

FINAL Minutes, May 23rd, 2016

National Stakeholder Team for Pesticide Safety Education Program (PSEP) Funding

All documents and minutes of the Stakeholder Team and its workgroups are posted at <http://psep.us/>

1. Introduction. Jim Burnette welcomed everyone to the meeting and indicated that attendance is not taken on the calls due to time constraints. (Addendum: 47 individuals were on this particular call.)

2. Results of the *First National Dialogue on The Critical Need for IPM Support of Pesticide Safety Education, and next steps*

Carol Black thanked the attendees of the First National Dialogue and reviewed some key points from the [meeting summary notes](#). Liza Fleeson moderated the Dialogue and provided PSEP background information. Attendees were engaged, and everyone agreed on the need for communication.

Michele Rogers noted the good dialogue, and shared key points with ECOP (Extension Committee on Organization and Policy) at their January meeting.

David Epstein indicated that USDA and EPA made it clear that there are documents that guide the agencies, e.g. the [National Roadmap for IPM](#), Requests for Applications (RFAs), etc. Any comments on the IPM Roadmap can be sent through Carol Black or directly to David. Edits or comments made to USDA NIFA RFAs should be sent to the NIFA personnel who attended the First National Dialogue. David believes that there are opportunities and a need to educate individuals about the role of pesticides in IPM.

Don Renchie said that, as a PSEP, he has a responsibility to teach PSE including IPM.

Carol Black noted discussions with the Western Region IPM Center and with other western PSEPs about future needs.

It was agreed that the Steering Committee should now solicit members for a Stakeholder Team IPM workgroup focused on next steps as documented in the meeting summary notes and in the Stakeholder Team's [IPM Statement](#). Ronda Hirnyck is willing to help lead. Carol Somody would also like to see a letter from Stakeholder Team leadership go to Sonny Ramaswamy and Jim Jones, concerning the meeting results and next steps.

3. Stakeholder Team's [draft recommendations](#) concerning Supplemental Environmental Projects – update and next steps

Dave Scott indicated attempts over the past year to try to get a sense of how to move helpful information/guidance to PSEPs, to Regional EPA offices, and to industry (perhaps through the AAPCO Industry Committee). Carol Somody asked about the possibility of forming a Stakeholder Team workgroup to move forward; Dave replied that he does not yet have an approach.

4. 2016 targeted fund-raising campaign for priority resource development for password-protected website – next steps

Carol Somody indicated that various resources are in development and planned, some specifically for this website. Many resource ideas were received from PSEPs last year, and a first prioritization was done. Carol Black repeated concerns about this website being available only to PSEPs.

Carol Somody proposed a workgroup to focus on the website. Carol Black stated that the first task of the workgroup should be to determine whether the Stakeholder Team should be involved in this funding/resource effort since the Stakeholder Team has no money handling mechanism; PSEP-IMI through CropLife Foundation managed previously donated funds. Carol Somody responded that PSEP-IMI funders have indicated that they will not be using the remaining PSEP-IMI funds to develop additional resources specifically for this website.

Bob Magee stated he would talk about PSEP-IMI efforts later in the call. Don Renchie noted that there is a PSEP-IMI supported effort moving forward with eXtension.

5. Consumer education – next steps

Jim Burnette indicated that a conference call was held last May, following the completion of the Consumer documents and several Stakeholder Team discussions about getting CSPA (Consumer Specialty Products Association) and its members more engaged in supporting PSEPs. (Addendum: There are [long](#) and [short](#) Consumer documents, both for use by PSEPs to engage their stakeholders – not for consumer use).

Jim summarized key points raised on Stakeholder Team calls last year - the high percentage of total pesticide exposures that occur in the home, the importance of PSEP training of Master Gardeners for consumer outreach and confidence in using pesticides, and the excellent contacts that some PSEPs already have with companies that make consumer products.

Kerry Richards, Fred Whitford, Carol Somody, and Jim Burnette were originally going to work on action steps to engage CSPA companies in support of PSEP. Carol Somody suggested that a new Stakeholder Team workgroup be formed to determine next steps, because of the significant value that various PSEPs have in educating the public. Mike Wierda said that he has been doing some outreach at Farmers Markets, and volunteered to participate on the workgroup.

6. EPA funding status for PSEPs and for meetings

Kevin Keaney indicated that EPA issued two requests for applications (RFAs) related to pesticide safety. One was to coordinate meetings, workshops, etc. to advance the safe use of pesticides (\$2.5 million total over 5 years) and the other was for support of PSEP (up to \$1 million/year for 5 years, half from PRIA funds and half from discretionary EPA funds). The National Association of State Departments of Agriculture Research Foundation (NASDARF) applied for, and won, both awards but then declined to accept them. This has serious implications:

- 1) Likely delays in key future meetings – e.g. the National Pesticide Applicator Certification and Training (PACT) Workshop planned for 2017 will now be delayed until 2018.
- 2) Likely reduction in Year 1 support of PSEP. Half of the planned Year 1 commitment to PSEP will probably disappear, since the discretionary portion can be used for other EPA efforts while the EPA must spend time re-issuing new RFAs (probably this summer). Don Renchie noted that even the distribution of the PRIA portion to PSEPs may now be delayed into 2017.

Jim Burnette asked why NASDARF refused to accept the awards. Kevin replied that the NASDARF Board did not feel it was a good business move; the Board noted its organization's strong comments concerning both the Worker Protection Standard (WPS) and Certification and Training (C&T) proposed rules.

Carol Black invited anyone to contact her for assistance in developing a proposal, if they are interested in applying when EPA reissues the RFAs. In addition, the original RFAs are still posted and could be used to start preparing a proposal.

7. PSEP-IMI update

Bob Magee stated that all funder contributions for 2016 have been received, so the total \$3 million commitment is in hand. Michelle Giddens of eXtension has been hired to manage grants. Of the 25 Goal 1 states, ~11 are on track, ~10 may be performing sufficiently, and ~4-5 have not been in contact (Michelle will follow-up). A few states have not received their year 2 funding. Concerning resource development, the TX, ND, and NY resources have been completed, and the NC resource is in progress (Michelle will follow-up with the others.) If a PSEP is not responsive and funds are returned or not expended, those funds will be used to support PSEP-IMI projects.

The PSEP Center at eXtension is a phase 2 project led by Don Renchie, Dean Herzfeld, Thia Walker, Kerry Richards, Kim Pope, and Sonja Thomas (with Jane Stautz and Bob as PSEP-IMI liaisons). Carol Somody suggested a short summary of this project for posting on the Stakeholder Team's website.

8. Password-protected website – update and needs

Wayne Buhler summarized the current status of the [PSEP-IMI password-protected website](#). This website resides on the NC State Extension server, and now contains ~797 resources contributed by 24 states. It is password-protected – up to two individuals from each PSEP can have access. There are ~12 PSEPs that are not yet members; once approved, PSEPs have access to all resources. Wayne recognized the effort of the four PSEP compilers in the initial population of the website, which now has 15 categories of topics, a how-to page, and resource-specific conditions of use.

9. Future of the Stakeholder Team

Carol Black asked that Stakeholder Team members consider the team’s progress and its charge going forward, and send ideas.

10. Other business

Carol Somody reminded the Stakeholder Team that she and Jim Burnette are again available for meetings with any of the Goal 1 advisory committees that desire it, or to help engage other stakeholders of importance.

Jim Burnette stated his continued commitment to the Stakeholder Team, thanked everyone, and adjourned the meeting.