

## PSEP Stakeholder Team – Federal Workgroup

September 5, 2013 - Conference Call Notes and Follow-Up

Attendees: Chuck Moses (AAPCO); Carol Somody, (Syngenta); Andrew Thostenson (NDSU); Carol Black (WSU); Jim Fredericks (NPMA); Lee Van Wychen (WSSA); Leslie Gilbert (USDA-NIFA)

The meeting commenced with an introduction and a summary of the work done to date by the workgroup, given by Charles Moses. After introductions of persons in attendance, Andrew Thostenson gave an overview of the PSEP-IMI Board activities. At the current time 5 pesticide registrants are assisting with funding for the initiative and a total of \$1,000,000 will be available in each of the next 3 years to fund PSEP proposals. Once finalized, the RFP (Request for proposals) will be distributed. Although Board activities will be separate from activities we are scheduling in the federal workgroup, we may be asked to assist the Board from time to time. Andrew also mentioned that the WSSA News Release was finalized and distributed which discusses the PSEP-IMI.

Federal funding sources that are now and might be available to PSEP programs were discussed, using the matrix (dated March 15, 2013) developed by Liza Fleeson and based on past federal workgroup meetings. The matrix has been updated again (dated September 9, 2013) based on this meeting and follow-up actions.

### 1. PRIA (Pesticide Registration Improvement Act): Annual Product Maintenance Fees and New Product Registration Actions

PRIA sets in place two fee mechanisms: annual maintenance fees for existing registrations and fees for new registration actions. One goal could be to increase the share of PRIA funds to PSEP from the current funding level. Another might be increased funding to PSEP from a fee increase, which would require stakeholder involvement and have to be approved by Congress.

A portion of PRIA funds, generated from new registration actions and annual maintenance fees, are currently being used to fund PSEP programs, pesticide worker protection activities, and partnership grants.

These are discretionary grants and 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 contacts with someone in EPA who reviews or approves grant applications. Having input into the allocation process or PRIA language modification (including PSEP funding in the partnership grant language, for example) would be beneficial. If PSEP language is included in the RFP for partnership grants, PSEP's could be eligible for this funding.

EPA's PESTWISE web page contains a discussion of PRIA partnership grants. Also on this webpage is a discussion of EPA's strategic goals, and how promoting IPM plays a major role in achieving these goals. This just exemplifies the need to link PSEP programs to IPM promotion. Part of the problem with pursuing increases in PRIA funding is finding the right opportunity or place to enter the process. Who would be the right person to talk to at this point? Further discussion is needed to determine how to approach key individuals from the PRIA Committee, PPDC Workgroup, or other organizations. Opportunities to participate in PRIA related teleconferences involving both EPA and PRIA Committee representatives would offer a valuable opportunity to give input.

The registration service fee system was reauthorized by the Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act (PRIA 3) until September 30, 2019, although the decision times or the timeframe or amount of time that the Agency has to make a decision under the system do not apply to applications received after September 30, 2017.

2. EPA regulatory actions (consent agreements between EPA and FIFRA violators) could potentially generate funding for PSEP programs. EPA regulatory actions can originate from EPA Headquarters. However, the bulk of EPA regulatory actions are initiated at the regional level. A discussion with an EPA regional enforcement division representative revealed that EPA has some latitude to mitigate monetary penalties. The guidance for this can be found in the Supplemental Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). **Information on this policy can be found on line and it was agreed that the SEPA guidance will be reviewed prior to the next workgroup meeting.**

### 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.

PESP (not PSEP) has largely funded IPM activities and not pesticide safety/stewardship. Contact is Frank Ellis. EPA PestWise web site states there are no funds available for 2013. With EPA's role in pesticide registration, it appears justified that partnership funds be used for education of pesticides users for to ensure proper use, safety, and environmental protection.

IPM education/adoption via USDA should include pesticide safety education as a component of IPM. There may be an opportunity to submit comments to effect some language changes in the RFA for USDA-IPM funding. **Research is being done for contact information on where comments should be submitted. An IPM position paper will be prepared in the Non-Governmental/Other Workgroup, modified by the Federal Workgroup, and then finalized by the full Stakeholder Team.**

Stakeholder Team members will be offered the opportunity to sign on to the Position Paper, which will have a variety of uses.

**It was decided that the federal workgroup would work on a document to discuss its position and justification for PSEP funding increases, beginning with three of the federal funding areas identified. The position document on the need for IPM support of pesticide safety education will be drafted in the Non-Government/Other Work Group. The position document will be the starting point for more formal discussions or position paper development with the appropriate individuals, committees and/or organizations.**