

National Stakeholder Team for Pesticide Safety Education Program Funding

Conference Call 4—March 1, 2013

Archived documents available at <http://psep.us>

Fleeson moderated the call

- Indicated that about 22 members had logged on to the call
- Opened with operational issues
- Mentioned that the detailed notes from Call 3 were distributed to the team. Summary was posted to the <http://psep.us> website.
- Directed each Workgroup Leader to share a bit about what was happening with their particular group

Somody thanked all the work groups for their hard work and then mentioned that the team was reaching out to a couple of new players, the Association of Public Land Grant Universities (APLU) and the North American Certified Crop Advisors Board.

Thostenson added that new members and background documents continue to be posted to the website as they are finalized by the members.

Fleeson asked Somody to briefly share what the Non-Governmental Group (NGG) was up to. Somody said NGFG had several calls and the notes from those calls were posted on the web. Essentially they have:

- Crafted and distributed a survey to gauge industry support for funding PSEP. Also, they are trying to determine what sorts of institutions could/would consider acting as clearing houses for accepting industry funds and then distributing to PSEP
- The group is grappling with determining just what sort of PSEP need there is
- They are examining different ways of distribution/formulas for funding PSEP.
- They are looking at short term solutions, i.e., meeting the immediate financial needs of PSEP through individual company and/or coordinated company gifting.
- They are exploring time-lines and when or how might a company respond with their budgeting cycles.
- They are also exploring long-term legislative activities at the federal level to support PSEP through line items, check-offs, or trying to amend the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act (PRIA).
- They are developing a flow chart to understand what steps are needed and how and when they should be carried out.

Black was invited to report on the activities of the Other Work Group (OWG)

- The OWG is compiling a list of interested entities. Basically, this is a brainstorming exercise to think of as many institutions, associations, and companies nationwide that have an interest in or stake in pesticide safety. Ultimately, they are identifying the people who will be helpful when trying to effect legislation or garner support for PSEP in the execution phase of the Team's work.
- The vast majority of the group's activities have centered on understanding just what the financial condition of PSEP is and how PSEP might receive funds in a manner that would minimize administrative overhead expense. The survey was sent to all state PSEP Coordinators in early February. Since the second

half of the month the group has been cleaning up the data, asking for clarifications, and trying to encourage participation. At the time of this call we are working with data from about 41 states.

- Thostenson added that the participation rate was exceptional and many respondents were clearly enthusiastic about providing the information the Team needs to make good decisions.
- Black then stated that during March the OWG and other interested Team members would try to make sense of the data and draw some conclusions for use by other groups. She hoped to have more detailed comments about the data in the next full Team call.

Fleeson then invited Purcell to make a few comments about USDA-NIFA Grant funding opportunities. Purcell indicated that there was a major Request for Applications (RFA) that included pesticide safety activities that was open until March 19. The details for submission were available on the NIFA web at:

<http://www.csrees.usda.gov/fo/extensionipmcoordinationandsupportprogram.cfm>

Fleeson then spent some time describing some of the Federal Workgroup Activities (FWG). Specific notes of this conversation are posted on the web. The FWG was exploring PSEP funding through EPA funding streams that traditionally go to State Lead Agency (SLA) institutions. They were exploring whether and how PSEP might access these funds. She noted that some EPA Regions actually solicited PSEP in various states to submit proposals to enhance pesticide safety activities. She also noted that some SLAs have been passing through funds to PSEP for a number of years and this was also discussed in the State Work Group (SWG). Finally the group was exploring ways to make USDA-NIFA IPM grants more explicitly "PSEP Friendly". Somody added that she would like to have conversations with USDA-NIFA to find out what could be done to accomplish this. Purcell was open to this and said she would send Somody details about RFA language and how to best comment upon them for future RFA. She was also open to having further conversations with the Team which would include her superior and other colleagues in her section. Fleeson emphasized the need to capture this in a framework or road map document that the team would produce later in the spring that would point to specific action steps the Team or members of the Team could take to follow through on supporting PSEP.

Black was invited by Fleeson to make some general comments about the sorts of things she was seeing in her initial review of the data in the PSEP Financial Survey. Black indicated that, even though she was familiar with many programs across the country and the relative financial health of PSEP generally, she was still stunned at how many programs were in such dire straits. Thostenson indicated that this was sobering to him as well. Somody indicated that it was worse than she thought and she understood from some of the follow-up questions that some states have to turn away applicators wanting training because of resource limitations. Magee asked about further details and Black said it was a bit soon to get too specific, but agreed to share the raw data with him and invite him into the evaluation group. Somody indicated that additional members of the NGG would be open to this as well and that this information was vital to being able to make good decisions on how best to help PSEP. Black agreed to work them in and invited Somody to gather up some people to help. Black indicated that the data was still coming in and being evaluated for errors, but she was hoping in the next 10 to 14 days to be able to have focus group calls to try to sort states by not only their resources but also correlate this to the number of applicators certified in a particular state.

The hour was drawing to a close and Fleeson asked that the Team and the work groups focus their energies over the next month to pull the data and ideas together and start thinking about how this could be incorporated into a framework or road map document to begin being drafted in April. Thostenson indicated that the State Workgroup had more or less finished their activities and would begin producing such a document in that time frame. Somody

asked that the folks start looking ahead towards creating communications pieces, newsletters, news releases and presentation on the Team's work. Thostenson and Fleeson both echoed the need for looking ahead into May and beyond especially with respect as to how to execute all the ideas captured by the various groups and members.

The team adjourned without setting the date for the next call, but Fleeson said this would be forthcoming in the next week and would likely be in the first 10 days or so of April.