

PPDC Farmworker & Clinician Work Group

Meeting Notes

April 22, 2021

Attendance

Name	Organization	Attended
Walter Alarcon	The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (CDC-NIOSH)	x
Ruben Arroyo	California Agricultural Commissioners and Sealers Association (CACASA)	x
Kaci Buhl	Oregon State University, Department of Environmental & Molecular Toxicology	x
Allison Crittenden	American Farm Bureau Federation (AFBF)	x
Ricardo Davalos	Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (FDACS)	
Africa Dórame-Avalos	Inter-Tribal Council of Arizona, Inc.	
Jeannie Economos	Farm Workers Association of Florida	x
Iris Figueroa	Farmworker Justice	x
Melanie Forti Rogenhofer	Association of Farmworker Opportunity Programs (AFOP)	x
Katie Karberg MD	Bayer Crop Science	x
Patsy Laird	Syngenta/ American Association of Pesticide Safety Educators (AAPSE)	x
Amy Liebman	Migrant Clinicians Network	
Dominica Navarro	Northwest Center for Alternatives to Pesticides	x
Mily Treviño-Sauceda (Co-Chair)	Alianza Nacional de Campesinas	x
Emma Torres	Campesinos Sin Fronteras	
Jennifer Weber	Pesticide Safety Education Program (PSEP) Maricopa County Cooperative Extension The University of Arizona	x

EPA Co-Chairs: Steve Schaible and Carolyn Schroeder

Other Attendees:

EPA Office of Pesticide Programs: Shannon Jewell, Aidan Black, Kelsi Grogan, Rachel Eberius, Stephanie Burkhardt, Thomas Lopiano, Jennifer Park, Ana Rivera- Lupiáñez, Emily Ryan

Agenda

1. Review last meeting notes and content to finalize – 10 mins
 - a. Check in on ground rules/use of TEAMS
 - b. Summarize points of discussion from last meeting
2. Revisit charge questions and tie into stakeholder intention in developing PRIA 4 reporting requirements– 20 mins
 - a. Brief summary of worker protection activities scope
 - b. Overarching Charge Question: How should EPA go about addressing new reporting requirements specified in PRIA 4 for PRIA set-asides for worker protection activities?
 - 1) How should EPA evaluate appropriateness & effectiveness of worker protection activities?
 - 2) How should EPA engage stakeholders in decisions to fund such worker protection activities?
 - 3) How and when should EPA reach out to stakeholders, including worker community-based organizations, in their development of analyses on appropriateness and effectiveness of such activities?
3. How do we want to address these charge questions? – 60 mins
 - a. What are the problems or themes we should focus on?
 - b. What are the causes of these problems?
 - c. What are the potential solutions?
 - d. Tools for getting ideas down on paper (root cause analysis, breakout groups)
 - 1) How do we turn discussions into possible solutions?
 - 2) How do we turn these solutions into recommendations for EPA?
4. May 12/13 PPDC meeting presentation - 20 mins
 - a. How (who) would the group like to draft slides?
 - b. Who will present?
 - c. Workgroup or subgroup (PPDC prep) meeting in May?
5. Action items /homework - 10 mins
 - a. Breakout groups to flesh out problem statements and root causes
 - b. Prep for PPDC presentation (Mily and others)
 - c. Farmworker guest meeting planing (Mily, Jeannie, and others)

Ground Rules and Previous Meeting Notes

- Went over the ground rules discussed at the last meeting (use cameras and hand raising feature preferred)
- Discussed the use of the Teams channel and continued plan to send out files via email as well as posted in Teams
- Reviewed and finalized the March 12 meeting notes; to be posted on the PPDC webpage

Scope of the Workgroup

- EPA provided a summary of the scope of worker protection activities that this workgroup is intended to address, i.e., focusing on the PRIA-funded grants and related activities with an emphasis on the agricultural sector (e.g. farmworkers)
- EPA acknowledged that there have been (and will be) a lot of ideas and problems identified but we wanted to focus the group back towards the goal of making recommendations to the EPA related to the charge questions.
- EPA explained the three current cooperative agreements that the Certification and Worker Protection Branch oversees related to worker protection that receive PRIA funds:
 - Pesticide Educational Resources Collaborative (PERC)
 - Pesticide Education Resources Collaborative – Medical (PERC-med)
 - Association of Farmworker Opportunity Programs (AFOP)
- Referred to the background/overview presentation from the February meeting that includes the charge questions and summaries of the cooperative agreements.

May 2021 PPDC Presentation (to report out on this workgroup's progress and direction)

- EPA provided background on the structure of the PPDC
 - Every 6 months the PPDC meets (October and upcoming in May)
 - May 12/13 are the meetings for the workgroup to report out to the rest of the PPDC workgroups
 - If the workgroup would like to make recommendations to the EPA, they need to be fielded by the entire PPDC and open to all the stakeholder opinions
- EPA informed the workgroup of what is requested for the May PPDC meeting
 - The Farmworker and Clinician Workgroup will present from 1:30-2:30 on Wednesday, May 12
 - The 1-hour time slot includes time for Q/As and discussion (ideally a 30-min. presentation with 30 mins. for discussion)
 - Shannon Jewell, PPDC coordinator, will send out invite to the workgroup
 - Asked for workgroup volunteers to make slides and presentations (their slides)
 - Need the members to take the lead on developing the slides - EPA prepared some draft skeleton slides if prefer to use as a starting point (includes roster, charge questions, and dates of meetings)
 - PPDC coordinator requests slides by May 6th
 - A facilitator is available to assist with the session;
 - EPA offered to set up a dry run with the facilitator;
 - workgroup expressed interest to facilitate the session themselves and to consider adding an external facilitator role.
- Several workgroup members volunteered to draft slides and/or present

- Mily, Kaci, Iris, Jeannie, and Amy to form a subgroup to prepare the presentation.
- The workgroup noted that there are no recommendations yet and that the presentation would be an update on discussions had so far and next steps.
- The subgroup coordinated times to meet and will finalize offline.
- The subgroup agreed to draft slides and share with the workgroup before finalizing.
- EPA offered support for subgroup preparing for the presentation
 - EPA will pass on a template PowerPoint that the workgroup can use if it would like
 - EPA offered the subgroup the opportunity to do a dry run with the facilitator hired for the meeting
 - The subgroup felt that it would be good to have a facilitator from within the workgroup to amplify the group's voice
- Some workgroup members expressed concerns about the PPDC needing to accept recommendations of this workgroup
 - EPA reiterated that the May PPDC meeting is to share updates and potentially engage in Q&A to further inform the PPDC audience
 - Workgroup members wanted to know what would happen if the PPDC did not support/approve the recommendations put forth by this workgroup
 - EPA clarified that even if the recommendations are not supported/approved by the PPDC, EPA (specifically the Certification and Worker Protection Branch) will have heard the recommendations and be able to use them to guide its work on relevant cooperative agreements

Charge Questions Review

- The charge questions were revisited, and background was provided on how organizations like Farmworker Justice were involved in negotiating the text of PRIA to make sure the funding is helping farmworkers.
 - Overarching Charge Question: How should EPA go about addressing new reporting requirements specified in PRIA 4 for PRIA set asides for worker protection activities? Specifically:
 - How should EPA evaluate appropriateness & effectiveness of worker protection activities?
 - How should EPA engage stakeholders in decisions to fund such worker protection activities?
 - How and when should EPA reach out to stakeholders, including worker community-based organizations, in their development of analyses on appropriateness and effectiveness of such activities?
- Some workgroup members expressed that they had trouble understanding the charge questions and a “plain language” alternative way of looking at the charge questions was shared with the workgroup. One alternative included answering these questions:
 - What are the outcomes of the PRIA-funded activities that EPA should track?
 - What are existing resources/data/tools for quantifying these outcomes?
 - Who are the stakeholders to reach out to for appropriateness/effectiveness?
 - Who are the audiences/voices we want to have included?
- EPA explained to the workgroup the intent behind the charge questions
 - EPA want wants to know what some indications are of the outcomes. That is, getting at whether the materials were effective.

- EPA has been reporting in terms of numbers of videos and content created, numbers of people trained, number of materials distributed, but this workgroup has expressed in its conversations the importance of looking at the impacts of the materials (instead of, for example, the quantification of the materials themselves)
 - Workgroup expressed that some quantitative information is valuable -such as recording numbers of people trained, number of people reached (e.g., numbers of website downloads of materials)
- EPA wants to know from the stakeholder community what/how it should be looking at to see if the materials it is funding are working?
 - What should EPA be considering?
 - How can it be measured over time?

Discussion: How to Address the Charge Questions?

- Workgroup members gave EPA feedback on measuring effectiveness of trainings/materials
 - Workgroup members emphasized that knowledge retention should be an area EPA should examine further
 - Workgroup members proposed potential measures of knowledge retention, including:
 - Following up after trainings to measure knowledge retention
 - Comparing it to how much they knew before/after the training
 - An example was provided regarding knowledge retention in farmworkers in Florida. An EPA approved training was compared to a AAPSE training for workers in Florida. A paper is coming out where the results and knowledge retention from the two trainings were assessed. They found that the knowledge retention was greater with the AAPSE training than with the EPA training.
 - Workgroup members suggested evaluation tools such as surveys and focus groups
 - The importance of the availability of training materials in multiple languages was emphasized
 - Potential methods for tracking who is accessing training materials was discussed
 - It was noted that simply tracking who is accessing training materials may not be granular enough information
 - Currently PERC-med can track which states training materials are accessed from, but more detailed information would be helpful.
 - The workgroup discussed other projects that have attempted to track who is accessing the training materials. These projects dedicated large portions of their budget to tracking information.
 - Workgroup members emphasized that information tracking and adding quantitative measures is often an expensive endeavor.
 - It was pointed out that this workgroup can express to EPA the importance of this data and lead to changes to the worker protection program or elsewhere
 - Is there potential to increase funding for these efforts?
 - EPA expressed that measuring qualitative outcomes are desirable too
 - The workgroup discussed trainings working within the cultural context of communities
 - Workgroup members questioned how training effectiveness in terms of cultural competency could be measured

- Data on effectiveness needs to have a mechanism for change
 - Needs to have a correction cycle
 - Check in and course correction on a regular basis would be needed
 - EPA noted that, in addition to quantifying the outcomes to see if they are effective, there are approaches/methods that could be a way that we can address the development of materials upfront. This would be an area more focused on best practices for developing training for your target audience (rather than just tracking effectiveness).
 - A workgroup member summarized this point by outlining best practices and methods to developing materials that get at the “appropriateness” part of the charge question.
 - EPA suggested the workgroup consider what parameters/language could be included in Request for Applications (RFAs) to clarify expectations and ensure grant applicants plan for addressing the appropriateness and effectiveness
 - Adding criteria to RFAs is one way to have clearer expectations to address some of the comments heard today – regarding appropriateness, measuring effectiveness and how that data is to be used.
- Impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on farmworker training were discussed
 - How many people got stuck in a situation where training was not provided and new employees did not get training as a result of the pandemic?
 - The workgroup discussed what the potential impact of COVID-19 was/is on training? How could this be measured?
 - Example provided - Florida for many years had the goal to train 500 people/year. When COVID-19 hit, they stopped the trainings for a time. Now they are doing smaller groups outdoors. Trainings used to be for 30-40 workers but now they’re limited to 6-10 workers.
 - The appropriateness/effectiveness of remote/virtual trainings was questioned, due to the target audience and potential lack of/limited access to internet/technology.
 - It was noted that trainings are still required, so skipping trainings is a violation of the WPS.
- A workgroup member suggested that the effectiveness of trainings is not the only factor (policies and culture are major factors)
 - Florida used to do HCP trainings but found that the training worked, but there were no long-term changes in the health clinic practices or procedures. This issue was partially attributable to clinic staff turnover rate and not evoking permanent change at the Medical director/admin level
 - Suggestion: provide training and then evaluation a few months later and ask what changed (policies or practices) for reporting, identifying and treating pesticide related illness
 - Example: the owner of the nurse said that the video was "required but not a big deal - pesticides aren't bad"
 - Need a culture shift in growers
 - Example: growers often tell the workers that pesticides are "medicine for the plants." This minimizes the seriousness of the training and the potential dangers of pesticides which may result in a lack of worker understanding.

- What tools or evaluations have been built into other EPA or other federal grants that could be a pathway that could be used?
 - EPA/OPP includes the required Grants Office criteria in RFAs and terms/conditions in grant agreements
 - In addition, OPP adds programmatic criteria and terms/conditions – and these can be refined/edited to some degree. EPA co-chairs expressed interest in exploring what language is being used by other federal programs for this group to consider
 - EPA asked if workgroup members have examples of grant agreement language to share with EPA
- It was mentioned that the workgroup should provide specific attention to H2A workers in terms of resources and training and health care
 - H2A workers are a vulnerable group that have a lot of obstacles, e.g., don't get training, don't know their rights
 - Need special attention to these workers
 - Very important that it be brought up because it was not part of the last meeting
 - Would be useful to have more data on H2A workers to bolster the issues with some statistics
- Several workgroup members acknowledged the potential challenges of having industry representatives on the PPDC in order to get “buy in”/support from the full PPDC membership.

Methods for Addressing the Charge Questions

- EPA emphasized the importance of getting ideas down on paper and having workgroup member participation/input
- EPA suggested the idea of doing a root cause analysis with a “fishbone” tool to help develop themes/areas of focus
 - Some workgroup members expressed their support for this idea
 - EPA emphasized that the workgroup could work on the fishbones independently in between the meetings.
 - Once you have the list of why the problems exist then you can use another tool to list out solutions based on their impact/difficulty addressing them
- Some workgroup members expressed that they didn't have the full scope of all the issues that would fit within EPA's purview and wanted to know if EPA could help direct them based on the conversation
 - Which areas is EPA more suited to address recommendations from this workgroup?
- The workgroup discussed the use of subgroups to focus on specific issues, but ultimately decided against it because multiple members wanted to be involved on all issues.
- There was a suggestion to sort the identified issues into those within EPA's wheelhouse/authority and those outside (but good context to be aware of). Discussion points:
 - Issues within EPA's purview could be sorted by the solutions to address them (e.g., regulatory, grants, enforcement), being mindful of the potential solutions and appropriate office.
 - This workgroup should focus on the charge questions
 - The issues that can't be addressed within the narrow scope of this workgroup could be considered for future PPDC workgroups/charge questions.

Future meeting planning

- Workgroup members expressed an interest in having a May meeting in addition to the PPDC meeting on May 12th
 - EPA agreed to follow up on scheduling this meeting after May 12
- Workgroup members agreed to focus the May and June meetings on issues and barriers related to farmworker training, such as:
 - Farmworker training: List issues/barriers related to:
 - Training access (H2A?)
 - Training effectiveness
 - Evaluating training outcomes
 - Enforcement of WPS
- Workgroup members agreed to focus the July and August meetings on issues and barriers related to clinician training, such as:
 - Clinician training: List issues/barriers related to:
 - Training access
 - Training effectiveness
 - Evaluating training outcomes
 - Enforcement of reporting requirements (state level)
- Workgroup brought up other issues as well, including:
 - Lack of bilingual labels
 - No national reporting system
 - Questions about the SENSOR program (incident surveillance)
 - It was discussed whether these would all be in the scope of this workgroup and the coordination this might require with other agencies and EPA offices

Action Items/Homework

- Prep for PPDC presentation (subgroup: Mily, Iris, Kaci, Jeannie, Amy, Patsy)
 - Will set up a meeting in the morning on the April 29th
 - Will send presentation to workgroup for review prior to May 6th
 - Will send presentation to OPP's Shannon Jewel by May 6th
- Farmworker guest meeting planing
 - No plans or action items
 - Discussed whether the group wanted to invite farmworkers to speak and lead it as a testimony and/or discussion based on their topics
 - EPA confirmed translators can be provided if given enough lead time