

Minutes of AAPCO BOARD Conference Call

Date: November 4, 2013

Meeting Convened at 1 p.m. ET

Present on the call: Jeff Comstock, VT, President; Charles Moses, NV, Director; Dennis Howard, MD, Director; Amy Bamber, MT, Director; Steve Dwinell, FL, Director; and Grier Stayton, AAPCO Executive Secretary.

AAPCO Website Update – Stayton reported the AAPCO publications archive work is continuing at Purdue via Cassens and staff. A web link was provided to the BOD which illustrated the “file cabinet” organization of the digitized publications. The 2013 publication was included. The publications will be searchable. The cost to AAPCO will be in the neighborhood of \$3,000. Comstock will post the link in the AAPCO Newsletter.

SFIREG Funding Discussion – Comstock discussed options under consideration for savings to the SFIREG grant. Comstock asked for comments regarding an option to combine the Working Committee meetings and extending them by one day. Moses supported the idea but questioned if both WC agenda items could be cover in the time allotted. Howard asked if there had been any input from the SFIREG Chairs regarding the concept. Dwinell thanked Comstock for the effort put into the proposal but did not agree that conflating the WC’s would benefit grant goals. Dwinell added that the cost savings were not that significant and noted the agendas for the WC’s change with the issues. He concluded that the current system is working, and if the WC’s are combined the long-term viability of SFIREG would be in question. Bamber noted that WC meetings have been intermittently combined in the past and perhaps they could be held more frequently to test the theory. Bamber did not support having POM labeling and enforcement issues tied up with EQI issues. She also noted the more frequent use of WC workgroups to resolve issues within the context of WC directives. Bamber noted the compost issue as a good example of the WCs working together and supporting each other. Dwinell found the opportunity for more frequent meetings with EPA to also be a benefit of continuing with the existing schedule. Comstock pointed out sustained funding is not guaranteed and referenced a conversation with Dan Helfgott regarding the “value added” worth to EPA of the current meeting structure. Dwinell responded that EPA will support the grant if they see the SLA input as valuable and suggested additional discussion with EPA senior management at the next full SFIREG meeting. Moses recommended keeping the Comstock proposal as a back-up plan in case funding cuts occur. Comstock stated there would be no action on this discussion for at least one year. Meetings for 2014 have already been scheduled. Howard supported keeping the current structure of meetings, but having an open mind to change if necessary. Comstock asked the SFIREG Chairs to incorporate break-out groups for mutual topics of interest during the May 2014, joint WC meeting.

PSEP Steering Committee Update – Moses described the ongoing efforts of the National Stakeholder Team, charged with establishing sustainable funding for the Pesticide Safety Educators Program (**Attachment 1**). Objectives of the National Stakeholder Team include: establishing a permanent source of federal funding for PSEP in every state and territory; determining the potential for additional support through state and territory pesticide product registration fees, enforcement fines and more; exploring ways for stakeholders to provide unrestricted gifts, grants and endowments to support PSEP; and promoting awareness of PSEP and the importance of program funding. Through the NST workgroup for “Improvement and Modernization Initiative” there currently is \$3 million being provided by industry for a period of 3 years to make PSEP self-supporting by 2016. The NST is currently in the middle of an RFP – PSEPs have until November 15th to submit proposals to the workgroup. Part of their proposal must include a mechanism for obtaining long-term, sustainable funding. Other PSEP workgroups are

exploring alternative funding sources. Moses serves on the Federal Workgroup which is considering PRIA monies for funding and the use of EPA Consent Agreement fines to support the program. Dwinell asked how many dollars are currently available through the RFPs and Moses responded, \$1 million. Moses noted the draft letter (Attachment 1) asks SLAs for two things:

- 1) Establish state stakeholder teams to encourage / advocate dedicated PSEP funds.
- 2) Establish federal or state standards for re-certification.

Letters have been sent out to AAPCO and ASPCRO members for their support of PSEP and to submit proposals for the monies available. The draft letter addressed to Steve Dwinell, Chair of SFIREG, requests SFIREG assistance toward PSEP's funding initiative. Dwinell stated the letter should be directed to AAPCO and not SFIREG. Moses referenced a letter sent from Ed Crow to AAPCO (sent to AAPCO email distribution lists October 11th).

Moses asked how the Continuing Education issues should be addressed and Dwinell replied that the PSEP educators should discuss this directly with EPA. Moses referenced the CTAG 2011-2013 Accomplishment Report and based upon this report he would recommend the workgroup send their comments to CTAG. Comstock noted the training criteria are built into individual state certification plans and he questioned why the focus of the request is to EPA.

Moses affirmed he will ask the workgroup to contact CTAG for support of this component of the initiative as opposed to SFIREG. Moses felt momentum is being lost – that Extension needs to submit proposals. More will be known by the November 15th deadline.

The BOD conference call adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:



Grier Stayton,
Executive Secretary, AAPCO

Attachment 1
Draft Letter Soliciting SFIREG Support of PSEP Initiative

Dear Mr. Dwinell,

October 22, 2013

The National Stakeholder Team for Pesticide Safety Education Program (PSEP) Funding was formed in October of 2012. Its steering committee, 4 workgroups, and 66 member organizations are evaluating many ideas for financial and other types of support of land-grant university-based PSEPs. The ultimate goal is to expand educational opportunities for applicators and increase their competency in core principles of pesticide safety.

- 1) We request that SFIREG facilitate a dialogue between State Lead Agencies and EPA on the content of recertification classes. States vary widely in what they approve for re-certification of pesticide applicators. Some states have no PSE requirements in category recertification classes or requirements that are weak, vague, or not enforced. The result is that many applicators can go through recertification without any review of/update on core principles of pesticide safety.
- 2) We also request that SFIREG strongly encourage State Lead Agencies to provide leadership and assistance to non-robust PSEPs in establishing a state stakeholder team that includes industry members to advocate for dedicated PSEP funds through legislative change (e.g. registration fee increases directed specifically to PSEP, funds from enforcement actions). A non-robust PSEP is one that cannot make high quality, low cost core PSE available, in a variety of ways, to all applicators seeking certification, and cannot provide adequate train-the-trainer opportunities.

The National Stakeholder Team has created the [PSEP Improvement and Modernization Initiative \(PSEP IMI\)](#), a three-year national project with \$3MM in start-up funding focused on creating greater applicator access to core PSE training, and more self-sustainable PSEPs:

- 1) With SLA approval, PSEP IMI funds are available now for PSEPs to assist in evaluating proposed recertification classes, recertification policy evaluation/development, and/or recertification regulatory evaluation/development in 2014, 2015, and 2016. Guidance is available in the 2013 "[Pesticide Applicator Recertification: Addressing Both Core and Category Topics in Training](#)" white paper developed by the Certification and Training Assessment Group (CTAG).
- 2) With SLA support, PSEP IMI funds are available now to form a stakeholder team and implement a state plan to make the PSEP self-sustainable by 2016. The National Stakeholder Team is also ready to assist, where requested by the PSEP or SLA, in promoting the interest of state stakeholders; conversely, state stakeholders are welcome to request assistance with legislative change from the National Stakeholder Team. Guidance is available in the 2013 "[Legislative Action at the State Level to Support PSEP](#)" white paper developed by the State Workgroup of the National Stakeholder Team for PSEP Funding.

SFIREG's serious consideration of these requests for assistance is greatly appreciated.

Chuck Moses and Carol Somody, Co-Chairs, National Stakeholder Team for PSEP Funding
cc: Jeff Comstock Derrick Lastinger Don Renchie