

PSEP FUNDING WORKGROUP – FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

January 15, 2013 - Conference Call Notes

Attendees: Andrew Thostenson (ND); Carol Somody (Syngenta); Dave Scott (IN); Jim Burnette (NC); Jim Fredericks (NPMA); Kevin Keaney (EPA); Lee Van Wychen (WSSA); Leslie Gilbert (USDA); Mary Purcell (USDA); Ronda Hirnyck (ID); Liza Fleeson (VA).

The first meeting of the Federal Government Work Group commenced with a brief discussion of the use of conference calls and emails as the primary methods of communication, the anticipated time period of three months for completion of the group's activities, and the work product of the group which will include possible federal funding sources, efforts necessary to secure funding (including designation as short or long term) and tools that can be used to cap overhead charges. In addition, an overview of the other three Work Groups was provided.

The meeting continued with a discussion of the importance of developing strategies to communicate the importance of Pesticide Safety Education Programs and the need for a consistent message as the Team and Work groups continue their work. The message should ideally include data which can demonstrate the direct impact of pesticide safety education and the implications if it is not adequately done. Quantitative data is preferred, for example documentation of reduced accident rates. Possible sources of information include both the USDA and AAPSE (American Association of Pesticide Safety Educators). Jim Burnette shared an opportunity to relay the importance of pesticide safety education at the NASDA (National Association of State Departments of Agriculture) Meeting (February 2013). North Carolina's Commissioner currently serves as President. *Jim has drafted information for the Commissioner and will forward for any additional comments.*

The following ideas for federal government funding were also discussed:

1. Federal penalty dollars for education – the possibility of designating federal penalty dollars for education was raised, specifically, is there a prohibition to designating those dollars? Kevin Keaney shared that those funds can be *allocated*, for example, the allocation can be part of the negotiation with an entity. To designate funds for education, a legislative change would be needed. It was suggested this be approached in two stages:
 - a. Short Term – reach out to Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assistance (OECA) regarding the possibility or process for allocating federal funds collected as part of an enforcement action or negotiated settlement for education (*Kevin Keaney will reach out to OECA....*);
 - b. Long Term – research the legislative change that would be necessary to designate federal penalty dollars for education.

2. Incorporating pesticide safety education into Integrated Pest Management (IPM)
 - a. E-IPM RFA - the current RFA (Request for Funding Announcement) for Extension-IPM does not focus in the proper way on the importance of pesticide safety education in the chemical component of IPM, i.e. the goal “**enhancing IPM understanding among pesticide applicators**” **does not include teaching pesticide safety to applicators**. Is this something that can be changed? And if so, how?
 - b. It was pointed out that the E-IPM RFA is different from the IPM Center RFA. It is possible to provide comments on the RFA’s, but the latter one comes out shortly (Kathy Kimble-Day) (Carol Somody will follow-up....).
 - c. IPM Centers – the 4 regional IPM Centers have the liberty to decide priorities for funding. The possibility of refocusing or including pesticide safety education needs to be explored. (*Ronda Hirnyck will research....*).

3. Overhead/Indirect Costs – current overhead/indirect cost rates act to further reduce the availability of funding for pesticide safety education programs. Can the current rates charged by the USDA be reexamined? Would legislation be required or appropriate to cap costs? (*Mary Purcell is researching for USDA; Ronda Hirnyck will research for the IPM Center grants*).

Other items discussed include the need to get organizations focused on pesticide safety education. Regardless of personal feelings regarding the use of pesticides, pesticides are legal to be used and thus there is a fundamental need to educate users.

Finally, the possibilities of other organizations as sources of funding were discussed, for example, Department of Transportation (DOT), which conducts right-of-way applications. Other examples include the National Park Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Natural Resources Conservation Service. Is there a way to weave pesticide safety education into their funding priorities?

Call adjourned at 4 PM. Next call to be announced.