

PSEP FUNDING WORKGROUP – FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

February 1, 2013 - Conference Call Notes

Attendees: Carol Somody (Syngenta); Dave Scott (IN); Lee Van Wychen (WSSA); Leslie Gilbert (USDA); Ronda Hirnyck (ID); Tyler Wegmeyer (AFBF); Liza Fleeson (VA).

The 1 February meeting of the Federal Government Work Group commenced with a brief overview of the activities of the other three Work Groups followed by a review a proposed working or tracking document to record the potential funding sources identified by the Work Group including the current status; suggested changes; mechanism for change; actions necessary for change; and whether the potential for the funding source is short term or long term. In addition to tracking the activities of the Work Group for each of the potential funding sources, the document may be of utility in the development of the framework or roadmap by the National Stakeholder Team for Pesticide Safety Education Funding. The Work Group had no suggested changes to the training document. In addition, the Work Group had no additional comments or revisions to the 15 January conference call notes. The final conference notes will be posted at www.psep.us.

The discussion continued focusing on IPM Centers as a potential funding source (base or complementing other funding sources) and the inclusion of pesticide safety education in Request for Applications (RFA). Ronda Hirnyck provided information regarding Regional IPM Centers including a link to the Western IPM Center's current RFA <http://projects.ipmcenters.org/Western/RFAs/RFA38.pdf> [detailed information in email forwarded to Work Group]. The role of the Regional IPM Centers is to coordinate the activities of the Region. Each region has their own Stakeholder Committee. Concerns have been expressed that projects which include pesticide safety education are not appropriately supported. Ronda indicated that she has received funding for projects that included pesticide safety education thus, it appears this may be a possible source for some funding. The RFA encourages... *projects that extend integrated pest management (IPM) information to audiences who will use this knowledge to decrease the risks associated with pest management.* . As with all grants, “wording” is extremely important. Types of grants that may be funded by the Western IPM Centers RFA include: (A) IPM Work Groups; (B) Outreach and/or Publications; (C) Surveys/Crop Profiles; (D) Pest Management Strategic Plans; and (E) Addressing Western IPM Issues In addition, collaboration is a central goal of these grants thus multi-state projects/programs are encouraged. The “IPM Work Groups” may be an option to help to address the pesticide safety education program funding issues.

IPM Work Groups (IWGs) must be multi-state and are intended to build and enhance communication and collaborations within the region about an IPM topic area that addresses information, resource, and research needs in region-wide or broad-area categories. The objectives and measures of a IWG could be to look at multi-state regional pesticide safety education programs and determine how to leverage resources and bring different groups together in that region. Through an IWG, it may be possible to shift the current paradigm that IPM and pesticide safety education are two separate entities rather than inherent in each other's programs. While one region could fund the IWG, the product could have national implications, for example, materials could be used for multiple programs, the development of a national

repository. The consensus of the Work Group was this competitive grant was a viable option towards addressing some of the funding issues.

During the discussion regarding IPM Center grants, a question arose regarding how indirect cost rates. Leslie Gilbert explained that for the 30% cap that NIFA has on indirect costs, indirect cost rates can be calculated in two ways (both of which come out to the same dollar amount). In addition, institutions normally have an official negotiated indirect cost rate which they may use in lieu of the 30%. This is often higher than the USDA's 30% cap but is computed differently. It depends on the actual dollar amount. Leslie indicated she would be sending additional information [additional information provided in email of 4 February].

The Work Group continued with a brief discussion regarding other federal agencies/organizations as sources of funding for example, Department of Transportation (DOT), which conducts right-of-way applications, the National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Natural Resources Conservation Service. Lee Van Wychen provided information regarding invasive plant liaisons to some agencies, for example, NFWS. There are funds that go into pesticide programs although these tend to be used "on the ground". The need to get these organizations focused on pesticide safety education was reiterated. This again points to the importance of developing strategies to communicate the importance of Pesticide Safety Education Programs and include data which can demonstrate the direct impact of pesticide safety education and the implications if it is not adequately done. This information needs to be "upfront" in the framework/roadmap developed by the Team. This discussion will be continued at the next meeting.

In closing the following agenda items will be discussed at the next meeting:

1. Extension IPM (from the 15 January conference notes): *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?*
2. Other Organizations – *in addition to those listed, what other organizations may be vested in pesticide safety education? What about other business support?*
3. Pesticide Maintenance Fees - *can a portion of these funds be dedicated to pesticide safety education (in addition to PRIA funds)? What is the mechanism? What action is necessary?*

Call adjourned at 4 PM. Next call is scheduled for February 14, 2013 @ 2 PM (EST).