

Final Meeting Summary
First National Dialogue on The Critical Need for IPM Support of Pesticide Safety Education
December 9, 2015 – 9 AM-12 PM
EPA, Potomac Yards South, 2777 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA

Participants

Moderator Liza Fleeson, Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services and Represented the Association of Structural Pest Control Regulatory Officials (ASPCRO)
Bill Hoffman, Chief of Staff, USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA)
Michael Fitzner and Herb Bolton, USDA NIFA Institute of Food Production and Sustainability, Division of Plant Systems - Protection
Sheryl Kunickis and David Epstein, USDA Office of Pest Management Policy (OPMP), David is also on the Federal IPM Coordinating Committee
Jackie Mosby and Kevin Keaney, EPA Office of Pesticide Programs, Field and External Affairs Division (FEAD)
Frank Ellis, EPA Office of Pesticide Programs, Environmental Stewardship Branch
Shirley Hymon-Parker, Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ESCOP) and North Carolina A&T State University
Michelle Rodgers, Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP) and University of Delaware
Don Renchie, American Association of Pesticide Safety Educators (AAPSE) and Texas A&M University
Carol Black, National Stakeholder Team for PSEP Funding and Washington State University

Meeting Summary

It was noted and understood by the end of this meeting, that the focus was not to seek funding, but a dialogue to better incorporate pesticide safety education (PSE) in IPM-related information where appropriate, including but not limited to road maps, RFAs, web sites, outreach materials, and policies — by EPA, USDA, SLAs and universities.

We focused on more widely articulating the relevance and importance of PSE in many forums (road maps, meetings, outreach, RFAs, etc.) By not formally recognizing PSE and its important role in EPA and USDA IPM programs, PSE is readily overlooked, becoming a silent partner, and some land grant university PSE Programs (PSEP) are facing significant sustainability issues. By increasing recognition of the PSEP's role, USDA, EPA, State Agency, and University stakeholders might take note and become more supportive of PSE in the future. The group recognized that PSE is fundamental to many IPM programs and risk mitigation and that a better PSE-IPM alignment and recognition could be addressed.

USDA provided philosophical and regulatory barriers for their support of basic pesticide applicator training, noting it was the regulatory responsibility of EPA and the states with primacy for pesticide programs. However, USDA agreed they had a role in extending research and education on IPM issues, which include PSE.

USDA, NIFA staff made an important distinction concerning IPM and PSE; they are not concentric. Some IPM programs utilize pesticides as a management tool, while others strive to greatly minimize or eliminate pesticide use. Although IPM and PSE issues overlap in a number of important areas, they are not the same. Recognition of where IPM and PSE are, and are not the same, is important in this dialogue on PSE and IPM.

USDA noted that PSE is fundamental to their outreach/extension efforts. Also, for example, 13 Land-

Grant institutions have a pesticide safety education component included in their competitively-awarded Crop Protection and Pest Management, Extension Implementation Program Area projects. However, Carol Black noted that only PSEPs with sufficient capacity (FTEs) have the ability to partner and seek grant funding. USDA suggested PSE coordinators could serve on the Regional IPM Center advisory committees or steering committees to improve recognition of PSE issues in the USDA regions. USDA is open to partnering with interested parties to word-smith existing/future documents to be more inclusive of PSE.

EPA noted increased funding this year with their administration's focus on the revised regulations.

There was concurrence at the close of the meeting that the meeting was valuable. It was also noted that improved communication would better serve each program's stakeholders.

Action Items

- Get notes to David by early next week – Federal IPM meeting
- Get notes to Michelle for January ECOP meeting
- Initiate a change in culture to include PSE in upcoming state and federal IPM discussions (also EPA regulatory discussions)
- Ask the Stakeholder Team to review USDA documents that could better recognize the role/importance of PSE (*added note: EPA stewardship as well*). When promoting/discussing IPM, find places to acknowledge the importance of safe pesticide use and the underlying education component (PSE). Provide suggested language edits to USDA leadership – two examples
 - USDA Road Map – respond to David Epstein
 - USDA Crop Protection and Pest Management Competitive Grants – respond to Herb Bolton
- There is no responsibility for Federal IPM Coordination Committee to provide upward advice. Can this be changed to improve communications and needs?
- Work with Herb Bolton and Regional IPM Centers for representation on Steering Committees and Advisory Committees – Larry Olsen and Carrie Foss have experience
- Stakeholder Team and AAPSE to reach out to PSEPs to initiate partnership communications with IPM Coordinators for next round of Crop Protection and Pest Management Competitive Grants Program, Extension Implementation Program Area funding opportunity in fiscal year 2017. (*added note: also EPA stewardship grants*)
- Communicate with state lead agencies to facilitate and encourage the discussion about the importance of PSE within IPM programs, especially with specific commodity groups or practitioners (ag/urban)
- Reach out to AAPSE members to better articulate issue with Proposal #8 --- That State IPM Coordinators get appropriate support and credit for PSE done in association with or in support of the PSE Program Coordinator
- Request PSEP coordinators who also have IPM responsibilities to share job description – especially a successful one – Jim Dill, University of Maine for example
- ECOP and ESCOP relay the focus of this meeting was not funding but an improved recognition of the role and need for PSE as a complement to some components of IPM programs. Need for institutional support for PSEPs

Opening Remarks

- The October 2012 convening of the National Stakeholder Team for Pesticide Safety Education Programs (PSEPs), which currently has 107 members from universities, state agencies, NGOs, and federal agencies. The Team's purpose is to evaluate and support opportunities to strengthen PSEPs since all states should have a robust land-grant university PSEP that offers unique value for safe pesticide use, associated risk mitigation, and job/skill creation.
- 25% for PSEPs have less than ½ person (FTE) to run their program
- 40% of PSEPs operate on less than \$75,000 per year (salary/operations)
- This prompted the creation of PSEP-IMI, which is a pooling of support resources by pesticide registrants (\$3,000,000 total over 3 years) to assist states with capacity issues to become more sustainable, and support other PSEP resource develop/sharing efforts. Those states that applied for three years of funding to work towards improved sustainability are termed Goal 1 States
- The goal of today's meeting is to focus on improving the communication and articulation of IPM programs efforts/materials with pesticide safety education (PSE) messaging.
- In addition to today's IPM Dialogue, the Stakeholder Team has worked on other efforts to further support PSEPs such as meeting with Extension Directors and facilitating workgroups and support efforts for Goal 1 states. The intent of the meeting is not to focus on funding, though the basic funding thread is recognized.

Supportive notes

– not necessarily in the order they were discussed

Roles and Communication

- Federal and state agency and university communications are needed on the role and importance of PSE; Extension Directors have a significant role in priorities
- Federal programmatic responsibility for the core PSE program shifted agencies from USDA to EPA, and FIFRA prohibits EPA from requiring training on IPM and USDA noted it cannot use its funds to support basic pesticide applicator training
 - USDA can support new and improved ways to manage pests and mitigating risks
 - USDA views basic pesticide applicator training as an EPA function
- State programs are delegated by EPA for pesticide registration, compliance, and applicator certification; however, training is not a component of that relationship (*added note: unless the certification process is conducted by training*)
 - Registrants and others may not recognize this
- Recognize that times have changed from pass through and capacity funding to competitive grants
- IPM is a core strategy for pest management and may include pesticide use, and PSEP is a core tool for IPM to deliver/meet its goal when pesticides are used.
- Would like to re-establish harmony between USDA and EPA in relation to PSE
- Agencies and universities have a responsibility to work together to serve the regulated community
- IPM and PSE connection is recognized by some university leadership, but other do not see the connection
- Another challenge is training the next generation of IPM scientists
- PSE goes beyond certified applicators and includes general pesticide users

Integration and Recognition of PSE

- Need to recognize the importance of PSE in IPM efforts involving pesticides (discussions, RFAs, documents, outreach)
- PSE should not be the overlooked and the silent partner
- The USDA, NIFA Crop Protection and Pest Management Competitive Grants, Extension Implementation Program Area already includes IPM Education for Pesticide Applicators as one of the eight major emphasis areas. is– Currently 13 states have funding supporting this emphasis area – propose language tweaks to invite increased participation by PSEPs
- Grants require outcome reporting in addition to activities
- Concern that IPM is often misunderstood and IPM programs vary in their use of pesticides or no use at all.
- EPA stewardship shifted from IPM in Schools to Safe use of Pesticides in Schools
- University plans for work and reporting may lose the connection to PSE; report is tagged to one or more priority areas

Capacity

- Funding streams have significantly diminished and there is significant need for PSEP sustainability
- PSEP capacity to seek/participate in competitive grants is an issue. Those with capacity are successful in grant partnerships.
- Fresh curriculum is critical for continuing education to keep applicators coming to training
- Capacity is not only a PSEP issue, but an Extension issue
- Some Goal 1 states have stark challenges; some will succeed at Goal 1, others will not.