

Draft Fungicide Strategy Framework to Reduce Exposure of Federally Listed Endangered and Threatened Species and Designated Critical Habitats from the Use of Conventional Agricultural Insecticides
Docket EPA-HQ-OPP-2026-2973

<https://www.regulations.gov/docket/EPA-HQ-OPP-2026-2973>

Comment Builder for EPA's Draft Fungicide Strategy Framework

We have developed this document to encourage your continued comments on EPA's actions under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) Workplan Update and other draft decision (Draft Strategy) which is presented on the docket through 3 documents. In this Comment Builder, these documents will be referenced by their short titles, and page references will be by "D#:#" where **D#** is **Document Number** (in the table below) and the **number after the colon is the page number** referenced.

[Link to the documents open for comment:](#)

D1) Draft Insecticide Strategy to Reduce Exposure of Federally Listed Endangered and Threatened Species and Designated Critical Habitats from the Use of Conventional Agricultural Insecticides

<https://www.regulations.gov/document/EPA-HQ-OPP-2026-2973-0002>

D2) Appendix D. Listed Species for the Fungicide Strategy

<https://www.regulations.gov/document/EPA-HQ-OPP-2026-2973-0001>

D3) Appendix F. Adjuvants

<https://www.regulations.gov/document/EPA-HQ-OPP-2026-2973-0003>



Link to Draft Fungicide Strategy Comment Portal, where you can submit your comments:

<https://www.regulations.gov/commenton/EPA-HQ-OPP-2026-2973-0004>

EPA Comment Deadline: Monday, June 29, 2026

EPA's Draft Strategy has four stated goals (D1:16):

1. *Identifying mitigation for listed species under the authority of FWS in CONUS likely impacted at the population-level by the agricultural use of conventional fungicides;*
2. *Providing flexibility for implementing mitigation through FIFRA actions that would reduce major routes of fungicide exposure (runoff/erosion, spray drift, and on-field) for listed species;*
3. *Improving the efficiency of future ESA consultations with FWS on conventional fungicides by applying the strategy to future registration and registration review actions, where appropriate; and*
4. *Increasing regulatory certainty for growers and other stakeholders regarding the use and availability of conventional fungicides and providing growers and other applicators with flexibility in selecting mitigation that works for their operation(s).*

Products Included in the Draft Fungicide Strategy:

Conventional Fungicides

Registered Use Sites:

Agricultural crop use sites in the lower 48 states

Agricultural uses are any land planted with orchards, vineyards, Christmas trees, row crops, specialty crops, sod farms, or flooded crops (e.g., rice cranberries). Other outdoor use sites, including forests, pasture/grass or rangeland are not considered agricultural uses for the purposes of this strategy. Fungicide uses outside the scope of this effort (e.g., non-agricultural uses, uses outside of CONUS) will be addressed in future efforts and in chemical-specific biological evaluations.

Application Methods:

Foliar applications made with ground or aerial equipment, soil treatment, treated seed, and granular formulations



The slide deck used during the FESTF-hosted webinar on the draft fungicide strategy, as well as the recording of the webinar, is available in the [Resource Hub in FESTF Lens](https://lens.festf.org) (<https://lens.festf.org>).

Opportunity for Comments

Like the previous strategies, EPA has requested comments on specific topics in the Draft Strategy. EPA also references having considered previous comments from the Herbicide and Insecticide Strategies; however, it is possible those comments have not been fully addressed or completely integrated into what will be their overall ultimate plan. In addition to responding to EPA's specific requests for comments, the degree to which your previous comments on prior strategies or actions have been addressed (or not addressed) by EPA is important to note.

EPA's specific requests for comments:

From D1: 11-12: Although the Draft Strategy largely follows the previously established methodology, there are some notable differences in the draft framework, on which the Agency is seeking stakeholder input as outlined below.

On-field species: The draft Fungicide Strategy evaluates listed vertebrates (e.g., birds, mammals) that may be on agricultural fields, and which consume contaminated dietary items including treated seeds.

- EPA welcomes stakeholder comments that could inform the likelihood that the identified 11 on-field listed terrestrial vertebrate species (discussed in Section 2.6.2) would be on-field and exposed to an applied fungicide.
- EPA welcomes information on potential on-field mitigation measures to reduce potential fungicide exposure for these species.
- Information that may be helpful to EPA
 - Any success stories for current efforts and programs in place that address these species; include specific crops, geographies, methods, and technologies where in-field species presence is addressed
 - Stewardship, best management practices, or other application technologies that should be considered as mitigations for in-field species.

Spray drift adjuvants: The draft Fungicide Strategy proposes to expand spray drift adjuvants as a mitigation option: expand oil emulsion adjuvants for use with insecticides and fungicides as opposed to only with herbicides and add guar gum spray drift adjuvants as an option for fungicides, insecticides, and herbicides at specified minimum rates and spray volumes.

- EPA is requesting feedback on this update for spray drift adjuvants as part of the public comment period for this draft strategy.
- Information that may be helpful to EPA:
 - Highlight other adjuvants, aid, methods, and technologies used to reduce drift
 - Suggestions for improving the evaluation and approval process for additional adjuvants/mitigations
 - Specific crop and chemistry needs
 - Acceptable mitigations for specific crop application needs, such as air blast and other application methods not explicitly covered in the Draft Strategy



Usage data: The draft Fungicide Strategy incorporates usage data on acres treated with fungicides. Because of the more regional pattern of fungicide usage, the incorporation of usage data served to identify listed species where mitigation may be applicable for fungicides.

Seed treatments: EPA seeks additional information regarding seed treatments during the public comment period for this draft strategy, including: seed treatment usage information, information and data on the availability of pesticides on the seed coat to runoff, prevalence of non-commercial (e.g., on-farm, on-site) seed treatments, effects of handling (e.g., loading, planting) on the quality of the pesticide coat and its availability for runoff, and relevant agronomic practices that might reduce the potential for runoff from treated seeds (e.g., seeding depths, disposal).

- Information that may be helpful to EPA:
 - Stewardship and best management practices used to reduce exposure to non-targets (on/in-field or via runoff off field)
 - Any technologies in use or development that significantly reduce non-target exposure

Additional areas to review for commenting:

- EPA plans for engaging with stakeholders to discuss implementation, mitigation development and other measures, including (but not limited to) improvements to the Mitigation Menu website, EPA outreach and web resources, etc (D1:56)
- The current process of commenting on specific active ingredients during registration review, such as benefit/impact assessments and proposed mitigation measures (D1:59)
- Feedback on the PALM tool (D1:61)
- Feedback on EPA's education efforts thus far (D1:62)
- General feedback on EPA mitigations (D1:67)
- Information that may be helpful to EPA:
 - Possible improvements for the overall EPA ESA Workplan including the Herbicide, Insecticide, Rodenticide, and Draft Fungicide Strategies as well as Hawaii and Vulnerable Species
 - Comments on compliance and enforcement
 - Insights on qualifying conservation programs that provide a mitigation pathway including examples in different regions that achieve the same outcome(s) as prescribed label mitigations and practices

Please note: “This draft Fungicide Strategy will have a 60-day public comment period and will be finalized by the end of November 2026” and “As is common practice when EPA seeks public comments on registration and registration review actions, where appropriate, EPA would seek public comment on proposed mitigation including that resulting from implementing the Fungicide Strategy.” (D1:11)

