

Minutes, February 10th, 2014 National Stakeholder Team for PSEP Funding

All documents and minutes of the Team and its workgroups are posted at <http://psep.us/>

1. Updated Membership List

New organizations were welcomed. The 76 diverse organizations position the Stakeholder Team well for the 2014 work plan, including Phase 2 fund-raising for PSEP-IMI. Potential funders do pay attention to who is on this team.

(The updated member list is now posted on the website.)

2. Expansion of Steering Committee

Dave Scott (Indiana) has agreed to lead the State Workgroup going forward. This workgroup is critical to the Team's success, and Andrew Thostenson was thanked for leading the State WG in its development of a key document (Legislative Action at the State Level to Support PSEP) last year. Dave, Chuck Moses, and Carol Somody will be meeting with Jeff Case on March 10 to begin discussions about state registration fee increases directed to PSEP. Those PSEPs who pursue Goal 1 (State Sustainable Programs) will lay the groundwork for future state-specific discussions about this and other funding options.

3. Summary of 2013 Activities

Everyone is welcome to solicit additional organizations for the Stakeholder Team, and the summary of 2013 activities can be shared with any interested party.

(The summary is now posted on the website.)

4. Draft 2014 Workplan Summary

Please review the draft work plan (sent with the agenda) and send any questions, comments, or additions. The work plan will be finalized and the workgroup coordinating each task will be added. Do not hesitate to join one or more workgroups, or to volunteer to "lead" on a task in the work plan.

5. Federal Workgroup – Update and Next Step

The minutes of the most recent Federal Workgroup meeting are now posted on the website.

a. EPA Consent Agreements for Supplemental Environmental Projects (SEPs)

Chuck Moses communicated with a Special Project Analyst at EPA, and it appears that the agency might be willing to consider funding a PSEP compliance promotion project as part of a settlement agreement. A one-page “SEP-for-PSEP” position paper, for discussions with EPA management, will now be prepared.

(The EPA SEP Feedback document is now posted on the website.)

b. Request for a National Dialogue on Critical Need for IPM Support of PSE

Mike Weaver, president of AAPSE, has responded that AAPSE will participate in the dialogue. Daryl Buchholz, head of the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy, has responded that ECOP will participate. AAPCO and ASPCRO have circulated the document to their Boards, and it is an item on their February agendas. Mike Page of the Florida Dept. of Agriculture and Consumer Services will champion ASPCRO participation. AAPCO and ASPCRO are working toward establishing a solid relationship with OPMP, so this dialogue fits well. David Epstein is chair of the Federal IPM Coordinating Committee (FIPMCC) and is soliciting comments.

David Epstein indicated that the FIPMCC meets quarterly and that feedback on the IPM Statement was requested in December. Jim Farrar (Western IPM Center Director) has submitted a consolidated response from the four IPM Centers, and David is following up. (This can be distributed to the Stakeholder Team – see attachment to this email). David also met with NIFA individuals who have a historical perspective. Marty Draper is taking the lead in putting together a summary of past RFAs, for the March 5 FIPMCC meeting and a future discussion on gaps.

David asked that the Stakeholder Team identify grant language that is considered prohibitive of pesticide safety education efforts. Carol Somody asked about priority setting by the Centers; David will discuss that with them as well.

Leslie Gilbert indicated that the new Farm Bill will result in major changes. Where there were 5 programs, 5 Requests for Applications (RFAs), and 5 panels, there will now be 1 RFA, and probably 2 panels instead of 5. The RFA is not fully written yet, but these changes should lead to stream-lining.

Leslie recently provided the Federal Workgroup with two ways to get on the distribution list for specific NIFA grants:

Requests to be added to the Pest Managers listserv should be sent to Kathy Kimble-Day at kday@nifa.usda.gov. Minimum required information is name and email address. Desired additional information is institution, state, and phone number.

For notification of future NIFA RFAs released on www.grants.gov:

- Register at <http://www.grants.gov/search/subscribeAdvanced.do>
- Be sure to use the correct CFDA Number; AFRI = "10.310"; SBIR = "10.212"; Higher Education Challenge Grants = "10.217"; Regional Integrated Pest Management Program = "10.200"; Organic Programs = "10.303"; Specialty Crop Research Initiative = "10.309"

More detailed instructions about registering for email notification are available at <http://www.nifa.usda.gov/funding/notification.html>

c) AAPCO Board Meeting (March 9)

Chuck Moses and Carol Somody will be discussing several needs with the Board (SLA Goal 1 support, etc.)

6. University Workgroup – Update and Next Steps

Carol Black discussed the PSEP Survey Summary.

There are almost 875,000 certified applicators, 48% of which are commercial applicators. Of the commercial applicators, 60% work in urban environments. Thus there is a wide variety of training needs, which adds to PSEP training burden. About 44% of the states have less than 1000 newly certified applicators per year– study manuals and sometimes classes support this training need. Total applicators range from less than 10,000 per state (42% of states) to >50,000. Training needs are not one size fits all. Concerning full-time equivalents (FTE), ~37% of PSEPs have 1 or less FTE. Figure 4 in the summary indicates that funding amount varies greatly by state, as well as funding source. More than half (55%) of PSEPs receive no support from their SLA, yet many states require certification beyond FIFRA requirements. It will be critical for PSEPs to look at all opportunities and to operate like a business – an overview of a business plan is on the website.

PSEPs can use the PSEP Survey Summary with their administrators, SLA's, state stakeholder team, etc. to indicate how their program compares to other (unidentified) PSEPs. Any PSEP can request their individual survey data from Carol Black, for comparative purposes, if they did not retain it. There is very good data on 47 of the states.

There are some limitations to the data. Inform the Steering Committee if there is other information from the survey that you would like to see summarized in some way.

(The PSEP survey summary is now posted on the website.)

7. PSEP IMI – Update and Next Steps

Andrew Thostenson provided an update. Five registrants committed the initial \$1MM/year for 3 years. The PSEP-IMI Board (now a Steering Committee) was formed to administer the funds. The RFP was released Sept. 30, and 29 applications were received by the November 15 deadline. Award notifications have begun.

CropLife Foundation agreed last month to become the legal entity for copyrights, contracts, and administrative support, in addition to its previous agreement to disburse the funds. Details are still in development. Bob Magee indicated that a PSEP IMI Steering Committee strategic vision session is planned for late May.

There is a need to revise the fund-raising letter and offer something to large contributors (e.g. use of PSEP-IMI resources for internal training). The big push for Phase 2 funding will get underway this month. As planned, the Stakeholder Team will handle fund-raising and facilitation for PSEP-IMI goal 1.

8. State Workgroup – Next Steps

- State SEPs as a funding source for PSEP
- Facilitation for PSEPs pursuing Goal 1
- Influencing for PSEP

See section 2.

9. Other

Don Rennie indicated that his EPA region has its mid-year meeting in April. PSEP IMI updates at regional EPA meetings would be beneficial, and regional EPA administrators should be asked to look at national priorities, because they are not aligned with pesticide safety education. There is a national push and large funding for IPM in Schools, but not pesticide safety education.

EPA grants as well as USDA grants are being evaluated by the Federal Workgroup. Priorities for future grants from PRIA funds will also be assessed. Carol Black noted that, after proposed revisions for worker protection are finalized, the implementation stage will place an additional burden on PSEP (with implementation funds potentially available). Chuck Moses indicated that worker protection is a current use of PRIA funds.

Phil Mulder stated that 2014 is a critical year for Extension as well as for PSEP, and an opportunity to spotlight the history of PSEP. Documents from Norm Nesheim, etc. about the history of pesticide safety education in the US will be located (see attachment to this email). Andrew noted that Mike Weaver has assembled photos related to this history.

With no further comments, the meeting was adjourned.