

Final Minutes, July 20th, 2015

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

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

1. First National IPM Dialogue/Leadership Meeting (December, 2015) – [participants](#); first draft agenda for discussion (appendix 1)

The first (leadership) meeting will focus on the first eight points of the Team's [IPM statement](#). Carol Black reminded the Team that there was also a [response from the IPM Centers](#).

Candace Bartholomew noted (by email) that FIFRA Section 28 should be part of the discussion.

ACTION: Please send suggestions concerning the draft IPM agenda by August 20; the next step will be for the Stakeholder Team to work on the pre-reading materials for the meeting.

Fred Whitford noted that he had no problems intermingling IPM and PSE in his PSEP's educational outreach. USDA's National Agricultural Pesticide Impact Assessment Program (NAPIAP) provided funding to university designees for different purposes (crop profiles, etc.) – the elimination of this program was the first blow to PSEP. USDA has eliminated even pass-through support of the minimal funding remaining from EPA for PSEP. Fred stated that PSEP funding should stay separate from IPM funding.

ADDENDUM: (from <http://www.epa.gov/oppfead1/trac/napiap.htm>)

Note: Information not current; NAPIAP now defunct

The National Agricultural Pesticide Impact Assessment Program (NAPIAP) is a cooperative effort between USDA and state and territory Land Grant institutions. The mission of NAPIAP is to promote informed regulatory decisions on agricultural pesticides. NAPIAP accomplishes this mission through the assessment and evaluation of pesticide use, benefits, and alternatives. The network of Land Grant cooperators provides USDA with the capability to respond quickly to pest management issues and questions.

Since enactment of the FQPA, NAPIAP priorities have been shifted to the development of state or regional crop-pest profiles. These crop-pest profiles will concisely describe crop horticultural and pest management practices, taking special note of the current pest management practices, critical pesticide uses, resistance management strategies, and IPM programs.

When critical pesticide uses may be lost due to regulatory action under FQPA, the crop-pest profiles along with the Pipeline database will provide the basic information needed to develop transition strategies.

Fred Whitford asked if the upcoming IPM dialogue could be an [AAPSE](#) agenda item; Andrew Thostenson responded that the next two agendas were full. Kerry Richards indicated that she

would add it to the agenda of the NEPACT (Northeast PACT) breakfast meeting on August 6th during the upcoming [PACT](#) workshop and asked if the documents could be shared with others.

Everything on the Team's website (<http://psep.us/>) can be shared beyond the Team; the IPM Statement and participants in the first IPM dialogue are posted; the draft agenda will not be posted until finalized by the Team.

Kerry also suggested possible edits to points 6 and 7 in the draft agenda.

ACTION: Since the agenda points come directly from the Team's IPM Statement, the Team should review the entire statement and send any suggested edits by August 20. The statement went through nine drafts before it was finalized, so please send critical edits only.

2. Progress of "Goal 1" – A High Priority Item in Upcoming Teleconferences with 17 state advisory committees (appendix 2) and with Extension Directors Associations (appendix 3); discussion on if/how Stakeholder Team can further assist

Carol Somody reminded the Team that Goal 1 is a three-year project with funding commitments of up to \$25,000/year for each of the 25 states that are pursuing this detailed analysis of how to become more robust and sustainable. All contract requirements must be met to ensure continued funding, and a number of states have already been funded for year 2. The Steering Committee of the National Stakeholder Team has now transitioned from national Goal 1 teleconference (12) to individual teleconferences with the advisory committees that are the drivers of Goal 1 in each state. Ten of the 17 requested teleconferences have been scheduled thus far, and nine of these will be completed by the end of July. Some states are making significant progress, while others have received extensions or adjusted start dates, or are trying to meet year 1 deadlines. A checklist of critical items was distributed to PSEP and SLA advisory committee members on March 3rd (appendix 2).

Fred Whitford noted that Goal 1 may be unachievable for some states, due to part-time staff, inexperience, lack of administrative support, and/or other obligations. He asked about the possibility of moving Goal 1 funds from underperforming states, to states making good progress. Carol responded that this will not be possible, and that unspent funds will be utilized for a different project already in development. (ADDENDUM: The Goal 1 requirements are designed to better position Goal 1 PSEPs for future success; Goal 1 does not require that a PSEP be more robust and sustainable by the end of the three year project.)

Various mentorship efforts by PSEPs have benefited, and continue to benefit, Goal 1 PSEPs. The possibility of additional mentorship was mentioned. (ADDENDUM: Two PSEP coordinators volunteered after the meeting to be a mentor for a specific Goal 1 state, if any Goal 1 state desires this.)

ACTIONS: Submit any ideas on how the Team can further assist Goal 1 states. Also, indicate if you are willing to be a mentor to a Goal 1 state. If you are a Goal 1 state facing significant challenges, please consider sharing them with a member of the Stakeholder Team Steering Committee (Jim Burnette, Dave Scott, Carol Black, Carol Somody).

Time has been requested with each of the four regional Extension Directors Associations, to discuss the barriers/challenges to Goal 1 success and to request assistance. A summary document (Appendix 3) has been distributed, and the Southern, Western and Northeast associations have allotted time on upcoming agendas.

Concerns were expressed during (and after) the meeting about the very small time allotment by the NE Extension Directors to discuss Goal 1 and other Team activities; a request will be made for additional time. The Southern and Western associations have allotted 45 minutes and 30 minutes, respectively.

Fred Whitford indicated the need to stress to the extension directors that continued funding of Goal 1 depends on the progress being made.

3. PSEP Educational Resource Priority Needs Assessment – Update

There was a very small response to the first request for priority needs, possibly due to heavy workloads. (The process was outlined at the [May Full Team Meeting](#).) The goal, again, is resources that give PSEPs (and their partners in Extension and in the SLAs) unique advantages over other educators. Since private trainers and others will not have access (and PSEPs can copyright state versions), this is another opportunity for PSEPs to distinguish their programs. Targeted fund-raising will complement \$140K seed money when priority needs are identified.

ACTION: Additional ideas concerning priority resource needs are requested from PSEP coordinators, by September 16th (reference April 16th memo). It should also be helpful to review what is on the PSEP password-protected website).

Wayne Buhler thanked the Team for its efforts, and the meeting was adjourned.

Appendix 1. Draft 1 – Agenda – First IPM Dialogue

Appendix 2. Goal 1 Checklist

Appendix 3. Extension Directors – PSEP Update and Request

Appendix 1. Draft 1

AGENDA - First National Dialogue on: “The Critical Need for IPM Support of Pesticide Safety Education” A Statement of the National Stakeholder Team for PSEP Funding

December 9, 2015 – 9 AM-12 PM

EPA, Potomac Yards South, 2777 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA

- I. Introductions (9:00-9:10 AM)
- II. What is and is not pesticide safety education (PSE) (9:10-9:30)
- III. What is and is not integrated pest management (IPM) (9:30-9:50)
- IV. The Current Landscape (9:50-10:10)

Break (10:10-10:20)

- V. Should PSE be an integral part of IPM efforts (and vice versa) (10:20-10:40)
The IPM Roadmap; FIFRA Section 11(2)(c)

- VI. Leadership Proposals – Discussion and Action Steps (10:40-11:40)
Points 4-8 of the National Stakeholder Team Statement:

4. That the Federal IPM Coordinating Committee and IPM Center Stakeholder Committees tasked with setting priorities are well-balanced, understand the importance of PSE in protecting human health and the environment, and contain strong advocates for PSE.

5. That USDA, the Regional IPM Centers, and the state IPM Coordinators actively work to advance PSE in Center/Coordinator activities and IPM grant criteria.

6. That more State IPM Coordinators and State PSE Program Coordinators work together to advance core principles of PSE as part of IPM educational materials, and to advance core principles of IPM as part of PSE educational materials.

7. That the proposed Federal Agency IPM Training Program includes PSE as a key component, and that strong advocates for PSE be part of the development and implementation teams.

8. That State IPM Coordinators get appropriate support and credit for PSE done in association with or in support of the PSE Program Coordinator.

- VII. Closing Comments (2 min each) (11:40-12)

Adjourn

Appendix 2. Goal 1 Checklist

- Accurate university contract office project start date
- PSEP familiar with documents in [Goal 1 section](#) of psep.us
- PSEP reviewing notes of Goal 1 teleconferences

- Advisory committee members familiar with contract and appendices
- Advisory committee using [Effective Land Grant University Pesticide Safety Education Programs: Mission, Need, Requirements, Target Audiences, Goals, and Key Activities](#) to define desired program
- Advisory committee using state's [CPARD](#) data to assist in identifying target audiences and potential stakeholder team members
- Advisory committee reviewing educational roles (current/desired) of PSEP and SLA
- Advisory committee requesting assistance (documents, teleconferences, stakeholder engagement, etc.) from Stakeholder Team Steering Committee where needed
- All advisory committee and stakeholder team members familiar with [The Value of Robust Land-Grant University Pesticide Safety Education Programs](#)

- Talking points (Oct. 8) customized to engage potential stakeholder team members
- Stakeholder team established (by end of year 1)
- State agricultural chemical association on stakeholder team
- Associations whose members PSEP educates (or could educate) on stakeholder team
- Stakeholder team members provided to PSEP-IMI
- Quarterly teleconferences of stakeholder team (once established)
- All advisory committee and stakeholder team members committed to moving PSEP to a more robust and sustainable condition

- All minimum requirements done by dates in the contract letter and appendices
- Interim reports submitted to PSEP-IMI
- Draft work plan submitted to PSEP-IMI
- Assessment of state laws impacting product registration fees, training fees, etc. (year 1)
- Assessment of university policies impacting available PSEP funds (year 1)
- Use of PSEP business plan template to assist with business plan development (years 1-3)
- Assessment of legislative and other funding opportunities (years 1-3)
- Assessment of current and potential use of online and distance education (years 2-3)
- Documentation of all assessments, decisions, etc.
- Extensions requested from PSEP-IMI where justified

- Information considered for interim reports:
 - Changes to advisory committee
 - Non-confidential information of interest from advisory committee meetings
 - Information of interest from stakeholder team meetings
 - Anything requested in feedback on your previous interim report
 - Significant changes/updates to draft work plan
 - Progress on minimum requirements
 - Planned next steps

Appendix 3. Extension Directors – PSEP Update and Request

More Robust and Sustainable Pesticide Safety Education Programs (“Goal 1”) A Major National Effort

25% of PSEPs have less than ½ person to run their program
40% of PSEPs have less than \$75,000/year to run their program (including salaries)

Request to Extension Directors

Provide leadership and proactive assistance to PSEPs pursuing Goal 1

National Stakeholder Team for PSEP Funding (<http://psep.us/>)

- Established in October, 2012; currently [107 members](#) from 96 organizations
- Evaluating and supporting various opportunities for strengthening PSEPs; Goal 1 critical
- Founding premises:
 - Robust Land-Grant University Pesticide Safety Education Programs have [unique value](#)
 - All 50 states should have a robust Pesticide Safety Education Program

Goal 1 Statistics

- 25 states have signed 3-year contracts to pursue Goal 1 (>\$1.8MM commitment by industry)
- States are diverse in size, location, and type and number of certified applicators
- States contain ~344,000 of the ~900,000 certified applicators (188,000 commercial, 156,000 private)

Goal 1 Minimum Contract Requirements

- Letters of commitment from State Lead Agency (SLA) and University Extension Administration
- Advisory committee with PSEP, SLA, and University Extension Administration representation
- Draft work plan within 6 months of receipt of funds
- Current PSEP balance sheet to the advisory committee within 6 months of receipt of funds
- Assessment of state laws and university policies that impact funding opportunities (year 1)
- Stakeholder team established in year 1, with quarterly meetings (e.g. teleconferences) once formed
- Assessment of legislative and other funding opportunities (years 1-3)
- Business plan development (years 1-3)
- Assessment of current or potential use of on-line and distance education (years 2-3)

Goal 1 Support from National Stakeholder Team

- ~75 members of the National Stakeholder Team actively involved in supporting Goal 1 efforts
- >6000 hours invested in 2014 (*excluding* work of advisory committees and state stakeholder teams)
- 12 National Goal 1 teleconferences, notes, and follow-up (October, 2014 - April, 2015)
- [Goal 1 website](#)
- [PSEP business planning tool](#) (April, 2015)
- Sponsorship of [National manual development workshop](#) (May, 2015)

- [Password-protected website](#), accessible only to the 50 PSEPs (August, 2015)
- Individual teleconferences with 17 state advisory committees (June – October, 2015)
- [First National Dialogue](#) on the [Critical Need for IPM Support of Pesticide Safety Education](#) (December, 2015)
- [Resource development](#) for use by PSEPS and their land-grant university and state lead agency partners (2014-16)
- Various types of support to Goal 1 states whenever requested (ongoing)

Barriers/Challenges to Goal 1 Success – Your Leadership Needed

- Workloads and other priorities resulting in a lack of time commitment to Goal 1
- Lack of attention to contract requirements and timelines
- Level of engagement and/or true commitment of advisory committee members to Goal 1
- Level of engagement and/or true commitment of stakeholder team members to Goal 1
- Lack of true interest in and/or understanding of pesticide safety education
- Lack of attention to defining a more [effective pesticide safety education program](#)
- Lack of attention to minor categories of certified applicators and/or [consumer education](#)
- Lack of attention to Goal 1 teleconference notes and other types of Goal 1 support
- cursory assessments and reports
- Lack of expertise in organizing and directing this type of project