Tribal Pesticide Program Council - Full Council Spring Meeting

March 5th-March 6th , 2025

Day 1, March 5th

Traditional Opening Ceremony, Welcome, Introductions

Renee Keezer, White Earth Nation, provided the morning prayer to open the meeting.

TPPC Opening Remarks

Jasmine Courville, TPPC Chair, delivered opening remarks and current overview of TPPC developments emphasizing the number of comment letters the group has submitted and noting some of the responses from the EPA and other Federal agencies. Jasmine also mentioned the Policy workgroup wrapped up comments on EPA's herbicide and rodenticide strategies, the Pollinator workgroup currently has a survey out to understand the needs of tribal communities so they can create technical resources for them, and lastly, noted the resignation of Jake Luger, Standing Rock Sioux representative and long-standing pesticide inspector.

Mark Daniels, TPPC Program Manager, conducted roll call and TPPC members and meeting participants introduced themselves.

Jasmine mentioned the upcoming Pesticide Inspector Residential Training (PIRT) in Polson, Montana scheduled for July 21-24, 2025, and wanted to make sure tribes will be able to travel given the current uncertainty around federal grants. Those on the call noted their tribes do not have any travel restrictions.

TPPC Outreach Materials Workshop

Mark Daniels facilitated the discussion on TPPC outreach materials. The materials reviewed included the vertical banner, trifold brochure, and the 1-

pager. There is also a PowerPoint presentation that was mentioned but this was not discussed in depth during the workshop.

- Vertical banner—this is brought to in-person events, 5ft tall, no real suggestions from group.
- Brochure trifold—consensus from group is that the “How to become a member” section is confusing, not friendly sounding, and needs to be reworked.
- 1 pager just text—summary and highlights of recent comment letters and actions, customize for specific regions.
- PowerPoint presentation—Mark put together and there is one Renee put together, but this was not covered in the discussion.

Project overview of GRIC’s Tribal Regulatory Activity Compliance and Enforcement Records (TRACER) database
Dan Hoyt, Gila River Indian Community

Dan Hoyt, Gila River Indian Community, gave presentation on TRACER database. Tribal Regulatory Activity, Compliance, and Enforcement Records. There are about 53 agriculture entities they regulate, operating on about 35,000 acres, and they also regulate about 14 marketplaces that they inspect regularly. They have about 118-120 non-agricultural entities such as pest management businesses who come from surrounding cities and towns and conduct various regulated activities in the Gila community.

Database: What can we do with data? What functions do we perform with data?

- Authorization issuant, they issue permits, certifications, registrations
- Compliance monitoring, routine inspections, for cause inspections, enforcement
- Provide assistance in various forms including compliance, assistance, technical assistance
- Education and outreach
- They also have pesticide application data in their new code, regulated entities, those who conduct aerial applications and ground applications are required to send records and data about those applications that they then maintain as well and analyze

All these different functions have a multitude of different data that is associated with it.

Submitted proposal to get funding for this project. 3 phases, planning and design, development and implementation, and operational maintenance.

Phase 1: Worked with an external company to take all the data and functions and capture what we are doing and what we could be doing moving forward. It was a deep dive into the data and identified each and every data concept, looked at how they were functioning operationally and allowed them to question if they can make revisions that would save efficiency and have additional benefits.

Phase 2: Construct database working with internal IT department, stakeholders, and staff within pesticide control office. Dan demonstrated the actual product during the presentation.

Went over the Sharepoint database demo.

For each individual they have the ability to add notes, attach files and event history (trainings they have gone through), they have a general ledger that is a checkbook registry,

They have the ability to search for any particular individual or contact, they have the ledger, they have their references.

Application records: When they receive application records from agricultural establishments who are applying pesticides, aerial or ground, they send record of that and it gets put into database. Who they are, and what activity and the details about that pesticide, what the pest condition is, what the crop is, what method of application was, who applicator was—this is all added into record and appears in their datalist. Various colors correspond to the toxicity of pesticide used. Goal to use least toxic.

Authorization: Authorizations include permits, registrations, and certifications. These are things that their office issues to either a regulated individual in the case of a certification, or a regulated entity in the case of a permit or a registration. The program breaks it down by permit and shows which is active, expired, or pending.

Registrations: When they issue a permit, they include who they are authorizing and permitting to conduct activities, permit type, agriculture or non-agriculture, pending or active, when received it, new permit or renewal, and if there is a fee associated with it/when it was collected. Any supporting

documents are also attached. Similar process is followed for establishment registrations.

Compliance and enforcement: The inspector enters all the information after they complete the inspection. This includes identify the inspection type, agricultural use or not, identify the number of documentary and physical samples, whether it was for cause, and if it was for cause, there is a complaint associated with that as well, and if it was a compliance assistance inspection or container and containment. The inspector also tracks the hours they spend on the inspection. There is a workflow associated with the inspection as well where they can set a status such as “compiling the draft” or “initial peer review” and other status updates as the process continues to the next step. Comments are able to be added by other staff members during the peer review.

In the enforcement module, they select the entity, select the individual, they associate it with whatever inspection was supporting this enforcement action, they identify the tribal violations, and identify enforcement action or Federal violations. When they open an enforcement action, it allows them to enter information into their civil penalty matrix which provides further data and ability to make other adjustments.

Correspondence log: Essentially, they log almost every interaction they have with a regulated entity or individuals. For example, if they have a phone call with a regulated individual, it will get logged. If a permit was received in the mail, this gets logged as well. Or, if a community member calls about bedbugs or something along those lines, this gets logged as well. Track and assign how long they spent with these correspondences. They can be technical assistance, compliance assistance, complaints, etc. Can also view all past correspondence when speaking with someone or entity. They have template letters they can generate as well depending on particular circumstances, such as renewal letters.

Neutral inspection scheme: They identify, based upon their neutral inspection scheme, the frequency in which the regulated entities need to show up on their radar so that they can ensure that they inspect them in accordance with their neutral inspection scheme. This allows them to keep track of entities and have them on an inspection schedule of sorts, so they are not focusing too much on one entity over another.

Charts and graphs are used to allow for various visualizations of different data. Maps feature is currently under development, but this will allow further

ways to visualize data. They have the ability to run numerous reports due to the amount of data they have, and they can adjust filters depending on what they are interested in viewing.

Training and outreach: When they conduct training or have outreach events, they log all the specifics such as start and end times, target audience, population they are serving, which program, in-person training or virtual, how many attended, credential indicator, etc.

Dan explained that they are currently in Phase 3 which is the maintenance phase, and they do have plans on expanding to incorporate their waste program and possibly others down the line. They are happy to share their resources with those who are in the initial steps of doing something similar.

Association of Structural Pest Control Regulatory Officials (ASPCRO) and State FIFRA Issues Research and Evaluation Group (SFIREG) Updates
Allison Cuellar, ASPCRO President; Steve Dwinell, SFIREG Chair

ASPCRO presentation: Allison Cuellar, ASPCRO President, presented on the vision and mission of ASPCRO. Their goal is to be a unifying voice of state, territorial, and non-agriculture pest control regulatory. Allison went over the structure of ASPRCO, noting their board consists of 5 officers and 3 at-large members serving a 2-year term. They work with a multitude of agencies, ranging from academics to federal agencies to industry organizations. They have numerous technical working committees, the active ones include: Public Health, Inspector Training, School Integrative Pest Management (IPM), Label Stewardship, Structural Fumigation, Termiticide Label Review, Termiticide Standards, Rodenticides, and Building Codes. They have two inactive technical committees, Structural Remediation and IICAP—Task Force.

ASPCRO Inspector Training will be conducting the 5th annual training in August. They called for nominations in August and September last year and selected the inspectors in September. There are 31 inspectors that were selected, and they have been doing monthly webinar sessions that run from October to July. These are recorded in case the inspector is unable to attend. These webinars cover a wide range of topics including entomology 101 that focuses on termites and other wood strength, one that focuses on elements and evidence with an attorney that does environmental law, one on courtroom testimony, and one on e-commerce, to name a few. This all

culminates in August when they do the annual in-person training. They hold an in-person training in the morning and then set up a practical incident in the hotel for the inspectors to work through. In the end, the inspector can earn a certificate for each webinar they attend and the practical in-person training from the association, ASPCRO.

The 2025-2026 cohort will be selected in the same way as this year's cohort. They will call for nominations at the end of their annual meeting and they will select participants in September. One thing to note, if you get nominated and are selected, the training is free, but the travel is not. As of now, the webinars are not open to the public, they are kept closed for the inspectors in training and the speakers.

ASPCRO has two meetings a year, a midyear meeting and the annual conference. The mid-year meeting is a one-day meeting where the committees meet in the morning and then in the afternoon, they have business meetings with the Board to talk about activities ASPCRO is doing and what their objectives are for the coming year. At the annual conference they have committee and board meetings, along with inspector training the first full day. They then hold conference/general sessions during the remaining 3 days.

Currently, ASPCRO is working on a few things including pre-emption, residential mosquito applications, sulfuryl fluoride implementation, rodenticides, ESA activities, and administrative work. Allison spoke in more depth about rodenticides noting the Final Biological Evaluation (BE) was released in November 2024, and it explained what mitigations you should expect to see on label. Also of note, the EPA will be revising the 2022 Proposed Interim Decision (PID) and this should occur in Spring 2025.

SFIREG presentation: Steve Dwinell, SFIREG Chair, presented on SFIREG, noting the goal is to allow state lead agencies to interact with each other and also with EPA on pesticide policy issues. State lead agencies have primacy when it comes to inspection, enforcement, certification and training. The responsibility is given to the States, and they are equal partners in the Pesticide Programs. They can communicate directly to the EPA, allowing them to have a meaningful role in the development of pesticide policies and regulations. SFIREG has two meetings a year with Full SFIREG and in between those two meetings, they have working committee meetings. Full SFIREG is composed of 10 representatives from each of the 10 EPA regions. Prior to the full meeting twice a year, each representative organizes a

meeting in their region to identify what issues are occurring and what the states think about them.

Working committees focus on researching and developing issues that are brought up by the regions and then report to Full SFIREG. The committees are Pesticide Operations and Management, Environmental Quality Issues, and ESA Strategy Implementation. All working committees try to have representatives from every region. Steve noted that all representatives on working committees and the regional representatives, their travel is covered to meetings.

TPPC Coordinator Update

Mark Daniels, Institute for Tribal Environmental Professionals

Mark went over projects worked on since the fall meeting and discussed the budget.

Since the fall meeting, TPPC has facilitated 4 monthly executive teleconferences and scheduled and assisted monthly meetings for the risk assessment and policy work groups. In terms of the policy work group, they helped prepare and submit two comment letters to the EPA. The TPPC also developed and coordinated the current meeting, which was changed at the last minute from hybrid to virtual due to uncertainty around funding given the recent changes at the Federal level. Two more newsletters have been put out, the listserv has been updated to include 7 new members, and the website maintenance has continued with ongoing updates as needed. The group also worked on the TPPC top priorities for 2025 and the top 5 were covered in the newsletter that came out at the end of January.

In terms of budget, the TPPC has not yet received the fiscal year 2025 funding, as the federal government has been operating on continuing resolutions since October. The continuing resolutions funding will run out mid-March. Incremental funds were requested but nothing has happened as of yet. Given the situation, we have until August or September before the funding runs out.

Given the current political climate, there is a lot of uncertainty in terms of budgeting. The EPA is also in the dark on the future and does not have any

additional information to provide. They are unclear on what will happen with EPA funding and staffing.

Hot Topics Discussion with TPPC Members
TPPC Meeting Attendees, facilitated by Jasmine Courville

Mark went around and called on members to discuss what they are working on and if they have any new projects their tribe is working on that they wanted to share.

Renee Keezer: Continuing work on the pilot risk assessment project looking at the pesticides in the surface water and in vegetation. Samples are being collected from wild rice and the bulrushes to see if there is any uptake into those plants. Analytes are being seen in the water but not in vegetation. Renee also put together some presentations for integrated pest management training, working with the White Earth housing and tenants on bed bugs, roaches, and mold. Working with Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to send out denial letters for pesticide treatments to people that apply for aquatic plant management permits on White Earth and Leech Lake. They are having a major rat problem in one of their villages so they are working on addressing that.

Tracy Jensen, Gila River Indian Community: Continuing work with pollinator program, working on an IPM outreach video for a school, and keeping busy with inspections.

Jasmine Courville: Working on developing a Pesticide Stewardship Partnership Program, similar to what Oregon and Washington created. There is also a fish study that Jasmine is working on, most of the fish will be native fish. Roughly 100 fish samples have been collected at almost every water body across the state of Montana. They will be looking for pharmaceuticals and water pesticide detection. Additionally, Blackfeet tribe is proposing to do a spray project on an area that is getting overtaken and encroached by weeds; Jasmine will be following up on this project as it moves forward.

Phillip White, Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes: Been working on outreach, presented to 300 students and they have another 2,000 students coming up. Phillip’s personal goal is to present to 3,000 students by the end of the year. Phillip is also working on an eradication project for Eurasian watermilfoil.

Jon Weeden, Cherokee Nation: Focusing on fixing their pesticide application notification database.

Jefferson Biakeddy, Navajo Nation: Jefferson will be doing compliance, monitoring, and inspections over the soil film ligation that will be occurring. In addition, Jefferson will continue to monitor WPS trainings and is wrapping up 3 investigations, including the human exposure football game case.

Eric Gjevre, Coeur d'Alene Tribe of Idaho: Focusing on inspections, just attended the Pesticide Director's meeting in Seattle, and is working on his Circuit Rider Program Annual Meeting.

Cricket Herrera, Yakama Nation: Focusing on inspections, asked to speak at Washington State at the RUP Certification in Indian Country, working on tribal pollinator coloring book, and working with FEMA—about 17 homes got approved for funding to rebuild after fire.

Kingsley Nephew, Seneca Nation: Mostly pesticide permits, working on putting together work plan for next 5 years for grant, considering a possible pilot program to mitigate the blue-green algae during the summer.

Tison Gill, Gila River Indian Community: Had a pollinator garden tour for several different organizations and has the Worker Protection Standard (WPS) handler training sessions coming up.

Curry Blankenship, Muscogee Nation: Working on pesticide inventory for the entire tribe.

Steve Anderson, Choctaw Nation: Currently has classes going on for WPS for agriculture handlers, working with Ron on IPM and pollinator protection plans for the tribe, in-house inspection process is going well and hoping to have a version of that codified soon, has a pollinator plot project going and hopes to have one in all 12 of their districts by the end of fiscal year, and they are concerned about the effects of the wild hogs on their black bear population and they are looking into it. Discussion about warfarin.

Jessica Raspitha, Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe: Updating pollinator protection plan, working with native plant nursery to incorporate more pollinator protective species, and working on outreach efforts for 2025 focusing on awareness of the pollinator plan and Tribal Pesticide Code.

Theodore Puetz, Ak-Chin Indian Community: Working on establishing the Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP) and getting enforcement policy in place, reviewing the pesticide ordinance that is at least 12 years old, and as

part of outreach for the GAP objective they recently completed a communication meeting with stakeholders/community members for the programs department.

James Jackson, Cherokee Nation: Working on the notification system so they can be more present in what's out there and more involved in what's being applied on the tribal properties.

Camilo Perez, Quechan Indian Tribe: Completed test for approval, working on deliverables for 3rd quarter, completing inspections, doing outreach and allocations, compliance assistance, and working with farmers in regard to pollinator protection.

Diania Caudell, California Indian Basketweavers Association: Working on prevention and other things related to fire control and creating new pesticide program pamphlets and updating existing ones for the different geographical areas in California.

Jaclyn Listo, Tohono O'odham Nation: Working on outreach materials for community members, had a health fair end of last year, did outreach materials on pesticide safety at home and a top 10 tips as handouts for the community, will continue to make pamphlets and handouts for community members.

Dan Hoyt: Each of their programs will have a booth at the Earth Day event, the pollinator booth will have a cornhole type game to promote pollination and they will also have some WPS Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) to show and tell (gloves/masks), they are finishing up permitting season, continuing work on certification and training plan, working on ongoing administrative work and working on QAPP.

Karen Schumacher, Kootenai Tribe of Idaho: The Kootenai Tribe of Idaho continues to do contaminant monitoring in and around the Kootenai River. They recently mitigated a culturally significant site that was used as a dump by the city and county and given back unclean. They are planting a pollinator garden there this spring, they were also selected to receive funding for a garden on the reservation that will have native plants and pollinators. Lastly their composting project is finally taking shape with the Sandpoint Organic Agricultural Center.

Day 2, March 6th

Welcome and TPPC Opening Remarks
Jasmine Courville, TPPC Chair

Jasmine welcomed everyone to day 2 and asked those participants who were not in attendance yesterday to introduce themselves.

Mobile PFAS Destruction
John Tracy, Aclarity Water

John Tracy presented on per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) mitigation. Aclarity is a 7-year-old start up that consists of 22 scientists and engineers, based in southeast Massachusetts. Reviewed various industrial categories and mentioned one of their priorities is to get more involved in what companies' plans are for dealing with PFAS.

There are four main areas for the PFAS management ecosystem: 1) capture and disposal, 2) concentration (most common foam frac, Reverse Osmosis (RO), or Nano Filtration (NF)), 3) measurement and monitoring (how much PFAS do you have in your inlet stream and is process being effective), and 4) destruction (treatment technologies).

How do they break down PFAS: electrochemical oxidation creates free electrons generated on the anode surface to break C-F bonds to produce CO_2, F-. They have to circulate the water many times through these electrodes in their systems to have contact with the PFAS and break that down.

Aclarity has 3 types of electrochemical technology: 1) Lab scale testing at Aclarity or in the field, 2) Field deployments using single reactor mobile units, and 3) Octa full scale systems which can run up to 30,000 GPD.

Applications of Aclarity: They are focusing on contaminated streams that are drinking water sources, usually low concentrations of PFAS between 10-100 nanograms per liter. They also focus on sources of upstream Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) and they try to intercept that upstream source before it comes to the POTW. Another segment they look at is clean up of

Aqueous Film Forming Foam (AFFF) tanks, trucks, or lagoons. Lastly, they address treatment of contaminated groundwater from AFFF or industry.

Capabilities of Aclarity: 1) Process engineering, 2) working on grant applications directly with clients or with the engineering firms, 3) system supply (manufacturing systems via 3rd parties), 4) site services (they have a team that works on installation startup and commissioning, training, ongoing operations), and 5) working with customers to help them with testing requirements.

PFAS destruction in Landfill Leachate: Aclarity's work on landfill leachate uses a foam fractionated process and is getting about 92% total PFAS destruction and just under 90% destruction for the PFAS 6. In a 12-hour period in the trailer, they can treat 50-100 gallons in a batch. In the Octa commercial system, the batch size would be 250 gallons.

PFAS destruction in AFFF: Results from lab-scale test of destroying PFAS in rinse water from cleaning AFFF tanks indicate greater than 95% total PFAS destruction. They found destruction across the range of short and long chain PFAS. These results can translate to other AFFF contaminated waters, and they are able to destroy onsite rather than trucking to landfills or incinerators.

In addition to PFAS destruction, they also do ammonia removal in leachate RO reject.

In conclusion, Aclarity destroys PFAS onsite in landfill leachate, RO reject, and industrial effluents. They have multiple pilots on landfill leachate, wastewater, groundwater, AFFF contamination, RO concentrate, and foamate. Their capability on wastewater includes PFAS precursors and/or majority short-chain PFAS. With electrochemical destruction they are able to take on organics and ammonia. Lastly, they have engineering and site services capabilities to deliver complete PFAS projects.

Pilot test on site is largely the cost of manpower to run project over 4-6 weeks, it runs about $5k-$10k/week depending on location and what they are doing.

Pesticides in Water
Lisa Nowell and Michelle Hladik, USGS

Lisa Nowell and Michelle Hladik presented about pesticides in water. They focused on the chemistry of pesticides and what happens to them in the environment and any potential effects on aquatic organisms, other biota, or humans. They discussed the most efficient way to gather the data.

Having pesticides applied has helped increase food production and reduced insect-borne disease but once they are applied, they are in the environment and can move throughout the environment. Pesticides have been found in surface water, groundwater, air, etc. For this presentation, they are focusing on water.

Are there ways we can think about when they are applied where might they go in the environment?

There are many different types of pesticides, but the major groups include fungicides, herbicides, and insecticides. There are different types of applications including industrial, commercial, home and garden, highways, mosquito control vector, and the more dominant sector being agricultural. Agriculture represents the vast majority of pesticide applications in the United States.

Pesticides applied for many different uses and in different methods such as aerial application or drenching. Then you can get a precipitation event and runoff which can go down through the groundwater or flow to streams. Can also get evaporation drift. In short, many ways the pesticides can go from the area they were originally applied to further out in the environment. The pesticides could settle out, be transported even further downstream, absorb particles, and even taken up by fish.

This presentation will focus on streams and water systems. One of the things they look at is what are the physical chemical properties that can influence where this pesticide might go. They also consider the water solubility as an indicator of where it might go—does it want to be in water or with something other than water? Soil adsorption and volatility are other features they consider when studying where pesticides might go when applied. How easily can chemical be broken down, pH, temperature, the steepness of the land when pesticide is applied, etc. are other questions they might consider as well.

Considering where the pesticides might partition to is one question but then you need to consider how you sample them, where should you sample them, what should you be looking for, and what is the objective. There are numerous sampling techniques and ways to process samples and the one you pick will be largely influenced by your objective.

In terms of exposure, they compare measured concentrations, which is exposure to information on the inherent toxicity or carcinogenicity of the chemical. For human health risk assessment, they look at exposure through different routes such as oral consumption of drinking water, food exposure, inhalation, and dermal exposure. They also consider duration of exposure and chronic longer term or lifetime exposure.

In terms of hazard, this is determined by running toxicity tests with animal surrogates. This can be supplemented by epidemiological occupational studies, if available. The EPA then determines dose response information for both non-cancer and cancer effects. The EPA then derives standards and guidelines and makes assumptions based on the dose response data.

For aquatic life exposure, they consider duration and distinguish between acute or short-term exposure versus longer term or chronic exposure. Hazard is based on aquatic toxicity tests typically done with a standard set of test organisms. EPA has issued water quality criteria for a few pesticides under the Clean Water Act, and a larger number over 700 aquatic life benchmarks were developed.

The Pesticide Toxicity Index was designed to predict the toxicity of mixtures.

Several large-scale studies were reviewed that measured pesticide occurrence in streams and rivers, groundwater, drinking water, and fish. Human health benchmarks have rarely been exceeded in water or fish, but potential effects are predicted for aquatic organisms in most studies, especially for invertebrates in streams that have agricultural or urban land use, or both, within the watershed.

In summary, the fate of a pesticide in the hydrologic system is influenced largely by its own physical chemical properties as well as conditions in the environment and the method used to apply the pesticide.

Association of American Pesticide Control Officials (AAPCO) Updates
Jennifer Friend, AAPCO President

Jennfer Friend, Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services and new AAPCO President, presented on AAPCO initiatives and opportunities.

Their mission is to represent the States in the development, implementation, and communication of sound public policies and programs related to the sale, use, transport, and disposal of pesticides.

Past work they did was related to the Endangered Species Act and the crossover with pesticide registration. They had a compliance workshop back in September. They are continuing to do training and mentioned keeping an eye out for PREP courses and trainings that become available. There continues to be a lot of work being done with their pesticide safety educators, the extension agents across the US who are helping AAPCO with certification and training.

A large portion of AAPCO's work is done through groups and committees. Some are long standing; others have come about when issues arise (Pollinator Protection, E-commerce, Technology Work Group). There are also issues brought to AAPCO that get elevated from SFIREG, these are issues that come up in the States and Territories. AAPCO has 3 working committees, Pesticide Operations Managment Committee, Environmental Quality Issues Committee, and Endangered Specific Implementation Committee.

AAPCO just completed their annual meeting where a lot of time was devoted to talking about things like emerging technologies and digital labeling, certification and training plans, e-commerce, and the Endangered Species Act and implementation. You can go to the AAPCO website to review presentations from the meeting.

Other things that AAPCO did was spend a lot of time looking at the policies of the association, looking at the budget, strategic planning, and making sure the association is in a good position. Continuing to work on communication through their listserv, newsletter, and meeting minutes.

Still looking at ongoing issues including funding for States, working with Pesticide Safety Education Programs (PCEPs) in regard to certification and training, Endangered Species Act and all the implications with pesticides, the Worker Protection Standard and keeping an eye on application exclusion

zones, digital labeling, the bilingual labeling changes, PFAS issues and pesticide registrations decisions coming through EPA, and updating training resources.

TPPC Work Session - 2025 Priorities
All attendees, facilitated by Jasmine Courville

This work session started by allowing those who did not share their updates with the group yesterday during the Hot Topics session to have time to share any important updates they have been working on.

Destiny Eder, Fort Peck Tribes: Continuing to work on trainings. They lost their credentialed inspector and completing trainings has been on hold.

Luis Sanchez, Cocopah Indian Tribe: Starting working on the QAPP for their program and mentioned might be needing some help on that front.

Dave Lewis, Yavapai-Apache Nation: Lost a key staff member who had come a long way in learning how to do pesticide management and they are now rebuilding and working on preparing a new person to fill that position.

Jeremy Phillips, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community: Working on grant deliverables and wondering what is going to happen with funding, particularly concerned about the smaller tribes. Difficult to plan ahead since the future of funding is unclear. They are dealing with restrictive use applications and preparing for their Integrated Pest Management Training.

After the updates, the group discussed the TPPC priorities in a closed-door session by reviewing the 2025 TPPC priorities document and talking about ways to advance the priorities.

PPDC Electronic Labeling Program Update
Sarah Hovinga, Bayer US, and Lisa Dreilinger, Arxada

Sarah and Lisa presented an update on the PPDC's electronic labeling program.

Submission and approval/technology charge questions: Are there tools that could be utilized for improving/maximizing efficiency during the

label submission and review process? (e.g., PDF comparison tools, new software, e-CSF; structure/layout of labels; might distinguish between types of product labeling; recordkeeping/information within salesforce; optimization of salesforce usage) Ideally, what does the optimum electronic experience look like to maximize Agency resources and to maximize user adoption (submission, review, data tagging, and approval)?

Content and accessibility charge questions: What are the requirements of accessibility for labeling? (e.g., scannable technology, blind, deaf, color blind, non-English speakers, illiterate, no access to internet). The EPA's Label Review Manual guides what's allowed on the label; what are the opportunities for modernization of claims and content? And how would we communicate this to stakeholders?

Created two structured label templates for antimicrobial structured label and registration division structured label.

Mapped out what the optimal electronic experience would look like for submission and approval/technology. See PowerPoint slides for diagram.

Key recommendations: structured labeling approach needs to be voluntary at first, involves consistent data elements and standardized phrases, evaluating other pesticide types is necessary, a central label guidance location should be established, and future integration of tools such as QR codes. Longer term, they suggested structured digital labeling as essential, collaboration as necessary across States and Tribes, and utilizing advanced document/section comparison technologies/AI. See PowerPoint slides for more details.

Atmospheric Deposition of Pesticides: What Do We Know?
Dr. David Gay, coordinator of the National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NADP)

Dr. David Gay presented on atmospheric deposition of pesticides.

Pollutants found in rain can include acids, bases, oxidants, organics, PFAS compounds, radiological elements, metals, pesticides, herbicides, other agricultural chemicals, and biological elements.

Drifts can include spray drift (feet to about a mile) and regional drift, after evaporation (miles to 100 miles).

NADP is a Cooperative Research Support Project (US Department of Agriculture). They measure wet deposition of pollutants (from precipitation). They also measure gaseous concentrations for dry deposition calculations. The goal is to monitor the chemistry of precipitation (rain and snow) and in the atmosphere, as consistently and accurately as they can, for long periods to determine changes over time (trends).

Wet deposition measurements are made from a collector with a sensor and movable lid (NCON NTN Collector) and samples are sent to the laboratory every week from 250 sites. NADP focuses on measurement of inorganics and PFAS compounds. However, Integrated Atmospheric Deposition Network (IADN) does make pesticide measurements but limited in scope as mostly are collected as a few sites around the Great Lakes.

USGS has a map on their website which you can find out what pesticides are used in abundance near your area or where they use a particular pesticide in abundance. There are over 500 pesticides on their list.

Dry deposition data: Pesticides in the gaseous part of the atmosphere, many locations showing organochlorines despite almost all being banned in the 1970s. They persist in the environment. For example, DDT was detectable in the atmosphere in 90% of the sites they looked at.

Wet deposition data: Atrazine was found in almost all the samples and organochlorines were detected in every state where measurements were made.

According to one study that looked at when deposition of pesticides occurs, the data suggested it overwhelmingly occurs during May and June. This study was short term and only for one location (Ohio) so it is important to keep that in mind. Could be related to planting season in Ohio (corn and soybean) so it may only hold for the Midwest.

In terms of how much is found in precipitation, USGS says that the amounts generally account for less than one percent of the total amounts applied. However, keep in mind that this may seem small, but it can represent many tons for some high use pesticides. This is not capturing dry depositions.

Another study looked at glyphosate in precipitation and found glyphosate in 75-80% of the samples and in fairly low concentrations.

Integrated Atmospheric Deposition Network (IDAN): While limited in locations studied, findings suggest Lindane concentrations are going down, as well as DDT compounds and Chlordane.

In conclusion, when looking at wet or dry depositions, a wide variety of pesticides are present in the atmosphere. Many older organochlorides are still showing up despite being banned several decades ago. Newer pesticides are breaking down more quickly and don't have a longer-term half-life in the atmosphere.

Open Discussion/Closing Remarks
All attendees, facilitated by Jasmine Courville

The group discussed the upcoming National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) changes and Renee mentioned they have put some comments together and they can be shared with Mark and then the policy group can work on it.

Discussion on timber production and the changes that will come on this front under the new administration.