**Massachusetts Glyphosate Commission**

**Unofficial[1] Meeting Minutes – September 17, 2024, 11:00 a.m. Via Microsoft Teams**

---

***THIS MEETING WAS RECORDED AND IS AVAILABLE ON THE COMMISSION'S WEBSITE***

***PowerPoint Slides shared in the meeting are available on the Commission's website***

1. Chair, Commissioner Bonnie Heiple, Welcomed commissioners and attendees.
   - Four commissioners in attendance:
     - Chair Bonnie Heiple, MassDEP Commissioner
     - MDAR Commissioner Ashley Randle
     - Deputy Director Mass Wildlife Eve Schluter
     - Director from the Department of Public Health Kristopher Callahan
     - Quorum is met. (Commission member Julie Richburg was absent)
   - Welcomed John Wilhelmi from ERG program lead for the scientific investigation, and MassDEP and MDAR agency staff.
   - Reviewed virtual meeting logistics – The meeting is being recorded. Cameras and microphones of public attendees are off. There will be an opportunity for feedback and comment at the end of the meeting. Meeting chat can be used for technical issues.
   - Started sharing **PowerPoint** slides.
   - Review of agenda **PowerPoint Slide #2**

2. **Draft minutes** of last meeting held 2-9-24 were distributed to commission members.
   - Commission members: are there any corrections or changes that should be made to the minutes?
   - No corrections offered.
   - Requested motion to approve minutes. Commissioner Randle moved to adopt minutes. Seconded by Eve Schluter. Motion carried.

**3. Status of Scientific Review/ Final Report**

Commissioner Heiple shared background **PowerPoint Slide #3:** - Reminder of what brings us here today. Overview of Commission's work in creating the Scientific Review: Developing Scope; Retaining ERG to lead drafting of the Report, Reviewing Phase 1 and Phase 2 drafts – and now a final proposed version. The main agenda item for today is review and adoption of Final Report.

**PowerPoint Slide #4 –** Status of Final Report

[1] These minutes were not adopted by the Commission. See the full recording of the meeting on the Commission's website for the complete content of the meeting discussion.

- The Report was posted for public comment, in accordance with the decision of the commission at the last meeting.
- Public comments were accepted until July 22 – and the Final version of the Report is now on the Commission's website.
- Also posted – a track changes version of the report showing changes to public comment edition.
- Two comments were received during the comment period. Both are attached as received in Appendix A to the Final Report.
- One of the comments identified 2 factual errors, which have been corrected in the Final Report. These changes are in section 2.5.5 (p. 25 +) and 2.5.8 (p. 38 +). The other comment received did not suggest any changes to the Report.

**PowerPoint Slide #5** DETAILS OF CHANGES MADE SINCE PUBLIC COMMENT:

**"Glyphosate Scientific Review - Phase Two Report (8-30-2024) - Track Changes.docx"**

- The starting point for this file was the public comment draft.
- Formatting; adding Appendix A. Updates to cover page and headers now indicate that this is a final report that was completed in August 2024. A cover sheet for Appendix A was added noting the public comments included, who submitted them, and when they were received.
- Literature cutoff date. Two sentences were added to the Executive Summary to emphasize that the report contents are based on literature and assessments available in January 2023. Literature and assessments issued since that time are generally not reflected in the report. In Section 1.2, two sentences were added that again note the cutoff date for the literature review.
- Factual corrections. A sentence in Section 2.5.5 that read: "Other assessments listed in Table 2 did not address reproductive toxicity" was deleted. A sentence in Section 2.5.8 that read: "Other assessments listed in Table 2 did not address developmental toxicity" was deleted.

4. **Reminder of the statutory charge to the Commission (full text) PowerPoint Slide #6** Chair reviewed text from statute creating Commission.

   **Charge to Pesticide Subcommittee and MDAR PowerPoint Slide #7**

   - Chair reviewed statute's direction to Subcommittee and MDAR.
   - The Commission's enabling statute provides that once the Scientific Review/ Report is completed, it is to be used by the Pesticide Subcommittee in an Individual Review of Glyphosate. After the Individual Review is completed, the Report and Individual Review are both to be submitted by MDAR) to the legislative committee specified (committee on environment, natural resources and agriculture).
   - Chair noted that after the initial legislative appropriation of $50,000, additional funds were contributed by MDAR and MassDEP to complete the scientific review.
   - The Chair thanked John Wilhelmi, the team at ERG and Tetratech that worked on the Scientific Review. The chair thanked all of the commission members and MDAR and MassDEP agency staff.

**Discussion**. Commissioner Heiple opened the floor for any additional thoughts from the Commission members on the Final Scientific Review and Report. No comments raised.

**Motion to Adopt the Final Report.** The Chair called for a motion to adopt the Final Scientific Review as the final product of the Commission and formally ask the Pesticide Subcommittee to use the Report in its Individual Review of Glyphosate. Motion offered by Eve Schluter. Seconded by Ashley Randle. Motion carried.

**Questions:**

The Chair opened the floor to the public for anyone that would like to provide comment and expressed appreciation for the public engagement over the years in the Commission's meetings and providing comments and feedback on the Report. As the Report as now been adopted as final Chair asked for comments to focus and feedback regarding the process or future actions.

Question from Andrea Serlin: Thank you for the hard work on this Report. The legislative committees have changed. Will report be sent to either the agricultural committee or environment committee?

> Response: Chair Heiple assumes that both committees will be informed with copies of the report sent to both. Defers to Commissioner Ashley Randle, MDAR. Commissioner Randle concurred.

Question from Marymar Ruggles: This is first meeting she has attended. Why is use not prohibited of chemicals / substances in question while scientific review proceeds? If there is a substance that has been used environmentally has a question over it why is the use of the chemical not stopped while the review of scientific research goes through?

> Response: There are certification and other approval processes for chemicals and other materials. The Commission was directed to review the growing body of literature studying the effects of Glyphosate to make sure that as a state we were keeping up with that science. This was a special committee funded by the legislature to conduct a study given the level of concern and the evolving information on Glyphosate in particular.

Question from Meghan McDonough: Asked in the chat if horticultural vinegar or removal and solarization were considered as eradication methods and how will the results be expected to affect consumers in the state? Thanked the Commission for its work.

> Response: (Chair Heiple) Other Commission members invited to also respond.
> The kind of an alternatives analysis of the sort that Meghan suggesting likely will be considered in the next phase of work by the Pesticide Subcommittee. This report collects the state of the scientific evidence on Glyphosate, which will then inform the work of the Pesticide Subcommittee as it evaluates potential uses and applications.
>
> (Ann Lowery) Noted the report includes a section on alternative control methods. The Report is on the website.

(Commissioner Randle) Regarding the first part of Megan's question, it would need to be registered as a pesticide by EPA and then registered and approved by the Pesticide Subcommittee, depending on what it is and how it works.

Question: Marymar Ruggles – What is the scientific review process to prove the safety of new technology or products before they are introduced into the market?

Response: (Commissioner Heiple) The main pathway is the one that Commissioner Randle referenced, which is the EPA certification and registration process. EPA is the Federal Environmental Protection Agency that's charged with the task of reviewing chemicals that are proposed for certain applications in the U.S. Asked Commissioner Randle if there are processes at the state level, or do we rely primarily on the federal EPA review?

(Commissioner Randle). MDAR relies on EPA's review process to establish safety. Products are registered for use in Massachusetts as applications for use are received by MDAR.

No other questions raised.

**Other Business**: **PowerPoint Slide #8**

- The Chair asked Commission members for any other issues they would like to discuss. None raised.
- The Chair thanked everyone involved over the years including John and the teams at ERG and Tetratech. The Report is a comprehensive and valuable collection of the state of knowledge about the ecological and health concerns associated with Glyphosate.
- Rep. Gentile was not in attendance. Chair thanked him in absentia for starting this work and this Commission.
- Thanked Commission members - a wise collection of expertise reflected in the membership – as well as the Commission members' teams for the time and expertise contributed to this Commission's work, including MDAR and DEP staff.
- Thanked members of the public, whether attending for first time or having attended many Commission meetings. Your engagement and participation have been really valuable and contributed greatly to the direction of the Commission's work.

**Adjournment.** The Chair acknowledged no other matters raised for the Commission to consider and asked for a motion to conclude the work of this Glyphosate Commission and adjourn.

- Motion from Eve Schluter to adjourn. Seconded. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned.

***THIS MEETING WAS RECORDED AND IS AVAILABLE ON THE COMMISSION'S WEBSITE***