (ASPCRO) REPORT

Irene King, NMDA, ASPCRO Vice President

King began by thanking Linda Johns, MT, for all of her hard work and dedication to ASPCRO. She also thanked Leslie Smith, TX for hosting ASPCRO's annual meeting in San Antonio, TX this past August. ASPCRO had record attendance at the meeting. Spray foam emerged as a significant issue during the conference.

Derrick Lastinger, GA and the National Pest Management Association put on a non-soil fumigation training in Delaware this past year for EPA staff.

The Structural Remediation committee is working on a wiki site for structural remediation. ASPCRO hopes to present it in August 2019 at their annual meeting.

ASPCRO submitted a C&T letter to the OPP director, requesting the Q&A document and template be made public as soon as possible so that the states could understand the process better.

Kelly Friend, FL and David Wayne, KY are new board members.

The mid-year meeting will be in Minneapolis, MN April 1-2, 2019.
The annual meeting will be held in Franklin, TN August 28-30 and will include a pest management tour.

TRIBAL PESTICIDE PROGRAM COUNCIL (TPPC) REPORT

Fred Corey, Aroostook Band of Micmacs

STATE FIFRA ISSUES RESEARCH & EVALUATION GROUP (SFIREG)
FULL COMMITTEE MEETING
December 3-4, 2018
U.S. EPA, POTOMAC YARDS, CRYSTAL CITY, VA
MEETING MINUTES

In October 2018 the TPPC held their meeting at Gila River. Three issues emerged as priorities:

1. EPA's risk assessments need to include tribal cultural activities.
2. TPPC wants to see more direct implementation for tribes by EPA.
3. Work on the Status of Pesticides in Indian Country report. This is a compendium of issues and challenges tribes face related to pesticides. They hope to have the report ready in March 2019.

The Tribal PREP held at Fort Peck, MT was well attended and well received.

TPPC will next meet concurrently with AAPCO in March 2019.

The Fall Meeting will be held in October 2019, hosted by the Yakima Nation.

TPPC is currently bringing some new tribes into TPPC and are working on identifying training needs.

December 4, 2018, 8:30 am

INGREDIENT TRANSPARENCY

Diane Isbell, EPA, OPP, AD and Anthony Lamanno, NY, Region 2 Representative

Lamanno discussed the issue of including inert ingredients on labels, which has been requested by retailers and required by a new CA law. State programs had an issue because of the workload requirements; conflicts with current regulations; concerns that partial disclosure can be misleading; naming conventions are difficult to manage; and CBI issues. They considered a Pesticide Registration Notice to resolve the issues, but are currently waiting for EPA to determine how the issue will be dealt with.

Ed White, IN, added that the term 'inert' is likely misleading to consumers, as many inerts are not actually inert.

Fleeson Trossbach thanked Lamanno for leading the state workgroup.

Isbell reviewed the current requests for ingredient transparency and said that EPA has defaulted to CA law requirements. She provided a slide, which is attached to the minutes. EPA does not have a solution to the issue at this time. Currently the Label Review Manual is the guide.

Begin referred an issue to Region 3 because Walmart tried to register a citronella candle that did not have a pesticidal claim on it. The states were split on how to handle that situation in registration.

STATE FIFRA ISSUES RESEARCH & EVALUATION GROUP (SFIREG)
FULL COMMITTEE MEETING
December 3-4, 2018
U.S. EPA, POTOMAC YARDS, CRYSTAL CITY, VA
MEETING MINUTES

POLLINATOR PROTECTION ACTIVITIES

Deanna Colby, EPA, OPP, RD and Liza Fleeson Trossbach, VA, SFIREG Chairperson

Fleeson Trossbach reviewed the MP3 development process including the flexibility inherent in MP3s. She discussed the critical elements of an MP3 and the metrics for evaluation. At this time PPDC has developed recommendations for EPA to consider related to the state MP3s, which have been accepted by EPA. They have created a 28-question survey including both qualitative and quantitative questions, which will be distributed to the states by AAPCO. The survey is not yet final.

Colby thanked the states and said they are looking forward to moving ahead and continuing the dialogue after the survey results are aggregated. This may be next year.

LABORATORY DIRECTORS COMMITTEE LIAISON REPORT

Mike Stage, AR, SFIREG Lab Directors Liaison

Stage informed the committee of upcoming laboratory workshops: FY 19 Pesticide Residue workshop to be held in Florida; FY 20 Formulations workshop in Nevada; and FY 21 Pesticide Residue workshop to be held in Michigan.

PESTICIDE PROGRAM DIALOGUE COMMITTEE (PPDC) REPORT

Liza Fleeson Trossbach, AAPCO Liaison to PPDC

Please see attached presentation.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE DEPARTMENTS OF AGRICULTURE (NASDA) ACTION ITEM – STAG FUNDING

Aline DeLucia, NASDA and Tony Cofer, AL, AAPCO President

Cofer began by outlining his priorities as AAPCO President, which included increasing the STAG funding states receive in their PPGs. He started the discussion with NASDA about funding and wanted to partner with them to assist us, especially as Cooperative Federalism has been more recognized in recent years.

The Alabama Commissioner introduced a resolution to that effect at SASDA. It passed and then went to NASDA where it also passed and is now an action item. This directs NASDA's staff to make increasing STAG funding in the PPGs a priority. NASDA will urge EPA to increase state and tribal funding.

STATE FIFRA ISSUES RESEARCH & EVALUATION GROUP (SFIREG)
FULL COMMITTEE MEETING
December 3-4, 2018
U.S. EPA, POTOMAC YARDS, CRYSTAL CITY, VA
MEETING MINUTES

DeLucia further explained that she has added STAG funding to her policy priorities, which means she will spend 50% of her time working on it. It may take up to three years to resolve. She added that her other priorities include Endangered Species Act issues, WPS and C&T, PRIA, and Biostimulants. Creger also offered that it has been beneficial to partner with ECOS and other similar associations in the past on similar efforts.

NATIONAL PESTICIDE SAFETY EDUCATION CENTER UPDATE (NPSEC)

Kerry Richards, NPSEC

Richards let the committee know that the NPSEC store has Pesticide Safety Education Materials for sale, including many of the PERC resources. She also informed the committee of NPSEC's Meeting Grant award by EPA which will support a PACT meeting every two years.

FULL SFIREG CONSIDERATION OF REGIONAL ISSUE & WHITE PAPERS

Full SFIREG Committee Members

1. The session began with the Commodity Fumigation Paper. Drake believes at this time that the issue is only relevant in Region 4 states after a national survey did not show it to be a national issue. Drake withdrew the issue and the Region 4 states will work on it with the Region 4 office, and report back on their efforts at the next meeting.
2. Verhougstraete had reviewed the Integrated Collection and Transfer of Information and Evidence Collection paper during his Region 5 report the preceeding day. There was discussion about it being for federal inspections only, and Creger recommended sending it to POM for further consideration. The committee agreed and voted unanimously to send it to POM.
3. McHugh detailed the Region 9 24(c) Cannabis Pesticide Use paper. In discussion it was pointed out that there is a new attorney general as well as a new EPA administrator, and the issue has been determined in part by those positions. Currently FDA is also working on the issue. There is also a new Assistant Administrator coming on board for EPA who may be amendable to 24(c)s on Cannabis. Messina said that given the concerns with medical use, there is probably some room to continue working on it.

Fleeson Trossbach called for a vote, resulting in: 2 members suggesting the issue be referred to POM; 5 members asking for further clarification from EPA and moving it to POM; and 2 members saying the paper should be formalized and sent to EPA. The committee will pursue the second option at this time.

**STATE FIFRA ISSUES RESEARCH & EVALUATION GROUP (SFIREG)
FULL COMMITTEE MEETING
December 3-4, 2018
U.S. EPA, POTOMAC YARDS, CRYSTAL CITY, VA
MEETING MINUTES**

Action items were reviewed and the meeting was adjourned at 11:30 am.