

PSEP “Non-Government” and “Other” Merged Workgroups Meeting #1 – Sept. 16, 2013

Attendees: Tom Delaney (Professional Landcare Network, Inc.), Richard Gupton (Agricultural Retailers Association), Ronda Hirnyck (University of Idaho), Allan Hovis (Bayer CropScience), Linda Johns (Montana Dept. of Agriculture), Bob Magee (DuPont Crop Protection), Carol Somody (Syngenta), Don Rennie (Texas A&M University), Renee Woody (North Carolina Dept. of Agriculture and Consumer Services)

This was the first meeting of the merged “Non-Government” and “Other” Workgroups.

1. Fund-raising campaign beyond the Big-6 registrants to attain target funding goal for PSEP IMI (the PSEP Improvement and Modernization Initiative)

PSEP IMI has been spun-off from the Stakeholder Team and is now being implemented by a separate Board. Stakeholder Team workgroups will provide support to the PSEP IMI Board when requested.

The Non-Government/Other Workgroup is responsible for assisting with the fund-raising effort beyond the Big-6 registrants. Five of the Big-6 gave commitments totaling \$1MM/year for 3 years. The Stakeholder Team’s proposal was to request \$125K/yr total from CLA members beyond the Big-6, \$125K/yr total from RISE members, and 50K/yr from associations. This totals \$300K/yr (but we are now actually \$500K/yr short of our goal due to only five of the Big-6 participating.

There was some discussion of what funding amount should be requested from manufacturers, formulators, and distributors, and whether requests should be tied to sales. It was decided that several registrant members of this workgroup would contact a few of the larger manufacturers and some distributors to gauge reasonable contribution levels. (ADDENDUM: Carol has contacted three manufacturers. They would not offer advice on contribution levels, only on content of the letter.)

The fund-raising letter will be drafted by this workgroup, and will include the goals of the initiative, some measures of success, and requested contribution levels. The letter will be finalized and signed by the PSEP IMI Board. Some distribution will occur via CLA committees, but we will have to reach out separately to some organizations. The process with RISE members is still to be determined.

2. Edits to First Draft of Stakeholder Team Position Paper on “The Critical Need for IPM Support of Pesticide Safety Education,” (not necessarily final title)

NIFA is responsible for national IPM grants; the reference to NIFA, etc. in the paper will be spelled out.

There was some discussion of collaboration that does take place between some PSEPs and IPM Coordinators. Likewise, there has been some purposeful differentiation between roles of PSEPs and IPM Coordinators. Some examples of synergies are the Western IPM Center’s three Water Quality/BMP modules and some IPM RFA language that supports PSE. (ADDENDUM: Carol reviewed the modules and, overall, they are very good. They are insect-centric in places, and make some incorrect recommendations (e.g. waiting until populations exceed thresholds is not a good recommendation for resistant weeds; selecting least hazardous pesticides is too simplistic a message in the Landscape and Homeowner modules). One slide in the Ag module is titled “Use IPM (i.e., biological, cultural, and mechanical practices) to manage pests” – we see this incorrect definition of IPM too often, one of the things we must change to get PSE its rightful place in IPM education.)

Fund-raising letter and IPM position paper could both benefit from the mention some of the key PSE topics of concern – life-cycle management (storage, disposal, etc.), pollinators, worker protection, public health (bed bugs, mosquitoes, etc.), school IPM, water protection, resistance management, etc.