

## Genevieve Krieger

After reading through the background, it seems to me that, of the five options, there are two which would not make sense, two that might make sense, and one that is questionable. It seems unfeasible to implement option D, given the necessary increase in funding, and manpower. If there is no guarantee that the EPA would receive the necessary resources to carry out this plan - this plan could go horribly wrong, leading to ineffective, underworked staff and an overall waste of resources without creating a concrete positive impact. Conversely, it seems that option E, maintaining the status quo, would be just an even worse choice because it guarantees that the problem at hand will not be resolved. I am curious to learn more about option C, specifically the net impacts of passive pheromone dispensers. Why would they remain included if they are categorized under List 2? Are passive pheromone dispensers worthy of being allowed for their ability to protect crops? If so, do the benefits outweigh any/all of the environmental harms caused? These are important questions to address when discussing organic foods. If passive pheromone dispensers are deemed 'safe' or in some way the exception of List 2, it might make sense to pursue this path. That said, I am hesitant to endorse this path as it simply does not seem to do enough, and would not work to address the larger issue at hand. In my un-expert opinion, paths A and B appear to be the best course of action. Option B, allowing 'minimum risk' pesticides, would be a good way to address the problem in its entirety by replacing the outdated EPA categorizations of Lists 1-4. Option A, allowing specific EPA-permitted inert ingredients, would take the existing infrastructure and give it a face-lift, cutting out the excess ingredients in Lists 3/4 that are outdated and are rarely used. My final thoughts are that, ultimately, pesticide companies should be required to publicize inert ingredients used in their products. If consumers had transparency, the EPA and other regulatory bodies would not be pressured to constantly update their categorizations as new ingredients come out. Updating or reimaging Lists 1-4 is a great idea, but they will constantly be playing catchup if they wish to keep up with new innovations (as evidenced by option D.) Rather, consumers should be given the opportunity to make educated choices and determine for themselves which ingredients they feel comfortable putting on their crops/bringing into their homes.