

I. Draft Proposal for Support of PSEP

Somody gave a summary of information that has been considered in the development of the Non-Government Workgroup's proposal:

- Some very successful programs, for diverse reasons
- PSEP support type and level are diverse
- No good correlations between strength of PSEP and: state registration fee, # of certified applicators, importance of agriculture in the state, number of state fines, PSEP budget goals
- Diverse PSEP target goals
- Minimum certification/recertification standards lacking
- Grants often not friendly to PSEPs
- University, State Lead Agency, government, and industry support often lacking, or worse
- Revenue stream for PSEPs increasingly more erratic, PSEP positions are trending toward soft money
- Pesticide safety education not seen as critical by many, opposed by some, ignored by others (conservation groups, insurers)
- No one good solution short term, maybe not even long term
- Variable collaboration/sharing by PSEPs
- No cohesive PSEP program.

The Proposal:

- Goal of the proposal is a simple process of disbursement/reporting.
- Implementation of the proposal will not be easy – there will be a significant need for expert volunteer assistance (facilitation, etc.)
- Both strong and weak PSEPs will be eligible, for different challenges, but it is fully expected that some strong PSEPs won't (and some very weak PSEPs will lack the infrastructure to) apply for funds. In the latter cases, support will have to start with the SLA, university, and/or industry.
- Proposal is focused on creating sustainable programs rather than providing absolute dollars to fill a gap

Thostenson noted that the proposal assumes that PSEPs will try to become more self-sufficient.

Magee indicated that he had discussed the draft proposal with the chair of the CLA Registration Committee. For the May 21 presentation to that committee, it will be important to discuss EPA/USDA support of PSEP and how we got the \$1.5 MM price point. (NOTE: the proposal will also be presented to the RISE Regulatory Affairs Committee in early June, barring an earlier teleconference.)

Concerning EPA/USDA support, Somody noted that it is important not to confuse EPA funding of SLA's to funding for PSEP. In addition, even SLA's having Memorandums of Understanding with their PSEP often do not provide significant funds (though some provide manpower to help with training).

Concerning restricted gifts, Somody noted that ~50% states said "no or unsure" concerning their ability to accept a restricted gift with no overhead allowed. Black corrected this: ~50% indicated "no or unsure" for a restricted gift with match. Somody indicated that the proposal does not require a match. (Follow-up: there are 22, 6, and 7 states indicating yes, no, and unsure, respectively, for a restricted gift with no overhead allowed).

Somody would like to see one payout per year, in first quarter of the agreement year. This will also make disbursement easier for CLF.

Black asked if there were any concerns with forward funding; none were raised by those on the call.

Mulder said that the overhead amount should be specified, rather than indicating "low overhead", which is ambiguous. Somody added that the actual overhead allowed will be decided by the future Board. CLF, as a non-profit, can limit overhead and, of course, some universities could prohibit a PSEP application under those conditions. The Board would then have to decide how to proceed.

The proposed roles (below) for the Stakeholder team in the draft proposal were reviewed. None were removed; a fourth will be added – "Champions support for PSEP (letters, grant comments, etc.)"

1. PSEP Stakeholder Team Responsibilities:
*Finalizes Industry Funding Proposal for PSEP**
Establishes Board
Provides appropriate facilitators, where needed

*Now called "Proposal for Support of the Pesticide Safety Education Program", because it goes far beyond industry funding

Black noted that the previous schematic of process (drafted by Magee) should be included in slide set.

Mulder asked about carryover of funds. Somody cited an example where a PSEP is allowed very low carryover at the end of the year (with the rest going back to university). Concerning possibly carryover rules in the restricted gifts/contracts, it was recognized that carryover could be allowed for a "challenge" that has a 2 year workplan for achievement, but the final decision on these types of issues must be made by the Board. Second-year funding would be contingent on successful progress of current activities.

II. Workgroup Updates:

State Workgroup

Thostenson noted that this workgroup's report "Legislative Action at the State Level to Support PSEP" (focused on state pesticide registration fee increases directed to PSEP) is in progress and will be submitted to the State Workgroup this week for approval. A broader document on ways to collaborate at the state level to obtain support for PSEP is also in progress.

Other Workgroup

Black commented that critical support activities have continued, focused on the survey data and the draft Proposal for Support of PSEP.

Federal Workgroup

Fleeson indicated that this workgroup will finalize its spreadsheet of federal funding sources, current status, desired change, mechanism, timeframe, and action steps.

III. Next Steps for the Stakeholder Team

Although the original idea was for a 6-month team, Somody requested that the team remain intact, due to its important proposed roles in the Proposal for Support of PSEP. Meetings could be quarterly or as needed. Thostenson proposed that another Full Team meeting be held in June. Renchie and Fleeson agreed. Fleeson proposed mid-June, with some email correspondence in the interim re members who are willing to continue, etc.

Renchie proposed that an update/request for feedback be done at the Pesticide Applicator Certification and Training Workshop in August. Black suggested that draft proposals could be vetted by CTAG, AAPSE, and AAPCO. Somody recommended that feedback be requested from all PSEPs (some are not AAPSE members), particularly on the criteria, at the appropriate time.