

Feedback on: Identifying and Prioritizing Research and Programmatic Needs in the Detection, Mitigating, and Remediating PFAS in Agriculture and Food Systems - A collaboration between USDA ARS - Center of Excellence for Environmental Monitoring and Mitigation and the University of Maine

	Impression: What was your overall impression of the <i>Identifying and Prioritizing Research and Programmatic Needs in the Detection, Mitigating, and Remediating PFAS in Agriculture and Food Systems</i> – workshop?	Hoped for Outcome(s): What would be one or a few things you would like to happen in the future, as an outcome or continuation of the workshop activities and dialogs and roadmaps, etc.?	What could have been better? What is one thing you would have liked to have been different about this meeting?
1.	The workshop was productive, insightful, well-organized, timely, engaging, comprehensive, ambitious, and forward-looking.	Continued engagement to keep the momentum going, a formalized roadmap, and specifically one that includes and moves the needle on PFAS data sharing at national, regional, and local levels that leverages a network of data sources/access nodes that can aid in topic-specific, need-specific use cases to address existing PFAS questions as well as identify outstanding data gaps.	This is not specific to this workshop, but I would like to see more engagement in data access and data sharing solutions. It is quite common for data gaps to be identified and for ‘more data’ to be listed as a key priority. Yet, the individuals/groups left to address this issue are often small (though mighty). We truly need more subject matter experts engaged in solving the data access and data sharing problems. It can’t be left to data scientists, computer scientists, and data enthusiasts alone.
2.	Excellent	Provide the final roadmap as proposed during the workshop to participants. Bring in more University partners especially those with more expertise with PFAS or related areas	More subject matter expert presentations

Feedback on: Identifying and Prioritizing Research and Programmatic Needs in the Detection, Mitigating, and Remediating PFAS in Agriculture and Food Systems - A collaboration between USDA ARS - Center of Excellence for Environmental Monitoring and Mitigation and the University of Maine

3.	<p>It was a monumental task to pull just the ag related folks together that are interested in PFAS. My overall impression is that there are so many peripheral impacts and associated disciplines. This was a really good first step in the right direction of setting a course for ARS research, and the leadership did a tremendous job at pulling in all aspects of possible contributors.</p>	<p>The problem is so large and vast, this is almost its own national program theme. I would like to see an annual continuation of the workshop focusing on innovations, breakthroughs, and discussions of challenges. Right now, this appears, on the outside, to be a localized problem. I'm afraid if we were honest and everyone sampled, we would find it's an everyone problem. I would like for ARS to commit to addressing this issue in a sustainable and equitable way.</p>	<p>Hindsight is 50/50. It would have been nice to have non-ARS or even professional facilitators conduct the breakout meetings. That would give ARS a chance to participate more. In some of the breakouts I attended, a few people dominated the conversation, shut down others' ideas, and made it difficult to "dream" about what could be done to address the problem. The ARS facilitators did their best to try and redirect, but it was difficult for them to do that, appear impartial, and still provide valuable input from ARS' perspective. I also realize that comes at an economic cost, so it may not have been practical.</p>
4.	<p>Congrats to you and your team on a successful meeting.</p> <p>Again, thanks so much for your efforts and graciousness in making this meeting available virtually.</p>	<p>I was able to sit in on a lot of the USGS meeting, too. Long story short, there is an incredible amount of synergy between the ARS efforts and that of the USGS teams – certainly the sampling (soils and waters) and bioaccumulation information (mostly wildlife species, but not exclusively). Just to say that as the teams are forming and growing, looping in with the experts who were at the USGS meeting may be of value. I look forward to the slides and any further activities.</p>	
5.	<p>I would like to congratulate you on an incredible, informative, productive, and successful workshop! I believe that we truly made progress and set up the community to address priority research and data needs in a coordinated fashion.</p>	<p>I am eager to work with you all to move forward on the roadmap next steps, especially related to data sharing.</p>	

Feedback on: Identifying and Prioritizing Research and Programmatic Needs in the Detection, Mitigating, and Remediating PFAS in Agriculture and Food Systems - A collaboration between USDA ARS - Center of Excellence for Environmental Monitoring and Mitigation and the University of Maine

6.	It was a lot of work identifying and getting down on paper the objectives, problems, milestones, and roadmap. Most groups have a start, but future meetings will be needed to iron out ideas and refine directions. To be honest, I don't believe most people even know this is an issue.	For the milestone tables to be updated and expanded as needed to show progress and objectives to be re-evaluated.	Make sure every agency that could provide help/impact was at the table.
7.	Very positive, there was a clear path to produce a consensus document that will guide future decisions.	More grant calls from the federal government.	Suggestion: In my humble opinion, this organization need to involve more animal management specialists, animal nutrition, reproduction, dairy foods scientists. The livestock industry in Maine is the one bearing the brunt of regulation (likely the case for US, due to bioaccumulation), IMO this group should be heavily represented in this type of meetings, both producers and scientists.
8.	I was only able to attend the first half of the workshop, but overall the presentations were informative as was the discussion in the break-out group. It was useful to have a mix of decision-makers and scientists.	I hope that there are continued conversations between the agriculture, food safety, and environmental/human health risk assessment community on the best paths forward for 1) preventing PFAS contamination of farmland and 2) pathways forward for farms with significant existing contamination.	My only complaint is that, at least during the time that I was attending the conference, the food provided did not accommodate vegetarian or vegan dietary needs.
9.	The workshop was extremely effective. I believe it was well organized and had a great mixture of individuals present to brainstorm and work toward common goals around PFAS.	a. I would like continued conversations amongst those with different areas of expertise coming together to discuss solutions to the extremely large and nebulous PFAS problem. b. I would like for USDA ARS to take a novel approach to scientific communication that is consumer, producer, and policy-maker focused.	a. I would have preferred the latter Monday (I think they mean Tuesday) session happen first.

Feedback on: Identifying and Prioritizing Research and Programmatic Needs in the Detection, Mitigating, and Remediating PFAS in Agriculture and Food Systems - A collaboration between USDA ARS - Center of Excellence for Environmental Monitoring and Mitigation and the University of Maine

10.	It was a very engaging and productive workshop. I appreciated that there was ample time for meaningful discussion of the many issues and complexities related to PFAS in agriculture, and the identification of research priorities to address them.	I would like to see a work group formed to shepherd forward the priorities identified during the workshop.	I wish there had been more lead time ahead of the conference. Because of the short window between the announcement and the meeting, no toxicologists from Maine CDC were able to attend. The MECDC team has a depth of knowledge that would have been added value to the conversations.
11.	I thought the meeting was well organized and the 2-days of breakout sessions was extremely useful. Although the talks during the 1st day helped me decide which breakout session to attend. I was also surprised how easily input during the 1st two days morphed into the breakout groups on the last day – which I think really addressed the areas where additional work is needed.	Continued dialogue between agencies to make sure we are working to a common goal/endpoint. For example, setting a threshold/action/trigger levels needs to align with analytical capabilities.	Depends on the goal of the meeting. Total transparency between agencies was difficult with non-gov't representation. Maybe have the last day or one afternoon as a close door session??
12.	Overall, that USDA-ARS is fully engaged and they're the right people to help answer these complex multi-disciplinary questions. It was a good mix of science and policy.	I'd like to see some of the big things that were discussed emerge into being, like fitting into the ITRC framework, building a data warehouse, and creating venues for ongoing multi-agency and multi-disciplinary collaboration.	Through no fault of the organizers, it was a little disappointing to have only 6 states represented.
13.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Very well organized -Informative speakers -Breakout sessions were productive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Continuation of breakout sessions -More time devoted to speakers presenting cutting edge data -What progress have we made? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -More speakers presenting data. -There didn't seem like there was much interest in the afterhours sessions.

Feedback on: Identifying and Prioritizing Research and Programmatic Needs in the Detection, Mitigating, and Remediating PFAS in Agriculture and Food Systems - A collaboration between USDA ARS - Center of Excellence for Environmental Monitoring and Mitigation and the University of Maine

14.	It was informative. It helped me a lot in clearing my doubts regarding PFOS analysis. The way group discussions were organized with the members of USDA, EPA , ARS, made it better and more useful. It was not just about listening PPT only, we participated in discussions which helped me a lot.	To have more precise and validated analytical methods for different matrices like cells, liquids etc	These types of meetings should have more participation of research scientists, PhD students for healthy discussions. And also this will help in sharing of more relevant information between people.
15.	Lovely meeting you. Congrats to you and your team on running a meaningful three days of programming. I left feeling like the conversations were productive and the time spent at the workshop was well worth it.	Continued open dialogue, especially between state and federal entities, about the path forward for understanding the scope of PFAS contamination and the response process as we move forward. I also would like to continue the conversation, and am happy to help facilitate working groups, etc.	I sense this was out of the committee's control, but in case it is helpful for higher ups to hear- a little bit more heads up would have been great. I think having our toxicologists and a few more members of the response team there would have been helpful/rounded out the Maine brain trust, but it was too short notice for some folks who have kids, livestock, etc.!
Earlier comments:			
16.	Thank you for a great event and I really appreciated the online option for those of us unable to attend in person. Keep up the great work and thank you for your thoughtful organization and speaker line up!		
17.	Wow, what a fantastic meeting! Thank YOU for all the efforts and passion you put into the organizing! I thought it went very well, and heard so many positive comments from the participants on everything from food choices to topic choices 😊!		