

Report to SFIREG (June 2023): Activities of the Environmental Quality Issues (EQI) Working Committee.

Hotze Wijnja, EQI Chair, Massachusetts Department of Agricultural Resources

Submitted May 31, 2023

EQI Committee Members

The EQI Working Committee is focused on issues related to water quality, human health and the environment, risk assessments, and technical aspects of the implementation of pesticide programs.

Current EQI members are James Cooper (FL), Beth Dittman (NC), Rajinder Mann (MN), Kathryn Rifenburg (OR), David Scott (IN), Mary Tomlinson (ME), and Christina Zimmerman (WA).

Summary of EQI Activities:

EQI met virtually several times to discuss the work on various topics related to the JWC and Full SFIREG meetings. The Spring Joint Working Committee (JWC) meeting was held on April 17-18, 2023, in Arlington, VA. The POM and EQI committees had joint sessions and a breakout session to discuss issues in detail within each committee. Summary notes of the April JWC meeting are included further below.

Status of Selected Topics and Tasks (since December 2022):

- **Mosquito Control Mist Blower Use in Residential Settings:** Status: draft issue paper
 - In 2022, a white paper on the issues related to drift from the target site to their adjacent non-target property was submitted to EPA-OPP. Concerns include potential direct and indirect exposures and risk to humans and pets, and to pollinators. Use directions and restrictions for mosquito control are confusing, minimal, or completely nonexistent. In the white paper, EQI requested clarification on whether the mosquito adulticide registration risk assessments included nontarget risks from drift exposures, specifically related to the application with the power mist blowers that are currently being used with adulticide applications to residential properties.
 - EPA-OPP provided a response to the draft issue paper. Based on the response, EQI decided that the white paper should be revised and updated into a formal issue paper for consideration by SFIREG. EQI continues to have concerns regarding the labeling of products for this use pattern, such as the absence of language to protect people, and the lack of

guidance on how SLA's can properly address issues related to the issues with this use pattern. At the meeting in December of 2022, SFIREG supported this effort.

- The draft issue paper is provided to SFIREG at the current meeting for consideration and support. The issue paper points out that, unlike product labels for agricultural use pesticides regulated under the federal Worker Protection Standard (WPS), residential use pesticide label directions do not include restrictions that protect non applicator humans from direct exposure from spray or drift. Likewise, residential use product labels do not have requirements designed to protect humans or pets from exposure to drifted upon surfaces before the drift residues have dried. Intentionally treated target areas are addressed on labels but *drifted upon* nontarget areas are not. The significance of human and pet exposures through *direct drift* or *contact with wet* nontarget areas has become a greater concern now that application technologies are being used that have a greater potential to drift.
- As proposed remedies, the issue paper specifies use directions and restrictions to be added to residential mosquito control product labels that would: (1) not allow applications in a way that will contact any person or pet either directly or through drift, (2) not allow adults, children, or pets to contact pesticide exposed surfaces until target treatment and adjacent areas have completely dried, and (3) not apply the product in a manner that allows spray to drift to adjacent off-target areas. Furthermore, the restrictions should apply to all residential product labels that allow application technologies that result in drift and off-target application.
- **Methomyl Fly Bait: Survey on misuse incidents:** Status: ongoing effort
 - A survey was sent out to SLAs earlier this year. Nineteen (19) responses were received. The results were discussed at the JWC meeting. Comments and suggestions included:
 - The survey results indicate that misuse of this pesticide continues to occur.
 - Additional data, such as sales data would be helpful to get better insight in 'RUP' use versus 'General' use. We could reach out to Retail Association (ARA) and distributors.
 - Reach out to registrant(s) to find out what kind information we can get.
 - Compare the latest survey results with the 2020 survey results ([michigan-methomyl-survey 2020.pdf](#)) and consider a previous issue paper on this topic ([Methomyl issue paper 2013.pdf](#))
 - Consider options to request an amendment of EPA's interim decision on methomyl.

- **Treated Seed Regulation Issue Paper:** Status: Awaiting formal response
 - The Treated Seeds issue paper was submitted to EPA on August 31, 2022 ([Treated Seed Issue Paper](#) and [Cover Letter](#)).
 - At the time of drafting this report, SFIREG and EQI had not received a formal response to this issue paper. However, EPA has indicated that it is in the final stages of preparing a response and it is expected to be shared shortly.
 - EPA has indicated that the Issue Paper response will consider their response to the petition ([EPA Responds to Treated Seed Petition | US EPA](#)) and clarify questions and aspects not already addressed in the petition response.

- **Pesticides of Interest Tracking System (POINTS) follow-up:** Status: Ongoing effort
 - For states that are interested in obtaining historic data in POINTS, it could be suggested to login the system and generate the reports of interest.
 - EQI could facilitate this by providing a demo through Teams or other remote webinar options.
 - EQI is reaching out to Washington State University and persons involved with previous efforts on using the system (such as PREP course materials)
 - Such training materials could be used to provide POINTS system instruction for states that are interested in retrieving data captured in POINTS.

- **Water Quality Data Reporting:** Status: Ongoing effort
 - The relevance of monitoring data on water quality and pesticides is getting recognized again in the context of ESA mitigation efforts.
 - To facilitate data sharing, it was suggested to request from EPA a webinar on the use of the Water Quality Exchange (WQX).
 - EQI is in the process of reaching out to EPA.

- **Cover crop and Plant Back Issue Paper follow-up:** Status: Ongoing effort
 - During the discussion on the follow-up to cover crops and plant back issue paper, it was suggested to update the Label Review Manual with the new cover crop definitions provided in EPA's response to the issue paper. EQI is looking into to this and reaching out to EPA.
 - EQI is also following efforts with meetings with USDA and other stakeholders regarding cover crop and plant back aspects as described in the issue paper.

- **ESA and Pesticides:** Status: Following developments
 - At the April JWC meeting, EPA and USDA Office of Pest Management Policy presented on the efforts related to ESA and Pesticides. EPA provided an update on the workplan pilot projects implementation, and various efforts on developing early mitigation measures.

USDA-OMP presented on their interaction with EPA, and OMP's consulting with NRCS on FIFRA mitigation measure. NRCS is an excellent resource for growers related to various conservation efforts and thereby can be a useful resource in the context of certain ESA mitigation measures. However, there are limitations in the use of NRCS guidance and technical assistance programs given that they don't have regulatory mandates of enforcement, and there is a lack of technical or local support for these measures.

- EQI will consider opportunities to contribute to comments and feedback on certain aspects of related to proposed mitigation measures.

- **PFAS and Pesticides:** Status: Following developments
 - EQI continues to follow the developments related to PFAS and pesticides. EPA provided updates during the April JWC meeting, including:
 - EPA's PFAS Strategic Roadmap; Progress with the National Testing Strategy,
 - Updated PFAS definition as used under TSCA ([Per--and-poly-fluoroalkyl-chemical-substances-designated-as-inactive-on-the-tsca-inventory](#));
 - Four pesticides fall under this expanded PFAS definition:
 - Broflanilide
 - Pyriproxyfen
 - Tetraconazole
 - Hexaflumuron
 - Registration status of these pesticides is not affected but EPA will conduct additional review of potential degradates.
 - Relative to pesticide inerts that were identified as PFAS, 12 were removed from the list of inert ingredients, while there are two that are still being used.
 - Overview of laboratory testing progress and analytical method development.
 - Additional testing results were expected to be released in May 2023.
 - Information can be found at [Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances \(PFAS\) in Pesticide and Other Packaging | US EPA](#).

 - EQI has been following developments and updates related to a 2022 study that reported relatively high levels of PFOS in a number of insecticide products ([Journal of Hazardous Materials Sept 2022](#)). On May 30th, EPA released results of follow-up work on EPA's verification analysis of this study. EPA evaluated the 10 pesticide products included in this study using two different test methods to detect PFAS. EPA tested all samples using both methods and did not detect the presence of PFOS, nor any of 28 additional PFAS it screened for. One of the most important differences between the two methods is that EPA's method ensures accurate measuring of PFAS by eliminating interference from the oils and surfactants present in these formulations which can result in false positive detections.

- EQI has also taken note the recent PFAS test results released recently by the Center for Biological Diversity that showed detections of several agricultural pesticides ([PFAS Letter to EPA \(biologicaldiversity.org\)](#)). This is another example of a study that attempted to test for PFAS in pesticides using existing laboratory services. As indicated by EPA testing mentioned above, existing laboratory methods can result in erroneous results for PFAS in pesticide products.
- **Additional topics of interest:**
 - EQI continues to follow several other topics that have been considered and discussed, including developments related to Dicamba, Chlorpyrifos, ESA and pesticides, Registration Review related items, Rodenticides PIDs, Atrazine, EDSP,

Meeting Notes on the April 17-18, 2023 Joint Working Committee meeting:

Combined POM and EQI Meeting notes:

Meeting Notes on Topics Discussed and Presented at the April 2023 JWC Meeting:

Special thanks to Pat Jones (NC) for assisting with the audio-visual equipment and Sydney Ross (NC) for also helping with the AV and taking detailed notes at the meeting.

Please refer to the meeting materials for papers and presentations from the Spring JWC meeting on the AAPCO website <https://aapco.org/2015/07/29/working-committees/> compiled by Amy Sullivan, AAPCO Executive Secretary. An outline of the various topics/presentations covered in the POM and JWC joint sessions are as follows:

POM/EQI Joint Meeting:

- AAPCO President updates (Liza Fleeson Trossbach, VA, Past President)
- SFIREG Chair updates (Gary Bahr, WA)
- Office of Pesticide Programs (OPP) Update (Ed Messina, US EPA)
- Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assistance (OECA) Update (Kelly Engle, US EPA)
- **Dicamba** (Hotze Wijnja, MA, Amy Brown, FL, and Andrew Muench, Cathryn Britton, EPA Pesticide Re-evaluation Division (PRD), and Sarah Meadows, EPA Registration Division (RD)
 - Sarah Meadows, EPA provided an update and stated that EPA has been having calls with Dicamba states

- Andrew Muench, EPA provided an update on registration review
 - Revised human health and draft ecological risk assessments were posted comments closed October 2022
 - 746 comments were received and are currently being reviewed
 - Comments available on registration.gov
<https://www.regulations.gov/docket/EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0223>
 - Next step is the PID comment period, EPA will be considering early risk mitigations
 - Currently EPA is working on an herbicide strategy for ESA

- **Pesticide Registration Improvement Act (PRIA) 5 – Bilingual labeling** (Hotze Wijnja, MA, Amy Brown, FL and Elissa Reaves, Linda Arrington, Susan Bartow (PRD) and Steve Schaible (OCSP) and Megan Provost, Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment (RISE))
 - Elissa Reaves, EPA gave an update on PRIA 5-Specifically to Bilingual Labeling
 - PRIA 5 signed into law December 29, 2022
 - Spanish language translation required on the label or available electronically
 - EPA Spanish Translation Guide for Pesticide Labeling will serve as a guideline for registrants [Spanish Translation Guide for Pesticide Labeling | US EPA](#)
 - There are two exceptions: antimicrobial and non-agricultural use products (not RUP) can comply by providing a link to the safety data sheets (SDS)
 - Stakeholder input required on how to make the bilingual labels accessible to farmworkers – National Webinar on June 15, 2023
 - Deadline for first stakeholder engagement is June 2023 (Engaging with SFIREG/JWC counts towards this)
 - Many other deadlines presented through 2030, RUPs due first (December 2025)
 - There is currently a large Spanish labeling team working on the Bilingual label requirements
 - There will be an email box to use for ideas and questions
 - Megan Provost, RISE, Chair PRIA Coalition, gave an update from their perspective
 - Scannable Technology/QR Codes on labels to link to translation
 - SDS exception not available for non-agricultural RUPs
 - PRIA 5 does not require the entire label to be translated on the parts required in the EPA Spanish Translation Guide for Pesticide Labeling
 - EPA must consult with the states regarding implementation
 - There are no enforcement provisions, only subject to FIFRA
 - There is a lot of concern from States regarding this topic, especially since label revisions will be done through non-notification

- **A Modern Approach to EPA and FDA Product Oversight – Whitepaper** (Hotze Wijnja, MA, Amy Brown, FL and Dee Colby (RD))
 - Dee Colby, EPA provided an overview of the purpose of the Whitepaper
 - The paper has been in the works for a long time, the paper can be found at [US EPA - WHITEPAPER: A Modern Approach to EPA and FDA Product Oversight](#)
 - March 22, 2023, FDA and EPA had a meeting for public feedback
 - Public comment period ends April 24th
<https://www.regulations.gov/docket/EPA-HQ-OPP-2023-0103>
 - Goal is that only one agency regulates
 - Current approach is 50 years old and outdated
 - EPA lacks the staff with the expertise to regulate products like pet collars and topically applied products
 - Additionally, the new paradigm is focused on pet products that control ectoparasites on animals, not just on if they enter the bloodstream of the pet
 - There were concerns raised over will this impact beekeepers; Dee Colby, EPA, responded that they may address honeybee products in the future, they noticed the concern from beekeepers in the comments and are interested in their comments. The focus currently is on the pet products and genetically engineered products (e.g., GE mosquitos)
 - There were also concerns raised about down the drain products affecting water quality, more EPA than FDA, how will FDA deal with this in its framework? Dee Colby, EPA responded, perhaps not specifically for wash water, but FDA does have an assessment program, this came up as a comment in the public comment period; both sides are concerned that making sure that safety is addressed.
- **Laboratory Presentation** (Hotze Wijnja, MA, Amy Brown, FL, and Jona Verreth, Montana Department of Agriculture)
 - Jona Verreth MT, gave a presentation on the challenges associated with testing of Minimum Risk Pesticides (25b) products
 - He suggested that if testing is important to regulators, then we should set up a 25b working group to answer these questions
 - Sarah Caffery (POM, IN), Chair of the AAPCO 25b workgroup, plans to connect with Jona regarding the needs

- **Endangered Species Act (ESA)** (Hotze Wijnja, MA, Amy Brown, FL, Gretchen Paluch, IA and Elissa Reaves, Melanie Biscoe, Tracy Perry, Ricardo Jones (PRD), and Jan Matuszko, Brian Anderson Environmental Fate and Effects Division (EFED) and Elyssa Arnold, USDA Office of Pest Management Policy)
 - Jan Matuszko, EPA, gave an overview of the workplan pilot projects implementation and progress
 - Completed final BE for sulfoxaflor
 - Completed draft risk assessments consistent with ESA for two new AIs
 - Completed ESA review pilots for the rodenticides, methomyl and carbaryl
 - Currently working on the Neonicotinoids
 - Currently working on Herbicide strategy
 - Elissa Reaves, EPA, gave an update on the ESA Workplan Appendix
 - Focus is on early mitigation
 - Received 100 substantive comments
 - Also received detailed comments from the AAPCO ESA workgroup and EPA would like to continue working with the group.
 - Top three themes from stakeholder comments
 - Consistency with practices
 - Required mitigation measures to be effective
 - Currently drafting mitigations for pilot species
 - More engagement with EPA upfront
 - EPA is not planning to respond to comments, will address them going forward
 - Registration review deadline extended to October 2026 to align with ESA strategies
 - Elyssa Arnold, USDA Office of Pest Management Policy gave a presentation on Natural Resources and Conservation Service (NRCS), who they are and their perspective on use of National Practices Standards information in mitigation measures
 - They are not part of NRCS, but works closely with them and NRCS approved the presentation
 - Gretchen Paluch, IA, APPCO ESA Workgroup Co-Chair gave an overview of the new workgroup's activities, including:
 - Interest in working with EQI to look at the surface water run off statements (ecological mitigation statements, Koc verbiage);

- looking at ways to communicate and information sharing of with states that have robust water monitoring programs and how that information can be shared to EPA.
 - Note: the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s (FWS) draft biological opinion (BiOp) for Enlist products is out for public comment and is due July 24th. [Biological Opinions Available for Public Comment and Links to Final Opinions | US EPA](#) (this was announced after the JWC meeting)
- **Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program (EDSP)** (Hotze Wijnja, MA, Amy Brown, FL, and Scott Lynn (OCSPP))
 - Scott Lynn, EPA gave a presentation of the EDSP program and recent developments described in the white paper “Availability of New Approach Methodologies (NAMs) in the Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program (EDSP)”
 - History of EDSP program and challenges
 - Development and evaluation of high-throughput (HT) *in vitro* assays and *in silico* methods as new approach methodologies (NAMs), including databases and computational models, for use as alternatives to the current suite of assays in the EDSP Tier 1 battery to accelerate the pace of screening, add efficiencies, decrease costs, and reduce animal testing
 - More information available at: [Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program \(EDSP\) | US EPA](#)
- **SFIREG Public Comment Process and Issue Paper Follow-up** (Gary Bahr, WA, SFIREG Chair, Hotze Wijnja, MA, Amy Brown, FL)
 - Gary Bahr, WA, SFIREG Chair, gave an overview of the public comment process, how we could organize the process and the need for a better way to track submitted comments/issue papers:
 - SFIREG started discussions at the December 2022 meeting for process improvements for SFIREG and SLAs to provide comments to EPA
 - Developing comments is time consuming • Quality comments are important
 - Involve SFIREG, JWC, SLAs, AAPCO, work groups, others to discuss these issues and coordinate on developing comments.
 - Establish a tracking and document system • Utilize the Non-Profit Licensing of Microsoft Office 365 with TEAMs and TEAMs Channels

POM Session included:

- **Pesticide Devices** (Amy Brown, FL, Sarah Caffery, IN, POM committee members and Kristen Willis, Antimicrobial Division (AD))
 - Kristin Willis, EPA addressed the AAPCO Pesticide Devices Making Public Health Claims issue paper from 2019
 - EPA is working on a formal response, COVID 19 health crisis caused serious delays, but there is no timeline for a response
 - New compliance advisory issued February 2023 related to devices
 - https://www.epa.gov/system/files/documents/2023-03/pesticide_device_compliance_advisory.pdf
 - Updated the device guide for consumers webpage which provides guidance related to producing, distributing, and selling pesticidal devices
 - <https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/pesticide-devices-guide-consumers>
 - Workgroup to update PRN 76
 - PRIA 5: Development of Public Health Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Pesticide Devices
 - Provided \$500k for the next five years; expected outcome to include scientific sound methods for development of performance standards related to devices that produce a substance
 - Committee expressed concerns over devices making health claims, the lack of guidance for SLAs and the M009 code/process (PRIA)
 - EPA is working on guidance for SLAs
 - EPA From a research perspective EPA can't take on everything, but we are looking to make clarification for those that are pesticides/ making pesticidal claims
 - Sarah Caffrey (IN) gave a presentation on Indiana's experiences and concerns over devices
 - There was more discussion and concerns raised over the lack of response from EPA regarding the AAPCO Pesticide Devices Making Public Health Claims issue paper from 2019
 - For now, POM will wait on the official response
- **Paraquat FAQs revisions** (Amy Brown, FL, Kristia Thomas, SD, and POM committee members)
 - Kristia Thomas (SD) gave an overview of the custom blender question that was added
 - EPA PRD reviewed the question and answer, they had no issues with the response
 - All POM members present were in favor of adding the question and revising the FAQ

- Amy Brown will make the final revision and send to Amy Sullivan for posting on the AAPCO website
- **AAPCO 24c guidance revisions** (Amy Brown, FL, Sarah Caffery, IN, Morgan Griffith, VT and POM committee members)
 - Sarah Caffery, IN, Morgan Griffith, VT presented the new 2023 draft
 - The committee reviewed the draft in real time and answered questions identified by Sarah and Morgan
 - Amy Brown will schedule a separate meeting to finish reviewing and finalizing the draft before submitting it to EPA for review
- **Additional Discussion**
 - Pet Product Questions response from EPA
 - EPA provided answers to the Pet product issues from previous meetings, forwarded to AAPCO members by Amy Sullivan on 3/3/23
 - Amy Brown asked that the committee review the response

POM/EQI Joint Meeting:

- **PFAS** (Hotze Wijnja, MA, Amy Brown, FL, and Anne Overstreet (BEAD), Jeff Dawson (OCSP))
 - Jeff Dawson, EPA started the presentation giving a detailed update on the National Testing Strategy and progress
 - OPPT working definition - [Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances \(PFAS\) in Pesticide and Other Packaging | US EPA](#)
 - The PFAS working definition was expanded and went from 2 pesticide active ingredients to 4 A.I.s
 - Broflanilide (new pesticide)
 - Pyriproxyfen
 - Tetraconazole
 - Hexaflumuron
 - EPA is looking at their degradates
 - Currently this is not affecting their registration status
 - Anne Overstreet, EPA gave an overview of leaching testing progress and additional testing results should be released in May 2023
 - Results can be found at [Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances \(PFAS\) in Pesticide and Other Packaging | US EPA](#)

- **Rodenticides** (Hotze Wijnja, MA, Amy Brown, FL and Melissa Grable, Dana Friedman, Steven Peterson, Kent Fothergill, Anna Senninger, Julie Javier, Susan Bartow (PRD)
 - Melissa Grable, EPA gave an update of the registration review progress for the rodenticides including mitigations and ESA pilot species
 - Public comment period for the 4 PIDs closed February 13, 2023
 - Draft BEs should be out for public comment November 2023, "Rodenticide Strategy" will make recommendations to reduce exposure
 - Final BEs expected to be completed in 2024, will then initiate consultation with the Services
 - Final ID expected to be completed in 2024
 - Path forward, EPA received 22,000 public comments from the PIDs
 - Concerns include cost passed down to the consumers, RUP status, plastic waste due to single use only for consumers, crop loss, carcass search and PPE
 - Reviewing comments, holding stakeholder meetings and consulting with the Rodenticide Task Force, FWC, CDC, USDA and FDA

- **Chlorpyrifos and other Organophosphate's (OP) Petition Updates; OP Registration Review Schedule** (Hotze Wijnja, MA, Amy Brown, FL and Melissa Grable, Dana Friedman, Trish Biggio, Alex Feitel, Anna Romanovsky, Kelly Sherman (PRD) and Royan Teter, Christine Trostler (OECA)
 - Melissa Grable, EPA provided an update on the **Chlorpyrifos topic**
 - Most registrants have submitted requests to voluntarily remove food uses
 - Notice of Intent to Cancel (NOIC) was issued to Gharda for 3 products on December 14, 2022
 - Gharda and grower groups challenged EPA's tolerance revocation on decision – filed with the Eighth Circuit Court on December 15, 2022
 - Gharda and grower groups requested hearing and requested a stay on January 13, 2023, this was denied on March 31st
 - Gharda and grower groups filed an appeal on April 10th, no decision on the appeal as of today (April 18th)
 - BiOP NMFS completed on June 30, 2022, label revisions with mitigations measures are currently being reviewed by EPA, Due on Dec 30, 2023 (18 months)
 - Return programs
 - EPA working with registrants; not authorized yet

- Final Cancellation order will be issued shortly
 - Disposing or relabeling, EPA will advise states
 - Updates will be provided to SLAs and the FAQ [Chlorpyrifos | US EPA](#)
- **Note: After the meeting Alex Mckee, EPA provided the following summary:**
- There are 2 chlorpyrifos Federal Register notices publishing this week in the following docket: <https://www.regulations.gov/docket/EPA-HQ-OPP-2022-0223>
 - The one that may be of most interest is FRL 10924, Cancellation Order for Certain Chlorpyrifos Registrations and Uses, May 4, 2023:
 - This is the final cancellation order that follows the December 13, 2022, Federal Register Notice of Receipt of Requests to voluntarily cancel or amend certain product registrations
 - It includes the cancellation of 14 products (Corteva and Winfield) and three Adama products with use cancellations, and initiates return programs for Adama and Corteva products
 - Adama and Corteva requested that EPA allow for the return of existing stocks that are in the hands of end users and distributors. EPA approved the return program agreements on April 19, 2023 and Adama and Corteva were notified of the approval of their return program agreements the following day (April 20, 2023). Additional information can be found in the docket ([EPA-HQ-OPP-2021-0523](#)) or by contacting the registrants: Adama (866) 406-6262; ordergroup@adama.com and Corteva (800) 258-3033
 - EPA published FRL 10923 Intent to Cancel Certain Pesticide Registrations and Amend Registrations to Terminate Certain Uses: Chlorpyrifos on May 3, 2023:
 - This is a notice of receipt of requests by registrants to voluntarily cancel their registrations of certain products containing the pesticide chlorpyrifos, or to amend their chlorpyrifos registrations to terminate one or more uses. This order includes the cancellation of eight products (Control Solutions, Tide, and Nufarm) and four products (Adama and AAKO) with use cancellations.
 - One of the registrants is interested in a return program and the Agency is working with that registrant to review their return program.
- Anna Romanovsky, EPA gave the **OPs with possible tolerance revocation Petition and registration review Update**

- The Petition requested that EPA revoke all tolerances and cancel all associated registrations for food uses for 15 OPs.
 - Docket EPA-HQ-OPP-2022-0490 – comment period I ended September 2022
 - 50,000 comments received
 - EPA does not have a date for response to petition
 - The revised registration review schedule was just published, search for cases in the schedule for OPs [Upcoming Registration Review Actions | US EPA](#)

- **Certification & Training – Update** (Carolyn Schroeder (PRD))
 - Carolyn Schroeder, EPA provided an update on C & T

- **Technology Workgroup – Update** (Dwight Seal, NC, Committee Chair)
 - Dwight Seal, NC presented on the AAPCO Technology Workgroup

- **CLA Registration Review Workgroup - – Update** (Sarah Caffery, IN and Mary Tomlinson, ME)
 - Sarah Caffery, IN gave an update on the Crop Life America Registration Review Workgroup activities

- **Other Emerging Topics** (Hotze Wijnja, MA, Amy Brown, FL, and Committee Members)
 - There were several topics brought up for discussion (Notes from Sydney Ross, NC)
 - **EPA Resources**
 - Sarah Caffrey (IN): There is an overarching response from EPA that there is not enough time for things, how can states help with this? Is there a better/ preferred communication route from states that can facilitate coregulator connection?
 - **PRIA 5 Spanish labeling**
 - Pat Jones (NC): EPA will not approve Spanish translation? All we have to go off is the guidance document. Liza Fleeson Trossbach (AAPCO, VA): Have asked EPA for spotlight call to discuss and disseminate information to the states, send all questions to Kelly Friend (FL) she is going to compile all the questions for EPA; Sarah Caffrey (IN): These are big questions, are any states looking to change their revised label review process? Liza Fleeson Trossbach (AAPCO, VA): Looking at it like it's a self-certification, we don't have the expertise and ability to do that, and

it's not the full label; Gary Bahr (SIFREG, WA): What about an enforcement case? Is this is a federal credential situation, what should be done?

▪ **Biopesticide testing**

- Gary Buckner (WA): Biopesticides is an emerging issue, laboratories have had issues testing for these products, EPA wanted testing for PEIs that were done; Liza Fleeson Trossbach (AAPCO, VA): As soon as companies (especially mosquito companies) see that we can't test for those they will start using them, more conversation around what type of actives are being seen

▪ **Water quality testing**

- Gary Bahr (SFIREG, WA): Water quality testing in region 10 testing has been long-term, but now finding that state paid for service type labs have been strained because of the commitment of those labs to test for emerging contaminants, now the state is down the list a bit, can we still utilize the lab long term?

POM tasks accomplished since the SFIREG December 2022 Meeting:

- POM completed the Paraquat FAQ revision, adding a question about custom blenders and it was sent to Amy Sullivan for posting on the AAPCO website on May 22, 2023
- POM completed the Draft 24(c) guidance document and sent to EPA for review on May 23, 2023
- POM continues to follow the Dicamba, Pet Products (A Modern Approach to EPA and FDA Product Oversight – Whitepaper), PFAS, Chlorpyrifos, Endangered Species Act, Registration Review, Seed treatment, Chlorine Gas, Rodenticides, PRIA 5 (Bilingual labeling and Development of Public Health Performance Standards for Antimicrobial Pesticide Devices specifically), Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program, OP Petition and C & T issues raised in the Joint/POM Sessions.

There are a lot of issues POM continues to follow and discuss, however at this time, we do not have any items requiring action to be taken by Full SFIREG

Additional information:

Call for POM and EQI committee member nominations was sent out by Amy Sullivan on May 8, 2023, with a deadline of June 2, 2023

