

**WSSA Liaison to EPA-OPP (Office of Pesticide Programs)  
Interim Report to the WSSA Board of Directors**

**Submitted by: Dr. Michael Barrett**

**Quarter 1, 2015**

First quarter expenses to visit EPA-OPP offices, make a presentation on the EPA Liaison position at WSWS, and host meetings at the WSSA meeting totaled \$5023.47.

**February 9-12**

I was pleased that three persons from the EPA-OPP Registration Division – Herbicide Branch and several USDA-APHIS attended the WSSA meeting in Lexington. During the meeting, I arranged for the Herbicide Branch representatives to meet with Tim Gray and Tim Miller from the WSSA Terminology and WSSA Standardized Plant Names Subcommittee to discuss and anticipated request for OPP to use the WSSA Composite List of Weeds as part of the “Smart Label” project. This will be an electronic label building and searching system. I also arranged for a breakfast meeting between USDA-APHIS and the Herbicide Branch to discuss herbicide resistance efforts in both groups.

**March 3-5**

Michael Barrett visited the offices of EPA-OPP and met with Registration Division (RD) and the Biological and Economic Assessment Division (BEAD) staff. I was invited by EPA-OPP and DuPont to participate in a meeting to discuss Zest herbicide for use on Inzen sorghum. In addition to RD and BEAD staff, representatives from DuPont, the National Sorghum Growers association, OPMP and APHIS attended the meeting. Prior to the meeting, I contacted extension weed scientists in major sorghum producing states to discuss the need for this technology.

During this visit I also participated in a meeting between the National Association of Independent Crop Consultants and OPP. This is a annual meeting NAICC holds with the agency. Among the topics discussed were herbicide resistance management actions the agency had taken and how to build relationships with grower groups to foster resistance management.

During this visit I also spent time discussing ideas for a WSSA sponsored summer tour for OPP staff and who in OPP would most benefit. Beyond herbicide resistance, other areas considered were off-target movement, and application technology, especially what people are doing at the field level.

### **March 8-11**

Michael Barrett traveled to Portland, OR where he attended the WSWS meeting and made a presentation on the EPA liaison position and OPP at the general session.

### **March 16-17**

A primary purpose for this trip was to participate in a meeting with Steve Powles with OPP that Jill Schroeder and I had helped to arrange. Among the topics discussed at the meeting were Australia's mandatory MOA labeling, mandatory resistance education in Australia, metabolic resistance, and the effect of herbicide resistant weeds on land values in Australia.

During this visit I meet with Dan Kenny, Skee Jones, Rachel Holloman and Jill Schroeder to further plan for the WSSA tour.

An important objective of this trip was to make a connection with the Pesticide Reevaluation Division (PRD) and understand that process. To this end, I met with Michael Goodis, Associate Director for PRD. He explained to me that all pesticides must be reevaluated within a 15-year window that started in 2007-2008. The first step in this was to prioritize which chemicals/classes to begin with and, in some cases, group them into classes. After this, for any one chemical or chemical class, a multi-year process begins to identify potential risk areas, work with registrants to address these including conducting additional studies if needed, and then an initial risk assessment is released for comments. Then the agency works with registrants, the technical product producers, to make any changes that are needed. The last step, before any regulatory decision is made, is to issue a proposed decision for comments. The overall goal is to reduce risk. Over time, new risk concerns may be identified as additional data becomes available or revised policies are adopted, which tend to be more stringent than older policies. A general objective of the PRD process, among others, is to ensure that any decisions made do not result in users relying on higher risk pesticides.