

PSEP FUNDING WORKGROUP – FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

February 14, 2013 - Conference Call Notes

Attendees: Carol Somody (Syngenta); Dave Scott (IN); Lee Van Wychen (WSSA); (AFBF); Jeanne Kasai (EPA); and Liza Fleeson (VA).

The 14 February meeting of the Federal Government Work Group commenced with a brief review of the discussion from the 1 February meeting which included:

- **Regional IPM Centers and other IPM sources** as a potential funding source (base or complementing other funding sources) and, specifically, IPM Work Groups (one of the types of grants funded) as a possible vehicle to help to address the pesticide safety education program funding issues by focusing on multi-state regional pesticide safety education programs and serving to shift the current paradigm that IPM and pesticide safety education are two separate entities rather than inherent in each other's programs.
- **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. Currently, they have funds that go into pesticide programs although these tend to be used for pesticide applications. The need to get these organizations focused on pesticide safety education was reiterated and again points to the need to communicate the importance of Pesticide Safety Education Programs including data which demonstrates the direct impact of pesticide safety education and the implications if it is not adequately done.

The Work Group continued the discussion regarding IPM Centers and the RFAs. Concerns were again expressed regarding the language in the RFAs and whether it adequately represents or includes pesticide safety education programs as being eligible for funding. Carol Somody will look at the language in all four regional IPM Center RFAs and will share the information with the Work Group.

The Extension IPM was the next item for discussion. These dollars are used to fund state IPM Coordinators using formula funding. Again, the concern was expressed that pesticide safety education is not recognized as part of IPM. The need to open a dialogue with Extension IPM was discussed. Lee Van Wychen will research the appropriate contact person. Also, Carol and Liza Fleeson will research the Extension IPM RFA and provide additional information to the Work Group.

Additional discussion regarding other federal agencies/organizations which use pesticides included determining what the appropriate mechanism would be to begin the discussion with these organizations regarding the importance of pesticide safety education and possibility of including funding and other support for pesticide safety education, for example, links to pesticide safety education and state regulatory agency websites. The consensus was that since funding and policy moves from federal to state level, first inquiry at the federal level is needed. Inquiry could be from other federal agencies (EPA? USDA?) or non-government organizations. The need to have the appropriate contact person was discussed. It was suggested that Leslie Gilbert may be able to identify the appropriate contact person in these organizations to begin the discussion. The need for a fact sheet or other outreach materials to provide information

regarding pesticide safety education to begin the discussion was raised. As has been discussed previously, the Team has agreed that we need to have strategies to communicate the importance of pesticide safety education and a fact sheet could be part of that information. This will ensure a consistent message. Liza will follow-up with an email to Leslie regarding contacts and share any information with the Work Group.

Pesticide Maintenance Fees as a potential source of funding were also discussed and whether or not a portion of these fees could be used towards pesticide safety education or if fees could be raised with the increase being used for pesticide safety education. Federal pesticide maintenance fees are currently “capped” at some level. The question was also raised if the fees are used by EPA solely for the maintenance of pesticide registrations or if some dollars go to other programs and if so, could pesticide safety education be a possibility? Would a legislative change be required? Jeanne Kasai offered to do some research regarding pesticide maintenance fees and will follow-up with the Work Group. PRIA was also briefly discussed. Information gathering is continuing in these areas.

Finally, Cooperative Grant Agreements between EPA and State Lead Agencies for pesticide regulation (SLAs) were discussed, specifically, the likelihood of SLAs committing some of those funds as part of the grant process towards pesticide safety education programs. These grants include dollars for both pesticide programs (including certification, training, water quality, endangered species, and worker protection) and enforcement (inspections/investigations, sampling). While SLAs commit to specific activities, funding from EPA to SLAs has remained static thus SLAs are using these dollars for current programs. If not doing so already, committing funds to pesticide safety education programs would take away dollars from other programs. In addition, SLAs are required to providing matching funds (% vary depending on program area) to the federal dollars received. Taken together, it was determined to be unlikely that SLAs would be able or willing to commit grant dollars to pesticide safety education programs if they are not doing so already and it is not seen as a viable option.

During the next call, we will revisit the Extension IPM RFA, other federal agencies/organizations and the pesticide maintenance fees in light of the information being gathered by the Work Group members.

Information regarding future calls is forthcoming.

Call adjourned at 3 PM.