

Final Minutes, June 13th, 2014 National Stakeholder Team for PSEP Funding

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

AAPCO – Association of American Pesticide Control Officials
AAPSE – American Association of Pesticide Safety Educators
APS – American Phytopathological Society
ASPCRO – Association of Structural Pest Control Regulatory Officials
CSPA – Consumer Specialty Products Association
EPA OPP – EPA Office of Pesticide Programs
EPA OECA – EPA Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance
ESA – Entomological Society of America
NACD – National Association of Conservation Districts
NASDARF – National Association of State Departments of Agriculture Research Foundation
PPDC – Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee
PRIA – Pesticide Registration Improvement Act
PSEP-IMI – PSEP Improvement and Modernization Initiative
SEP - Supplemental Environmental Projects
SLA – State Lead (pesticide regulatory) Agency
WSSA – Weed Science Society of America

1. Request to all team members to edit “Effective Land Grant University Pesticide Safety Education Programs” (attached to agenda and sent again with draft minutes)

Carol Black indicated that this “backbone” document was needed as a starting point for various needs – e.g. the next press release, future work on service to consumers, “Goal 1” state use (states pursuing strong, sustainable PSEPs), etc. Carol Somody noted that it is critical that the Team get this document right; a “final” version will be circulated to the Team before it goes to AAPSE leadership for approval.

There was a brief discussion about some of the wording but, due to time constraints, all suggestions were requested by email, by the June 30th deadline.

Andrew Thostenson said that some PSEP coordinators have assumed that what PSEP does was understood, but no existing document that summarized it was found.

Thia Walker indicated that, as a Goal 1 state, she welcomed this document as a tool to approach her advisory committee; Candace Bartholomew agreed.

2. Workgroup Updates/Upcoming Activities

a) Federal Workgroup

i. IPM Dialogue with USDA, etc.

Jim Burnette indicated that ASPCRO's letter has arrived, which supports PSEP and participation in the IPM dialogue requested by the Team. A similar letter from AAPCO is coming next week. Both organizations agree that PSE is a critical component of IPM.

Carol Somody indicated that the key organizations that were approached to participate in the IPM dialogue are now engaged, and that the many points in the Team's IPM statement are a very serious issue to the Team. Carol said that USDA IPM policy, grant focus, messages, etc. is impacting PSEP and PSE in many ways, directly and indirectly, and that the upcoming dialogue(s) should have happened long ago. The discussion needs to begin at a high level and will have to re-visit some very basic principles, just as the Team is having to re-visit what effective PSEPs do.

The next step will be for the Stakeholder Team Steering Committee to have a teleconference with the head of the Federal IPM Coordinating Committee (David Epstein, a member of the Stakeholder Team) to define the priority issues in the IPM statement and the desired participants in each dialogue that must take place.

Two PSEPs, Ronda Hirnyck and Wayne Buhler, have agreed to participate where appropriate, and a PSEP volunteer from the NE and SW would be desirable. These individuals must be PSEPs first, and understand and address PSE within a science-based, real-world IPM framework.

Kerry Richards volunteered to serve in this role for the NE, and Candace Bartholomew offered to be her backup.

ii. EPA Discussions

Jim Burnette noted his appreciation for the relation with EPA, USDA, and state partners, and said that the Team will continue to move toward discussions on PRIA, EPA IPM grants, etc. EPA OPP is currently going through changes, so proper timing will be important.

Carol Somody noted that these types of discussions cannot take place until the Team can show how many states have committed to Goal 1, to strengthen or re-build their PSEP. This should be known by the end of June. PRIA discussions will extend beyond EPA, of course (PRIA chair Phil Klein of CSPA, the PPDC, etc.)

b) State Workgroup

Dave Scott indicated that he had some discussions with Rutgers about engaging SLA support for Goal 1; Pat Hastings thanked Dave for his assistance and said it made a real difference. (As indicated in the “Who to Contact” document, Dave is always available to provide this kind of assistance.)

Dave spoke to EPA OECA about the Team’s SEP proposal – while they were not opposed, it was apparent that the Team will have to engage regional EPA OECA offices, since that is where funds are disbursed. Also, the changing leadership at OECA will add to the challenge in the short term.

c) University Workgroup

Carol Black is collecting all comments on the PSEP document in item 1.

This workgroup is also trying to characterize how PSEPs serve non-professional applicators (the general public). Examples of activities have been requested from all PSEPs. The most impact is likely through the Master Gardener Program, a volunteer group that receives training from PSEPs, etc. and then goes out and provides information to the general public. Blogs, pest/pesticide databases, fact sheets, etc. also serve a role. At Washington State University, for example, large impacts are seen with the PestSense and HortSense fact sheet databases which reach over 66,000 and 42,000 unique visitors (not hits, which are in the millions) each year; several other states provide these tools for home and garden pesticide use. Carol Somody said that these consumer impacts will be important to successfully engage CSPA in this effort to strengthen PSEP.

Kerry Richards noted that PA exposure data has been sent to Carol Black, involves mostly consumers, and therefore shows the significant need for homeowner education.

Jim Burnette pointed out that an entire group of NC pesticide users (“limited resource farmers”) are small, part-time farmers who use consumer products and should be educated. Also those using pesticides in community gardens should be educated.

Carol Black said that WV also responded that they are expending significant effort on pesticide safety education for small farmers.

Pat Hastings indicated that NJ has an initiative with organic growers to address the misconception that they are not using pesticides. Carol Black responded that the Pesticide Environmental Stewardship (PES) website now has an organic stewardship section.

d) Non-Government Workgroup

Carol Somody reiterated that no similar documents could be found to assist this workgroup in drafts 1-2 of the PSEP document in item 1.

Although active recruiting for additional Team members is not on-going, three elusive members are still being approached – NACD, APS, and CSPA (the latter now on hold until the document on PSEP support of the general public is done). Andrew Thostenson indicated that he has approached several APS members from ND State University (two of these individuals have also received a recent communication to APS' Extension and Chemical Control Committees, requesting APS representation on the Team.)

Carol indicated that Phase 3 PSEP-IMI fund-raising (the final phase), beyond the 36 Phase 1 and 2 companies, is on temporary hold. There is a need to resolve some questions concerning use of the funds. Also, the fund-raisers must be able to explain to registrants why PRIA dollars are supporting some projects instead of PSEP. It is hoped that Phase 3 fund-raising can re-start after an upcoming Funders Meeting, tentatively planned for July.

A communication is being developed by this workgroup to send to the 16 national associations on this team (excluding AAPSE, AAPCO, and ASPCRO, all already engaged at the national and state level). The email will request assistance and/or advice on how best to proceed in engaging the state equivalents of these national associations to participate in Goal 1 State Stakeholder Teams. The state associations must be assisted in understanding PSEP, the history of the Team and PSEP-IMI, the purpose of Goal 1, and the critical role of the state stakeholder teams.

3. PSEP-IMI Update/Upcoming Activities

Andrew Thostenson indicated that there is much PSEP-IMI activity, and that getting funds to a university is often not easy. Approximately 10 proposals are funded, ~10 are in discussion, and ~10 are awaiting further input from the PSEP.

Business planning has been a weakness of PSEP. Early discussions to develop a PSEP business plan model template were held with NASDARF last year. The University of Minnesota in association with Dean Herzfeld was identified as a candidate. Subsequently, NASDARF could not fund this effort, so the university has been invited by PSEP-IMI to submit a proposal. This is expected by the end of June. A number of individuals have been identified to assist, including PSEPs. Business plan model development should start in July – for Goal 1 states or any PSEP to use or adapt.

This summer, PSEP-IMI will decide how to invite new proposals, and will work on priority needs.

In April, a Who-to-Contact list went to all 24 current and potential Goal 1 States. This document has been posted to psep.us, so anyone is invited to read and utilize it for specific needs concerning PSEP. Various other documents have been posted to psep.us since the last full team meeting – for example, the 2012 SLA Survey has been updated to include 7 additional respondents, and contains valuable insights for Goal 1 and other states. Candace Bartholomew offered to submit CT data.

The updated Team Membership list has also just been posted to the website.

States that have not yet responded to February letters from CropLife America, (accepting their proposal or requesting certain modifications) have been given a June 30th deadline to indicate their intentions. Additional states, which were invited in February/March to participate in Goal 1, have been given the same deadline. (ADDENDUM: This date is not relevant to states with contracts in progress or completed.)

4. Other Activities

A spreadsheet containing publicly-available PSEP core educational materials (and Category Manuals) is in progress. This spreadsheet should not be confused with the much more detailed collection AND categorization of resources which the compilers will undertake (see RFP on <http://psep.us/> for details.)

WSSA's 2014 PSEP press release is targeted for July. Although it will mention the 50 year anniversary and link to a historical timeline, the focus will likely be the crossroads PSEP is at concerning its national presence. Goal 1 states should note something that was pointed out recently by a strong PSEP – that a strong PSEP can be the star of a university's extension outreach effort. Is there another extension outreach effort that covers such a diverse audience and has such an important impact on human health and environmental protection?

Carol Black indicated that one challenge that the Stakeholder Team Steering Committee faces is that it is very close to all these activities, and could miss something important. If you have a question or need, please call or email.

The next meeting date will be communicated shortly.
(ADDENDUM: July 31 – 11AM – 12 PM Eastern Time)

Jim Burnette adjourned the meeting.