

## PSEP FUNDING WORKGROUP – FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

March 8, 2013 - Conference Call Notes

**Attendees:** Carol Somody (Syngenta); Dave Scott (IN); Andrew Thostenson (ND); Jim Burnette (NC); and Jim Fredericks (NPMA).

The 8 March meeting of the Federal Government Work Group commenced with a brief review of the discussion from the 14 February meeting which included:

- **Regional IPM Centers and other IPM sources** as a potential funding source (base or complementing other funding sources). 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 and adequately recognizes that pesticide safety education is an important part of IPM. The need to open a dialogue with Extension IPM was discussed.
- **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. There is a need to determine 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. The need to have the appropriate contact person in addition to the need for a fact sheet or other outreach materials to provide information regarding pesticide safety education to begin the discussion was raised.
- **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.
- **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.

Additional discussion regarding the Regional IPM Centers and other IPM sources followed, including how might PSEP fit into the scope of the IPM. It was suggested that a document be drafted that supports pesticide safety education within the IPM framework. The question was raised whether the funding source and funding amount is sufficient such that PSEPs could “compete” for the funds and have the likelihood of being awarded dollars. The Work Group concluded that these sources may be useful for some PSEP programs, however, are not expected to be a major or consistent funding source. IPM sources should be included in the framework or roadmap the Team is developing.

It was offered that while there are many potential sources of funding, we should not get away from seeking a “long” term solution. Are there other national or state programs that are funded by the federal government (for example, GAP)? Also, the need to stress the importance of PSEP with a consistent message was reiterated. The example of potential sources of contamination by irrigation water (disinfection) was provided by Burnette....this (and other examples) could serve as additional justifications for the funding and support of PSEP. These types of examples need to be included in the strategic message being developed by the Team.

**Call adjourned at 12 PM.**

**The next call is scheduled for March 15, 2013 at 11 AM.**