

**Final Minutes, May 18<sup>th</sup>, 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/>**

Jim Burnette welcomed everyone to the meeting.

### **1. National IPM Dialogue**

Jim announced that the first IPM Dialogue (leadership meeting) is now scheduled for December 9 at EPA, the morning after the full-SFIREG meeting. The leadership of ten organizations will focus mainly on the first eight of the 24 points in the Team's IPM Statement (Nov. 11, 2013). These 8 points focus on IPM Emphasis and Leadership and will determine future action items and work groups.

Sonny Ramaswamy and most of the other presidents, directors, or chairs have already confirmed their availability. The ten organizations participating in the leadership meeting are:

USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture (USDA NIFA)  
USDA Institute of Food Production and Sustainability, Plant Protection Division  
USDA Office of Pest Management Policy (USDA OPMP)  
Federal IPM Coordinating Committee  
American Association of Pesticide Safety Educators (AAPSE)  
Association of American Pesticide Control Officials (AAPCO)  
Association of Structural Pest Control Regulatory Officials (ASPCRO)  
Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ESCOP)  
Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP)  
EPA Field and External Affairs Division (EPA FEAD)

Implementation meetings/teleconferences will follow the leadership meeting - five PSEPs have already committed to represent their regions.

### **2. EPA RFA - Funding Distribution Program for PSEPs**

Carol Black explained that these EPA funds were originally processed through USDA, and, the last two years, through NASDARF (National Association of State Departments of Agriculture Research Foundation). The new five-year cooperative agreement is open to universities, state governments, not-for-profits, and others noted in the RFA; applications are due June 22. Details, plus answers to questions being asked, are posted at <http://www.epa.gov/pesticides/grants/rfa-pest-safety.html>.

Richard Pont noted that additional questions should be sent to Jeanne Kasai ([kasai.jeanne@epa.gov](mailto:kasai.jeanne@epa.gov)).

Kerry Richards asked if this was now \$1MM in funding (versus \$500K in recent years). Richard indicated that \$1MM was the potential maximum, but that there was no guarantee. Only \$500K is committed; more would come from discretionary EPA funds, depending on the budget.

Some PSEPs have asked about their eligibility for the National Farmworker Training RFA (posted at the same link), which is looking for a grantee to coordinate a national program to educate farmworkers and their families and also train pesticide safety educators who will work with farmworker service organizations, growers, etc. The grantee may utilize existing EPA approved education materials or develop new materials, but all training materials should be targeted at the low literacy, predominately non-English speaking agricultural worker population.

Carol Black said that this RFA has primarily funded those who train farm workers – not applicators. It has been awarded to the Association of Farmworker Opportunity Programs (<http://afop.org/>) in the past, but PSEPs and others can apply.

Candace Bartholomew asked about the Field Implementation Meeting Support RFA. Carol Black responded that this handles workshops (e.g. PACT, CTAG). There are now three separate RFAs, for what used to be one RFA:

- 1) Funding Distribution Program for Pesticide Safety Education Programs (PSEPs) RFA
- 2) Pesticide Safety Resource Projects RFA (not yet released)
- 3) Field Implementation Meeting Support RFA (not yet released)

### **3. PSEP Educational Resource Priority Needs Assessment**

Carol Somody said that this assessment is being done to develop additional resources for exclusive use by PSEPs and their Extension and State Lead Agency partners who assist them with pesticide safety education. It is not part of PSEP-IMI. The first draft list of priorities is being created based on PSEP coordinator inputs (a change from the January proposal).

Topics that cover in-depth core, category-specific core, and recertification-core are encouraged, since problems most often involve basic principles of safe use that applicators forget, ignore, or never really learn.

Final prioritization will be done by a National Stakeholder Team workgroup – it has not yet been decided whether this will be an existing or new workgroup.

Further discussions will be held with PSEPs who own resources that could be enhanced (with funding) to easily meet a priority need, prior to funding the creation of new priority resources for password protected website.

The goal is more resources exclusively for PSEPs, which can be customized to create state-specific versions and then copyrighted by an entity of the land-grant university, if desired.

Some funding has already been committed. A new targeted fund-raising campaign will also begin, as soon as the needs assessment is complete. For example, certain associations may be willing to sponsor a particular resource that is targeted to their applicators.

Kerry Richards confirmed that PSEPs would have the opportunity to review and add to the proposed priority needs at the PACT poster session (near Wayne Buhler's poster about the password-protected website).

#### **4. “Goal 1” (25 states pursuing a more robust and sustainable PSEP)**

Since October, the National Stakeholder Team Steering Committee has sponsored 12 national Goal 1 teleconferences, and is now transitioning to meetings with individual Goal 1 state advisory committees (PSEP/SLA/University Administrators).

If any other PSEP would like to receive teleconference notes that are not specific to Goal 1 states, contact Carol Somody. For example, Dean Herzfeld presented an overview of the new PSEP business planning tool, the value of a business plan, and business plan hurdles. Phil Nixon discussed the many factors that have gone into making IL a robust PSEP (ADDENDUM: These factors include: the IL Pesticide Act providing funds for education on the proper use of pesticides; the strong relationship between the PSEP and the SLA; the recognition and championing of the PSEP's value by individuals in the SLA, in stakeholder groups, and in the PSEP, in reducing SLA workload and preventing problems for growers and applicators; the self-funding mechanisms which include pesticide registration fees but not dependency on the university or Extension; the willingness to challenge individuals in Extension and in the SLA who were not supportive or convinced of the importance of PSEP efforts; and the different strengths that the IL PSEP staff has, including the facilitator's business abilities.)

## 5. Other

Carol Somody reminded the Team of the need to engage Consumer Specialty Products Association ([www.cspa.org/](http://www.cspa.org/)) in recognizing the important value of PSEP to their products and customers.

Kerry Richards said that the PA Department of Agriculture supports her consumer outreach. Recent data from the two PA Poison Control Centers indicate a high number of calls, with 98% non-occupational exposures and most of these young children. Addressing this problem has been made a Master Gardener mission in PA. Carol responded that both safe handling of pesticides by consumers and protection of children should engage CSPA. Phil Nixon noted that an even better approach might be to show CSPA how pesticide safety education by PSEP via Master Gardeners can actually increase customers.

There have been attempts by both PSEP and industry members of the Team to get PSE brochures in stores (big box and smaller stores). There is resistance, for several reasons, including a desire not to potentially raise concerns among customers.

Kerry will develop some action steps, with assistance from Jim Burnette, Carol Somody, and Fred Whitford; she will also engage Nebraska as another example of a PSEP doing consumer outreach.

There was some discussion concerning attachment 1 (the document allowing PSEPs to copyright state-customized versions of newly-created resources (Goal 2d) funded by PSEP-IMI, if they desire). PSEPs can customize/change these resources and sell their versions to their applicators (e.g. the Wood Preservative and Public Health manuals). The question of selling state-customized versions in other states will require more discussion, because PSEPs vary in their attitudes about this. There will be well-defined rules on the password-protected website concerning the use of newly-created resources specifically developed for all PSEPs. Conversely, resources enhanced (Goal 2c) and/or donated by PSEPs have conditions of use that are defined by the PSEP.

Thia Walker noted that, at the Manual Development Workshop in Nebraska, Dean Herzfeld gave a presentation on the importance of copyright. This will be made available to PSEPs in the future by Cindy Folck, Program Manager for the OH PSEP and one of the coordinators of the workshop. A manual development community of sharing is also planned.

ADDENDUM: Attachment 2 (the document formalizing the agreement of the five major funders to use the newly created PSEP-IMI resources for internal use only) was not discussed on the call. This document is for the five funders that paid for the development of new resources for the password-protected website. It ensures that, if a

funder wants to use these resources, they will only use them to educate their own employees.



## Memorandum on Copyright/Attribution of Newly-Created PSEP-IMI Resources by Land-Grant Universities

### Pesticide Safety Education Program Improvement & Modernization Initiative 2014-16

Coordinated by the PSEP-IMI Steering Committee

Newly-created training resources and materials funded by PSEP-IMI can be used in their entirety or customized by Land-Grant University Pesticide Safety Education Programs (LGU PSEPs) for the LGU PSEP's use and/or for use by the land-grant university and state lead agency partners who assist the LGU PSEP with pesticide safety education.

When these newly-created training resources and materials are customized to create state-specific versions, they can be copyrighted by an entity of the land-grant university, if desired. Attribution must be given to "PSEP-IMI" or to "the Pesticide Safety Education Program Improvement & Modernization Initiative."

In no way will this copyright affect the rights of the funders of PSEP-IMI to use the original training resources and materials for internal training.

This memorandum does not cover existing resources that are enhanced using PSEP-IMI funds.



## Internal Use of Newly-Created PSEP-IMI Resources

### Pesticide Safety Education Program Improvement & Modernization Initiative 2014-16

Coordinated by the PSEP-IMI Steering Committee

*Sponsors of PSEP-IMI contributing  $\geq$ \$50,000/year for 2014-16 have the right to access all newly-created training resources and materials funded by PSEP-IMI, for **internal** use only by their organization. If your organization desires access to these newly-created training resources and materials, complete this form and return it to Priscilla Hammett via email at [phammett@croplifeamerica.org](mailto:phammett@croplifeamerica.org) or by fax to 202-355-1401.*

*This access does not cover existing resources that are enhanced using PSEP-IMI funds. These resources are subject to the conditions of use specified by the owner.*

Company name:

Contact name:

Contact phone number:

My organization requests access to all newly-created training resources and materials funded by PSEP-IMI. We agree to use these resources and materials, in whole or part, only for the education of our employees. In no case will these resources and materials be used for the education of external audiences.

---

Signature of Company Representative

---

Date

---

Name of Company Representative

---

Title