

Message

From: Matuszko, Jan [matuszko.jan@epa.gov]
Sent: 9/2/2020 4:04:50 PM
To: Peck, Charles [Peck.Charles@epa.gov]; Wagman, Michael [Wagman.Michael@epa.gov]; Farruggia, Frank [Farruggia.Frank@epa.gov]; Anderson, Brian [Anderson.Brian@epa.gov]; Corbin, Mark [Corbin.Mark@epa.gov]; Harwood, Douglas (Ethan) [harwood.douglas@epa.gov]; Matuszko, Jan [Matuszko.Jan@epa.gov]; Odenkirchen, Edward [Odenkirchen.Edward@epa.gov]
Subject: Conversation with Anderson, Brian, Corbin, Mark, Harwood, Douglas (Ethan), Matuszko, Jan, Odenkirchen, Edward, Peck, Charles, Wagman, Michael

Matuszko, Jan 11:08 AM:

who is Ammons? Is that a mistake?

Peck, Charles 11:09 AM:

not sure

Wagman, Michael 11:10 AM:

Thanks! Looks like from the previous slide there was no difference with btwn xtendimax alone and with vapor grip?

Peck, Charles 11:10 AM:

yup

Peck, Charles 11:11 AM:

I haven't seen the 2020 study

Matuszko, Jan 11:11 AM:

Bayer's order of topics wasn't ideal but I didn't want to start out the meeting being contrary. If we want to get to run-off, I suggest we really only ask questions that we really need to know.

Matuszko, Jan 11:12 AM:

then the 2020 study is one thing on our list they need to give us.

Farruggia, Frank 11:12 AM:

So to what extent do you think we need to address the low tunnel data?

Peck, Charles 11:13 AM:

I don't think we should consider it other than qualitatively, as the rates are much higher than typical rates

Matuszko, Jan 11:14 AM:

Wasn't trying to step on you guys. Wanted to give you protection so you didn't need to talk about your progress today. :)

Farruggia, Frank 11:14 AM:

I agree, we could add a paragraph or two explaining why they weren't considered, and list ou these reasons.

Farruggia, Frank 11:14 AM:

Thanks!

Peck, Charles 11:14 AM:

nope, thanks for fielding that question! :)

Peck, Charles 11:15 AM:

looks like plant height is their metric

Matuszko, Jan 11:15 AM:

yep.

Anderson, Brian 11:15 AM:

not using new data in their calcs?

Peck, Charles 11:15 AM:

2019 and 2020 data is included

Wagman, Michael 11:15 AM:

it says through 2020

Farruggia, Frank 11:15 AM:

yes, we are not far from their measure using direct measures of height.

Farruggia, Frank 11:16 AM:

I am assuming they are not including the VGX data

Wagman, Michael 11:16 AM:

VGX shouldn't effect the spray drift

Farruggia, Frank 11:16 AM:

thats right but it is more than just a drift exposure.

Corbin, Mark 11:16 AM:

remember. downwind is both drift and volatility

Wagman, Michael 11:16 AM:

good point

Farruggia, Frank 11:18 AM:

it is important to note that they are using a NOAEC not the 5% reduction relative to controls.

Matuszko, Jan 11:18 AM:

ok. Ask about this as needed. They have a different number than we do.

Peck, Charles 11:18 AM:

how does our 20% vsi line up? I think we're pretty close...

Matuszko, Jan 11:18 AM:

should we ask them if they think **Ex. 5 Deliberative Process (DP)**

Farruggia, Frank 11:19 AM:

our 20% is 210ft

Peck, Charles 11:19 AM:

so about 40 ft further...

Matuszko, Jan 11:20 AM:

ok. so we are close. It's really the call about how much damage we can accept.

Farruggia, Frank 11:22 AM:

i hope that is ok.

Matuszko, Jan 11:22 AM:

yes!

Matuszko, Jan 11:23 AM:

WE have to go here. ultimately, that's what these conversations are for.

Farruggia, Frank 11:25 AM:

Im not sure what the white paper they are referring to.

Farruggia, Frank 11:26 AM:

perfect Chuck!

Peck, Charles 11:27 AM:

I think they are referring to the white paper they submitted back in June with the VGX and their proposed mitigation options

Matuszko, Jan 11:27 AM:

I need to better understand why we have one interpretation of yield and they have another. Not right this second but before we present to Alex.

Farruggia, Frank 11:28 AM:

I will refresh myself

Matuszko, Jan 11:28 AM:

haha. thanks.

Farruggia, Frank 11:30 AM:

why are we meeting again?

Peck, Charles 11:30 AM:

so I guess they don't have an idea if 20% vsi is slight, moderate, or severe?

Farruggia, Frank 11:30 AM:

we need to move to the woody species

Matuszko, Jan 11:30 AM:

ok. let's move.

Farruggia, Frank 11:30 AM:

they are mining information at this point

Peck, Charles 11:31 AM:

they are still going to blame the incidents on other uses...

Matuszko, Jan 11:31 AM:

We are meeting again because our senior level folks told us to do so. Best thing we can do is steer the conversation the way we wish to go. Remember, there are folks from Alex's office listening so we need to make sure our voice is heard too. and that we are working with industry.

Farruggia, Frank 11:32 AM:

yep, thanks!

Matuszko, Jan 11:33 AM:

perfect meg.

Peck, Charles 11:33 AM:

if the corn was a problem, why didn't we see this before the OTT registration?

Farruggia, Frank 11:33 AM:

nice!

Corbin, Mark 11:33 AM:

exactly

Wagman, Michael 11:37 AM:

error bars are kinda high, but probably to be expected for a non-standard species.

Anderson, Brian 11:38 AM:

other symptoms?

Corbin, Mark 11:39 AM:

so height no impact but VSI there is impact?

Farruggia, Frank 11:39 AM:

yes, impact can manifest in something other than length

Anderson, Brian 11:40 AM:

what were the peach orchard symptoms?

Peck, Charles 11:40 AM:

I think it was damage to fruit and leaves

Corbin, Mark 11:41 AM:

damage as in reduced yield or in terms of visual symptoms?

Matuszko, Jan 11:41 AM:

you want to ask?

Peck, Charles 11:42 AM:

can there be damage to yield for an oak tree?

Matuszko, Jan 11:42 AM:

good response Frank!

Wagman, Michael 11:42 AM:

how did their Tier I study endpoints change from 60-90 days?

Farruggia, Frank 11:43 AM:

no idea how that changed. only got last measures (unless thats all I evaluated)???

Farruggia, Frank 11:46 AM:

VSI, height, weight, branching pattern, yield loss, defoliation etc.... are all possible responses in a tree. There are limited number of observable endpoints in terms of a study. The greenhouse design doesn't allow for measurement of yield; branching pattern is too variable so N would be huge; defoliation and biomass loss will be captured by the dry weight measure

Farruggia, Frank 11:47 AM:

we have these data right?

Peck, Charles 11:48 AM:

runoff data? yes, norsworthy paper, not that I know of

Matuszko, Jan 11:49 AM:

They keep telling us they want us to talk to Norsworthy. Rather than ask them for that paper, we should check in with Norsworthy and ask him about the Bayer product too.

Farruggia, Frank 11:49 AM:

plant over compensation in that plant height response at super low dose. That is one of the responses I am concerned with regarding the reliance on height distance measures.

Farruggia, Frank 11:52 AM:

this paper wasn't responding to us. we wanted to know what she just said regarding their field studies

Farruggia, Frank 11:53 AM:

I agree about talking with N about the paper and the product. Next week?

Matuszko, Jan 11:54 AM:

before we talk to bayer next would be ideal.

Farruggia, Frank 11:59 AM:

I need to jump off line to get some school errand done, but will be back after lunch.