

FINAL Minutes, July 25th, 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. Jim Burnette welcomed everyone to the call.

2. Workgroup Updates

All workgroups are just getting underway, and additional team members are invited to join any workgroup.

a) IPM workgroup – led by Ronda Hirnyck (Idaho PSEP)

Goal: Identify and implement next steps as documented in the Stakeholder Team's IPM Statement and First National Dialogue meeting summary notes

The first conference call meeting will be August 9. First steps planned by Ronda are to review the IPM Roadmap and brainstorm ways to incorporate PSEP into that. Ronda is hoping to come up with a list of IPM/PSEP objectives that could be proposed for addition to the Roadmap. In addition, Ronda would like the workgroup to think of ways that PSEP work, activities, and mission fit into an IPM program. The current workgroup members are Ronda, Ralph Bagwell, Don Renchie, Carol Somody and Lee Van Wychen.

b) Consumer workgroup – led by Jim Burnette (NC Dept. of Agriculture and Consumer Services)

Goal: Develop a plan for better engagement of consumer product manufacturers in supporting PSEPs

The National Stakeholder Team began discussions on engagement of these stakeholders in 2014 and developed both long and short outreach documents targeted at these and other stakeholders who need to understand PSEP efforts in consumer education. This new workgroup has developed a first draft document of action steps which will be distributed to the full team for comment. The current workgroup members are Jim, Carol Somody and Mike Wierda.

Wayne Buhler offered to provide the link to the "Homeowner" module of the Pesticide Environmental Stewardship (PES) website (pesticidestewardship.org.)

c) Workgroup for priority resource development for PSEP-IMI password-protected website – led by Richard Beard (Utah PSEP)

Goal: Develop a process for prioritization and development of PSEP resource needs for access via the PSEP-IMI password-protected website

Richard noted that this was a two-stage assignment:

The first task was to determine whether the National Stakeholder Team should be involved in this effort. The decision was yes, with the level of involvement not yet decided. These resources will be posted to the PSEP-IMI password-protected website, where contributors assign access rules. Richard noted that he has been asked by other PSEPs if his resources could be used/edited and offered for a fee, which he approved. This website provides a way to make PSEPs aware of other PSEP resources available to them, with clearly specified conditions of use.

3. PSEP-IMI Update on Goals 1 and 2 – Bob Magee (DuPont)

Bob indicated that 11 Goal 1 states have been approved for continued funding (10 states are starting year 3, one state delayed/starting year 2). Thus far, a problem is only anticipated with one Goal 1 state, which will be asked to return year 1 funding.

Ron Gardner asked whether it would be possible to determine if NY is one of the 11 approved states. Bob said yes, and also noted that the 11 Goal 1 states that have been approved for continued funding are not the total number of states that will continue to be funded – rather, those 11 states have already reached their funding review dates (based on the start of Goal 1 in their states).

4. PSEP Center (eXtension) Initiative – Bob Magee and Don Rennie

Bob said that the new eXtension initiative is moving forward well, and will benefit from cheerleading and vision. Currently, a job description is being written for someone to manage the E-training aspect.

Don noted that the PSEP-IMI password-protected website is only accessible to PSEPs. Several PSEP-IMI funders recognized the work in handling RFPs, fund distribution, etc. and discussions led to the eXtension initiative. Dean Herzfeld and Don Rennie are chair and co-chair of the PSEP Center workgroup, respectively, which is developing benchmarks.

One component of the eXtension initiative is that all resources will be fee-based, not only to the customer but to the PSEP, industry rep, etc. who utilizes another PSEP's

resources. PSEPs will be the distributors of their resources, and any organization (PSEP, industry, etc.) can pay an access fee to use the resource. Part of the access fee will go to the resource developer. Don considers the eXtension initiative complementary to the PSEP-IMI password-protected website.

5. EPA Updates – Kevin Keaney

- Re-issue of RFAs (Requests for Applications) for PSEP funding and meetings

Kevin Keaney reminded the Team that EPA's two RFAs related to pesticide safety (one for direct support of PSEP and one to coordinate meetings) resulted in both awards going to NASDARF (National Association of State Departments of Agriculture Research Foundation). NASDARF then declined the awards, indicating that it was a business decision (even though the awards totaled up to \$7.5 million over 5 years). EPA will indicate disappointment to NASDA. EPA is still preparing the re-competition of the RFAs.

- C&T rulemaking status/likely changes

Concerning the Certification and Training Rule, there were many constructive comments from State Regulatory Agencies and Extension. EPA has subsequently worked to make the rule less disruptive and has moved away from several proposals. The revised rule now goes to USDA and the Hill for 15 days of comment, and then to OMB (Office of Management and Budget).

- WPS rollout

Assistance in resource development to address changes in the Worker Protection Standard are being handled through EPA's cooperative agreement with UC Davis and Oregon State University - referred to as PERC (Pesticide Educational Resources Collaborative), and through a cooperative agreement with the Association of Farmworker Opportunity Programs (AFOP). Progress in development can be viewed on the [PERC](#) and [AFOP](#) websites.

Kevin then invited questions from the Team:

Jim Burnette asked whether the C&T Rule review time at OMB could be very long. Kevin replied that EPA planned to request an expedited review, and that EPA would be briefing the Hill since finalizing the rule is an EPA high priority. Kevin also indicated that there would be a very extended implementation period, since some states will have to deal with legislative and other time-consuming changes.

Carol Somody asked about the relationship between PERC WPS resource development and the training activities of AFOP. Kevin responded that PERC will initially focus mostly

on employer compliance with the WPS, while AFOP will focus on worker training materials. Resources developed by AFOP could ultimately be available on the PERC website.

Kevin added that there will also be two contracts focused on communications, one to Spanish-speaking audiences and another focusing on agricultural employers.

- Likely PSEP funding in 2016 and 2017

Don Renchie asked about the re-competition of the PSEP Support RFA, relative to PRIA funds (Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act.) Kevin said that the PRIA distributions are not tied to a specific year, so the first distribution to PSEP will now contain two years of PRIA funds. Since the other portion of the PSEP funding was discretionary EPA funds, it is possible that year 1 of these “common grant” funds could be lost, but EPA is working to retain a good portion of this funding for PSEP.

The re-issued RFA’s should be available soon; EPA is aware of how the delay in funding further jeopardizes many PSEPs.

6. Highlights of the PSEP/SLA Distance Education Survey – Laurie Gordon (Oregon Department of Agriculture)

CTAG (Certification & Training Assessment Group) conducted this survey over a year ago, and CTAG is now working on a white paper to provide guidance on approving distance learning courses.

Laurie indicated that a) the spreadsheet of the Survey Monkey results, b) the PowerPoint created by Survey Monkey and c) the PowerPoint summarizing the survey results and presented at the National PACT (Pesticide Applicator Certification and Training) Workshop last August in Philadelphia can all be posted to the National Stakeholder Team’s website. The spreadsheet of the Survey Monkey results containing all the raw data is very large and difficult to view on a computer, so Laurie recommended that Team members review the PACT PowerPoint and the PowerPoint created by Survey Monkey.

Laurie noted that one of the requirements of PSEP-IMI Goal 1 was to consider potential use of on-line and distance education. She acknowledged that some states do not allow this, due to identification verification and other challenges.

Jim Burnette indicated that NC has been struggling with the challenges for years. Laurie responded that the challenges will continue as technology changes, and offered a recent Oregon example where a media company was paid to do live webinars, with the guest speakers in their own offices and no proctors. This was a real concern for the Oregon Department of Agriculture, as well as the fact that ODA could not review the entire training program content up-front (and the presentation summaries that were

provided were insufficient.) These webinars were to be held live, but with each presenter speaking from their office via cameras mounted on their computers. The content was to be a series of PowerPoints, with live and taped interviews from different speakers, and the content was still being finalized days before the webinars were to be held. ODA has viewed courses as live, or as some type of distance learning, but these live webinars did not fit either category. Ultimately, ODA said participants could only obtain CEU (Continuing Education Unit) credits if viewed from a proctored location. There were also technology issues – some speakers could not be heard well from their offices.

Glenn Miller asked how successful internet courses are versus live webinars. Laurie replied that this was the first live webinar request for credit that ODA had received and, when she queried other states, they had not received such requests to date. Requests for credit for on-line, pre-designed courses are not uncommon.

Ron Gardner asked if the only real difference was the “live interview” component. Ron did two webinars two years ago, which were well-received, recorded, and THEN made into on-line recorded classes for credit, which included pre and post exams that each participant had to take. NY charges \$30/credit hour.

7. Other Business

Carol Somody asked Bob Magee if PSEP-IMI could share with Jim Burnette and her the list of Goal 1 states at risk of losing continued funding. Bob agreed to obtain this information from Michelle Giddens, the PSEP-IMI contract manager.

Don Renzie asked Carol Somody to forward the American Association of Pesticide Safety Educators (AAPSE) National Meeting reminder (August 5th hotel room block deadline) to the Stakeholder Team. Don noted that AAPSE rule changes now allow full membership to all, and invited everyone on the Team who was not a member to join.

Jim Burnette thanked everyone for attending and adjourned the meeting.