

Agricultural Innovation Board (AIB) Meeting-20240226_130248-Meeting Recording

February 26, 2024, 6:02PM

2h 30m 14s

● **Griffith, Morgan** started transcription

8 **81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16** 0:12

Welcome everybody.

It's 1:00 o'clock on February 26th or officially starting our aggravation board meeting.

As a reminder, this meeting is being recorded as public record and that participation

in a recorded meeting will be deemed as consent to be recorded, including

statements both written and oral public records, including this recording, can be

requested at any time in accordance with the Vermont Public Records Act.

So welcome.

Happy February.

Let's start off with our introductions of those on the call.

So we'll start with Members and let's start with members in the room.

So I think, and I'm gonna start with you, OK?

And he's already UVM extension.

Yeah.

Sarah Owens, state toxicologist with the health department.

Let's see on the collar members, Abby.

PA **Pajak, Abbi** 1:23

Abbey Pajak DECKO program.

8 **81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16** 1:29

Roy.

RB **Roy Beckford** 1:34

Right, Beckford.

And like and Hazel Reagan with UVM extension.

8 **81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16** 1:35

The.

Thanks Ryan.



Ryan Rebozo 1:44

Brian Rebozo with the Vermont Center, Rego studies.



81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 1:49

And when did 2?



Wendy Sue Harper 1:51

Wendy Sue Harper, soil scientist.



81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 1:56

Thanks.

And you too, OK?

Others that we have on the call.

I Brooke.



Decker, Brooke 2:09

Hi.

Are we doing intros from the agency?



15f5739c-d2a7-4d31-ba48-1d656f2c2883 joined the meeting



81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 2:12

Yeah.

So we just just so everyone knows who is on the call.

We yeah, just a quick intro.



Decker, Brooke 2:17

OK.



81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 2:17

What you do? Yep.



Decker, Brooke 2:17

Yeah.

Sorry, it was a quick transition.

This is Brooke Decker with a agency of agriculture listening it.



81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 2:26

Thanks.

See cash.



Cash, Steven 2:30

Steve Cash, Agency of agriculture, water quality division.



81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 2:38

Alright, uh, Dylan.



Dillon Gabbert 2:42

This is Dylan Gabbert with Bayer crop science.



81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 2:47

The thanks.

And so now I think that's everybody on the call.

I do have a phone number ending in 4575.

Would you like to introduce yourself?



15f5739c-d2a7-4d31-ba48-1d656f2c2883 3:02

Hi, dad.

Hey Steve shubar here.

I'm uh on the board and will get in front of a computer screen in about 10 minutes.

Thanks.



81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 3:06

The.

OK, great.

Thanks Steve.

Alright.

In the room, we also go around to go ahead and Briar and the chemical toxicologist with the agency tank.

Stephanie Smith umm.

Deputy director of the Public Health and Agriculture Resource Management Division at the Agency of Agriculture, Chillicothe fertilizer specialist at the agency, that agriculture is actually kowski agricultural resource management specialists.

Also the farm division.

And I'm Morgan Griffiths and I work in the farm division of the NCC.

And so.

Our agenda we posted so the main chunk of today is we're going over.

3 count key bills that are in front of legislature right now that are relevant to pesticide regulations.

And so before we get to that, the quick.

Update we have from the agency based from our recommendations that the IB gave to the Agency for Best Management practices for new unit treated article seeds is that the Secretary is considering issuing a set of BMPS.

And so what's in the statute?

Is that deadline Umm is a BMP should be issued to?

Umm, the house in committee.

Agg the House and Senate AG committees by March 1st.

So this experience considering issuing BMP is that would be consistent with the aiv recommendations that we made, but a final decision has not been made yet.

So, umm, those BMP's will be sent to members as soon as the secretary kind of makes that final decision and that should be pretty soon.

Obviously the first is on Friday and that we will send the BMP to members and that you guys will have a options to weigh in because what the next steps for those BMP's would be to go through the rulemaking process and so there will be ample opportunity for discussion and more input on them.

But so that's kind of the agency update as of right now.

Coming from what we have been doing.

So I think.

And I know the only other the action items that we had were to talk about the survey.

And so that's at the end of the agenda today.

Umm.

So I think we'll talk about that when that comes up.

And then so I think without further ado, we can just kind of start off with our first bill.

Which is relating to the use and prohibition of new neck pesticides and new neck treated article feeds and so Zach is gonna leave the charge on that.

Happy that you so.

If I'm speaking to you softly, just please don't hesitate to just let me know and I'll do better.

So may or may not be aware of recent legislation that's been circling around the Vermont State house, and as of last year, and also into this year, the New York Statehouse in Vermont.

This is House Bill 706.

I've been in the House Committee on Energy.

Sorry, Barry.

Culture, forestry and food resiliency.

Umm.

And then on the Senate side or New York side, they passed their bill, the birds and the Bees Act this past January last January, I think.

But New York has a kind of a quirky thing.

Where and the governor is able to instead of like Vito, necessary outright, they can send the bill back to the legislature and with revisions.

So the New York Bill was passed and but that is now been changed, per the New York governor.

So what I have here is kind of like a side by side of the current H 706 that are not bell umm and then the New York bill as it currently stands.

Like leave?

I hope so.

Let's things have changed more recently.

It's kind of a my short form notes because to do a side by side of these two bills is kind of odd, so I hopefully this is a little more digestible for the the board and other members who are tuning in.

 **sylvia (Guest)** joined the meeting

S **sylvia (Guest)** 8:39

And then.

8 **81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16** 8:50

So I guess just to take it away.

Said the House Bill 706 is broken into different sections.

I didn't include sections one or two sections one and two, or findings and definitions respectively, but getting to the thick of it.

 **Fantelli, Lisa** joined the meeting

8 **81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16** 9:10

Section 3 starts with the prohibition on new technology tree seeds and the prohibition relates to the sale offering for sale or use distribution or use of certain neonicotinoid treated article seeds.

They seeds that are treated or coated with a new thing.

It's joined pesticide on the flip side is New York and their prohibition is the sale offered for sale or use for distribution of certain seeds treated with the active ingredients.

Clevite close the endin, metoclopramide and dynamics.

I am taxham or any other neonicotinoid as determined by the department and regulation and department refers to with regards to New York.

That's the Department of Environmental Conservation, I believe, who actually has, unlike Vermont, they have state delegated authorities or regulate pesticides under fifth bra.

On the flip side, in Vermont, the state lead agency SLA is the Agency of Agriculture, Food and Markets.

So just a quick comparative note, umm the the vermontville does include use whereas the New York 1 doesn't.

It's not.

It's not really sure how it's that's meant to play out and you know, reality, but.

It gets a little tricky because under federal law.

Yeah, 'cause.

No, I treated article.

Seeds are treated articles and therefore they're exempt from.

Yeah.

Most provisions of 5th for us, so saying use regulating the use of them.

It's a little wonky, but regardless, the main differences in those are that.

The Vermont bill?

Kind of covered, intended to cover all neonicotinoid active ingredients, whereas the New York bill, you know it only covers those three Clippy and invite clip grid and the other one because I'm not gonna struggle through saying that again.

And then but with the other caveat that the the the Commissioner, I believe of New York, DC, has the option to regulate additional active ingredients through regulation both.

These like kind of bands are supposed to become effective on January 1st, 2029.

You'll see I have certain things highlighted on the left of the of the Vermont and that's, but based on the latest draft of H706 that was issued this past Friday.

So previously it was January 1st, 2027.

It is now 2029 to be more, umm in line with the New York bill.

And that's generally give the farmers and the manufacturers a little more time to get things ready.

And if anyone has a question also, just go ahead and fire away while I'm doing this because it's a little boring.

Yeah, this might be a silly question if you if you look at the records of neonicotinoid use in Vermont, what percentage they use is accounted for by treated seeds versus I guess foliar spray I I guess either one, no, why are they doing a bill to only stop treated?

I'll get to that.

It doesn't it it covers.

Other non treated seeds as well.

So like the unit gets noise would not be permitted for use in the state.

With certain caveats, they say one, but so sanctuaries for we don't have specific data on use of treated seeds because the usage of course that we receive are from commercial applicators, first of all and then second, all they're not considered pesticides, so they're not OK, you know, they don't fall under our required reporting, you know, pesticides.

So we do have and I think it's in our on our teams channel.

We did do some calculations based on assumptions of.

A range of what?

How much neonet could be honest seed and then at Sumption, of an acreage of corn, for example, planted in the state and then assuming that 99% of that corn was planted with those seeds?

So we did, you know, assumption after assumption, time, time, time to understand a pound total towns and that also pounds per acre compared to those other commercial applicators usage that is reported to us.

And so it is.

It is significant compared to commercial usage that is reported to us of assumed usage of.

OK.

Yeah, but you'll get to the point where outlines, because the question I would get to is what would be the replacement pesticide?

Yeah, that's that's definitely been a a hot discussion in committee of late.

And just like I kind of glossed over it, but.

Treated seeds are treated articles under Fifra and they are exempt in that.

So you you have to have a, you know, a certified applicator license to apply the pesticides to the seed.

But that's once that's done.

Regulation.

And so it's, you know, it's transportation, it's it's planting, all of that is outside of the scope of 5th bra and I believe still under Vermont law.

But anyways moving on.

So that the other part of this is what is the prohibition applied to?

So the types of seeds that this prohibition in Vermont would apply to our soybeans.

Crap Group 15 few cereal grains and I've had a table.

That's pretty much all cereal grains.

And then 15 through 22 just further breaks those down and says even more cereal grains.

Umm.

And then it's craft group 16, which is essentially the forage fodder and straw of everything that's in these serial grains grew.

And then further down, it's cropped fruit 16 through 22.

So I guess I can go here so.

This is crap.

Group 15 this is straight out of I believe the CFR code of federal regulations. So you have, you know, barley, buckwheat, corn, Millet, Pearl Millet, oats, popcorn, yadda yadda yadda to pull in the lane.

And then so this is the 15th through 22, which is hammerhands barley, it's it's very expensive.

Just kind of leave it at that.

Umm.

Covers just about everything, and then, like I said, the forage, the crack group UH-16 is essentially anything.

That's all that what I just briefly showed you that's used for forge butter or straw.

Umm.

On the other side, York, it's just corn, soybean and wheat.

They seem to have kept it rather simple.

And that's that.

Moving on, so both bills, there's a, you know, a general Pro fish prohibition.

But you know there is an exemption order is what it's called in Vermont and the Vermont bill, but it's called a waiver in New York.

So the exemption order in Vermont, so originally the bill was introduced as the Secretary of the Agency of Natural Resources was going to kind of had this happen, man.

 **Ann Hazelrigg** joined the meeting

8 **81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16** 18:11

You're right.

 **Ann Hazelrigg** left the meeting

8 **81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16** 18:14

But more recently, as a Friday that's been flipped because the Agency of Agriculture is the state lead agency who regulates pesticides.

So we now we.

Yeah, they recognize that.

And so it's back to this.

So the Secretary of agriculture may, after consultation with A&R, issue a written

exemption order to suspend certain provisions of the provision.

In New York.

Uh, the Commissioner, DC and consultation with a G may issue a waiver to allow for the use of such seeds for the production of agricultural commodities.

The Vermont bill doesn't have that kind of like caveat about production of agricultural commodities.

I don't think it's a big deal though, because I don't think you would be using the seeds for much else.

Umm.

And if I'm missing something.

So what do you have to do to issue an exemption order?

So back to Vermont and Vermont.

The Secretary of Agriculture must specify the types of neonicotinoid treated article seeds to which the exemption order of pause, the date on which the exemption order takes effect.

The exemption orders duration.

The exemption orders geographic scope and as of Friday, this may include specific farms, fields or properties.

Umm, I believe that is a a way to narrow it down.

So I I the way that's written, I think it could be very large geographic scope maybe like whole counties, maybe a whole state or at the lowest level specific farms, fields or properties.

Continuing on with New York or no, sorry for my.

Yeah, we would have to.

The AFM would have to provide a detailed evaluation of the agricultural seed market, including a determination that either the purchase of seeds would cause agricultural producers undue financial hardship or that there is an insufficient amount of commercially available seed not treated with neonicotinoid pesticides to supply agricultural producers and then, lastly, providing detailed evaluation of the exemption orders, anticipated effect on pollinator populations, bird populations, ecosystem health and public health, including not just sorry, including whether the exemption order will cause undue harm to pollinator populations.

Bird populations, ecosystem health and public health.

I'm previously it was.

At at a determination that the exemption order will not cause undue harm, and I

think that was changed because of concerns of whether or not that, that, that determination could ever be made as it was originally written.

On the flip side, in New York, the requirements for issuing a waiver are that the farm owner must complete an integrated pest management training of pest risk assessment and a risk assessment report must be completed.

That any seeds may only be planted on the farm property or properties identified in the pest risk assessment report, and that the farm owner must maintain current records of that report and records of when the seeds are planted, both which are subject to review.

So these are pretty different with regards to the use or the waiver and treated seeds, Morgan, correct me if I'm wrong, but this New York one seems to align more with I'm either Quebec or Ontario.

Is that a good statement?

Yeah, PM the IPM training aligns with Ontario and then yeah, and Ontario has to do a pest risk assessment to I'm think Quebec is the one that like has to do the test assessment but via certified agronomy at that then has to almost like prescribe them like yes based on this you can use you know if you use it because back.

So I guess more on Ontario.

Yeah. OK.

Thank you.

Uh, so yeah, little comparative note of the Vermont bill does not require IPM training pest risk assessment I seeds mainly be planting on properties identified in the past first assessment and the maintenance of record.

That's not to say that, and justice little later on that on such requirements could be made as part of best management practices under rulemaking.

On the flip side of New York, they don't require a detailed evaluation of the anticipated effects on pollinators and whether undue harm to pollinators or public health would result.

In addition, the Vermont Bill Umm allows other requirements that may be included in an exemption order so the exemption order could also establish restrictions related to the use of the seeds to which the exemption were applied to minimize harm.

So it's yeah, kind of just additional restrictions, I guess that would be like BMP.

Other restrictions related to the use of the untreated treated article seeds that the secretary considers necessary.

New York doesn't.

You know, there's no mention of additional requirements, duration of the exemption order in Vermont, so one year, so an exemption order cannot be issued for the duration of longer than a year as opposed to in New York.

It is 2 years.

Back to Vermont.

So and this is VOA FM, my apologies.

Recent changes VFM must submit a copy.

I believe AFM, a copy of any exemption order issued to the Senate committees on Natural Resources and Energy and our culture.

Uh.

The House committees on Environment and Energy and Agriculture, foods of forestry and the agricultural innovation for so, any exemption order that would be issued would need to go to these committees and board on the New York side.

The the C is required to report to the legislature annually on the number of waivers issued.

So it's kind of a quite a difference there reporting.

So as opposed to every exemption order, not New York, just is looking to get the number of orders issued.

So rescission of an exemption order in Vermont?

Yeah, secretary bag and consultation with ANR may rescind an exemption order at any time.

Rescission. Effective?

No sooner than 30 days after issuance and does not apply to neonicotinoid treated article, seeds planted or sown before such rescission comes into effect.

New York build does not.

I don't believe touch on this again or not again.

But just for note, there's various other aspects of New York law.

I'm sure I'm missing and I'm because I just looked specifically at this bill, so they may cover this or other things that I'm not speaking to.

Umm, rulemaking.

So in addition, in and this is New York, the Commissioner of DC is required to adopt appropriate rules prior to undertaking the waiver process.

As for Vermont, I'll get to this more down the road, but.

The rules have to do with the BMP that I'm leave you all have been discussing for.

A bit.

So moving on, so this is Section 4 of the Vermont bill and this relates to neonicotinoid pesticides.

Not treated article seeds and this is prohibited, uses and and then I have similar on the New York side.

So the prohibition the Vermont bill proposes to prohibit the following uses of neonicotinoid pesticides.

The outdoor application of Munich tutorial pesticides.

Any crop during bloom and they do give a a definition of bloom.

Uh, the outdoor application of neonicotinoid pesticides to soybeans or any crop in the field.

Cereal Grains crop group and that's the same graph groups that I mentioned above.

UM, the outdoor application of neonicotinoid paths are not pesticides to any crop between heading or castle emergence and harvest.

The outdoor application is neonicotinoid pesticides to crops in the leafy vegetables, brasca bulb, vegetables, herbs and spices and stock stem and leaf petiole, vegetables, crop groups and they crop groups are listed there, harvested after bloom.

The application of the index is going pesticides to ornamental plants and six the application of new next really pesticides to trunk graphs.

Can't.

Yeah, go ahead.

This is get to your question.

So these are all the.

Other prohibitions of the highlighted one is it without it on Friday, was added on Friday, and that's to get at cause.

One of the alternatives that they could have used for.

Having the Munich on the seed was to spray it in fear of like we heard right.

And so this would make that application also prohibited is not understanding with without a wave, without a waiver.

Yes.

Thank you for exemption order, sorry.

In New York.

The the bill would prohibit any person from applying or treating outdoor ornamental plants and turfs, except for the production of agricultural commodities or structural commercial applications within 1 foot of a building foundation perimeter to manage

structural paths, provided that the application is not conducted on any blooming plant with the pesticides of this kind of like a phase in approach, the active ingredients and middlebridge thyme and toxin or asseta amid Fritz on or after 12312026 and then the active ingredients close the end in or dinettes of furan, effective 12312024.

Sure.

You're not gonna.

So there's no fees in on the Vermont side and it's all neonicotinoid, all active ingredients.

Umm. Yep.

And this is Stephanie here.

This is without an exemption order.

None of these pesticides can be applied cause sinus to Ferran or heparin or however you say it.

That is, I think it's a chemical that's used in the treatment for spotted Lantern fly.

We don't have spotted Lantern fly in the state of Vermont, but it is an invasive pest in other parts of the country.

There's been some discussion.


Is there anything in the new amendment?

Because I know there's been some discussion in committee, they've talked about invasive.


Because it's, I think it's a systemic use, but it looks like it hasn't been written yet.

Then I don't think so, but I believe I got everything from.

 **Steve Schubart** joined the meeting

 **Steve Schubart** 31:42
I guess.

 **15f5739c-d2a7-4d31-ba48-1d656f2c2883** left the meeting

 **81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16** 31:45
Umm.
But Steve did.

Because are you chiming in?

Uh, OK.

SS **Steve Schubart** 31:53

Yes.

8 **81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16** 31:57

I.

SS **Steve Schubart** 32:00

And and I've been on the phone with all time.

8 **81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16** 32:00

That's a good question.

SS **Steve Schubart** 32:02

I've just just getting in front of my computer now. Thanks.

8 **81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16** 32:06

OK.

Thank you.

Without a yeah, in order.

So I just wanted I was processing it out loud, I guess with all of you.

Well, it could be it could be part of the is there this in the exemption or you're going to get to it?

Is emergency, right?

Yeah.

Anyway, that could be considered as an emergency, but yeah, you're gonna you're.

Yeah.

So yeah, the the Vermont bill would prohibit the application treatment of any new attic neonicotinoid pesticide, much larger group of plants.

Umm, with the exception of when where an application may be made and also pending the class slash group of plant or crop, the prohibition would become effective as proposed July 1st 2025.

And the New York bill has described as his quite different.

And only applies to turf.

So here's the exemption order.

So similar to the first part that I discussed with you and the Munich, so I treated seeds.

There is an exemption order, so there's the, you know, the general prohibition, but an exemption order can exempt these provisions.

So VFM may, after consultation with A&R issue a written exemption order to suspend certain provisions of the prohibition.

Similarly, New York has exemption order on their side as well, so the requirements for issuing an exemption order under H 706 Vermont, we need to specify the new Unix.

You know, pesticides, uses and crops to which the exemption order applies.

The data on which the exemption order takes effect, the exemption order, duration and the exemption orders, geographic scope, scope.

So that's the same as the treated seeds a a detailed valuation determining that an agricultural emergency or an environmental emergency exists.

And I'll provide that definition below.

DJ evaluation of reasonable responses available to address the agricultural emergency or the environmental emergency, including a determination that the use of Munich joy pesticides to which the exemption order applies would be effective in addressing the emergency.

And determination that there is no other, less harmful pesticide or pest manager practice that would be effective in addressing emergency.

And then lastly, I believe it's the same language for the seeds provided detailed evaluation of the exemption orders, anticipated effects on Paul native populations, bird populations, ecosystem health, public health, including whether the exemption order will cause undue harm to pollinator populations, bird populations so on.

And so the bill defines agricultural emergency as an occurrence of any pests that presents an imminent risk of significant harm, injury or loss to agricultural crops.

And the definition of environmental emergency is an occurrence of any pest that presents a significant risk of harm or injury to the environment or significant harm, injury or loss to agricultural crops, including any exotic or foreign pests.

It didn't.

We need preventative quarantine measures to avert or prevent that risk, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

So that's that would be a spotted Lantern fly.

You know infestation would be reasons for grounds for issuing exemptions.

Part of the grounds for assuming exemption artery.

On the other side, New York.

They can only issue an exemption order for if a valid environmental emergency exists.

Uh, it's essentially the same.

The pesticide would be effective.

No other less harmful pesticide or pest management practices would be effective.

And then that the executive order must include the basis basis of the determination.

Specify prove time period, geographic scope and purpose of the permitted use of such pesticide question, though.

Yep, but in New York, they're only prohibiting the use on soy, corn, and wheat.

So the exemption order? No.

Did I miss that?

Outdoor ornamental plants and curve, right?

OK, never mind.

Except for the production of agricultural commodities.

OK.

Thank you.

Sorry.

Yeah, no worries.

So yeah.

Yeah, just comparatively, they're pretty similar, except for Vermont.

Bill has that detail evaluation on the and decided effects of pollinators and whether the waiver will cause undue harm.

Similar to the treated seeds part above, an exemption order can establish additional restrictions.

Related to the Munich store pesticides to which the exemption order applies to minimize harm.

And and then others other restrictions that the secretary deems necessary.

In New York, they have that application using a pesticide containing the active ingredients, committed flow periods.

I'm methoxy and acetamiprid clothianidin or dinotefuran must take a department approved neonicotinoid course annually and maintain a record of this course for

three years.

So no such this does not exist in the Vermont built.

Both waivers can only be a year of New York and Vermont.

Reporting same as above, submitted a copy of any exemption order to the respective committees as well as the AIB I know we're porting and New York.

Recision same as above.

An exemption order. Me.

Maybe rescinded.

Research.

So the New York Bill goes into a little more details about research, and it requires their DC and AG agency or department.

I can't remember, in consultation with New York State's land grant university, I would imagine that that would be Cornell shall conduct a study to identify practical and feasible alternatives, the use of pesticides containing those active ingredients, and then the results of the study needs to be submitted to the governor.

As well as other people have had a certain at a certain time handy posted on their website.

So the bill doesn't really have any thing on, you know, this research, but the this board exists.

This board is doing a lot of this research and looking into these things, and it's continuing to do that work.

Ah, OK, so this is not short form.

So because it's and So what I've done here, this is regarding kind of rulemaking and other other things.

So on the left we have the current law and on the right is the proposed amendments to the current law, and this is so left current law, Vermont, right?

Vermont Law has proposed under age 706.

So under, I believe it's 60 SA Chapter 81, section 918.

Essentially this is the section that says that the Secretary of Agriculture shall register. Any economic poison is, you know, and various other details about how that's done. But yeah, the important part here is that says that the Secretary shall shall register as a restricted use pesticide, any neonicotinoid pesticide labeled as proved through outdoor use, and so on.

And then down below.

Umm, provided that the Secretary shall not register the following products as

restricted, use pesticides and less classified under federal law as restricted use products.

And then you have treated Articles C umm.

The bill is proposing to remove this and there is a language here actually that says unless otherwise.

Prohibited.

That's new.

You have to register any new pesticide as restricted.

Use and then they remove the treated article sees as something that we wouldn't register, so I I.

Sumption.

That maybe they want us to register treated article seeds, but I'm not gonna get into that.

Uh, moving on.

So we have treated articles, powers the Secretary of Best management practices.

So this is.

Under the current law, we have what you all have been one of the task is to.

Dot by rule best management practices for the use in the state of neonicotinoid treated article seeds.

And then there's.

A through G ohm, which I I believe you are are aware of.

So what the bill does?

It's similar, but different.

Uh, so it's same language for the beginning part, but then they remove or they take uh, yes.

How do you see this?

They this part is now a 2.

So these.

Yeah, the establishment is threshold levels.

That's lower and they've inserted above this, so shall adopt by rule BMP's for the use in the state of neonicotinoid treated article seeds when used prior to the proposed ban of January 1st, 2029, so that would be, you know, between when this bill hypothetically passes and the time that the ban and 2029.

Yeah, the secretary of our culture, in consultation with the board would need to.

Go through rulemaking to have rules for yeah, Munich is only treated article seeds B

neonicotinoid treated article seeds when the secretary issues a written exemption order authorizing use for the treated article seeds.

So that's post ban bans in place.

It's 2029.

The exemption order is sent out and you know we would have, I guess, separate BMP hypothetically that address.

Specifically to the exemption order, I'm not entirely sure how that is supposed to work out, but you know we're not there.

See neonicotinoid pesticides when the secretary issues a written exemption order.

So this is not the seeds, but just pesticides generally, and you and your next toy pesticides.

So that would be post 2025.

When that ban takes place, so if an exemption order is made, we would need to have BMP's on the use of neonicotinoid pesticides as they apply to that you mention order, I guess.

Uh D insecticide treated article seeds others than a neonicotinoid treated article seeds.

So I believe the idea there is to have BMP's for, you know, what are the other neonicotinoid?

There are other pest insecticides that are going on seeds, so we know of the divides, but this has brought enough that it could be just other insecticides other than dynamites or neonics.

And then.

It's been they get, you know, in developing the rules with the AIB, the Secretary shall address and this is where it goes back to normal somewhat.

So we have the establishment of threshold levels of pest pressure required prior to the use of the Munich annoy treated article seeds, insecticide treated article's or neonicotinoid pesticides.

Essentially, this is just really expanding the breadth of these criteria to include more than just neonicotinoid treated articles.

Seeds, but to also include insecticide treated article seeds.

Availability of non treated article seeds that are not neonicotinoid treated article seeds or that are not insecticide treated article seeds economic impact from crop loss as compared to crop yield when Munich Denoy treated articles.

Seeds insecticide treated article seeds or neonicotinoid pesticides or years relative

toxicities.

Munich.

Joy tried article sees so one I I I think you probably get the point.

They just kind of add insecticide treated article feeds, new actinoid pesticides to all these criteria.

And then this.

This is the same, it's just changed to three because they added that too.

Continuing to, yeah, just go back up.

So they did add.

So we're all used to seeing those A through G, right?

But we're not used to seeing that H and I.

Can you go down a little?

So those are right.

So like 2.

Thank you.

Required topics feel like we've all been discussing this in terms of those seven required tactics, things like how we like structure our last year and a half, right.

So this is first time I just saw right now.

So yeah, so that's a big difference for us to think about that those are two new ones.

You just want to.

Yeah, I'm sorry.

By the effects of insecticide treated article feeds on wild pollinators, managed pollinators and other beneficial insects, and lastly, the effects of insecticide treated article seeds on soil health farms that do not use insecticide treated article seeds, including organic farms.

Those are those are new, otherwise they largely the same, but added in second saturated article feeds or neonicotinoid pesticides.

Umm.

And then kind of like timing wise?

Honor before March 1st, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to.

Yeah, committees House and Senate.

A copy of the proposed rules required to be adopted under this and that if you go back up.

That is.

Neonicotinoid treated article seeds when used prior to January 1st, so that would be.

Umm yeah.

BMP's for Munich treated art seeds prior to ban.

Umm.

And then additional, more work on an honor before July 1st, 2025 adopt rules, establishing best management practices for use in the state of treated article seeds containing or coated with anthranilic diamide.

OK.

Well, that leave wraps it up.

Anyone why is that last section in there?

Those killed me too.

I think they're trying to take into effect unintended unintended consequences, right?

So yeah, if if the band goes into place on.

Neonicotinoid treated seeds.

You know the then is everyone gonna start using diamines?

Umm.

And the the concern, you know what?

What?

What all that entails?

The idea here is that the secretary for the need to see our culture will have.

BMP's that address these other insecticides as opposed to like you know, singling out Munich tonight.

Insecticides only, but I I think it it's also broad enough that.

At least open the door for BMP's.

For other insecticides across the board, umm it it just in this specific act and this is like this language down here this is like would be session law, meaning that it wouldn't be in statute.

It would.

It would just be in the act if it worked passed, so I you know, later down the road they could.

Yeah, and issue another pass.

Another bill that said, hey, you have to come up with BNP, that address this other insecticide that's going on.

See, it's not your nicotine noise or diamide.

And they would have authority to do that, because this is all insecticides.

Right, so hopefully everyone's asleep.

I'm done.

Unless you have questions.

Yeah.

I think we'll take questions and or I think that one of the main reasons why we're going through the bills today are because it is in our responsibility list to provide comment, advice, recommendation based on current legislature that's been introduced.

So I think this is a time for Members to.

Voice opinions that can then be given to Secretary of agency bag.

Relevant to these, so if anyone has a question and or just a comment opinion concern in support.

Anything of that that this is now the time to.

Voices go ahead and I didn't remember a date being put in there.

The 2029 is that has that always been in there?

In the room in the bill?

Yeah.

So it used to be.

 **Cash, Steven** left the meeting

8

81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 54:12

2027 The original bill at 7:06 as proposed, it was the band I believe would have gone in to affect in 2027.

They changed that Friday.

OK.

To 29, right, OK, alright.

Which is kind of good because that mirrors right.

New York, right.

Right, that that was because I feel like in New York goes.

Then from will be more likely to follow.

Yeah, here's the bill.

But I believe you.

Thanks. Yeah.

Well, I'm gonna stop sharing my screen.

Right.

Think back to Roy.

RB Roy Beckford 55:13

Yeah, I was curious for the New York.

8 81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 55:13

Yes.

RB Roy Beckford 55:18

Build, so to speak, who's responsible for the pest risk assessment report.
Is it?

8 81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 55:26

Ohh.

RB Roy Beckford 55:27

Is it I I PM who I I just was just curious about that.

8 81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 55:32

That's a good question.

I it seems like it's on the farmer.

I think it also will fall into.

So the New York EC, which is the you know like that the Pesticide Regulation Agency of New York.

Umm, have to adopt rules to further explain the waiver process?

Yes.

So I think that we just, yeah, we have to wait to see those rules to understand what they I think it.

So it will be up to their determination to explain in the rules how that successfully works and I PM training requirement.

So I think it will be explained further once they make those rules.

Yeah, the The New York deal is generally a lot less verbose and that you know as Morgan saying, I think it's with the understanding that a lot of the details, nuances are going to be explained further by regulation.

RB Roy Beckford 56:38

OK. Thanks.

 **Marguerite Adelman** joined the meeting

8 81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 56:40

Yep.

Any other questions or?

Concerns or words of support for the bill that Members wanna.

Chair.

What?

Thank you, Dan.

Yep, no.

Umm.

And with the quick turn around from Fridays and then that, that's great.

Umm.

OK.

So our we're really shifting gears and we're going to go to Pam Grier to talk about another bill.

That is not neonet related.

No, but I'll let her kind of set it up.

Umm, just like when Zach was talking.

If I'm too quiet, please let me know.

I don't know which microphone is.

Let me know.

I also have lots of wordy slides.

My apologies there.

Yeah, it's too slow.

Hold on while I get my slides up.

OK, at first I wasn't going to have any slides, but I thought this would be a little bit better than staring at us in the room.

MA Marguerite Adelman 58:08

I don't know.

8

81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 58:17

So S 197 S proposed is in.

Umm, it's not in the, umm, eggs committees is actually in the health and Welfare committee and I'm not going to speak to all of those sets.



b213d0ca-d5e3-47b7-a225-e84420b8f4f9 joined the meeting

8

81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 58:36

Umm.

Parts until I get into the amendment discussion.

But what?

Senate Health and Welfare did is they asked Senate egg to review sections 6 and seven.

And So what you're looking at here is the language from Section 7 as proposed and what this bill does is it puts a prohibition on.

That's the sides.

If it contains P fast, but the initial bill as proposed actually defined singles out the 6P fast that you have here a through F, and says that they're not allowed in any pesticides product and they use the language, you can see it at the very bottom.

Acting V6 ingredients can't be in a pesticide if it's the active, inactive or inert ingredient.

I think that's all I have to say about that one.

We'll go to the I'll go through the rest of the build first before.

The bill also went on to describe.

It was a bit confusing, but essentially a focus on making sure that pesticides do not get stored in fluorinated containers if the pesticide is stored in a fluorinated container that it would have to be tested, and if it tested above 20 parts per trillion, then it would be profile would be prohibited.

And so no, I'm just going.

I'm not going to comment, I'm just going to keep talking about what is written.

OK, so section C then starts the description of other the annual submission of the confidential statement of formula and an affidavit in the affidavit would attest to whether or not that pesticide product had ever been stored in a fluorinated container.

 **John Brabant (Guest)** joined the meeting

8 **81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16** 1:00:40

And it went into some details of what the menu the registrant would have to submit to the state.

And I'm actually not going to go into those details just to say that there were some specific pieces of information that the bill requested.

And that the all of this would take place starting January 1st of the upcoming year.

Now I'm going to go back.

And.

When I read this portion, I saw it as very redundant to federal law he passed are not allowed as the active ingredient, or they inactive ingredient of any pesticide product.

So this portion was redundant.

The fluorinated container piece is interesting.

There's developing evidence that there is definitely the possibility that PFAS can be created kind of denovo in packages that are foreign in plastic containers that are fluorinated, and this is a really big topic nationally within the state lead agency.

There's not a lot of.

How do I say there's not a lot of ways to test whether or not you have PFAS coming into your products that are reliable and so they're to date has been a lot of conflicting reports of, yes, we find peace fast.

No, we don't find peace fast.

And so this is interesting, but likely to be front with enforcement difficulty from the an agency perspective of trying to test every product.

They're simply isn't the testing capacity to get all 12,000 products tested on an annual, you know as needed based.

Umm.

Currently for Section C, the agency already has the ability to collect the confidential statement of Formula Anytime we need it.

And when you talk about doing it at this scale, what does it look like for the agencies because each one of these documents is a confidential document that must be kept secure.

And so you would have to create a portal by which we could receive 12,000 of those and link them up to the product that they registered to.

So if we don't have a use for the data in terms of, we're not going through every single ingredient on every single product, then the utility of collecting those doesn't become that useful.

The same thing happens with the affidavit for each product that's registered for each year.

So person registering the pesticide would be required to essentially get the legal team at each one of these registrants to sign off that the product had never been stored, transferred or contained in a fluorinated container in prior to coming here, I was in Maine when similar very similar bill was passed in Maine in the combination of the affidavit about container fluorination in the CSF caused major problems with the state of Maine, and we actually have a I don't want to say I don't want to bad mouth for months, but we have a different registration system we.

Already have an electronic portal that was able to accept these kind of documents that were requested, and it still took us an extra \$100,000.

And we have 1 1/2 time, 1 1/2 FT E right working on this and it was a major a major issue in two day meeting has still not been able to access any of the information that they've collected for litigation concerns.

So the collection of this data would be a huge effort and when you don't know what you want to do with the data, it's not as useful.

I the details of the station are really AH, I I don't have any comment on them and it's really quick.

Turn around time in order to stand up a process for the intake of that much data.

That much confidential data to be able to be ready to do that on the next registration year would be difficult.

They say everything.

I think so.

I don't know if thinking that was the original bill.

Yes, I think so.

Very recently, a an amendment has been proposed and the amendment changes everything.

So you could see the yellow highlighting that shows the new language, and I said at the beginning I skipped over the 1st 5 sections of the bill.

This kind of replaces a good portion of the first part of that bill in it, it essentially creates a statewide prohibition on any product that contains P pass that has been intentionally added to the product.

And this actually affects pesticides much more broadly than the initial bill did.

So and it's because the definition of.

And and I've cut this from an earlier portion in the amendment.

But the language that they use here to define a feedback is a class of fluorinated organic chemicals containing at least one fully fluorinated carbon atom.

Now I was in Maine when this definition came into our regulations also, and this definition is a very, very broad definition.

There's a good reason that you want to use a broad definition.

Essentially, we are in mass with PFAS and part of the reason we're in that mess is when PFOA and POS were found to be bad actors, if they were forced off of the market 20 years ago in industry pivoted to very similar chemicals.

It's the concept of the regrettable substitution.

And so a definition, this fraud is really intended to make sure that we never again allow these chemicals into the marketplace.

This particular definition, the one fully fluorinated carbon definition, it's very broad and it pulls in many, many things that you would not consider to be pee fast the other day in the one of the committees, somebody was asking for a like the origin story of the the class of the word PFAS.

And I think we could actually have a good 20 minute discussion on just this problem.

But I think part of the problem with PFAS regulation in the United States today has been that nobody wants to say these long chemical names and that what we've been calling them has been changing.

So 16 years ago, I think when I got married, I got new pots and pans because I got rid of all my Teflon pots and pans.

But back then, we weren't calling it too fast.

It was C8 was the big chemical name that you associated it with.

And over time, we've just been changing the name of what we call this group of chemicals.

And I still hate this particular definition.

I think I've been pretty clear memo.

So the last couple years about that, but this is, This is why I think this definition is really difficult.

On the left you have PFOA.

This is a PDF that has been prohibited for use manufacturer in the United States for 20 years, and it's one of these, just traditional Pfaff of concerns on the right you have

by sponsoring it takes currently registered insecticide.

That's widely used and kick in mosquito product in under this one.

Fully fluorinated carbon definition, both of them would be considered to be P5.

I have some other pictures.

Alright, Sarah.

Doctor Owen and I have been participating with the EC in a working group trying to come to a consensus on what kind of definition of ppads we can move forward with that doesn't further confuse the topic.

Let's say a quick way to put that.

Yeah.

No, the quote that you had up here is the definition that Doctor Owen provided in testimony last week.

Or the week before and it takes the one fully fluorinated carbon definition that I just showed you from the original language.

And then as on to it that it would be found in what I refer to as Tosca 887 and it's referred to in the CFR quote here.

And before I go any further, recently EPA issued an order to all manufacturers to go back in time for the last 10 years into inventory every time they have used one of these Tosca 87 chemicals.

So Dec is interested in aligning our the states collection of data with this definition so that we can then use all the federal information that we get so it can year or two we're EPA will be collecting data from use patterns all across the United States for the past ten years and we'll have a much better idea of where Pete asks have been used because one of the things I think you been in a conversation about PFAS with people always pull out their favorite place I found PFAS recently like dental sutures is one that I thought.

Was really interesting.

Dental floss.

I tried to find plumbing.

Umm plumbers putty that wasn't pee fast and they almost can't do that.

So we that's what EPA is grappling with right now is trying to identify all the places in commerce where we have pizza.

So by reference, the working definition that we have here uses the Tosca 87 definition and then it allows for exemption of chemicals.

That are already heavily regulated.

Things like medicine, veterinary medicines and pesticides, so long as those items are not persistent bioaccumulative toxic in the of course, there would have to be the ability to add chemicals to that list.

It's at the bottom of the screen.

You can see the definition.

I it's a very complicated definition.

I like to refer to it either as A2 carbon definition or the task definition, or sometimes the ECA working definition, because for a while in pesticides, that's what they were referring to.

This table shows you.

So the one fully fluorinated carbon definition is the table in the top, and it has really broad reach where it says main and Minnesota.

Those two lines, if you use one fully fluorinated carbon definition, you would classify somewhere between 56 and 90 pesticide active ingredients as P fast down at the bottom.

It's it's not in a table and I apologize, it's a pretty ugly slide.

It says one fully coordinated carbon would be in the state of Vermont, 42 active ingredients, or about 1600 different veterinary products, so that one fully fluorinated carbon definition pulls in a bunch of things that you just wouldn't imagine to be P path.

There are some human medicines as well.

Not very many of them.

Then at the very top of that table where it says Tosca on the side.

This is the working definition.

That definition only pulls in about four pesticides.

Active ingredients and none of the veterinary medicine products.

So the Tosca 887 is a smaller, it pulls it in fewer chemicals, but it by numbers it's not a huge difference.

The the task definition still has over 11,000 chemicals in its list.

Ohh goodness.

Sarah, what did I miss?

The language you showed is probably going to change on consumer product, so.

I guess that's the a good point that we have the initial bill as submitted an amendment and likely amendment to the amendment.

The language from the bill or the language of the definitions of.

It's not the language of the bill you're saying it's like all the change.

Probably I think right now.

The proposal to ban P bats and all consumer products is right.

Like we did change.

And I think the definition is likely to change also.

I hope so.

Yeah, I don't know what else to.

Through at the board.

I think we can ask the board if anyone has any.

Question or opinion? Umm.

It's about it complicated.

OK, umm and scary how president?

RB **Roy Beckford** 1:15:11

There's an interesting comment in the chat.

Ohh I don't know if Margaret wants to talk about that for a second.

MA **Marguerite Adelman** 1:15:25

Sure.

I don't mind saying something.

8 **81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16** 1:15:25

Yeah.

OK Marguerite, I can also I know that you've been in the chat and I can leave it for we.

We do have dedicated time at the end of the agenda for public comment and so if you.

MA **Marguerite Adelman** 1:15:37

OK.

8 **81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16** 1:15:40

Maybe let's save it for the public comment period and then we can capture it in the Minutes and it will be in the transcript because it will be in the chat as well.

RB **Roy Beckford** 1:15:48

Let me let me say this though I what if if is there anybody?

Is there any member that are that have any sense of what the veterinary, the feel of veterinary medicine might, umm, are these folks here?

Would would respond or react to this?

8 **81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16** 1:16:09

Umm I yes.

I've been talking to the state vet and they're very concerned.

We went through the list of all FDA approved vet medicines that would be for use here in Vermont.

There were those 42 active ingredients, but it was when the the vet started going through that list for chemicals that they used, that they did become quite concerned. So for instance, the anesthetic gas that you use for every pet surgery, you know like dog and cat with is considered key facts under the one fully coordinated carbon definition.

Umm, I can't remember some of the other examples, that one was just very notable because very common meeting for the isophorone yeah.

And Halen, one of the more financially accessible for people, limited funds.

Yeah, and.

Yes.

I'll that.

Do any other Members have anything that you would like to share relevance of this bill?

Yeah, it can be in regards to those.

So basically, the only time that there is this significant potential significant impact to have to decide Umm is is that?

Broader language that might change but is right now in the amendment.

Umm.

Hold in, but as introduced, the festive guideline which I'm just making sure I understand this as introduced the pesticide language wouldn't have affected many pesticides because any at all.

And then now because they're pulling in all products, that's when pesticides gets pulled into the picture.

So we'll have to see them.

How that changes and so we'll maybe just, yeah, I mean, we'll have you back and whatever to understand how on a broader, I mean, yes, those I think veterinary also includes impacts agriculture as well in addition to websites.

I think both of those veins, we can continue to keep. Ryan.

Yeah, there's no doubt that people don't belong in pesticides.

Like when you think about the traditional P fast.

Yeah.

And there there are none that are allowed for you.

Umm, as soon as the pesticide company becomes aware that there is a PFAS in the product because it contamination, they're required to notify EPA within 30 days that contamination occurred and EPA has been following up rapidly with companies when known cases of contamination have occurred.

It's that the violation of you for us to have a fast in your product.

OK.

Umm.

So before were last chance, I'm gonna switch.

We're gonna switch to the last bill that's been introduced.

OK.

So Dave, you're do you have something to share or are you just gonna talk?

I'm just gonna talk.

OK, that's fine. That's.

Umm, alright Dave and you wanna just introduce yourself to the store every.

Yeah.

Hi everybody.

For the record, Dave Huber, deputy director of the Forum division.

Uh, nice to nice to see everybody in person and on the screen, so I'm gonna talk a little bit about F272, which is a bill that was introduced with a goal of regulating second generation anticoagulant rodenticides.

I'm just gonna say escars from here on out for the acronym for that, for the purpose of this bill is bill is gonna propose for require that the secretary of the Agency of Agriculture registers second generation anticoagulant rodenticides escars as restricted use pesticides that may only be used by certified pesticide applicators and it's a pretty short build.

The short of it right now is that this bill is being contemplated as uh being assumed

and subsumed by General Housekeeping bill that they can see is of of working on with the committee.

And so this bill may or may not be around and it's independent for much longer.

We're just wanted to give you a heads up on that.

Uh, But what this does is it does make amendments to six BSA section 911.

Ohh and what it's doing there is it's including a definition of the second generation anticoagulants as far as and what they're saying.

That means is that any rodenticide containing any one of the following active ingredients for different come from adding alone dynacomp or that alone, and so those are the four scars.

There are a lot of rodenticides out there.

They're edgars.

Those are the first generation anticoagulant.

Ohh and I can get into what those are as well as the 2008 EPA guide and so on rodenticides.

But before I do, just wanted to touch upon the rest of the bill.

It is also looking to to make these escars restricted.

Use pesticides are groups in the state of Vermont, and it is also looking to have a couple of studies done as well as potential rulemaking on rodenticides.

The studies the studies are being done at the federal level right now by the EPA and the EPA is supposedly gonna come to an answer in a conclusion about scars coming up here in the fall.

And so I think it's not exactly certain that this is necessary to go through these reports or the rulemaking, but ohh testimony has has focused on what scars are the different classification of pesticides AB and C and the state as well as the 2008 EPA guidance for the reclassification of red missives.

Does anybody have any questions about the 10,000 foot view before I jump into, if warranted?

Uh one inch view.

I would love to hear the one interview of the study.

I I don't know.

Like what you're saying?

Like there are some in there.

So maybe like what's been proposed that yeah, so this is a umm.

So right now there is there is a bunch of potential mitigations in a draft for the MSI

study that the EPA is looking at and the EPA is going to be looking at these potential mitigations and they should be coming up with an answer as to what they're going to do, whether or not they're going to establish this or not.

But it does look like they are going to be moving on these mitigations.

Post application follow up to dispose of spill it or kicked out bait.

Use of base stations that exclude listed species by size or behavior.

Restriction of consumer products to non refillable bait stations.

The 4th one, which is the most germane to this bill?

Classification of rodenticides as restricted use pesticides for F cars and escars, so they're gonna be looking at that at the federal level, which would in essence make this bill.

Uh, you know?

Not necessary.

They're also gonna be looking at the placement of base stations within 5 feet of structures, the prohibition of broadcast and in borough uses and areas where at times the year with the animals have access to the treated area of statement saying do not apply directly to water, which I think we can all agree is something that should be on the renderer side.

Uh.

And establishment of the endangered species bulletins to implement specific mitigations needed in limited geographical areas or at times of year to protect particular species.

So I'll go into play with the ESA risk mitigation that the EPA has been working on for the past couple of years and is now wrapping up very quickly.

I believe Steve Bunnell has probably talked to this group repeatedly about the ESA and the ohh what's going on at the federal level with the NSA post application.

Follow up to report dead or dying animals.

Those would be reported to the EPA pesticide Incident reporting website as soon as possible.

I have a link for that as well and then lastly post application follow up which would include carcass, search, collection and disposal statements.

So that's what the EPA is mulling over.

And it looks like they're going to be moving on those.

Uh, roughly the same time that this bill would go into effect.

And as we know, you have to be in the states have stricter structure than the federal

government when it comes to sort of regulation.

And so right now this would be stricter.

OK.

But then, if the EPA does move on this with their own regulations, then it would just be as strict.

What the agency is understanding the committee might want to do is potentially get rid of the report rulemaking.

Uh, and have this so that, uh, all escars are gonna be restricted.

Use pesticides.

Currently in Vermont, there are 68 products that are registered to contain as cars and 56 of these are classed as date restricted use class A-12 or class as Class B control sale and that's because they have the agricultural exemption applied to those products and that's based again on the 2008 EPA restrictions on rodenticide guidance.

So Asgard's class says Class B.

They can be used in agricultural buildings.

Can't be sold in minimum £8.00 for agricultural use, and they have to contain a statement that says do not use this product in homes or other human residences.

And you, you're not gonna find these products over at stores such as Home Depot or Lowe's, but you will find these over at farm stores like Agway or Tractor Supply.

Anything that's catering to the agricultural community, you're probably going to be finding these escars that are Class B being sold.

And again, that's because of the agricultural exemption.

So just to cut to the chase, what the bill would be doing is making so that the AG exemption has gone away and that all as far as are that.

Are classified as Class A restricted use in the state now.

They can still be used by the pest management professional industry to make applications, but then you have somebody who is certified to use Class A product making that application, you know, the incentive agriculture has been responding to concerns about secondary poisoning and non targets.

We put together education campaign for consumers to use tamper resistant base stations and probably can't see it too well.

I can't see it too well on the screen, but I've shared this with AIB several months ago.

I think over the last summer and essentially what this is is it's an alert for retailers who were selling Rd downside that if if they can cause it's not mandated.

But we've had really great cooperation with the stores.

Yeah.

If they are selling bread and aside, then we would appreciate it if they would put this plastic post drop that is water resistant so it can get splashed on and what it does is it says that it's illegal to use these bases outdoors without a base station.

So further puts the parameters and the legal guidance on how to properly and adequately use and legally use rodenticides in the state.

There's also a QR code that if you scan it will take you right to the Agency of Agriculture's website where there's a embedded YouTube video showing the appropriate ways to use a base station with the use of rodenticides.

 **Inoue, Emilie** joined the meeting

8

81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 1:29:26

So we have that poster in a video.

We've also provided education for pest control operators regarding the proper use of reidentified.

We've had two meetings, 2 rodenticide meetings.

One we held jointly with New Hampshire and we've had very good attendance at these rodenticide meetings.

The aim for these meetings was to get the pest management professionals involved so that they understand that while they may have a target on their backs right because they're using products, potentially the misuse is being done by folks who are just purchasing this and using it outside of their training because all pest management professionals who are utilizing for it as it should have gone through the licensure that is provided by the Agency of Agriculture.

And then we've also got our standard investigation and enforcement actions for rodenticide misuse that goes through our standard investigatory administrative process and our administrative enforcement process to make sure that.

Ohh, compliance is bad.

And I just want to provide a little bit of background to everybody on F cars and escars just so everyone is aware of what these products are besides besides the names of the chemicals, uh, first generation anticoagulants F cars, they include anticoagulants that were developed as rodenticides prior to 1970.

And these compounds are much more toxic when feeding occurs on several

successive days, rather than on one day only.

So chloroplast known die fast known, and warfarin those were first generation anticoagulants and they are currently registered to control rats and mice in the United States.

Escars, on the other hand, were developed in the 1970s.

Uh, and there were used to control rodents that are resistant to ask cars, so ascar is also are more likely than escars to kill after one nice feeding.

And these compounds kill over a similar course of time, but they tend to remain in the animal tissues longer than do the first generation anticoagulant.

And these properties mean that the second generation products do pose greater risk than non target species.

That might speed on base only once, or that might speed upon animals that have eaten the base, but due to these risks, the escars they're no longer registered for use in products.

Geared toward consumers and are registered only for the commercial pest control industry and structural pest control markets, SR's are registered in the US and they do include, as I said earlier, brodifacoum Maddie alone.

That kind of come and dive basically alone.

Now there's other rodenticides that are also in use that are not neither Edgar nor Esgar, and those are like cool, sacral and zinc falsified from methylin also.

But while these are not anti coagulants, they're toxic in their own way, and these are products that are mainly used by some of our federal government partners.

They just prefer to use those as opposed to escars or affairs.

OK.

And then anybody?

Have any questions or thoughts to share?

Remember I see Steve 2 bar.

You're kind of you're only.

Producer on the call member right now and I was just wondering about those agriculturally exempt product.

Do you ever use any type of revenge type product in your operation?

SS **Steve Schubart** 1:33:20

I'm probably not a good producer to comment on that.

8 81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 1:33:24

Yeah.

SS Steve Schubart 1:33:24

We would not use any of those poisons on our soils.

But yeah, I'm happy to offer more thoughts there, but I think they're off topic.

8 81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 1:33:45

Well, fine.

Thank you for sharing.

I just yeah, basically.

So it's only those 12 products that are kind of in question of being classified differently.

So have different accessibility right?

I'm sorry.

What more?

And then that is, you know, see if this goes through, that exemption would be gone for you, but you'd be able to hire a PMP if pest management professional to do that work, which gives some people piece of mind, other people see dollar signs and say I could do it for cheaper myself, but there in lies of a fundamental question and potential problem by doing it yourself are you without the license or are you are you potentially going to run afoul of compliance issues?

SS Steve Schubart 1:34:33

I can only, yeah.

Looks like someone else was going to make a comment.

8 81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 1:34:40

Ohh it's OK, but see if you can finish this off first.

That's fine.

SS Steve Schubart 1:34:43

Ohh, we don't use rodenticide.

We don't have any issues with that.

I think there are issues with regulating things that farmers can and can't do on their land, but I think we've all seen that.

Farmers know how to get around that stuff with our own ingenuity. Umm.

So I don't know it kind of sounds like the right to repair question to me a little bit.

Umm, but I don't.

You know, I'm not a huge fan of poisons, so probably not a good person to ask about it.

8

81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 1:35:23

OK.

Thanks for sharing, Steve.

Stephanie.

Yeah, it just doesn't take like the the traps that are pre evaded that are current I think are those those are not are those currently available to the arterial and will those remain accessible to residential use those will because so those are and I can go into 2008 guidance as well because that does tackle Stephanie questions.

So in Vermont, we have three classes of pesticides, AB and C, and Stephanie is referring to ready to use base stations.

These are Artus for the most part.

This is bromethalin, chlorophenol and diphacinone, so we're talking Edgars in those products and those are, like I said, they are ready to use in packaging.

It's a pre debated station now they can be sold with a refillable up to £1.00 of bait that can be in that same packaging and that allows the user to get the RTU product they're ready to use and then refill it one time and that can be included with the base station and the retail package.

Those are Class C Those would be untouched by this build because this bill is focusing on escars and the Artus are first generation F guards.

So this would this would be affecting those 12 products that have the AG exemption and are currently Class B.

But if they didn't have the age exemption, they would be Class A anyway.

So you know, all this does is it, in essence, get rid of the AG exemption for Class B scars.

And there's only 12 of them, and the agency is prepared to to, you know, pump these up to a Class A.

It's just requiring that we make the change on our end and then they would go

through the routine administrative investigatory inspection processes that we already have in place.

If there was found to be a compliance issue and that yeah, and that would lead to the administrative enforcement process, which we already have in place and we wouldn't be bogged down or burdened by an additional 12 product for the Class B restricted sales, I'm gonna start reading off a bunch of products here and just know that these products must contain at least four pounds of base.

They can be larger quantities, they can be blocked, Pelletier paste, and they are not RTU in a base station, but the label direct use in a base station if outdoors.

So these products are bromethalin colorfast known diphacinone chlorophyll and think 55.

So for those products, they're Class B.

Again, it has to be at least four pounds of base that it's being sold now, product labeled for use around agricultural buildings is where we get into the tagging exemption for Class B, and this is those 12 products they are sold in a minimum of £8.00 for agricultural use.

And again, they have to contain the statements.

Do not use this product at homes or other human residences, so this is strictly for AG.

Use.

These are brodifacoum from add, elone, dynacomp and Diphu alone, so those are the scars that normally would be Class A state restricted federally restricted, but their Class B due to the aging exemption.

If you see any of those products, those four products that I just read off protiva come from adding loans I found at home and typeset alone.

If you see them being sold in a container size of 16 or more pounds and it has a label on there that says four professional use, then you can rest assured that it's already classified as a class that a product in the state.

And these are all based on the rodenticide reclassification guidelines for May 28th, 2008 from the EPA.

Thanks, babe.

Any other questions, comments, concerns today Members want to share?

Great.

Before we move to the next topic, I know that at the beginning meeting I forgot to ask about the January minute.

I didn't hear about any.

Edits to those minutes.

But we're members, except those minutes as they were provided to you.

It's being not pretty sure I was absent.

OK, I got everything.

 **b213d0ca-d5e3-47b7-a225-e84420b8f4f9** left the meeting

8 **81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16** 1:40:33

So our final topic before we allow for public comment, which I appreciate everyone joined today for that.

So we should have plenty of time for that.

But our last topic is regarding our.

Survey.

So we talked a little bit about it last month.

We talked about winter being a good time.

Winter is slipping away from us as we see.

Uh.

Temperatures in the 50s coming up.

Umm, so I know that that's tricky for us, so I know we had talked about Roy and I don't know if you had a chance to kind of check in or and maybe you do about we had talked about potentially piggybacking on any UVM type of survey that was going out.

So we wouldn't overwhelm farmers with things I didn't know.

If you had any luck, Roy, looking to see what might be coming out from a VM in the near future.

RB **Roy Beckford** 1:41:35

Sure.

Yes, I did email survey of of extension folks were planning to do their survey.

That's sounds weird, I know, but it so I have.

Three people in extension and UVM that are get ready to do some kind of pharma survey.

One is just about ready and the 2nd and 3rd that I'll mention are kind of looking at later on.

Don't down the year.

So Margaret Skinner, who's her entomologist.

Is looking to put out a survey soon and I would like to kind of get some sense of what the survey questions from.

Yeah, would be, would be like as well.

David Connor from from Cal.

From the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences is also looking at putting something together.

But later on this year and Mark Canelo from our ad business unit also is they're contemplating doing a a survey of of of farmers now specifically looking at farm viability issues.

But certainly, you know, they feel like there would be some synergy.

Ohh.

Including some questions that would come from from the IB as well.

So those are those are the three and there may be others I did as I said said out it kind of whites email swaths.

So there may be others who will check in with me soon, but these folks are more or less starting with Margaret Skinner, pretty much ready to to move on to help.

8

81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 1:43:16

Thank you.

We're that's incredibly useful, Margaret.

Who is her intended audience?

Do you know?

RB

Roy Beckford 1:43:28

It shield shield looking.

8

81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 1:43:29

Probably.

RB

Roy Beckford 1:43:29

She's looking at covered agriculture groups, so people are doing green houses and that kind of thing, but it doesn't have to be restricted to that group if she sees value in UM, creating synergy with questions about, you know, pesticide issues.

8 81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 1:43:37

Greenhouse.

RB Roy Beckford 1:43:51

Ohh, as I said she is our ohh she's an anthropologist and is interested in the data anyways.

8 81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 1:44:09

Ohm.

So I had, I mean it numbers speak up, but I have the list of questions that we asked in last year's survey.

If you want to look at that, if you want to.

Pick questions from last year that you want to continue that we could potentially work with either of these three.

It sounds like Margaret, we would need to get a move on, right, because she's looking to use it to send it out sooner. Umm.

RB Roy Beckford 1:44:44

Yep.

8 81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 1:44:50

But then the other two, David and Mark, maybe we have a little bit more time, so I'll go ahead and run.

RB Roy Beckford 1:44:54

No.

Much more time.

So they're looking at later on this year.

And David even mentioned possibly 25 so early 25.

So there's time for those two.

But but like I said, there may be other people who may contact me at any point, you know, who are who have gotten a grant that requires a a survey.

8 81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 1:45:10

OK.

RB Roy Beckford 1:45:20

So you know that might pop up just suddenly.

This happens all the time and extension.

8 81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 1:45:31

So let me pull up.

2nd.

So I'm trying to pull up the questions that we had last year and so things that you wanted to here umm.

Keep or not?

So the the first couple are just around.

You know who is completing out, who is completing the survey so far?

Name umm.

And then thighs of farm location.

This was something, so I think location county, we do need to know because that's a requirement in the statute that we have to have a survey that encompasses the 14 counties.

But I think we do have to keep counting.

At least.

So other questions we included last year?

Any of the following reasons persuade you to reduce pesticide use?

Uh with the list?

Things are?

We asked in the previous year, did you practice I PM?

If so, what?

Kind of practices that you do.

What would encourage you to practice them?

So in this coming year.

What type of operation?

Do you have whether it's organic, non organic or you have both in your property?

We asked a lot of questions about treated seed knowing we did this knowing that we

were going to have the, you know, discussion happens that we did for the majority of the year.

More about treated seeds, so if you could for just one without a neuronic would you? I remember correctly the answered are the answers to this were either don't know or don't use.

We didn't get a lot of.

Non organic conventional farmers just bonding.

With lots about custom test site treatment, umm.

And then what types of pesticides do you use?

And then we asked about ad plastic.

This is a potential on our list of responsibilities.

In addition to pesticide ID plastic, when the two I know and I and then I saw your face, I know that you sent an article that I forgot to share with Members.

And I will do so when I share the Minutes for this meeting.

That was about microplastics.

I apologize.

I'm sorry I didn't get that out.

And so we did ask about what types of egg plastic do you use?

How do you manage them?

Basically, how do you reuse them?

Or do you recycle them?

Or do you dispose for landfill?

What would persuade you to change your current practices bag?

Plastic and we talked about soil tests because we also have just other ad inputs in our responsibility.

So whether it's synthetic fertilizer or natural fertilizer we asked about.

And what type of services do you use?

And then if there's anything else you want to add, so I wonder if Members had an idea if they wanted to keep certain questions, if there was some a specific topic that they wanted to really.

Asked about for this.

Round for this year or?

Umm, if we wanted to.

Jump on the opportunity to get in with.

Margaret survey that's coming up.

I'm happy to go with you guys.
Have an idea of what questions you want to ask?
Yeah, when you do.

WH **Wendy Sue Harper** 1:50:42

Would it be useful to have ask a question?
Are you concerned about microplastics, or are you concerned about PFAS in you know the product you're using or in your soil or something like that?
It would that be useful for us to ask that that's all.

8 **81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16** 1:51:08

I don't know if I have anything.
Anyone have thoughts of what is it useful to ask that question?
What will we do with the info with the information?
Same, everybody's gonna say yes, but I don't know.
Yeah.
Yeah.
What are we going to do with that? Umm.
Sorry.
Yep, him.
Can you ask them instead what they have concerns of like and use it as a way to get feelers out, or where people's concerns are?
Ohh it in instead of click then so then you don't have they can't click all still put in P fast and microplastics.
Get people thinking, but to use it as kind of horizon scanning.
That might help us help focus us.
Yeah, could help, but would so, but what are your concerns?
Questionmark or what are your concerns about the inputs that you use or yes so environment or environmental concerns like.
I feel like there's a couple of ways we could qualify concerns.
That's a very broad question.
Yeah, but it's so freeing.
Maybe people will wanna fill out the survey.
Put their paragraph thoughts and.
I do.

My personal thought is that I think we put a lot of effort into this survey in 23 and we didn't really learn a lot from it because of who answered it.

I guess really like so we basically the people who answered it didn't have high like pesticide input onto their farm and we're treated seed input onto their farm.

So the so the information we were trying to gather was just not there to gather from the participants who answered it.

So I'm.

Personally, I'm kind of liking that because I feel like maybe it might be in focus us, whereas we didn't really get any focus from last year's survey.

Is a survey required by statute?

Yeah.

So I think it can be interpreted that way.

So it's listed in the list, so it says like we have to do a in a report and then it basically lists a survey to inform the annual report.

So it doesn't say an annual survey, but it says to inform the report so it can be assumed that.

I guess that this survey should be new every year.

If you're writing a new report every year, I have also wonder whether or not the survey the work of the AIB, the work of the agency to get in front of various groups, my in influence, the not that more people might respond this upcoming year due to the outreach that has happened by the agency, you know participation on various.

Farmer Alliance groups working with you know.

Anyway, just an idea and I don't know the answer to that, but I'm I'm hopeful maybe.

Umm.

But we could just change the survey completely and just ask one question.

Survey with one question.

And what county are you from and what country?

Do what country you're from and eliminate names like.

Initially we thought it would be nice to see if we asked the same survey.

This is what I was thinking I was participating in putting in the survey together was if people ideas changed over time.

That's why we collected.

Who was filling out the survey?

And so we could see it change over time for potentially see change over time with people completed it every year.

Umm, but we're only done it for one year, so maybe we can just change tactic now. Or we could return.

We could put the survey aside and return to it next year.

Yeah, we know that a lot with our big survey questions we ask, we'll have questions on multi year cycles because it gets repetitive to ask the same questions every year in a row last and every three to five years.

So some years we'll have shorter, shorter questions and.

That's great.

Yeah, great idea \$1000 per question.

So ah, you have to be very careful with them, but that idea can make sense, especially if you didn't get the responses that you wanted from the first year.

I think it makes sense to sort of think about it more holistically and what is the goal of the survey?

It's gonna look up the AIB statutory language and I don't have it up right now.

I was only thinking, you know, we worked on LEDs and Maple syrup and would this be a tool that we could use to ask questions about how widespread is the like?

What is the potential?

Because I think there's not a lot of testing which makes sense, and so it's an environmental issue that could be out there and we might not know what how bright is we could use it.

Yeah, I don't know.

I think it's what is it.

OK, I think the environmental, no, things like that.

If there's like, we get the higher cultural input.

Yeah.

And it's the specific to the the charge of the AIB, that's my understanding.

That's how we right orchestrated the questions.

So hold on, we'll get that answer, Steve, go ahead.

SS **Steve Schubart** 1:57:24

I think we did this, but the survey went out to the Vermont area producers, right?

8 **81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16** 1:57:31

Yeah, yeah.

SS Steve Schubart 1:57:31

Alliance OK. Yeah.

8 81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 1:57:33

I think we sent it to like the the head.

You know what I mean?

Like the.

Executive director or the administrator, you know, to ask them to disseminate to their members, you know, I mean, so it didn't go to all Members from directly from us.

It was to a single point of contact to for them to disseminate, with Anson, saying please disseminate.

We need your help to that single point of contact, so yeah.

SS Steve Schubart 1:58:05

Yep, I just making the point that I think a lot of what we're talking about impacts that group of producers heavily and however we can get them to weigh in is probably really important.

Maybe there's a raffle.

If you enter, I don't know.

I'm just just thinking outside of the box.

8 81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 1:58:25

Yeah, I agree.

I think any, I mean even attending like the Bordeaux brothers, which they're like any of their informational, umm days that they have for their customers, that's the audience that's there, right.

And you know, last year I remember attending and kind of.

Kind of probing about surveys and all of them were like, unless you give me money, I'm not filling out a survey.

Umm so which is it?

Which is understandable.

It's busy.

It's hard Rathman and do something for free and for nothing in return and.

Yeah, I know.

I know that you Join Now on our side is that you know we can't offer any financial incentive raffle.

I don't know if a different type of incentive.

I don't know.

I can take that as an action item to ask if what kosher is something or an experience at a farm or something like that could be offered, but I don't know, but I can.

I can certainly try and find out.

If it's, it's not my.

I'm not on the board, but I kinda like that idea of like a three to five year cycle on the really long list of questions that we've already developed.

And then maybe intervening shorter questions or shorter list of questions or a questions as was pitched earlier.

And then also building and when we have our longer list of survey questions and you bring up, you know, going to Bordeaux brothers or if we go to an event like if we go to Border View Farm for something that we as agents of the agency actually approach people and fill the survey out with them in person after the event like I actually think if we all did that just agents of the agency with our computers in approaching farmers we actually might get more participation then we got when we just sent it out earlier.

So like a different way of engaging you guys have a lot of people out in the field.

We have a lot of people out in the field.

I mean, we have inspectors that do inspections and we have, yeah, like at any point in time.

Yeah.

What kind of selection bias are you getting them?

Well, I don't know.

I mean, that's not something I'm thinking about.

I'm just talking.

That's something I'm good at so.

But ultimately it would be any, you know, we could think about that, I guess and maybe come up with an idea.

How how do other Members feel about the?

Longer set so that document that I just showed of questions on a three to five year cycle and a shorter potentially even, you know two questions with county.

Are you from what environmental concerns, if you have or kind of those alternate years, how do Members respond to that proposal?

WH **Wendy Sue Harper** 2:01:24

I'm OK with all with doing a longer set of questions, and then there's shorter set. I think that might be good.

RB **Roy Beckford** 2:01:36

So I'm gonna say this and I'm going to look at Steve while I'm saying it. Having lived vicariously as a farmer for a long time, I know that the rate of the rate of response.

WH **Wendy Sue Harper** 2:01:45

And this hello.
Hi.

RB **Roy Beckford** 2:01:53

Loretta response is it's perfect, is proportionate to how long the survey is.

WH **Wendy Sue Harper** 2:01:54

OK.

8 **81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16** 2:01:56

I got it.
I mean because.

RB **Roy Beckford** 2:02:03

Ohh easy.
The questions aren't to answer and how tired the farmer is.
That means how many surveys they had received prior to this one.
Those are some of the factors that all of them, but I as I was looking through the questions while you were we're showing them I I was kind of thinking well, I mean if you send these for example to to the beekeepers associations, the, the the response right now would be significant, it would be tremendous.
But so that that's what I think.

But in terms of dairy farmers and others were or more large scale, I I feel that when they're not tired, when they haven't received a dozen surveys prior, I mean they're gonna, they're gonna be happy to sit, to send our happier to send in responses.

If the questions are not exhaustive.

Right, Steve or wrong.

8 **81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16** 2:02:58

You.

Yeah, go ahead.

Is there a way you can tired and do like something that is already required?

I'm not very well versed on so all the water, water quality, divisions, regulations, but like you know is is an FFO an annual permit I I don't know but something like you know sneak it in to something that is you know it needs to be done and then it's there and I don't know just a thought.

You already doing something that you have to do like few more questions and look, I don't want to be deception.

Deceptive, but yeah, I think that could tie in to maybe not every year, but right three to five years like ohh like this is.

Yeah.

You know, we're on the 5th year, so your permit is gonna have, you know, we have to, I mean, granted, that's only, you know.

 **Decker, Brooke** left the meeting

8 **81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16** 2:04:14

Limited demographic, but yeah, some of that at least they would probably answer umm for on farm application might be yeah.

 **Decker, Brooke** joined the meeting

8 **81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16** 2:04:25

Then we have the.

Yeah, see and TV.

You know people who take the private applicator exam.

Yeah.

Yeah, we could, right, because there are captive audience.

Yep, potentially sitting in a conference room, taking an exam, specially if you had one of those surveys.

Interactive surveys.

Yeah, where you could record that?

I don't know whether we have such a thing.

Yeah, no.

I'm not sure technology that kind of technology, but thank you can do poll questions.

Anonymous poll question.

Yeah, you can talk to Sarah and Sarah and that's a lot coming up in April.

The core is in April, which which would include predators.

Yeah, right.

And then the 1A in March meeting, I think there's some right, it's a phone even the veterinarian like we had one component of phone app that right.

Yeah, I don't know.

So maybe that's too ways.

So if we have these, you know two questions and and please speak up front.

But I'm thinking I'm thinking OK, we have what county are you from?

So we can show that we've surveyed county, county and.

What are your environmental concerns?

Do you have a list?

Your farm?

Yeah, that they could.

Yeah, with another option.

So I'll list with another option that they could fill in.

I mean if you want it on the whole thing or that have another option, I don't know if you can type in all that stuff.

What that could end is asking understanding how agricultural inputs are used in current challenges they face and reducing them.

So maybe it's the current challenges that they face and reducing them that we really want to hear, because then that gives us a push of which of those could be reduced.

So the question is, what sounds like 2 questions.

Maybe like what are the concerns about environmental impacts of the agricultural inputs you use and what are your challenges to reduce?

Those impacts?

No, no.

Like and then the county.

Yeah, I think what you were trying to say, I think so, I mean, are the farmers really connected to the long term environmental impacts of their agricultural inputs or are they more concerned with the challenges and reducing those?

I I would think like the second part maybe more so because that's like a tangential thing that's hard for them to do.

I think in there. Yeah.

And I'm just guessing I know nothing about practice.

Even just speaking to like the seed question it, it allows them an opportunity to express what they see as a difficulty issue.

Yeah, put of units go away.

What?

What it's done there difficulty in.

How do they foresee it for them?

Umm, OK.

So three questions.

So if.

I reach out to.

Margaret Roy like and and with you and.

Ask if those are questions that she might be.

That fit, I mean, I don't want them to be like, way out in left field based on what she is already asking for. Umm.

RB

Roy Beckford 2:08:26

Yeah.

Well, you could.

You could reach out to her.

I mean, she was?

She asked me about what the questions were.

I I didn't provide anything to her.

I told her I I'd follow up, but you can certainly do that and see whether the it's a fit for.

For what?

Whatever she's doing, I will.

8 81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 2:08:42

OK.

RB Roy Beckford 2:08:42

I will let her know that to to to expect you.

8 81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 2:08:46

OK, perfect.

Umm, I know I've met her in a past life.

Years ago, but probably will not Remember Me.

But so that's good to give her heads up, right?

OK.

So I'll kind of propose those two three questions, including the county to see if they fit within her.

Umm.

Survey and if they don't fit within her survey, then I think we can figure out another another way to get them, whether it's through the.

When we're training on the cord exam for private and that would be lots of commercial applicators. Stuff.

Prior to would be accomplished in that.

Or through another just emails the segmentation like we did before.

Could you do hard copy stuff at meeting like a hard copy survey?

Yeah, because there are, you know, for that initial cert.

I think it's going to be in five different locations monitored by the agents.

Oht is agents.

We're in charge of the.

Umm surveys.

Yeah.

When they distribute the exams would be like private applicator, OK?

And then we could just give them the paper copy of it, and then we can still create it in an electronic format.

We would just stay to enter it ourselves, right?

We can divide and caucus.

You get some.

Answer I guess so.

So our options are.

Included with yeah.

Give me.

Hard copies when.

Or or yeah, or just, or talk to Sarah and see what her capabilities are because she does like she has to get them for research stuff.

She makes sure that gets everybody's she can talk to everybody and get their license number or see their face.

So she may have a way to send out a poll to everybody.

I just don't know.

What?

What do you want to be on our like?

If you wanna have some list for environmental impacts, so microplastics I know I've heard.

Do you wanna say Papa?

Umm, what are other some environmental impact pollinators also like about pollinator?

Yeah.

Neonics, or or insecticides broadly, or the rodenticide, do you know, do you use?

Yeah.

Or is that an issue and run your farm like non like non target prevention side exposure?

Sure. Yeah.

SS **Steve Schubart** 2:11:51

Did we mention old farm old silage tires?

8 **81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16** 2:11:57

Ohh how tires.

Tires. Yep.

SS **Steve Schubart** 2:12:04

The recommendation for a lot of us young farmers taking over farms with piles of those from our neighbors as generally to bury them in the ground because there's no you know, where to get rid of them.

That's what my neighboring farms have been telling me to do with our old ones. I think upstate New York has a really great water quality program for getting rid of those.

To clarify, we would never bury our tires, but that is that is the we were given by the older farmers in town.

8 **81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16** 2:12:34

That's it.

Yeah.

So do they have pizza sauce?

Is that the issue with old tires? 6 PPD.

That's the new one. Yep.

You want me to add that to the list?

It is a very toxic to fish and it's been coming off a tires and into why work 60 years.

You.

I thought you were supposed to through those tires off your truck and on those back roads now, and they all washed up in Waterbury out of food, so good collecting.

SS **Steve Schubart** 2:13:13

That is also been suggested to me.

8 **81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16** 2:13:20

I'm tired slicer program.

I mean, since we're recording this. Yeah.

We the agency, has a tire splicer, and we've had days advertised days that individuals can bring in their old tires in which will slice off the side walls, which can still be used.

We keep the side walls, which can still be used to cover a silage bunk, but it doesn't retain the water.

I guess that's the point.

So that does it's not a mosquito breeding habitat, so it doesn't get rid of the issues with the chemical, but you can still be useful sidewalls to put on your silage bunks and then the threads get donated to a energy generation facility and another state,

umm, I tell him.

Right man wins.

I I am not commenting on any of that, but it gets, but the tires get used in accordance with laws that protect the environment.

Apparently I don't know the details of the energy generation facility, so there are opportunities, I guess to to manage tires to not be mosquito breeding grounds specifically.

Umm.

OK, so how about options for the?

So we're gonna ask about environmental impact concerns of environmental impact.

So we have a list of those.

What are.

What are what I'm what am I talking about?

What are your challenges?

What are your?

What challenges do you face in reducing?

You put put environmental no.

Impact on the environment from the reuse of input.

Yeah, to reduce.

Doesn't pack.

So some.

What are some choices for that?

So what challenges to do so?

Cost.

Because availability. Yep.

Alternative alternative yeah.

And we don't have to be specific.

It could just be that broad, right?

Yeah.

Or the quality of the alternative or knowledge of our knowledge.

Thank you.

There's some in the chat.

There's some news about tire cheaper as well.

I don't know.

OK, Gates is still open, but I have heard that as well. OK.

Great.

OK, I think thank you for bearing with me.

I think we have some good.

Kind of next steps to work off of, so I'll contact Margaret and we will also contact Sarah Kingsley Richards at VM to learn about some of our different options for disseminating are three questions survey and we will save our longer survey for a couple years down the road.

To get that continual feedback on.

That's great.

Thanks for.

That discussion and thank you Roy for reaching out to everyone and extension.

That's very helpful.

OK, so unless Members have anything else to bring up, ask about questions.

Umm, I'll open it up for public comment.

OK.

Are there any members of the public that are joining us today?

Would like to provide comment.

I'll go ahead, Margaret.

Thanks for being patient.

No.

Can you not unmute?

Maybe I cause I muted.

MA Marguerite Adelman 2:18:15

I I think I did.

On music, I don't know how.

8 81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 2:18:16

Ohh Yep, we can hear you.

Yep, we can hear you.

MA Marguerite Adelman 2:18:20

OK.

I I just wanted, uh, the members of the committee, to encourage you to listen to Tyler Bennett's testimony before the Senate agriculture and the Senate Health and

Welfare Committee on P Foss in Pesticides.

Umm.

And she will provide a great deal of information as an asked, you know, a national expert on the issue.

But I I can tell you as the coordinator of the P Foss uh coalition here in the state of Vermont, that the studies that we've looked at have found 55 PFAS chemicals in over 1400 pesticides, and none of those 1400 pesticides that contain those 55 P FAS are among the P FOS that were removed by the EPA.

Alright, so PP.

Thoughts are used as active ingredients and pesticides because they have special qualities.

UM, that either extend itself?

Uh.

The shelf life or keep them effective as stable or provide an even coding.

Unfortunately, they are still toxic and as I wrote, you know, with 15,000 forms of P Foss, UMM, and I know that there's some dispute over the definition that that of those 15,000 forms, we've only really tested a handful for toxicity.

But we all know that they contain that really a strong chemical bond and that that bond is very difficult to break down and has huge environmental and human health impacts.

Umm, so yeah, it's true that the containers have been found to cause some of the PFAS contamination, but even a recent study done by Portuguese scientists in 2022 found that between 2015 and 2020, almost 70% of the pesticides introduced by manufacturers use P Foss in in their chemical formulation, we, as the public don't know what's in those and we can't find out because they're not listed, especially if they're in a nerd ingredients or business confidential.

Umm.

And we also know that a lot of our produce and a lot of our food is now on the shelves in supermarkets.

It's now showing people that's contaminant coming from either the pesticides or the bio sludge used on the soil.

My argument would be and.

I just hope that the Agricultural Innovation Committee would realize that double the poisons in this case is not good, and while the piece of legislation, Senate Bill 197, in my opinion, could be strengthened, I still think we need to say that there should be

more people thoughts in pesticides.

Umm, I just want to make that point.

I am in this area because I care about my grandchildren and future generations.

I want them to be able to eat blueberries and fruit and collard greens and kale and all the things you know that we're able to eat.

And one of my saddest experiences lately was speaking at Farm to play.

And what happened if Farm to play was interesting beforehand?

I had printed some information on our website about where farmers organic and non organic farmers could get their soil tested for free and I had someone from the organic movement right me back saying whoa, we don't want to do that.

I mean, if we find out that there's pizzas in our produce or in our products will get shut down and and go out of business.

So even you know the, it's easier to stay ignorant and ignore the problem that it is to actually do what we need to do, which is ban these products now and look at the alternatives.

And there are alternatives.

I suggest that you become familiar with kemsca and some of the European Union organizations that are coming up with alternatives to P Foss for many things, including semiconductors.

So that's all I wanted to say.

You know the question for your farmers would be if you could test for your crops or your soil for P Foss, would you?

Because I think that's where you'll get the shocking me answer.

So thank you for letting me at least say that we've been working for over five years on this issue and it's certainly one that I'm very passionate about.

8

81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 2:23:30

Thank you, Marie.

And who did she say?

Who's testimony?

Kyla Bennett. Kyla Bennett.

OK.

Yeah, she's referencing Kyla Bennett, the money to the UM committee Senate Committee for Health and Welfare. OK.

MA Marguerite Adelman 2:23:48

And also the Agricultural Committee, she testified before, both more than once, she's with the public employee, public employees and for environmental responsibility.

8 81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 2:23:54

Yeah.

Thank you, Marie.

Umm Sylvia, would you like to chair comment?

You can introduce yourself as well.

S sylvia (Guest) 2:24:17

OK, alright.

I'm not sure how to get my picture up, but can you hear me?

8 81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 2:24:23

Yes, we can hear you.

S sylvia (Guest) 2:24:25

OK.

Thank you Marguerite for your comments.

I back you on that on those comments.

I'm I want to put in a request.

I wanted to ask somebody on your committee, maybe it would be Morgan Griffiths to send me a Zach Zukowski chart.

Please on S the H706 comparison with the New York bill, could you do?

8 81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16 2:24:58

Yep, still the we'll, we'll put it.

I can send it to you, but it'll be posted on the Innovation Board website as a meeting material for today's meeting and I'll send you that link when it's up later this week.

S sylvia (Guest) 2:25:08

Alright, thank you.

So I would like to.

Speak to the S cars.

I did a little research this morning and found that Autobon is is uh.

Is have has comments on their website opposed to the user.

Would like to ask that the department actually to to not register these products in Vermont is the escars I don't know is it this?

Seems they're highly toxic.

They cause death by only one dose, and they're dangerous to our, our, our Raptors because the the.

The pesticide remains in the animal.

The dead animal can over over a for over 100 days.

So this seems like another way to kill off our our Raptors, which have somehow recovered from our DDT days.

Ohm.

I'm not sure why.

Yeah, this seems like the the nuclear option.

I just really.

Let let's let's consider not registering these S cars.

I don't know if if the door is alright if the horse is already out of the barn or not, but the.

This is a product that looks really dangerous to our wildlife.

I mean, it could be dangerous to your barn cat, you know?

And your.

So please consider.

I mean, we we don't have to register everything in our state that EPA said is OK.

I've heard I have seen testimony from former EPA right workers saying that EPA.

Has never really said no to a pesticide that came through the doors.

We we need to use some judgment here that would.

That would be my comment, so I'm opposed to use go on Audubon Vermont's website and see their comments. Umm.

303 dead Eagles in four years.

Most they all had.

The two or three rows comment and escars in their bodies, in their livers.

This is this is not what Vermont needs to do.

We need to reduce pesticides.

We need to reduce the dangers to our.

Uh. Earth community.

Uh, thank you.

8 **81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16** 2:28:30

Thank you, Sylvia.

Marguerite, I see that your hands still up to do you want to add another comment or?

MA **Marguerite Adelman** 2:28:44

No, I forgot to take it down, sorry.

8 **81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16** 2:28:47

OK.

No, no, that's OK.

I just wanted to give you the opportunity.

Is anybody else like to provide?

Public comment today for other record.

Alright, thank you for all of you who participated today.

Thank you to Members for dialing in and are coming in person on our next meeting is March 25th.

 **Szczukowski, Zach** left the meeting

 **Marguerite Adelman** left the meeting

8 **81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16** 2:29:32

Umm, but in the meantime, so I'll probably.

 **Fantelli, Lisa** left the meeting

8 **81e6ea8e-78b3-403e-b71f-8fb771917f16** 2:29:38

We'll be able to share an update about the MP's in the next week or so and then just look for minutes from today and.

Umm, meeting materials that get posted on.

Mine and on our SharePoint slash team site so thank you all and enjoy sun if you

have a little bit outside.

We do have a little bit here and Weston, so thank you very much.

 **Pajak, Abbi** left the meeting

 **Steve Schubart** left the meeting

 **Decker, Brooke** left the meeting

 **Dillon Gabbert** left the meeting

 **Ryan Rebozo** left the meeting

 **Goss, Jill** left the meeting

 **Wendy Sue Harper** left the meeting

Meeting Chat Entries

[Yesterday 2:11 PM] **Marguerite Adelman (Guest)**

There are alternatives to PFAS. PFAS are highly toxic; we don't need them. The definition used here is the one that is being used and endorsed by scientists around the world.

[Yesterday 2:17 PM] **Marguerite Adelman (Guest)**

Given 15,000 forms of PFAS....the absence of evidence of toxicity and danger is not the same as the evidence of absence of toxicity. We've only tested a few forms of them, but they all have the strongest bond in chemistry and don't easily breakdown in living beings or the environment.

Please listen to Kyla Bennett of PEER and her testimony before both the Senate Agriculture and Senate Health and Welfare Committees.

[Yesterday 2:38 PM] **Marguerite Adelman (Guest)**

A [new report](#) from the national advocacy organization Food & Water Watch details more than \$110 million spent on lobbying by the chemical industry from 2019-2022 on scores of bills introduced in Congress, including many to address the crisis of PFAS contamination throughout the country. As public awareness of the dangers of PFAS to human health grew over the last decade, so too did the corporate lobbying intended to derail action by Congress to hold the polluting industry accountable for cleanup and mitigation efforts.

Toxic per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) are commonly known as "forever chemicals" because they do not readily break down in the environment. Today PFAS are found virtually everywhere – including in the blood of nearly all Americans – and analyses estimate the cost of proper cleanup in the country to be billions of dollars.

Specifically, the report, "[PFAS and the Chemistry of Concealment](#)," found major PFAS companies and associated trade groups employed an army of lobbyists and spent more than \$110 million lobbying since 2019.

PFAS & The Chemistry of Concealment

Weak regulations in the U.S. have allowed multi-billion dollar chemical corporations to conceal the dangers of toxic compounds called PFAS.

[Yesterday 3:03 PM] **Szczukowski, Zach**

survey farmers from every county in the State to help better understand how agricultural inputs, such as pesticides, synthetic fertilizers, and plastics, are currently used, as well as current challenges farmers face in reducing these inputs in order to better inform recommendations to be provided in the annual report required under subdivision (1) of this subsection.

[Yesterday 3:18 PM] **John Brabant (Guest)**

Last I knew, Gates Salvage owned and operated a tire chipper and was accepting tires for a fee. Chips are ultimately used in waste to energy plants. Maybe come up with a subsidy program to encourage farmers to not bury the tires and instead take them to a place like Gates for processing? Maybe a farmer discount volume price could be negotiated with Gates and/or other tire chipping operations.

[Yesterday 3:19 PM] **Steve Schubart**

Thanks! We have not had luck there yet!

[Yesterday 3:20 PM] **John Brabant (Guest)**

Steve, are you looking for chippers to perform this service? Has Gates declined participating in such a program?

[Yesterday 3:21 PM] **Steve Schubart**

Happy to chat more John - stevenshubart@gmail.com

[Yesterday 3:21 PM] **sylvia (Guest)**

Yes, I would like to comment. Sylvia Knight

[Yesterday 3:21 PM] **Steve Schubart**

The issue is the expensive cost of excavating and hauling a tire pile left on farm to such facilities, if they are taking tires without charging a fee

[Yesterday 3:28 PM] **John Brabant (Guest)**



Kyla Bennett

Director of Science Policy

kbennett@peer.org

Northeast and Mid-Atlantic PEER's Director and PEER's Director of Science Policy, Kyla previously worked at EPA Region 1 for 10 years as a wetland permit reviewer and as the Region's Wetlands

Enforcement Coordinator. Kyla first became involved with PEER in the mid-1990s, when she became a whistleblower herself. Kyla has a Ph.D. in ecology from the University of Connecticut and a law degree from Lewis and Clark Law School in Portland, Oregon. Her familiarity with science, the law, and the inner workings of state and federal governmental agencies enable her to assist public environmental employees throughout New England.

[Yesterday 3:32 PM] **John Brabant (Guest)**

AAFM should meet with ANR about funding tire cleanups on farms using some of this fund.

[Yesterday 3:32 PM] **John Brabant (Guest)**

The Solid Waste Mgt Assistance Fund generates a few million dollars a year.