

## **Final Minutes, July 31st, 2014 National Stakeholder Team for PSEP Funding**

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

AAPCO – Association of American Pesticide Control Officials  
AAPSE – American Association of Pesticide Safety Educators  
ASPCRO – Association of Structural Pest Control Regulatory Officials  
ECOP – Extension Committee on Organization and Policy  
EPA OPP – EPA Office of Pesticide Programs  
EPA OECA – EPA Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance  
PSEP-IMI – PSEP Improvement and Modernization Initiative  
SEP - Supplemental Environmental Projects  
SLA – State Lead (pesticide regulatory) Agency

### **1. Welcome to new Team members**

Jim Burnette welcomed seven new organizations that have joined the team since the June meeting.

### **2. Progress Reports**

#### **Document on “Effective Land Grant University Pesticide Safety Education Programs” (LGU PSEP)**

Jim Burnette indicated that LGU PSEP has been submitted to AAPSE for endorsement, and is being sent to AAPCO leadership (Tim Drake) and to EPA OPP leadership (Jack Housenger). The Team created this document because nothing like it existed, there is a real need for this type of document to support ~25 states that will be pursuing PSEP-IMI Goal 1 (a more robust and sustainable PSEP), and it provides a starting point for various other PSEP-related discussions.

Andrew Thostenson indicated that LGU PSEP can be used immediately, the PDF is also posted on <http://psep.us/>, and the word document can be requested from Carol Black if edits are desired for specific audiences. (ADDENDUM: Depending on the edits, the reference to this being a Stakeholder Team document may have to be removed.)

Kerry Richards noted that this document will be of value to Goal 1 states, and Phil Nixon stated that he would put it in his newsletter.

## **First National Dialogue on “The Critical Need for IPM Support of Pesticide Safety Education”**

Jim Burnette indicated that the first dialogue will be high level, because of the seriousness of this issue. There are confirmed participants from USDA and EPA, but additional USDA and EPA participants will be invited. The first dialogue is targeted for fourth quarter.

Priority issues will be the first 8 of the 24 points in the Team’s IPM Statement, because they focus on IPM Emphasis and Leadership (the need for IPM to include PSE as a key priority, and how we get that to happen at the national, regional, and state levels), and because these 8 points will determine the success of the rest.

Chuck Moses noted that this IPM statement is the document completed in November (posted on <http://psep.us/>).

The 5 representatives of PSEP that will be involved in the national dialogue are CA (Lisa Blecker), ID (Ronda Hirnyck), MI (Larry Olsen), NC (Wayne Buhler), and PA (Kerry Richards). Leadership from AAPSE, AAPCO, ASPCRO, and ECOP will also be involved. (ADDENDUM: ESCOP, the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy, was recently invited and a response is expected soon.)

Carol Somody said that the first dialogue would involve ~17 participants. A successful dialogue would have impacts on many of the issues that USDA and EPA are currently dealing with. IPM direction is mainly driven by USDA, but EPA IPM direction also requires attention. Industry will not participate in this dialogue, but not because of lack of concern or interest – the progress of this discussion will be followed very closely.

The IPM Centers’ response (also posted on <http://psep.us/>) to the Team’s IPM statement indicates attitudes about pesticide safety education that can only be addressed at high levels, e.g.:

"PSE as a specific educational program has not been a specific stakeholder priority to date."

"Language in IPM RFAs that specifies an objective of “adopt(ing) alternative pest management practices” does not exclude PSE, and therefore the RFAs are not in need of revision."

"Alternative practices are generally scored highly in the panel review process if they promote the Regional IPM Center goals of improving the economics of adopting IPM practices and reducing risks to human health and the environment."

## **Supplemental Environmental Projects (SEPs)**

Dave Scott indicated that discussions concerning the use of SEPs to support PSEP continue with EPA OECA. National headquarters is open to the idea; the next step is for this Team to develop guidance to inform regional EPA OECA offices and State Lead Agencies. Jim Burnette noted that EPA also has a website on SEPs (<http://www2.epa.gov/enforcement/supplemental-environmental-projects-seps>)

(ADDENDUM – For more information, see *Use of EPA Supplemental Environmental Projects (SEPs) in Support of Pesticide Safety Education: A Statement of the National Stakeholder Team for Pesticide Safety Education Program Funding (4/9/14)* on <http://psep.us/>)

## **Website Enhancements - <http://psep.us/>**

Andrew Thostenson noted that many documents important to Goal 1 states are on the Team's website. A "Goal 1 State Resources" button has been added to the main page of the website, which will bring Goal 1 states to a page containing only those documents important to Goal 1 progress. Note that anyone can go to the Goal 1 State Resources page – these are not new documents and are often not specific to Goal 1 states. All documents on the new page will also remain available on the main page.

## **PSEP Education of the General Public**

Andrew Thostenson said that Carol Black's University Workgroup has completed its inputs to LGU PSEP and will turn its attention to drafting a document on how PSEPs educate the general public. PSEPs should continue to send examples to Carol. This document is being developed because PSEPs do work in this area (homeowners, Master Gardeners, etc.) The document will assist PSEPs and others on the Team in securing stakeholder engagement and support for PSEP beyond education involving RUPs and certified applicators. Jim Burnett echoed the importance of having this.

## **PSEP Press Release**

This press release by the Weed Science Society of America has been delayed only because of the very high PSEP-IMI workload. It will definitely be finalized and released in August or September at the latest. The press release will focus on the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of PSEP and the current crossroads.

### **3. PSEP-IMI – Updates on Funded Projects**

#### **From the Agenda (First PSEP-IMI Request for Proposals):**

Goal 1 (More self-sustainable PSEPs)

Goal 2a (National password-protected website for pesticide applicator educational materials and training programs)

Goal 2b (Recruitment and compilation of existing university/extension educational materials and training programs for the website)

Goal 2c (Update/enhancement of selected university/extension educational materials and training programs for national use)

Goal 2d (Development of new educational materials and training programs for national use)

Goal 2e (Creation of learning assessment tools for national use)

Goal 3 (Assessment of adequacy of pesticide safety education content in non-PSEP category recertification classes)

Andrew Thostenson provided an update. PSEP-IMI began in August, 2013. About two dozen states are expected to receive funding in 2014 to pursue one or more goals. Goal 1 is only one of the goals. There will also be a password-protected website for PSEPs to post what they want to share with other PSEPs. PSEP-IMI has provided funding to 4 PSEPs that will compile the resources from the 4 USDA regions and provide them to the North Carolina PSEP that is developing the website. Compilers will be reaching out to all PSEPs. The website will not only house existing materials but also resources that have been funded by PSEP-IMI. Examples of new or updated resources funded by PSEP-IMI in 2014 include train-the trainer materials, ornamental/turf and termite units, 2 national category manuals, and discerning the difference between mandatory and advisory language.

Resource development involves ~12 states, and it will be 8-9 months before these start to be available for use. PSEP-IMI will fund additional resources in year 2, and may invite specific proposals. For example, PSEP-IMI is funding a web-based business plan model for any PSEP to use (University of Minnesota, with a team of PSEPs providing inputs.)

Carol Somody said that 35 PSEP-IMI contracts are likely this year with PSEPs (plus the business plan contract); 30 will have been prepared by this week.

It is expected that 25 states will pursue Goal 1 (the 3-year plan to become more sustainable and robust). These 25 states contain ~344,000 of the ~900,000 certified applicators in the US (188,000 commercial and 156,000 private).

This will be a >\$1.8MM commitment by registrants over the next 3 years to Goal 1, and an unmeasurable time commitment by this Team. In addition, the time commitment extends far beyond the Team - the 25 states translate to 25 advisory committees and 25 state stakeholder teams. More than 75 individuals have already committed to serve on the advisory committees (a minimum 3 individuals per state) to ensure all required Goal 1 tasks are achieved. The advisory committees must contain the PSEP (or another committed coordinator), an SLA representative, and a university administrator. It is hoped that optional teleconferences can be provided to the Goal 1 advisory committees (in addition to the current one-on-one contact capability) in the near future.

One state has been funded by PSEP-IMI to develop national learning assessment tools, and two states have been funded to assess the adequacy of pesticide safety education content in non-PSEP category recertification classes.

Bob Magee indicated that he was surprised at the amount of time to get contracts through the entire process, and that an upcoming Funders' Meeting is planned to provide a strategic vision for the future and to improve the contract process. Richard Beard and Don Rennie provided examples of the range in contract "experiences". There was some additional discussion on the contract process.

Don Rennie noted that the issues facing PSEP are starting to get the attention of extension directors nationwide.

#### **4. The Case against the Privatization of Pesticide Safety Education**

Carol Somody indicated that privatization comments crop up periodically, fueled by a variety of factors (the current condition of many PSEPs, university overhead, employers who need the services on their schedule and not that of the PSEP, specialized training needs, non-English training needs, etc.) LGU PSEP includes some high-level reasons to champion PSEP (unbiased, science-based, effective training), but the Team must delve much further into this.

Comments are desired - some questions you **may** want to consider are listed below:

What are the for-profit alternatives to PSEP?

How do robust PSEPs impact the need for for-profit alternatives?

How do for-profit alternatives impact the need for PSEP?

What are the advantages and disadvantages of for-profit alternatives?

How does PSEP benefit for-profit alternatives?

How do PSEP efforts benefit highly specialized PSE (e.g. aerial)? Non-English PSE?

In those states where the network of not-for-profit trainers that support PSEP is declining in size and/or PSE focus (notably, county and regional agents), how can their role in PSE be strengthened or stabilized?

What does FIFRA say about PSE?

(ADDENDUM: A first draft will be developed by the Non-Government/Other Workgroup, for consideration by the Team.)

## **5. Other**

More than 50 members of the Stakeholder Team are currently actively engaged in work for the Team and/or PSEP-IMI. Many of the other team members (particularly associations) will be advising the Team soon - their state counterparts must be assisted in understanding PSEP, the history of the Team and PSEP-IMI, the purpose of Goal 1, and the critical role of the state stakeholder teams that will be forming in 25 states.

Jim Burnette asked if there were any questions, and adjourned the meeting.