

PSEP Stakeholder Team – Federal Workgroup

January 23, 2014 - Conference Call Notes and Follow-Up

Attendees: Charles Moses (AAPCO); Carol Somody, (Syngenta); Dave Scott (Indiana Office of the State Chemist); Leslie Gilbert (USDA-NIFA)

The meeting commenced with an introduction and a discussion of two handouts distributed with the meeting agenda.

1. SEP's

The first handout included questions submitted by Charles Moses to the EPA Analyst who is the Supplemental Environmental Project (SEP), point of contact. A SEP can be negotiated with violators of EPA statutes. A violator may seek a reduction in a monetary fine, in return for performing a SEP that is consistent with EPA guidance. Responses to the questions were included in this handout. A one-page SEP position paper will be developed and presented to EPA leadership for consideration.

As a follow-up to this, a conference call was scheduled with the EPA Analyst. However, this person could not make the meeting and no plans have been formalized for rescheduling the meeting. Since responses to the questions would indicate that a PSEP compliance promotion project was not out of the question, it was suggested that it might be best to have ideas for compliance promotion projects ready for submittal when the opportunity arrives. To ensure success, Dave Scott suggested that it would be a good idea to closely link a compliance promotion project with the actual type of violation. Dave also pointed out that most cases submitted to EPA for enforcement action in his state are generally **product** related. States would have more latitude to develop a SEP than EPA, especially since most enforcement actions involving **use** violations are taken on the state level. It would be much more difficult to develop an acceptable compliance promotion SEP utilizing EPA guidance, especially involving a product related problem. Some thought needs to go into compliance promotion SEP opportunities involving product related violations such as misbranding or an unregistered product.

2. PRIA

Following this, Charles Moses reported on the PRIA (Pesticide Registration Improvement Act) update given during the Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee (PPDC) Meeting which was held on December 5, 2013. There was a large discrepancy between the amount Congress authorized EPA to collect and how much was actually collected. In order to determine the reason for this, an e-mail was sent to Michael Yanchulis of the Information Services Branch, EPA-OPP. Michael responded by stating that Congress authorized 27.8 million based on consultations with OPP upper management and PRIA coalition members. The cost per product fee was increased in FY

2014 by \$325 to help make up the shortfall. Carol Somody stated that research would be helpful to determine all the factors that affect registration and maintenance fees.

PRIA sets in place two fee mechanisms: annual maintenance fees for existing registrations and fees for new registration actions. An objective to increase the share of PRIA funds to PSEP from the current funding level could be reached in at least two different ways: 1) increase per product costs and the amount authorized for PSEP, and/or 2) reallocation from worker safety and/or partnership grants. Partnership grants can be funded for periods of up to 5 years. Once the grant is awarded, there really is no way to try and redirect funding into PSEP programs. It would be better to work with the PRIA Committee directly or make contact with someone in EPA who develops grant applications. Having input into the partnership grant allocation process or PRIA language modification would be beneficial. If PSEP language is included in the RFP for partnership grants, it would improve PSEP eligibility for this funding.

If collections ever reach 27.8 million, another option might be to increase Congress' authorization, which would require stakeholder involvement. The registration service fee system was reauthorized by the Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act (PRIA 3) until September 30, 2019, although the amount of time that the Agency has to make a decision under the system will not apply to applications received after September 30, 2017.

3) IPM Funding

There are currently two funding streams used to support IPM education/adoption that have potential to better support pesticide stewardship and safety education: EPA Pesticide Environmental Stewardship Program (PESP) grants and USDA IPM Grants/Regional IPM Centers.

The second handout distributed with the meeting agenda was the IPM Statement of the Stakeholder Team which expresses the need to include favorable PSEP language and linkage in all USDA and EPA grants (request for applications or RFA's). EPA's PESTWISE web page contains a discussion of PRIA partnership grants and a discussion of EPA's strategic goals, including how promoting IPM plays a major role in achieving these goals. This just exemplifies the need to link PSEP programs to IPM promotion.

IPM education/adoption via USDA should include pesticide safety education as a component of IPM. Leslie Gilbert stated that USDA will be restructuring and will be moving to streamline some programs. Carol Somody reported that the IPM Centers recently submitted comments on the IPM Statement of the Stakeholder Team. The comments are now being reviewed. A new NIFA RFA will be developed as part of the reorganization and IPM Centers' review. It is not known when the new RFA will be coming out, since so many reviewers have to approve the final document. There is an opportunity to get on the USDA grant listserv so that notice can be received once the final RFA is released. However, the web page is being updated.

ADDENDUM: Leslie provided the following information after the meeting:

Requests to be added to the Pest Managers listserv should be sent to Kathy Kimble-Day at kday@nifa.usda.gov. Minimum required information is name and email address. Desired additional information is institution, state, and phone number.

For notification of future NIFA RFAs released on www.grants.gov:

- Register at <http://www.grants.gov/search/subscribeAdvanced.do>
- Be sure to use the correct CFDA Number; AFRI= "10.310" ; SBIR = "10.212"; Higher Education Challenge Grants = "10.217" Regional Integrated Pest Management Program = "10.200"; Organic Programs = "10.303"; Specialty Crop Research Initiative = "10.309"

More detailed instructions about registering for email notification are available at <http://www.nifa.usda.gov/funding/notification.html>

The leadership of AAPCO, ASPCRO, and AAPSE has all received copies of the IPM Statement of the Stakeholder Team. AAPCO and ASPCRO will discuss the Team's request for their participation in a national dialogue on this statement during their next board meetings. AAPCO and ASPCRO are already working to develop a better relationship with USDA-Office of Pest Management Policy (OPMP); OPMP's David Epstein heads the Federal IPM Coordinating Committee (also asked to participate). AAPSE has agreed to participate.

4) Future activities:

Preparation for the upcoming Stakeholder Team conference call (full team) on February 10;

Delineate Stakeholder Team Activities from PSEP IMI activities;

Identify members of the Team, who would be willing to assist PSEP's who receive PSEP IMI funds to pursue Goal 1 (self-sustainable programs); Dave Scott indicated that he would be willing to facilitate if a state reached out to him with a request for assistance.